

Scriptures and Doctrine :: what bibletranslation to get?

what bibletranslation to get? - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 5:59

id like to say this first because of what i have seen become of other threads on similar subjects, that we think of eternity before writing replies and opinions.

now me as a foreigner, see there are many translations in English, i have a KJV that i read from other then my first langu age. With this i use the Strong's concordance and the MH commentary, for deeper study. Now i do know a little but not s o much about the different translations, except that they are from different "strings" ??? of manuscripts, i also know there are many different opinions about them, but what i do want to know what are "good" about these translations and what a re "less good" about them, and what manuscripts they came from and how of a accurate translation it is.

i have heard good things about these translations

KJV

NKJV

ESV

NASB

and

moffats bible

.....

what id like to know is, im going to buy another version from the KJV, what version would most likely benefit me to study from along with the KJV?and why do you believe so? the reason i have the KJV is we don't have one singular version in Swedish from the same manuscripts as the kjv,and I'm beginning to see there are some differences to great to be overlo oked, missing verses and other important things

this is an hard question to answer i think because this is highly personal, but i hope you understand what I'm getting at w hen my English fall short of expressing everything in a better way

i was thinking of getting the ESV or the Nasb or Nkjb :-) what do you all recommend and why...

God bless you all

Christian

Re: what bibletranslation to get?, on: 2007/5/8 6:56

The Textus Receptus or The Received Text is the only manuscript that is trustworthy. Krispy Kritter can offer so much more info on this subject, I am sure he'll put in his offering.

However, the bibles that are translated from the Textus Receptus is the KJV, Tyndales New Testament, and the Geneva Bible with the Reformers notes.

My recommendation would be the Geneva Bible, and you can check it out here:
(<https://www.tollelegepress.com/store/product.php?productid58>) Geneva Bible

Re: what bible translation to get? - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 10:41

i just read some articles on bible translations, its all.... whats the word I'm looking fore...

i don't know, but i don't know if all Ive read is true, everyone seems to "defend" their own views on the matter, but my own conclusion is KJV is the one to prefer...

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 10:48

KJV brutha...

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 11:01

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:
KJV brutha...

Krispy

im working my way thgough the thread 'Call me King James Only! But only if....'

quite a lot to read

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2007/5/8 11:09

Quote:

-----i was thinking of getting the ESV or the Nasb or Nkjv what do you all recommend and why...

Brother,

I primarily use the KJV translation of the bible, but I do use the NIV paraphrase at times. They are based of different manuscripts and the NIV is not a literal translation but rather paraphrase. But God blesses and uses this method for me to glean things that I pass by on the KJV.

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 11:20

Quote:

-----'Call me King James Only! But only if....'

That was a **great** thread. I recommend that one to anyone who has questions about translations.

Krispy

Re: what bibletranslation to get? - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/5/8 11:37

NIV is great for studying the bible, although I personally prefer the NASB. I've recently gotten a few copies of the KJV and am currently reading it for the first time... some of the poetry of the bible is lost on the NIV and NASB.

Re: - posted by grace_2008 (), on: 2007/5/8 11:37

I prefer the King James 1611. It's the earliest translation that was ordered by King James himself. It's one of the first translations from the Hebrew Old Testament and Greek New Testament into English.

I have taken two languages in school and I know from experience that when you translate something from one language to another, you lose some of the real meaning and wording every time. It's almost impossible to translate something from one language to another and get the exact same accurate meaning and wording in anything. The earliest translation you can get into English is probably the best. It contains more of the actual meaning of the original Word of God.

You can go to www.usa-bibles.com and they will send you a free KJV Bible if you don't have one. Also, www.thekjvstore.com is a good internet website where they sell items that are only from the KJV 1611. They sell Bibles and a variety of good Christian stuff.

<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kjvdefns.htm>

This website leads you to a better explanation of why to use the KJV.

P.S. I'm not trying to advertise, just trying to help someone out. LOL!

:-P :-P

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 12:13

i do own a kjv, i mostly use this one for study and so on, I'm happy with it. I do understand almost everything, its some old words but i just look in my own language and get the meaning or "crack" the dictionary's to look it up. But the thing I'm looking for is closer to what Greg said

Quote:

But God blesses and uses this method for me to glean things that I pass by on the KJV.

Re: what bibletranslation to get? - posted by tjservant (), on: 2007/5/8 12:40

NASB

my 2 cents

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 12:56

Quote:

-----... some of the poetry of the bible is lost on the NIV and NASB.

Not to mention accuracy, among other things.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 13:00

Quote:
-----I have taken two languages in school and I know from experience that when you translate something from one language to another, you lose some of the real meaning and wording every time. It's almost impossible to translate something from one language to another and get the exact same accurate meaning and wording in anything. The earliest translation you can get into English is probably the best. It contains more of the actual meaning of the original Word of God.

What you say is true, however, **ALL** of the modern versions (NIV, NASB, LVT, ESV, etc) are translated from a completely different school of manuscripts from that of the Reformers Bibles, Tyndale, KJV. So you're not even reading the same thing when you read a KJV side by side with any modern version.

It's almost like reading a Spanish translation of a John Grisham novel, and a Spanish translation of a Frank Peretti novel, and calling it the same story. (that's a drastic analogy, but you can understand what I am saying)

That's the heart of the issue. They are not the same Bibles... at all.

Secondly, I believe that God has preserved His Word. This means I do not necessarily believe that whole meanings were lost. I believe God had His hand on the translation into English in 1611 (and before that as well). Not in the same way He did when it was first written, meaning I don't believe the translators of the KJV were inspired as Paul was inspired, but I believe completely that God was in control.

When you have a known lesbian on the translation committee of the NIV (she did not keep it a secret from the others on the committee... this is a well documented fact), I find it hard to believe God was in control.

By the way, I believe there are many other reasons why the NIV and other modern versions should be rejected... but on a moral level, this is one reason that should be taken seriously, but is usually downplayed... as you will see on this thread shortly.

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 13:08

I'm halfway through the
(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id12785&forum35&start80&viewmodeflat&order0) Call me King James Only! But only if.... thread, and I must say it is really "eyeopening" and honestly a little scary :-o .i recommend all to read it, great contribution by Krispy a philologist, that pdf from him really helped the 'thee' and 'thou',

what also confuses me is people who say they don't understand it....when English is their native language?

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 13:22

By the way, one argument meant to shoot down people like me is "Well... the even the translators of the KJV recommend in the front of the KJV that the reader should consult other translations." Yes they did. However, at that time they did **not** mean "other versions" based on "other manuscripts". They meant other translations of the Textus Receptus, which is good advice. But they had no intention of that meaning the NIV, NASB, etc.

At that time the manuscripts used (not all of them were known of at that time) for the modern versions were used to translate the Catholic "bible"... and the KJV translators would never have recommended what they considered "Catholic" manuscripts to their readers.

So someone says "well, the apographa (spell check, please) was in the 1611"... yes, it was. But only as historical, but not as scripture. The translators did not consider it to be inspired scripture. That's why it was separate from the OT and NT, and not intermingled.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 13:28

Quote:

-----what also confuses me is people who say they don't understand it....when English is their native language?

The only people I have ever met who speak english as a mother tongue, and claim not to be able to understand the KJV are people who dont read the Bible on a regular basis, and have never read it all the way thru.

I dont mean to be hard on folks, but thats been my experience.

I can understand if english is your second language... in which case I recommend both the KJV, and a translation in your language based on the Textus Receptus, and the same Hebrew. However, a century ago the Bible was **central** in teaching people english... both english speaking children in schools, as well as immigrants. But now we say "oh, they'll never understand the KJV." Thats a lie. A lie perpetrated by publishing companies.

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 13:31

one thing i dont really get is....why do they consider thease other manuscripts "better" then the TR manuscripts?

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 13:35

Quote:

-----one thing i dont really get is....why do they consider thease other manuscripts "better" then the TR manuscripts?

Thats the million dollar question. Not only do the two main manuscripts comprising the "Alexandrian Text" (modern versions) contradict the Textus Receptus in many areas... they also contradict each other.

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 13:39

in Swedish we have a new testament based upon TR, recently come out, the only complete bible is from the 1700...and since the Swedish language "evolved" more then the English i honestly don't get anything from that version, the other versions are all from the other modern ones.... and the latest "official" version was partly translated by non believers, so thats why i study from the KJV in English, its no problem with the words, all you need is Strong's dictionary and concordance, they really is great help to understand.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/8 13:46

The KJV, the NASB, and the ESV are my preferred translations.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/8 13:54

Hi Compliments...

Quote:

-----The Textus Receptus or The Received Text is the only manuscript that is trustworthy.

This is NOT a fact. After much study in the matter, there are many of us that do NOT believe that the *Textus Receptus* is the most trustworthy -- let alone the ONLY trustworthy manuscript.

I suggest that every individual study the matter on their own and do their best to avoid the enormous amounts of biased, secondhand sources in the matter of Bible translation.

That being said...

I own a KJV, NKJV, NASB, RSV, and NIV amongst several other that I hold onto for occasional reference. The two versions that I frequent the most are the KJV and the NIV. I believe that the KJV is a faithful translation from the *Textus Receptus* and the NIV is a faithful translation from the other sources. I will not "spit" on a translation or version in which I currently feel is inadequate -- less I find that I am spitting upon true words of God.

:-)

*EDIT...

- You may want to read the prefaces of each translation that you are considering. They are quite telling.

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2007/5/8 14:18

Quote:

-----*Hmmhmm wrote:*

one thing i dont really get is....why do they consider thease other manuscripts "better" then the TR manuscripts?

Possibly because these other manuscripts are older.

Since the *Textus Receptus* is based on a set of newer manuscripts the TR is regarded outdated. (According to my teacher)

Now I know there is:

Textus Receptus

Nestle-Aland

Wescott-Hort

Now I did notice the textual differences between a TR based Bible such as the KJV/SV (Dutch bible) and the NBG which is a Nestle-Aland based bible. These differences are so far I can tell words (and even a thing as a sentence) that are missing in certain verses.

A possible explanation might be that early scholars added these words to the original letters or gospel letters. A possible example is Matthew 5:44 where the NIV (don't know what the NIV is based on, I only know its not TR :D) only has:

“*But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you,*”

While the KJV has this line:

“*But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;*”

You can clearly see what is missing, now in this case scholars might have added this stuff to make it more clear.

But what is also possible is that the base text did contain all this stuff which is missing from Nestle-Aland and other manuscript sets. In that case the Word of God is degenerated and has been subtracted from.

Well this is what I know so far, please correct me if I made some (severe) errors.

I see that there are also some more replies now... still I'll post this message to be 'sharpened' by other iron. :-)

Also added 'according to my teacher'.

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 14:22

Quote:

-----I suggest that every individual study the matter on their own and do their best to avoid the enormous amounts of biased, secondhand sources in the matter of Bible translation.

This much I do agree with.

Let me also say that the differences between the TR and the Alex are so vast that they both can not be trustworthy. Either one is, or neither are. If neither are, then God decided somewhere along the line to prevent us from having His true Word.

Personally, I don't think He did that. And I don't think He preserved His Word thru the wicked Catholic Church.

But I won't separate from true believers who think differently from me. I love ccchhhrrriiisss, and others who disagree with me, and I'm proud to call them my brothers... even at the risk of being called a "compromiser". I've been called worse by scarier men... lol.

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 14:28

well I'm comparing the KJV alot to my Swedish version, that is from Alexandrian text, much is missing, someone said to me about 8 % is missing from TR, don't know if that is accurate but i have seen entire verses just gone.... or added if you look from the other side, but when looking at it as missing, its often very to me seemingly important parts that are missing.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/8 14:31

Hi Krispy...

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

The only people I have ever met who speak english as a mother tongue, and claim not to be able to understand the KJV are people who don't read the Bible on a regular basis, and have never read it all the way thru.

I don't mean to be hard on folks, but thats been my experience.

I can understand if english is your second language... in which case I recommend both the KJV, and a translation in your language based on the Textus Receptus, and the same Hebrew. However, a century ago the Bible was **central** in teaching people english... both english speaking children in schools, as well as immigrants. But now we say "oh, they'll never understand the KJV." Thats a lie. A lie perpetrated by publishing companies.

I really don't believe that it is a "lie." I know many highly educated believers who have a difficult time with the early 17th Century English of the King James Version. They are not making excuses for reading a different version. However, you are correct that they -- LIKE 95% OF ALL ENGLISH SPEAKERS -- are not fluent in the 17th Century grammar and usage of the KJV.

English is my wife's second language, yet she has a strong foundation in English (she has earned a Masters Degree). However, she finds the language of the KJV difficult to comprehend without a plethora of study aids -- which is completely against the desires of the translators (as is included in the original preface of the KJV). As familiar as I am with the KJV, I do not speak or "act out" such language in my everyday life. Consequentially, I sometimes must further reference a passage in a dictionary or lexicon in order to obtain an adequate explanation of the passage in question.

When I lead a person to the Lord, I often encourage them to read the NIV if they have difficulty with the KJV. I explain that there is a lot of debate about which version is best, but I tell them that it is important for them to be grounded in the Word. Over time, I explain, they will probably want to become familiar with the KJV. This isn't due to the unquestionable "superiority" of the version -- but because of the vast amounts of study aids available, as well as the idea of translative comparison.

:-)

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 14:31

Quote:

-----Possibly because these other manuscripts are older.

This is absolutely not true. The only "proof" that this is true is because the Catholic Church says it's true. There is no real evidence to substantiate this claim.

If you want to believe the Catholic Church... go ahead.

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 14:33

so far im going with TR best available translation is the KJV.

and from the other text it is the NIV or what say ye?

:-)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/8 14:45

Hi hmmhmm...

Quote:

hmmhmm wrote:

so far im going with TR best available translation is the KJV.

and from the other text it is the NIV or what say ye?

As far as English is concerned, I would say that this is at least a fair assessment.

I would encourage you to study this topic extensively. In my research, I actually went to the translators of the NIV with the rumors and slanderous statements that have been made. I also contacted several "experts" in the field of ancient translation in order to obtain their input. I presented them with questions and accusations from other works, and listened to their answers. I also researched the origins of the translations -- but not singularly from the obviously biased sources (on either side of the discussion).

Such research might take a little time, but it is well worth the effort (in my opinion). You might not come to the same conclusion as I did, but I imagine you will "see through" much of the "neo-ecclesiastic myths" about the translations.

Remember, both the *Textus Receptus* and *Alexandrian Texts* (amongst the others) were translated from pre-existing texts. The root question isn't about the English texts. The root, in my opinion, is about the sources. The sources are the reason for variations in the versions' text. Yet I have NEVER found a clear and concrete reason to believe that one source is altogether superior to the other.

:-)

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2007/5/8 14:57

Quote:

-----Krispy wrote:

This is absolutely not true. The only "proof" that this is true is because the Catholic Church says it's true. There is no real evidence to substantiate this claim.

If you want to believe the Catholic Church... go ahead.

I did not know the only 'proof' is by catholics claiming this is true.. and if you state it this way. No, I don't want to believe the Catholic Church, still this remark doesn't help me much. :-(
I'd still like to know why there are these differences between the TR and the other manuscripts.

Fixing up my english and adding quote

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/8 15:13

i will investigate this matter more closely.... I've done this some in the Swedish translations, and I'm not satisfied with the translators explanations and their motivation for choosing to translate in a certain way, and "leave" out hard passages to translate? some one counted that the new "official" version differed at 4000!/? places in the old testament alone. So in the Swedish I'm clinging to my "kjbv" for now, if anyone has some recommendation on books of this translation issue I'd be happy and glad for recommendations to look into more deeply

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 15:27

Quote:

-----I'd still like to know why there are these differences between the TR and the other manuscripts.

It's hard to answer this in a post... but I'll hit the hi-lites...

The Alexandrian Text, which the modern versions are based on, has its roots in Alexandria, Egypt. Alexandria was known for its intellect and education. It was also known as a major location for gnostics. Gnosticism, if you don't know what it is, is something you should try and understand.

At any rate, my research into this version debate seems to indicate that the Alexandrian Text is a mutation of what the Apostles wrote. There were many "gnostic gospels" that were circulating in those days, and the Apostles and the church fathers basically dismissed them. The recent discovery of the Gospel of Judas was one of them.

Well, most believe when Peter wrote: "...which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction." (2 Peter 3:16) he was referring to mainly gnostics, although it also applies to many others as well.

So butchering scripture was going on even before the writing of the NT was completed.

There is a lot of history about how these manuscripts ended up in the Catholic Church's hands, and the TR seems to have been in the hands of the non-Catholic believers all down thru history. It's a fascinating history as well. Those who were proactive in the preservation of the TR were horribly persecuted by the RCC over a 1500 year period. In the 1500's the Reformer's Bibles were banned, burned, and the translators were murdered... by the RCC. William Tyndale is a hero of mine. His translation makes up 80% of the KJV NT. He was betrayed into the hands of the RCC, strangled and burned.

I don't know... a lot of blood was spilled to preserve what came to make up the Textus Receptus. It was spilled by the hands, ropes, blades and flames of those who held onto the Alexandrian Text.

I know this is not "proof" that the TR is more reliable... but if we are to believe that God preserved His Word to all generations, as He promised to do... which way do you think He preserved it? Murderers or martyrs?

You tell me...

Krispy

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/5/8 15:35

Quote:
-----I know this is not "proof" that the TR is more reliable... but if we are to believe that God preserved His Word to all generations, as He promised to do...

My simple line of thinking is that we should believe what has been preserved, not what newly popped up. :-)

I'm probably oversimplifying things though.

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2007/5/8 15:54

Thank you for your reply Krispy! Time to reread early church history and about gnostics in 'the pilgrims church'.

So if I understand correctly, modern translations which are not based upon the TR have a higher risk incorporating texts manipulated by gnostics, because they have their oldest sources in Alexandria where gnosticism was hot?

Added commas at hopefully the right places)

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 16:42

Quote:
-----So if I understand correctly, modern translations which are not based upon the TR have a higher risk incorporating texts manipulated by gnostics, because they have their oldest sources in Alexandria where gnosticism was hot?

This is what I *believe*. This is what my personal research has led me to believe. Since I am a novice, and not an expert, I will stop just shy of making a rock solid statement like what you just said... because maybe someone here knows something that I don't.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 17:05

Here is something else to contemplate... Since 1881, when the first "modern version" arrived on the scene, there have been somewhere around 80 modern English versions (none of which were translations of the TR). Most of the 80 modern versions were copyrighted since 1960.

Why so many? If the main issue is making scripture easier to understand... then you would think after 80 tries, they would have accomplished the goal by now.

Also... would anyone here say that the church is now in a much better state than it was before 1881?

Exactly what have all these modern versions done for us? We are to be "fruit inspectors", right? So what is the fruit? There is more apostasy in the church than ever before... more compromise... more sin... more apathy...

I don't think we can blame the modern versions for *all* the ills of the church, but if these modern versions were to make scripture more accessible... why isn't the church revived and taking ground?

All of the real revivals in this country happened when the KJV reigned supreme as the Bible that most people read. Since WWII there have been no real revivals, at least not on a large scale.

I've posted here about the Cane Creek Revival that happened here in North Carolina last year. 4,000 people attended ten meetings, and about a thousand were baptised in the Cane Creek. It was to be a 2 week tent meeting, and lasted 3 months. What version does Ralph Sexton preach exclusively from? The KJV.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 17:45

KrispyKrittr said

Quote:

-----Here is something else to comtemplate... Since 1881, when the first "modern version" arrived on the scene, there have been some where around 80 modern English versions (none of which were translations of the TR). Most of the 80 modern verions were copyrighted since 1960.

Why so many? If the main issue is making scripture easier to understand... then you would think after 80 tries, they would have accomplished the goal by now.

Also... would anyone here say that the church is now in a much better state than it was before 1881?

Exactly what have all these modern versions done for us? We are to be "fruit inspectors", right? So what is the fruit? There is more apostacy in the church than ever before... more compromise... more sin... more apathy...

Yo, Krisper,

What's your take on the Apocrypha (or Deuterocanonical) books then? Up till 1885 they were widely available and included in every Bible and quoted by many of the early church fathers.

Whaddya think?

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/5/8 18:00

Meh, why have just one sword when you can have three or four of them?

Each one is good for cutting in different ways.

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 18:02

Luv ya, Ian... but thats not addressing the real issues. That's "bumper sticker" theology! LOL

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 18:03

Corey... I answered your question in PM because I saw that before I saw this in the thread...

Go ahead and copy paste what I PM'd to you.

Thanx!

Krispy

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/5/8 18:06

Krispy, I spent a good portion of my free time today reading on this topic, i'm still not convinced either way.

I have been blessed by the NIV, and i've seen people using the NIV be touched by the Lord in incredible ways. I love the KJV, but this whole KJV-only thing seems incredibly snobby and divisive to me.

I understand that there are some passages in the NIV which could be better, or are not clear, or go against doctrine... there are passages in a lot of my favorite books that do also. But of those things that you mention, they make up less than 1% of the scripture in the NIV... you're throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

I'm studying missions... i've spoken with guys from Wycliffe an organizations that has translated the bible into over a thousand other languages and seen millions of people come to know the Lord.

Guess what, they're not using TR.

Re: what bibletranslation to get?, on: 2007/5/8 18:58

Quote:

-----by KrispyKrittr on 2007/5/8 13:00:41

So you're not even reading the same thing when you read a KJV side by side with any modern version.

I don't want to tangle with you Krispy ;-), I'll lose because I can't argue textus riptus or whatever other textus is out there but I do know that God is bigger than the letters on a page we humans can argue about!

I'm only responding because your quote above got me wondering what the Scriptures actually do look like side by side next to the KJV... so let's take John 1.1-5 and put them all side by side and see if we are or are not reading the same thing...

WEY 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

NRSV 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

KJV 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

NKJV 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

AV 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

NASB 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

NIV 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

NLT 1 In the beginning the Word already existed. He was with God, and he was God.

WEY 2 He was in the beginning with God.

NRSV 2 He was in the beginning with God.

KJV 2 The same was in the beginning with God.

NKJV 2 He was in the beginning with God.

AV 2 The same was in the beginning with God.

NASB 2 He was in the beginning with God.

NIV 2 He was with God in the beginning.

NLT 2 He was in the beginning with God.

WEY 3 All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. What has come into being

NRSV 3 All things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made.

KJV 3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.

NKJV 3 All things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made.

AV 3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.

NASB 3 All things came into being through Him, and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being.

NIV 3 Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made.

NLT 3 He created everything there is. Nothing exists that he didn't make.

WEY 4 In Him was Life, and that Life was the Light of men.

NRSV 4 in him was life, and the life was the light of all people.

KJV 4 In him was life; and the life was the light of men.

NKJV 4 In Him was life, and the life was the light of men.

AV 4 In him was life; and the life was the light of men.

NASB 4 In Him was life, and the life was the Light of men.

NIV 4 In him was life, and that life was the light of men.

NLT 4 Life itself was in him, and this life gives light to everyone.

WEY 5 The Light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overpowered it.

NRSV 5 The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it.

KJV 5 And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.

NKJV 5 And the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it.

AV 5 And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.

NASB 5 The Light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it.

NIV 5 The light shines in the darkness, but the darkness has not understood it.

NLT 5 The light shines through the darkness, and the darkness can never extinguish it.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/5/8 20:07

I haven't read everything on here, but here is a website that may help.

<http://www.kjvonly.org/>

Jordan

P.S.

I really like the ESV!

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 20:31

I don't even see the 'thee', 'thou' 'ye' etc.. when I am reading the KJV. When I quote it, I quote it like I am reading it, accept when it comes to cutting and pasting.:-)

The English language is evolving, in about 100 to 300 years the KJV will not be understood by anyone it will be so old that it will need to be revamped brought up to date. But for now, in our day it's still very readable.

In truth, as we study the word of God, we are not looking for another translation or version, rather we are looking for a book that takes each word from the bible and gives us an alternative word that we might see the text in a different light.

I have come to the place in my walk with the LORD that it's not important that I try to understand the bible with my natural understanding. I read the bible, I meditate on it and by meditating on it the holy Spirit will quicken it as He so desires or it's stored away in my heart for future use.

When I was younger I had so many translations and versions, I threw them all out and kept the KJV. I didn't know what I know now that it's the holy Spirit that quickens the word to my understanding. Unless it's made alive in you, it's just head knowledge. I try not (only by His grace) to give into the temptation of trying to interpret the bible with my natural mind.

The King James, The Geneva Bible, Tyndale New Testament are the final authorities when it comes to correcting the NIV, NASB, RSV, and a host of others. As the Administrator of this site said, Primarily the KJV is the bible of choice, however the NIV is used as a reference (words that affect)

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 20:50

Intens4him, in my younger days as a searching student of the word I used to read some books that looked like they would be good to read. They all start out with good sound doctrine but when you get into the meat of the book then they start to reveal their true nature.

When we are seeking a bible version the first thing we do is look up our star verses, so we can make our judgment. Romans 8:1, John 1:1 these were just a couple of the verses that I used to look for and if there was no noticeable changes, I'd buy the bible. But it wasn't until I got into that bible when I would see so many errors and twisting of sentences that I could no longer read it. The reason why that was so is because I read the authoritative of all bibles, the KJV.

However, the KJV was not my first bible. The Living Bible was. When I turned 19, I picked up an old 1944 Gideon Bible (KJV) and began to read that, and like the Living Bible, I couldn't put it down. The living bible was like milk, but the KJV was like meat. I was hooked ever since.

But these other versions all start out with their key verses being just like the KJV, so that you and I might be fooled into thinking that there is nothing wrong with it, until you read more and you'll find Satan right in the midst of it twisting the words of God, saying "Hath not God said...."

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 20:50

Post was doubled

Re: - posted by saltlicker20 (), on: 2007/5/8 21:08

Personally I love to read and study out of the NASB, mainly because of the literal translation of it.

However...and I know I am about to crucified for this one (yikes!)...as I'm studying out of the NASB, I will usually read a chapter from it - then read out of "The Message" paraphrase to gain a different perspective and then go back to that same passage in NASB.

That's just me though :-)

DO

I Pet 4:2

Re: - posted by swsojourner (), on: 2007/5/8 21:24

ESV. It layers well with the KJV, and is easy to memorize.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/8 21:57

Hi Preach...

Quote:

PreachParsly wrote:

My simple line of thinking is that we should believe what has been preserved, not what newly popped up. :-)

I'm probably oversimplifying things though.

Yes, I think that this oversimplifies the idea -- which is often what I am afraid the "*KJV-only*" or "*Textus Receptus is the 'preserved Word'*" people seem to indicate a faith in. The *Textus Receptus* itself was translated from a group of manuscripts that no longer exist (like the *Textus Receptus*).

It appears that this "perfectly preserved" believers are basing their faith in the belief of a "preserved" and infallible written Word of God. Yet we KNOW that the King James Version is NOT perfect (due to the many revisions that occurred over the course of 150 years). Is the *Textus Receptus* a perfect translation from the sources in which it was taken? We will never know on this side of eternity -- and anyone who makes such a claim is acting upon secondhand presumption.

Did God have the power to perfectly preserve His Word? Of course! But it is wrong for *KJV-only* fellows to act as if they have a monopoly on a belief in inerrant text. There are some strong academic and historic arguments (not based upon preexisting bias) that indicate the same about some of the other sources too.

:-)

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/5/8 22:06

Pardon this slight but relevant diversion...I couldn't help but chuckle when I read Phillipians 4:5 as rendered in the translation "God's Word" (GW) Apparently we should tell people about our finer qualities...

Let everyone know how considerate you are.

Okay. Hey everyone...I am very considerate. :-P

MC

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 7:56

Quote:
-----There are some strong academic and historic arguments (not based upon preexisting bias) that indicate the same about some of the other sources too.

Hmmm... ya know, I studied both side of this issue when I spent two years researching it, and I've come to the conclusion that there are biases on both sides. You seem to imply here that the only side with a bias is the KJV side... not so, my friend.

Everyone here has to acknowledge that as a KJV supporter, I am certainly not out on the lunatic fringe. I think my approach to this is balanced and reasonable. I think part of that is due to the fact that I was saved in a NIV/NASB church, I loved the NIV for the first half of my Christian life, and I made fun of KJV people as being ignorant hicks.

So I have been on both sides of this argument. And no one can ever say I have condemned anyone for using a modern version. I've challenged folks, and tried to make them think... but y'all know that if you're saved, I call you brother and sister.

Having said that... yes, there is a bias on both sides. And that's unfortunate. But just as everyone is saying "Don't throw the baby out with the bath water!"... I say the same thing back. Just because there are some freaks on the KJV side, don't throw the issue away because all that does is make you ignorant too.

Quote:
-----But of those things that you mention, they make up less than 1% of the scripture in the NIV...

It doesn't do anyone any good to just pull figures out of the air. That statement is simply not true. The differences between the KJV and the NIV are vast.

Quote:
-----I don't want to tangle with you Krispy, I'll lose...

Don't be afraid... I'm a lovable teddy bear!

Quote:
-----...but I do know that God is bigger than the letters on a page we humans can argue about!

Psalm 138:2 *I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: **for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name.***

Sounds to me that God thinks pretty highly of His word...

...
Quote:
-----so let's take John 1.1-5 and put them all side by side and see if we are or are not reading the same thing...

Sure, I can show you hundreds of verses that are pretty much the same. But I can also show you hundreds of verses where **one** word is changed or not there, and it changes the entire meaning of the verse. I can also show you a whole list of verses completely missing from the NIV.

For instance:

Acts 8:37 *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*

You won't find it in an NIV. However, don't you think this is an important verse? It covers the doctrine of salvation **and** baptism. With it missing you have no confession unto salvation... you just have this eunuch wanting to be baptised. You can **assume** he believed, and that's why Philip baptised him... but the KJV (and TR) is rock solid on it.

Krispy

Re: The challenge of translation - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/5/9 8:11

Note this preface in the 1611 KJV version:

“For was anything ever undertaken with a touch of newness or improvement about it that didn’t run into storms of argument or opposition? ... was well aware that whoever attempts anything for the public, especially if it has to do with religion or with making the word of God accessible and understandable, sets himself up to be frowned upon by every evil eye, and casts himself headlong on a row of pikes, to be stabbed by every sharp tongue. For meddling in any way with a people’s religion is meddling with their customs, with their inalienable rights. And although they may be dissatisfied with what they have, they cannot bear to have it altered.” *

And the KJV did receive scathing objection.

As we know, the KJV underwent so many major revisions that it is not really the same bible as the original. I wonder if objection was kept at bay by maintaining the same label: KJV. Regardless of our position, I know that we do all value the need for translations, just like those translators of the KJV: to make the message clear to the common people.

I’m convinced that the original KJV translators would be jumping for joy over our modern versions. Today we have available much older and better sources. In 1947 the Hebrew manuscripts of the OT were discovered near the Dead Sea. Those copies were a thousand years older than anything previously known. Before that the oldest OT manuscript dated to the ninth century - having undergone numerous copyings.

Quote:

----- when you translate something from one language to another, you lose some of the real meaning and wording every time.

Keep in mind that each time the Hebrew text was copied (all by hand) something was altered – whether a spelling, a line omitted, or added.... So we can’t assume that the Hebrew copies that the KJV translators used were better than the older Greek copies. After all, they were quite distant from the original.

Today there are over 5000 manuscripts (handwritten copies). Of course they are all different. We can be thankful for the textual critics who have poured over these biblical texts - studied the context, word usage, etc, in order to come up with the most plausible rendition. (The Eclectic Greek Text)

May none of us be like those who resisted the KJV translation by doubting the credibility of versions that attempt to make the Word of God understood to the modern generation! It is a serious offence to plant doubts in people’s minds about their Bible. That would parallel what the liberals do when they say that the Bible CONTAINS the word of God.... but.... but.... but.

Quote:

----- And no one can ever say I have condemned anyone for using a modern version.

Praise God!

On the Last Day, it will not be the versions that will condemn us, but the failure to trust and apply what God is saying to us

ur generation. Our modern society does not have any excuse!

(<http://www.bible.org/netbible/>) The NET (New English Translation) - an electronic bible (one of the most recent translations)

There is also the Hollman Christian Standard Bible on (<http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search>) BibleGateway (1999-2004). It's a word-for-word approach.

Maybe it's worth checking out, but also, it's good to see how various translators render words and thoughts.

Diane

*(E F. Rhodes and L Lupas, The Translators to the Readers, American Bible Society)

Re: what bibletranslation to get? - posted by repentcanada, on: 2007/5/9 8:27

great post.

Mark 9:29

KJV - And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting.

NASB - And He said to them, "This kind cannot come out by anything but prayer."

NIV - He replied, "This kind can come out only by prayer.

ESV - And he said to them, "This kind cannot be driven out by anything but prayer."

BIG DIFFERENCE!!

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/9 8:59

I've been following this thread and wanted to thank everyone who's contributed. I looked on my shelf yesterday to see if we had a KJV (which we don't! I'm going to get one soon) and I stumbled across a book I had got a couple of years ago :

A General Introduction to the Bible
by Norman Geisler

WOW!!!

This is a 700 page tome that covers...everything this thread talks about! It's not the easiest read, as it's highly technical at times and it very scholarly. I figure reading this book would be equivalently to taking a college course on the subject.

I've been reading about textual criticism and the various texts and such, and I'm not as disheartened as I was earlier...I've discovered many many interesting things. For instance, I just read, that you can construct the entire New Testament except for 11 verses using only quotations from church fathers in the second and third centuries! Cool!

Whether you use the Textus Receptus, Majority Text, Nestle-Aland Text, or some other text, it is from 98.5%-99.9% pure (the same). He says that only about 40 lines (or about 400 words) of the NT are in doubt. And of course no doctrine is derived from any single verse, so one person reading the TR and one person reading a Critical Text should come away with the same doctrines. (I don't say this from personal experience, but from what I've read in this book. I could be wrong about this.) Also, I have to say, I was surprised at the history and construction of the TR. It's not nearly as watertight as some things I had read claim. (It is possible Geisler is biased against it, but I see no reason why he would be. I generally trust Geisler.)

Considering these things, I feel much more at ease reading versions like the NASB. (Although these things pertain to the texts and not versions - I'll be getting to the versions section soon...in about 100 pages :-P)

Nile

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2007/5/9 9:24

Hi repentcanada...

I don't think that anyone has ever argued that there aren't any differences between translations. But remember: These are not differences in wording -- these are differences in sources. Each academic translation was translated honestly from the sources from which they came. We can nitpick all of the versions with a fine toothed comb of academic and spiritual scrutiny, but we cannot use one version as a primer for another. If we want to use verses, one could argue that the King James Version regards "pagan holidays" (or as least Paul did) because of the infamous "Easter" reference in Acts 12 (which is an obvious mistranslation -- despite the strange defenses used for such wording).

Instead of simply comparing one translation by the other, I would admonish believers to compare the translation by the sources. The argument should not be against the subsequent translations -- but whether one set of sources is completely (or as some would claim, "perfectly") superior to the others. My understanding of the *KJV-only* crowd is that there are some who believe the KJV is the "preferred, preserved Word of God" and others within that camp who believe that the "Textus Receptus" was perfect.

It is my standing that no such determination can be made within the realm of academic integrity. There is simply not enough evidence to claim one source is immediately and vastly superior to the other. They are simply two sets of translations themselves, taken from completely different sources, that happen to differ in some senses. We are forced to trust in the translators (including modern translators, older translators, or even older, ancient translators).

It is for this reason that I rely heavily on the study of both the KJV and the NIV. I consider the KJV a faithful and academic translation from the Textus Receptus. I consider the NIV a faithful and academic translation from the other sources. The other academic translations are mostly divided into camps which used the same sources.

In the discussions like this, I believe that it is wise to abstain from verbally "spitting on" the versions in which we do not prefer or esteem. Unless we know the certainty (beyond ALL doubt) of this matter, we should not take efforts to discredit a work as important as the translation of God's Word. What if, by chance, both versions contain elements of the true Word of God? By slandering (or publicly abhorring) the work in which we despise, we might actually find ourselves bearing false witness to the very Word of God!

Am I saying that neither version is perfect? No. I am simply saying that I am not sure which (or if either) version is perfect in script, translation or sources. Thus, I am regulated to PRAY over EVERYTHING that I read in the Word of God, and I must ask God to reveal His Word to me. Thankfully, there is very little doctrine (if any) that actually changes between the versions. Sure, one can nitpick a verse with a fine-toothed comb of singular comparison (using one version as a primer for the other). However, the overall established doctrine of the Church remains the same. While one set of verses may differ, others support the obvious, established doctrine of the Church.

:-)

*EDIT...

- I am not accusing or targeting any single individual of having "spit" on a particular translation. Please don't read too much into such modern colloquialism.

:-)

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 9:34

Diane... I was gonna write a line by line response to your post, but as I read on I realized that perhaps you have not really gained a lot of understanding into the issues surrounding the modern versions. Maybe I'm reading it wrong, but none of your arguments seem to have anything to do with the real issues.

Quote:

-----As we know, the KJV underwent so many major revisions that it is not really the same bible as the original.

This is only partially true. It underwent 2 revisions, not "so many", and they were not "major"... they were grammatical. And if you read a 1611 next to the run of the mill KJV you have to really search to find any significant differences... and they would be clearer word translations, not whole verses. At the risk of offending you, I have to wonder if you've actually done this personally... or just read that somewhere.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 9:37

Quote:

----- (It is possible Geisler is bias against it, but I see no reason why he would be. I generally trust Geisler.)

From what I know about him, he does have a bias... but not having read the book you're referring to, I cant comment on it.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 9:39

ccchhhrrriiss... the only time I spit is when I have a pinch of Copenhagen between my cheek and gum!

Krispy

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/9 10:08

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Quote:

----- (It is possible Geisler is bias against it, but I see no reason why he would be. I generally trust Geisler.)

From what I know about him, he does have a bias... but not having read the book you're referring to, I cant comment on it.

Krispy

Yeah, after reading some more I sense a definite bias against the KJV and for the NASB. However, I'm not fully convinced that is bad, having not made up my mind concerning either.

Here's a very good article by Norman Geisler on Bible translations that would do us all some good:

([http://www.ankerberg.com/Articles/islam/2Geisler\(5\)-The-Bible-Has-It-Been-Translated-Correctly.htm](http://www.ankerberg.com/Articles/islam/2Geisler(5)-The-Bible-Has-It-Been-Translated-Correctly.htm)) The-Bible-Has-It-Been-Translated-Correctly

From the article:

We've got really three kinds of translations—the bad ones like the Jehovah's Witnesses' that are distorting the essential truths; good ones where all the essential truths are there, but better ones. And I would think that "better ones" would include the New American Standard Bible, but it's very literal; the New International Version, which is more literary; and then there's some that are kind of halfway in between, that improve on the King James and are literary but still literal—that would be the New King James Version of the Bible. It still has the rhythm and cadence of the old King James but it got rid of the archaisms like "He that letteth will now let" and "Quit ye like men" and so forth and then updated it in modern language, but it's not very much of a paraphrase or interpretive.

Here's what you have to keep in mind when you're looking at translations of the Bible. Who are the people that translated it? Were they biased? Now, obviously the people who translated the Revised Standard Version were biased. These were liberal scholars and when they came to Isaiah 7:14, they said, "Young maiden" instead of "virgin." Well, it had to refer to virgin because the verse is quoted in Matthew 1:21ff. It says, "A virgin shall conceive." So it's a bad translation and it comes out of the bias of the particular translators. Whereas, the New American Standard Bible, the New International Version are not done by biased liberal scholars. And another important thing about these translations is they're done by a committee of several scholars, not just one person ultimately like say, for example, the Living Bible that was done by Ken Taylor. Fine Christian, fine believer, doing it for his children, paraphrased it. But it's not a literal translation, it's a paraphrase and often it's a devotional paraphrase and people get blessed by it. But it's one person and it's a paraphrase.

If you want a more accurate Bible, you need to get a Bible where a committee of people and it's not really a paraphrase but is a translation, and that would be Bibles like the New International Version and the New King James Version of the Bible. But again, let me emphasize, all of the translations are good. We're not talking about bad versus good, we're talking about good versus better. Because all the essential truths are there. They haven't been distorted. And you can pick up any of these translations apart from the Jehovah's Witnesses' and a few other cultic translations and all of the essential truths of the Gospel are present.

Another point we should keep in mind is that we have 5,686 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament and maybe 10,000 of the Hebrew Old Testament in fragments and complete manuscripts. That's a neat thing, you know. We don't have the originals but the fact that we don't have the originals doesn't really hurt anything. Number one, if we had the originals, somebody probably would be worshipping it. Remember the snake in the wilderness that was put on the pole. They were later worshipping it.

Number two, if we had the original, somebody has to be custodian, right? They could tamper with it. But if you don't have any one original in the custodianship of any one group, and that group would claim to be the true Church, of course because they have the original, then you have it spread all over the world. Some of it in Russia, some in England, some in the United States. There's no way that anyone can tamper with all the copies. God has actually preserved His originals in the copies and He has preserved it from the possibility of worship and He has preserved it from the possibility of distortion.

Let me kind of summarize this whole thing. This book in our hand can be trusted because originally God inspired the writings that were given through Apostles and the Prophets who were given miracles to prove that they were men of God who made supernatural predictions. Jesus confirmed it to be the Word of God. Archaeology has confirmed it. The unity of the Bible. And furthermore, it has been so accurately transmitted down through the ages that whereas Homer's Iliad is only 95 percent accurate and the Mahabharata 90 percent accurate, this has been 99.9 percent accurately copied. And the .1 doesn't affect any doctrine, any major teaching of the Bible. The translations of the Bible are good, so when you pick up this Bible, you've got the Word of God, confirmed by acts of God, confirmed by the Son of God, accurately transmitted, and you have the very voice of God in your language speaking to you and to me.

Now, that puts the burden on us. If this is the Word of God and we can pick it up and read it, then we are obligated to obey its message. We are obligated to live by this book. The Bible, nothing more, nothing less, and nothing else. If you need something that you can count on, remember the words of Peter when he said to Jesus, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/5/9 10:26

I have a question.

Most of the time when someone quotes from two versions, I can see why they are different by looking at the different Greek text. This verse is from the old testament so I don't understand why.

Hsa 11:12 Ephraim compasseth me about with lies, and the house of Israel with deceit: **but Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints.** (KJV)

Ephraim has surrounded me with lies, the house of Israel with deceit. **And Judah is unruly against God, even against the faithful Holy One.** (NIV)

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/5/9 12:19

Quote:

----- Hsa 11:12 Ephraim compasseth me about with lies, and the house of Israel with deceit: but Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints. (KJV)

Ephraim has surrounded me with lies, the house of Israel with deceit. And Judah is unruly against God, even against the faithful Holy One. (NIV)

Ah, a dilemma! Did a scribe's pen run out of ink at a critical spot? Was Hosea using Judah as a comparison? Does Hosea add any further insight about Judah? Do other prophets of that day clarify? What WAS the spiritual condition of Judah at that time? We do know is that Judah was eventually judged, regardless of this obscurity. Also, the verse in question is not going to affect our understanding of that aspect of history. And neither will it obscure our overall understanding of Hosea's point: God's mercy towards the unfaithful.

Biblegateway is a good place to check on other renderings. Consider the HCSB – and note the footnotes :
12 Ephraim surrounds me with lies the house of Israel, with deceit.
Judah still wanders with El
and is faithful to holy ones.

Footnotes:

- a. Hosea 11:12 Or God
- b. Hosea 11:12 Or Judah walks with God and is faithful to the Holy One Hb obscure ;
- c. Hosea 11:12 Possibly angels, or less likely, pagan gods or idols

And the NASB:

12 Ephraim surrounds Me with lies
And the house of Israel with deceit;
Judah is also unruly against God,
Even against the Holy One who is faithful.

Or the CEV:

12 Israel is deceitful to me,
their loyal and holy God;
they surround me with lies,
and Judah worships
other gods. (Or " but Judah remains faithful.")

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 13:51

Quote:
-----Most of the time when someone quotes from two versions, I can see why they are different by looking at the different Greek text. Th
is verse is from the old testament so I don't understand why.

Because the Hebrew texts are different as well.

KJV - Masoretic

Modern versions - Septuagint

Krispy

Re: what bibletranslation to get? - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/9 14:33

some questions, Ive looked around but haven't found any satisfying answers yet,

how do they know for a fact that Alexandrian text is older?

if it is older, does that certainly make it better? so to speak older is always better?

what i found out is the dead sea scrolls, they found the book of Isaiah there, and if you compare that 2000 year old scroll with the KJV, you got an perfect match, or so i was told. To me that is good evidence KJV manuscripts is preserved quite well. anyway continuing to read articles from both sides, mostly i find opinions and arguments that people claim as "evidence",

so far I'm going with the best thing you can do is get a good translation from booth manuscripts and read and study both , that way you wont miss anything if you have the knowledge that they do differ

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 14:43

Quote:
-----From what I know about him, he does have a bias... but not having read the book you're referring to, I cant comment on it.

What does the old Geisler know anyhow. :-P

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 14:46

There is one line in KJV that had a profound impact on me, Proverbs 18:1, which seemed to indicate it is proper and good to seperate oneself from the world to seek wisdom.

When I showed this verse to a friend, it read from the NIV like seperating from the wisdom of the masses was the worst sin ever.

Simply baffling - but like I trust the words of a long-dead, salty preacher like Tozer over the vast majority of modern evangelical preachers, I trust my KJV over the modern translations.

Compare.

Quote:
-----NASB: He who separates himself seeks his own desire, He quarrels against all sound wisdom. (NASB Â©1995)

GWT: A loner is out to get what he wants for himself. He opposes all sound reasoning. (GOD'S WORDÂ©)

KJV: Through desire a man, having separated himself, seeketh and intermeddleth with all wisdom.

ASV: He that separateth himself seeketh his own desire, And rageth against all sound wisdom. BBE: He who keeps himself separate for his private purpose goes against all good sense.

DBY: He that separateth himself seeketh his pleasure, he is vehement against all sound wisdom.

JPS: He that separateth himself seeketh his own desire, and snarlest against all sound wisdom. WBS: Through desire a man, having separated himself, seeketh and intermeddleth with all wisdom.

WEB: An unfriendly man pursues selfishness, and defies all sound judgment.

YLT: For an object of desire he who is separated doth seek, With all wisdom he intermeddleth.

GSB: 18:1 Through desire a man, having {a} separated himself, seeketh intermeddleth with all wisdom.

(a) He who loves wisdom will separate himself from all impediments, and give himself wholly to seek it.

WES: 18:1 Desire - Thro' desire of wisdom, a man having separated himself from the company, and noise, and business of the world, seeketh and intermeddleth with all wisdom, uses all diligence, that he may search and find out all solid knowledge and true wisdom.

MHC: 18:1 If we would get knowledge and grace, we must try all methods of improving ourselves. 2. Those make nothing to purpose, of learning or religion, whose only design is to have something to make a show with. 3. As soon as sin entered, shame followed.

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 14:55

Quote:

-----how do they know for a fact that Alexandrian text is older?

Because the Catholic Church says it is. There is no real evidence.

Quote:

-----if it is older, does that certainly make it better? so to speak older is always better?

No it does not necessarily make it better because there is evidence in the Epistles that there were those who were "wresting" (or butchering) the scriptures during the Apostles days. Paul eluded that there were those who had writings they claimed were his, and he basically said they were forgeries. He also stated that many were taking his letters and changing them. So if someone shows up with an actual manuscript from the 1st century, you should treat it with skepticism cuz it could very well be a forgery.

Quote:

-----what i found out is the dead sea scrolls, they found the book of Isaiah there, and if you compare that 2000 year old scroll with the KJV, you got an perfect match, or so i was told. To me that is good evidence KJV manuscripts is preserved quite well. anyway continuing to read articles from both sides, mostly i find opinions and arguments that people claim as "evidence"

This is true, however it really only proves that the Hebrew Text used for the OT of the KJV is the best one. It doesn't prove one way or the other about the TR and Alexandrian... except to lend even more credibility to the translators of the KJV.

Quote:

-----so far I'm going with the best thing you can do is get a good translation from both manuscripts and read and study both, that way you won't miss anything if you have the knowledge that they do differ

Think about this... the modern versions dont have anything in them that isnt in the KJV. But the KJV has a lot in it that is nt in the modern versions. So if you stick with the KJV, you wont miss anything anyway! :-)

Krispy

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/9 15:04

Krispy, what do you think of the NKJV?

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/9 15:24

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Think about this... the modern versions dont have anything in them that isnt in the KJV. But the KJV has a lot in it that isnt in the modern versions. So if you stick with the KJV, you wont miss anything anyway!

thats true :-)

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/9 15:27

Quote:

Nile wrote:

Krispy, what do you think of the NKJV?

I'm wondering what is so bad about it, I'm comparing it, most of it seems to be "accurate" compared to the KJV...or the passages Ive looked up. I visited one website who claimed it was from "the pit of hell", don't know if ill go that far... they had some good claims, but some i thought....hmmm well they where a bit to sensitive about some things, but I'm interested to know about this version

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 16:03

Quote:

-----Krispy, what do you think of the NKJV?

To start with, removing the thees and thous and ye's can (and does) render the meaning of many passages differently. Philologo (I think) linked a very good article that explained this much clearer than I could... but there is a reason why the translators used the "thees and thous". Interestingly, those expressions were in the process of fading out of most English speech, but the translators used them because of the absolute clarity they gave to scripture.

Sooo... when they are gone, much is lost. And thees and thous and ye's is not hard to get ahold of, and isnt confusing at all once you understand what they mean, and why they are there.

Secondly, even tho it does not omit verses that other modern versions do, it does draw all those verses into question by having an asterik next to it, leading one to the footnotes where it says that "older and more reliable" manuscripts omit it

c etc... In fact, these manuscripts it refers to (the Alex Text) has never been proven to be older **or** more reliable, so in my way of thinking that is dishonest... intentional or not.

Also, even tho they did at least consult the TR in the translation, they still leaned almost completely on the Alex Text. (th us the footnotes) So the "New" Kings James really isnt new... nor King James... it's a modern version.

There are other reasons I dont use it, but this is the main thing. I think the name of it is misleading, and the premise of it i s misleading because it's a modern version that gives a nod to the TR... thats all it is.

It was a brilliant marketing scheme. Use the name of the most revered version in history. They've sure sold a lot of 'em. : -)

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/9 16:13

i founf philologos PDF document to be really helpful, here is a link,

(<http://ncw.biblebase.com/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?cid3&lid3>) Teach Thyself Olde Englishe

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/9 16:17

Ah, ok. Yes, I also think the thees and thous are good.

About the texts though, does it rely on the Alex texts as heavily as you suggest? In the book I have by Norman Geisler he lumps the KJV and NKJV together in most places, and many sites I have read say that the NKJV is based mainly off of the TR...hmmm...but I do remember hearing differently also...looks like I still have more research to do.

btw, school ended for me yesterday and I've been researched this topic the whole day. I start work next week though, a nd I won't have lots of time to spare then :-\

Nile

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/5/9 16:34

So do you guys think the KJV is without error? If it does have errors then why not use other translations like the ESV and NASB?

Jordan

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/9 16:45

Ive seen hard critics against KJV, but if the TR was corrupt manuscripts to me thats like implying people did not have a "correct" bible for hundreds of years! do anyone believe God would keep his word from people that long? but i do think the KJV is a very good translation of the TR manuscripts

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 16:58

Quote:
-----do anyone believe God would keep his word from people that long? but i do think the KJV is a very good translation of the TR manuscripts

No. Obviously powers that be struggled hard to keep God's Word from the people, and for some reason God allowed tha t to happen.

But the Bible has always been around, tho at times it was "underground", kinda like it is in China. Interestingly, it was us ually forced underground by the religious authorities... mainly, the Catholic Church.

Quote:

-----So do you guys think the KJV is without error? If it does have errors then why not use other translations like the ESV and NASB?

I have never found a true error or contradiction within the KJV. I do not believe it is a "perfect" translation in that I believe there are places where it could have been translated a little clearer, and in the OT there are some words that could have been used instead of the ones used... but I don't consider that an error. If I could go back in time and talk to the translators I might find that there is a very good reason why they chose a particular word or phrase... and then it's all just opinion.

I've had people say "this is an error in the KJV" or "that's an error in the KJV" ... but in the end it's not an error as such, but a difference of opinion in how it *should* have been translated.

Krispy

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/9 17:20

Hi Krispy...

Quote:
-----I've had people say "this is an error in the KJV" or "that's an error in the KJV" ... but in the end it's not an error as such, but a difference of opinion in how it should have been translated.

The Acts 12 reference to the pagan holiday "Easter" was a near definite error -- even though some people try hard to defend it. Nearly EVERY OTHER translation taken from the Textus Receptus properly translates the word as "PASSOVER" -- and even the Strong's lexicon defines it as such. It is an error. Why? I have no idea. As the KJV went through several revisions between 1611 and 1850 (nearly 240 years), I suppose that the scribes simply overlooked it.

I do not believe that the argument is really about the infallibility of the KJV. The real question, in my opinion, involves whether or not the Textus Receptus is indeed "perfect" or "superior" to all other sources. All questions about "modern versions remove words" is ridiculous in the sense that they were merely translated from a separate set of sources. I do not believe that there is enough evidence to make such a bold statement concerning the supremacy of one set of texts over the other. There is quite a bit of debate on the issue, and it really frustrates me to hear individuals speak as if they know the ultimate and final conclusion of the matter. To say otherwise, without really knowing everything about the issue, is dishonest (whether those proclaiming it mean well or not).

I believe that we need to be careful to use the words "belief," "opinion," or "educated conclusion" when making statements -- rather than make blanket conclusions about the issue of text superiority. Krispy is very good at explaining that his opinion in this subject is the result of a personal conclusion following personal study. I think that we would all do well to do likewise.

:-)

Re: ... to make plain the mystery... - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/5/11 6:23

Yesterday I was reading a do-it-yourself haircutting website, and came upon the words "fringe hair". I knew what "fringe" meant and what "hair" meant, but not "fringe hair". As a result, the subsequent instructions were hazy to me. Even though the writer had done an excellent job in explaining to laypeople, I was still an "outsider" in some ways. That reminded me of my US trip -- where we also experienced some language barriers -- between Canadian, American, and Brit. We had a few blank looks and good chuckles as a result.

But the proclamation of the gospel is no laughing matter. We DO need to be passionate about making the gospel plain.

Let's admit, among ourselves we use countless terms and expressions that mean nothing to "outsiders". We have our "inside talk". And yet spiritual truths are on the "outside" for most in our culture, including the church.

Since the days of the KJV translators, and long before that, the ardent desire for what's "right" has often left the recipients in the shadows, forgotten. We must guard against this.

This thread, including other sources, have caused me to realize that we can move passed the issues about text sources, because others have dealt with that. The burden for us is to make sure that the word of God can be understood in our c

ulture and time. Like the Wyclife translators, we need to move outside for ourselves and our world and into THEIR world in order to accomplish that.

Presently I am working on a course project about Bible translations. What an incredible task that is: finding the words and phrases that retain the original meaning, and yet can be understood today. I think the NIV came shy of that at times. For example: "manifold wisdom" in Eph. 3:10 We don't use the word "manifold" in our daily chatting. I think another translation captured the meaning better by saying: "his wisdom in its rich variety". And the phrase "which leads to debauchery" is clearer in another: "will ruin your life". Indeed, there is a place for the "thought-for-thought" approach, among our vast selection of translations.

The Lord has called me away from SI for a season, and this thread is a fitting stopping place. I am needing to pour my time into other things, including my studies - of preparation for God's calling on me - which is appropriately expressed with Paul words:

"to MAKE PLAIN TO EVERYONE the administration of this mystery" Eph. 3:8

"... to equip his people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ

. Then we will no longer be infants, tossed back and forth by the waves, and blown here and there by every wind of teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of people in their deceitful scheming. Instead, speaking the truth in love, we will in all things grow up into him who is the head, that is, Christ. From him the whole body, joined and held together by every supporting ligament, grows and builds itself up in love, as each part does its work." Eph. 4:14-16
May God continue to work in your lives, in order that the whole body will grow and build in love.

Diane

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 6:57

Quote:
-----The Acts 12 reference to the pagan holiday "Easter" was a near definite error -- even though some people try hard to defend it. Nearly EVERY OTHER translation taken from the Textus Receptus properly translates the word as "PASSOVER" -- and even the Strong's lexicon defines it as such. It is an error. Why? I have no idea. As the KJV went through several revisions between 1611 and 1850 (nearly 240 years), I suppose that the scribes simply overlooked it.

This comes up every time, and I was a little surprised it took this long for it to come up here. I'm glad it did though because there is a very reasonable (and correct, I'm convinced) for Easter being used in this passage.

Rather than me trying to explain it in my limited capacity, I'm going to do something I rarely do... copy paste someone else's explanation. Now... please understand that the author holds to the position that the KJV is perfect, in that he believes that there are no passages that could have been made a little clearer. This is not my position necessarily. I do happen to believe that there are places that are correctly translated, but maybe could have been translated a little clearer. Not that they can't be understood... but they could be understood a little easier.

So please put some of his bias aside, and listen to his explanation on this word "easter", because I believe it to be legitimate.

Krispy

Isn't "Easter" in Acts 12:4 a Mistranslation?

Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D.

QUESTION: Isn't "Easter" in Acts 12:4 a mistranslation of the word "pascha" and should it be translated as "passover"?

ANSWER: No, "pascha" is properly translated "Easter" in Acts 12:4 as the following explanation will show.

EXPLANATION: The Greek word which is translated "Easter" in Acts 12:4 is the word "pascha". This word appears twenty-nine times in the New Testament. Twenty-eight of those times the word is rendered "Passover" in reference to the night when the Lord passed over Egypt and killed all the firstborn of Egypt (Exodus 12:12), thus setting Israel free from four hundred years of bondage.

The many opponents to the concept of having a perfect Bible have made much of this translation of "pascha".

Coming to the word "Easter" in God's Authorized Bible, they seize upon it imagining that they have found proof that the Bible is not perfect. Fortunately for lovers of the word of God, they are wrong. Easter, as we know it, comes from the ancient pagan festival of Astarte. Also known as Ishtar (pronounced "Easter"). This festival has always been held late in the month of April. It was, in its original form, a celebration of the earth "regenerating" itself after the winter season. The festival involved a celebration of reproduction. For this reason the common symbols of Easter festivities were the rabbit (the same symbol as "Playboy" magazine), and the egg. Both are known for their reproductive abilities. At the center of attention was Astarte, the female deity. She is known in the Bible as the "queen of heaven" (Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17-25). She is the mother of Tammuz (Ezekiel 8:14) who was also her husband! These perverted rituals would take place at sunrise on Easter morning (Ezekiel 8:13-16). From the references in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, we can see that the true Easter has never had any association with Jesus Christ.

Problem: Even though the Jewish passover was held in mid April (the fourteenth) and the pagan festival Easter was held later the same month, how do we know that Herod was referring to Easter in Acts 12:4 and not the Jewish passover? If he was referring to the passover, the translation of "pascha" as "Easter" is incorrect. If he was indeed referring to the pagan holyday (holiday) Easter, then the King James Bible (1611) must truly be the very word and words of God for it is the only Bible in print today which has the correct reading.

To unravel the confusion concerning "Easter" in verse 4, we must consult our FINAL authority, THE BIBLE. The key which unlocks the puzzle is found not in verse 4, but in verse 3. (Then were the days of unleavened bread... ") To secure the answer that we seek, we must find the relationship of the passover to the days of unleavened bread. We must keep in mind that Peter was arrested during the "days of unleavened bread" (Acts 12:3).

Our investigation will need to start at the first Passover. This was the night in which the LORD smote all the firstborn in Egypt. The Israelites were instructed to kill a lamb and strike its blood on the two side posts and the upper door post (Exodus 12:4, 5). Let us now see what the Bible says concerning the first passover, and the days of unleavened bread.

Exodus 12:13-18: "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.

14 And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the LORD throughout your generation; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever.

15 Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses: for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel.

16 And in the first day there shall be an holy convocation to you; no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you.

17 And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this selfsame day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance for ever.

18 In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even."

Here in Exodus 12:13 we see how the passover got its name. The LORD said that He would "pass over" all of the house which had the blood of the lamb marking the door.

After the passover (Exodus 12:13, 14), we find that seven days shall be fulfilled in which the Jews were to eat unleavened bread. These are the days of unleavened bread!

In verse 18 we see that dates for the observance were April 14th through the 21st. This religious observance is stated more clearly in Numbers 28:16-18:

"And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the LORD.

17 And in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast: seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten.

18 In the first day shall be an holy convocation; ye shall do no manner of servile work therein:"

In verse 16 we see that the passover is only considered to be the 14th of the month. On the next morning, the 15th begins the "days of unleavened bread."

Deuteronomy 16:1-8: "Observe the month of Abib (April), and keep the passover unto the LORD thy God: for in the month of Abib the LORD thy God brought thee forth out of Egypt by night.

2 Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the passover unto the LORD thy God, of the flock and the herd, in the place which the LORD shall choose to place his name there.

3 Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction: for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life.

4 And there shall be no leavened bread seen with thee in all thy coast seven days; neither shall there any thing of the flesh, which thou sacrificedst the first day at even, remain all night until the morning.

5 Thou mayest not sacrifice the passover within any of thy gates, which the LORD thy God giveth thee:

6 But at the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the passover at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt.

7 And thou shalt roast and eat it in the place which the LORD thy God shall choose: and thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents.

8 Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread: and on the seventh day shall be a solemn assembly to the LORD thy God: thou shalt do no work therein."

Here in Deuteronomy we see again that the passover is sacrificed on the first night (Deuteronomy 16:1). It is worth noting that the passover was to be celebrated in the evening (vs.6) not at sunrise (Ezekiel 8:13-16).

In II Chronicles 8:13 we see that the feast of unleavened bread was one of the three Jewish feasts to be kept during the year.

II Chronicles 8:13: "Even after a certain rate every day, offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the solemn feasts, three times in the year, even in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles."

Whenever the passover was kept, it always preceded the feast of unleavened bread. In II Chronicles 30 some Jews who were unable to keep the passover in the first month were allowed to keep it in the second. But the dates remained the same.

II Chronicles 30:15,21: "Then they killed the passover on the fourteenth day of the second month: and the priests and the Levites were ashamed, and sanctified themselves, and brought in the burnt offerings into the house of the LORD. And the children of Israel that were present at Jerusalem kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with great gladness: and the Levites and the priests praised the LORD day by day, singing with loud instruments unto the LORD."

Ezra 6:19,22: "And the children of the captivity kept the passover upon the fourteenth day of the first month. And kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with joy: for the LORD had made them joyful, and turned the heart of the king of Assyria unto them, to strengthen their hands in the work of the house of God, the God of Israel."

We see then, from studying what the BIBLE has to say concerning the subject that the order of events went as follows: On the 14th of April the lamb was killed. This is the passover. No event following the 14th is ever referred to as the passover.

On the morning of the 15th begins the days of unleavened bread, also known as the feast of unleavened bread.

It must also be noted that whenever the passover is mentioned in the New Testament, the reference is always to the meal, to be eaten on the night of April 14th not the entire week. The days of unleavened bread are NEVER referred to as the Passover. (It must be remembered that the angel of the Lord passed over Egypt on one night, not seven nights in a row.

Now let us look at Acts 12:3, 4:

"And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread.) And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep

ep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people."

Verse 3 shows that Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (April 15-21). The Bible says: "Then were t he days of unleavened bread." The passover (April 14th) had already come and gone. Herod could not possibly have be en referring to the passover in his statement concerning Easter. The next Passover was a year away! But the pagan holi day of Easter was just a few days away. Remember! Herod was a pagan Roman who worshipped the "queen of heaven" . He was NOT a Jew. He had no reason to keep the Jewish passover. Some might argue that he wanted to wait until aft er the passover for fear of upsetting the Jews. There are two grievous faults in this line of thinking.

First, Peter was no longer considered a Jew. He had repudiated Judaism. The Jews would have no reason to be upset b y Herod's actions.

Second, he could not have been waiting until after the passover because he thought the Jews would not kill a man durin g a religious holiday. They had killed Jesus during passover (Matthew 26:17-19, 47). They were also excited about Hero d's murder of James. Anyone knows that a mob possesses the courage to do violent acts during religious festivities, not after.

In further considering Herod's position as a Roman, we must remember that the Herods were well known for celebrating (Matthew 14:6-11). In fact, in Matthew chapter 14 we see that a Herod was even willing to kill a man of God during one o f his celebrations.

It is elementary to see that Herod, in Acts 12, had arrested Peter during the days of unleavened bread, after the passove r. The days of unleavened bread would end on the 21st of April. Shortly after that would come Herod's celebration of pag an Easter. Herod had not killed Peter during the days of unleavened bread simply because he wanted to wait until Easte r. Since it is plain that both the Jews (Matthew 26:17-47) and the Romans (Matthew 14:6-11) would kill during a religious celebration, Herod's opinion seemed that he was not going to let the Jews "have all the fun." He would wait until his own pagan festival and see to it that Peter died in the excitement.

Thus we see that it was God's providence which had the Spirit-filled translators of our Bible (King James) to CORRECTL Y translate "pascha" as "Easter". It most certainly did not refer to the Jewish passover. In fact, to change it to "passover" would confuse the reader and make the truth of the situation unclear.

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/11 9:03

I went to the bookstore yesterday and got myself a new Bible!! I did lots of research to find just the one I wanted, and th e first store I went to didn't have it, but the second did. It's a parallel KJV-NKJV with center column references from the NKJV. Sweet!!! I think it's going to be really awesome. I can read the KJV and if I come across something that doesn't make sense all I have to do is glance over to the NKJV. Or I can read the NKJV and glance over at the KJV to see if it's the same.

I'm really excited! :-P

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/11 9:11

Hi Krispy...

No offense to Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, but his defense does not appear academically sound (in my opinion). The fact that nearly EVERY OTHER TRANSLATION taken from the Textus Receptus uses the word "Passover" in (<http://www.blueletterbible.org/cgi-bin/popup.pl?bookAct&chapter12&verse4&versionkjv#4>) Acts 12:4 is quite telling. In f act, the word "pascha" is included (<http://www.blueletterbible.org/cgi-bin/words.pl?bookAct&chapter12&verse4&strongs3957&page>) 29 times in the Strong' s Concordance to the KJV: 28 times as "passover" and 1 time as the pagan holiday "Easter." The term itself is derived fr om the Anglo-Saxon reference (which did not exist at the time of Luke, the author of Acts) for Eostre, Germanic goddess (also unknown or referenced at the time of Luke).

Which versions use "Passover?"

I was planning on making a list, but I really couldn't find ANY OTHER VERSION or TRANSLATION that used "Easter" -- other than the Bishop's Bible (upon which the King James' translators used as their base). Even older, foreign language

translations (such as the Spanish Reina-Valera Antigua 1569) translate the word as "Pascua" or "Passover."

It is my opinion that the defense of the word "Easter" in the Bible was a simple mistranslation by the translators of the KJV. Even 19th Century apologist Alexander Hislop wrote about the passage in his expose of the Catholic Church, "The Two Babylons":

Quote:
-----"Every one knows that the name "Easter" used in our translation of Acts 12:4, refers not to any Christian festival, but to the Jewish Passover. This is one of the few places in our version where the translators show an undue bias. Then look at Easter. What means the term Easter itself? It is not a Christian name. It bears its Chaldean origin on its very forehead. Easter is nothing else than Astarte, one of the titles of Beltis, the queen of heaven, whose name, as pronounced by the people Nineveh, was evidently identical with that now in common use in this country. That name, as found by Layard on the Assyrian monuments, is Ishtar. The worship of Bel and Astarte was very early introduced into Britain, along with the Druids, "the priests of the groves. Some have imagined that the Druidical worship was first introduced by the Phoenicians, who, centuries before the Christian era, traded to the tin-mines of Cornwall. But the unequivocal traces of that worship are found in regions of the British islands where the Phoenicians never penetrated, and it has everywhere left indelible marks of the strong hold which it must have had on the early British mind." - "The Two Babylons," Chapter III Section II

The consensus amongst most ancient linguists seems to indicate that the word should have been correctly translated as "Passover." Some argue that the error came when the translators of the King James Version were instructed to use the "Bishop's Bible" as their base, or when they were instructed to include some traditional Church terms (such as "Ecclesiastes").

I must point out that such a perceived mistranslation of the term does not change my perception of the King James Version. I still consider it a wonderful translation that relied primarily upon the *Textus Receptus*. It remains my translation of choice from the *Textus Receptus*. A mis-wording does not make me think any less of the KJV or the Word of God. There were other words in the KJV that were changed during its revisions in the 239 years between 1611 and 1850. Most of the errors of the original were minor and corrected. There is still a question as to why the several revisions still included the term. Was it merely overlooked, or did it remain because the revision committees were instructed to include it?

Regardless, we know that the Word is still inspired, even if a particular translation "got it wrong" ever-so-often.

:-)

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 9:12

Nile... I have a 7 or 8 volume set of Matthew Henry's commentary, hard back. It's my favorite set of books I have. Henry's commentary was, of course, based on the KJV. It starts at Genesis 1:1... has a portion of scripture, then Henry's expository teaching, then the next portion of scripture, then Henry's expository teaching... and on and on.

I love it, and I think you might like it too. I paid less than \$30 on ebay for it, and it was in near perfect condition when I got it. (still is)

Krispy

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/11 9:14

Hello roadsign (Diane)...

Thank you for your post. You will be in our prayers!

:-)

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 9:18

ccchhhrrriiisss...

Even if Easter is a mistranslation (which I really don't think it is), is it really an error? I'm sure the translators would have a very detailed explanation for why they used "easter", but unfortunately we can't ask them. They were extremely well educated men, and I doubt they just stuck that word in there without much debate.

But, unlike the hundreds of differences between the KJV & the modern versions, this example of what many are more than excited to call an error really makes no difference to **any** biblical doctrines.

I think at worst, this is an example of where the translation could have been clearer, but not an error.

But I think the explanation is legitimate. And I think the translators knew exactly what they were doing, and would offer us a very detailed explanation for why it's there.

But I could be wrong. I'm open to that.

Krispy

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 9:21

Krispy, there is a reason the 'Easter' translation comes up every time.

This has been said before but it needs to be said again. Easter is a mistranslation in the KJV. But don't take my work for it:

Let's just take a look at what some respected scholars have to say concerning this subject. I hate to 'name drop' but this is important in a discussion like this:

John Gill's Exposition of the Bible
intending after Easter,
or the passover,

Jamieson, Fausset, Brown Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible
intending after Easter--rather, "after the Passover"; that is, after the whole festival was over. (The word in our King James Version is an ecclesiastical term of later date, and ought not to have been employed here).

Matthew Henry Complete Commentary on the Whole Bible
He would do this after Easter, meta to pascha — after the passover, certainly so it ought to be read, for it is the same word that is always so rendered;

A.T. Robertson's Word Pictures of the New Testament
After the Passover (meta to pasca). The passover feast of eight days. "The stricter Jews regarded it as a profanation to put a person to death during a religious festival" (Hackett). So Agrippa is more scrupulous than the Sanhedrin was about Jesus.

Nave's Topical Bible
Easter (a.v.)
* (Should be translated "Passover," as in RSV and most other translations) Acts 12:4

Easton's Bible Dictionary
Easter
originally a Saxon word (Eostre), denoting a goddess of the Saxons, in honour of whom sacrifices were offered about the time of the Passover. Hence the name came to be given to the festival of the Resurrection of Christ, which occurred at the time of the Passover. In the early English versions this word was frequently used as the translation of the Greek pascha (the Passover). When the Authorized Version (1611) was formed, the word "passover" was used in all passages in which this word pascha occurred, except in Act 12:4. In the Revised Version the proper word, "passover," is always used.

Going back to the verses in Acts:

Acts 12:1-4

1Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church.

2And he killed James the brother of John with the sword.

3And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread.)

4And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.

The key to understanding this passage is to see why Herod put Peter in prison. It pleased the Jews. Luke takes care to

tell us that this was happening during the days of unleavened bread which was associated with Passover. Now, put yourself in Luke's shoes for a moment. Does it make sense that when Luke writes "meta to pascha" in this verse he is referring to a Easter festival celebrated by pagans? This is the same Luke who in his gospel used pascha 7 times—all referring to the (http://bible1.crosswalk.com/Lexicons/Greek/freqdisp.cgi?booklu&number3957&count7&versionkjv) passover

Considering that Luke tells us Herod saw that his actions were pleasing to the Jews and that all this occurred during the days of unleavened bread—associated with Passover, Herod did not want to insult the very people he wanted to please, so he decided to wait until the feast days were over to bring him to the people. Also, note Mark 14:1-2 "After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death. But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people."

The feast day refers to the feast of the passover and of unleavened bread.

But for me the most compelling argument is this:

King James Word Usage of pascha - Total: 29
Passover 28, Easter 1

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 9:27

Quote:
-----We see then, from studying what the BIBLE has to say concerning the subject that the order of events went as follows:
On the 14th of April the lamb was killed. This is the passover. No event following the 14th is ever referred to as the passover.
On the morning of the 15th begins the days of unleavened bread, also known as the feast of unleavened bread.
It must also be noted that whenever the passover is mentioned in the New Testament, the reference is always to the meal, to be eaten on the night of April 14th not the entire week. The days of unleavened bread are NEVER referred to as the Passover. (It must be remembered that the angel of the Lord passed over Egypt on one night, not seven nights in a row.)

Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D. is incorrect. Luke 22:1 says, "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover."

Luke 22:7 says, "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed."

The day of the feast, the feast of unleavened bread and Passover are used interchangeably as Luke himself attests.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/11 9:35

Hi Krispy...

In my opinion, the Acts 12:4 reference of Easter is a mere ERROR OF TRANSLATION (like Matthew Henry indicated). I do know several individuals who defend the celebration and use of the term "Easter" due to its inclusion in the Word of God. Is that really a doctrinal issue? It could (and has) become one by some people. To me, the issue is moot because we know that the Word doesn't acknowledge such a term as having any dire meaning.

However, you raise the very heart of the issue: There is a real difference between "modern versions" (like the NIV) and ancient "modern versions" (like the KJV) BECAUSE they are translated from completely DIFFERENT SOURCES! As much as this topic is discussed, a few individuals will continue to make accusations that the modern translations (like the NIV) "add or remove words" from the Word of God. We can point out that the versions are translated from different sources over and over again, yet people will continue to make blanket, surface observations with the purpose of indicating a "conspiracy" to destroy or discredit God's Word.

My opinion of the matter is this: Regardless of the differences between translations taken from the *Textus Receptus* or the other academic and credible sources, the true doctrine of the Church remains sound in both the KJV and the NIV.

Some believers have gone to great lengths to portray the NIV as soft on sins like homosexuality. Yet it remains completely clear that homosexuality is a sin. Some people have gone to great lengths to portray the NIV as denying the deity of Christ. Yet the NIV remains completely clear that doctrine of the Trinity exists. In fact, I cannot find a single undeniable doctrine of our Faith that has been ultimately altered by the complete NIV. While a word or phrase may change DUE TO THE SOURCES USED, the ultimate doctrine of the Church remains the same as you read the whole.

:-)

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 10:06

Altho I lean toward the theory that the translators included Easter for a reason (the one I listed), I am ok with the idea that it could have been translated clearer. As you said, it really is a mute point because it is inconsequential to any important issues.

Quote:
-----However, you raise the very heart of the issue: There is a real difference between "modern versions" (like the NIV) and ancient "modern versions" (like the KJV) BECAUSE they are translated from completely DIFFERENT SOURCES! As much as this topic is discussed, a few individuals will continue to make accusations that the modern translations (like the NIV) "add or remove words" from the Word of God. We can point out that the versions are translated from different sources over and over again, yet people will continue to make blanket, surface observations with the purpose of indicating a "conspiracy" to destroy or discredit God's Word.

Here I agree with you completely. I believe any conspiracies happened in ancient times when the manuscripts were altered. I am of the opinion that it was the Alex Text that was altered... and I think the evidence and history behind the Alex Text proves this.

I do question the motivation of the publishing companies, but not necessarily the translators. Any new translation is a short term money maker. The amount spent on marketing new translations is mind boggling. I find it interesting... even humorous... that there is really no marketing of KJV's, yet the only modern version that comes close to challenging the KJV in sales is the NIV.

I do question the integrity of some of the translation committees, but not necessarily their motives. For instance, there was an outspoken lesbian on the translation committee of the NIV. It was not a secret that she was a lesbian... she is "ordained", and written quite a bit about justifying the gay lifestyle with scripture.

That, to me, is a red flag... but apparently not to those on the translation committee.

One of the translators on the committee of the NASB released an article a few years after it's release repenting of having been a part of it's translation, and declaring his allegiance to the KJV.

I think that says something.

I'm sure if we do the National Enquirer thing and examine the KJV translators we could come up with some dirt on a few of them. We're all human. But what I'm talking about are sins of a lesbian that were not hidden, but overlooked. And a translator who later stated he was wrong.

Does this mean if you read an NASB or NIV then you aren't saved? Of course not... I was saved in an NIV church. But as believers we should be interested in truth. My search for truth led me to where I am today.

Krispy

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/11 11:22

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Nile... I have a 7 or 8 volume set of Matthew Henry's commentary, hard back. It's my favorite set of books I have. Henry's commentary was, of course, based on the KJV. It starts at Genesis 1:1... has a portion of scripture, then Henry's expository teaching, then the next portion of scripture, then Henry's expository teaching... and on and on.

I love it, and I think you might like it too. I paid less than \$30 on ebay for it, and it was in near perfect condition when I got it. (still is)

Krispy

Alright, thanks for the recommendation! I'll keep an eye out for it/put it on my list of books to get.

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 12:41

I don't see "Easter" being mentioned as a problem, no more than I think the days the the week are less holy for having pagan names:

Monday (Moon Day), Tuesday (Tyr's), Wednesday (Woden's Day), Thursady (Thor's day), Friday (Freyja day), Saturday (Saturn's day), Sunday (Sun day)....

Pagan months of the year:

January (Janus' day - the god of portals), February (februum, purification in Latin), March (Mars, god of war), April (Aphrodite - goddess of love), May (Maia - mother earth goddess), June (Juno - Zeus's wife), July (Julius Ceaser), August (Augustus)...

Quote:

-----In most languages of Christian societies, other than English, German and some Slavic languages, the holiday's name is derived from Pesach, the Hebrew name of Passover, a Jewish holiday to which the Christian Easter is intimately linked. Easter depends on Passover not only for much of its symbolic meaning but also for its position in the calendar; the Last Supper shared by Jesus and his disciples before his crucifixion is generally thought of as a Passover meal, based on the chronology in the Gospels. Some, however, interpreting "Passover" in John 18:28 as a single meal and not a seven-day festival, interpret the Gospel of John as differing from the Synoptic Gospels by placing Christ's death at the time of the slaughter of the Passover lambs, which would put the Last Supper slightly before Passover, on 14 Nisan of the Bible's Hebrew calendar. According to the Catholic Encyclopedia, "In fact, the Jewish feast was taken over into the Christian Easter celebration."

The English name, "Easter", and the German, "Ostern", derive from the name of a putative Anglo-Saxon Goddess of the Dawn (thus, of spring, as the dawn of the year) — called æster, æstre, and ðistre in various dialects of Old English. In England, the annual festive time in her honor was in the "Month of Easter" or ðistur-monath, equivalent to April/Aprilis. The Venerable Bede, an 8th Century English Christian monk wrote in Latin:

"Eostur-monath, qui nunc paschalis mensis interpretatur, quondam a dea illorum quae Eostre vocabatur et cui in illo festa celebrabant nomen habuit."

Translates as: "Eostur-month, which is now interpreted as the paschal month, was formerly named after the goddess Eostre, and has given its name to the festival."

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/11 12:56

can anyone provide a complete list of the "missing" verses? or the added verses depending on how you look at it.... id like to go through them all and compare and see what the difference makes for my self. Grateful for any help. I thought it would be easier to see how great the difference is.

God bless you

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 13:06

This is not an exhaustive list, but here is a list of missing or altered verss:

(Keep in mind, some modern versions do include them in the text, but there will be a footnote saying "the older and more reliable manuscripts omit" ... which the Alex Text has never been shown to be either "older" or "more reliable")

Matthew 1:25, 2:11, 5:22,44, 6:13,33, 9:18, 11:23, 14:33, 16:3, 17:21, 18:11, 19:16-17, 20:7,16,22,23, 20:20,21:44, 22:30, 23:14, 26:31,33, 27:35

Mark 1:1,2, 5:6, 6:11,20, 7:16, 9:29,44,46,4, 10:24, 11:3,8, 13:14, 14:68, 15:28,39, 16:9-20

Luke 1:28, 2:14,22,33, 4:4,8, 6:48, 8:45, 9:54-56, 11:2-4,54, 12:31, 17:36, 22:19-20,43-44, 23:34,38,42,45, 24:3,6,12,36, 40,42, 51-52

John 1:14,18, 3:16,18, 3:13, 5:3b,4, 6:69, 7:53-8:11, 8:6, 9:35, 10:14-15,29, 18:36, 1 John 4:9

Acts 1:3, 2:30,47, 7:45, 8:37, 9:5,6, 15:34, 17:26, 18:7, 20:28, 23:9

Romans 5:1, 8:1, 9:5, 10:15, 13:9, 14:10

1 Corinthians 5:4, 10:20,28, 11:24, 11:29, 13:3, 15:47

2 Corinthians 4:6

Ephesians 3:9, 5:9

Colossians 1:2,14, 2:18,23

1 Timothy 3:16

2 Timothy 3:16

Hebrews 3:6

James 5:16

1 Peter 1:22

2 Peter 3:10

1 John 5:7-8,18

Revelation 13:18, 22:14, 22:1

Krispy

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/11 13:19

Hello...

I would like to interject that these "missing" or "added" verses are not *deleted from* or *added to* the NIV. They simply were not present in the majority of the text sources and ancient manuscripts used in the NIV. In the end, all of these variations are simply the differences between the sources used for the basis of the translations.

As for the superiority of the Textus Receptus, Alexandrian text sources, or other sources (Dead Sea Scrolls, etc...), I simply do not believe that there is enough evidence to make a final, ultimate verdict in the matter. That is why I personally study both the NIV and the KJV -- which I believe represent the best, and most academic translations of their sources.

Of course, I will always study with my KJV due to the great amount of FREE resources available. The plethora of readily available sources are a wonderful means for serious study of God's Word.

: -)

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 13:29

Quote:
-----I would like to interject that these "missing" or "added" verses are not deleted from or added to the NIV. They simply were not present in the majority of the text sources and ancient manuscripts used in the NIV. In the end, all of these variations are simply the differences between the sources used for the basis of the translations.

Absolutely correct. I agree. The fault is w/ the sources they used, which results in these verses not showing up in the modern versions.

Quote:
-----As for the superiority of the Textus Receptus, Alexandrian text sources, or other sources (Dead Sea Scrolls, etc...), I simply do not believe that there is enough evidence to make a final, ultimate verdict in the matter. That is why I personally study both the NIV and the KJV -- which I believe represent the best, and most academic translations of their sources.

This is where we differ. I think there is enough evidence to convict.

Quote:
-----Of course, I will always study with my KJV due to the great amount of FREE resources available. The plethora of readily available sources are a wonderful means for serious study of God's Word.

Absolutely right... and I'm glad you brought that up. The KJV has no copyright on it. We are free to quote from it in written, spoken and published material without having to pay royalties to the copyright holder. This is **not** true of the modern versions, all of which is copyrighted, and you can not use without permission and/or paying someone.

This is why I question the motives of the publishing companies. Money is the issue.

Who owns the copyright to the NIV? The International Bible Society holds the copyright, but Zondervan has exclusive rights to the NIV, which means that's where the majority of royalties go. Who owns Zondervan? There are a couple levels above Zondervan... but the buck stops (literally) at Rupert Murdoch. Owner of Fox... an unbeliever who is responsible for much of the trash on TV.

Krispy

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 13:42

Quote:
-----The KJV has no copyright on it. We are free to quote from it in written, spoken and published material without having to pay royalties to the copyright holder. This is not true of the modern versions, all of which is copyrighted, and you can not use without permission and/or paying someone.

This is why I question the motives of the publishing companies. Money is the issue.

Who owns the copyright to the NIV? The International Bible Society holds the copyright, but Zondervan has exclusive rights to the NIV, which means that's where the majority of royalties go. Who owns Zondervan? There are a couple levels above Zondervan... but the buck stops (literally) at Rupert Murdoch. Owner of Fox... an unbeliever who is responsible for much of the trash on TV.

Krispy this is misleading. The KJV does have a copyright on it.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_James_Version#Copyright_status) Source

Quote:

In most of the world the King James Bible has passed out of copyright and is freely reproduced. This is not the case in the United Kingdom.

In the United Kingdom, the rights to the Authorized Version are held by the British Crown.

Also please read this (<http://www.baptistpillar.com/bd0548.htm>) article.

Quote:

If the fact that the King James Bible is not under copyright in the US indicates that it is the word of God and not the word of men, as the newer versions are indicated to be by virtue of their copyright, does that also mean, as the KJV is under copyright in England, that it is not the word of God in that country? To me, the copyright argument does not prove anything other than that currently if you want to print the NIV you have to pay to do so, but you do not have to receive anyone's permission to print the KJV in this country. However, one hundred years from now (or even 75 years from now) the copyright on the NIV will cease and anyone can print it without permission or payment. Will the NIV be a better or more accurate version in 50 or 75 years when its copyright expires?

I don't think so. The argument dealing with copyright is weak at best, and deceitful at worst. There are so many good reasons to believe in the superiority of the King James Bible, it seems odd to me to use a false argument to support a book of Truth.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/11 13:52

Hi Krispy...

Yes, we certainly disagree about whether the evidence is present to discredit one set of sources, and ultimately, the versions translated from it. I have read many arguments, pro and con, about the sources used for the NIV. I am inclined to test the sources of such dispute. Currently, a majority (from what I understand) of translators, archaeologists, linguists and manuscript historians support the unbiased authenticity Alexandrian Texts. Does this make it right? Of course not. However, in my opinion, there is enough reason to abstain from making a final judgment in the matter.

The KJV is not without similar criticism. Issues have been historically raised concerning the instructions that were given to the translators of the KJV. For instance, they were instructed to use a questionable version (the "Bishop's Bible") as the basis of the "new" version. Some traditional terms and phrases were retained, seemingly against the wishes of some of the translators. Additionally, some have criticized the translators' exclusive use of "formal equivalence" (word-for-word translation, rather than the "dynamic equivalence" style that conveys thought). Anyone who has translated a passage from Spanish to English (or vice versa) realize the problems associated with exclusive use of either formal equivalence or dynamic equivalence. And of course, there are scholars who believe that the Alexandrian text and other sources are intrinsically superior to the Textus Receptus.

One problem that I have noticed with the KJV is the lack of footnotes. The translators certainly noted areas of dispute -- but they are not included in the finished manuscript. The NIV is quick to include the debated passages, phrases or words with an footnote signifying such rationale and alternative explanations.

As for Zondervan, I'd like to also let it be known that they were independent at the time that the New International Version was published (in 1978). They were not purchased by HarperCollins (which is now owned by NewsCorp) until 1988. No one in Fox, NewsCorp, HarperCollins, or any other secular corporation had any input into the translation.

*EDIT...

- As far as a "copyright" is concerned, you may want to consider that the works by David Wilkerson, Leonard Ravenhill, etc... are protected by copyrights. In addition, certain other works are also legally protected or copyrighted (including the KJV of the Gideon Bibles found in hotels). Does this mean that they are "in it for the money?" Of course not. They simply are protecting their own name. Since it was published, the NIV is allowed to be used in a work up to 500 verses (or less than 25% of a total work). This is not to simply "make money" off of a version -- but to protect it from being commercially reproduced or used in a malignant manner.

:~)

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 14:37

Jay... I'm not being misleading. A copyright held by the "crown" of England is far different from one being owned by a publishing company.

First off, as an American, the "crown" of England is meaningless to me. (sorry philologos!)

Secondly, you dont have to pay royalties to the Royalty, or have their permission to reproduce this.

Once again, Jay... your putting apples beside oranges.

There is no comparison here.

Also, I dont use the copyright issue to proove the KJV is the Word of God. My point about the copyright is that money is involved, and if there is any reason for the over **80** modern English versions produced in the last 120 plus years... it's publishing rights. And when there is a copyright on what is supposed to be God's Word, and that copyright generates money for a secular entity... I say there is a problem there.

And yes... I have a problem with a KJV (which has no copyright royalties) costing the same as an NIV at the bookstore.

Krispy

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 15:03

Krispy, the only reason the United States (as one of many) does not recognize the KJV copyright is because of the number of years that has passed since it was created.

Let me put it this way, Go to the United Kingdom and start creating copies of the KJV and "her majesty" has every right to sue you.

Also, in about 90+ years we can all enjoy the NASB, the NIV, the ESV etc. as Public Domain.

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 15:27

Quote:

-----First off, as an American, the "crown" of England is meaningless to me.

As a Canadian it means alot, GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!! ;~)

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 15:39

Krispy,

I don't want you to think I am picking on you with this, but it is (as the article before said) weak at best and dishonest at worst to use the copyright argument against modern versions.

Basically, the purpose of the copyright is to protect a company like Crossway (ESV), Lockman (NASB), and Zondervan (NIV) from having another company print, distribute, and sell the translation that they spent their time, talent, and treasures creating.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 15:40

Quote:

-----First off, as an American, the "crown" of England is meaningless to me.

:-) I agree, but that is another discussion for another time. haha

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/11 15:40

quite a list..... will take a little time to go through.....

thanks Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 15:54

Quote:

-----Basically, the purpose of the copyright is to protect a company like Crossway (ESV), Lockman (NASB), and Zondervan (NIV) from having another company print, distribute, and sell the translation that they spent their time, talent, and treasures creating.

I help in the ministry of a local church here who prints KJV's for free distribution. They are shipped to military personnel and to disaster victims (along with truck loads of food, clothing, etc)...

It's a ministry, and we're not interested in "protecting" ourselves against anyone. We're interested in getting the Word of God out to people who need it.

I understand printing costs and things like that, but it's a rather strange thought to me that publishing companies feel the need to protect themselves financially when God's Word is not something to be used for profit. Scripture even discusses that itself.

... and I don't feel like you're picking on me. These are valid points you're bringing up.

Krispy

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/11 16:22

I've got to side with Krispy on the Copyright issue. Copyrights in the Christian community are a big gripe of mine. If the NIV or NASB or ESV or whatever is as good as the publishers claim it is, and if the translators and publishers believe that their Bible is the most accurate and closest to the actual words of God - then what a crime to copyright it or make a profit off of it!!! Just think about this: People are selling the word of God...*for a profit*. That makes me sick to my stomach.

Can you imagine the apostle Mark writing his gospel, then saying, "I have here a full and accurate account of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ. I have been inspired by the Holy Spirit to write these words. Those who wish to have eternal life will find it within the pages of this book. Now...who's got the highest bid?"

:-)

Quote:

----- As far as a "copyright" is concerned, you may want to consider that the works by David Wilkerson, Leonard Ravenhill, etc... are protected by copyrights.

Indeed they are, and I wish they weren't! Or at least that they had clauses for free distribution. Again, like with Mark's g

ospel, look at what we have here...someone writes a book to edify and help believers or to convert sinners...and then charges money for it? That person must not really believe the message that their books contains is all that important...

Consider the copyright in Zac Poonen's books:

Quote:

----- Copyright - Zac Poonen (1990)
This book has been copyrighted to prevent misuse.
It should not be reprinted or translated without
written permission from the author.

Permission is however given for any part of this book
to be downloaded and printed
provided it is for FREE distribution,
provided NO ALTERATIONS are made,
provided the AUTHOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS are mentioned,
and provided this copyright notice is included
in each printout.

By the Spirit,
Nile

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 16:37

Quote:

-----If the NIV or NASB or ESV or whatever is as good as the publishers claim it is, and if the translators and publishers believe that their Bible is the most accurate and closest to the actual words of God - then what a crime to copyright it or make a profit off of it!!! Just think about this: People are selling the word of God...for a profit. That makes me sick to my stomach.

Crossway (ESV), International bible society (NIV) and the Lockman Foundation (NASB) are non-profit organizations.

A non-profit organization (abbreviated "NPO", or "non-profit" or "not-for-profit") is an organization whose primary objective is to support an issue or matter of private interest or public concern for non-commercial purposes, without concern for monetary profit. A nonprofit organization may be involved in a wide range of areas relating to the arts, social issues, charities, early childhood education, healthcare, politics, religion, research, sports or some other endeavor.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non_profit) Source

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 16:38

Quote:

-----Can you imagine the apostle Mark writing his gospel, then saying, "I have here a full and accurate account of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ. I have been inspired by the Holy Spirit to write these words. Those who wish to have eternal life will find it within the pages of this book. Now...who's got the highest bid?"

Would you get mad at Mark if took a collection to help him devote his time to making this gospel available to as many people as possible?

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/11 18:32

Ah, I see. Thank you for correcting me on that point!

However, I still think money is an issue here...I'm curious, are the bookstores non-for profit also? Also, this doesn't really address the issue of copyrights without free distribution clauses.

gtg, I'll respond more later if necessary.

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2007/5/11 20:19

Where does are bible come from

To me it is not more important where the bible comes from.

I have read pretty much most of the NIV as it was the bible that I used in school and in a church I was recently at and some of the other versions.

What we have also got to note it who organised the NIV? Was it christians? Did they believe? To me there has been secondary motives? When the NIV was written it was written as a Gender Specific Version. Meaning they took out the bits they did not like. There has been things like that with the other

Gnostic

The big problem I find with the NIV is the gnostic passages such as 2 Timothy as Alexandria at the time was a big gnostic centre and it has come down into our bible translations.

Clement of Alexandria

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clement_of_Alexandria) Clement of Alexandria

Does the translation effect my doctrine or belief?

To me it can recently someone used a passage that was well known to me and because it was in a different translation basically made that verse me something different to what it actually says.

I am learning Hebrew at the moment or trying to and it does make a difference

I work at the christian bookshop so I pretty much know most of the bibles coming out.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexandrian_text-type) Alexandria Text type

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Majority_Text) Byzantine Text Type

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caesarean_text-type) Ceserean text type

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/11 20:36

Quote:

JaySaved wrote:

Quote:

-----Can you imagine the apostle Mark writing his gospel, then saying, "I have here a full and accurate account of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ. I have been inspired by the Holy Spirit to write these words. Those who wish to have eternal life will find it within the pages of this book. Now...who's got the highest bid?"

Would you get mad at Mark if took a collection to help him devote his time to making this gospel available to as many people as possible?

Not necessarily. There's a far-cry difference between that and the modern scene though...

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/12 8:14

here is something that i considered to be an important missing part.

KJV

1Ti 6:5 Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: **from such withdraw thyself.**

ESV

1Ti 6:5 and constant friction among people who are depraved in mind and deprived of the truth, imagining that godliness is a means of gain.

ASV

1Ti 6:5 wranglings of men corrupted in mind and bereft of the truth, supposing that godliness is a way of gain.

ISV

1Ti 6:5 and incessant conflict between people who are depraved in mind and deprived of truth. They think that godliness is a way to make a profit.

i dont have the niv or nasb translation....but i think the "from such withdraw thyself" part are missing in them also, maybe someone could provide them from those translations, Ive also found some other things, I'm going through the verses, the ones Krispy provided. And a couple more, at first glance they might not seem so important, but some are, like i believe this verse above, but still we can find other verses that say the same thing in booth manuscripts...but still it is good to know that these verses or parts of them are "missing" in the other manuscripts.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/5/12 19:50

Aren't there verses added in at the end of Mark in the KJV?

Also, about the copyrights. If you feel it's wrong to copyright the Bible, isn't it wrong to copyright and sell Christian music since it's for "ministry"?

Jordan

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/12 21:22

Quote:

HomeFree89 wrote:

Also, about the copyrights. If you feel it's wrong to copyright the Bible, isn't it wrong to copyright and sell Christian music since it's for "ministry"?

My personal conviction is that it shouldn't be sold (for profit) if it's your "ministry". And nowadays with music, it's very easy to make it available for free on the internet.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/14 16:10

Krispy wrote:

Quote:

-----One of the translators on the committee of the NASB released an article a few years after it's release repenting of having been a part of it's translation, and declaring his allegiance to the KJV.

I think that says something.

Some KJO advocates state that Franklin Logsdon was the (<http://www.scionofzion.com/logsdon.htm>) Chief Translator of the NASB. Some KJO advocates say he was (<http://www.mountainretreatorg.net/apologetics/whyweuse.shtml>) Co-Founder of the NASB. The truth is here straight from the Lockman Foundation:

The Lockman Foundation's Official Response to KJVO claims about Frank Logsdon

Published with permission from The Lockman Foundation

The Board of Directors of The Lockman Foundation launched the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE translation work in the late 1950's following the completion of the AMPLIFIED NEW TESTAMENT. Dr. S. Franklin Logsdon was acquainted with Dewey Lockman, president of The Lockman Foundation, prior to Mr. Lockman's death in 1974. Mr. Logsdon was never a member of the Board of Directors, nor was he an employee of The Lockman Foundation. Mr. Logsdon had no authority to hire employees or translators for the Foundation, to set policy, to vote, to hold office, to incur expenses, etc. He cannot be considered "co-founder" of the NASB, nor part of The Lockman Foundation, nor part of the NASB translation team, nor did he write the forward of the NASB. According to our records, he was present at board meetings on two occasions -- once to hear a travel report; and once to deliver an "inspirational thought."

Mr. Logsdon last wrote to Mr. Lockman in fall of 1973 that he was moving to Florida. Mr. Lockman replied that he was surprised and saddened by his decision to leave the area. Mr. Lockman passed away in January of 1974, and no further correspondence was exchanged between Frank Logsdon and The Lockman Foundation. He resided in Florida until his passing some years ago.

The grass withers, the flower fades; but the word of our God stands forever. Isaiah 40:8 (NASB)

The Lockman Foundation
(<http://aomin.org/lockman.html>) Source

Best uncorrupted text - posted by Psalm73 (), on: 2007/5/14 16:34

Get out the westscot and hort greek(throw those bibles out), and try on Tyndale's bold pan on the New Testament. How about that 1526 N.T coupled with a 1537 Matthew's O.T with the printing of today. You could do much comparison but the word of God will tell you about those that have corrupted and done an abominable work. Try this, they have diminished the Revelation, and have taken away from the gospel of Luke. (example)

(compare with me) And accept Paul and I's exhortation

Eph 4:10 He that descended, is even the same also that ascended up, even above all heavens, to fulfil all things.

11 And the very same, made some Apostles, some prophets, some Evangelists, some Shepherds, some Teachers:

12 that the saints might have all things necessary to work and minister withall, to the edifying of the body of Christ,

13 till we everyeachone (in the unity of faith, and knowledge of the son of God) grow up unto a perfect man, after the measure of age which is in the fullness of Christ:

14 That we henceforth be no more children wavering and carried with every wind of doctrine, by the wiliness of men and craftiness, whereby they lay a wait for us to deceive us.

This is the best bible today without printing and 2 loving souls should join me that it never be copyrighted, it's greek has to be shown as superior, even despite the weaknesses of the 1537 O.T

Psalm 26 I hate the congregation of the wicked and I will not sit among the ungodly.

I washed my hands with innocency O Lord, and so go I to thy altar

Lord, I love the habitation of thy house and the place where thy honour dwelleth

O destroy not my soul with sinners, nor my life with (with) the bloodthirsty.

Praise the Lord Jesus Christ

Re:, on: 2007/5/14 17:21

Quote:
-----Aren't there verses added in at the end of Mark in the KJV?

No... writings from the 1st century show quotations from the passages supposedly added centuries later to Mark. Kinda hard to quote from something that hasn't been written yet.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/14 17:25

Quote:
-----Some KJO advocates state that Franklin Logsdon was the Chief Translator of the NASB. Some KJO advocates say he was Co-Founder of the NASB. The truth is here straight from the Lockman Foundation:

Well... there is plenty of evidence that disputes the information the Lockman Foundation is putting out... Be careful what you call "truth"... apparently, it isn't.

Please read this: <http://www.wayoflife.org/articles/logsdon2.htm>

Secondly, I'm considered a bit on the fringe if I suggest there might be a conspiracy of any degree involved in the modern versions.... yet it's perfectly ok for people on the other side of the debate to accuse KJV'ers of conspiracies all over the place. I find the duplicity to be a bit humorous.

Krispy

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/14 17:42

Well, somebody is lying. Either the Lockman Foundation or the KJO advocates.

No offense, but I will stick with Lockman.

Re: Here's what Hmmm, on: 2007/5/14 18:36

Quote:
-----by hmmm on 2007/5/12 8:14:03
i don't have the niv or nasb translation....but i think the "from such withdraw thyself" part are missing in them also, maybe someone could provide them from those translations,

NASB 1 Tim 6.5 and constant friction between men of depraved mind and deprived of the truth, who suppose that godliness is a means of gain.

NKJV 1 Tim 6.5 useless wranglings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, who suppose that godliness is a means of gain. From such withdraw yourself.

NIV 1 Tim 6.5 and constant friction between men of corrupt mind, who have been robbed of the truth and who think that godliness is a means to financial gain.

Amplified 1 Tim 6.5 And protracted wrangling and wearing discussion and perpetual friction among men who are corrupted in mind and bereft of the truth, who imagine that godliness or righteousness is a source of profit. From such withdraw

Re: - posted by lightwalker (), on: 2007/5/16 6:58

One day I was trying to explain something to my daughter and I told her to read a passage in Psalms 66. Now I read the KJV mostly. And having said that I am not one of those foaming at the mouth people that say that all other versions are road kill and that you cannot be saved if you read them. However the passage I wanted her to read had to do with the death to sin that we are called to and just how terrible it is to us. Jesus Himself said it was like taking up a cross, and likened it to death.

So anyway I had her read it and lo and behold her version said awesome. I had visions of hippies on acid looking up and saying awww. Anyway the true sense of the word given in the greek means a fear of God and not something cool. It seems to me that the modern translators pick and choose sometimes by their own thoughts and not according to the meaning that the writer meant to convey. My personal belief is that the KJV has a power that the modern versions lack.

Re:, on: 2007/5/16 7:06

Quote:
-----I am not one of those foaming at the mouth people that say that all other versions are road kill and that you cannot be saved if you read them.

Most of us KJV'ers are not either... thats a stereotype. :-)

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/5/16 7:08

Quote:
-----No offense, but I will stick with Lockman.

What makes them any more credible than anyone else? Of course they wont side with someone who is discredtiing them. Thats called a "conflict of interest".

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/16 7:45

Quote:

It seems to me that the modern translators pick and choose sometimes by their own thoughts and not according to the meaning that the writer meant to convey.

YES!! this is what i have found to, or at least in the Swedish versions they have taken away much of the "powerfully" words and picked others and just become a "light" version of the bible.

an example

Jer 17:9 The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately **wicked**: who can know it?

in the Swedish version it says translated now.... desperately ill ?!? or sick as in a deices ?!?

as the ESV also says

Jer 17:9 The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately sick; who can understand it?

here is the ASV

Jer 17:9 The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is exceedingly corrupt: who can know it?

that one captured it quite well, don't know what the NIV says...or the NASB.... but still i find many new translation always seems to pick the meaning that makes man look less wicked and sinful, and tone down what God thinks about it

just some observations from me...

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/16 9:07

Quote:
-----One day I was trying to explain something to my daughter and I told her to read a passage in Psalms 66. Now I read the KJV mostly . And having said that I am not one of those foaming at the mouth people that say that all other versions are road kill and that you cannot be saved if you read them. However the passage I wanted her to read had to do with the death to sin that we are called to and just how terrible it is to us. Jesus Himself said it was like taking up a cross, and likened it to death.
So anyway I had her read it and lo and behold her version said awesome. I had visions of hippies on acid looking up and saying awwwww. Anyway the true sense of the word given in the greek means a fear of God and not something cool. It seems to me that the modern translators pick and choose so metimes by their own thoughts and not according to the meaning that the writer meant to convey. My personal belief is that the KJV has a power that the modern versions lack.

I assume you are referring to Psalm 66:3 and 5. The NIV and most modern translations say:
(NIV) "Say to God, "How awesome are your deeds! So great is your power that your enemies cringe before you."

"Come and see what God has done, how awesome his works in man's behalf!"

The (KJV) says, "Say unto God, How terrible art thou in thy works! through the greatness of thy power shall thine enemies submit themselves unto thee."

"Come and see the works of God: he is terrible in his doing toward the children of men."

The Hebrew word translated 'awesome' by the NIV and 'terrible' by the KJV is

any yaw-ray' and it means:

1. to fear, revere, be afraid
 1. (Qal)
 1. to fear, be afraid
 2. to stand in awe of, be awed
 3. to fear, reverence, honour, respect
 2. (Niphal)
 1. to be fearful, be dreadful, be feared
 2. to cause astonishment and awe, be held in awe
 3. to inspire reverence or godly fear or awe
 3. (Piel) to make afraid, terrify
2. (TWOT) to shoot, pour

The definitions mean to stand in awe of, to be astonished at to be in godly fear of. Now, given that in our modern language 'terrible' is mostly used for things of low quality and 'awesome' means (outside of the hippie culture) impressive and frightening, we see that the translators felt 'awesome' succinctly described the sense of awe we have for God's works. They did not choose terrible because they don't want anyone to think that God's deeds are of poor or inferior quality.

Did the KJV translators make a mistake in using terrible? Not really, terrible was used differently at that time.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/16 9:10

Quote:
-----What makes them any more credible than anyone else? Of course they wont side with someone who is discredtiing them. Thats call
ed a "conflict of interest".

This is a double sided argument that neither one of us can win. If we have two sides who say different things, you weigh the evidence and make a decision as to who is telling the truth and who is lying.

I have made my decision to trust the Lockman Foundation over a lot of King James Only Advocates. You have chosen t
o trust the advocates over the Lockman Foundation, that is your choice. Let us both be fully convinced in our own minds
that we are right and the other is wrong.

Re:, on: 2007/5/16 9:27

Quote:

JaySaved wrote:

Quote:
-----One day I was trying to explain something to my daughter and I told her to read a passage in Psalms 66. Now I read the KJV mostly
. And having said that I am not one of those foaming at the mouth people that say that all other versions are road kill and that you cannot be saved if y
ou read them. However the passage I wanted her to read had to do with the death to sin that we are called to and just how terrible it is to us. Jesus Hi
mself said it was like taking up a cross, and likened it to death.
So anyway I had her read it and lo and behold her version said awesome. I had visions of hippies on acid looking up and saying awwwww. Anyway the t
rue sense of the word given in the greek means a fear of God and not something cool. It seems to me that the modern translators pick and choose so
metimes by their own thoughts and not according to the meaning that the writer meant to convey. My personal belief is that the KJV has a power that t
he modern versions lack.

I assume you are referring to Psalm 66:3 and 5. The NIV and most modern translations say:
(NIV) "Say to God, "How awesome are your deeds! So great is your power that your enemies cringe before you."

"Come and see what God has done, how awesome his works in man's behalf!"

The (KJV) says, "Say unto God, How terrible art thou in thy works! through the greatness of thy power shall thine enemies submit themselves unto th
ee."

"Come and see the works of God: he is terrible in his doing toward the children of men."

The Hebrew word translated 'awesome' by the NIV and 'terrible' by the KJV is

any yaw-ray' and it means:

1. to fear, revere, be afraid
 1. (Qal)
 1. to fear, be afraid
 2. to stand in awe of, be awed
 3. to fear, reverence, honour, respect
 2. (Niphal)
 1. to be fearful, be dreadful, be feared
 2. to cause astonishment and awe, be held in awe
 3. to inspire reverence or godly fear or awe
 3. (Piel) to make afraid, terrify
2. (TWOT) to shoot, pour

The definitions mean to stand in awe of, to be astonished at to be in godly fear of. Now, given that in our modern language 'terrible' is mostly used f
or things of low quality and 'awesome' means (outside of the hippie culture) impressive and frightening, we see that the translators felt 'awesome'
' succinctly described the sense of awe we have for God's works. They did not choose terrible because they don't want anyone to think that God'
s deeds are of poor or inferior quality.

Did the KJV translators make a mistake in using terrible? Not really, terrible was used differently at that time.

But the word "terrible" still carries with it a more profoundness not captured by the word "awesome" especially when today the word "awesome" is cheaply used in the "cotton candy" church to mean pretty much what isn't "awesome".

Re:, on: 2007/5/16 10:00

Quote:

-----Let us both be fully convinced in our own minds that we are right and the other is wrong.

I am truly fully convinced in my own mind that you are wrong... most of the time.... lol :-P

Just kidding, brother!

Krispy

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/16 10:20

Quote:

-----But the word "terrible" still carries with it a more profoundness not captured by the word "awesome" especially when today the word "awesome" is cheaply used in the "cotton candy" church to mean pretty much what isn't "awesome".

Allow me to use this as an illustration: (I do respect your opinions)

What if I respond and say, "That was a terrible response."

Do I mean that your response is full of awe and I have a godly fear of it? No, I mean that your response was poor and of low worth.

That is the most common meaning in today's world of the word terrible.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/16 10:23

Quote:

-----I am truly fully convinced in my own mind that you are wrong... most of the time.... lol

If I may quote the world-renowned philosopher (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Curly_Howard) Curly Howard when he became frustrated that no one understood him, "Is everybody dumb?" :-P

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2007/5/16 11:40

Quote:

-----YES!! this is what I have found to, or at least in the Swedish versions they have taken away much of the "powerfully" words and picked others and just become a "light" version of the bible.

Quote:

-----an example

Jer 17:9 The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?

in the Swedish version it says translated now.... desperately ill !?!? or sick as in a deices !?!?

maybe wicked wasn't the best word to use in the first place. It works both ways.

Isaiah 53:10

The KJV says "bruised"

The NASB says "crushed"

Crushed is a far better word for what happened.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/16 12:17

you are right in that, however.... :-) if you look in websters....

so the word had a more "powerful" meaning back in the day of English language....

here are from Websters dictionary

Bruised

BRUISED, pp. Crushed; hurt or broken by a blunt or heavy instrument.

Just that time change the meaning of some word, but for today nasb captured it perfectly i must say :-)

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2007/5/16 12:26

Quote:

hmmhmm wrote:

you are right in that, however.... :-) if you look in websters....

so the word had a more "powerful" meaning back in the day of English language....

here are from Websters dictionary

Bruised

BRUISED, pp. Crushed; hurt or broken by a blunt or heavy instrument.

Just that time change the meaning of some word, but for today nasb captured it perfectly i must say :-)

key words...had(past) and today(present)

I will always use the KJV, but when teaching youngsters TODAY...I sometimes don't have the time to redefine, explain and update everyword that needs it. Some children in my Church have never read a Bible before.

just rambling.... :-)

Re:, on: 2007/5/16 12:29

Quote:

JaySaved wrote:

Quote:
-----But the word "terrible" still carries with it a more profoundness not captured by the word "awesome" especially when today the word "awesome" is cheaply used in the "cotton candy" church to mean pretty much what isn't "awesome".

Allow me to use this as an illustration: (I do respect your opinions)

What if I respond and say, "That was a terrible response."

Do I mean that your response is full of awe and I have a godly fear of it? No, I mean that your response was poor and of low worth.

Thats why words mean something and some words have more weight, depending on what is being spoken and consideration given because of who speaks them. Using your illustration, you would be more accurate/precise to say my words are lousy, weak, crummy, ain't worth reading, ad nausm, etc. Even terrible would fit.

Quote:
-----That is the most common meaning in today's world of the word terrible.

I know what you mean Brother, however, when associated with God who can cause the Earth to tremble and fall upon itself, terrible may even be too mild a word of expression when referring to Him.

I might be picking fly dirt outta pepper on that one, but I still prefer the KJV. :-)

Re:, on: 2007/5/16 12:45

Quote:
-----but when teaching youngsters TODAY...I sometimes don't have the time to redefine, explain and update everyword that needs it. Some children in my Church have never read a Bible before.

My suggestion... take the time.

By the way, I never read the Bible before I was saved either. Hardly read it after I was saved for awhile. We don't exactly speak the "king's English" where I live... but I didn't have nearly as much trouble understanding it as everyone told me I would.

Pays not to listen to people sometimes. :-)

Krispy

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2007/5/16 14:25

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Quote:
-----but when teaching youngsters TODAY...I sometimes don't have the time to redefine, explain and update everyword that needs it. Some children in my Church have never read a Bible before.

My suggestion... take the time.

By the way, I never read the Bible before I was saved either. Hardly read it after I was saved for awhile. We dont exactly speak the "king's English" where I live... but I didnt have nearly as much trouble understanding it as everyone told me I would.

Pays not to listen to people sometimes. :-)

Krispy

Let me re-phrase

The time I was given was not enough.

When I have 5 or 10 minutes IÂ'm not going to spend too much of it translating the QueenÂ's English. IÂ'm like you and many othersÂ...came to the KJV years laterÂ...I like itÂ...and understand it (I always liked Shakespeare). I would never teach or speak without having done my homework on a subject or scripture, but I do not feel it necessary to use the KJV every time I speak, especially for a few minutes with the kids.

my 2 cents

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/5/17 16:05

Do you guys have a problem with the ESV? It was built upon Tyndale's version and the KJV, at least that's what I've heard. It is very close to the KJV , but without all the archaic words and phrasing.

Jordan

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/17 16:12

ESV is a wonderful translation. I have enjoyed it tremendously.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/17 17:25

Quote:

HomeFree89 wrote:

Do you guys have a problem with the ESV? It was built upon Tyndale's version and the KJV, at least that's what I've heard. It is very close to the KJV , but without all the archaic words and phrasing.

Jordan

ive heard this to.... are all the verses that are in the KJV in the ESV? and are they based on the same manuscripts?

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/17 19:43

Sorry, the ESV is another one of those Westcott-Hort modern translations.

Which I will say once again, is a fine translation.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/5/17 20:35

Quote:

hmmhmm wrote:

Quote:

HomeFree89 wrote:

Do you guys have a problem with the ESV? It was built upon Tyndale's version and the KJV, at least that's what I've heard. It is very close to the KJV , but without all the archaic words and phrasing.

Jordan

ive heard this to.... are all the verses that are in the KJV in the ESV? and are they based on the same manuscripts?

It isn't based on the TR, but I think it is just as good as the KJV. Since we don't have the original texts what makes the TR the authority over the other texts?

Here is an article that has helped me a lot.

Westcott & Hort vs. Textus Receptus: Which is Superior?

By Doug Kutilek

5/24//96

The New Testament was inspired by God, and came from the pens of its writers or their amanuenses in infallible form, free from any defect of any sort, including scribal mistakes. However, God in His providence did not choose to protect that infallible original text from alterations and corruptions in the copying and printing process. Scribes and printers made both accidental (usually) and deliberate (occasionally) changes in the Greek text as they copied it. As a result, the surviving manuscript copies of the New Testament differ among themselves in numerous details.

Many attempts have been made (even as early as the second century A.D.) to sort through the manuscripts of the New Testament and weed out the errors and mistakes of copyists, in order to restore the text to its original apostolic form. Those who have made such an attempt have differed one from another in the resources at their disposal, their own personal abilities as text editors, and the principles followed in trying to restore the original text of the New Testament.

The two most famous attempts at restoring the original text of the New Testament are the Textus Receptus, dating from the Reformation and post-Reformation era, and the Greek text of B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, first published in 1881. These two texts were based on differing collections of manuscripts, following differing textual principles, at different stages in the on-going process of the discovery and evaluation of surviving New Testament manuscripts, and, not surprisingly, with often differing results. There is much dispute today about which of these texts is a more faithful representation of the original form of the Greek New Testament, and it is this question which will be addressed in this study: Which is the superior Greek New Testament, the Textus Receptus/"Received Text" or the "Critical Text" of Westcott and Hort?

Any proper and adequate answer given to this question must begin with the matter of definition of terms. First, what is meant by the term "superior"? This may seem an unnecessary question since it might be supposed that all would agree on the answer, namely, the superior Greek New Testament is that one which most closely preserves and presents the precise original wording of the original Greek writings of the New Testament. However, in the rather voluminous popular literature on this issue, some writers have argued that one text or another is superior because it is perceived to contain more proof-texts of the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, or some other doctrine. In fact, to make a selection on such a basis is much beside the point. Additional supporting proof-texts of numerous doctrines can be found in various Greek manuscripts or versions, though the readings are beyond dispute not the original reading of the New Testament. "Which Greek text most closely corresponds to the original New Testament?"--this and no other consideration is proper in deciding which Greek text is superior.

Next, what is meant by the term, "Received Text."? This name was first applied to a printed Greek text only as late as 1633, or almost 120 years after the first published Greek New Testament appeared in 1516. In 1633, the Elzevirs of Leyden published the second edition of their Greek text, and that text contained the publisher's "blurb": *textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum*, or, "therefore you have the text now received by all," from which the term *textus receptus*, or received text was taken, and applied collectively and retroactively to the series of published Greek New Testaments extending from 1516 to 1633 and beyond. Most notable among the many editors of Greek New Testaments in this period were Erasmus (5 editions: 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535), Robert Etienne a.k.a. Robertus Stephanus (4 editions, 1546, 1549, 1550, 1551), Theodore de Beza (9 editions, between 1565 and 1604), and the Elzevirs (3 editions, 1624, 1633, 1641). These many Greek texts display a rather close general uniformity, a uniformity based on the fact that all these texts are more or less reprints of the text(s) edited by Erasmus, with only minor variations. These texts were not independently compiled by the many different editors on the basis of close personal examination of numerous Greek manuscripts, but are genealogically-related. Proof of this is to be found in a number of "unique" readings in Erasmus' texts, that is, readings which are found in no known Greek manuscript but which are nevertheless found in the editions of Erasmus. One of these is the reading "book of life" in Revelation 22:19. All known Greek manuscripts here read "tree of life" instead of "book of life" as in the *textus receptus*. Where did the reading "book of life" come from? When Erasmus was compiling his text, he had access to only one manuscript of Revelation, and it lacked the last six verses, so he took the Latin Vulgate and back-translated from Latin to Greek. Unfortunately, the copy of the Vulgate he used read "book of life," unlike any Greek manuscript of the passage, and so Erasmus introduced a "unique" Greek reading into his text. Since the first and only "source" for this reading in Greek is the printed text of Erasmus, any Greek New Testament that agrees with Erasmus here must have been simply copied from his text. The fact that all *textus receptus* editions of Stephanus, Beza, et al. read with Erasmus shows that their texts were more or less slavish reprints of Erasmus' text and not independently compiled editions, for had they been edited independently of Erasmus, they would surely have followed the Greek manuscripts here and read "tree of life." Numerous other unique or extremely rare readings in the *textus receptus* editions could be referenced.

In this connection, it is worth noting that the translators of the King James Version did not follow exclusively any single printed edition of the New Testament in Greek. The edition most closely followed by them was Beza's edition of 1598, but they departed from this edition for the reading in some other published Greek text at least 170 times, and in at least 60 places, the KJV translators abandoned all then-existing printed editions of the Greek New Testament, choosing instead to follow precisely the reading in the Latin Vulgate version. No edition of the Greek New Testament agreeing precisely with the text followed by the KJV translators was in existence until 1881 when F. H. A. Scrivener produced such an edition (though even it differs from the King James Version in a very few places, eg. Acts 19:20). It is Scrivener's 1881 text which was reprinted by the Trinitarian Bible Society in 1976. This text does not conform exactly to any of the historic texts dating from the Reformation period and known collectively as the *textus receptus*.

Furthermore, a careful distinction must be made between the *textus receptus* (even in its broadest collective sense) on the one hand, and the majority text (also known as the Byzantine or Syrian text) on the other. Though the terms *textus receptus* and majority text are frequently used as though they were synonymous, they by no means mean the same thing. When the majority text was being compiled by Hodges and Farstad, their collaborator Pickering estimated that their resultant text would differ from the *textus receptus* in over 1,000 places; in fact, the differences amounted to 1,838. In other words, the reading of the majority of Greek manuscripts differs from the *textus receptus* (Hodges and Farstad used an 1825 Oxford reprint of Stephanus' 1550 text for comparison purposes) in 1,838 places, and in many of these places, the text of Westcott and Hort agrees with the majority of manuscripts against the *textus receptus*. The majority of manuscripts and Westcott and Hort agree against the *textus receptus* in excluding Luke 17:36; Acts 8:37; and I John 5:7 from the New Testament, as well as concurring in numerous other readings (such as "tree of life" in Revelation 22:19). Except in a few rare cases, writers well-versed in textual criticism have abandoned the *textus receptus* as a standard text.

The question remains to be resolved: how shall we define *textus receptus*? It has been customary in England to employ the 1550 text of Stephanus as the exemplar of the *textus receptus* (just as the Elzevir text was so adopted on the continent of Europe), and so we will follow this custom. For our purposes here, the term *textus receptus* means the 1550 edition of the Greek New Testament published by Robertus Stephanus.

The Westcott and Hort text is much simpler to define. This is the Greek New Testament edited by B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort and first published in 1881, with numerous reprints in the century since. It is probably the single most famous of the so-called critical texts, perhaps because of the scholarly eminence of its editors, perhaps because it was issued the same year as the English Revised Version which followed a text rather like the Westcott-Hort text.

It needs to be stated clearly that the text of Westcott and Hort was not the first printed Greek Testament that deliberately and substantially departed from the textus receptus on the basis of manuscript evidence. Westcott and Hort were preceded in the late 1700s by Griesbach, and in the 1800s by Lachmann, Alford, Tregelles, and Tischendorf (and others), all of whose texts made numerous revisions in the textus receptus on the basis of manuscript evidence; these texts, especially the last three named, are very frequently in agreement with Westcott and Hort, against the textus receptus.

Likewise, it is important to recognize that the English Revised New Testament which came out in 1881 was not directly based on the text of Westcott and Hort, although in many particulars they are the same. The Greek text followed by the Revisers was compiled and published in 1882 in an edition with the KJV and ERV in parallel columns. It is true that the Westcott-Hort text and the English Revised New Testament of 1881 are rather similar to each other, but they are not identical.

Though the Westcott-Hort text was the "standard" critical text for a generation or two, it is no longer considered such by any one, and has not been for many years. The "standard" text or texts today are the Nestle or Nestle-Aland text (1st edition, 1898; 27th edition, 1993) and/or the various editions of The Greek New Testament published by the United Bible Societies (1st edition, 1966; 4th edition, 1993). The last two editions of each of these sport an identical text, a new "received text," so to speak. It is true that the Westcott-Hort text is part of the heritage of both the Nestle texts and the UBS texts. Eberhard Nestle originally used as his text the consensus reading of three editions of the Greek New Testament in his day, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Weymouth, later substituting Weiss for Weymouth. The UBS editors used the Westcott-Hort text as their starting point and departed from it as their evaluation of manuscript evidence required.

None of the major modern English Bible translations made since World War II used the Westcott-Hort text as its base. This includes translations done by theological conservatives--the New American Standard Bible, the New International Version, the New King James, for examples--and translations done by theological liberals--the Revised Standard Version, the New English Bible, the Good News Bible, etc. The only English Bible translation currently in print that the writer is aware of which is based on the Westcott-Hort text is the New World Translation of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

In a very real sense, the very question of which is superior, Westcott and Hort, or the textus receptus, is passe, since neither is recognized by experts in the field as the standard text. However, since modern printed Greek texts are in the same respective families of text, namely the Alexandrian (Nestle, et al.) and the Byzantine (majority text), it is suitable to ask, "which one is superior, i.e., which comes closer to presenting the Greek text in its original form?"

What is perhaps the strongest argument in favor of the Westcott-Hort text vis-a-vis the textus receptus, is the fact that it has firm support from the oldest extant Greek manuscripts, plus the earliest of the versions or translations, as well as the early Christian writers of the 2nd through 4th centuries. Age of manuscripts is probably the most objective factor in the process of textual criticism. When Westcott and Hort compiled their text, they employed the two oldest then-known manuscripts, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as their text base. Since their day, a good number of manuscripts as old and in some cases a century older and more than these two manuscripts have been discovered. With a general uniformity, these early manuscripts have supported the Alexandrian text-type which the Westcott-Hort text presents. It is true that these papyrus manuscripts occasionally contain Byzantine-type readings, but none of them could in any way be legitimately described as being regularly Byzantine in text. The agreement of some of the papyri with Vaticanus, especially p75 of the early third century, has been quite remarkable.

Of the early versions, the Westcott-Hort text has strong support in the various Coptic versions of the third and later centuries, plus frequent support in the Old Latin versions and the oldest forms of the Syriac, in particular the Sinaitic and Curetonian manuscripts whose text form dates to the second or third century (though there are also strong Western elements in the Old Latin and the early Syriac). Jerome's revision of the Old Latin, the Vulgate made ca. 400 A.D., also gives frequent support to the Alexandrian text. Of early Christian writers before the fourth century, the Alexandrian text has substantial support, especially in the writings of Origen, whose Scripture quotations are exceedingly numerous.

On the other hand, the Byzantine text-type, of which the textus receptus is a rough approximation, can boast of being presented in the vast majority of surviving manuscripts, as well as several important versions of the New Testament from the fourth century or later, and as being the text usually found in the quotations of Greek writers in the fifth century and after. The most notable version support for the Byzantine text is in the Peshitta Syriac and the fourth century Gothic version. A second-century date for the Peshitta used to be advocated, but study of the Biblical quotations in the writings of Syrian Fathers Aphraates and Ephraem has demonstrated that neither of these leaders used the Peshitta, and so it must date from after their time, i.e., to the late fourth century or after. Therefore, this chief support for a claimed second-century date for the Byzantine text-type has been shown to be invalid.

On the down side, the distinctively Alexandrian text all but disappears from the manuscripts after the 9th century. On the other hand, the Byzantine manuscripts, though very numerous, did not become the "majority" text until the ninth century, and though outnumbering Alexandrian manuscripts by more than 10:1, are also very much later in time, most being 1,000 years and more removed from the originals.

Returning to the specific texts, Westcott-Hort vs. the textus receptus: in truth, both texts necessarily fall short of presenting the true original. Obviously, those readings in the textus receptus which are without any Greek manuscript support cannot possibly be original. Additionally, in a number of places, the textus receptus reading is found in a limited number of late manuscripts, with little or no support from ancient translations. One of these readings is the famous I John 5:7. Such readings as this are also presumptively not original. And if one holds to the "nose count" theory of textual criticism, i.e., whatever the reading found in a numerical majority of surviving Greek manuscripts is to be accepted as original, then the textus receptus falls short in the 1,838 readings where it does not follow the majority text.

Besides these shortcomings, others also apparently occur in a number of places where a perceived difficulty in the original reading was altered by scribes in the manuscript copying process. Probable examples of this include Mark 1:2 (changing "Isaiah the prophet" to "the prophets," a change motivated by the fact that the quote which follows in 1:3 is from both Malachi and Isaiah), I Corinthians 6:20 (where the phrase "and in your Spirit which are God's" seems to have been added after the original "in your body," which is the subject under consideration in the preceding verses), Luke 2:33 (changing "his father and his mother" into "Joseph and his mother" to 'safeguard' the doctrine of the virgin birth), Romans 8:1, ended (borrowing from verse 4, in two stages, the phrase "who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit"), Romans 13:9 (the insertion of one of the Ten Commandments to complete the listing), Colossians 1:14 (the borrowing of the phrase "through his blood" from Ephesians 1:7), etc.

On the other hand, the defects of the Westcott-Hort text are also generally recognized, particularly its excessive reliance on manuscript B (Vaticanus), and to a lesser extent, Aleph (Sinaiticus). Hort declared the combined testimony of these two manuscripts to be all but a guarantee that a reading was original. All scholars today recognize this as being an extreme and unwarranted point of view. Manuscript B shows the same kinds of scribal errors found in all manuscripts, a fact to be recognized and such singular readings to be rejected, as in fact they sometimes were rejected by Westcott and Hort (e.g., at Matthew 6:33).

What shall we say then? Which text shall we choose as superior? We shall choose neither the Westcott-Hort text (nor its modern kinsmen) nor the textus receptus (or the majority text) as our standard text, our text of last appeal. All these printed texts are compiled or edited texts, formed on the basis of the informed (or not-so-well-informed) opinions of fallible editors. Neither Erasmus nor Westcott and Hort (nor, need we say, any other text editor or group of editors) is omniscient or perfect in reasoning and judgment. Therefore, we refuse to be enslaved to the textual criticism opinions of either Erasmus or Westcott and Hort or for that matter any other scholars, whether Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Burgon, Hodges and Farsad, or anyone else. Rather, it is better to evaluate all variants in the text of the Greek New Testament on a reading by reading basis, that is, in those places where there are divergences in the manuscripts and between printed texts, the evidence for and against each reading should be thoroughly and carefully examined and weighed, and the arguments of the various schools of thought considered, and only then a judgment made.

We do, or should do, this very thing in reading commentaries and theology books. We hear the evidence, consider the arguments, weigh the options, and then arrive at what we believe to be the honest truth. Can one be faulted for doing the same regarding the variants in the Greek New Testament? Our aim is to know precisely what the Apostles originally did write, this and nothing more, this and nothing else. And, frankly, just as there are times when we must honestly say, "I simply do not know for certain what this Bible verse or passage means," there will be (and are) places in the Greek New Testament where the evidence is not clear cut, and the arguments of the various schools of thought do not distinctly favor one reading over another.

This means there will at times be a measure of uncertainty in defining precisely the exact wording of the Greek New Testament (just as there is in the interpretation of specific verses and passages), but this does not mean that there is uncertainty in the theology of the New Testament. Baptist theologian J. L. Dagg has well-stated the theological limits of the manuscript variations in the New Testament,

Although the Scriptures were originally penned under

the unerring guidance of the Holy Spirit, it does not follow, that a continued miracle has been wrought to preserve them from all error in transcribing. On the contrary, we know that manuscripts differ from each other; and where readings are various, but one of them can be correct. A miracle was needed in the original production of the Scriptures; and, accordingly, a miracle was wrought; but the preservation of the inspired word, in as much perfection as was necessary to answer the purpose for which it was given, did not require a miracle, and accordingly it was committed to the providence of God. Yet the providence which has preserved the divine oracles, has been special and remarkable....The consequence is, that, although the various readings found in the existing manuscripts, are numerous, we are able, in every case, to determine the correct reading, so far as is necessary for the establishment of our faith, or the direction of our practice in every important particular. So little, after all, do the copies differ from each other, that these minute differences, when viewed in contrast with their general agreement, render the fact of that agreement the more impressive, and may be said to serve, practically, rather to increase, than impair our confidence in their general correctness. Their utmost deviations do not change the direction of the line of truth; and if it seems in some points to widen the line a very little, the path that lies between their widest boundaries, is too narrow to permit us to stray.

To this may be added the testimony of Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, the pre-eminent British authority on New Testament manuscripts at the turn of the twentieth century. In discussing the differences between the traditional and the Alexandrian text-types, in the light of God's providential preservation of His word, he writes,

We may indeed believe that He would not allow His Word to be seriously corrupted, or any part of it essential to man's salvation to be lost or obscured; but the differences between the rival types of text is not one of doctrine. No fundamental point of doctrine rests upon a disputed reading; and the truths of Christianity are as certainly expressed in the text of Westcott and Hort as in that of Stephanus

Even advocates and defenders of the supremacy of the Byzantine over the Alexandrian text agree in this assessment. One such writer was 19th century American Southern Presbyterian theologian Robert L. Dabney. He wrote,

This received text contains undoubtedly all the essential facts and doctrines intended to be set down by the inspired writers; for if it were corrected with the severest hand, by the light of the most divergent various readings found in any ancient MS. or version, not a single doctrine of Christianity, nor a single cardinal fact would be thereby expunged.... If all the debated readings were surrendered by us, no fact or doctrine of Christianity would thereby be invalidated, and least of all would the doctrine of Christ's proper divinity

be deprived of adequate scriptural support.
Hence the interests of orthodoxy are entirely
secure from and above the reach of all movements
of modern criticism of the text whether made
in a correct or incorrect method, and all such
discussions in future are to the church
of subordinate importance.

These sober and sensible judgments stand in marked contrast to the almost manic hysteria found in the writings of some detractors of critical texts who write as though those texts were a Pandora's box of heresy. In truth, all text families are doctrinally orthodox. A dispassionate evaluation of evidence is very much to be preferred to the emotionally charged tirades that characterize much of the current discussion.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/18 2:18

OK, well for me i stick with the KJV . Ive visited websites and read articles that basically claimed the KJV bible came down straight from heaven printed in English and ready to go, i don't agree on that,

however, i do think that the missing or added verses depending how you look at it, they are very important, and one point that i think is that there are over 80 translations available in English from the Alexandrian text.... one could imagine they would get it right soon.

;-)

as Ive said also earlier, there is no translation in my language from TR, which is sad i think, even as i see claims in both "camps" why one set of manuscripts are better than the other. My own conclusion is the TR is better. I do think one can read from Alexandrian text and get all the doctrines right, but i think one should have the knowledge that they are two different bibles. From two different manuscripts.

and those who say they have a hard time with the old English when their first language is English i have a hard time believing since i understand 95% of the KJV and English is my second language
but i still looking for a good Alexandrian translation, one can't go wrong when reading from both

:-)

Re: - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/18 8:58

Quote:
-----OK, well for me i stick with the KJV . Ive visited websites and read articles that basically claimed the KJV bible came down straight from heaven printed in English and ready to go, i don't agree on that

Well balanced view. I personally have grown to love the KJV because of the richness in the expression of old english. After studying other languages I've learned that current english is terribly deficient in expressing things. The old english seems to have a beautiful authority to it. That's all personal preference though :-). I think it's really off balance to take a hard KJV only stance. There are other reliable translations available for those who care about a true representation of God's word.

Quote:
-----and those who say they have a hard time with the old English when their first language is English i have a hard time believing since i understand 95% of the KJV and English is my second language

Preach it! The thing I noticed in a lot of the churches I've been is that the people who complain the most about the old english are the ones who want a shallow christianity and so they want versions that are shallow too. That's my experience though and I don't in any way want to generalize or make assumptions on anyone else's experiences.

Jeff

Re:, on: 2007/5/18 9:08

I don't want to over generalize either, but my experience is that those who claim they can't understand the KJV have never read the KJV.

Now, I know many very sound and deep Christians who prefer the NASB, or a version like it. I've never heard from these folks "I can't understand the KJV" ... they just prefer the NASB. I can respect that, even though I don't agree with their conclusions about the NASB.

But if someone hasn't even read the KJV cover to cover... don't tell me it's too hard to understand. That someone is basically too lazy to understand it.

I dare say that person won't understand the NASB either.

Krispy

Re: - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/18 9:15

Very well put Krispy.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/18 11:50

Hi Krispy...

Quote:
-----I don't want to over generalize either, but my experience is that those who claim they can't understand the KJV have never read the KJV. But if someone hasn't even read the KJV cover to cover... don't tell me it's too hard to understand. That someone is basically **too lazy** to understand it.

My experience in this matter is quite different. I have met people who have attempted to read the KJV, but simply had difficulty with the archaic, early 17th Century language. My wife has an IQ of 145 and has earned a Master's Degree, yet she still has difficulty with the language of the translation. My experience is that unless you are already familiar with the early 17th Century language, you will have some difficulty with the translation. You will either have to familiarize yourself with the archaic language -- or purchase some additional tools that help define or interpret the words that are in question. Why would someone (particularly, an unbeliever) attempt reading something from cover-to-cover that they simply have difficulty understanding?

The English language of the KJV -- no matter how you attempt to put it -- has changed. The verse mentioned earlier (concerning the word "terrible") does not take the same meaning today. The language is no longer the "language of the common" reader. Instead, it often requires a dictionary that includes 17th Century meanings. This is quite contrary from the translators' intent as included in their Preface.

I was blessed to have been raised in Church. Even though I didn't give my life to Christ until I was a teen, I have been quite familiar with the language of the KJV. After meeting the Lord, I have become even more familiar with the language. However, this world is not so blessed. The modern English speaker is not nearly as familiar with the language and usage of the KJV. They pick it up and often think, "*It's 'greek' to me!*" How do I know? I have heard several people tell me this. Should we force unbelievers to learn the archaic 17th Century language of the KJV? Or should we do as the translators of the KJV believed and make the Word of God available in the language of the "common" man?

Of course, my esteem for both the KJV and the NIV has little to do with the common understanding of the language. I simply have never seen a credible argument against the sources used for the NIV that I felt were credible enough to discount the translation.

:)

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/18 12:21

maybe i should get me one of those NIVs all the heretics are talking about :-P ;-)

no but seriously, what is the difference between the niv , nasb, rsv , esv, asv..... when they all come from the same man uscripts?

witch one of those is the "most" accurate?

my original question was what version would make a good complement my old English KJV :-) still haven't decided,

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/18 12:42

Quote:

hmmhmm wrote:

maybe i should get me one of those NIVs all the heretics are talking about :-P ;-)

no but seriously, what is the difference between the niv , nasb, rsv , esv, asv..... when they all come from the same manuscripts?

witch one of those is the "most" accurate?

my original question was what version would make a good complement my old English KJV :-) still haven't decided,

I would say NASB.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/18 14:04

Quote:

-----no but seriously, what is the difference between the niv , nasb, rsv , esv, asv..... when they all come from the same manuscripts?

witch one of those is the "most" accurate?

By accurate do you mean literal?

The NASB is the most literal of them all. It is almost word for word according to the Greek.

The ESV is very literal, but the translators have made the sentences more 'english' in their wording.

The NIV is not as literal as the ESV and utilizes more of a paraphrase. They are wanting to be literal but also convey th e text into a very understandable and readable English.

Also, I know very little about the RSV and the ASV.

Re: - posted by ravenmolehil, on: 2007/5/18 15:04

Any good preferences to STUDY Bibles?? to supplement my KJV

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/18 15:18

Quote:

-----Any good preferences to STUDY Bibles?? to supplement my KJV

NASB

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/5/18 15:24

Hi JaySaved...

Quote:

-----The NIV is not as literal as the ESV and utilizes more of a paraphrase. They are wanting to be literal but also convey the text into a very understandable and readable English.

Anyone who has translated a paragraph from one language into another is aware of the problems/dangers of literal word-for-word translation. It is actually impossible for a work to be translated literally from one language into another and still remain coherent. Why? Each language is different due to different grammar and usage rules. Sometimes, articles and pronouns come before the verb and sometimes, they come after the verb. Instead of translating word for word, a translator must translate phrase by phrase, or sometimes, sentence by sentence. In other words, a translator is forced to make a "best guess" about what is being said.

For instance, go to (<http://babelfish.altavista.com/>) BabelFish and experiment with translating from one language to another. Even though their program uses both word-for-word and phrase-for-phrase translations, it is wrong at least 40% of the time in everything except for the most basic sentences.

There is much debate about the strengths and weaknesses of dynamic equivalence, formatic equivalence and idiomatic translation. The KJV relied heavily upon "formatic equivalence" (a strong word-for-word translation) of the Textus Receptus. However, the translators certainly interjected words and phrases that were not included in the original text to improve the coherence and understanding of the particular passage. This is often seen by brackets or italics in some of the versions available of the KJV (particularly the early copies). Versions like the NLT relied primarily on "dynamic equivalence." This form of translation attempts to include both the literal language and the context. The translators of the NIV (1978) attempted to invoke both methods. The strength in this was that they were able to include footnotes of possible alternatives in translation.

As to the original question: Why confine yourself to two translations? I have a library full of translations. I am not afraid of any honest academic or scholarly translation. Simply put (again), I feel that the KJV is a great (albeit dated) translation taken from the Textus Receptus -- with the Bishop's Bible used as a base -- while using early 17th century formal equivalence. The NIV is another good translation taken from the other sources, while trying to utilize both dynamic and formal equivalence. However, I have several other versions that I consult from time to time.

While the root of the Bible translation debate lay primarily within the context of the accuracy of the sources used, I still feel that it is a "safe" thing to keep the alternative academic and scholarly translation around. The overall doctrine of the Church is still the same, and our faith will remain rooted in the Christ that we know rather than in the work of men.

:)

Re:, on: 2007/5/18 15:26

I'll stick w/the KJV. I'm fully convinced in my own mind. :-)

Krispy

Re: - posted by ravenmolehil, on: 2007/5/18 15:34

James Knox (in Deland FL) has a vast set of messages on versions etc. ((& He is set on KJV also)) He gets really deep in historical background etc... alot of research was done in these series.

Hope this helps.. Hmmhmm

I can give you links if you need them,

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/18 15:38

Quote:
-----James Knox...

Krispy, is this THE James Knox?

Re: - posted by ravenmolehil, on: 2007/5/18 15:40

Another person direct me to this series:

<http://www.biblepreachingarchives.org/index.php?basedir=Li9KYW1lcyBXLiBLbm94L0JpYmxlIFZlcnNpb24gSXNzdWVz>

I don't know much else about the guy,, but these are good

Re: - posted by ravenmolehil, on: 2007/5/18 16:11

His series on the Bible does seems to be better than his stuff on Calvinism

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/18 16:20

Quote:
-----His series on the Bible does seems to be better than his stuff on Calvinism

:eek:

Re: - posted by ravenmolehil, on: 2007/5/18 16:36

No offense Krispy; but being young in the faith, I couldn't make heads or tails of it; Its been hard for me to find concrete info on either side; & like i told Jay, "I guess for the now I'm a Cal-menian"
_____Sorry to get the thread off topic_____

Re:, on: 2007/5/18 17:13

Yea, it's THE James Knox.

I love this guy's teaching. I do, at times, find myself not being sure I agree with everything he is saying. But thats not much. I think he's straight on. And his church is really living out their faith too. Someone can be a great teacher/preacher... but if their church body is doing nothing, I begin to wonder whats going on. Thats certainly not true for his church.

I can tell y'all right now, he's gonna ruffle a few feathers of some folks on this forum. If y'all think I get a little strong... give this guy a listen.

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/5/19 14:36

Mr Knox has some **STRONG** sayings and statements !

Quote...
.....some of you are so upset you will never listen again, you rather continue in unbelief then get right with God. Thats alright thats not my problem....thats yours.... when you stand in front of the judgment seat of Christ...

he has some good points.... about the NIV... anyone else listened to these messages ??? i listened to the ones called NIVKJV1 , 2 and 3

Re:, on: 2007/5/19 15:15

I have, I listened to his entire series on versions. Didn't agree with *everything*, but I did agree w/ probably 90%.

Krispy

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/5/20 20:09

What do you KJV only people think of this site? I don't like the way everything is handled on it, but I do think they have some good points.

<http://www.kjvonly.org/>

Jordan

Re: - posted by repentcanada, on: 2007/5/20 20:39

I prefer the King James version, but have to say I have been blessed listening to the New Living Translation bible audio.