



Scriptures and Doctrine :: The Nestle Greek Text

The Nestle Greek Text, on: 2006/4/23 17:22

THE NESTLE GREEK TEXT

Based upon the Westcott and Hort N.T., the text of Eberhard Nestle (or the Aland-Nestle or the third edition of the United Bible Society, both of which are founded on the Nestle text and are almost identical to it), **is being used today as the Greek New Testament in most of the seminaries.** It contains about **four changes per verse when compared to the Textus Receptus.** Incredibly, we are told this does not affect a single Christian doctrine. But it does — it creates doubt in the minds of even the most devout that they really have an infallible Bible in their hands. It devastates the Christian's faith that the Bible is really the Word of God.

Eberhard Nestle's Greek text has 36,191 changes in the New Testament from the Textus Receptus. The resulting text would hardly read as the same book! Yet, it has to do so up to a point. The new translations read differently in some places but not everywhere. What if someone found an ancient Greek text out in the woods or in a cave? Would it be accepted as a genuine New Testament manuscript? What would be the hallmark, the criterion, the standard against which it would be measured?

Believe it or not, after all we have said concerning the textual critics' negative views of the Textus Receptus — it is nevertheless the standard by which all other manuscripts are measured. The new-found ms would have to agree 90% with the Textus Receptus to be considered legitimate.

However, all Satan has ever needed is 10%. If we selectively alter God's Word 10%, we can remove a significant amount of the verses dealing with blood atonement and with Jesus' deity thus casting doubt in the minds of young men and women as to whether they have available to them the Word of God. Or, as the devil said, "Yea, did God really say that? Is that really God's Word? You can't believe that!"

The Catholic Church (Whore of Rome) teaches those very words and now she is continuing to seduce the Protestant church to use the same Greek text upon which the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate of Jerome is based (as well as the more modern Roman version, the Rheims-Douay).

The Catholic church has almost succeeded in doing away with the Word of God as translated by Tyndale, which God has providentially watched over all of these years. We are always seeing footnotes (such as the Great Commission as given in Mark 16 and many other passages) that inform us that "the oldest, best, most reliable, most trustworthy, manuscripts read differently." What this means in simple language is, according to the scholars, an "untrustworthy manuscript" is one written on poor quality paper, and done in the handwriting of a non-professional scribe. A "trustworthy" one is written on high quality paper or vellum, and obviously prepared by highly educated professional scribes or scholars in neat capital letters — despite the fact that there may be many misspellings and omissions. However, they are referring to less than ten manuscripts and almost always only two — Vaticanus and Sinaiticus Aleph.

This is no more logical than if an alien came from another planet in outer space and perhaps found a Bible with notes written on the edges and words highlighted or underlined. If he reasoned as our modern scholars, it would be judged as corrupt and untrustworthy. By the same logic, a Bible on a shelf which had never been used except for occasional reference would be declared good and trustworthy because it was clean and neat.

An example, as noted above, is Mark 16:9-20 where many Bibles contain a very dishonest footnote which states that the oldest and most reliable Greek MSS do not contain these verses. As noted on page 19, we have over 3,000 N.T. Greek manuscripts, none of which is complete — neither does any contain all four of the gospels in their entirety. Over 1,800 contain Mark 16:9-20 and only three do not. So you see, the footnote is both very dishonest and misleading. As mentioned previously, Vaticanus even has a space left exactly the size of those verses. More than ninety-nine percent of the Greek manuscripts have those verses; they are THE WORD OF GOD.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I pray that this might open one persons eyes.

God bless,

Stever

Re: [b]The Scholars versus the Jesus[/b], on: 2006/4/23 20:45

THE SCHOLARS VERSUS JESUS - THE BATTLE CONTINUES

Mark 12:37 relates that the "common people" heard Jesus gladly. With the exception of a few like Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, it was the scholars and religious leaders of His own day who rejected and resisted Him most vehemently. Nothing has changed for the great majority of modern scholarship rejects both God's promise that His Word would be preserved as well as the deity of Jesus Christ. It is still the common people who keep holding on to the true God-given, God-preserved Text upon which the King James was based.

The new translations profess to be revisions of the 1611 King James. They are not for they are not even from the same Greek text. A radically different Greek New Testament was produced and has been used as the foundation for the new translations. We have had a new "bible" foisted upon us which is not a Bible at all for God authored only ONE Bible.

Equally distressing is that the numerous modern translations are being sponsored and/or produced by publishing companies and by individuals who answer to no ecclesiastical arm of the Church. There is no one to whom they are accountable. Thus faithfulness to accurate translation is of little consequence to most of them. The criteria has become readability rather than correctness, and after a Madison Avenue sales promotion advertising the product as "easy to understand" or "reads just like today's newspaper", the final criteria and motive become that of profit.

The Westcott-Hort Greek text contains about 5,788 departures from the Greek text of the Textus Receptus. There are about 40 major omissions. These omissions deal with the virgin birth, the bodily resurrection, the deity of Jesus, and Jesus' authority. The readings of the 1611 King James translation are supported by third and fourth century Western and Byzantine manuscripts which are of the same age as Vaticanus B and Aleph. The Textus Receptus exalts Jesus in about ten passages in which the others tend to disparage and detract from Him. Out of the nearly 8,000 verses in the New Testament, 152 contain doctrinal corruptions in the W-H text.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by Ruach34 (), on: 2006/4/27 15:48

I am interested in more of this dialogue. I have just been revealed to the fact that modern translations have variations and mistakes.

I recently purchased a Tyndale NT and have appreciated reading it's pages.

What bible can we rely on and can we truly know? Did Tyndale translate from the textus receptus? And more so on this line, No we can never stray from the written word of God in comparing experiences and lining up teaching with, but doesn't the Lord God write His word upon our hearts. Word on a page cannot transform, the Word of God is life and transforming. Many people know the word of God from the Bible and can quote from memory but have no life in them, reproducible life.

The early apostles had nothing but the Septuagint and were far greater in power, anointing and faith. Maybe we should study more the septuagint... Just some questions to see if I can get some response. By the way, is there a reliable Septuagint out there. I know Tyndale did some translating and another finished after Tyndale's death?

Rich

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/27 16:26

I got turned off to the NASB, NIV and most of the new translations, because of 1 John 5:7, I just could not get that out of my head why that verse was omitted. I'm not really a conspiracy kind of guy, but I do think certain verses were left out to fit in with early church heretics. What are your thoughts?
I read the NKJV, and the KJV and like them a lot.

blessings to all

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/4/27 17:05

1 John 5:7 TNIV (Today's New International Version) Print
< Go to 1 John 4 View this Chapter Go to 2 John 1 >
7 For there are three that testify:

< Go to 1 John 4 View this Chapter Go to 2 John 1 >
Today's New International Version
International Bible Society
Â© Copyright 2001, 2005

1 John 5:7 NIV (New International Version) Print
< Go to 1john 4 View this Chapter Go to 2 John 1 >
7For there are three that testify:

< Go to 1john 4 View this Chapter Go to 2 John 1 >
New International Version
International Bible Society
Copyright Â© 1973, 1978, 1984

1 John 5:7 KJV (King James Version) Print
< Go to 1john 4 View this Chapter Go to 2 John 1 >

7For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

< Go to 1john 4 View this Chapter Go to 2 John 1 >
King James Version
Public Domain

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2006/4/27 17:06

boomatt, 1 John 5:7 hasn't been "omitted" from any text. It doesn't exist in any manuscript. Never did. Not even the ones used to compile TR. It was a marginal note found in a handful of manuscripts. Erasmus didn't even want to include it in his version, but eventually did. If you read all of 1 John 5, that verse doesn't even make much sense. John is talking about Christ being manifest in the flesh here on earth. The water and the blood refer to his birth, and Spirit testifies of such. The three bearing witness in heaven has nothing to do with what John is saying. When I read it, it just seems out of place. There have been pressures from cults since the 2nd century to "prove" from one passage that the Trinity is true, so this verse would do such that. But it is by no means necessary. The trinity is all over the scriptures, cover to cover. All 66 books scream "TRINITY".

Ruach34, This topic has been hot and lengthy for years on this site. Stever will try to persuade you to believe that the KJV is the only reliable Bible and all the others are deliberately corrupt. Philologos (where is he by the way?) will thoroughl

y educate you on translation principles and various manuscript issues and difficulties. He will argue that the KJV is probably the best, but there is nothing damnable about the NASB or a few other "newer" versions. Many of us on this site prefer the KJV, myself included, for various reasons, some "scholarly" and some not ("scholarly" debate aside, I just like the way it sounds, and it makes me think about what is being said). Still others prefer the NASB or NIV. Chrrrrriiiiissss (don't know if I put the right amount of extra letters in there ;-)) likes the NIV, and has said some very noteworthy things about it.

I suggest going to the thread "Why would anybody still use the KJV". Much can be gleaned from there.

Be ready to step in deep, and have fun on your search :-)

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/27 23:41

Try Answering These From Your NIV

By Rex L. Cobb

INSTRUCTIONS:

Using the New International Version Bible, answer the following questions to this NIV quiz.

Do not rely on your memory. As the Bible is the final authority, you must take the answer from the Bible verse (not from footnotes but from the text).

Fill in the missing words in Matthew 5:44. "Love your enemies, _____ them that curse you, _____ to them that hate you, and pray for them that _____ and persecute you."

According to Matthew 17:21, what two things are required to cast out this type of demon?

According to Matthew 18:11, why did Jesus come to earth?

According to Matthew 27:2, what was Pilate's first name?

In Matthew 27:35, when the wicked soldiers parted His garments, they were fulfilling the words of the prophet. Copy what the prophet said in Matthew 27:35 from the NIV.

In Mark 3:15, Jesus gave the apostles power to cast out demons and to: _____

According to Mark 7:16, what does a man need to be able to hear?

According to Luke 7:28, what was John? (teacher, prophet, carpenter, etc.). What is his title or last name?

In Luke 9:55, what did the disciples not know?

In Luke 9:56, what did the Son of man not come to do? According to this verse, what did He come to do?

In Luke 22:14, how many apostles were with Jesus?

According to Luke 23:38, in what three languages was the superscription written?

In Luke 24:42, what did they give Jesus to eat with His fish?

John 3:13 is a very important verse, proving the deity of Christ. According to this verse (as Jesus spoke), where is the Son of man?

What happened each year as told in John 5:4?

In John 7:50, what time of day did Nicodemus come to Jesus?

In Acts 8:37, what is the one requirement for baptism?

What did Saul ask Jesus in Acts 9:6?

Write the name of the man mentioned in Acts 15:34.

Study Acts 24:6-8. What would the Jew have done with Paul? What was the chief captain's name? What did the chief captain command?

Copy Romans 16:24 word for word from the NIV.

First Timothy 3:16 is perhaps the greatest verse in the New Testament concerning the deity of Christ. In this verse, who was manifested in the flesh?

In the second part of First Peter 4:14, how do we speak of Christ? And, what do we Christians do?

Who are the three Persons of the Trinity in First John 5:7?

Revelation 1:11 is another very important verse that proves the deity of Christ. In the first part of this verse Jesus said, "I am the A _____ and O _____, the _____ and the _____:"

Conclusion: Little space is provided for your answers, but it's much more than needed. If you followed the instructions above, you not only failed the test, you receive a big goose egg.

(Ed. These are all missing in the NIV.) So now what do you think of your "accurate, easy to understand, up to date Bible" ?

If you would like to improve your score, and in fact score 100%, you can take this test using the Authorized (King James)

Bible

I am not king James Only, I just like to read a more accurate translation.

I don't think bad about anyone who doesn't read the King James.

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/27 23:45

I didn't write any of these, but I have checked these sources out, and they are real

© 2001 by David W. Daniels

Question: Is it true that 1 John 5:7 is not in any Greek manuscript before the 1600s? If it is true, why is it in the King James Bible?

Answer: 1 John 5:7 belongs in the King James Bible and was preserved by faithful Christians. But the passage was removed from many Greek manuscripts, because of the problems it seemed to cause.

It is true that there is a small number of Scriptures that are not the same between the King James Bible and the so-called "Majority" Greek text. There are a number of reasons for this:

The so-called "Majority" text was not really based on the majority of texts, but rather a relatively small number of manuscripts. The last person to try to find the differences between the majority of Greek manuscripts, Dr. Von Soden, did not collate more than 400 of the more than 5,000 Greek texts. In other words, what is commonly called the "Majority" Greek text is not a collation of the majority of manuscripts at all.

The "Majority" Greek text is also the main Greek text used by the Eastern Orthodox religion. They had a vested interest in changing (or deleting) some texts. More on this in a moment.

1 John itself is not in a large number of extant Greek manuscripts.

So why then is 1 John 5:7 in the King James Bible, but not in many of the existing Greek manuscripts? To understand the answer, we must look at the history of what happened shortly after the Bible was written.

The Greek and Roman Institutions

During the early growth of the Christian church, ministers (whether saved or not) wrote down doctrines that they said were Christian and Biblical. Starting after the death of the apostles (about 100 AD) many people taught the lie that Jesus was not God the Son and Son of God, or that Jesus became God at His baptism, or the false doctrine that the Holy Spirit was not God or was not eternal.

The growing religion that became known as Roman Catholic, after many debates eventually agreed on the doctrine of the Trinity. So they had no reason to remove 1 John 5:7 from their Bibles, since it supported what they taught.

But the Greek Eastern Orthodox religion was combating a heresy called "Sabellianism," and would have found it easier to combat the heresy by simply removing the troubling passage from their Bibles.

A Trail of Evidence

But during this same time, we find mention of 1 John 5:7, from about 200 AD through the 1500s. Here is a useful timeline of references to this verse: 200 AD Tertullian quoted the verse in his Apology, Against Praxeas
250 AD Cyprian of Carthage, wrote, "And again, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost it is written: "And the three are One"

in his *On The Lapsed*, *On the Novatians*, (see note for Old Latin)

350 AD Priscillian referred to it

350 AD Idacius Clarus referred to it

350 AD Athanasius referred to it in his *De Incarnatione*

398 AD Aurelius Augustine used it to defend Trinitarianism in *De Trinitate* against the heresy of Sabellianism

415 AD Council of Carthage appealed to 1 John 5:7 when debating the Arian belief (Arians didn't believe in the deity of Jesus Christ)

450-530 AD Several orthodox African writers quoted the verse when defending the doctrine of the Trinity against the gainsaying of the Vandals. These writers are:

A) Vigilius Tapensis in "Three Witnesses in Heaven"

B) Victor Vitensis in his *Historia persecutionis*

C) Fulgentius in "The Three Heavenly Witnesses"

500 AD Cassiodorus cited it

550 AD Old Latin ms r has it

550 AD The "Speculum" has it

750 AD Wianburgensis referred to it

800 AD Jerome's Vulgate has it

1000s AD miniscule 635 has it

1150 AD minuscule ms 88 in the margin

1300s AD miniscule 629 has it

157-1400 AD Waldensian (that is, Vaudois) Bibles have the verse

1500 AD ms 61 has the verse

Even Nestle's 26th edition Greek New Testament, based upon the corrupt Alexandrian text, admits that these and other important manuscripts have the verse: 221 v.l.; 2318 Vulgate ; 629; 61; 88; 429 v.l.; 636 v.l.; 918; l; r.

The Vaudois

Now the "Waldensian," or "Vaudois" Bibles stretch from about 157 to the 1400s AD. The fact is, according to John Calvin's successor Theodore Beza, that the Vaudois received the Scriptures from missionaries of Antioch of Syria in the 120s AD and finished translating it into their Latin language by 157 AD. This Bible was passed down from generation, until the Reformation of the 1500s, when the Protestants translated the Vaudois Bible into French, Italian, etc. This Bible carries heavy weight when finding out what God really said. John Wesley and Jonathan Edwards believed, as most of the Reformers, that the Vaudois were the descendants of the true Christians, and that they preserved the Christian faith for the Bible-believing Christians today.

Who Has the Most to Gain? Who Has the Most to Lose?

The evidence of history shows us that the Roman Catholic religion was relentless in its effort to destroy the Vaudois and their Bible. It took them until the 1650s to finish their hateful attacks. But the Vaudois were successful in preserving God's words to the days of the Reformation.

Now we have to ask ourselves a question: Who had the most to gain by adding to or taking away from the Bible? Did the Vaudois, who were being killed for having their Bibles, have anything to gain by adding to or taking from the words of God? Compromise is what the Roman religion wanted! Had the Vaudois just followed the popes, their lives would have been much easier. But they counted the cost. This was not politics; it was their life and soul. They above all people would not want to change a single letter of the words they received from Antioch of Syria. And they paid for this with their lives.

What about the "scholars" at Alexandria, Egypt? We already know about them. They could not even make their few 45 manuscripts agree. How could we believe they preserved God's words?

The Reformation itself owes a lot to these Christians in the French Alps. They not only preserved the Scriptures, but they show to what lengths God would go to keep his promise (Psalm 12:6-7).

And that's only part of the story about the preservation of God's words.

Blessings

:-o :-o

Re:, on: 2006/4/28 0:53

Quote:

BeYeDoers wrote:

boomatt, 1 John 5:7 hasn't been "omitted" from any text. It doesn't exist in any manuscript. Never did. Not even the ones used to compile TR. It was a marginal note found in a handful of manuscripts. Erasmus didn't even want to include it in his version, but eventually did. If you read all of 1 John 5, that verse doesn't even make much sense. John is talking about Christ being manifest in the flesh here on earth. The water and the blood refer to his birth, and Spirit testifies of such. Three bearing witness in heaven has nothing to do with what John is saying. When I read it, it just seems out of place. There have been pressures from cults since the 2nd century to "prove" from one passage that the Trinity is true, so this verse would do such that. But it is by no means necessary. The trinity is all over the scriptures, cover to cover. All 66 books scream "TRINITY".
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Erasmus had the writings of the early Church Fathers. What do we find there? Westcott and Hort wanted nothing to do with the study of Patristics (the writings of the early Church fathers, other than those found at the Vatican Library)-

"KJV 1 John 5:7-8 "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

Cyprian (200-258) "The Lord says, "I and the Father are one.,' and again it is written of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit 'and these three are one.'" (The Treatises of Cyprian I:1:6)

xxxxxxxxxxxx

So what it boils down to is either lack of information that creates misunderstanding, or deliberate obfuscation of the truth that is meant to mislead. You will have to be the judge, as the Spirit leads.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2006/4/28 9:31

Quote:

-----Cyprian (200-258) "The Lord says, "I and the Father are one.,' and again it is written of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit 'and these three are one.'" (The Treatises of Cyprian I:1:6)

That's not even what 1 John 5:7 says. "I and the Father are one" are found in the gospel of John, and his letter says the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, not the Son. John never calls the Word "Son". He calls Him God on a couple of occasions, and there is no doubt they are the same. But John uses "Word" to describe the preincarnate Christ and the Christ coming to conquer at the end of the age. He uses "Son" to describe the incarnate Word. No doubt they are the same, but that is just how John uses his words. And again, reading all of 1 John 5, verse 7 doesn't really fit in. You can force it there, but it sounds strained.

All the quotes I have read from early church fathers that KJV-only people cite as proof are quite vague in what they are actually refering. I have yet to read a quote that says "it is written by John, For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost." All the quotes show nothing more than the early church believed 100% in the trinity and could show it in scripture, but none quote 1 John 5:7 as we have it, at least that I have seen. The correlation

n is a forced one by KJV-only people.

And why is it that KJV-onlyers damn Latin manuscripts and insist on using only Byzantine Greek and church fathers, but when it comes to this verse, they use some of the very things they damn? You have got to be consistent. If the Greek manuscripts can't be trusted for this verse, why are they trusted for the rest of the New Testament? Stever, many times you have used the fact that over 90% of the manuscripts are Byzantine, and that they agree with each other more than the Alexandrian to show that they are more reliable, but then when it comes to this verse, you have to outside the Byzantine family to make it work? You can't have your cake and eat it too.

Question: why does the fact that the Alexandrian texts don't have verses that Byzantines do prove that the Alexandrian scribes intentionally deleted them? It could work the other way around, that the originals didn't have them and Byzantine scribes added them for consistency. OR they could be completely independent events. They all had fragments and had no idea of the existence of the others, so the two families came out different. This whole comparing versions thing and drawing conclusions is a logical fallacy. Correlation does not infer causation. Evolutionists make the same mistake. Just because two things are similar doesn't mean that one caused the other. In reading pages upon pages of this debate, I have seen zero evidence that anything was ever intentionally corrupted. Just speculation and use of the genetic fallacy argument. If y'all can produce a church quote or 3rd century historian showing that Origen did indeed intentionally change something that subsequently affected all the Alexandrian texts and not any others, that would be great. But showing differences in texts and then say that Origen was in Alexandria and handled those texts in no way proves anything. I have read some of the early church fathers, and both liberal and conservative scholars on this issue, and it is overwhelming that 1 John 5:7 is not original. The only people that claim it to be authentic are highly fringe KJV-only pastors that use horrible logic and very vague sources.

All that being said, I still find the KJV "to be nearest to the best" quoting Ravenhill. I use it most of the time. Every once in a great while, I refer to the NASB. There are a few inconsistencies and errors in both translations that the other seems to clear up and make more readable/teachable. I also can't stand the NIV and think its name should be changed to "Not Inspired Version" :-). It is terribly inconsistent and inaccurate of its rendering of WH. I find it watered down, and you indeed arrive at different views of scripture (not essential doctrines) by using it. I disciplined a guy for 2 years with him using NIV and me using NASB, and we came to many different conclusions of what some passages taught. He eventually threw it out and got an NASB. I now use KJV, as I said, and find it somewhat disconcerting that one of the 2 major texts WH used were found in a trash can in a Catholic monastery.

Blessings,
denver

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/28 10:44

I dont get how you can say that the NIV and other similar versions havent been corrupted somehow?

Take the test which I posted a couple of posts below. Now dont get me wrong, I own a KJV, NKJV(my favorite), NASB(second favortie), NIV and a NLT. Yes I look like a version collector nut, but these new versions (not including the NASB) have completely watered the gospel down.

I find nothing wrong with people who use any other version (well, okay besides "the message", Just kiddin).

I definitely feel they were in the original manuscripts. Can I prove it, NO. But nobody can prove it wasnt in it, so we are all really talking about something we wont get some great conclusion about.

I do think it is a little weird, However, that some pretty important verses have been cut out, or completely removed.

have a blessed day bros

Re:, on: 2006/4/28 10:54

Quote:

BeYeDoers (Denver) wrote:

Quote:

-----Cyprian (200-258) "The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one.,' and again it is written of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit 'and these three are one.'" (The Treatises of Cyprian I:1:6)

That's not even what 1 John 5:7 says. "I and the Father are one" are found in the gospel of John, and his letter says the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, not the Son. John never calls the Word "Son". He calls Him God on a couple of occasions, and there is no doubt they are the same. But John uses "Word" to describe the preincarnate Christ and the Christ coming to conquer at the end of the age. He uses "Son" to describe the incarnate Word. No doubt they are the same, but that is just how John uses his words. And again, reading all of 1 John 5, verse 7 doesn't really fit in. You can force it there, but it sounds strained.

All the quotes I have read from early church fathers that KJV-only people cite as proof are quite vague in what they are actually refering. I have yet to read a quote that says "it is written by John, For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost." All the quotes show nothing more than the early church believed 100% in the trinity and could show it in scripture, but none quote 1 John 5:7 as we have it, at least that I have seen. The correlation is a forced one by KJV-only people.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

We are only reading the letters of the early Church Fathers that either specifically quote the text, or refer to it in their own words. We do not have the "original autographs", the original velum Scriptures. What we do have in many cases is specific reference to the Scripture, and support for the Received Text from the early Church Fathers.

These are some of the quotes that are specific, and some are vague, but they all back up the "Received Text"---the Textus Receptus:

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF THE EARLY PATRISTIC SUPPORT FOR RECEIVED TEXT READINGS

DOCUMENTATION:

KJV Mark 1:1, 2

Irenaeus (130-202) "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ., the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets..." "Mark...does thus commence his Gospel narrative; 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as it is written in the prophets,... Plainly does the commencement of the Gospel quote the words of the holy prophets, and point out Him...whom they confessed as God and Lord" (Against Heresies III:10:5, 11:4, 16:3).

KJV Mark 16:19

Irenaeus (130-202) "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God." "Also, towards the conclusion of his Gospel, Mark says: so then, after the Lord Jesus had spoken to them, He was received up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God." (Against Heresies III:10:6).

KJV Luke 22:44

Justin (100-165) "And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." "For in the memoirs which I say were drawn up by His apostles and those who followed them, it is recorded that His sweat fell down like drops of blood while He was praying, and saying, 'If it be possible., let this cup pass.'" (Trypho 103:24).

KJV Jn 1:18

Irenaeus (130-202) "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." "the only begotten Son of God, which is in the bosom of the Father ..." (Against Heresies III:11:6), 'the only begotten Son, who...' (IV:20:6) "the only begotten Son, which (IV:20:11).

KJV John. 3:13

Hippolytus (170-236) "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." (Against the Heresy of One Noetus I: 1:4).

KJV John 5:3, 4

Tertullian (160- 221) "...waiting for the moving of the water, For an angel went down at a certain season unto the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had." "if it seems a novelty for an angel to be present in Waters, an example of what was to come to pass has forerun. An angel, by his intervention, was want to stir the pool at Bethsaida. They who were complaining of ill-health used to watch for him; for whoever had been the first to descend into them, after his washing ceased to complain." (on Baptism I:1:5)

KJV Jn. 6:69

Irenaeus (130-.202) "And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ the Son of the living God." "By whom also Peter, having been taught, recog

nized Christ as the Son of the living God..." (Against Heresies III:11:6).

KJV John. 14:17 " ... but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."
P66 (c. 200) " ... shall be in you."

KJV Acts 8:36 - 37 "Å...See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? 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."

Cyprian (200-258) "In the Acts of the Apostles: 'Lo, here is water; what is there which hinders me from being baptized? Then said Philip, If thou believe st with all thine heart, thou mayest." (The Treatises of Cyprian I:1:43).

KJV I Tim. 3:16 "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh..."

Ignatius (35-116) "God was in the flesh" (To the Ephesians I:1:7).

Hippolytus (170-236) "God was manifested in the flesh" (Against the Heresies of Noetus I:1:17).

Dionysius (3rd cent.) "For God was manifested in the flesh" (Conciliations I:1:853).

KJV I John 5:7-8 "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are thre ee that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

Cyprian (200-258) "The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one.,' and again it is written of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit Å'and these th ree are one." (The Treatises of Cyprian I:1:6)

KJV Rev. 22:14 "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the ci ty."

Tertullian (160-221) "Blessed are they who act according to the precepts, that they may have power over the tree of life, and over the gates., for enteri ng into the holy city." (On Modesty I:19:2).

CONCLUSION

KJV II Pet. 3:16 "As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlea rned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction."

Tertullian (160-221) "Now this heresy of yours does not receive certain Scriptures; and whichever of them it does receive, it perverts by means of addit ions and diminutions, for the accomplishment of its own purposes." (On Prescriptions Against Heresies I:7:1),

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever concludes:

Even in fundamental circles the issue relating to the various modern translations of the Bible is controversial. It is not merely the question of "inspiratio n". The crux is that of preservation. Has God preserved His Word perfect for us today, or was it only perfect in the "original" autographs? If God has not preserved His Word perfectly, we must assume that we are preaching and teaching from a book that is not completely reliable as the "original" aut ographs are no longer accessible.

If we believe that the Bible is still the inerrant Word of God, we must then deal with the problem of determining which version is the true Word of the Liv ing God. Logic dictates that two opposing statements cannot both be true. Therefore, two contradicting "Bibles" cannot both be the inerrant Word of God. I proclaim that the "King James" or "Authorized Version" is the Word of God translated into the English language to the extent that it is the final a uthority in all matters of conduct and faith. Furthermore, as the modern translations since 1881 often differ from the King James Bible in wording as w ell as doctrine, and since two conflicting texts cannot be infallible, perfect and inerrant, the reader must of necessity make a choice.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/4/28 11:15

In the preface to the 1611 edition, the translators of the Authorized Version, known popularly as the King James Bible, state that it was not their purpose "to make a new translation ... but to make a good one better."

Indebted to the earlier work of William Tyndale, Wyclif and others, they saw their best contribution to consist in revising and enhancing the excellence of the English versions which had sprung from the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

I think this is the intention of the translators of all the new versions that are out.

Stever concludes:

Quote:

-----we must then deal with the problem of determining which version is the true Word of the Living God.

We must not look at the versions but to cross reference and look at the implied contextual meaning of what the Word says.

I even like to cross reference the "Good News Bible" for a amplified understanding.

We don't worship the book, but who the book reveals.

Re: - posted by RevKerrigan (), on: 2006/4/28 14:07

I would like to invite anyone, especially those who profess KJVO to listen to an audio debate that I have on my website. It was done on the John Ankerberg show between the editors of the newer versions and KJVO advocates. Check it out (<http://www.pinpointevangelism.com/23.html>) PinPoint Evangelism. Just scroll down and you will find it! God Bless!

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/28 16:43

RevKerrigan,

I like the site, I just was able to take a small glance at it, but I will look more into it tonight, thanks

god bless you brother,

Matt

Re: vaudois or waldensian - posted by Ruach34 (), on: 2006/4/28 16:59

What about the Vaudois or Waldensian. what can be said for those. Is it merely a 'good' story?

I am truly not one to debate versions of the Bible but like to find more information about the history of the 'ekklesia.' I have been reading Ehrmans book on 'Lost Christianities.' Anybody read that book?

Interesting, to say anything. I have found, though, with all the reading and study of extra-biblical stuff and histories I lose the time to know Him. To know Him is by far the greatest mystery and journey, 'For we will surely find Him.

Hallelujah

Rich

Re:, on: 2006/4/28 19:46

Quote:

Logic wrote:

In the preface to the 1611 edition, the translators of the Authorized Version, known popularly as the King James Bible, state that it was not their purpose "to make a new translation ... but to make a good one better."

Indebted to the earlier work of William Tyndale, Wyclif and others, they saw their best contribution to consist in revising and enhancing the excellence of the English versions which had sprung from the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

"I think this is the intention of the translators of all the new versions that are out"
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response: **Absolutely incorrect.** It was the intention of Westcott and Hort, due to their Catholic sympathies, to replace the majority text (the Textus Receptus) with the minority text.

What was the intent of Hort? Below, find specific proof of his revulsion of the Textus Receptus. It is from the book by Floyd Nolen Jones entitled "Which Version Is The Bible":

In 1851, Mr. Hort wrote:
"I had no idea until the last few weeks of the importance of texts having read so little Greek Testament and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus. Think of that vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late manuscripts."

Thus at only age twenty-three and having admitted he had almost no preparatory background, Hort concluded that the Textus Receptus was "vile" and "villainous". At that time he dedicated his life to its overthrow, intending to supplant it with another text. The text he eventually replaced the TR with was Codex Vaticanus B.

At the time of this decision, young Hort had been schooled in Classical Greek and was unaware that the New Testament had not been written in that form of the Greek language. Since the Greek of the New Testament as recorded in the Textus Receptus did not rigidly follow the syntax of the Greek of the classics, Hort deemed it as an inferior quality of Greek. This misconception was responsible for his having rashly termed the TR as "vile" and "villainous". Indeed, the Egyptian papyri which proved that the N.T. had been written in Koine (common) Greek rather than Classical Greek had not yet been discovered.

Vaticanus B had been "discovered" in 1481 on the library shelf of the Vatican. To understand Vaticanus B, we have to go back to approximately 200 A.D. to an early so-called "Father" of the church named ORIGEN. If the student researches encyclopedias and other reference materials, he will find Origen, Westcott, and Hort spoken of as having been great men of God—men of faith. They will state how much the Church is indebted to them, that Origen was the first scientific textual exegete of the Scriptures, etc. However, such is not what one finds upon close examination of the facts.

ORIGEN ADAMANTIUS - THE FOUNTAINHEAD OF THE PROBLEM

Origen compiled an Old Testament called the Hexapla (c.245 A.D.). It was, in effect, a parallel Bible which had six columns. The first column was the Hebrew Old Testament. Three other columns portrayed Greek translations by men who were Ebionites. They believed in the ethical teachings of Jesus but did not believe in Paul's doctrines of grace. Indeed, they called Paul an apostate and wholly rejected all his epistles. They did not believe Jesus was Deity—that He was God with a capital "G", and taught that Joseph was the father of Jesus. Several of the Ebionites whose translations were included in these columns later apostatized, returning to Judaism.

One of them (Aquila of Sinope, 80-135 A.D.) was excommunicated from the Christian community for steadfastly refusing to give up astrology and for practicing necromancy. During the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117-138), he supervised the building of a pagan temple to Jupiter on the site of the Temple of Solomon and placed a statue of the Emperor where the Holy of Holies had been. Aquila produced a new translation of the Old Testament into Greek wherein he deliberately translated many sections of Scripture concerning the Messiah in such a way as to make it impossible to apply these passages to the Lord Jesus Christ. He conjectured that the Greek word "parthenos" of Matthew 1:23 was not the virgin Mary but represented a corruption in the original text. According to Aquila, the correct understanding was that Jesus was the bastard son of Mary and a blond Roman soldier of German extraction named "pantheras" (Eng. = panther). Origen considered the works of these Ebionites to be "inspired" and thus included them in his "Bible".

The fifth column (written in classical Greek) supposedly is Origen's revision of an older pre A.D. Greek Old Testament translation. Today, this 5th column is referred to by text critics (though they are loathe to admit this) as the "LXX" or the "Septuagint".

Origen also worked with the New Testament. Whereas he mainly translated the Old, he edited the New. Origen traveled extensively and everywhere he found a Greek New Testament, it was altered to fit his doctrine. He, of course, felt that he was merely "correcting" the manuscripts. However, men of God do not change original manuscript readings. If one does not agree with the text of a manuscript, the place for change is at translation; but to alter the original document—never! Origen had a wealthy patron who supplied seven stenographers and seven copyists to accompany and assist him as he systematically altered Scripture.

Origen was the third head master of a school in Alexandria, Egypt, which had been founded in 180 A.D. by the Greek philosopher Pantaeus. Pantaeus was succeeded in 202 A.D. by Clement of Alexandria (not to be confused with Clement of Rome) who taught that Plato's work was also inspired in the same sense as Scripture. Their writings indicate they were lost, albeit "religious", Greek philosophers. Neither professed a new birth apart from water baptism; indeed, it was on the basis of their having been so baptized that they declared themselves "Christian".

However, the New Testament repeatedly declares that this is not how one becomes a Christian as water neither saves nor redeems. Rather, the Bible teaches that in order to be a Savior you must live a sinless life, die on a cross and come back to life on the third day. As Mary, the Roman Catholic church, the Baptist church, Calvin, Wesley, or any present day churchmen etc. did not die on the cross and come back to life on the third day, they cannot be the savior of men's souls. Since water did not die on the cross and come back to life on the third day, it also cannot save the soul.

ORIGEN'S BELIEFS

The following is a composite gleaned from many sources depicting the beliefs of Origen. Let us examine them to see if he was in fact a "great early Father of the Church" as we are often told.

This Greek philosopher had been taught by the founder of Neo-Platonism (Ammonius Saccas 170-243 A.D.). Neo-Platonism is a strange combination of Aristotelian logic and Oriental cult teachings. It conceives the world as being an emanation from "the one"—the impersonal one (not the personal "Abba" of the Bible) with whom the soul is capable of being reunited while in some sort of trance or ecstasy.

As a follower of that philosophy, Origen attempted to amalgamate its views to Christianity. The problem with Origen, as with many who profess Christianity today, was that he tried to take "the best" of the world system (that which he had learned in school - his old philosophic views etc.) and incorporate them into Christianity; but they do not mix. It will be noted that many of Origen's beliefs coincide with Roman Catholic and Jehovah's Witness doctrine, both of which are "Christian" cults. Origen believed:

. Origen's beliefs were transferred to the text he was creating. This is only some of the watering down that we find in all of the newer versions, as well as the Catholic Bible, and Catholic Church as well.

1.in soul sleep (that the soul "sleeps" in the grave until the resurrection). However, the Bible teaches that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord (II Cor.5:8);

2.in baptismal regeneration (belief that one is saved by water baptism). Although Satan was the originator, Origen is the first man we can find who was a strong proponent of this doctrine;

3.in universal salvation, i.e., the ultimate reconciliation of all things including Satan and the demons;

- 4.that the Father was God with a capital "G" and Jesus was God with a little "g" – that Jesus was only a created being. Thus, Origen was not Christ in the most basic of all doctrine, namely the person of the Lord Jesus the Christ;
- 5.to become sinless, one had to go to purgatory . This doctrine is nowhere to be found in Scripture;
- 6.in transubstantiation (that at communion the bread and wine actually turn to the body and blood of Christ); and
- 7.in transmigration and reincarnation of the soul. (The resurrection of Jesus corrects that error as He came back to life as the same Jesus. Hebrews 9:27 says "And it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." Thus the Bible teaches there is no reincarnation.);
- 8.and would not concede that any intelligent person could believe that the temptations of Jesus as recorded in the Scriptures actually happened;
- 9.the Scriptures were not literal (Origen was the "father of allegories");
- 10.neither in an actual "Adam" nor the fall of man and that Genesis 1-3 was not literal or historical;
- 11.the correct interpretation of Matthew 19 was that a man of God should be castrated and thereby proceeded to emasculate himself;
- 12.and taught eternal life was not a gift, rather that one must seize hold on and retain it (but Eph.2:8 says "By faith are ye saved through grace; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.");
- 13.that "Christ enters no man until he grasps mentally the doctrine of the consummation of the ages" (that would eliminate about 99% at most typical Christian gatherings);
- 14.or intimated that non baptized infants were hell bound; and
- 15.the redeemed would not experience a physical resurrection (yet I Cor.15 teaches the physical resurrection, as do many other Scriptures). Moreover, around 200 A.D. Alexandrian "Christians" taught that Mary was the second person of the Trinity ("Quarterly Journal of Prophecy" , p. 329). Origen is often depicted as a "man of God", especially because he "died for his beliefs". That is certainly a commendable character trait, but Mussolini , Karl Marx and Hitler also died for their beliefs. That does not mean they were Christians. Many people have believed in a cause enough to give their lives for it, but it does not follow that they were Christian. Origen's beliefs clearly show that he was a religious gnostic Greek philosopher and not truly a born again son of God.

Before closing this section it must be noted that the frame of reference taken in selecting the correct text from among the variant readings during the 1870-1881 revision was said to be that of a "neutral" approach. This meant that the problem was to be approached with the mind set that said readings should not be chosen which "reflect a doctrinal bias" – that Scripture displaying a doctrinal bias should be viewed suspiciously. Thus if the variant being examined read to the effect that Jesus Christ is God come in the flesh, that should be viewed as highly suspicious for it is very doctrinal. The problem with such a priori is that the Bible is a book of doctrine (II Tim.3:17).

Most modern scholars who work on Bible revision also like to think of themselves as being "neutral" maintaining that they translated or chose a reading having come to the problem with a "neutral" approach. But do we really believe that God would take a "neutral" point of view toward His Son and up on His finished work of redemption? When we read the letters of Paul and John, do we conclude that they were neutral? The standpoint that Jesus is Jehovah God – the Creator – come in the flesh is not a neutral position. Neither Peter nor Luke took a neutral position! Indeed, there is no such thing as a neutral position concerning the deity of Christ Jesus.

Westcott and Hort championed the so-called "neutral" method and it has been with us ever since. The question that must be faced is – would a man who fits the spiritual description of Origen as outlined on the two previous pages (whose work W&H used) ever produce a neutral text? Some of these textual critics are sincere but deceived. However, most are wolves in sheep's clothing. Origen was the first wolf in this cult and the fifth column of his Hexapla along with his edited N.T. are the fruits of that wolf cult. This concludes the first installment in our exposé of this great horror.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

I pray that these facts have opened eyes and hearts to the truth that is so hard to find in these last days.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/4/29 0:26

Just another example of new version taking God and Christ out of our salvation and putting man and his works at the forefront again.

1 Corinthians 8:6 TNIV (Today's New International Version) Print

6 yet for us there is but one God, the Father, from whom all things came and for whom we live; and there is but one Lord , Jesus Christ, through whom all things came and through whom we live.

1 Corinthians 8:6 NIV (New International Version) Print

6yet for us there is but one God, the Father, from whom all things came and for whom we live; and there is but one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things came and through whom we live.

1 Corinthians 8:6 KJV (King James Version) Print

6But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.

for whom we live or through whom we live is a great distance from "we in Him and we by Him. We are in God by His Seed, By Jesus Christ who is the Seed in whom we have Life.

See the subtle difference, one we do it, the KJV God and Christ do it in us. Taking away from the Life in Christ and God and making us, "surely God knows you will be just like Him."

In Christ: Phillip

Re: The NIV Corruption, on: 2006/4/30 1:25

Stever posts:

The NIV Corruption

Scripture Comparison

Let's consider some important doctrinal truths that are attacked by the NIV. You should note that most of these omissions are found in the other new versions also, if you want to compare.

The NIV even refutes the idea that the Bible is the preserved, inspired, Word of God. Note:

Psalms 12:6-7 (KJV) The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

Psalms 12:6-7 (NIV) And the words of the LORD are flawless, like silver refined in a furnace of clay, purified seven times. 7 O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever.

Can you see how the meaning is completely corrupted by this supposed improved "Bible".

God has a warning to anyone who would dare change His Word.

Revelation 22:18-19 (KJV) For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

Revelation 22:18-19 (NIV) I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds anything to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book. 19 And if anyone takes words away from this book of prophecy, God will take away from him his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this book.

You will note, they change book of life to tree of life (what part would we even have in the tree of life?), then they confuse the last part of the verse, by dropping "and" and running the verse together, it is weakened. The warning is weakened. THIS IS WHAT THE NIV IS ALL ABOUT. IT CORRUPTS, OMITTS, WEAKENS AND CHANGES GOD'S INSPIRED WORD. I pray that this study will be used by God to give you a conviction concerning the Word of God. I don't know where anything is improved or fortified in the NIV. Here is a good question. Why would you want to use a single shot 22, when the enemy is using a M-16? Give me a real rifle and the right ammo for the battle.

A. The Deity of Christ is Clearly Attacked.

1. By changing "God" to "He" they remove the fact that Jesus is God. This is done in the NASV also.

1 Timothy 3:16 (KJV) And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

1 Timothy 3:16 (NIV) Beyond all question, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body, was vindicated by the Spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the nations, was believed on in the world, was taken up in glory.
2. By changing "Christ" to "God" they deny that Jesus is God.

Romans 14:10 (KJV) But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand and before the judgment seat of Christ. Romans 14:12 (KJV) So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

Romans 14:10 (NIV) You, then, why do you judge your brother? Or why do you look down on your brother? For we will all stand before God's judgment seat.

Romans 14:12 (NIV) So then, each of us will give an account of himself to God.

3. They change "Son of God" to "Son of Man", who gave them the right to call Jesus a liar?

John 9:35 (KJV) Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God?

John 9:35 (NIV) Jesus heard that they had thrown him out, and when he found him, he said, "Do you believe in the Son of Man?"

4. In Matthew 9:18, Matthew 20:20, and Mark 5:6 "Worshipped" and "Worshipping" is changed to "knelt down". This removes the due respect of our Saviour.

5. Jesus is eternal, He did not have an origin.

Micah 5:2 (KJV) But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

Micah 5:2 (NIV) "But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times."

6. Again, Jesus is eternal, He is the beginning and ending.

Revelation 1:8 (KJV) I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

Revelation 1:8 (NIV) "I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, "who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty."

7. The NIV omits the first part of the verse, and leaves out the name Jesus, who is called the Son of God by these devils.

Matthew 8:29 (KJV) And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?

Matthew 8:29 (NIV) "What do you want with us, Son of God?" they shouted. "Have you come here to torture us before the appointed time?"

8. NIV leaves out Jesus.

Matthew 16:20 (KJV) Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.

Matthew 16:20 (NIV) Then he warned his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ.

9. They omit Christ and add man - this is wrong!

John 4:42 (KJV) And said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

John 4:42 (NIV) They said to the woman, "We no longer believe just because of what you said; now we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this man really is the Savior of the world."

10. Where did this name for God come from "One" - this is the New Age universal god - "the One".

John 6:69 (KJV) And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

John 6:69 (NIV) We believe and know that you are the Holy One of God."

11. NIV Omits Jesus Christ.

1 Corinthians 16:22 (KJV) If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.

1 Corinthians 16:22 (NIV) If anyone does not love the Lord--a curse be on him. Come, O Lord !

12. NIV omits by Jesus Christ.

Ephesians 3:9 (KJV) And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:

Ephesians 3:9 (NIV) and to make plain to everyone the administration of this mystery, which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things.

13. When did God cease to be wise?

1 Timothy 1:17 (KJV) Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

1 Timothy 1:17 (NIV) Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

14. Omits by himself.

Hebrews 1:3 (KJV) Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;

Hebrews 1:3 (NIV) The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven.

15. The NIV attacks the priestly order of Jesus!

Hebrews 7:21 (KJV) (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:) Hebrews 7:21 (NIV) but he became a priest with an oath when God said to him: "The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind: 'You are a priest forever.'"

16. The NIV changes Lucifer's name to "morning star."

This shows how insidious the NIV corruption is. Remember that this is one of the blessed titles given to our Lord Jesus in (Revelation 22:16). Here they provide confusion between who Satan is and who Jesus is. One thing is for sure, Satan is not the bright and morning star, but the wicked evil deceptive one, who was called before his fall, "Lucifer".

Isaiah 14:12 (KJV) How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! Isaiah 14:15 (KJV) Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.

Isaiah 14:12 (NIV) How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations! Isaiah 14:15 (NIV) But you are brought down to the grave, to the depths of the pit.

Note: At least 70 times, the NIV omits GOD! * Jesus - 15; Christ - 25; Lord - 16; God - 13.

*Somebody must not like Jesus, Christ, Lord, and God.

B. The Virgin Birth.

1. The NIV removes "firstborn" - questions the virgin birth!

Matthew 1:25 (KJV) And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.

Matthew 1:25 (NIV) But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son. And he gave him the name Jesus.

2. The NIV changes "Joseph" to "the child's father" - questioning the virgin birth!

Luke 2:33 (KJV) And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

Luke 2:33 (NIV) The child's father and mother marveled at what was said about him.

3. The NIV changes "Joseph and his mother" to "his parents" which attacks the virgin birth.

Luke 2:43 (KJV) And when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and Joseph and his mother knew not of it.

Luke 2:43 (NIV) After the Feast was over, while his parents were returning home, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusa

lem, but they were unaware of it.

4. The NIV changes "only begotten of the Father" to "One and Only" which is a New Age title for some cosmic god.

John 1:14 (KJV) And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

John 1:14 (NIV) The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.

5. Notice the NIV omits "Christ" and "is come in the flesh". This is important to us who are saved.

1 John 4:3 (KJV) And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

1 John 4:3 (NIV) but every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist, which you have heard is coming and even now is already in the world.

C. The Atoning Death of Christ.

1. The NIV Omits over half of the verse.

Matthew 27:35 (KJV) And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

Matthew 27:35 (NIV) When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots.

2. The NIV removes the verse (even the Catholic Bible has this verse).

Mark 15:28 (KJV) And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.

Mark 15:28 (NIV)

3. They omit "they struck him on the face", this weakens the fulfillment of Isaiah 50:6 "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting".

Luke 22:64 (KJV) And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee?

Luke 22:64 (NIV) They blindfolded him and demanded, "Prophecy! Who hit you?"

4. The NIV omits the BLOOD and question the Deity of Christ in these verses.

Colossians 1:14-15 (KJV) In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: 15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

Colossians 1:14-15 (NIV) in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. 15 He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.

D. The Resurrection of Christ.

1. This Omission attacks both the Virgin Birth and Resurrection of our Lord. Without the resurrection, we have not hope of eternal life.

Acts 2:30 (KJV) Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;

Acts 2:30 (NIV) But he was a prophet and knew that God had promised him on oath that he would place one of his descendants on his throne.

2. The NIV omits "of the dead".

This brings in question the power of God in resurrection. Many cultists teach that Jesus was not raised in a physical body. The "New Bibles" give these false doctrines aid and comfort.

Acts 24:15 (KJV) And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.

Acts 24:15 (NIV) and I have the same hope in God as these men, that there will be a resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked.

3. The NIV omits "him that liveth for ever and ever". Jesus said "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death."

Revelation 1:18

Revelation 5:14 (KJV) And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.

Revelation 5:14 (NIV) The four living creatures said, "Amen," and the elders fell down and worshiped.

Satan hates the resurrection of Christ, and will do anything he can to fight it.

4. They delete the truth that our Lord has a body; this is taught by the modernist, and cults of our day. When Jesus is seen as not having a BODY, He is seen without a resurrection.

Ephesians 5:30 (KJV) For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

Ephesians 5:30 (NIV) for we are members of his body.

E. The Ascension of Christ.

1. They leave out "I go to the Father" this attacks the all important doctrine of the ascension of Christ. If Jesus did not resurrect and if He did not ascend back to the Father, then we have no hope of salvation and we have no hope of the second coming.

John 16:16 (KJV) A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.

John 16:16 (NIV) "In a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me."

2. They leave out "is the Lord", Jesus is Lord to the Glory of God the Father.

1 Corinthians 15:47 (KJV) The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.

1 Corinthians 15:47 (NIV) The first man was of the dust of the earth, the second man from heaven.

F. The Doctrine of the Trinity.

The Devil hates all three of the Godhead. Many references to names of God are attacked.

1. Who gave the translators the authority to change God's name? Jeremiah spoke about so called "Prophets", "which think to cause my people to forget my name" (Jeremiah 23:27).

Exodus 6:3 (KJV) And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.

Exodus 6:3 (NIV) I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob as God Almighty, but by my name the LORD I did not make myself known to them.

Genesis 22:14 (KJV) And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovahjireh: as it is said to this day, In the mount of the LORD it shall be seen.

Genesis 22:14 (NIV) So Abraham called that place The LORD Will Provide. And to this day it is said, "On the mountain of the LORD it will be provided."

2. It is apparent that the NIV does not like to use the blessed name Jehovah, why? Is this to accommodate the New Age crowd?

For anyone to alter the name of our God is ungodly and out of Hell. (Of course they don't like HELL either, study on).

Exodus 17:15 (KJV) And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovahnissi:

Exodus 17:15 (NIV) Moses built an altar and called it The LORD is my Banner.

3. In the NIV study bible I am using, I cannot find one time they use the name Jehovah, why? What is wrong with the blessed name of God? It is the Hebrew.

Isaiah 12:2 (KJV) Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid: for the LORD JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation.

Isaiah 12:2 (NIV) Surely God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid. The LORD, the LORD, is my strength and my song; he has become my salvation."

4. These verses teaching the Trinity.

Exodus 3:14 (KJV) And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.

Exodus 3:14 (NIV) God said to Moses, "I AM WHO I AM. This is what you are to say to the Israelites: 'I AM has sent me to you.'"

5. The NIV removes the word Godhead which is a direct reference to the Trinity.

Most every cult I know of hates the Trinity, can a person be saved and deny this great doctrine? in 1 John 2:22 "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." We have already seen how that the deity of Christ is attacked, the Fatherhood of God, and we will see how the person of the Holy Spirit is attacked.

Romans 1:20 (KJV) For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

Romans 1:20 (NIV) For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--his eternal power and divine nature--have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

Colossians 2:9 (KJV) For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Colossians 2:9 (NIV) For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form

Acts 17:29 (KJV) Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.

Acts 17:29 (NIV) "Therefore since we are God's offspring, we should not think that the divine being is like gold or silver or stone--an image made by man's design and skill.

6. They put part of verse 8 and call it verse 7. This is corrupt and evil.

1 John 5:7-8 (KJV) For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

1 John 5:7-8 (NIV) For there are three that testify: 8 the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement. There is no greater verse in all the Bible to teach the doctrine of the Trinity than (1 John 5:7), yet the modern versions omit them, and textual criticism has a heyday with this verse. Yet this verse is found in "The old Syriac A.D. 170, old Latin A.D. 200, Vulgate: 4th and 5th century, Italian 4th and 5th century". Also many church fathers quoted this and it is found in "Liber Apologetic A.D. 350, Council of Carthage A.D. 415." The idea that the True Word of God was lost for 1800 years, and then found by our Catholic friends, is an insult to God Almighty and His ability to preserve His Word.

7. The Holy Ghost changed ...

Acts 8:18 (KJV) And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money,

Acts 8:18 (NIV) When Simon saw that the Spirit was given at the laying on of the apostles' hands, he offered them money

Romans 15:19 (KJV) Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.

Romans 15:19 (NIV) by the power of signs and miracles, through the power of the Spirit. So from Jerusalem all the way around to Illyricum, I have fully proclaimed the gospel of Christ.

John 7:39 (KJV) (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)

John 7:39 (NIV) By this he meant the Spirit, whom those who believed in him were later to receive. Up to that time the Spirit had not been given, since Jesus had not yet been glorified.

We can see that they don't like "Spirit of God" or "Holy Ghost", why? Because Satan wants to weaken the Trinity.

8. Looks like they could at least translate this Holy Spirit, but this unholy day hates the Holy things of God.

Acts 6:3 (KJV) Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.

Acts 6:3 (NIV) Brothers, choose seven men from among you who are known to be full of the Spirit and wisdom. We will turn this responsibility over to them

1 Corinthians 2:13 (KJV) Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

1 Corinthians 2:13 (NIV) This is what we speak, not in words taught us by human wisdom but in words taught by the Spirit, expressing spiritual truths in spiritual words.

9. Again it's meaning is changed.

Romans 8:15 (KJV) For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.

Romans 8:15 (NIV) For you did not receive a spirit that makes you a slave again to fear, but you received the Spirit of sonship. And by him we cry, "Abba, Father."

10. The truth is questioned !?!

Acts 11:17 (KJV) Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ

st; what was I, that I could withstand God?

Acts 11:17 (NIV) So if God gave them the same gift as he gave us, who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I to think that I could oppose God?"

11. There is a great deal of difference between weakness and infirmity. Infirmity happens because of outside influences, but weakness speaks of one's character. Our Lord was entirely without sin.

Hebrews 5:2 (KJV) Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity.

Hebrews 5:2 (NIV) He is able to deal gently with those who are ignorant and are going astray, since he himself is subject to weakness.

12. Questions Deity !!

Revelation 1:13 (KJV) And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, ...

Revelation 1:13 (NIV) and among the lampstands was someone "like a son of man," ...

Revelation 14:14 (KJV) And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, ...

Revelation 14:14 (NIV) I looked, and there before me was a white cloud, and seated on the cloud was one "like a son of man" ...

Daniel 3:25 (KJV) He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.

Daniel 3:25 (NIV) He said, "Look! I see four men walking around in the fire, unbound and unharmed, and the fourth looks like a son of the gods."

G. The Doctrine of Salvation by Faith. The NIV attacks this most important doctrine. Satan surely doesn't want anybody saved by grace.

1. The Word of God is our authority for salvation and to defeat Satan.

Luke 4:4 (KJV) And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.

Luke 4:4 (NIV) Jesus answered, "It is written: 'Man does not live on bread alone.'"

2. They omit repentance, Satan hates real heart felt, Holy Ghost inspired repentance.

Matthew 9:13 (KJV) But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

Matthew 9:13 (NIV) But go and learn what this means: 'I desire mercy, not sacrifice.' For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners."

3. They remove the need for the heart to be converted by simply removing the heart.

Matthew 12:35 (KJV) A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil t.

Matthew 12:35 (NIV) The good man brings good things out of the good stored up in him, and the evil man brings evil things out of the evil stored up in him.

4. In John 3, the great chapter on the New Birth, the NIV does much damage to the doctrine of salvation by faith in the Son of God.

a. They leave out "which is in heaven" which takes from the Lord's deity.

John 3:13 (KJV) And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.

John 3:13 (NIV) No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven--the Son of Man.

b. They leave out "should not perish" the reference to hell.

John 3:15 (KJV) That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.

John 3:15 (NIV) that everyone who believes in him may have eternal life.

c. They remove the sonship of the believer - John 1:12.

John 3:16 (KJV) For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, ...

John 3:16 (NIV) "For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, ...

d. They just keep on changing, and changing, and changing.

John 3:36 (KJV) He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

John 3:36 (NIV) Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, but whoever rejects the Son will not see life, for God's wrath remains on him."

5. The new birth is changed to a process where you are nurtured into the kingdom. The question, What Kingdom?

John 1:12 (KJV) But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his

John 1:12 (NIV) Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God--

6. The doctrine of Salvation by grace through faith could never be clearer than in Romans. Look what the NIV does:

Romans 11:6 (KJV) And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

Romans 11:6 (NIV) And if by grace, then it is no longer by works; if it were, grace would no longer be grace.

7. The NIV does not stand on the great doctrine of salvation by grace through faith.

The translators were out of "works" backgrounds. The NIV staff was quoted as saying, "A Christian never 'IS' but always 'IS BECOMING'". Notice how they take God's grace out of your heart.

Colossians 3:16 (KJV) ... with grace in your hearts to the Lord.

Colossians 3:16 (NIV) ... with gratitude in your hearts to God.

8. Salvation is not a sure thing in the NIV, but rather a process. Notice the change in this verse.

2 Corinthians 7:10 (KJV) For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death.

2 Corinthians 7:10 (NIV) Godly sorrow brings repentance that leads to salvation and leaves no regret, but worldly sorrow brings death.

9. This omission reveals the blatant design of Satan through the new bibles. No where can you find a more blessed verse than Acts 8:37, that teaches salvation is without baptism or works, and the NIV omits it altogether.

Acts 8:36-37 (KJV) And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? 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.

Acts 8:36-37 (NIV) As they traveled along the road, they came to some water and the eunuch said, "Look, here is water. Why shouldn't I be baptized?" 37

10. Another shocking omission is found in Mark 6:11, this verse teaches the serious result of rejecting Christ.

Mark 6:11 (KJV) And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrhah in the day of judgment, than for that city.

Mark 6:11 (NIV) And if any place will not welcome you or listen to you, shake the dust off your feet when you leave, as a testimony against them."

11. You will find in the NIV that salvation is a matter of obeying and not believing.

Romans 11:32 (KJV) For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.

Romans 11:32 (NIV) For God has bound all men over to disobedience so that he may have mercy on them all.

Hebrews 3:18 (KJV) And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not?

Hebrews 3:18 (NIV) And to whom did God swear that they would never enter his rest if not to those who disobeyed ?

Hebrews 4:6 (KJV) Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief:

Hebrews 4:6 (NIV) It still remains that some will enter that rest, and those who formerly had the gospel preached to them did not go in, because of their disobedience.

12. The NIV also teaches a plan of salvation that not only depends on works to "be saved", but it depends on works to "stay saved".

2 Timothy 2:12 (KJV) If we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us:

2 Timothy 2:12 (NIV) if we endure, we will also reign with him. If we disown him, he will also disown us;

13. The NIV reduces our sure confidence to a hope. This sure fits most people who say, "Well, I hope I am saved."

Hebrews 10:23 (KJV) Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;)

Hebrews 10:23 (NIV) Let us hold unwaveringly to the hope we profess, for he who promised is faithful.

14. In the salvation of Saul, the NIV omits much from the all important text concerning his conversion.

Acts 9:5-6 (KJV) And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. 6 And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.

Acts 9:5-6 (NIV) "Who are you, Lord?" Saul asked. "I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting," he replied. 6 "Now get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you must do."

They omit "and the Lord said". This deletes the authority of the one speaking. The other omission is the statement "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks". This is the convicting work of the Holy Spirit. My How Satan hates the convicting work of the Holy Ghost, but without this no one can be saved. In the NIV Saul doesn't call Jesus Lord, why? Because they teach a plan of salvation that consists of a process of good works. When Saul called Jesus Lord, he was saved. That's why Ananias called him, "Brother Saul" in Acts 9:17.

15. The NIV doesn't think much of repentance.

Mark 2:17 (KJV) When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

Mark 2:17 (NIV) On hearing this, Jesus said to them, "It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick. I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners."

What did Jesus call these sinners? Modern man rejects the idea of old fashioned Bible repentance, yet it still gets the job done. Repentance is not some separate act done in a procession of steps, but rather it is the turning from a life of rejecting Jesus and turning to God by faith.

16. The cross is also deleted from the corrupt version.

Mark 10:21 (KJV) Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell what soever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me.

Mark 10:21 (NIV) Jesus looked at him and loved him. "One thing you lack," he said. "Go, sell everything you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me."

H. The Doctrine of the Second Coming is abused in the NIV.

The NIV attacks the kingdom of God and the coming reign of Jesus. This is done because of the New Age, Satanic doctrine, that the Anti-Christ will win the battle of Armageddon and will rule in place of Christ.

1. Let's consider the model prayer in Luke 11:2-4.

a. You will notice that the NIV changes "Our Father" to "Father", why? Because we live in an age that believes in the universal fatherhood of God, that is "everyone is a child of God". This Devil crowd uses the prayer given in the NIV as a prayer to their father, Satan. They also omit, "which art in Heaven,". We must ask, "Who is this father in the NIV?" They also omit, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth". What is the will of God for this earth? It is for the Lord Jesus to return and put all of His enemies under His footstool and for Him to reign in power and glory.

Luke 11:2 (KJV) And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.

Luke 11:2 (NIV) He said to them, "When you pray, say: "Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come.

b. "My" to "the".

John 14:28 (NIV) "You heard me say, 'I am going away and I am coming back to you.' If you loved me, you would be glad that I am going to the Father, for the Father is greater than I.

c. They also change 2 Thessalonians 1:2 from "God our Father" to "God the Father" in the NIV.

d. This is true in 1 Timothy 1:2, Philemon 1:25; and in Revelation 22:21. The devil hates for us to preach that God can be our own Father, of whom we can cry, "Abba, Father."

e. "but deliver us from evil" deleted.

Luke 11:4 (KJV) And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

Luke 11:4 (NIV) Forgive us our sins, for we also forgive everyone who sins against us. And lead us not into temptation."

2. The NIV continues to eliminate God's Kingdom.

Matthew 6:13 (KJV) And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

Matthew 6:13 (NIV) And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.'

They change "evil" to "evil one", and omit the kingdom, power and glory of God for ever. Why would anyone put confidence in this corrupt NIV.

3. They omit the second coming.

The devil hates the second coming because he knows his time will be over.

Matthew 25:13 (KJV) Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.

Matthew 25:13 (NIV) "Therefore keep watch, because you do not know the day or the hour.

4. Look how the NIV attacks the rapture of the church. The whole verse is omitted.

God bless,

Stever

P.S. There is more, that I will post later. Can you see the end product of the NIV and the newer versions. It did not happen by accident, but was intended by the Translators, starting with Origen, followed by Eusebius, and then followed by Westcott and Hort. The NIV and the other Newer versions, is there intentional deceit?

God will be the judge of the whole matter very soon.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2006/4/30 2:17

Hello Stever...

Quote:
-----Let's consider some important doctrinal truths that are attacked by the NIV. You should note that most of these omissions are found in the other new versions also, if you want to compare.

The NIV even refutes the idea that the Bible is the preserved, inspired, Word of God.

...

P.S. There is more, that I will post later. Can you see the end product of the NIV and the newer versions. It did not happen by accident, but was intended by the Translators, starting with Origen, followed by Eusebius, and then followed by Westcott and Hort. The NIV and the other Newer versions, is there intentional deceit?

God will be the judge of the whole matter very soon.

I do not know how to make this more clear. The NIV was translated from a completely different set of ancient texts than the KJV. It NEVER omitted anything. The fact that a particular word or phrase is omitted is testament to the fact that the bulk of the ancient source texts used for NIV simply did not have them. Thus, it would have been DISHONEST to include them for the sake of tradition (such as some of the ecclesiastical terms that were purposely insisted upon for the KJV).

It is unwise to consider the validity of a translation by using a side-by-side comparison of one translation using another. Why? Because they are only translations of the different sources that they used. Since different sources were used, why should we expect them to be translated from language to language to language to language exactly the same.

I live in extreme south Texas (about an hour south of Corpus Christi). As an experiment, I recently asked several Spanish speaking friends to translate a two-page paper for me. Two of these individuals are graduate students majoring in Spanish. Another was a bilingual education major, minoring in Spanish. And two more were Mexican citizens that are attending college in the United States. A few days later, I received the finished translations. And you know what? Every single one of them was different. While the mass bulk of what they translated was the same -- there were some noticeable differences in verbiage, grammar and terms. I asked several of them about the differences. They told me that there are often several ways to say the same thing. If this is what we can expect from a Latin-based language such as Spanish, what

can we expect when translating something into a grammatically complex language like English? And how much more if the source texts that are being translated from are completely different? Would they be exactly the same? Of course not!

Stever, it seems that your real qualm is with the source material -- and not with serious, academic translations like the NIV. The KJV is a wonderful translation. In fact, I personally prefer it as the best source derived from the Textus Receptus. However, the NIV is also a great translation using the other sources. I often like to refer to both of them. This is not to consider one as being vastly superior to the other, but as a way to consider two translations based upon different sources.

I truly believe that it is important that you refrain from making slanderous allegations about translations like the NIV or their translators. You often state as "fact" what is merely your own "opinion" based upon the things that you have studied. You do not know any of the translators of the NIV. Nor do you know any of the translators of the KJV. Nor do you have any source texts to judge. Even if you did, I'm not certain about your expertise with translating such old languages. Therefore, it is impossible for you to determine such things based upon books or webpages that were written using some sort of bias.

Why am I writing this? It is important that people that happen to read your posts realize that there are many other perspectives about this issue. Many of us have seriously studied this issue -- and have simply arrived at a completely different conclusion. Of course, you have every right to state your conclusions. But it is important that you are careful about distinguishing what is your conclusion -- and what is undeniable fact. We should do our best to make certain which is which.

:~)

Re: Re: Ccchhrrriiiss, on: 2006/4/30 11:22

Dear Ccchhrrriiiss:

As the years have progressed, I believe that Satan is behind the modern translations. The once great soul winning denominations have been reduced to social clubs by means of modernist translations that question every important doctrine needed to get to heaven.

On this thread I have provided insight into the mindset of Westcott and Hort, who are responsible for the creation of "neutral" Textual Criticism, and in the process of their "Revision Committee" were responsible for swapping the Received Text found in the Protestant Bible for the Minority Text found in the Catholic Bible. Now, when a Protestant Christian opens the NIV, NASB, or any of the "newer" Bible versions, he is in effect opening up the Catholic Bible unawares.

The "analysis" made by you Ccchhrrriiiss is flawed. We have a Bible, that has been handed down to us by the Disciples & Apostles. It was created in Koine Greek, and the language is a dead language. What does that mean? The meaning of the words are frozen in time. There is no confusion as to the meaning of the words-their meanings are cast in stone and frozen. Ccchhrrriiiss's example of the Mexicans translating English (which is a living language, where the meaning of words are in a state of flux and change) to Spanish is absolutely absurd and has no relationship to the translation of the Received Texts and what transpired then. The Received Texts were written in Koine Greek, a language that became a "dead language" approximately 200 years after the Canon was established, and were then translated into Latin & Greek by Erasmus, and then from there translated into English. This English that we find in the King James is 1611 English, and again is locked in time as of 1611. The English language was not changing dramatically at that time as it is today. England controlled much of the World then, and the language was stable. That is why if we pick up an 1828 Noah Webster's American Dictionary of the English Language all of the meanings of words that appear in the King James are not quite clear to us today, COME ALIVE TO US. Also, with the Strong's Concordance we can look up the meanings of the Koine Greek words that are found in the New Testament for further clarification.

What I have posted here documents how Origen and others actually changed the Sacred text to conform with their own heresies. This is the "source material" that created the Catholic Bible and is called the minority text.

The fact that Ccchhrrriiiss has posted what he has (below my post) reveals to me (again) that he has not read or understood what I have posted. His response is like that of a person who is deaf, that is not only trying to respond to a

Scriptures and Doctrine :: The Nestle Greek Text

speech, but also telling others while standing on the rooftops that what they heard is wrong. YET, HE NEVER REFUTES WHAT HE THINKS THE OTHER PERSON SAYS, HE JUST SAYS, AS LOUD AS HE CAN THAT THE OTHER PERSON IS WRONG, WRONG, WRONG.

Ccchhrrriiiss continues to believe that there are no doctrinal differences that really matter between the NIV and all of the other newer versions and the King James Bible. With him, it is all in the "original source material". I am very well aware of that. To be very clear, I will state it one more time, without the textural proofs that I normally post to back it up---"THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE ORIGINAL SOURCE MATERIAL. THE RECEIVED TEXT IS THE TEXT "RECEIVED" FROM THE DISCIPLES & APOSTLES AND THE "CHURCH", AND AMOUNTS TO THE VERY WORDS OF GOD. THE "MINORITY" TEXT IS TEXT CREATED BY ORIGEN AND OTHERS THAT BECAME THE CATHOLIC BIBLE. THE PROTESTANT BIBLE HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE RECEIVED TEXT. THE CATHOLIC BIBLE HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE MINORITY TEXT. THEN, AFTER WESTCOTT AND HORT PERFORMED THEIR "WORK", THEY SWAPPED THE RECEIVED TEXT WITH THE MINORITY TEXT. SO TODAY, WHEN YOU PICK UP THE NIV OR THE NEWER VERSIONS, YOU MIGHT AS WELL HAVE A CATHOLIC BIBLE IN YOUR HANDS."

I truly pray that this opens eyes and hearts in the understanding of this most important issue-Which Version. I have seen so much doctrinal error, even here on sermon index. 30 years ago, that was not the case. The error was always found with the Cults- the Latter Day Saints, JVH, and others. But today, even Christians are reading Bibles that water down sound Christian Doctrine, found in God's Word.

We do not serve a God who causes confusion by providing us with a different Bible (His WORD) that takes away from understanding his Majesty, and Power and will for our lives. We serve a God who provides us with HIS WORD that teaches us:

2 Timothy 1:6-7 KJV

"6. Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.
7. For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind."

God bless,

Steve

P.S. Ccchhrrriiiss, I would be interested in a Scholarly debate of this issue. You are a College man that surely knows how to take two sides of the same issue, and be able to be either for or against the other side, no matter what your own internal bias is, don't you? Go back to my first post in this thread, as well as my first post on Philologos' thread of "Why would anyone still read the King James Bible", and refute what I have posted by documentation and source material, not adjectives. Not words like WRONG, UNWISE OR DISHONEST. Those very adjectives, without source material that can be verified, will provide you with a failing grade!

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:
Hello Stever...

Quote:
-----Let's consider some important doctrinal truths that are attacked by the NIV. You should note that most of these omissions are found in the other new versions also, if you want to compare.

The NIV even refutes the idea that the Bible is the preserved, inspired, Word of God.

...

P.S. There is more, that I will post later. Can you see the end product of the NIV and the newer versions. It did not happen by accident, but was intended by the Translators, starting with Origen, followed by Eusebius, and then followed by Westcott and Hort. The NIV and the other Newer versions, is there intentional deceit?

God will be the judge of the whole matter very soon.

I do not know how to make this more clear. The NIV was translated from a completely different set of ancient texts than the KJV. It NEVER omitted anything. The fact that a particular word or phrase is omitted is testament to the fact that the bulk of the ancient source texts used for NIV simply did not have them. Thus, it would have been DISHONEST to include them for the sake of tradition (such as some of the ecclesiastical terms that were purposefully insisted upon for the KJV).

It is unwise to consider the validity of a translation by using a side-by-side comparison of one translation using another. Why? Because they are only translations of the different sources that they used. Since different sources were used, why should we expect them to be translated from language to language to language exactly the same.

I live in extreme south Texas (about an hour south of Corpus Christi). As an experiment, I recently asked several spanish speaking friends to translate a two-page paper for me. Two of these individuals are graduate students majoring in Spanish. Another was a bilingual education major, minoring in Spanish. And two more were Mexican citizens that are attending college in the United States. A few days later, I received the finished translations. And you know what? Every single one of them was different. While the mass bulk of what they translated was the same -- there were some noticable differences in verbage, grammar and terms. I asked several of them about the differences. They told me that there are often several ways to say the same thing. If this is what we can expect from a latin-based language such as Spanish, what can we expect when translating something into a grammatically complex language like English? And how much more if the source texts that are being translated from are completely different? Would they be exactly the same? Of course not!

Stever, it seems that your real qualm is with the source material -- and not with serious, academic translations like the NIV. The KJV is a wonderful translation. In fact, I personally prefer it as the best source derived from the Textus Receptus. However, the NIV is also a great translation using the other sources. I often like to refer to both of them. This is not to consider one as being vastly superior to the other, but as a way to consider two translations based upon different sources.

I truly believe that it is important that you refrain from making slanderous allegations about translations like the NIV or their translators. You often state as "fact" what is merely your own "opinion" based upon the things that you have studied. You do not know any of the translators of the NIV. Nor do you know any of the translators of the KJV. Nor do you have any source texts to judge. Even if you did, I'm not certain about your expertise with translating such old languages. Therefore, it is impossible for you to determine such things based upon books or webpages that were written using some sort of bias.

Why am I writing this? It is important that people that happen to read your posts realize that there are many other perspectives about this issue. Many of us have seriously studied this issue -- and have simply arrived at a completely different conclusion. Of course, you have every right to state your conclusions. But it is important that you are careful about distinguishing what is your conclusion -- and what is undeniable fact. We should do our best to make certain which is which.

:-)

Re: - posted by leaf (), on: 2006/5/1 16:48

Hi,

This is my first post on this site, though I have been visiting it for some time. I am an evangelical christian with a a bit of a passion for Tozer. A friend of mine, also an evangelical, is very much against many of the newer translations and the text chosen for those translations. I, however, am not completely convinced by some of the arguments against the use of modern textual apparatus. I have studied koine greek, both at an evangelical bible college and a sceptical university as well as the history of textual transmission. I use both the Textus Receptus and the UBS 3 in my studies, but only UBS 3 in my devotions. I'm no expert, but my own feeling is that not all modern versions are as bad as each other and the KJV does not always do the text justice (even the Textus Receptus text). I much prefer the NASB's "Only Begotten God" to the KJV's "Only Begotten Son" in John 1:18. Christ's Divinity is forcibly asserted (and it gives a headache to Jehovah's witnesses) as well as maintaining the poetic power of John 1:1. The bible is divinely inspired, but I believe that the people chosen to be the instruments of the Holy Spirit were chosen for a reason. And for me the NASB captures the grandeur of the poetic John (chp 1) better than any other version. Having said that some modern versions go too far. The modern trend of de-genderising scripture is, for me, disturbing since it is a deliberate mis-translation. A principal has been abandoned, future versions may suffer the consequences. On the whole I prefer the NASB and the KJV, but ultimately both are translations and need to be read under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and a fair bit of humility!

Re: Sorry for the pun - posted by deltadom (), on: 2006/5/1 19:11

This does sound like a chocolate bar . This is very interesting as I am interested in greek versions aswell