

The Blessed Hope!

“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;” –(Titus 2:13)

Diamond & Nugget #4

The words “falling away” are the Authorized Version rendering of **“apostasia”**. The verb form **“afistamai”** comes from its present middle tense of **“afisthmi”**, the root verb. The simple verb **“Jisthmi”** in its intransitive sense means “to stand,” the prefixed preposition means “off, away from,” and the compound verb, “to stand off from.” The word does not mean “to fall.” Greek has a word for that, **“piptw”**. **“Afisthmi”**, in its various uses, is reported by Thayer as follows: “to make stand-off, cause to withdraw, to stand off, stand aloof, to desert, to withdraw from one; in contexts where a defection from the faith is in view, it means “to fall away, become faithless.” The verb is rendered by the translators of the Authorized Version “to depart,” in Luke 2:37; Luke 4:13; Luke 13:27; Acts 12:10; Acts 15:38; Acts 19:9; Acts 22:29; 2nd Corinthians 12:8; 1st Timothy 4:1; 2nd Timothy 2:19; Hebrews 3:12. In Luke 8:13 it is translated “fall away,” in Acts 5:37, “drew away,” and in Acts 5:38, “refrain.”

Had they translated the word here instead of interpreting it, they would have rendered it by the word “departure.” The predominant translation of the verb form is “to depart,” also, that where it is translated “fall away,” the context adds the idea of “falling away” to the verb, which action is still a departure.

E. Schuyler English, in 1954 translated it as “departure” as the correct rendering of **“apostasia”** in this context, also informs us that the following translators understood the Greek word to mean “a departure” in this context:

1. The Wycliffe Bible (1384)
2. The Tyndale Bible (1526)
3. The Coverdale Bible (1535)
4. The Cranmer Bible (1539)
5. The Great Bible (1540)
6. The Breeches Bible (1576)
7. The Geneva Bible (1608)

But this is not so with the 1611 King James Bible. Why so is an honest question of great importance? This is the purpose of this “Diamond and Nugget.” To many it might

not seem a matter to be concerned about, but in the course of history the finer details are soon lost and forgotten. Yet seven English translations rendered it as “Departure!” “**Apostasia**” is used once more in the New Testament and is translated “to forsake” (AV), signifying a departure. The neuter noun “**apostasion**” in Matthew 5:31; Matthew 19:7; and Mark 10:4 is rendered by the Authorized Version, “divorcement,” which also signifies a departure, here, from antecedent relations.

“**Apostasia**” was used at times both in classical and Koine Greek in the sense of a defection, a revolt in a religious sense, a rebellion against God, and of the act of apostasy. Liddell and Scott in their classical lexicon give the above as the first definition of the word. Moulton and Milligan quote a papyrus fragment where the word means “a rebel.” But these are acquired meanings of the word gotten from the context in which it is used, not the original, basic, literal meaning, and should not be imposed upon the word when the context does not qualify the word by these meanings, as in the case of the Thessalonians passage, where the context in which “**apostasia**” is embedded does not refer to a defection from the truth but to the rapture of the church.

The fact that our word “**apostasy**” means a defection from the truth is entirely beside the point since we do not interpret Scripture upon the basis of a transliterated word to which a certain meaning has been given, but upon the basis of what the Greek word mean to the first century reader. The fact that Paul in 1st Timothy 4:1 uses this verb in the words “**some shall depart from the faith**” and finds it necessary to qualify its meaning by the phrase “**from the faith**” indicates that the word itself has no such connotation. The translators of the Authorized Version (KJV) did not translate the word, but offered their interpretation of it. They should have translated it and allowed the student to interpret it in its context.

With the translation of the word before us, the next step is to ascertain from the context that to which this departure refers. We note the presence of the Greek definite article (the) before **apostasia**, of which the translation takes no notice. A Greek word is definite in itself, and when the article is used the exegete must pay particular attention to it. “The basic function” of the article is to point out specific or individual identity. It does more than mark “the object as definitely conceived,” for a substantive in Greek is definite without the article.” This departure, whatever it is, is a particular one, one differentiated from all others. Another function of the article is “to denote previous reference.” Here the article points out an object the identity of which is defined by some previous reference made to it in the context.”

Paul in 2nd Thessalonians 2:1 has just spoken of the coming of the Lord. This coming is defined by the words “**our gathering together unto him,**” not as the Second Advent, but as the rapture. The Greek word rendered “and” can also be translated “even,” and the translation reads, “**the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, even our gathering together unto him.**” The article before **apostasia** defines that word by pointing to “**the**” gathering together “**unto him**” as that departure. This article determines the context which defines **apostasia**. The translators took the context of 2nd Thessalonians 2:10-12 as deciding the significance of the word, but they went too far afield, not

grasping the function of the definite article “the” preceding *apostasia* which points back to the rapture of 2nd Thessalonians 2:2, not ahead to the refusal to believe the truth of 2nd Thessalonians 2:10-12. The article is all-important here, as in many instances of its use in the Greek New Testament. In 1st Thessalonians 4:13-18, Paul had given these saints teaching on the rapture, and the Greek article here points to that which was well known to both the reader and the writer, which is another use of the Greek definite article. Thus, the “departure” of the church from earth to heaven must precede the great tribulation period. And so we have answered our questions again. It might be added that the reason why Paul merely speaks of a pretribulation rapture rather than a pre-seventieth week rapture is that he is addressing himself to the needs of the Thessalonian saints and is not explaining the particular place of the rapture in the prophetic program of God.

While this may sound far more technical to the reader it is the grammatically correct rendering of the Koine Greek which determines the intent of the author of the text. Since most of you are interested in the Rapture it begs being as accurate as possible within the grammatical and linguistics of the Greek text. The fact that this is an issue today is a consequence of very few pastors today have actually been required to study Greek at all. As an example of what I am referring to is the United Methodist Church. The denomination has 13 accredited theological seminaries, and none require their students to take Greek! Fewer than 10% of pastors have Biblical language skills. What I am going to share now will help to explain the background which led to the King James Bible replacing the word “departure” and replacing it with the word “falling away.”

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603) there had been a moderately tolerant working relationship between the Queen and the Protestant (Calvinist) reformers. The burghers of London and other English cities were for her an invaluable source of financial and other support for her rule - which was continually on the defensive against the likes of the "Catholic" defender Philip II of Spain.

Lacking an heir of her own, it became apparent that Tudor rule would eventually pass into the hands of the Stuarts of Scotland. Though Mary Stuart had been an ardent Catholic, her son James had been raised in Protestant (Calvinist) circles. In 1603 when Elizabeth died and indeed James came to the English throne as James I, it might have appeared that the going would henceforth be better for the Protestants in England.

In many ways James played to the Protestant reformers. He sponsored a new English translation of the Bible (the venerable King James version!) - which pleased the reformers. He also was himself strongly opposed to the re-opening of England to Catholicism - though mostly for political reasons than for reasons of religious conscience. James was a political centrist which necessitating the pleasing of both Protestants and Catholics.

But he also was a thorough royalist, strongly supportive of the "divine right of kings" theory of monarchy by which the claim was put forth that kings were responsible to God alone - and not to any human agency (such as Parliament). Unfortunately, he would

soon discover that Parliament had a mind of its own and expected the king to share rule with Parliament. Little by little tensions began to mount as the King and Parliament came into conflict.

Part of his difficulty would be over the matter of religion. He had during his earlier days as King of Scotland tired of the "upstart" behavior of the Scottish Calvinists. He was now prepared to rule directly over the Christian community in England - through an episcopal (hierarchical) system that linked all the Church of England to his personal rule. Thus was he much opposed to the idea of Presbyterian government (rule by leaders among the commoner or burgher class) at the local level. During his rule he actively discouraged the growth of independent or "separatist" communities and congregations - that is, local communities and churches that tried to work outside of the episcopal system. Overall, this was not a position all that different from Elizabeth's - except that he lacked her political insights and thus found himself in trouble on a number of fronts at the same time.

Cambridge University was at this time a hot-bed of protestant (Calvinist) and even separatist religious thinking in the early 1600s. Sons of prosperous English burghers came to this venerable institution to explore a world of widening economic, intellectual and spiritual opportunities.

At Cambridge University young men began to fashion a purist or "Puritan" vision of a newly emerging society, one operating directly under the sovereignty of God (making the place of the sovereign king a bit problematic). This was sort of a theory of "divine rights" of burghers - in counter to the "divine rights of kings" theory of the monarchy. These independent-minded scions of the burgher class came to see themselves not as essentially subjects of the English crown, but as subjects of God. According to their Protestant or Puritan mindset, individuals were to be led in living out their lives only by their own Scripturally disciplined minds and their own prayerfully cultivated Christian consciences. Nothing was to stand between themselves and their beloved God. Not even an English king!

It was not long before there was a clash between royalist and puritan views--especially separatist views. One such group of separatists led by a Cambridge-trained minister finally decided early on to leave England entirely and resettle themselves in Holland where they could live in a Christian community that operated in accordance with their Puritan principles. Some of this group would later (1620) make yet a second move as "pilgrims" in pursuit of their dream, this time to the new world - to Plymouth, Massachusetts.

When James died in 1625, his son Charles I (1625-1649) came to power. Generally, policies continued much as they had under James - except that the debate over royal power was now widening and deepening in intensity. On the continent the doctrine of royal absolutism (all power rightly belongs to the king) was being aggressively put forward in the French and Spanish courts. Inevitably the issue came to England.

Charles immediately upon his ascension to power brought an even more aggressively royalist and aristocratic (or "cavalier") mood into English politics. Charles favored the old landed families (many of whom had Catholic sympathies) over the new independent-minded burgher (urban middle class) families in his appointments to the royal court. In particular, he allowed himself to come under the almost controlling influence of Buckingham, one of his father's advisors. Buckingham was very much a royal absolutist - one who was inclined to make no compromises with the burgher interests of Parliament.

To gain the impact of this period that led to the King James Bible, I need to go back to a period of intense conflict with Rome. The greatest European power of all during this century was the Spanish monarchy of Charles I (1516-1556) and his son Philip II (1556-1598) - possessors of fantastic plundering of gold and silver from the mines of their lands in newly discovered America. These two monarchs made Spain the power of Europe during the 1500s.

Feeling more threatened by the Protestant movement than by the now-powerless Roman pope, both Charles and Philip took the Catholic Church under their wing as protectors and fought to restore it against the Reformation. And they might have succeeded had Charles not been so hard-pressed by the Muslim Turks who were trying to conquer his Christian holdings in Eastern Europe--and by the intrigue of other European kings who wanted Philip's power curbed.

The Protestant Reformation got a toe-hold in England when King Henry VIII (1509-1547) began to undermine the position of the Catholic Church in England in order to pursue his own personal political (and matrimonial!) goals. He had no particular theological argument with Catholicism, but in fact thought of himself as a kingly "Defender of the Faith." Henry's attack on the church had more to do with his desire to secure the legitimacy of his fluctuating matrimonial decisions - and to get his hands on the vast wealth in property, labor-services and monies of the Church.

Through a policy of unrelenting confiscation, Henry transferred vast sums of wealth from the Church to the royal coffers - or to his supporters, who were coming rapidly to reconstitute themselves as a new gentry or nobility of wealth. They were in close league with the King, buying up Church lands with their vast wealth earned through manufacturing, mining, commerce and banking - probably entirely for reasons of social status, though they put these new acquisitions to work as sources of new capital undergirding their ever-increasing wealth.

In any case, this new urban, capitalist nobility ultimately became supporters of the Reformation out of a fear that the restoration of the Church's position would have entailed the loss of their own. Also they probably understood how throwing countless numbers of monks and nuns out onto the labor market did not hurt their labor costs any not to mention that closing the abbeys likewise gave the poor no refuge except to go to work at a slave-wage rates for these new industrial-commercial elite.

From 1547 to 1558 England shifted back and forth in politics between the Protestants and the Catholics. Under Edward VI (1547-1553), England veered toward Protestantism. Under "Bloody" Mary I (1553-1558), the Catholics seemed to be in ascendancy. Indeed, during the brief reign of Mary, who married Spanish King Philip II, it even appeared that England might be brought into the Habsburg holdings as a new Spanish-dominated province. The English were outraged.

Elizabeth I (1558-1603) carefully plotted a "middle" course largely designed to keep herself secure in her position as queen. During the first part of her reign she succeeded through diplomacy in neutralizing the influences of the pope and Catholic Spain. At home her natural sympathies were with the Protestant position - though not with the more radical "Puritans" among them. She also rebuilt the alliance her father had established with the newly emergent commercial/industrial lords - encouraging an industrial revolution during her reign.

But during the second part of her reign, Catholic hostilities both at home and abroad began to mount. Catholic Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland--who also had good claim to the throne of England - became a rallying symbol for English Catholicism, especially after Mary was forced to resettle in England after a Protestant revolt threw her out of Scotland in 1568. By the 1580's there were continual Catholic plots to assassinate Elizabeth - brought under some degree of control only after Mary's beheading in 1587.

Meanwhile Elizabeth's efforts to help the Protestant rebellion in the Netherlands against Catholic Spain's rule there, plus the authorizing of English privateers to attack Spanish shipping, only pushed Spain beyond the possibilities of any diplomatic solution. In 1588 Spain sent its "invincible Armada" to punish England - only to have the Spanish navy destroyed by the English navy, and by a series of natural disasters which greeted the Spanish survivors as they tried to make their way home. This by no means ended the Spanish danger - which only seemed to enlarge across the channel as Philip persisted in his efforts to manipulate religious policies and royal succession in neighboring France.

In her last year's Elizabeth faced problems at home that taxed her powers: drought and poverty in the English countryside; an empty royal treasury and a huge tax burden placed on her people brought on by her diplomatic/military efforts to keep England independent; a more aggressive Protestantism which looked to Parliament rather than the monarchy as the real power in English politics.

Keep in mind the Jesuits came into existence in the early 1540 period, as a counter-Reformation force to destroy the Protestant Reformation of Martin Luther in 1517. When Luther's books were banned at Cambridge, revolutionary-thinking students such as William Tyndale, a priest, theologian and gifted linguist, fled the university. Sympathetic to Luther's views, Tyndale intended to translate the Bible into English from fresh sources following in the tradition of Erasmus. When denied approval by English Catholic Church authorities, he found financial support for his translation project through

well-known Lollard Humphrey Monmouth, a wealthy cloth merchant, who provided him with food and shelter.

To complete his work, Tyndale had to go into hiding. His life was in constant danger. To get his Bible printed, he had to stay one step ahead of authorities working to stop him. In 1526, Tyndale's New Testament was finally printed in Worms, Germany northwest of Frankfurt on the Rhine River. Smuggled into England, the beautiful text, once in the hands of the people, became a sensational success. Encouraged by such glowing success, Tyndale produced corrected versions with his New Testament and began working on the Old Testament.

Authorities could not short-circuit the demand for Tyndale's work. They resorted to buying copies simply to burn them. The battle over the Bible became very bloody. Many, including Tyndale, who was betrayed by a friend, lost their lives fighting for the right to have the Bible in their native tongue. Tyndale was never able to finish the Old Testament. The calculated ecclesiastical destruction of Tyndale's first translation of the New Testament was so thorough that only three copies survive today. One is housed in the British National Library.

Eventually the Bible war in England became tangled with Henry VIII's battle to divorce his first wife. The severing of the English church from Rome had little to do with the Protestant Reformation fomenting in Europe. Henry wanted out of his marriage so he could produce a legal heir to the throne. If it meant that he become the head of the English church, so be it.

After winning his fight with Rome, the proud king soon realized that he faced an incredible dilemma. The nation was bitterly divided between Catholics and Protestants. He recognized that even the newly established English church was splintering into religious factions. By 1530, it had become clear that the English clergy could not prevent the spread of Tyndale's translations and Luther's tracts. Henry's leading counselors urged him to produce a new official Bible to attempt to reunite the nation.

Henry laid the task at the feet of the English bishops. Yet because of deep disagreement with the project, the bishops delayed efforts to start work on a new translation. By 1535 nothing had been done. So began a history of back-and-forth wrangling over the Bible within the English church. Multiple versions of the English Bible were produced by different feuding factions. Several translations incorporated glosses espousing the doctrinal viewpoints of the translators. So ensued a new kind of war, not one of Bible translation but one of Bible interpretation.

By the time James I (James VI of Scotland) came to the throne, two bloodstained centuries of war over Bible translation had taken place. As James ascended the throne, essentially that war was over. People were free to own and read the Scriptures. Now came the need to strip the English Bible of all interpretation. He especially wanted to get rid of the very popular translation known as the Geneva Bible. Full of Calvinist teaching, it stood contrary to his belief in absolute monarchy.

At the surprising suggestion of Puritan leaders (dyed-in-the-wool Calvinists), James personally convened the Hampton Court Conference on Jan. 1, 1604, to officially start the massive translation project. He set strict translation guidelines to ensure translator objectivity and that only the purest translation of the Scriptures was brought into English.

So James ordered a new translation. It was to be accurate and true to the originals. He appointed fifty of the nation's finest language scholars and approved rules for carefully checking the results.

James also wanted a popular translation. He insisted that the translation use old familiar terms and names and be readable in the idioms of the day.

It was made clear that James wanted no biased notes affixed to the translation, as in the Geneva Bible. Rule #6 stated: "No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek Words." Also, James was looking for a single translation that the whole nation could rely on "To be read in the whole Church," as he phrased it. He decreed that special pains be "taken for a uniform translation, which should be done by the best learned men in both Universities, then reviewed by the Bishops, presented to the Privy Council, lastly ratified by the Royal authority...."

The Bible was divided among six teams of scholars; two each were set up at Westminster, Oxford and Cambridge Universities. Not only did they use the best Hebrew and Greek texts, they took advantage of every available version to compare the variant readings. The basic text was completed in four years. Then the translation was subjected to two additional years of further checking. Then, to ensure the very best translation, in 1610 another team, two men from each of the original six teams, completed a final check.

Consider how preposterous it was to have a team of elite scholars writing for a largely illiterate public. We can only stand back in amazement at their achievement. Think how ludicrous the translation mandate was. It called for a product commissioned to reinforce a clear-cut royal political agenda, to be done by elite scholarly committees, reviewed by a self-serving bureaucracy, with ultimate approval reserved to an absolutist monarch. The final product was intended primarily for public and popular consumption. It was to be read orally - intended more to be heard in public than to be read in private.

How many works of literary genius do you recall that were done by committee? How many premier scholars are you aware of who can write for the ear? Not to mention in a context intended to evoke a spirit of worship!

How optimistic would you have been that a team of about 50 could handle the technical and linguistic challenges while at the same time producing a work with a cadence, rhythm, imagery, and structure that would resonate so deeply with the popular consciousness that it shaped a civilization and culture in a unique way? However,

history shows that they were successful in creating a translation that not only met the needs of their generation but also succeeded in influencing the lives of generations to come.

The 1611 King James Bible did not escape the tampering of its opposition. For example, it is of great significance that all these Satanic symbols were originally placed on the original 1611 KJV Bible. The Rosicrucians who created these symbols really and truly believed that they were creating "centers of occult power" which would throb with demonic power 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Freemasonry watchers believe that Sir Francis Bacon and King James firmly intended to create a Rosicrucian Bible, filled with occult symbols which were "throbbing with Satanic power", designed to move the entire English-speaking peoples of the world into the "Mystic Christianity" called Rosicrucianism.

And, of course, Pilgrim and Puritan leaders of the day knew this belief, because they were "aware of Satan's devices"; within seconds, these genuine Christian leaders would have recognized these symbols, knew of the importance placed on them by Satanists and were able to quickly reject the original 1611 King James Version of the Bible as a "wicked Bible from that wicked King!"

The King then promptly gave that manuscript to Sir Francis Bacon, who possessed it for about a year, until 1611, at which time when he handed the manuscript back to the King, who then promptly sent it to his official printer.

Historians have debated why King James felt that Bacon needed this manuscript for one year and what Bacon did with it or to the manuscript while he had it for that length of time. Now, however, we feel confident that Bacon used this time to plan how to coordinate the text with all these symbols -- page after page after page!



These Masonic handshakes occur in the Genealogies Section. In many cases, on an entire page of a Family Tree, the handshake will occur way down the page, and sometimes between only two people. This was the case with King David. The Antichrist traces his lineage back to King David, I included such a genealogical chart in my article, ***“The Satanic Talmud and the Synagogue of Satan – Part 6”***. This is extensively illustrated in Laurence Gardiner’s ***“Bloodlines of the Holy Grail”***.

The first Masonic handshake (above) is shown between the Adam and Eve headpieces. The thumb making that distinctive grasp of the first knuckle of the other hand. Down below, between Adah - Lamech - Zillah, are more distinctive Masonic handshakes.

The Masonic handshake up at the very top between the Adam and Eve headpieces means that the New World Order will be established, and governed, by Masonry. We know this is the planned future of Paradise on Earth which Sir Francis Bacon set as his ultimate goal. Suffice it to note there that the New World is planned to be governed by Freemasonry. Sir Francis Bacon is considered the founder of the Rosicrucians, as well as the modern form of Freemasonry.

These pagan Rosicrucians and Freemasons led by Sir Francis Bacon had their hands all over the original 1611 King James Bible. They took perfectly good text and added page after page after page of Rosicrucian artwork, some of which tells a hidden story, while others are just symbols. These Masonic handshakes are very real and very telling, for they tell the story that Francis Bacon and King James conspired to produce a Rosicrucian masterpiece when they published this Bible.

Likely, Bacon, James, and the Knights of the Helmet intended that this KJV would be the perfect complement to the Shakespearean plays in popularizing the new Elizabethan English with the common people. In the opinion of one Masonic author, Bacon and the Knights of the Helmet considered how to popularize this new English amongst the people and concluded that two different tools were required:

- 1) Arts and Entertainment -- Hence the Shakespearean plays;
- 2) The "People's Holy Book" -- hence the King James Version of the Bible

However, Sir Francis Bacon and King James were in for a rude shock, as their new Bible was soundly rejected by the religious leaders of the day. Both Pilgrim and Puritan leaders immediately rejected the KJV, based upon the Satanic symbolism they instantly recognized. Even Anglican pastors - who are supposed to take orders from Headquarters without murmur, complaint, or resistance - rebelled, refusing to take out their beloved Geneva Bibles and put in the new King James Bibles, filled with all these Satanic symbols.

In about 1650, another printing run was undertaken, and this time, all these Satanic symbols were taken out. All coding was likewise removed. At this point, the KJV was fine - it was the Bible we know and love and trust today. Gradually, over the next 100 years, the natural superiority and beauty of Elizabethan English took over and gradually forced the Geneva Bible into obscurity.

The Holy Spirit prevented these Rosicrucians from tinkering with the text, He prevented Francis Bacon and King James from triumphantly popularizing a Rosicrucian Bible, and He preserved His integrity in the minds and hearts of true believers of that time. But,

can you now begin to see how Pilgrim leaders so quickly rejected the new King James Bible?

Although this “Diamond and Nugget” is longer than I wanted them to be, it is revealing in how the dynamics of the late 16th century played into the publishing of the King James Bible. I have shown how the King James Bible was influenced by the various religious voices of the day, the struggle for purity and convenience. Few people outside the world of English history know anything about how Sir Francis Bacon inserted Satanic symbols in the original King James Bible during the year King James allowed Bacon to possess the text and upon return was rushed into print.

We have reason to believe Sir Francis Bacon did more than simply insert pages of Rosicrucian and Freemasonry art work into the King James Bible. *‘The Religious Foundations of Francis Bacon's Thought’* (Volume 1) (The Eric Voegelin Institute Series in Political Philosophy), January 10, 2006 by Stephen McKnight. McKnight provides close textual analyses of eight of Bacon’s texts in order to establish the religious themes and motifs that pervade his writings from 1603 to 1626. Such analysis is necessary because there are so many contradictory interpretations of the same key texts and because prevailing scholarship often ignores Bacon’s religious ideas or dismisses them as part of the cultural images that Bacon supposedly manipulated to conceal or disguise his modern, secular, materialistic, and rationalistic views. Was Sir Francis Bacon responsible for the sudden change to replace “Departure” with the expression “Falling Away” found in 2nd Thessalonians 2:3? It certainly should not be ruled out of the picture; however, there is another possibility that has not been discussed. Personal papers and correspondence of Sir Francis Bacon are tightly controlled by the Crown and Freemasonry’s highest order, the Order of the Garter.

During the last fifty years of the 16th century, Rome made repeated efforts to influence all Protestant writings, such as Luther’s tracts, and the English Bibles in print. The Jesuits introduced a Jesuit Bible in 1582, printed in English. The effort of the Jesuit Bible was to draw the English people back to a Bible by Rome. All of the New World belonged to Spain, she ruled the seas and dominated Europe. The Spanish sovereign and the Papacy united in their efforts to send into England bands of highly trained Jesuits to sow dissent and disharmony. By these, plot after plot was hatched to place a Catholic ruler on England’s throne.

The Jesuits commissioned two of its best writers to discredit Luther’s claims that Pope Leo X was the Antichrist. One writer, Luis De Alcazar promoted the idea that all the prophecies had been fulfilled by 70 A.D. and that the Antichrist came centuries before (known as Preterism).

Francisco Ribera, the second writer promoted the idea that prophecy was way into the future (Futurism); this was their way to deflect accusations and to protect the resident Pope Leo X. Pope Leo X was born with a silver spoon in his mouth (December 11, 1475 – December 1, 1521), born Giovanni di Lorenzo de' Medici, he was pope and ruler of the Papal States from March 9, 1513 to his death on December 1, 1521. Born into the

prominent political and banking Medici family of Florence, Italy, Giovanni was the second son of Lorenzo de' Medici, ruler of the Florentine Republic, and was elevated to cardinal in 1489.

When I was a seminary graduate student, I would often walk the stacks of the seminary libraries thousands of books, taking mental notes of topics and subjects of books long out-of-print and forgotten. Many seminaries maintain rare collections that are kept under lock and key, away from the open stacks, usually limited access to Doctoral students doing thesis research or faculty writing theological books. There are indications that significant influence by the Jesuits was underway on the translators of the KJV Bible. The various factions were looking for ways to bring unity between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church.

This practice was really nothing new, it is referred to as 'consultation'. In large translating committees for new translations committees will draw on the expertise in different fields of expertise or areas of the Bible. For example Jesuit Cardinal Carlo Montini from Rome's Pontifical Institute played a major role in the translation of the New International Version (NIV). We know from the notes where Jesuit Cardinal Carlo Montini was bringing to bear his influence in producing a Bible that both Protestants and Catholics could live with in harmony, as part of Vatican II, which was an effort in Jesuit ecumenism.



From my library research in eleven years of seminary academics, I can say with 90% confidence that the Jesuits of the day were influential in getting the KJV translators to substitute the use of the phrase "**Falling Away**" rather than the word "**Departure**", which seven previous English Bibles translated "**apostasia**". To confirm that belief today, would require one to travel to the UK and request special permission to access the personal papers, writings, and notes of the original members that did the bulk of the

translation work to achieve the wishes of King James. I say 90% confidence, allowing a 10% chance or possibility that Sir Francis Bacon was involved. Obtaining such special dispensation from Westminster, Oxford, and Cambridge is about as hard as it is to gain access to the Vatican archives or the Gold Bullion Depository at Fort Knox, KY.

Blessings

PastorBob, EvanTeachr@aol.com
www.pastorbobreid.com