

Scriptures and Doctrine :: NASB or NKJV??

NASB or NKJV??, on: 2008/7/1 20:03

Which is your favorite version? I mostly read and study from the NASB, however, lately I have been liking the NKJV. So me of the words used in the NKJV have a stronger thought emphasize. Of course that is personal opinion. Here is an example:

NASB:

1 Peter 4:1 " Therefore, since Christ has suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves also with the same purpose, because he who has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin,"

NKJV:

1 Peter 4:1 " Therefore, since Christ has suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves also with the same mind, for he who has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin,"

just some thought. I like the KJV but I have a hard time reading through.

What are your thoughts?

:-)

Re: NASB or NKJV?? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/1 20:20

I use the NASB, it is the most literal word-for-word translation available on the market. NKJV isn't bad, however, in my brief uses of it, I have found that isn't as literal in its translation (which makes doing a word study harder), and sometimes, seems to soften some harder passages.

Re:, on: 2008/7/1 20:25

I agree with your comments, its ultimately up to ones own opinion. I do find also the NASB a better word for word. However I feel the opposite in some respect to the NKJV, for me it heightens a deeper thought or intense understanding of a verse.

thanks brother

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/1 20:55

I have a difficult time with the other versions that leave out scripture and words that have been recorded a few hundred years before these modern versions came out. They say there going by the two oldest manuscripts but I still have difficulty accepting that God would allow us to be without the correct scriptures for almost 300 years so now we can just leave them out because they had been added by men.

The KJV & NKJV are both considered along with the NASB to be word for word translation. The NASB does leave out words and scripture that are in the KJV

The niv is not word for word but a thought translation and leaves out scripture and words that are in the KJV.

I can read any of them but I rely more on the KJV because of words left out by the other versions However the NKJV does have the same scriptures and is more in line with the KJV than the other versions.

Not to be argumentative but just believe in standing with the whole counsel of God and just have the conviction that the authorized version was copied from the correct manuscripts. I believe the KJV should have stayed with the name- the authorized version.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/7/1 21:33

I actually believe the YLT is the most literal word-for-word. Of course, Young's is a word-for word of the Textus Receptus (the same Greek text from which the KJV was translated), whereas the NASB is not. The real question, I suppose, is which translation is the most literal to its respective text. Using this logic, it is not very accurate to say one translation is more literal than another when the x and y variables are different.

Re: 1611 was a ways back in speech, but more beautiful in mind., on: 2008/7/1 21:46

I have a Holman Study NASB that I have used for 25 years. It seems to be generally doctrine free, and the Holman crowd put a ton of the original literal expressions, especially when they had to tweak the ancient word, to insert it into our English. This has really been helpful, and has directed my Bible reading more to original thought. I love my NASB.

Saying that, I often compare with my KJV, word and paragraph, to get a deeper derivative. I cut my teeth on the KJV, as so many have, and when I changed over to NASB, I lost almost all of my memory of scripture. I had memorized over 150 psalms, taken directly out of scripture from the KJV, and countless passages, that are much different as a sound, and also a lyric. There is a beauty and a cadence that KJV possesses that makes it conducive to the thought, I think. Consider Psalms 23 any other way, or Isaiah 53. What a beautiful sound and rhythm these Scholars had.

Some passages though are thick, and archaic, especially in the Pentateuch, which seem very mental, like eggheads translated, in a way the common man would not grasp. NASB generally gives me a feel that I can grasp more, in these passages. I like NKJV especially for the New Testament, as it flows with my history more, and taste for order.

The hardest thing about them all, is doing what it says to do. :-)

Re: NASB or NKJV??, on: 2008/7/2 0:00

My favorite, as most of you are aware, is the King James Version.

Several months ago I ordered a CD from Southwest Radio Church <http://www.swrc.com> of an interview given by S. Frank Logsdon, given by him on February 17, 1974. (CD #A-183)

Following is some of the information on this CD. Of course, the NASB has totally downplayed Logsdon's involvement in the project. However, Logsdon's personal interview reveals a true man of God who wanted to set things straight before he met his Maker. He gave the interview when he was 74 years old, and died 13 years later at age 87:

A better translation? - Logsdon's story

S. Frank Logsdon (1907-1987), a respected evangelical pastor and conference speaker, gives us his testimony about his well-meaning but mistaken attempt to relegate the Authorized Version of the Bible to oblivion by producing a new translation.

He tells his own story how it came about that from serving as a committee member for the production of the New American Standard Bible, he was constrained, by force of evidence and good conscience, to re-trace his steps back to the King James Version.

His involvement with the said project came about from an invitation by Franklin Dewey Lockman who, according to his opinion, "wasn't schooled in language or anything; he was just a businessman; he did it for money; he did it conscientiously; he wanted it absolutely right and he thought it was right" (that is, the NASB).

Upon reflection and by hindsight, Logsdon reasons that "the devil is too wise to try to destroy the Bible. He knows he

can't. He can't destroy the Word of God. But he can do a lot of things to try to supplant it, or to corrupt it in the minds and hearts of God's people.
A better translation?

He says how foolish it is for modern versions, among them the NASB, to pose as better translations than the AV (KJV). To give this impression, whenever there was an omission of words or phrases or even whole sentences in the NASB, the editors would put in a footnote: "Not in the oldest manuscripts." But they do not tell you what those oldest manuscripts are. Or they say, "Not in the best manuscripts. What are the best manuscripts. They don't tell you. By this subtle ploy, the average reader notices the note in the margin and he takes it for granted that the scholars know better than he. Who is he to protest? Who is he to raise his voice "against the scholars." That would be the height of impertinence and foolhardiness.

But when the popular phrases, "the best manuscripts," and "the oldest manuscripts" are thrown about here and there - to intimidate the inquirers - what is meant by them is quite surprising. By such phrases is usually meant the Codices A and B, that is, the Sinai and Vatican manuscripts. Where do we find these two "revered" manuscripts? Of all places, in the custodial care of Rome!!

Virtually all of our revisions, of recent years in particular, that claim to be superior to the AV, come through that stream. What's more, nobody has seen the Vatican manuscript. It's under lock and key in Rome. And the only copies we have are the copies Rome decided to give to the outside world.

What should our Protestant reaction be? Well, if we happen to be true Protestants, we wouldn't trust them one bit. The guardian of these manuscripts is notorious for her apostasy and denial of New Testament Christianity. Why should we consult her manuscripts when the vast majority of ancient manuscripts are in agreement with each other, and so vastly different from the Vatican and Sinai manuscripts.

And yet, wonder of wonders, the United Bible Society and other smaller Bible translation societies, opted for the eclectic text as corrupted by these two manuscripts in particular. (The Trinitarian Bible Society of London is one noble exception).

Paul's Bible, my Bible

Quoting Logsdon again: "I tell you, I used to laugh with others when a person would try to slander the intelligence, perhaps, of some who say, 'Well, if the Authorized Version was good enough for Paul it's good enough for me.' You get a lot of ha, ha's. Say, that perhaps is true. If this is the Word of God, and Paul had the Word of God, then things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. We have the Book that Paul had!"

The reasoning is such: Paul had the pure Word of God (in a different language from mine). I have the pure Word of God (in the Authorized, since I'm much deficient in Greek and Hebrew).

Therefore Paul and I own the same Word of God.

But by the same reasoning, the reader of the NASB cannot say this. The hundreds of omissions in his Bible are the result of corrupted texts introduced and disseminated by the Gnostics and heretical teachers of the early church (Origen, Marcion, Eusebius, and so on). These omissions were done after the death of the apostle Paul. So the NASB reader and the apostle Paul do not read the same Bible.

Archaisms, archaisms, archaisms...

The impression is given that the AV (KJV) is loaded down with Elizabethan English that is outdated and foreign to today's readership. It is a Bible that belongs to the past. It's incumbent upon us then to update the Bible and present our faith to a modern culture in a more effective way, making a definite impact that could not be made with the AV (KJV).

Logsdon continues: "It's true there could be, and perhaps should be, some few corrections of words that are archaic. And a few places where it could read just a little more freely." What he's hinting at is that it would be sensible and right to update the spelling, and this has actually happened twice since the first publication of the Authorized in 1611. But the revisions were not in the sense or in the editing of the AV (KJV). It was in such minor things as spelling: for instance, instead of "sope" it was updated to "soap," and so on.

"When I say corrected," Logsdon clarifies, "I mean just some of the archaic words such as 'he who lets will let until he be taken out of the way.' Now we don't use the word that way, but you can find out what it means by taking just a moment to look it up."

Logsdon, however, is far from suggesting a revamping of the AV (KJV) text. "Back in Jeremiah 4:22, we read, 'My people are sottish.' There wouldn't be two people in the congregation that would know what that means. But I like it because when I looked it up, I found that it had more meaning than any other word you could put there. It means thick-headed. God says, 'I can't get through to you because you are thick-headed.' And maybe He wants it to stay there. If a person looks it up he gets a better understanding of it than if another word were put in there to change it."

Difficult words

Studies have shown that, contrary to popular opinion, the AV (KJV) is easier to understand than the other modern translations (excepting, of course, the paraphrases which are no translations at all, taking such liberties with the text). The average length of AV (KJV) sentences is shorter than any other translation; the vocabulary is simpler.

Any earnest inquirer can check out these things for himself. He will be surprised how much mud-throwing has been done by those who want to sell there modern cheap wares.

"Actually," says Logsdon, "I don't think there is anything wrong with the AV (KJV), and it has been tested for 362 years. Are you ready to throw it overboard because the scholars have come along and said, 'Well now, this is better; read better; you can understand it better'? I mean to tell you, with all their self-justification, people know less and less about God's Word."

A better translation? How could it be?

The criteria for a competent translation of the Scriptures, among other things, are at least two:

1. It should be done from the preserved Greek and Hebrew texts.
2. It should be done by devout men, fully qualified doctrinally and morally and intellectually speaking.

But this is not what we find on the committee for the first revision of the AV (KJV)!

Logsdon continues in his eye-opener lecture: "So when they saw that there wasn't much to revise, here they had their committee arranged. **One was a Unitarian, a man by the name of Smith.** That's why you find on verses concerning the incarnation there's something wrong. Such as 1 Timothy 3:16 'By common consent great is the mystery of godliness.' Don't you believe that the mystery of godliness depends upon what man thinks, or his opinion. The verse continues in the 1881 version, 'he who was manifest in the flesh.' You've been manifest in the flesh; I've been manifest; (that statement alone is meaningless). It's God who was manifest in the flesh. Do you see the Unitarian flavour there? He got in some blows somewhere, and that must be one of them."

Butchered by the critics' penknife

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Westcott and Hort, in foot-notes and translations, have changed and mutilated the Greek text in about six thousand places. This is why we have so many omissions in our modern Bibles. Words omitted, in brackets, parentheses, or italics are counted as not authentic according to brain-washed modern scholarship.

The interview continues, but that is what I will post for now.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

reformer wrote:

Which is your favorite version? I mostly read and study from the NASB, however, lately I have been liking the NKJV. Some of the words used in the NKJV have a stronger thought emphasize. Of course that is personal opinion. Here is an example:

NASB:

1 Peter 4:1 "Therefore, since Christ has suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves also with the same purpose, because he who has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin,"

NKJV:

1 Peter 4:1 " Therefore, since Christ has suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves also with the same mind, for he who has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin,"

just some thought. I like the KJV but I have a hard time reading through.

What are your thoughts?

:-)

Re: NASB or NKJV?? - posted by Limey153 (), on: 2008/7/2 5:28

A dear friend of mine once said that an effective test of a good translation is to look at 1 John 5:7. This verse is an extremely important and meaningful verse but it virtually erased from MANY translations.

This is 1 John 5:7 in the NASB
7. For there are three that testify

and here is 1 John 5:7 in the NKJV
7. For there are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one.

Re:, on: 2008/7/2 7:08

Neither... KJV all the way!

Krispy

Re: - posted by Fugodedios (), on: 2008/7/2 8:51

I agree Limey153. I have read the NASB and have seen many problems with it. and there is a chunk of meat missing in his portion of scripture(1 John5:7) and also others. For example look at Luke 2:33 in the NASB

NASB Luke 2:33

And His father and (AD)mother were amazed at the things which were being said about Him.

KJV Luke 2:33

And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

It just seems like something strange is going on with these verses and if someone young in the faith comes in and reads something like this they could say "see Jesus' father was not God it was Joseph". JW and Muslims would love this subtle translation of Luke 2:33 and might have it in their arsenal to debate with Christians. NOW!! I am not saying that those who study or read from the NASB are fallen, but should be alert. Some in this post have been blessed by the NASB as they have stated. as for myself I went back to the KJV.

:-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/2 9:38

Why are you guys hijacking the thread? The original question was, which is better, NKJV or NASB? Why not just start another thread about this worn out subject?

Re: - posted by Limey153 (), on: 2008/7/2 9:52

I'm sorry but I actually fail to see how this thread is being hijacked :-(Surely for folk that prefer the KJV it is fair enough for them to say "I don't read either NASB or NKJV, but in fact prefer KJV".

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/2 10:01

It should be noted that the KJV did nothing different than what modern scholarship does today. They had a collection of manuscripts which they drew from to form their translation. For none of their manuscripts had perfect agreement either. Some of their manuscripts, like all manuscripts, had additions and subtractions. In fact, none of the 5,000 some odd manuscripts that exists are in perfect agreement with each other. Thus, their translators sifted through the manuscripts and compiled their own based on what texts they thought were best. The only difference between today and then is that we have a wider selection of manuscripts to sift through, with new ones being discovered almost every year. What the KJV editorial committee has done is no different than what is being done today, and has been done for thousands of years in every language wherever the Bible has been translated.

And today, if you read Hebrew/Greek/Aramaic, and have access to a critical manuscript (which is readily available for purchase), you can decide for yourself which texts are best, as all the major and many of the minor differences between texts are well documented. Through some Bible programs, such as made by Logos and others, you can even buy scanned copies of many of the actual manuscripts to view them for yourself.

Oh by the way, the compiled manuscript that the KJV translation committee used is not exactly known. Many people have attempted to uncover it through backwards translation, but, several versions of the so-called "received text" have been published... with differences among them. So for those of you who insists that the KJV had the right manuscript and that God had preserved it... well, apparently that manuscript hasn't been preserved for our benefit. So, it looks like all of Christianity will have to forever depend upon the 1611 KJV (which by the way, is not the edition most of you use anyway, there were several revisions, which included the entire omission of the apocrypha... included in the beloved 1611 version !)

Re:, on: 2008/7/2 12:14

Butchered by the critics' penknife

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Westcott and Hort, in foot-notes and translations, have changed and mutilated the Greek text in about six thousand places. This is why we have so many omissions in our modern Bibles. Words omitted, in brackets, parentheses, or italics are counted as not authentic according to brain-washed modern scholarship. With a red pencil mark all these omissions which occur in your Bible and prepare yourself for a big surprise.

These are the changes, and deletions found in New Testament of the NASB Bible:

Matthew

- 1:25 firstborn is omitted.
- 5:44 bless them that curse you is omitted.
- 6:13: kingdom, power, glory is omitted.
- 6:27 stature is changed.
- 6:33 of God is omitted.
- 8:29 Jesus is omitted (as Son of God).
- 9:13 to repentance is omitted (in calling sinners).
- 12:35 of the heart is omitted.
- 12:47 verse is omitted (about Christ's mother).
- 13:51 Jesus said unto them, and Lord are omitted.
- 15:8 draweth unto me with their mouth is omitted.
- 16:3 O ye hypocrites is omitted.
- 16:20 Jesus is omitted.
- 17:21 verse is out (about prayer and fasting).
- 18:11 verse is out (telling that Jesus came to save).
- 19:9 last 11 words (**about adultery**) are omitted.
- 19:17 God is omitted. None good but (God).
- 20:7 whatsoever is right receive is omitted.
- 20:16 many be called but few chosen is omitted.

- 20:22 baptised with Christ's baptism is omitted.
- 21:44 verse is omitted (about Christ the stone).
- 23:14 verse is omitted (woe to Scribes and hypocrites).
- 25:13 wherein the Son of Man cometh is omitted.
- 27:35 fulfilled spoken by the prophet is omitted.
- 27:54 the Son of God is changed to a son of God.
- 28:2 from the door is omitted.
- 28:9 they went to tell his disciples is omitted.

Mark

- 1:1 Son of God omitted in the NASV, as well as the Nestle, New World, Wescott and Hort, and others.
- 1:14 of the kingdom is omitted (concerning Jesus' gospel).
- 1:31 immediately is omitted (about Christ's miracle).
- 2:17 to repentance is omitted.
- 6:11 more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah is omitted.
- 6:16 from the dead is omitted.
- 6:33 him is changed to them.
- 7:8 washing of pots and cups is omitted.
- 7:16 verse is omitted (about having an ear to hear).
- 9:24 Lord is omitted. (A believer called Jesus Lord).
- 9:42 verse is omitted (about Hell).
- 9:46 verse is omitted (about Hell).
- 9:49 every sacrifice shall be salted is omitted.
- 10:21 take up the cross is omitted.
- 10:24 for them that trust in riches is omitted.
- 11:10 in the name of the Lord is omitted.
- 11:26 verse is omitted (about forgiveness).
- 13:14 spoken of by Daniel the prophet is omitted.
- 13:33 and pray is omitted, or in italics.
- 14:68 and the cock crew is omitted.
- 15:28 verse is omitted (about Scripture being fulfilled).
- 15:39 the Son of God is changed to a son of God.
- 16:9-20 whole 12 verses are omitted in some Bibles or put in parenthesis.

Luke

- 1:28 blessed are thou among women is omitted.
- 2:33 Joseph is changed to father.
- 2:43 Joseph and his mother is changed to parents.
- 4:4 but by every word of God is omitted.
- 4:8 get thee behind me Satan is omitted.
- 4:41 the Christ is omitted (about the Son of God being Christ).
- 6:48 founded upon a rock is changed to well-built.
- 7:31 and the Lord said is omitted.
- 9:54 even as Elijah did is omitted.
- 9:55 ye know not what manner of spirit is omitted.
- 9:56 son of man is come to save lives is omitted.
- 11:2-4 much is omitted from the Lord's prayer.
- 11:29 the prophet is out (about Jonah).
- 17:36 verse is omitted (one taken, another left).
- 21:4 cast in unto the offerings of God is omitted.
- 22:20 verse is out in NEB and RSV.
- 22:31 and the Lord said is omitted.
- 22:64 they struck him on the face is omitted.
- 23:17 whole verse is omitted in many modern versions.
- 23:38 letters of Greek, Latin, Hebrew is omitted.
- 23:42 Lord is omitted (the thief addressing Jesus).

- 23:45 sun was eclipsed in Moffatt and NEB.
- 24:3 of the Lord Jesus is omitted.
- 24:6 He is not here, but is risen is omitted.
- 24:12 verse is omitted (Peter's testimony).
- 24:40 verse is omitted (Christ showing them hands and feet).
- 24:49 of Jerusalem is omitted.
- 24:51 carried up into heaven is omitted.

John

- 1:14 begotten is out in 1:18; 3:16; 3:18.
- 1:27 preferred before me is omitted (about Jesus).
- 3:13 which is in heaven is omitted.
- 3:15 should not perish is omitted.
- 4:42 the Christ is omitted.
- 5:3 waiting for the moving of the water is omitted.
- 5:4 whole verse omitted.
- 6:47 on me is omitted (about believing on Christ).
- 6:69 that Christ the Son is omitted.
- 7:53 to 8:11 is omitted, in brackets or italics.
- 8:16 Father is omitted, or changed to He.
- 9:35 Son of God is changed to Son of man.
- 11:41 where the dead was laid is omitted.
- 16:16 because I go to the Father is omitted.
- 17:12 in the world is omitted.
- 20:29 Thomas is omitted.

Acts

- 2:30 according to the flesh raise up Christ is omitted.
- 7:30 of the Lord is omitted (about an angel).
- 7:37 Him shall ye hear is omitted (about Christ).
- 8:37 whole verse omitted or in brackets or in italics.
- 9:5,6 much is omitted (concerning God's will).
- 10:6 what thou oughtest to do is omitted.
- 15:18 known unto God....is omitted.
- 16:31 Christ is omitted.
- 17:26 blood is omitted.
- 20:25 of God is omitted (about the kingdom).
- 20:32 brethren is omitted.
- 23:9 let us not fight against God is omitted.
- 24:6-8 much is omitted, in brackets or in italics.
- 24:15 of the dead is omitted (about the resurrection).
- 28:16 half of the verse is omitted or doubt is cast upon in by the use of italics or brackets.
- 28:29 whole verse is out, in italics or bracketed.

Romans

- 1:16 of Christ is omitted or taken the usual precautions about it.
- 1:29 fornication is omitted.
- 5:2 by faith is out in RSV and other versions.
- 8:1 last ten words omitted or in italics.
- 9:28 in righteousness is omitted.
- 10:15 of peace is out (concerning the gospel).
- 10:17 of God is substituted to of Christ.
- 11:6 last 18 words are omitted.
- 13:9 shall not bear false witness is omitted.
- 14:6 fifteen words are omitted.
- 14:21 offended, made weak is omitted.
- 15:29 of the gospel is omitted.
- 16:24 whole verse is omitted or italicised or bracketed.

1 Corinthians

- 1:14 I thank God is out of many Bibles.
- 5:7 for us is omitted (about Christ sacrificed).
- 6:20 last 7 words are omitted.
- 7:5 fasting is omitted.
- 7:39 by the law is omitted (about the wife being bound).
- 10:28 the earth is the Lord's is omitted, and more.
- 11:24 take, eat is omitted (about the Lord's Supper).
- 11:29 Lord's is omitted, referring to the body.
- 15:47 the Lord is omitted (about the Lord from heaven).
- 16:22 Jesus Christ is omitted.
- 16:23 Christ is omitted.

2 Corinthians

- 4:6 Jesus is omitted.
- 4:10 the Lord is omitted.
- 5:18 Jesus is omitted, or in italics.
- 11:31 Christ is omitted, or in italics.

Galatians

- 1:15 God is omitted.
- 3:1 that ye should not obey the truth is omitted.
- 3:17 in Christ is omitted.
- 4:7 in Christ is omitted.
- 6:15 in Christ Jesus is omitted.
- 6:17 Lord is omitted.

Ephesians

- 3:9 by Jesus Christ is omitted (about God creating).
- 3:14 of our Lord Jesus Christ is omitted.
- 5:30 of his flesh and of his bones is omitted.
- 6:1 in the Lord is omitted. (About obeying parents).
- 6:10 my brethren is omitted.

Philippians

- 3:16 let us mind the same thing is omitted.

Colossians

- 1:2 the Lord Jesus Christ is omitted.
- 1:14 through his blood is omitted or in italics.
- 1:28 Jesus is omitted.
- 2:11 of the sins of is omitted.
- 3:6 sons of disobedience is omitted.

1 Thessalonians

- 1:1 from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ is omitted.
- 2:19 Christ is omitted.
- 3:11 Christ is omitted, or in italics.
- 3:13 Christ is omitted, or in italics.

2 Thessalonians

Â• 1:8 Christ is omitted, or in italics.

1 Timothy

Â• 1:17 wise is out (about God being the only wise).

Â• 2:7 in Christ is out, or in italics.

Â• 3:16 God is changed to He (about they mystery of the incarnation).

Â• 4:12 in Spirit is omitted.

Â• 6:5 from such withdraw thyself is omitted.

2 Timothy

Â• 1:11 of the Gentiles is omitted.

Â• 4:1 Lord is omitted.

Â• 4:22 Jesus Christ is deleted.

Titus

Â• 1:4 the Lord is deleted.

Philemon

Â• verse 6 Jesus is omitted.

Â• verse 12 **receive him** is omitted.

Hebrews

Â• 1:3 by himself is omitted (about the purging of our sins).

Â• 2:7 set him over the works of thy hands is omitted.

Â• 3:1 Christ is omitted.

Â• 7:21 after the order of Melchisedec is omitted.

Â• 10:30 saith the Lord is omitted.

Â• 10:34 in heaven is omitted.

Â• 11:11 was delivered of a child is omitted.

James

Â• 5:16 faults is changed to sins.

1 Peter

Â• 1:22 through the spirit is omitted.

Â• 4:1 for us is omitted (about Christ's suffering).

Â• 4:14 last 14 words are omitted.

Â• 5:10 Jesus is omitted.

Â• 5:11 glory and dominion is out of some

2 Peter

Â• 2:17 forever is out or in italics.

Â• 3:9 us is changed to you.

1 John

Â• 1:7 Christ is omitted.

Â• 2:7 from the beginning is omitted.

Â• 4:3 Christ is come in the flesh is omitted.

Â• 5:7,8 many words are out or changed.

Â• 5:13 last 13 words are omitted.

Jude

Â• verse 25 wise is omitted, referring to God.

Revelation

Â• 1:8 the beginning and the end is omitted.

Â• 1:11 ten words are omitted (Alpha and Omega...).

• 2:13 thy works is omitted.
• 5:14 Him that liveth forever and ever is omitted.
• 6:1 and see is omitted here, in verse 3, 5, and 7.
• 8:13 angel is changed to eagle.
• 11:17 and art to come is omitted.
• 12:12 inhabitants of (the earth) is omitted.
• 12:17 Christ is omitted.
• 14:5 before the throne of God is omitted.
• 16:17 of heaven is omitted.
• 20:9 God out of omitted.
• 21:24 of them which are saved is omitted.

All these omissions, and many more, are very pleasing to Romanism, which thrives upon the absence or twisting of Scripture. By this rate, the critical rats will nibble away all of the Word. What Satan succeeded in doing in the Garden, he is still doing up to this day.

But his pernicious work will not succeed forever. And meanwhile his allies and ministers posing as messengers of light, will be exposed for what they are: pretenders who take it upon themselves to sit in judgement over the Word of the living God!

Sincerely,

Walter

:~)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/2 12:17

Brother, did you ever consider that the "omissions" of the NASB were "additions" by the manuscript family that makes up the KJV?

Re:, on: 2008/7/2 12:23

Dear KingJimmy:

The deletions found in all of the newer versions are from the same texts that created the corrupt Catholic Bible, the Minority text. That is where the error can be found, not in the Authorized Version, in the Majority Text, that created the Protestant Bible

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/2 12:35

Brother, you have grossly oversimplified how textual criticism is done. I fear you are ignorant. If you want to see how textual criticism is actually done, and how complicated of a process it is actually is, consider the following paper I wrote in seminary on a textual variant found in Mark 11:19.

To summarize, the issue in the paper is whether a particular greek word here should be singular, plural, or omitted altogether, as each has textual evidence. Beware, only read this short paper if you want truth. But if you want to be ignorant, and say "those darned papists!" you can.

<http://www.iamadisciple.com/articles/papers/ProclamationOfReformation.pdf>

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/2 13:18

And in case if anybody is wondering here, my conclusion agreed with the "received" text. But my conclusion wasn't based so much on the evidence that a vast majority of texts agreed with the singular reading, but rather, there simply isn't (in my opinion) any reason to see why the text would have been changed from plural to singular. The plural reading is much easier grammatically, and it is easy to see why a scribe would've attempted to "correct" the less grammatically friendly singular reading. Either way, none of this can be known for sure. While textual criticism has a science behind it... much of it is also an "art."

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/2 14:25

Hi waltern...

Quote:

waltern wrote:

The deletions found in all of the newer versions are from the same texts that created the corrupt Catholic Bible, the Minority text. That is where the error can be found, not in the Authorized Version, in the Majority Text, that created the Protestant Bible

Brother, your statements sounds like it is implying that any modern text is "Catholic" in nature. Do you understand that the "Authorized" Version (authorized by a corrupt king named James) was taken from a completely different set of sources, including the Bishop's Bible? The translators admitted that they were instructed to adhere to some "traditional" renderings that were known to be less than faithful to the Textus Receptus. The TR itself was completed by one man -- a Catholic humanist named Desiderius Erasmus.

It is tiring to correct the brethren who insist that a modern, scholastic translation like the NIV is guilty of "deleting" or "changing" passages. It is a faithful, academic and critical rendering of the ancient texts considered by most scholars as being the most credible ensemble of texts. I fear that many of the KJV-only believers distort the truth by basing their "research" solely upon the prejudiced works of other KJV-only writers.

If you really want to discuss the issues of textual supremacy, then why not perform real research? Instead of consulting yet another KJV-only or KJV-supreme book or website (or their sources -- which are typically other KJV-only info), why not visit a library? You can contact the translators of the NIV, etc... in order to properly distinguish between the gossip, rumors and lies reported by many within the KJV-only crowd.

I just truly feel that we border on "bearing false witness" in many of these discussions by repeating the info that we glean from 2nd hand sources. In fact, if we are wrong, then we may be guilty of bearing false witness against a faithful translation of the Word of God! Sadly, most of the people that I know who are adamantly "KJV-only" are so convinced by what they have read or been taught that they would not consider further research.

But this discussion is about the NASB and the NKJV. While I prefer neither of these for my daily reading, I do consult both on occasion. My preference is the KJV as a great (but undoubtedly flawed) representative of the TR texts and the NIV as a great (but also undoubtedly flawed) academic representative of the other texts.

:~)

Re:, on: 2008/7/2 14:53

Quote:

-----The TR itself was completed by one man -- a Catholic humanist named Desiderius Erasmus

You say this as if he was a dyed in the wool Catholic... which he was not. While it is true that he was raised a Catholic, and never left the RCC, he was highly critical of the Pope. He was highly critical of the excesses of the Catholic clergy. He was highly critical of over indulgences of many monks. And he was highly critical of many of the RCC's doctrines.

While he was not a Reformer like Martin Luther or the others, he certainly had the spirit of one within the church itself.

So lets not misrepresent Erasmus, knowingly or unknowingly, in order to prove our points. It's called "bearing false witness"

ess" when you dont give all the facts.

Quote:
-----It is tiring to correct the brethren who insist that a modern, scholastic translation like the NIV is guilty of "deleting" or "changing" passages. It is a faithful, academic and critical rendering of the ancient texts considered by most scholars as being the most credible ensemble of texts. I fear that many of the KJV-only believers distort the truth by basing their "research" solely upon the prejudiced works of other KJV-only writers.

While what you say is true... the NIV is a rendering of a certain underlying text, I grow tired of folks who claim that all KJV people think that the NIV writers purposely left things out. Most of us on this site who are KJV people do know what we're talking about. We do understand the issues.

I grow tired of being painted into a corner by prejudice against the KJV people. Both sides paint with a broad brush... but it is the modern version side that paints KJV people as "ignorant" or "misinformed".

It just aint so, brother... and you know better.

You may disagree with me, and draw different conclusions about this issue that I... but you cant say I'm "ignorant" or "misinformed".

Krispy

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2008/7/2 15:22

Quote:
-----I grow tired of being painted into a corner by prejudice against the KJV people.

And I grow tired of being painted into a corner by prejudice against the modern translation people.

Quote:
-----Both sides paint with a broad brush...

I agree.

Quote:
-----but it is the modern version side that paints KJV people as "ignorant" or "misinformed".

I disagree. It works both ways. While the "moderns" have and do at times say this, the KJV folks have also leveled these same accusations.

Its okay for someone to have a differing opinion...even if it's wrong ;-)

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss () , on: 2008/7/2 16:10

Hi Krispy...

I understand your perspective. Out of all of the pro-KJV individuals that I know, I have always respected your opinion and sensibilities in the matter of textual criticism – even though I disagree with your ultimate conclusion (well, at least I think that I do).

I have read more posts and opinions on textual criticism than I ever wanted to. I was surprised to learn of so much prejudice both ways. It is imperative for believers to TEST EVERYTHING in regard to this matter. There must be honest research performed before an opinion is formed. Unfortunately, it has been my experience here at SermonIndex that many of the KJV-only crowd (of which I do NOT consider you, Krispy, a part of) have been influenced in a single direction via biased works. Even having read many of these works, I later found through critical research that many of the often repeated claims are bogus. In fact, most of the “defense” of the KJV here and elsewhere usually results in an attack on modern translations like the NIV. I feel that this is a strange tactic of “defense.”

Quote:

You say this as if he was a dyed in the wool Catholic... which he was not. While it is true that he was raised a Catholic, and never left the RCC, he was highly critical of the Pope. He was highly critical of the excesses of the Catholic clergy. He was highly critical of over indulgences of many monks. And he was highly critical of many of the RCC's doctrines.

While he was not a Reformer like Martin Luther or the others, he certainly had the spirit of one within the church itself.

So lets not misrepresent Erasmus, knowingly or unknowingly, in order to proove our points. It's called "bearing false witness" when you dont give all the facts.

Hmmm. Krispy, I think that you have gone a little too far in “reading between the lines” here (or perhaps “poor translation” of the essence of my post ;-)). My entirely truthful statement about Erasmus was not the same as those who spread gossip, rumors or conjecture about a person or work. Erasmus was a practicing Catholic (whether we want to admit it or not, or whether or not he had issue with the Pope or certain doctrines of that “Church”). In addition, he was a self-admitted “humanist.” What is so “false” about this? Yes, he had his issues with certain practices within the RCC – but so did Michelangelo (and quite a few believers and unbelievers through the years). But in the end, we have a group of people embracing the “inerrancy” of a KJV that is based upon a “Received Text” that was almost entirely translated by a single, wayward Dutch Catholic humanist. Yet ironically, those same KJV-only folk are the ones who point the finger of heresy at strong academic translations taken from a plethora of other ancient text sources. It is a bit strange, and a lot like the pot calling the kettle “black.”

Quote:

While what you say is true... the NIV is a rendering of a certain underlying text, I grow tired of folks who claim that all KJV people think that the NIV writers purposely left things out. Most of us on this site who are KJV people do know what we're talking about. We do understand the issues.

I grow tired of being painted into a corner by prejudice against the KJV people. Both sides paint with a broad brush... but it is the modern version side that paints KJV people as "ignorant" or "misinformed".

It just aint so, brother... and you know better.

Krispy, you are very different than the typical KJV-only advocates who visit the forum with a mission (as if they were sent by God) to spit upon every version except their cherished and supposedly “infallible” translation. How many KJV-only threads have there been where a brother claims that the “modern” translations “purposely left out” or “mistranslated” important words, sections, or even entire passages that are “rightfully” included in the KJV? They almost NEVER mention that these differences reflect the differences in source material. If we want to be very honest, you would certainly acknowledge this to be true. While you yourself aren’t guilty of this (although, I am not sure about your current defense of the word “Easter” in Acts chapter 12), you know that there are very loud individuals who spread such statements that seemingly indicate that something “sinister” took place when the translators of the NIV got together. Should we simply review the many Bible translation threads over the past few years?

Quote:

You may disagree with me, and draw different conclusions about this issue that I... but you cant say I'm "ignorant" or "misinformed".

You're right that I might disagree with you based upon the conclusion that I drew from my own research. However, it is a stretch to claim that I said that YOU (or anyone else) was "ignorant" or "misinformed." I do, however, feel that anyone who limits their "research" to a few pro-KJV books or websites has greatly diminished the credibility of their argument or defense of the KJV. If someone wants to question the integrity of the NIV – then they should at least contact the people who actually translated it! Unfortunately, we cannot contact the translators of the KJV concerning their thoughts about the original 1611 KJV. However, I have noticed that the arguments presented about the supremacy of the KJV often do not reflect the translators' words in the original preface to the KJV.

As always, I think that the question of textual supremacy comes down to a question of the sources used for translation and the textual criticism methods by which the work was translated. I don't know that ANYONE could claim with absolute certainty that the Textus Receptus used for the KJV is superior in every way to the Alexandrian (et al) texts used for the NIV. I understand the arguments on both sides – but I think that it is unwise to take a final position on a matter that is not ultimately clear.

Re:, on: 2008/7/2 16:22

Hey guys... was in a bit of a bad mood when I wrote what I wrote. I apologize. I'm dealing with a certain level of spiritual compromise in an organization of which I am one of the leaders, and it has me a bit irritated.

I know y'all understand where I am coming from, and I was tickled when you said I am a different kind of KJV advocate. Probably because my only cause is truth... I don't fight for a cause for the sake of fighting for the cause... know what I mean?

Anyway, to quote Al Gore, I was a bit "snippy" earlier when there was no reason for me to be.

I love y'all... hopefully you know that!

Krispy

Re: Lets Calm down please, on: 2008/7/2 17:38

I started this thread because I was curious on the what others thought about the NASB or NKJV. I have had some concerns about the NASB in their choice of words. I don't know why everyone uses the NASB, I only use it because I have heard it is considered one of the best in word for word. But why? Who determines this? I posted an example I stumbled on when I was studying 1 Peter. I thought the NKJV was better with the text, than the NASB. I actually got a better understanding from the NKJV.

I am actually thinking about getting a NKJV. I wasn't sure about the NASB anymore.

Lets not turn this into a debate! The KJV is great and will continue to be the favorite. For me I have a hard time reading through it. Lets not turn this thread into a KJV debate.

Can't we all just get along! :-P

Love
Mike

Re: NASB or NKJV?? - posted by Smokey (), on: 2008/7/2 18:31

I always cringe when I see a discussion start up about bible translations. Without fail the modern translation camp squares off with the KJV camp, and there is a quick fierce flurry of verbal salvos fired back and forth, nothing is resolved, and eventually both sides tire of the fuss and thankfully let the thread die. Nothing much changes. Blessings Greg ;-)

Re: The translations adventure - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/2 18:49

Quote:

----- Can't we all just get along!

Bless you, Mike, I appreciate your caution against division. After all, there are plenty of "bible scholars" out there who would love to see us argue over bible translation "errors". It props up their own mission: to discredit the reliability of the Bible. When we realize that we have many enemies "out there" who have been writing convincing "reliable-latest-researched" proof that the Bible is a big fake, then we will realize that we can't afford to divide ourselves over the Bible. People need to know that it is trustworthy.

Last year I did a research paper on Bible translations and was fascinated by what I discovered. There is plenty information out there on the subject. In fact, when you start digging, you see that this is no small battle. And yes, there is certainly a lot of mudslinging going on in the family of God. But as you proceed, you develop discernment between who are speaking with authority and who with their fixed opinion.

The NASB is a fine translation, but, as many have felt, the translation team tried too hard to translate word for word. Thus you see some woodenness in the language. Greek and English are very different. Translators do need to exercise some discretionary flexibility in order to convey the intended meaning.

You may wish to use Bible Gateway or E-Sword to compare translations. (E-Sword is keyed to Strong's concordance.) A lot of very fine translations have come out since the NASB - ranging in style, purpose, and intended audience.

Just today I discovered Bill Mounce's blog where he discusses various exegetical challenges. He is a Greek scholar and teacher (maybe KingJimmy took some of his courses) who includes helpful information on the website - mainly helps for Greek study. I'm in the midst of his course "Basics of Biblical Greek" - slugging through it on my own. Mounce's method is far more than just a bunch of dry grammar. He gets you into Bible translation and also explains various translation challenges. (I think his dad is/was a Bible translator). By studying Greek my appreciation for the challenge of Bible translators grows by the day! We need to be supporting these people in prayer, not pitting ourselves against them with our less-than-well-informed opinions! They have an important job!

Here's the site - which should take you to various adventurous places:
(<http://www.teknia.com/>) Teknia Greek

Have fun!

Diane

Re: NASB or NKJV?? - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/2 19:13

Quote:

----- lately I have been liking the NKJV. Some of the words used in the NKJV have a stronger thought emphasize.

I would only caution that maybe we shouldn't pick versions based on what we think "sounds the best" based on what we would like to hear (i.e. emphasis on the "for us" in the qtd. verse). We should strive for what is the most accurate, pure version of what God has chosen to say to us. Of course, through diligent study, different people come to different conclusions on what this is :-)

Re:, on: 2008/7/2 22:00

Quote:

roadsign wrote:

Quote:

----- Can't we all just get along!

Bless you, Mike, I appreciate your caution against division. After all, there are plenty of "bible scholars" out there who would love to see us argue over bible translation "errors". It props up their own mission: to discredit the reliability of the Bible. When we realize that we have many enemies "out there" who have been writing convincing "reliable-latest- researched" proof that the Bible is a big fake, then we will realize that we can't afford to divide ourselves over the Bible. People need to know that it is trustworthy.

Last year I did a research paper on Bible translations and was fascinated by what I discovered. There is plenty information out there on the subject. In fact, when you start digging, you see that this is no small battle. And yes, there is certainly a lot of mudslinging going on in the family of God. But as you proceed, you develop discernment between who are speaking with authority and who with their fixed opinion.

The NASB is a fine translation, but, as many have felt, the translation team tried too hard to translate word for word. Thus you see some woodenness in the language. Greek and English are very different. Translators do need to exercise some discretionary flexibility in order to convey the intended meaning.

You may wish to use Bible Gateway or E-Sword to compare translations. (E-Sword is keyed to Strong's concordance.) A lot of very fine translations have come out since the NASB - ranging in style, purpose, and intended audience.

Just today I discovered Bill Mounce's blog where he discusses various exegetical challenges. He is a Greek scholar and teacher (maybe KingJimmy took some of his courses) who includes helpful information on the website - mainly helps for Greek study. I'm in the midst of his course "Basics of Biblical Greek" - slugging through it on my own. Mounce's method is far more than just a bunch of dry grammar. He gets you into Bible translation and also explains various translation challenges. (I think his dad is/was a Bible translator). By studying Greek my appreciation for the challenge of Bible translators grows by the day! We need to be supporting these people in prayer, not pitting ourselves against them with our less-than-well-informed opinions! They have an important job!

Here's the site - which should take you to various adventurous places:
(<http://www.teknia.com/>) Teknia Greek

Have fun!

Diane

great comment Diane. I appreciate your gentle demeanor in your comment.

I just started a theology class at church, we are finishing up basics on Hermeneutics. Its not a in depth course just covering basics. So going through this I have looked closely into the verses I would study and look for observations and as I would begin to compare with other translations, some just, for me, had a stronger impact.

I am feared trying to delve into Greek, I have a hard time with grammar and english! :-) Greek would be a huge challenge, but I think I would be up for trying to learn.

Blessings to you
Mike

Re:, on: 2008/7/2 22:06

Quote:

BeYeDoers wrote:

Quote:

-----lately I have been liking the NKJV. Some of the words used in the NKJV have a stronger thought emphasize.

I would only caution that maybe we shouldn't pick versions based on what we think "sounds the best" based on what we would like to hear (i.e. emphasis on the "for us" in the qtd. verse). We should strive for what is the most accurate, pure version of what God has chosen to say to us. Of course, through diligent study, different people come to different conclusions on what this is :-)

If I really wanted to hear something I liked I would read the New Living Translation! :-)

However, I think you have missed my point I was making and what others have stated on this thread concerning omitting and choice of word translations.

Mike

PS

I was just curious on the bible translation others used. I didn't want to get into a debate, I just had some concerns on certain passages. SI, for me is a great place for accountability, there are many on here who I personally value their opinion.

I won't comment on this thread again...sorry for the ruckus! :-)

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/2 22:20

Oh brother, I meant nothing demeaning toward you by my comment! I hadn't read anything else on the thread but your initial post. And I didn't mean to insinuate that you picked your Bible such as to remove the heavy and keep the light, or whatever...even though you probably couldn't have read what I said in any other way :-o My bad. Sorry. It was more of a generalized, "let's be careful how we approach this" kind of thing.

For the record, I think the Byzantine text is superior to the Alexandrian, and that old(er) English is more precise than modern English, so I like to study KJV almost exclusively. I believe the NASB is the best for the Alexandrian set, and consult it from time to time.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/2 22:44

I don't know why everyone uses the NASB, I only use it because I have heard it is considered one of the best in word for word. But why? Who determines this?

The NASB is generally considered the best word-for-word translation by those who know Greek/Hebrew. I had about 1 1/2 years of Greek in seminary. When I would make a translation of a text, and then look it up in different versions to see how they handled it, I would see just how serious the NASB was in making sure they translated it as accurately as possible. Such is especially evident in how they try to preserve as much as possible different grammatical constructions.

Because of this, many say the NASB is sort of "wooden" in its reading, as it is not nearly as fluid in its prose. But for me personally, I would rather have something that has a little less pleasant of reading style. I'm about serious studies of God's word. I don't need goosebumps from reading a text, I need truth.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/2 22:52

Just today I discovered Bill Mounce's blog where he discusses various exegetical challenges. He is a Greek scholar and teacher (maybe KingJimmy took some of his courses) who includes helpful information on the website - mainly helps for Greek study. I'm in the midst of his course "Basics of Biblical Greek" - slugging through it on my own. Mounce's method is far more than just a bunch of dry grammar. He gets you into Bible translation and also explains various translation challenges. (I think his dad is/was a Bible translator). By studying Greek my appreciation for the challenge of Bible translators grows by the day! We need to be supporting these people in prayer, not pitting ourselves against them with our less-than-well-informed opinions! They have an important job!

Yes, I had the Basics of Biblical Greek by Bill Mounce in seminary. It is an amazing resource. You get a mighty baptism of Greek with him. I wish I had kept up on my studies since seminary in regard to Greek. But sadly, life got in the way, and I had other things that keep vying for my attention. I would at least like to build up my vocabulary again, along with the basic grammatical endings. Thank God though, should one have a question about Greek outside the academic world, you are able to consult your book... unlike on a test :-). Maybe after I move and unpack everything, I'll dedicate 15 minutes of my lunch everyday to memorizing words and such again.

Also very worthy reads for Greek are the grammars by David Allen Black. If folks don't use Mounce to learn Greek in seminary, they tend to use Black. Both are outstanding scholars. Mounce is just much more user friendly :-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/2 22:58

And for what it's worth, The Message can be something worth taking a peak at every now and then. Eugene Peterson has an amazing command of words, and sometimes he really seems to hit the nail on the head. Consider Philippians 3 where Paul is talking about his battle with the party of the circumcision. Peterson calls them "those knife-happy circumcisers!" (ROFL) Such really captures the "mood" of Paul in regard to that party. Now, don't pick up the stones. I'm not a big Message fan. I like to think of it more as a running commentary than translation. And so long as people read it in that light, it can be a useful tool.

NLT is an ok paraphrase/dynamic equivalent translation. I think it can be helpful for understanding passages that are just plain hard to read no matter what translation one is using. I personally find it to be very good for simply reading the OT history books of the Bible. However, one definitely can see where the theological outlook of the translators comes in, on let's say, the sermon on the mount.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/7/2 23:03

I read the NKJV. Got the NASB, but gave it away to a new believer the day after I bought it...only bible I had with me at the time :-). So I never really got to read it. 8-)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2008/7/2 23:33

Hello...

Just a thought, but you can access many different translations for comparison purposes at (<http://www.biblegateway.com>) BibleGateway. I use this resource every day. It is a nice companion to other Bible websites, software and paper Bibles. The website allows you to access quite a few English versions and translations, as well as Bible versions/translations in other languages.

I enjoy searching through the Word via the various translations available. It sure beats having to purchase multiple translations or parallel Bibles.

:-)

Re: Majority or Minority text?, on: 2008/7/3 9:00

Ccchhhrrriiisss posted this previously:

Â“Â...Â...Â...Â...Â... While I prefer neither of these (NASB or the NKJV) for my daily reading, I do consult both on occasion. My preference is the KJV as a great **(but undoubtedly flawed)** representative of the TR texts and the NIV as a great **(but also undoubtedly flawed)** academic representative of the other texts."

Walter replies to Ccchhhrrriiisss:

In fact, if you or I went to Seminary or a Bible College today, that is exactly what we would be taught---the Word of God that we have before us today is flawed, no matter what version we use. Whether we use the Majority text, or the Minority text--- it is equally flawed. The problem, they will tell us and teach us, is that the **original text is lost**, and Bible Scholars & Textual Critics have, to the best of their ability, tried to Restore the "Original" Biblical Text.

Yet God's Word promises us that His Word will stand forever:

The grass withereth, the flower fadeth:
but the word of our God
shall stand for ever
Isaiah 40:8

God has also promised us to both give and protect His Word:

"Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten my word to perform it." (Jeremiah 1:12)

Here God says He is watching over His Word to perform it -- to make all that He has said come to pass:

Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." (Mark 13:31)

God did not promise to keep the original piece of material upon which His words were given. He says His Words SHALL NOT PASS AWAY. Therefore, this promise demands that we still have them on planet earth:

Jesus also says, "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation ; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mark 8:38)

Why this verse if God has NOT preserved His Word?

"But the word of the Lord endureth forever." (1 Pet.1:25)

This is a direct quote of Isaiah 40:8. God has said that His Word will endure forever! He did not promise that the original piece of paper, rock or vellum would exist forever but that He would preserve the Word -- forever.

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever." (Isaiah 40:8)

".. for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." (Psalm 138:2)

Look at that! God says He has magnified His Word above His name! That is incredible for supposedly THE name was so sacred to the Jews that they did not even pronounce it.

Jesus said "... and the Scripture cannot be broken." (John 10:35)

God has promised to keep His Word as revealed through these Scriptures! But there is more!

"The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shall keep them, O Lord, thou shall preserve them from this generation forever." (Psa.12:6, 7)

This is a promise from God! He says He will preserve it. He did not just promise to give the originals pure and f

ree from error – He promised to preserve the text forever!

"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John 12:48)

Since God's Word will judge us, are we to believe that God will judge us by something which He meticulously gave us and then lost along the way? Would it be just and fair of God to judge us with these words if they are no longer trustworthy – to hold us accountable when our guide is not 100 percent reliable?

In Matthew 5:18, Jesus said **not "one jot or one tittle" shall change in the Word of God. Specifically, He was speaking of the Old Testament.** We are being taught today that perhaps the Old Testament is not true, that it is full of contradictions, scribal errors, etc., but Jesus said that it was true and unerring – even to the smallest detail – and He was not referring to the originals, but to copies of copies of copies.

"Do you not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:45-47)

Was Jesus speaking of the "originals"? No, for they did not have the originals. They had copies of copies of copies of the originals yet Jesus said "not one jot or one tittle" had been changed. If God has only promised the "ORIGINALS" to be pure then Jesus erred in His assessment of the Scriptures. Should these statements of Jesus concerning the Scriptures be inaccurate then He is not Lord, no longer all knowing, no longer all God.

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (John 5:39-40)

The ultimate purpose of the Scriptures is to lead us to Christ – and then to guide our lives. If the Scriptures are not accurate, if they have been changed or altered, if they have been lost so that we no longer have the Word of God, how can we come to Christ for they are the Holy Spirit's implement to testify of the Lord Jesus.

Faith in the preservation of the text is a basic Bible doctrine. Furthermore, the context of these many promises is not that God's Word is to be preserved in a jar somewhere in a cave or desert, lost for hundreds of years waiting to be found and restored to the believing remnant of the Church. **The context is very clear in Second Timothy 3:16-17 that the inspired Word was given by God as a deposit to the Body of Christ "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works". Therefore, for God to accomplish this stated purpose for His having given us His Word – it must remain accessible to the disciples of the Lord, Christ Jesus!**

Throughout the minority text, that has been used as the basis for all of the newer versions of the bible in print since 1881, we find deletions and changes from the Majority text, over 5,000 changes that affect sound Bible Doctrine. These changes many times relate to the name of Jesus. Jesus is the name that Christ was born with, and it means "Savior". The meaning of the word Christ is "Messiah", and it is His Title of Rank. In much of the minority text, Christ has been eliminated from His name. God's word tells us that Scripture cannot be broken:

John 10:35 – "...and the scripture cannot be broken;

Those who want to replace the King James Version with new Modern Versions are constantly stating that **"no Bible Doctrines are affected by the changes"**. One school recently published an article by one of its teachers in which he said that, **"BOTH TEXTS ARE THE WORD OF GOD."** It is difficult to understand how two texts differing in over 5,000 places can both be the Word of God. The result of these changes made by the MINORITY text affect the Bible Doctrines which Christians have always believed. Following are changes in the book of Matthew that are glaring examples of how these changes have altered or eliminated the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian faith. Is there a difference in the texts (the Majority verses the Minority)? **You be the judge:**

MATTHEW

1:25 "her firstborn" is omitted. That Jesus was her firstborn indicates that Mary and Joseph had sexual relations after the birth of Jesus and that others were born of her. The omission here seeks to add credence to the false doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the perpetual virginity of Mary. The Bible is clear that Jesus had brothers and sisters.

5:22 "without a cause" is removed. In the Sermon on the Mount the Lord warned of judgment for those who were angry with a brother without a cause. Should this change be accepted everyone who is angry with his brother may be judged. The effect is to bring Jesus into judgment for failing to observe his own words (see Mark 3:5). Such is contrary to the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ.

6:4, 6, 18 "openly" is out. It is a Bible Doctrine that Christian work done unnoticed for the glory of the Lord will one day be rewarded openly (Col. 3:4).

6:13 "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever, Amen" is deleted. This ascription of praise to "Our Father" is found in 491 out of 500 existing manuscripts. This statement was made a century ago by Dean John Burgon.

8:29 "Jesus" is left out. The demons bore witness to the fact that Jesus was the Son of God. It was an identification of Jesus (in humanity) as the Son of God (in Deity). It affects the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

9:8 "marvelled" is changed to "were afraid." There is no reason to believe that the people were afraid because Jesus healed the sick of the palsy. There is every reason for them to marvel at the miracle.

9:13 "to repentance" is left out. The Bible doctrine of repentance is one that men would like to do away with. God requires that in order to be saved one must truly repent (Acts 17:30; 2 Peter 3:9). The word means "a change of mind" and there must be that concerning God, sin and salvation. Men think that sin does not really separate them from God--they must change their mind about that. Men think that salvation is by works--they must change their mind about that. There is nothing more evident today than the absence of repentance among those who are professing to be converted.

15:8 "draweth nigh unto me with their mouth" is left out. According to Isaiah 29:13 it belongs in because Isaiah prophesied of these hypocrites exactly that way.

16:2,3 "When it is evening ... the signs of the times" is all omitted. The Pharisees and Sadducees came looking for a sign and the signs were all around them. Jesus called them hypocrites because they could not tell the signs of the times.

17:21 Whole verse is left out. Power with God is to be had by prayer and fasting. That is a fundamental truth of the Word of God.

18:2 "Jesus" is left out. This is done many times by the corrupt Greek Text of Westcott and Hort. I have not chosen to remark about each instance because it would add many pages to this work. The MAJORITY Text continuously places the word "Jesus" in the narrative with the definite article preceding it. Thus it places him in the center of things and in command. It is doctrinally unsound for such prominence to be discarded for the word "he."

18:11 The whole verse is omitted. This verse tells us that man is lost, that he needs to be saved, and that the Son of man is the one who can do that. The doctrine of salvation through Jesus Christ is affected by this change.

18:15 "against thee" is omitted. This omission sets us up as watchdogs over others and if one sins we are to go and tell him. Such is not the teaching of Scripture. Were we to declare every sin we would be constantly busy (bodies) judging the actions and motives of everyone. This change is a very bad error.

18:35 "their trespasses" is omitted. Same thought as mentioned in 18:15.

19:9 "and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery" is removed. This is a very important doctrinal change which concerns divorce and remarriage. A man who divorces his wife and remarries commits adultery, and also the man who marries the divorced wife commits adultery.

19:16,17 "Good" before Master is omitted. In addition to that, the phrase "Why callest thou me good?" is changed to "Why askest thou me concerning the good?" Good Master is correct and Jesus responded to show the young man that only one was good and that one was God. The conclusion should have been obvious. Since Jesus was good he was necessarily God. The omission and change destroys the intended testimony to the Deity of Christ.

20:16 "for many be called, but few chosen" is left out. The Lord would have us know that many are called to inherit eternal life, but few are chosen by virtue of believing in Christ. It is a Bible doctrine that God wants all men to be saved but few

w will come to Christ for salvation.

21:12 "of God" is out. Jesus, who was God in the flesh, came to his own temple and said, "My house shall be called the house of prayer." It was the temple of God and the God of the temple was there.

22:30 "of God" is removed. There are good angels and fallen angels. The believers, in the resurrection, will be like the good angels "of God" who alone are in heaven.

23:8 "Master" is changed to "teacher." There are many teachers but only one master. The change here takes away the pre-eminence that God intends for his Son.

25:13 "wherein the Son of man cometh" is omitted. The warning to watch is tied to the imminent return of the Lord. The omission here does away with the doctrine of the Lord's second advent.

26:28 "new" is dropped before testament. The apostle Paul tells us that Jesus said, "this cup is the NEW testament in my blood." The change here is intended to corrupt the Word of God and to confuse Christians.

27:35 "that it might be fulfilled ... did they cast lots" is all omitted. It is very important in Matthew's gospel, where Jesus is portrayed as the King of Israel, to show that he is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies. Here the parting of his garments and casting lots is the fulfillment of Psalm 22:18 which portrays the crucifixion of Christ. To omit this is to show the intended corruption of the Word of God by the textual critics.

28:6 "the Lord" is omitted. The very reverent angels said, "see the place where the Lord lay." They would not say, "see the place where he lay." The constant attempt to humanize Jesus and take away from his Deity does not endear the Westcott and Hort Greek Text to believers.

In conclusion, for those that believe God are struck with a dilemma. Did God, who spoke everything into existence out of nothing, who is outside of time and space, who counts the hairs on all of our heads, who sent His only Son to die on a cross for the sin of mankind, on a specific day, the 14th day of Nissan, the day of the original Passover (fifteen hundred years before), **Could this same God preserve the Scriptures, or would he need fallen, fallible, corrupt man to help Him restore the Scriptures? My Bible tells me that He did preserve the Scriptures, Himself. My understanding of who He is also tells me the same thing. What does the Bible say about this issue ?**

Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." (Mark 13:31)

Sincerely,

Walter

PS- Please respond with Bible Scripture from the Minority texts that prove they do not affect sound Bible doctrine or try to diminish the deity of Jesus Christ.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/3 9:34

walter,

We have over 5,000 different texts out there today. NONE contain the full text of the Scripture. NONE fully agree with each other. This is not speculation or theory, this is fact. In fact, the text used as the basis of the KJV is nothing more than a compilation of texts. The "majority text" is not a single text, rather, it is a family of texts. The reason they attempt to "restore the original," is because none of the texts agree with each other. Thus, the translator before doing his work, surveys all the texts they have access to, and attempts to "establish the text."

Modern scholars are not the only ones that do this. Yes, even your beloved KJV translation is the product of such a task. Also, your theory about the preservation and inspiration of Scripture does not take into account that for a period of time, the word of God was entirely lost and hidden in the ruins of the temple in Jerusalem. Then in the days of king Josiah the Scriptures were rediscovered. The Scriptures themselves talk about this.

So, unless your theory of inspiration and preservation takes into account all these things, then your theory is nothing more than a fantasy. The KJV translators did nothing different than what is done today. The only difference is that modern translators have more manuscripts to take into consideration. They, like the KJV translators attempt to use the texts they

find "best."

In fact, if you read the paper I linked to, you will find that I did the exact same thing that translators have always done in seeking to "establish the best text." I was not forced to select a specific text to form the basis of my translation. In fact, no modern translation does. Even if the modern translation uses the UBS4/NA27 as the basis of their translation, they still make individual choices about every single verse. In fact, they sometimes (like in my paper) go against the established variant.

Also, in addition to these things, Bruce Metzger published a commentary that explains WHY they selected the variant they did for every single variant within the Greek NT. They also note when the committee had disagreement over the final product. So, nothing here is hidden. There is no conspiracy. You can read the commentaries they wrote about their own text, and see if you agree with their conclusions. Many times there is unanimous consensus amongst them, but other times they are split in two or three groups over a single verse.

Sadly, you don't have such an advantage with the texts that form the KJV. Indeed, we don't even have the text that formed the basis of their translation. There have been many that have attempted to "restore" the lost TR that formed the basis of their translation. But there is no way of knowing absolutely for sure which version formed that basis.

Re: get the diagnosis right: on translation criticisms - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/3 9:46

Walter, Bart D. Ehrman would love you!

In all seriousness, we can't forget that the scribes and Pharisees had an accurate translation in their day. They had every word memorized: word for word, jot and tittle. And yet this can be said of them:

Quote:
----- "Jesus" is left out.

Why did they miss the pivotal event in history when it was prophesied throughout the very words that they cherished and revered? Did it have to do with their translation ... or ...

Might the same affliction not apply today?

I'm saying this, because if we are chasing after a false diagnosis (based on alleged omissions in certain versions) we will miss the obvious cure - which is VERY obvious throughout the Bible - regardless of translation!

Surely you cannot doubt that!

PS: I marvel at how idiot-proof God made the Bible. If you miss a point in one chapter, for whatever reason, you are bound to see it again in another, and another, and another... unless, of course, you are blind!

Let's not blame translations for sending people to hell! Nor the translators!

Diane

Re: Greek Greek Greek Greek - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/3 10:02

Quote:
----- Yes, I had the Basics of Biblical Greek by Bill Mounce in seminary. It is an amazing resource. You get a mighty baptism of Greek with him.

Thank you KingJimmy for your encouragement. Studying Mounce's Greek indeed does feel like drowning - (I come up for air by visiting SI).

They say studying another language is a good preventative for Alzheimer's – so, I'll try to hang in and hope some of it sticks – in spite of my weak memory.

Diane

Re:, on: 2008/7/3 10:09

Walter responds to Diane:

Isaiah 7:14

Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV-Majority text)

"A young woman is going to have a baby." (Jerusalem Version-Minority text, **Catholic Bible**)

"A young woman who is pregnant will have a son." (Good News- Minority text)

"Behold a young woman shall conceive ..." (RSV-Minority text)

There is nothing new about a young woman's having a baby, yet this is supposed to be a sign whereby God is promising deliverance in an almost impossible situation!

The Hebrew word "almah" (hmlu) occurs only seven times in the O.T. It should be rendered "virgin" here for although "almah" could mean "young woman", every time it is used in the Old Testament the context demands that it means "virgin". The other six times it is translated "virgin" in most of the various versions. **Why the sudden departure in the verse before us?** The miracle was going to be that a virgin was going to conceive!

Furthermore, the New Testament confirms the fact in Mat.1:23 that Mary was a virgin: "Behold, a virgin (Greek = "parthenos" = partheno") shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."

All languages contain both "weak" and "strong" words. By "weak" is meant a word that has many shades of meaning or even widely different meanings, i.e., the word "cool" is still in today's English. Such words can defy etymological studies. "Strong" words, on the other hand, are words which have a very limited narrow meaning – often only one possible sense.

We begin to see the manifold wisdom of God in choosing to reveal His Word to man in two tongues. Weak words in one which could lead to confusion could be covered by strong words in the other by cross references and quotations. Such is the case before us. The "weak" Hebrew word "almah" (though we have already shown that by its Biblical usage it is not so weak) is covered in the N.T. by the "strong" Greek word "parthenos" which can only be translated one way – "virgin".

Moreover, context is the decisive factor for determining the final connotation of any word or phrase, not the dictionary definition or etymology. Etymology, though often helpful, is not an exact science. It should be used for confirmation, not as the deciding factor.

The translators of the modern versions are well aware of the incontrovertible decisive nature of "parthenos" hence the translation of Isaiah 7:14 into any other word represents deliberate willful alteration of the Word of God.

In denying the virgin birth of Christ, they are saying:

- 1) Jesus was a bastard as Mary was unmarried when she conceived;
- 2) Mary was a fornicator;
- 3) God has lied to us in Mat. 1:22-23;
- 4) Christ was not God, not deity (having a physical father, He was only human); and
- 5) Christ was a sinner as he would then be a descendant of Adam and inherit Adam's nature as in Rom. 5:12.

The three verses placed before us serve as an excellent barometer for each of us to use in determining whether a given

"version" is trustworthy or not. We must all individually decide- is it the "Majority" text or the "Minority" text that can be trusted?

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

roadsign wrote:
Walter, Bart D. Ehrman would love you!

In all seriousness, we can't forget that the scribes and Pharisees had an accurate translation in their day. They had every word memorized: word for word, jot and tittle. And yet this can be said of them:

Quote:

----- "Jesus" is left out.

Why did they miss the pivotal event in history when it was prophesied throughout the very words that they cherished and revered? Did it have to do with their translation ... or ...

Might the same affliction not apply today?

I'm saying this, because if we are chasing after a false diagnosis (based on alleged omissions in certain versions) we will miss the obvious cure - which is VERY obvious throughout the Bible - regardless of translation!

Surely you cannot doubt that!

PS: I marvel at how idiot-proof God made the Bible. If you miss a point in one chapter, for whatever reason, you are bound to see it again in another, and another, and another... unless, of course, you are blind!

Let's not blame translations for sending people to hell! Nor the translators!

Diane

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/3 10:32

We must all individually decide- is it the "Majority" text or the "Minority" text that can be trusted?

Issues regarding the "majority" or "minority" texts have nothing to do with the Old Testament. Majority/minority text issues are something entirely to do with the Greek NT. The OT is primarily derived from the masoretic hebrew texts. Of course, various other texts of Hebrew and Aramaic origins come into play here, but, not to the extent we have in the NT. So far as memory serves correct, the OT texts are represented by only about 2,000 manuscripts, and have far less variants than the NT.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/3 10:38

Regarding the infamous "virgin" debate in Isaiah, Walter posed this question:

Quote:

----- Why the sudden departure in the verse before us?

In order to fit the context: For the child referred to in Isaiah 7 to be Jesus, would not have been the "sign" to Ahaz that God intended. When reading the context of Isaiah 7:14 you find that the consequences of God's action is going to come very soon, before this child "can tell right from wrong".

Prophecies could have double meanings. Of course this situation would not have applied when the prophecy was carried over into the NT. (no "conspiracy here intended by the translators!!)

PS Walter, I am wondering if you have any thoughts relating to my last post to you.
Diane

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/3 10:49

Thank you KingJimmy for your encouragement. Studying Mounce's Greek indeed does feel like drowning (I come up for air by visiting SI).

Mounce's Greek grammar will give you amazing confidence when it comes to translating. By the time you finish the grammar, you will feel you can translate just about anything... especially if you diligently work through your notebook. But, alas, reality hit me when I began a Greek NT hermeneutics class in seminary. I was given a text where I did not recognize half the words. I had to do much searching through the BDAG in those days! Then after a while, you'll need to begin to access Daniel Wallace's Intermediate/Advanced Greek! It can be very discouraging at times, but I personally found it all a very enriching process. I was confident after 3 semesters of Greek that I could learn just about anything! It will definitely stretch you.

Out of curiosity, how far along are you in Mounce's book? Are you doing your parsing and translation exercises?

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/3 10:54

Quote:

----- Out of curiosity, how far along are you in Mounce's book? Are you doing your parsing and translation exercises?

I'm almost done the book, (being slowed down a bit by SI - ha! No, really, it's my brain that goes into neutral quite regularly) Yes, I am doing the work book, have the CD lectures, etc, and have ordered the next level, but may redo the basic course before proceeding.

Diane

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/3 11:02

I wish I really had purchased the full blown CD lectures. I think when I crack open my Greek again, I'll probably buy a copy. The mini-lectures with the book I found pretty helpful. The full would have been outstanding.

One thing I am glad I had when I took Greek at school was having a good TA. I learned more from my TA than my professor. He explained those difficult parts of the translations quite well.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/3 11:04

Just a further encouragement about about learning Greek yourself... I met a pastor/street evangelist who used almost entirely his Greek NT to preach from. He had marked up his Greek NT in the same manner which I mark up my regular NASB! Sadly though, those critical Greek texts have almost no margins to write in! He had taught himself simply from Moune/Wallace/Black. He was very well versed.

Re:, on: 2008/7/3 11:39

In response to Diane's remark:

"Regarding the infamous "virgin" debate in Isaiah"

I never really knew that it was considered "infamous" by anyone, until now, by you, Diane.

In the book "Prophecy Knowledge Handbook", John F. Walvoord had this to say about the "Sign" of Immanuel's birth (Immanuel means "God with us"):

Isaiah 7:1-17

The attack on Judah by Ephraim will not be successful (vv. 1-9). This was fulfilled in the events which followed. Isaiah recorded that "the Lord spoke to Ahaz, 'Ask the Lord your God for a sign, whether in the deepest depths or the highest heights'" (v. 10). God promised that a sign would be given to Israel, "therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a Son, and will call Him Immanuel. He will eat curds and honey when He knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right. But before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right, the land of the two kings you dread will be laid waste. The Lord will bring on you and on your people and on the house of your father a time unlike any since Ephraim broke away from Judah-He will bring the king of Assyria" (vv. 14-17). Isaiah predicted the invasion of the king of Assyria and the destruction of the land (vv. 18-25)

The prophecy concerning the virgin with child has been variously considered by conservative scholars. Some believe it referred to a contemporary situation where a young woman, still a virgin, was about to be married and would bear a child, fulfilling the prophecy. Another point of view is that the prophecy is exclusively messianic and refers to the fact that Mary, while still a virgin, would be the mother of Christ (Matt 1:18, 25), which according to Matthew 1:21-23 was a fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah. Still others consider the prophecy as referring to both, that is, a contemporary reference to a child whose birth is mentioned in Isaiah 8 and whose ultimate prophetic fulfillment is the birth of Christ.

Isaiah 7:18-25. Isaiah predicted that the Assyrians would make desolate the land which was fulfilled in the Assyrian captivity of the ten tribes (2 Kings 17:1-8).

SUMMARY OF MESSIANIC PROPHECIES IN ISAIAH

The prophecy concerning the virgin birth of Christ should be considered in the context of other messianic prophecies in the whole Book of Isaiah. Major future messianic prophecies include the reign of Christ in the kingdom (2:3-5), the virgin birth of Christ (7:14), the joyful reign of Christ (9:2, 7), the rule of Christ over the world (v. 4), Christ as a descendent of Jesse and David (11:1, 10), Christ to be filled with the Spirit (v. 2: 42:1) Christ to judge with righteousness (11:3-5; 42:1, 4), Christ to rule over the nations (11:10), Christ to be gentle to the weak (42:3), Christ to make possible the New Covenant (v. 6; 49:8), Christ to be a light to the Gentiles, and to be worshiped by them (42:6; 49:6-7, 52:15), Christ to be rejected by Israel (49:7; 53:1-3), Christ to restore Israel and judge the wicked (61:1-3)

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

roadsign wrote:

Regarding the infamous "virgin" debate in Isaiah, Walter posed this question:

Quote:

----- Why the sudden departure in the verse before us?

In order to fit the context: For the child referred to in Isaiah 7 to be Jesus, would not have been the "sign" to Ahaz that God intended. When reading the context of Isaiah 7:14 you find that the consequences of God's action is going to come very soon, before this child "can tell right from wrong".

Prophecies could have double meanings. Of course this situation would not have applied when the prophecy was carried over into the NT. (no "conspiracy" here intended by the translators!!)

PS Walter, I am wondering if you have any thoughts relating to my last post to you.
Diane

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/3 11:44

I never really knew that it was considered "infamous" by anyone, until now, by you, Diane.

It is an infamous passage that is hotly debated. You cannot work your way through any commentary on this passage of Isaiah, or commentaries on Matthew, without running into a big debate about the subject. Some insist on the young maiden translation, others virgin. Some say never is a young maiden not a virgin. Others say Matthew, who has a unique way of citing OT passages of Scripture as fulfilled, was not quoting Isaiah in the way we typically think of i.e. in the historical-grammatical sense... but rather, another sense altogether. Such is especially evident given that in the subsequent chapters to Isaiah 7, an "Emmanuel" is apparently born in Isaiah's own time.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/3 12:02

Come on folks! please whatever Bible works best for your own personal understanding, let's not go first grade on this. Many in this thread have been involved in this type of discussion before, God Bless America on the upcoming 4th of July, just feel blessed today you're in the land of the free and yes still home of the brave and thank God Israel are our buddies, yes I am trying to detour all the emotions, but that's my calling here. :-P

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2008/7/3 12:27

Hi walter...

Just so you know, my "modern" NIV (taken from what some call the "minority" texts) has the following translation and footnotes for Isaiah 7:14...

Quote:

14 Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and **will call him Immanuel.**

Footnotes:

- a. **Isaiah 7:14 The Hebrew is plural.**
- b. **Isaiah 7:14 Masoretic Text; Dead Sea Scrolls and he or and they**
- c. **Isaiah 7:14 Immanuel means God with us.**

It seems like those "sinister" translators of the NIV are trying to make this prophecy apply to Jesus coming from (gasp) a virgin!

:-O

Re:, on: 2008/7/3 13:10

Quote:

-----Come on folks! please whatever Bible works best for your own personal understanding...

Well... I wish it were that easy. But for some of us, there are some very serious issues surrounding this topic. "Whatever floats your boat" is an all too common cry in the church today on a plethora of different issues. But that seems to be one phrase we never find in the Bible.

Instead, in scripture, we see "whatever floats GOD's boat".

Krispy

Re: Bruce Metzger - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/3 13:22

Quote:

----- I am trying to detour all the emotions, but that's my calling here.

Thank you for your good intentions for us, brother, but I don't know what "emotions" you are referring to. As far as I see this is a fine discussion. In fact, I would challenge your suggestion that we should just fly with our own convictions and leave it with that. That may seem like a good idea, but it is bound to be more divisive in the long run. I'm a big believer in peacemaking as opposed to peacekeeping. Peacekeeping suppresses conflict, but it doesn't change people. Peacemaking does. Blessed are the peacemakers... ..

Walter, I read the commentary, and can indeed support the need to defend the divinity of Christ from the OT. Still, to me, in the bigger scheme, the word "young woman" in Isaiah is not forced for ill purpose, and it need not threaten the OT divinity of Christ (unless one wishes it to) or the credibility of the translators.

Bruce Mertzner has received brutal accusations for this - accused of being an unbeliever, etc. (http://www.bible.org/page.php?page_id4862) Here is a eulogy on him by Daniel Wallace (an evangelical Greek scholar). You can get a feel for the man and also the conflict. As far as I'm concerned, the evangelical community should have been supporting him - a lone light for the Gospel in such an environment as Princeton. I think he repaired a lot of bridges burned unjustly by the fundamentalists in earlier years.

To KingJimmy re Greek study: I appreciate all your comments. Going at it alone, it's nice to connect with someone who can relate - and is even familiar with the same study material! I doubt that I will ever be like that man reading the Greek Bible only.

Diane

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/3 13:28

Ok folks may God forgive me for the interruptions of some of the stone faced Christians, my response was meant to be a joke, but I forgot jokes and some Christians mix like cats and dogs :-(. Please forgive me, please! Holy Jesus.

On a better note, Krispy if I have no clue what the KJV is saying "and I mean I have no clue" even how to pronounce some of the words much less understand them, were not all scholars or teachers but when I read the NASB I totally understand it, so riddle me this what does a man do? Just don't read the Bible period?

Re:, on: 2008/7/3 14:03

Quote:
-----On a better note, Krispy if I have no clue what the KJV is saying "and I mean I have no clue" even how to pronounce some of the words much less understand them, were not all scholars or teachers but when I read the NASB I totally understand it, so riddle me this what does a man do? Just don't read the Bible period?

Hey Bill... how goes it, bro?

Can you tell me what parts of the KJV you're referring to when you say you "have no clue" what it means? You're an American... er, Texan... brought up in the public school system, correct? Please pin point for me what parts you're referring to, then maybe I can help you.

Other than some of the Old Testament names, what words cant you pronounce?

Are there words in the KJV that are no longer in use in everyday English? Yes. Are there words in the KJV that are no longer in the dictionary (particularly Websters)? No.

In fact, there are Bible dictionary booklets you can get online that are written specifically to help people with those archaic words... few as they are.

I hear this argument all the time from people who think the KJV is too hard to understand... and what about all those old archaic words... etc etc. Yet, when I ask them which words, or what passages are too hard to grasp... they cant tell me.

And Bill, I'm sure you read your Bible so this is not aimed at you... but 9 times out of 10 those folks who make these claims against the KJV as an argument for modern versions... dont hardly ever (if ever!) read their modern versions! Much less the KJV.

Fact is, Bill, if you run across something you dont understand.... get a dictionary. Do a word study. Cant understand a particular passage? Get Matthew Henry's commentary out and study and read it over and over until you do understand it.

It's called **STUDYING** the Word of God.

The Bible says **study** to show thyself approved... not dumb down the scripture to show thyself approved.

The message of the gospel is so simple that a small child can understand it. That is very true. But the same can not necessarily be said for the deeper things of God. It takes no work at all to gain salvation, but it does take work and desire on our part to gain the deeper things of God.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/7/3 14:52

Reply to ccchhhrrriiisss:

All of the modern versions are deficient in Bible Doctrine. I have previously posted twice on this thread in regards to specific books of the Bible, all in the New Testament, that document problems in the newer versions. Since I did not specifically post on the NIV, I challenge you to take my prior thread, that went into each Book of the New Testament, and see how the NIV compares to the NASB, in every verse that I quoted for the NASB verses the KJV.

I know that you will not take me up on this challenge. You already know the answer.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:
Hi walter...

Just so you know, my "modern" NIV (taken from what some call the "minority" texts) has the following translation and footnotes for Isaiah 7:14...

Quote:

14 Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and **will call him Immanuel.**

Footnotes:

- a. **Isaiah 7:14** The Hebrew is plural.
- b. **Isaiah 7:14** Masoretic Text; *Dead Sea Scrolls* and *he or and they*
- c. **Isaiah 7:14** *Immanuel* means *God with us*.

It seems like those "sinister" translators of the NIV are trying to make this prophecy apply to Jesus coming from (gasp) a virgin!

:-o

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/3 14:58

Thank you Mr. Krispy that was a good old Country boy reply, and this old Country boy could understand that reply, it translated like this, I need to seek help from some simpler sources to understand the meaning of the harder to understand words. I think I now can invite Larry the Cable guy over for our Bible Study. :-P thank you, thank you very much, you have been a big help today, may God Bless you and yours over these 4th Holidays, and also may God make sure Krispy don't eat too much.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/3 15:03

Hi Bill...

I understand your plight. I know quite a few individuals who have difficulty comprehending the early 17th Century vernacular of the King James Version.

My wife was born and raised for half of her life in Mexico. She moved to the United States, graduated with honors from a large public school, and received both an undergraduate degree (with honors) and a graduate degree (with a perfect 4.0) from major universities. Yet she has quite a bit of difficulty understanding the language used in the King James Version. Yes, she can read it and understand some of it. However, she finds it extremely cumbersome to use a Bible translated into a language (17th Century English) that is not spoken any longer.

My experience is similar. I graduated at the top of my classes in high school and college. I earned two Bachelor's degrees with Honors, a Master's degree, and I am currently finishing my PhD. As familiar as I am with the English language, I still must consult books in order to properly decipher the essence of the 17th Century grammar and usage of the King James Version.

When the King James Version was created, the translators desired a version that was "common." This means that they endeavored to create a version in what was then the modern language—so that "common folk" (like you and me) did not have to consult others to have the Word of God interpreted for us (ala the Roman Catholic Church or other orthodox denominations). The translators produced a very good translation taken from the major(ity) ancient texts of that time. While they admitted to having purposely borrowed ecclesiastic and traditional terms from other works (like the Bishop's Bible), they did their best to create a work that would be easily understood by even the most common literate person.

Even the most ardent KJV supporter admits that this is not the case. Personally, I find the argument that the KJV is "easily understood" by common school children to be nonsense. I have NEVER met a child who easily understood the language of the King James Version—unless they were raised in Church from a young age. Yet even these children need the instruction of others to assist in understanding the grammar and usage.

Like Krispy mentioned, it often takes an English dictionary, a Bible dictionary or a commentary to understand the wording of the King James Version. While this is completely commendable and understandable, it certainly deviates from the translator's desire to have a version that was understandable WITHOUT the necessity of such things. Besides, a dictionary is not always helpful with some of the words—because some of the words have changed their meaning from the 17th Century (like the word “know,” “knoweth,” or “knew” equating to an intimate sexual relationship, ala Matthew 1:25). However, the definitions found in dictionaries vary from work to work. In fact, each selection is usually the product of one or two men (or, at most, a small committee). In addition, as much as I appreciate the work of Matthew Henry & Co., I understand that his commentaries are entirely his own. In other words, they are Matthew Henry's understanding of the Scriptures. The same can be said of every other Bible commentary or dictionary. It doesn't mean that they aren't helpful—they are—but that they are the effort of imperfect men.

It is a fallacy to argue that a proper modern translation “dumbs down” the Scripture simply because it is translated into the language of the day. The English today bears little resemblance to the English of the 15th or 16th Century. Today's Spanish in Mexico or Central/South America is hardly reminiscent of the Spanish spoken in Spain today—let alone Spain in the 17th Century (just look at the translation ability of Microsoft Word—and the specific Spanish choices available for translation). It is not “dumbing down” a language to speak in a manner for which others can understand. I have a large vocabulary. However, I purposely avoid using words that might not be understood by those with whom I communicate. I don't feel that I am “dumbing down” for the sake of others, but allowing my thoughts to be wholly understood by my choice of words.

That being said, I fully agree with Krispy's thoughts regarding the need to study the Word of God in order to fully understand and appreciate it. This will usually take research (through the consultation of other materials, like Bible commentaries, Bible dictionaries). However, is this the purpose of the Word of God? When our Lord walked upon the earth, His most faithful followers were children and unlearned men and women. He spoke in a manner by which He was easily understood (although he also spoke with parables to accentuate and unlock the secrets of the Kingdom of God).

When the Lord speaks to my heart, He doesn't speak in 17th Century King James English. In fact, He often doesn't even speak in English at all. Most of the time, the Lord places something into my heart or mind that transcends the languages of Earth. It might be a burden to pray for an individual, the unction to share my faith to a stranger on a park bench, or the burden to give what little money that I have to someone else. The point is: God has never spoken to my heart with a “thee,” “thou,” or “thus” (except when I learn from the King James Version or other contemporary works). I don't suspect that God will speak in English—let alone 17th Century English—when we finally meet Him face-to-face.

Personally, I feel the liberty to read other versions of the Bible that I feel are credible. Usually, I do this to cross reference what other translators felt while translating their particular work into English or Spanish. At other times, I reference the NASB, NKJV, NIV or other translations just for a little more clarity into a phrase or the meaning of the passage. Now, there are certainly some “translations” and “versions” that I avoid. But this is usually due to the research into the credibility of the sources or due to questions about the methods by which those works were translated.

When asked about my Bible preference, I usually tell people that I believe that the Word of God is infallible—even though the best translation efforts of men are not. The translators of the KJV, NASB and NIV all admitted that their efforts were honest but less than perfect attempts. When asked, I tell others that I personally prefer the KJV as one of the best translations from the TR and the NIV as one of the best translations from the other ancient text sources. But I let them know that I look at other versions too. And, of course, I always encourage people (as they mature) to research this topic on their own, while warning them about the plethora of biased, prejudiced material available.

Regarding this topic: I have heard the argument that the NASB is a better and more literal translation than most other versions taken from the TR. However, I just don't know enough about that translation to make such a judgment (although I have read several secondhand sources both pro and con). I've done extensive research into the translation of the NIV and the rationale behind the sources/methods used for it. I've also done quite a bit of research into the translation of the KJV too. I've heard quite a few statements for and against the NASB. I have heard and read even more statements AGAINST the NKJV, but I can't say that I know enough to make any sort of judgment either way. I guess that it is just good to be aware that there might be issues (for or against) either.

Of course, these are simply my own thoughts.

:-)

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/3 15:19

Thanks Brother Chris now I don't feel so stupid, your explanation really Blessed me. I am not a dummy, I have run my own a/c and heating business in Houston for over 30 years so I do have a clue. I just cannot read and understand the KJV and I don't think God would want me to apologize, I think God would just appreciate the fact that I am doing my best to just understand his word and grow closer to him, whatever version I use.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/3 15:36

I must say as well, that I have difficulty with the KJV. And I say that as a Bible college graduate whose primary Bible instructor read in class from the KJV. I can read most of it just fine, but, there are sometimes where I am left scratching my head wondering what something means.

Furthermore, it should be noted that there is a difference between the original 1611 KJV english and the KJV most of you probably have on your night stand. I dare say, hardly any of you could actually read the 1611 version and make much sense of it. Which is why I find debates insisting that the 1611 KJV is "the" word of God rather silly. For nobody I know actually uses the 1611 version. If you did, then you are also regularly reading the apocrypha along with the OT/NT, which was included in the original 1611 version.

Re: war or peace - over translations - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/3 16:13

Quote:

----- I know that you will not take me up on this challenge. You already know the answer.

Hi, Walter, I don't know if you are saying this prophetically or otherwise...Â...Â...Â...

Actually, I did glance at the list. It's not new. Somewhere in my past I have read explanations for these apparent "flaws". There's a video out too.

My eye did catch one particular example on your list: It happens to be addressed in the very same Greek material that KingJimmy and I have been discussing. The way grammatical articles are used in Greek would explain why that alleged "mistake" is actually a possible translation. The context would also bear that out.

As you see, I am not keen to debate those points. I would be more concerned about the reason for what seems to be a zealous witch hunt aimed at invalidating translations that are fine.

While checks and balances are important in the Christian community and do help keep translators sharp, sometimes critics are less-than-objective or fair because of their preferred biases. Instead of edifying the Church of Christ, their works tear it apart. It puts stumbling blocks in the road of those who should be trusting their Bibles.

Here, in Craig Blomberg's article, you see a powerful example of how crazy things can really get when it comes to translations - based more on rumor than discernment:

(<http://www.tniv.info/pdf/Blomberg.pdf>) "The Untold Story of a Good Translation" (The last few pages are especially thought provoking.)

Diane

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2008/7/3 16:18

Well said Brother Chris, well said.

Thanks for taking the time to post such a complete and thoughtful reply. I hope many take the time to read it.

Thanks for sharing your insights

Re: NASB or NKJV?? - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/4 0:55

I like the word "sottish" :-)

Quote:
-----Logsdon, however, is far from suggesting a revamping of the AV (KJV) text. "Back in Jeremiah 4:22, we read, 'My people are sottish.' There wouldn't be two people in the congregation that would know what that means. But I like it because when I looked it up, I found that it had more meaning than any other word you could put there. It means thick-headed. God says, 'I can't get through to you because you are thick-headed.' And maybe He wants it to stay there. If a person looks it up he gets a better understanding of it than if another word were put in there to change it."

And can no longer resist the urge to not apply it to the same one who brought it forth. It hopefully will be taken in the spirit and intent I would have it ... It's a humorous word in a certain sense and if I go any further than that ...

Read through this in its entirety last night, up to the point it had gone and caught up just a few minutes ago, plus or minus a few ... things. Wanted to say that it is appreciative how cordial and respectful for the most part it has been for the usual tones that this topic tends to generate. A lot of great comment and helpful, encouraging aspects. I would love to learn the Greek someday, what KingJimmy and Diane has shared is very encouraging, hopefully others might take an interest who might have been considering.

The KJV ... argument, that is so often brought out, scratch that, is always brought out even when a posting is asking a different question should be enough in itself to arrest even for a moment, just what the continual impulse is and why it can not hear anything, consider anything other than its constant refrain in the thoughts. It's not a question to be answered in rebuttal, we know *why* and all the semantics that go into it ... What is curious is that the great majority here have little to no issues with the translation and primarily use it, so the preaching to the crowd here ...

Languages. Would think this is the starting point well before any translation could even be understood let alone debated. It does seem to be largely absent from the translation discussions and I am asking it by way of observation and wonder. Maybe this might help further the thought;

For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: 1Co 1:22

Which seems to imply something about their makeup and culture. What about these aspects? And what did the world do before King James came along and the version derived/applied to his name? It spawns many more related questions and not the least the translations of translations into other languages in other countries(ccchhhrrriiisss bringing forth a great example). It is a fallacy to compare apples and oranges over what is 'preserved', it's an issue of semantics or even logistics and they somehow are fused together to support the Authorized Version as "it". Saying all that seems futile and I anticipate the retort but there is a ridiculousness to all this that never ends ...

Diane mentioned the great point;

Quote:
-----PS: I marvel at how idiot-proof God made the Bible. If you miss a point in one chapter, for whatever reason, you are bound to see it again in another, and another, and another... unless, of course, you are blind!

So completely true, it is almost if one tried to purposefully set forth to destroy the very words it would still backfire on the m. Greatly overstating it but still the point. Here is where I would want to draw this back to the original question asked. I have since coming into the light used the NKJV as my main Bible. The first one was a "Spirit Filled" I believe it is called and has it's ... slant towards the charismatic camp, the presumed favorite of the WOF ... Ah, that may not be entirely fair, but it is a study Bible with footnotes. Currently, have been using John MacArthur's NKJV for probably the last 5 or 6 years, maybe longer, it was a reaction in part to coming out of the varied confusion I was in prior. It is a strange thing that I still rarely refer to the footnotes, not purposefully ...

Actually, did want to mention this, what is there to the idea that maybe we can be preoccupied too much with semantics and lose the context and meaning from just straightforward reading? It's not a dismissal one way or the other and maybe I am just not so fond of separating 'study' from 'devotional' reading, they seem to blur together or maybe it's just that I never really thought about having to separate them ... It seems also to recall a mention about studying theology or was it going to seminary, either way even theology is the study of God, perhaps it's just whether or not our heart is in it.

I appreciate greatly a resource like E-Sword that it gives you a variety of modules so you can have a variety of different versions. I will be honest and state I do not really like the NIV, I have a copy in the bathroom (sorry) that was given to me and it always seems to leave me wanting. But the point is, to draw back to Diane's mention above is that when it comes to discussion here for instance, often the train of thought or the word I am looking for I cannot readily find directly in the KJV, searching the other versions (RV, YLT, ASV, ESV, ISV, MKJV) usually never fails to produce what I am looking for. Maybe it's the way I tend to think, in thought 'translation', I am not sure.

I also noticed that I lean quite naturally towards the KJV text and that is no help to the conspiracy element out there, it's just what it is. And the other mention is that I find a smooth transition between the NKJV and the KJV primarily because I am not didactically thinking about it, an interesting phenomenon considering a love for words and their meanings\descriptions\history's.

Maybe it is the scrutiny over words in a sense that makes the whole grand argument what it is, that the scrutiny is misplaced and downplays the expression and meaning, the scrutiny of the heart.

There is so much to all this, it cannot be dismissed out of hand the arguments for what has become of the many and the 'modern' versions. There is something about "ease of reading" that makes me wonder why we would want all our thinking and brain sweat done for us. And the archaic ... every time I hear even that word I think "cool". I love the archaic, the old, the dead saints and the old sermons and the Old Paths. Yes, it is SermonIndex in it's finest, yet still here we moderns are and even many of the speakers and preachers are still living ... relics? It's the mindset and the lostness, the re-discovery of things that have stood the test of time but are just covered with layers of dust from disuse.

Well, that is a bit of a ramble, my two bits.

Re:, on: 2008/7/4 2:19

The First Messianic prophecy appears in the first Book of the Bible, at the beginning of time. Open your Bibles and let's begin with Genesis 3:15.

Who could draw a picture of a man not yet born? Surely God, and God alone. Nobody knew over 500 years ago that Shakespeare was going to be born; or over 250 years ago that Napoleon was to be born. Yet here in the Bible we have the most striking and unmistakable likeness of a Man portrayed, not by one, but by twenty or twenty-five artists, none of whom had even seen the Man they were painting.

The astounding miracle of these predictions of Christ proves that "the inspiration of that portrait came from the Heavenly Gallery, and not from the studio of an earthly artist. Nothing but Divine prescience could have foreseen it, and nothing but Divine power could accomplish it." Peter confirms this when he wrote, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (II Peter 1:21).

"The Christ of the New Testament is the fruit of the Tree of Prophecy, and Christianity is the realization of a plan, the first outlines of which were sketched more than 1500 years before," as David Baron expresses it in "Rays of Messiah's Glory".

It is the fulfillment of specific, detailed prophecies that provides the Bible its divine seal—a seal that can never be

counterfeited, since it is affixed to the truth which it attests, namely, that God's foreknowledge of the actions of free and intelligent agents is one of the most "incomprehensible attributes of Deity and is exclusively a Divine perfection." We readily concede that the prophets themselves may not have understood the full import of the predictions they gave when they pictures beforehand the expected Messiah, yet the language they used could not refer to anyone else in history. **It was thus that Paul was able to persuade the Jews that Jesus was the predicted One "out of the prophets" (Acts 28:23).**

This is from the Book "All the Messianic Prophecies of the Bible" by Herbert Lockyer

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: The First Messianic Prophecy, on: 2008/7/4 2:27

The Birth of Jesus:

1. The "seed" of the woman

The only key to all messianic prophecy is found hanging at the front door of the Bible. This "key" was given by God to that "old serpent, the devil." He was the first to learn of a Deliverer who would come to destroy his devilish works. To him was given the initial promise and prophecy of redemption from the sin he had brought into God's fair universe. "And the Lord God said unto the serpent.... I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." (Genesis 3:15)

From this point on, the chain of promises and prophecies concerning "the seed of the woman" lengthen until it ends in the birth of Jesus, who was not only "the seed of the woman," but "the seed of Abraham," and "the seed of David."

Forecast: "The woman...and her seed" (Genesis 3:15)

Fulfillment: "Mary was found with child of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 1:18)

"...to thy seed, which is Christ" (Gal. 3:16)

"Till the seed should come to whom the promise was made" (Gal. 3:19)

Forecast: "And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land (Gen 12:7)

Fulfillment: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made (Gal 3:16)

Forecast: "Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David... I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels" (II Samuel 7:8, 12)

Fulfillment: "The gospel of God...concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Romans 1: 1,3)

With the first direct messianic prophecy in the Bible there commenced "the highway of the Seed." What God said about the seed of the woman constitutes "the bible in embryo, the sum of all history and prophecy in a germ" for here is intimated, not only the Virgin Birth of Christ, but also His vicarious sufferings—"Thou shalt bruise His heel"; and His complete and eventual dominion over Satan and his works—"It (Christ) shall bruise thy head" (see Hebrew 2:9-15).

The Virgin Birth

The phrase just considered, "her seed", is not found elsewhere in the Bible. Well over one hundred times we read of "the seed" and "seeds", but in all cases the seed of the man is meant. **But the "seed of the woman" is a unique concept and can only be interpreted as a foreshadowing of the virgin birth of our Lord. If He was not to be born of a virgin, then Adam would have been referred to: "his seed", not "her seed".** When the Prince of Glory came, the prince of this world could find nothing in the One who sprang from "her seed." The reason? "Mary...was discovered to be pregnant---by the Holy Spirit (Matthew 1:18).

Such a mystery this is to us. Bishop Handley Moule asserts that "in Scripture a mystery may be a fact which, when revealed, we cannot understand in detail, though we can know it, and act upon it....It is a thing to be known only when revealed."

ealed.Â” With reference to the Virgin Birth, it is certainly true that Â”we cannot understand it in detail, though we can know it, and act upon it.Â”

Forecast: Â”Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel (Isaiah 7:14)

Â”For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given (Isaiah 9:6)

Fulfillment: Â”And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son...then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon theeÂ” (Luke 1:31, 34, 35)

Â”When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy GhostÂ” (Matt. 1:18)

Â”Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. (Matt. 1:23)

To fulfill the amazing prophecies of the birth of Christ, God performed a biological miracle, for the manner of His begetting was something unknown in human history and experience. Reason may declare that among humans what happened to Mary is impossible; however, Mary also had to learn that, Â”with God nothing shall be impossible.Â” Responding by faith to the divine revelation, the virgin said, Â”Be it unto me, according to Thy word.Â”

From:

All the Messianic Prophecies of the Bible

Herbert Lockyer

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: The First Messianic Prophecy, on: 2008/7/4 2:33

Isn't it somewhat remarkable that whenever the birth of the Messiah is spoken of in prophecy, reference is made only to His mother, or to the womb, never to a human father, which, of course, Jesus did not have.

Â”The Lord hath called me from the wombÂ” (Isaiah 49:1)

Â”The Lord.... formed me from the womb to be his servantÂ” Isaiah 49:5)

Â”The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a manÂ”(Jer 31:22)

Â”Thou art he that took me out of the wombÂ” (Psalms 22:9)

Â”Until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forthÂ” (Micah 5:3)

Although we speak about the supernatural or miraculous birth of Christ, we must understand that there was nothing unique or exceptional about the process of His birth, which came about in a completely natural way. **The miraculous element was not in the formation of our Lord's body or in its appearance in the manger, but in the manner of its begetting or conception. His birth was supernatural in that He was virgin-born, that is, He was conceived apart from natural generation by the method of sexual intercourse. This is what Mary herself meant when she said, Â”I know not a man.Â” She bore the prophesied One as the result of a divine creative act, and was virgo intacto. Thereafter, Mary lived in the usual relations of wedlock with her husband, Joseph, bearing children in a natural way. (See Marr. 13:55, 56)**

All who are born after the ordinary course of nature have the root of sin within them. Had our Lord been born according to the laws of natural procreation, having a human father as well as a human mother, then He (Christ) would have had to cry, Â”Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.Â” (Psalms 51:5), but He was born Â”holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners (Hebrews 7:26). Because He was conceived by the Holy Spirit, His substance was pure and immaculate, and without original sin. To save sinners, it was imperative for Him to be sinless, hence, the necessity of a VIRGIN birth. So He came, Â”Offspring of a virgin's womb.Â” The miracle of His birth is seen in that in spite of the sinful pedigree His genealogies prove, He yet entered the world a perfectly sinless Person. Â”That holy thing which shall be born...shall be called the Son of God (Luke 1:35)

From:

All the Messianic Prophecies of the Bible

Herbert Lockyer

Sincerely,

Walter

Re:, on: 2008/7/4 3:04

Hello, Bill:

I have not always been a King James guy. Years ago, I was in love with my NIV. However, once I received the Baptism of the Holy Spirit God's Word truly came alive to me. After a lot of searching, I ended up with the King James Bible that my Grandmother had given me when I was 10 years old.

One of the good points about the archaic language in the King James is that the **meaning of the words is frozen in time**. Actually, between the years of 1611 and 1828 the English language was quite static. Travel then was not like it is today, and words kept their meaning. In 1828 Noah Webster published his Dictionary of the English Language. Most of the Words that are troubling you in the King James Bible can be found there. I personally purchased my own 1828 Dictionary. However, if you go online, you can use one for free at: <http://www.cbtministries.org/resources/webster1828.htm>

I would like to look up one word for you, to show you what I mean- so you can see how this word has changed over time . especially the last 100 years:

MAR'RIAGE, n. The act of uniting a man and woman for life; wedlock; the legal union of a man and woman for life. Marriage is a contract both civil and religious, by which the parties engage to live together in mutual affection and fidelity, till death shall separate them. Marriage was instituted by God himself for the purpose of preventing the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, for promoting domestic felicity, and for securing the maintenance and education of children.

Marriage is honorable in all and the bed undefiled. Heb.13.

1. A feast made on the occasion of a marriage.

The kingdom of heaven is like a certain king, who made a marriage for his son. Matt.22.

2. In a scriptural sense, the union between Christ and his church by the covenant of grace. Rev.19.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

MrBillPro wrote:

Thank you Mr. Krispy that was a good old Country boy reply, and this old Country boy could understand that reply, it translated like this, I need to seek help from some simpler sources to understand the meaning of the harder to understand words. I think I now can invite Larry the Cable guy over for our Bible Study. :-P thank you, thank you very much, you have been a big help today, may God Bless you and yours over these 4th Holidays, and also may God make sure Krispy don't eat too much.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss () , on: 2008/7/4 4:50

Hi Brother Walter...

Quote:

-----Reply to ccchhhrrriiiss:

All of the modern versions are deficient in Bible Doctrine. I have previously posted twice on this thread in regards to specific books of the Bible, all in the New Testament, that document problems in the newer versions. Since I did not specifically post on the NIV, I challenge you to take my prior thread, that went into each Book of the New Testament, and see how the NIV compares to the NASB, in every verse that I quoted for the NASB verses the KJV.

I know that you will not take me up on this challenge. You already know the answer.

Brother, how would you like for me to respond? In truth, I feel that the entire premise for your KJV-only argument is built upon a STRAW MAN fallacy!

I looked over your posts, but it would be extremely difficult to respond to it. Why? Because I fear that ANY answer that I give you -- no matter how complete -- would not suffice your prejudice. Your statements here and there are filled with rhetorical errors of assumption. For instance:

Quote:

"All of the modern versions are deficient in Bible Doctrine."

"I know that you will not take me up on this challenge. You already know the answer."

"The translators of the modern versions are well aware of the incontrovertible decisive nature of "parthenos" hence the translation of Isaiah 7:14 into any other word represents deliberate willful alteration of the Word of God."

"In denying the virgin birth of Christ, they are saying:

- 1) Jesus was a bastard as Mary was unmarried when she conceived;
- 2) Mary was a fornicator;
- 3) God has lied to us in Mat. 1:22-23;
- 4) Christ was not God, not deity (having a physical father, He was only human); and
- 5) Christ was a sinner as he would then be a descendant of Adam and inherit Adam's nature as in Rom. 5:12."

"The three verses placed before us serve as an excellent barometer for each of us to use in determining whether a given "version" is trustworthy or not."

Do you see the problem here? You are making very bold final assessments based upon your own understanding and assumptions of this issue (or a reiteration about what others feel about this issue). You continue to accuse the translators of modern versions of "omitting" words or passages during the translation process. What part of DIFFERENT SOURCE MATERIAL do you not understand? The translators of the NIV claimed to have produced a translation that they felt was faithful to the sources that they used. This is no different than the translators of the KJV. They both attempted to create a translation that was faithful to their source. There wasn't any "omission" of words or phrases. Rather, they endeavored to create a translation from the sources that they used. Period. There wasn't anything sinister in this. Yet you make it seem like the translators saw some words or phrases in the sources that they used and decided to omit them due to an ominous, underlying rationale.

Have you spoken with ANY translator of ANY version of the Bible? What are the sources for which you have based your judgment? Do you see the danger of making an accusation if you haven't even consulted a firsthand source?

Correct me if I am wrong, but you seem to indicate that you feel that the KJV is perfect. Is this true? You wrote:

Quote:

-----God has also promised us to both give and protect His Word:

"Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten my word to perform it." (Jeremiah 1:12)

Here God says He is watching over His Word to perform it -- to make all that He has said come to pass:

Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." (Mark 13:31)

God did not promise to keep the original piece of material upon which His words were given. He says His Words SHALL NOT PASS AWAY. Therefore, this promise demands that we still have them on planet earth:

Jesus also says, "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mark 8:38)

Why this verse if God has NOT preserved His Word?
"But the word of the Lord endureth forever." (I Pet.1:25)

This is a direct quote of Isaiah 40:8. God has said that His Word will endure forever! He did not promise that the original piece of paper, rock or vellum would exist forever but that He would preserve the Word – forever.

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever." (Isaiah 40:8)

".. for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." (Psalm 138:2)

Look at that! God says He has magnified His Word above His name! That is incredible for supposedly THE name was so sacred to the Jews that they did not even pronounce it.

Jesus said "... and the Scripture cannot be broken." (John 10:35)

God has promised to keep His Word as revealed through these Scriptures! But there is more!

"The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shall keep them, O Lord, thou shall preserve them from this generation forever." (Psa.12:6, 7)

This is a promise from God! He says He will preserve it. He did not just promise to give the originals pure and free from error – He promised to preserve the text forever!

"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John 12:48)

Since God's Word will judge us, are we to believe that God will judge us by something which He meticulously gave us and then lost along the way? Would it be just and fair of God to judge us with these words if they are no longer trustworthy – to hold us accountable when our guide is not 100 percent reliable?

In Matthew 5:18, Jesus said not "one jot or one tittle" shall change in the Word of God. Specifically, He was speaking of the Old Testament. We are being taught today that perhaps the Old Testament is not true, that it is full of contradictions, scribal errors, etc., but Jesus said that it was true and unerring – even to the smallest detail – and He was not referring to the originals, but to copies of copies of copies.

"Do you not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:45-47)

Was Jesus speaking of the "originals"? No, for they did not have the originals. They had copies of copies of copies of the originals yet Jesus said "not one jot or one tittle" had been changed. If God has only promised the "ORIGINALS" to be pure then Jesus erred in His assessment of the Scriptures. Should these statements of Jesus concerning the Scriptures be inaccurate then He is not Lord, no longer all knowing, no longer all God.

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (John 5:39-40)

The ultimate purpose of the Scriptures is to lead us to Christ – and then to guide our lives. If the Scriptures are not accurate, if they have been changed or altered, if they have been lost so that we no longer have the Word of God, how can we come to Christ for they are the Holy Spirit's implement to testify of the Lord Jesus.

Since you are advocating that God took it upon Himself to perfectly preserve His written Word, I assume that you feel that the KJV and its lineage of source material are entirely perfect?

How do you feel about the fact that the KJV has undergone several revisions between 1611 and 1850? The version that we have right now is the result of multiple corrections and revisions that mostly corrected minor flaws in grammar, wording or usage. However, these were more than a single "dot and tittle." In other words, the KJV in 1611 was NOT perfect. In fact, there are some pretty good arguments that it is flawed today. As well-sounding as some arguments in defense of it might be, I truly believe that the inclusion of the pagan word "Easter" in Acts chapter 12 is an obvious error. The Hebrew word used is the same for *the Passover*. We can't blame this on Erasmus (the Dutch Catholic/Humanist solely responsible for the Textus Receptus) because this word appears as "the Passover" in nearly every other TR-based translation. I don't buy the argument that the KJV was "the only one that got it right." So this single word ("Easter") is also more than a single "dot or tittle."

There are seeming contradictions in the Word of God that are often pointed out by atheists or other unbelievers. Many of these could be attributed to poor translation from the sources. For instance, II Kings 24:8 and II Chronicles 36:9 give the age of Jehoiachin when he began reigning as King in Jerusalem. The KJV lists this as 18 years old in II Kings 24:8 and

d 8 years old in II Chronicles 36:9. However, the “modern” translations list both of these – as recorded in their sources – at 18 years old.

Again in Acts 9:7 and Acts 22:9, we read about Paul’s conversion experience. The KJV reads as follows:

Quote:

-----**ACTS 9:7** And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, **hearing a voice**, but seeing no man.

-----**ACTS 22:9** And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but **they heard not the voice** of him that spake to me.

What’s the deal? Is Paul mistaken, lying or just confused? Did they or didn’t the people with him hear a “voice”? However, the “modern” translations like the NIV read (according to their sources):

Quote:

-----**Acts 22:7** The men traveling with Saul stood there speechless; they heard the sound but did not see anyone.

-----**Acts 22:9** My companions saw the light, but they did not understand the voice of him who was speaking to me.

Do you see how the supposedly flawed “modern” translations read in such a way that eliminates the apparent contradiction? They didn’t translate this in order to eliminate the apparent flaw, but because their sources read as such.

Compare I Kings 4:26 with II Chronicles 9:25. Compare II Samuel 24:13 with I Chronicles 21:11. This list could go on and on. Atheists and unbelievers often point to these apparent contradictions in order to mock those who claim that the written Word of God is perfect in “every dot and tittle.” When I am confronted by unbelievers (or even Christians) about such things, I admit the possibility about flaws in the translation process with the various translations. However, I point out that these things are inconsequential in determining the need for a relationship with our Lord. The essence of all of the Scriptural doctrines is completely and entirely sound.

I get a kick out of individuals who claim that the “important doctrines of the Church” are altered by “modern” translations like the NIV. I can “show” the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, the miracles, the need for repentance, the Trinity, the penalty for sins, that homosexuality is a sin – and any other important thing from my well-worn NIV Bible. Just because a word or two may differ between the KJV and the NIV (as it differed in the sources from which they were derived) doesn’t “translate” into a bold and arrogant accusation that the NIV is soft on sin and “deficient in Bible doctrine” (as you claimed).

If someone really wants to research the reasons for which the translators of the NIV decided to use the “minority texts” or an eclectic approach to translation, then they should contact the International Bible Society, the translators and Bible scholars. The vast majority favor both the inclusion of these texts and both an eclectic and dynamic equivalence method for translation. I have spoken with and corresponded with quite a few of the translators and consultants about the work. I wrote and called quite a few text and language “experts” and “scholars” regarding this issue. I searched through older works about the KJV...including viewing some scanned pages of a first print KJV from a major library database (which dispelled the lie that the KJV has not changed since it was first published in 1611). I’ve read the preface to the original KJV. I’ve researched the lives and contemporary works of the men who were involved with the KJV translation process (strange and interesting info if you look into it). In addition, I did read some biased works – so that I would know what questions were being asked, as well as the basis for such bias. I researched the Textus Receptus, the Alexandrian text types and other sources used (or omitted) in various translations – as well as the origins of each. In the end, I came to a conclusion that it is impossible to claim with any degree of certainty that either the KJV or the Textus Receptus was perfect. I also felt that it was difficult to argue (in light of academic scrutiny) that these works are superior to modern texts or the sources from which they are derived.

Brother Walter, if you were asking me to make a list of all of the doctrines that you claim are “missing” from the NIV, I just don’t know if I can do it. Why? Because EVERY important doctrine of the Church is found in the NIV. If you really don’t believe me, perhaps you should open a new thread. You could entitle it: “IS IT IN THE NIV?” Instead of questioning a dozen issues at one time, you could present one at a time. I will do my best to look through my NIV and find at least two or three verses for that doctrine that you mention (because a matter is established upon the testimony of two or three witnesses). After this one is discussed, we could move on to another...and then another...until we run out of doctrinal issues. If you take my word for it (which I do not expect or even desire for you to do), you will find that each doctrine is safely located within the pages of the NIV. While one passage might differ from another (typically due to the difference in source material), you can still find those important doctrines throughout the rest of the text. I just think that it is better to go one at a time for the sake of clarity.

Anyway, I appreciate these sorts of discussions. Please do not feel at all like I am attempting to intimidate you or question the integrity of your research or beliefs. Rather, we can encourage one another in our most holy faith as we both seek the Truth for ourselves. The Lord bless you and keep you!

:-)

Re: Blow by - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/4 8:45

Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers. 2Ti 2:14

that they strive not about words; it became them to strive and contend for the form of sound words, for the wholesome words or doctrines of our Lord Jesus, but not about mere words, and especially such as were

to no profit; to no advantage to truth, nor to themselves nor others; were not to edification, to spiritual edification, to glorify edifying, which is in faith:

but to the subverting of the hearers; the confounding of their minds, misleading their judgments, and overthrowing the faith; and therefore were not only unprofitable, but hurtful and pernicious, and by all means to be avoided.

John Gill

Walter, maybe just some very plain speaking here. What is it that allows such a supposed freedom to practice this blow by, where you are haranguing over your penchant with disregard to all others? Countless times and innumerable posts are hijacked by you yourself and brought down to ruin because of your peevishness and littleness and striving over words, King James words. In fact it is so predominant that one would get the impression that James the King is your master and you are his servant, having to defend and deride anything other than this littleness of mind that is forever made up.

You exhibit a certain air and pride by forcing the issue, constantly, redundantly, it is a selfish ambition and here, when the question was never asked about your KJV opinion, you must come and force it nonetheless. It's hijacking Walter, plain and simple.

The constant battering is the equivalent of repeating "*There is no Santa Claus!*", "*There is no Santa Claus!*", "*There is no Santa Claus!*". Until your hearers are so sick of it they start to suppose that this fellow is so bound up in it that maybe there is a Santa Claus after all.

The great overshooting and striking resemblance to every KJV only advocate that has ever passed through this forum is this same manner of spirit. I almost want to suppose they are the same person they are so interchangeable and indistinguishable. They have the same traits and repeat the same arguments over and over again, even when they find the agreement they sought, the barrage continues. The core elements of scripture itself seem to mean little to nothing, though thought and expression, principle, character and disposition, spiritual conversion, spiritual grasp all run over to ignore the very basis of 2Ti 2:14.

Give it up. Back off already. Challenge your fixed notions and give place to your own Brethren. Take T. Austins considerations to heart;

A spiritual person is first of all one who seeks to know the revealed will of God in His Word. You cannot be a spiritual person, after the kind of which we are speaking, and neglect or be careless about the Word of God. You will be one who is really diligent in reading and searching the Word of God, with one object - to know what God wants where you are concerned. If there were more of that, there would be a different kind of Christian, stronger, purer, and far more satisfying to the Lord.

No Violation of the Word of God

Moreover, a truly spiritual person will never violate the Word of God. Should they do so, they will know all about it inside of themselves. The Holy Spirit will make it clear to a spiritual person that they have gone contrary to the Word of God. Under the government of the Spirit we shall never be a contradiction to the Scriptures. It does not mean that all at once we shall be a perfect expression of all that is in the Word of God, but it does mean that the Holy Spirit will be dealing with

us in the light of what is in the Scriptures. Have you not sometimes experienced an inward, unaccountable sense of grief? You may not have put it that way, but you had a strange sense of grief, of distress. The Holy Spirit has been grieved about something you have said or done, the way you have behaved. You cannot explain it or put it into words, but you just say to the Lord, 'Now, Lord, I am conscious that something is not right. I put it into Your hands, and trust You to show me, and make it clear.' Either sooner or later, you come on something in the Word of God, which exactly explains just where you failed, just where you defaulted. There it is, and you did not know that it was in the Word of God. You know, it is possible to get a surprise over what is in the Word of God. I have been reading and studying the Bible for quite a good many years, but some eighteen months ago I came on a fragment in the Bible that I never knew was there - I had never seen it before! I expect there are plenty more. If you told me that that was in the Bible, I should not have known where to find it. But it just suited and fitted into a position in which I was at that moment. I needed something at that time for my deliverance - for my salvation, in a sense - and I came on that something. I opened my Bible, and there it was, right there. It amazed me; it was so fitting to the whole situation. It described my situation in one single sentence.

The Holy Spirit knows the Bible, He knows what He has written; and if the Spirit is in us, and we are seeking to live in the Spirit, we shall live in the Word. The Word is a living thing when that is so. Spiritual people are people of the Word, and consciously or unconsciously they are checked up by it. And I do say to you, especially to young Christians (it may be necessary to many others as well): Be very careful about your life in the Word of God. Do not choose only the things that you feel you can understand. Do not just pick out the things that you like. How we like to take up our Bible, and find out something so nice and helpful - perhaps a lovely promise and just to live on that sort of thing, the delicacies of the Word of God. It is just lovely! And all the time there are whole sections that we pass over. 'Those are parts that we do not understand - we do not read them.' Now, do not make any mistake like that. You will find that there are treasures which come to light in times of special need in the very parts that you would never read. You do not like all those long lists of names - that is all they are - difficult names at that. You cannot pronounce them, so you quickly turn the page. You will find some treasures there - hidden treasures!

But how much more necessary it is for us to read this Word first of all that it shall be there for the Holy Spirit to work upon. It is just there, that is all. We read: for the moment we do not realize what it means, or that it is a message to us; but we have read it, and it is there. Presently, the Holy Spirit begins to speak to us about that very thing, and it becomes most valuable, and by it we may be guided. I suggest to you that you read this Word always with a view, first of all - What has God to say to me here? It is going to touch everything.

And do not accept any human reasonings about the Word. Paul has a number of things to say, in his first letter to the Corinthians, for instance - things that people do not like, especially moderns - about dress and head coverings and all sorts of things. The modern mind says, 'Oh, well, Paul was old-fashioned, he was a woman hater', and so on. If you listen to that, you will get out of harmony with the Word of God. That Word is there to put you right and keep you right with God. Violate those things, and you will limit your own spiritual life. Conduct and behaviour are governed by the Word of God, and there is nothing in the whole range and realm of our human life that is not touched by it. I say that thoughtfully: it is true. The Word of God touches all our temperament; it touches our dress, our behaviour, our talk; it touches everything that you can think of. Somewhere in the Word of God there is something about it. A spiritual person gives a large place to the Word, and allows the Word to adjust them. They do not argue at all. If the Word of God says that, then that is all there is to it.

Re: A word to KJVOers - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/4 8:58

To those who are in the KJVO crowd, (and how this may apply to anyone here, I leave in God's hands.)

When I see you standing in front of me, I see you on a huge box, much higher than I. You cannot see my eyes. You do not stoop down to understand me, my struggles, my joy. You do not know anything about my spiritual journey, what God may have been doing in my life, and what translations he has spoken through to draw me to himself.

No, you judge me without knowing me - because I trust a book that you believe (via secondary sources) has been perverted by people who deliberately want to draw people away from Christ, or at best, are unreliable translators). But you do not know that God used those very translation(s) to show me the light of his true salvation and bring me into fellowship with him. And he continues to do so. You have mocked my most-treasure possession.

Since, according to your criteria, I am deluded and less intelligent than you, you likely sense no burden to pray for me, as Paul prayed for the saints - that they would know the power of God's love, and receive enlightenment by the Spirit.

It is noteworthy that Jesus reserved his most scathing rebukes to those who were guardians of the Word. Why? Because they were using it to keep people AWAY from Jesus! They were obscuring the way rather than paving the way - in their zeal to preserve it.

It seems like we have no shortage of modern day scribes and Pharisees. And we see the same effects in the churches: discouraged people, turned off people, people leaving the church. Sadly, many today have not seen the nature of Christ in those who have been so zealous to guard the word. And worse yet, too many stop reading the Bible, not merely because the world draws them away but for another reason: Either because language is so old and foreign to them, or (according to the "experts") there are so many flaws in all the other translations, that you just can't trust them.

Paul was also concerned about this danger in the church, and reserved his most pointed condemnation for the most zealous guardians of the Word:

"God's name is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you." Rom. 2:24.

We could say today: Countless are mocking the reality of God because of what they have observed in those who claimed to be his followers but were more interested in the jots and tittles than the Lord of the word. In their obsessions, they missed the big picture.

May someday this never be said to anyone here:

"I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

Diane

Re: NASB or NKJV?? - posted by JRuth (), on: 2008/7/4 10:23

My favorite version is the KJV!!! I believe it is the only true english Bible!!!

Revelation 22:18,19

18.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.

I believe that these other versions have done just that, and they have disobeyed God!!

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/4 11:19

Read my sig. line, A time is coming and has now come when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for they are the kind of worshipers the Father seeks. God is spirit and his worshipers must worship in spirit and in truth

- John 4:23-24

Ok if this time is coming, maybe God knew there would be other versions "of course God knew" he knows everything, so maybe this is why he said there "will" come a time when the "TRUE" worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth. Brothers and Sisters "IF" your worshiping the Father in spirit and truth, I don't care what version your using you cannot be misled by the re-written words of man no matter how watered down they may be, because he is going to clear up any issues with that through the worshiping the Father in spirit, this is my story and I am sticking to it. :-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/4 11:20

My favorite version is the KJV!!! I believe it is the only true english Bible!!!

Revelation 22:18,19

18.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.

My my, the same verse is found in my NASB!

What if the KJV added verses? In fact, it did. It included the entire Catholic apocrypha in its early additions. Perhaps, maybe, this is why the church of England is in the state it is today... because they added those books to the Bible back in 1611?

Gee wizz....

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/4 11:46

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

My my, the same verse is found in my NASB!

Gee wizz....

Yes but the KJV folks would not know that they don't read the NASB. :-P

Now what did my Dad use to call folks that would do something like that? nevermind. :-P

Re:, on: 2008/7/4 15:04

What is the big deal about all of this- **Which Version?** Shall we all just rely on the Holy Spirit that lives within us, and just throw out our Bibles? We are told that they all contain error, and are not the Absolute Word of God. The Word of God can only be found in the original autographs, but we no longer have them and the text we have now, today, has been corrupted. What are we to do?

The important question that each of us must ask ourselves—Is there a difference in the presentation of Bible Doctrine between the Majority text and the Minority text?. **On this thread I Previously posted Bible Doctrine (teaching) about the “the Seed of the woman”**. This is important doctrine because it is the first prophecy found in the Bible, given by God Himself about a coming redeemer, the “Seed of the woman” that would vanquish Satan and redeem fallen man to God. This same “seed” continues throughout the Old Testament, **and becomes the “seed” of Abraham and the seed of David.**Of course, we all know that women do not have seed, men have seed. With that in mind, let's look at the First Prophecy I posted:

15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

I used the **Majority text**, the King James to present this teaching. If I was to use the **Minority text**, found in the majority of the newer versions of the Bible, **what would I find? Would I find this prophecy intact? Would it make sense, so that I could follow this Prophecy of a coming Savior that continues throughout the Old Testament?**

Again, each of us has to decide.

The following is from the Minority text, as found in the **NIV: 15. And I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel.**

The teaching of the coming Messiah, the seed of the woman is missing. Why?

The New Jerusalem Bible (Catholic bible), also derived from the Minority text says the same thing: 15. I shall put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; it will bruise your head and you will strike its heel.

The teaching of the coming Messiah, the seed of the woman is missing. Why?

The New American Standard, also derived from the Minority text says: 15. and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

If I quote the Living Bible, also the Minority text, what does it say?: 15. From now on you and the woman will be enemies, as will your offspring and hers. You will strike his heel, but he will crush your head."

The teaching of the coming Messiah, the seed of the woman is missing. Why?

The Revised Standard, again that relies on the Minority text has this to say: 15. I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel."

The New American Bible, the Minority text says: 15. I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; He will strike at your head, while you strike at his heel."

The teaching of the coming Messiah, the seed of the woman is missing. Why?

The New Revised Standard, the Minority text , says: "15. I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will strike your head, and you will strike his heel."

The teaching of the coming Messiah, the seed of the woman is missing. Why?

Youngs Bible, says:

15. and enmity I put between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he doth bruise thee - the head, and thou dost bruise him - the heel.'

Darby's Bible, **that uses the Majority text and the Minority text** has this to say:

15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall crush thy head, and thou shalt crush his heel.

New Living Testament, the **Minority Text** has this to say:

15. From now on, you and the woman will be enemies, and your offspring and her offspring will be enemies. He will crush your head, and you will strike his heel."

The teaching of the coming Messiah, the seed of the woman is missing. Why?

The Literal bible, with Vertical Strongs, has this to say:

15.

[0342] And hostility [7896] I will put [0996] between you
[0996] and [0802] the woman, [0996] and between
[2233] your seed [0996] and [2233] her seed.
[1931] He [7779] will bruise you {in} [7218] the head,
[0859] and you [7779] will bruise him [6119] {at} the
heel. [0413] to

The World English Bible:

“3:15 I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and her offspring. He will bruise your head, and you will bruise his heel.”

The teaching of the coming Messiah, the seed of the woman is missing. Why?

In conclusion, it is obvious that the first Prophecy of the coming Messiah is found in the Majority text, the Authorized Version, the King James. In the Minority text we find the problem. In some versions the Prophecy can be found in its entirety, and in most it is missing.

Since this is the first, and most important prophecy, that is recorded in the Majority text every time, shouldn't we rely on the Majority text, the KJV for study and internalization (bringing God's Word from our heads to our hearts) of God's Word?

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/4 15:21

walter,

I'm sorry if this sounds rude, as it is not meant to be, but are you deliberately being ignorant? The "majority" and "minority" text has nothing to do with the Hebrew scriptures. The Hebrew scriptures, even in the newer translations, come mostly from the Masoretic texts. The issue of "majority" vs "minority" texts has only to do entirely with the Greek manuscripts, not the Hebrew.

This has already been mentioned several times on this thread. It seems you simply do not care what anybody has to say.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/4 16:09

Quote:

-----KingJimmy wrote:

It seems you simply do not care what anybody has to say.

My guess would be he don't have any patent on that here. :-P

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/7/4 16:32

Just to add something real quick, I have seen people mention a few times something along the lines of "it is up to each person to individually decide". That is individualistic nonsense. This is the Scripture we are talking about. The church of God needs to be able to stand firmly on an accurate and faithful transmission of God's word to us. We need to seriously consider what is the most accurate translation available to us in English.

KingJimmy,

In your studies of the Scripture texts, did you study any about the Reformation period and the Reformers view of Scripture and the Romish response? I know that one of the Romish arguments were that the Scripture had textual variants and could not be trusted; therefore, the church (pope) is the true interpreter of Scripture. However, the Reformers (Beza, later Puritan followers) stated that the texts they were using were the pure and preserved Scriptures. If you have studied this at all, what did you think about it?

Re:, on: 2008/7/4 16:42

Hello, King Jimmy:

Perhaps another way to word it would be this way: The newer Bible versions, produced since 1881 have not all accurately translated the Hebrew Text in the Old Testament in regards to the first major prophecy, given by God, about the "Seed of the woman." In fact, **only a very limited number of the Newer Versions**, created by the Textual Critics and Bible Scholars who have created these newer versions, have been able to translate Genesis 3:15 correctly.

I do understand that the newer Bible versions, produced since 1881 have all relied on the Minority text when presenting the New Testament.

I find it interesting, that the same men who had trouble understanding that God was referring to the "seed of the woman", because, of course women do not have seed, and because of their "eclectic" approach to Scripture, found it necessary to choose the variant text that went along with their human understanding about the seed being the "progeny" of Eve. It had nothing to do with Eve, and everything to do with the supernatural, all powerful, all knowing God of the Universe who is in the business of creating miracles. The miracle in this case is that a virgin would conceive, and not be impregnated in the natural way by a man, but in the supernatural way by the Holy Ghost. And the man born this way, **The Seed of the Woman**, would be the God Man, Christ Jesus, who would live a sinless life, be persecuted for my sins, placed on cross to die for my sins, and resurrect from the dead, in order that all who believe in Him are saved from their sin, brought upon us by Adam, and will live with Him forever in new, glorified resurrected bodies, just like His own.

That is reason enough for me to question everything else the "eclectics" have to say.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:
walter,

I'm sorry if this sounds rude, as it is not meant to be, but are you deliberately being ignorant? The "majority" and "minority" text has nothing to do with the Hebrew scriptures. The Hebrew scriptures, even in the newer translations, come mostly from the Masoretic texts. The issue of "majority" vs "minority" texts has only to do entirely with the Greek manuscripts, not the Hebrew.

This has already been mentioned several times on this thread. It seems you simply do not care what anybody has to say.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/4 17:08

Hi waltern...

Quote:

I find it interesting, that the same men who had trouble understanding that God was referring to the "seed of the woman", because, of course women do not have seed, and because of their "eclectic" approach to Scripture, found it necessary to choose the variant text that went along with their human understanding about the seed being the "progeny" of Eve. It had nothing to do with Eve, and everything to do with the supernatural, all powerful, all knowing God of the Universe who is in the business of creating miracles. The miracle in this case is that a virgin would conceive, and not be impregnated in the natural way by a man, but in the supernatural way by the Holy Ghost. And the man born this way, The Seed of the Woman, would be the God Man, Christ Jesus, who would live a sinless life, be persecuted for my sins, placed on cross to die for my sins, and resurrect from the dead, in order that all who believe in Him are saved from their sin, brought upon us by Adam, and will live with Him forever in new, glorified resurrected bodies, just like His own.

That is reason enough for me to question everything else the "eclectics" have to say.

I "dare" you to find a person who can translate your paragraph above into Spanish WITHOUT using an "eclectic" approach. It would be IMPOSSIBLE to translate something that could be understood without such an approach. Some words just do not have a dynamic equivalent when being translated from one language to another. While the modern translators acknowledge this need, the translators of the KJV, etc... used a similar approach without calling it "eclectic."

Don't believe me? Try getting a missionary or scholar that you know to translate your paragraph into Spanish. Then find another person to do the same. Then another. Then get a Spanish dictionary and translate each word separately. You will quickly find that none of these paragraphs will say the exact same thing!

Just something to chew on...

:-)

By the way, I mean "eclectic" in the sense that they will have to choose various dictionaries and words in which to translate this single paragraph (rather than using different paragraphs to translate). It is all a part of the eclectic type of translation process.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/4 17:32

Perhaps another way to word it would be this way: The newer Bible versions, produced since 1881 have not all accurately translated the Hebrew Text

There is a world of difference between the output of one's translation of a text, and the text itself. Being that I don't know Hebrew, although aware of some controversies (e.g. Isaiah 7), I am not really in a place to judge the quality of the translations of other men.

However, be that as it may, being aware of those controversies, I can definitely see how men might conclude some things that they have about why they translated a word one way or another. Indeed, some translators seem to possibly have made some errors. Did they do so on purpose? Perhaps? Being that most of these men are dead, such a thing is difficult to conclude without reading any written record as to why they translated something the way they did. The "better" scholarly commentaries are often a good source of information on controversies over translation issues, as they often wrangle with the original texts themselves, and provide their own translations.

Whatever the case, even if they made a poor translation, that doesn't mean their text was poor. Nor is there any "guilt by association" here. Just because one translation wasn't very good doesn't automatically make other translations from the same texts bad. In regard to textual criticism and translation, each decision regarding a variant and each translation of each verse must stand on its own merits for each decision. Overall, one might consider each version excellent/great/good/acceptable/bad/just plain wrong.

That is reason enough for me to question everything else the "eclectics" have to say.

Such is a dangerous and unfair view to have. "Eclectics" are found in the most horrible liberal camps, but they are also found in godly conservative evangelical camps. Furthermore, just because they may or may not understand all the teachings of Scripture doesn't mean we should toss their works away. Indeed, men could be outstanding translators and textual critics, but poor theologians. Should we damn Martin Luther's works just because he was far off on many things?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/4 17:45

In your studies of the Scripture texts, did you study any about the Reformation period and the Reformers' view of Scripture and the Romish response? I know that one of the Romish arguments were that the Scripture had textual variants and could not be trusted; therefore, the church (pope) is the true interpreter of Scripture. However, the Reformers (Beza, later Puritan followers) stated that the texts they were using were the pure and preserved Scriptures. If you have studied this at all, what did you think about it?

I'm sorry, I haven't studied much in regard to the controversies in textual criticism from the Reformation period. I imagine since Rome had such a high theology regarding its right to interpret Scripture, they made whatever arguments they could to undermine the right of others to interpret Scripture, or at least cast doubt upon the doctrine of sola Scriptura.

However, I am more familiar with the contemporary arguments of some who say we should stick to the majority text because it was the text of the Reformation. As great as that makes it historically speaking, such doesn't make it right just because Luther, Calvin, and others used it. Indeed, I know of no doctrine that was crucial towards the cause of the Reformation that couldn't have been found in the minority texts. As it stands, no doubt, each of the Reformers made usage of many different manuscripts over their years. Who knows for sure what text they had in their hands at any given time. We can be sure though, that whatever text they had, none were exactly the same. For there are differences between texts even in the majority texts.

Re:, on: 2008/7/4 18:44

King Jimmy said this about Martin Luther:

“Should we damn Martin Luther's works just because he was far off on many things?

My response:

We all know that men don't have the same grasp of Scripture, and all men have prejudices. One of Luther's prejudices was his hatred of the Jews, God's chosen people. However, when he went about in his translation of both the New Testament and later the Old Testament, **he did not change the Scripture to go along with this hatred.** He had the ultimate love and respect for God's Word, and never added to it, nor subtracted from it.

We are all commanded to do just that. In the last Book of His Bible, the Lord Jesus Commands us:

"18. I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: if anyone adds to them, God will add to him the plagues which are written in this book; 19. and if anyone takes away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God will take away his part from the tree of life and from the holy city, which are written in this book. 20. He who testifies to these things says, "Yes, I am coming quickly." Amen. Come, Lord Jesus. 21. The grace of the Lord Jesus be with all. Amen.

Luther's Mantra was Solo Scriptura:

Sola scriptura was a foundational doctrinal principle of the Protestant Reformation held by the reformer Martin Luther and is a formal principle of Protestants today. It may be contrasted with Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Anglican, and Oriental Orthodox teaching in which doctrine is taught by the teaching authority of the church, drawing on the "Deposit of Faith" and based on what they consider to be Sacred Tradition, of which the Bible is a subset.

Only men like these (Martin Luther) should be allowed to even be involved with this type of work.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

King Jimmy wrote:

Perhaps another way to word it would be this way: The newer Bible versions, produced since 1881 have not all accurately translated the Hebrew Text

There is a world of difference between the output of one's translation of a text, and the text itself. Being that I don't know Hebrew, although aware of some controversies (e.g. Isaiah 7), I am not really in a place to judge the quality of the translations of other men.

However, be that as it may, being aware of those controversies, I can definitely see how men might conclude some things that they have about why they translated a word one way or another. Indeed, some translators seem to possibly have made some errors. Did they do so on purpose? Perhaps? Being that most of these men are dead, such a thing is difficult to conclude without reading any written record as to why they translated something the way they did. The "better" scholarly commentaries are often a good source of information on controversies over translation issues, as they often wrangle with the original texts themselves, and provide their own translations.

Whatever the case, even if they made a poor translation, that doesn't mean their text was poor. Nor is there any "guilt by association" here. Just because one translation wasn't very good doesn't automatically make other translations from the same texts bad. In regard to textual criticism and translation, each decision regarding a variant and each translation of each verse must stand on its own merits for each decision. Overall, one might consider each version excellent/great/good/acceptable/bad/just plain wrong.

That is reason enough for me to question everything else the "eclectics" have to say.

Such is a dangerous and unfair view to have. "Eclectics" are found in the most horrible liberal camps, but they are also found in godly conservative evangelical camps. Furthermore, just because they may or may not understand all the teachings of Scripture doesn't mean we should toss their works away. Indeed, men could be outstanding translators and textual critics, but poor theologians. Should we damn Martin Luther's works just because he was as far off on many things?

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/4 19:21

Hi Brethren,

Who is the author of confusion? We know it is not God.

There will be disagreements on this until Jesus comes back. We need to realize that all translating is subject to some error but the word of God is never in error. I hope we could all agree that the scriptures authorized by God are correct. I believe that an authorized version given by God through men to all languages of people would be great.

But this is not what we have, we have over 25 different versions and the devil loves to have it so and loves for us to fight over them and also he loves to water down the word, make it unreliable, have people confused, and because he doesn't want us know the truth which is a person (Jesus).

Here are some thoughts that I have thought about concerning this dilemma among God's Children concerning different versions.

Wouldn't it have been better if there was only one Authorized Version which was the original words of the apostles handed down to us without any copying errors?

Wouldn't it also have been better if the scholars of King James day had stuck with the name Authorized Version instead of KJV?

Wouldn't it also have been better if all the people had enough of the fear of God in them when they decided to study and rightly translate the word that they would have stayed true to the original manuscripts and kept it named the authorized version and not have several other copyright versions. God should have the only copyright to his Word and we will see who has the final say about that. I don't think anybody going to argue with God about their copyright versions.

Wouldn't it also had been great if the Authorized Version was the bible that was proof read over and over to correct error, along with the manuscripts it had been translated from, instead of using the two manuscripts they used in around 1900 when all of these modern versions started with all their copyright laws, to the English of our day.

Some conclusions, the main problem started when they found two manuscripts that were older so they must be more reliable. How can we know for sure? Every modern translation of our day, except the NKJV, relies mainly on a different set of manuscripts than the KJV (should have been AV) and they all have one thing in common, they are all copyrighted.

So here we go, one group has the fear that we have taken away from the word of God, another group has the fear we have added to the word of God, another group fears we have corrupted the word of God, it goes on and on.

Brethren I believe it is a serious thing to handle the word of God. We should study and rightly divide the word of truth. Commentary books, amplifying books, dictionaries, other spiritual books are ok in our study but when we translate 25 different versions and call them the bible is why we're in a dilemma until Jesus comes back.

I know a missionary who read the niv before he got saved but now relies more on the KJV. I know others because they can understand the modern versions better they rely on one of them. No matter what version one reads whether it is altogether correct on every verse or not, the basic truth of salvation can be found in Jesus Christ and thank God for that. Our salvation is in Jesus Christ no matter what version you read and truth still comes from Him.

Your opinion may be different than mine and we can still both be saved but I am one of those who fear that the modern translations of the newer versions are treading on dangerous waters when their main objective is to try and make it more understanding to the masses and call it the bible, therefore I believe they have watered down the Word of God. The true way to understand scripture is by the Holy Spirit living on the inside of the one reading the word. The Letters in the bible were written to believers.

I believe one must have a literal word for word translation for a proper foundation along with any of these other versions. Therefore if one totally relies on a version (ex. Niv) that is not word for word then he is relying on the thoughts of the translators. Some of the thoughts are interpreted correctly but we know that every thought will not be totally correct because of the lack of divine inspiration.

Now we look at the two most popular word for word (KJV & NASB). Sadly, the KJV has not been updated for the 20th century; except for the NKJV which did consult other manuscripts other than the one's used in the KJV. But I have noticed that all the scriptures seem to be there that are in the KJV.

So let's narrow it down to the two most popular (word for word) translations of our day.

The KJV & NASB are the one's many will tell you are the most literal. But I believe one of these has an unfair advantage over the other. The NASB was updated from the ASV which supposedly was to take the place of the KJV for better reading. The problem is the manuscripts the ASV used caused them to leave out verses and words that were in the KJV. The NASB is better reading because of the update but the problems still lie in the fact of translating correctly. Now we are told for over two hundred years we have had words and scriptures we should not have had because they had been added.

Let me say this, it grieves my heart the way the KJV only advocates have displayed themselves. I am not a KJV only advocate. I believe the bible should be called the Authorized Version and not be copyrighted. Some are going to lean one way or another according to their convictions. I say to anyone ready to throw out the KJV (AV) for the NASB I would only hope your convictions are based on your fear of God in never tampering with His word who said we would never be without His word. Your convictions must be that for over two hundred years God was hoping for somebody to please find those two oldest manuscripts so the word of God that people believe they have can be corrected.

But if you study other versions with the KJV (AV) it only because you fear God and you know his word should not be changed or taken away from and the only reason you use any additional helps is because you know that no one has really updated the KJV (AV) to the Language of our day.

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2008/7/4 19:55

I enjoyed your post rbanks. Many good points but I would like to put forth a point or two of my own. This is not in direct reply to you brother rbanks...just tossing it out there.

Quote:
-----I am one of those who fear that the modern translations of the newer versions are treading on dangerous waters when their main objective is to try and make it more understanding to the masses and call it the bible, therefore I believe they have watered down the Word of God.

I wonder how many people shared this very concern back in 1611 when that newfangled King James Version came out. The KJV translators themselves said they were attempting to put it in more modern and understandable language. I think most of them would have advocated a new translation if they were still alive.

I use the ESV most of the time but I must admit...I frequently check out the KJV. I doubt I will ever totally abandon it...raised on it and all. Plus I kinda dig old school English. I am also a big fan of parallel Bibles.

Grace and Peace

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/4 20:18

Great! statement rbanks, but only one problem with what you said, it would be one less disagreement us Christians would have to bicker about and that would not be good, see some of us if we didn't have anything to bicker about or disagree on, we would look like a Deer in the headlights of a car. :-)

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/4 20:24

Quote:

tjservant wrote:

I enjoyed your post rbanks. Many good points but I would like to put forth a point or two of my own. This is not in direct reply to you brother rbanks...just tossing it out there.

Quote:

-----I am one of those who fear that the modern translations of the newer versions are treading on dangerous waters when their main objective is to try and make it more understanding to the masses and call it the bible, therefore I believe they have watered down the Word of God.

I wonder how many people shared this very concern back in 1611 when that newfangled King James Version came out. The KJV translators themselves said they were attempting to put it in more modern and understandable language. I think most of them would have advocated a new translation if they were still alive.

Thanks TJ,

I agree! When I was writing that part on my post I should have explained it a little differently maybe.

Although the main objective shouldn't be to understand better, it still should be close to the main objective of course, but not at the sake of losing the richness of the pure word of God and cause us to lose the fullness of the meaning.

Which would still require us to dig deeper into the word of God because his word is not our words, but much higher.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/4 21:55

Hi rbanks...

Just a few responses to your post:

1. The King James Version isn't copyrighted here in the United States. However, I believe that it is copyrighted in the United Kingdom.
2. The King James Version of the Bible is not a word-for-word translation. Like anything that is translated from one language into another, the Bible translators needed to consider which words would be best representative of the languages from which they came. This can be a tricky thing...and we already know that the translators of the KJV were required to use the Bishop's Bible as a basis (along with some of the traditional historical language that supported the hierarchy of the Church of England). They also had to align the translated words to the vernacular structure of the early 17th Century English language.
3. Finally, the King James Version is not perfect. It was revised quite a few times between 1611 (when it was first published) and the current edition finished in about 1850. This is in addition to the extensive revisions made during the translation process. Don't forget: The original 1611 KJV even contained the books of the Apocrypha! Subsequent editions re

moved them at the bequest of the authorities of the Church of England.

I suggest to anyone who is an advocate of any version of the Bible: Research the history of the translation. It is difficult to claim that the KJV is entirely out of the original tongues when the New Testament is based upon a source that was translated by one man (a Dutch Catholic/humanist named Erasmus) while the translators were strictly instructed to maintain the language that would support the king and his "authorized" church.

As much as I enjoy the KJV of the Word of God, I realize that it is not entirely perfect. The translators themselves admitted this upon its completion. As I indicated earlier, there are some places in which two passages saying the same thing get the facts incorrect. This might very well be due to the fact that it was like that in the Textus Receptus, Bishop's Bible or other sources used for the KJV.

The important thing is that we realize that God's Word is perfect...even if the best translations might still fall a bit short. That is why prayer and study is so vital with the Word of God. It isn't that we can't trust the words of any version...but that we must understand that there might be a variation of the same passage from one version to the other that might have gotten it right. That is why I advocate looking at as many versions as possible.

Until one of us have a firsthand copy of the Epistles of Paul, the Gospels or any other book/letter—we are forced to realize that these were handed down, copied, and recopied over and over again until they ended up into the hands of the earliest sources now available.

:-)

Re: NASB or NKJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/4 22:33

Quote:

-----We all know that men don't have the same grasp of Scripture, and all men have prejudices. One of Luther's prejudices was his hatred of the Jews, God's chosen people.

Libel Against Luther

Similarly, the great German Reformer, **Martin Luther**, continues to be slandered to this day. Whole websites are dedicated to depicting Luther as an anti-Semite who laid the foundations for the holocaust!

The accusation that Martin Luther was an anti-Semite, responsible for massacres, reveals an ignorance of history. Luther was pro-Christ and he was zealous in evangelism. For decades he lovingly and patiently reached out to the Jewish people in his area with the Gospel. In 1523, Luther accused Catholics of being unfair to Jews in treating them "as if they were dogs". Luther was outraged and declared that such mistreatment made it even more difficult for Jews to convert to Christ.

Luther wrote *"I would request and advise that one deal gently with the Jews...if we really want to help them, we must be guided in our dealings with them, not by papal law, but by the Law of Christian love. We must receive them cordially, and permit them to trade and work with us, hear our Christian teaching and witness our Christian life. If some of them should prove stiff-necked, what of it? After all, we ourselves are not all good Christians either."*

Fifteen years later, however, the persistent rejection of Christ and repeated blasphemies of those Jewish people in his community, provoked Luther to write: **"On the Jews and their Lies."** In this pamphlet, Luther wrote against the *"madness and blindness that blasphemes Christ"* in the Rabbinic teachings. Luther declared that he could not *"have any fellowship or patience with obstinate blasphemers and those who defame our dear Saviour."* These blasphemies included describing our Lord Jesus Christ as *"the bastard son"* of *"that whore Mary"*, and even worse. Blasphemy was a civil crime. Luther taught that to tolerate such blasphemy was to share in the guilt for it. Therefore, he proposed measures of *"sharp mercy"* which included confiscating all Jewish literature which was blasphemous and prohibiting Rabbis to teach such blasphemy.

However, to quote these reactions of Luther without explaining their local context of opposing the repeated blasphemies of Jewish individuals in his community and then to project guilt for the continent-wide, anti-Christian holocaust of World War II upon the great 16th Century Reformer is ludicrous. How can any Christian Reformer of the 16th Century be blamed

ed for the evils perpetrated by humanists (who clearly rejected his teachings) nearly 400 years after his death!

Hitler was a disciple of Nietzsche (the philosopher who declared: "God is dead") - not Luther. Luther was not an anti-Semite. His arguments against Jewish individuals were theological, not biological or cultural. He was speaking out against blasphemy and heresy, not opposing an entire race or nation of people.

It is most disturbing that such a humble and God fearing man, who, against all odds, gave to the church and the world the Bible, freely available in the common tongue; who introduced congregational singing; championed justification by God's Grace, received by faith, on the basis of the finished work of Christ; who stood for sola Scriptura - that Scripture alone is the ultimate authority; and who was so wonderfully used of the Lord to bring about the greatest Biblical Reformation and birth of freedom that the world had ever known, could be the target of such vicious slander.

The Scriptures implore us: ***"Brothers, do not slander one another. Anyone who speaks against his brother or judges him speaks against the Law and judges it."*** James 4:11

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id24040&forum34&post_id&refreshGo) When All Men Speak Well of You ~ Hammond

Quote:

-----NASB or NKJV??

Which is your favorite version? I mostly read and study from the NASB, however, lately I have been liking the NKJV. Some of the words used in the NKJV have a stronger thought emphasize. Of course that is personal opinion.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/4 22:38

Quote:

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi rbanks...

Just a few responses to your post:

1. The King James Version isn't copyrighted here in the United States. However, I believe that it is copyrighted in the United Kingdom.
2. The King James Version of the Bible is not a word-for-word translation. Like anything that is translated from one language into another, the Bible translators needed to consider which words would be best representative of the languages from which they came. This can be a tricky thing...and we already know that the translators of the KJV were required to use the Bishop's Bible as a basis (along with some of the traditional historical language that supported the hierarchy of the Church of England). They also had to align the translated words to the vernacular structure of the early 17th Century English language.
3. Finally, the King James Version is not perfect. It was revised quite a few times between 1611 (when it was first published) and the current edition finished in about 1850. This is in addition to the extensive revisions made during the translation process. Don't forget: The original 1611 KJV even contained the books of the Apocrypha! Subsequent editions removed them at the bequest of the authorities of the Church of England.

correct on copyright - the only place where it is copyrighted is in the UK, could be because of the King James name which I have stated should have been named the Authorized Version.

I have clarified about the errors in translating and have stated that no version is perfect.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/4 23:13

Hi rbanks...

Quote:

correct on copyright - the only place where it is copyrighted is in the UK, could be because of the King James name which I have stated should have been named the Authorized Version.

Actually, I believe that the Bishop's Bible was the "authorized version" between 1611 until about 1614 (when the official Church of England began recognizing the King James Version as the official translation of the official Church of England). I'm not sure where I read this, but I'll try to find it if I can.

Personally, I don't like the word "authorized." Who exactly authorized the translation? A less-than-ideal king named James the First. I've never been a citizen of the United Kingdom nor a member of the Church of England. Besides, I don't know how much such an authorization is worth coming from a corrupt king and church.

But I agree that the title "King James Version" doesn't adequately explain the version. Perhaps it should have been called *The Translation Authorized by King James and the Church of England in 1611?*

Just a funny thought.

:-)

By the way, thank you for your gracious post and responses. If possible, could you elaborate upon the reason that you want to call it the Authorized Version? Is it because you desire to distance it from the King or because you see it as the authorized edition for the Church of England?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/4 23:26

And in case if anybody wonders, my nickname on here, KingJimmy, isn't a stance on the KJV! It's a name I received in Bible college. I was a young(er) pup then, having only been a Christian a couple years, and didn't have a very good ability to quote the Scriptures. So, sometimes I would be debating a professor or classmate, and I would loosely quote a Scripture. Being that most of my classmates were men with many years in the pastorate already under their belt, they would blurt out "What translation is that from?" To which one day I whimsically replied "The King Jimmy Version!" And from that day, one of the students began frequently calling me "King Jimmy!" :-)

Re:, on: 2008/7/4 23:29

Changes to the King James Bible

ccchhrrriiisss had this to say:

"It was revised quite a few times between 1611 (when it was first published) and the current edition finished in about 1850. This is in addition to the extensive revisions made during the translation process. Don't forget: The original 1611 KJV even contained the books of the Apocrypha! Subsequent editions removed them at the bequest of the authorities of the Church of England"

I continue to hear this statement, made over and over. Is it a true statement? Is it a fact? Or is it just a statement made, that twists the facts to a pre-determined end? What exactly are all of these changes that Ccchhrrriiisss has mentioned, and continues to mention? Are they substantial changes that **affect Doctrine**, or are they **cosmetic, and grammar changes, that had nothing to do with Doctrine?** I hold the second point of view, **based upon fact, not supposition and innuendo.**

The following information was derived from the following reference material:

The King James Version of 1611, The Myth of Early Revisions, David F. Reagan, Pastor of Trinity Baptist Temple, Knoxville, TN.). Dr. Reagan utilized data from F.H.A. Scrivener's The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611), 1884. Dr. Scrivener was a conservative and member of the 1881 Revision Committee.

Also McClure, *The Translators Revived*, op. cit., p. 194 -200

Herman C. Hoskier, "The Authorized Version of 1611", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 68; (October, 1911), pp. 693-704.

It is continuously asserted that the King James Bible has been revised four times in the past. **This is offered as proof that no valid objection should be forthcoming to continued revision and endless new translations.** The reality is that there have been several editions of the text **but no revisions have been made.**

The printing press was invented in 1450 by the German Johann Gutenberg. Although this was 161 years before the 1611 KJB edition, the printing apparatus had changed very little. The type was set by hand, one character at a time. The process was quite slow, difficult and tedious, hence frequent errors resulted in all publications.

The first edition of the King James also contained such printing errors, **but these were not the kind of textual alterations which freely occur in modern versions.** These were obvious and simple printing oversights. The second printing published later in 1611 corrected about 100 such textual differences.

Of course, such errors do not render a Bible or any other book worthless— they merely need to be removed in subsequent editions.

The first two alleged "major revisions" of the King James Bible took place within 27 years of its first edition. The 1629 edition was but a careful correction of earlier printing errors. Only nine years later, a second so-called major revision was distributed. **Dr. Samuel Ward and John Bois, two of the original translators, participated in both of these undertakings. However F.H.A. Scrivener describes this as merely being a reinstatement of words, phrases and clauses overlooked by the 1611 printers— thereby amending these errors. Thus, 72% of the approximately 400 textual corrections in the KJB were completed by 1638. Hence, we find that instead of two major revisions, there were two stages of a single process— namely, the purging of early printing errors. Similarly, the last two "major revisions" were but two stages in standardizing the spelling. Very few textual corrections were necessary for these two publications (1762 and 1769). Thus, the term "four major revisions" is a misnomer, and as such, is grossly misleading.**

Much is made by the detractors of the KJB claiming as many as 75,000 changes in the King James Bible since 1611. At first glance, this does seem to be a problem. However, before citing examples, the reader is enjoined to keep in mind that the real issue at hand is that of final authority.

Further, the reader needs to be appraised that the original King James Bible is very different in appearance than those published today. Were one to go to a museum to view an original, he would find that he could hardly read it. Indeed, many of the words that were legible would be strangely spelled. The changes fall into three categories (1) printing changes, (2) spelling changes and (3) textual changes.

The printing type used for the original edition was Gothic. The type style or font that the reader has before him and that with which he is familiar is Roman. Although the Roman type style originated fairly early, Gothic had been the predominant form for many years in most European countries. The printers of the original King James chose the Gothic because of its beauty and eloquence. Several of the letters are noticeably different in appearance.

The Gothic "s" looks like the Roman "s" when used as a capital letter or at the end of a word, but when it occurs as a lower case "s" at the beginning or in the middle of a word, the letter looks similar to our "f". Over 30,000 changes were of this kind, as in *Mofes* to *Moses*. The Gothic "v" looks like a Roman "u" and vice versa. Now we can see why our "w" is called a "double-u" rather than "double-v". The "v" was changed to "u" 45,281 times (i.e., *Dauid* to *David*, *wiues* to *wives*, *vnto* to *unto*). The Gothic "j" looks like our "i", hence *Iudah* becomes *Judah*, *iudged* to *judged* etc. Remember, these are not spelling changes— they are simply type style changes. These changes reflect a large percentage of the "thousands" of alterations in the KJB, but obviously such modifications do not corrupt or in any way harm the actual text.

As to the changes in orthography (spelling), most histories date the beginning of Modern English around 1500. Hence, by 1611 the grammatical structure and basic vocabulary of present day English had already been firmly established. However, the spelling did not stabilize at the same time. In the 1600's spelling was largely phonetic as standards had not yet been established. Even among the well educated, an author would spell the same word several different ways, often in the same book and even on the same page. It was not until the eighteenth century that spelling began to be uniform. Therefore, in the last half of that century, the spelling of the 1611 KJB was standardized.

Over 30,000 additional changes involved dropping the final "e" off of the old English spellings such as— *sunne* to *sun*, *f*

owle to fowl, goe to go, shee to she, nowe to now etc. Double vowels and double consonants were more common such as mee to me and ranne to ran. **Other changes included ffarres to stars, ynough to enough, moneth to month, yeres to years grinne to grin; flying to fleeing; needed to sneezed etc.**

These typographical and spelling changes account for almost all of the so-called "thousands" of alterations since 1611. Obviously none of them can be truly said to in any way alter the text. Thus they cannot honestly be compared with the thousands of actual textual changes which blatantly appear in the modern versions. The significance of this simply cannot be overstated.

As to the actual textual differences between the 1611 edition and our present editions, there are some variations – but they are not of the magnitude of a revision. Rather, they are merely the correction of early obvious printing errors. They are not textual changes made to alter the reading. This may be readily ascertained by (a) the character of the changes; (b) the frequency of the changes throughout the Bible; and (c) the time the changes were made.

In the first printing, words were occasionally inverted. A plural may have been in singular form or vice versa, and at times a word was mis-written for one that was similar. A few times a word or even a phrase was inadvertently omitted. The omissions were obvious and did not portray the doctrinal implications of those found in modern translations.

Dr. F.H.A. Scrivener compiled a list of the variations between the 1611 edition and later printings. A random sampling giving the first textual correction on consecutive left hand pages is depicted in the following chart.

1611 Reading	Present Reading	Corrected
1 this thing	this thing also	1638
2 shalt have remained	ye shall have remained	1762
3 Achzib, nor Helbath, nor Aphik of Achzib, nor of Helbath, nor of Aphik		1762
4 requite good	requite me good	1629
5 this book of the Covenant	the book of this Covenant	1629
6chief rulers	chief ruler	1629
7And Parbar At Parbar		1638
8For this cause	And for this cause	1638
9 For the king had appointed for so the king had appointed		1629
10Seek good	seek God	1617
11The cormorant	But the cormorant	1629
12returned	turned	1769
13a fiery furnace	a burning fiery furnace	1638
14The crowned Thy	crowned	1629
15thy right doeth thy right hand doeth		1613
16 the wayes side the way side		1743
17 which was a Jew	which was a Jewess	1629
18 the city	the city of the Damascenes	1629
19 now and ever both now and ever		1638
20 which was of our fathers	which was our fathers	1616

Only one --(#10) has serious doctrinal implications. Here, the 1611 reading of Psalm 69:32 has "seek good" where the correct reading should be "seek God". But the spelling similarity of the words "good" and "God" reveal the problem to be merely that of a weary type setter's having misread the proof. This error was so obvious that it was caught and corrected in 1617, only six years after the first printing and well before the first so-called 1629 revision. **Dr. David Reagan reports (p. 11) that his examination of Scrivener's entire appendix resulted in this as being the only doctrinal variation.**

Both the character and the frequency of the changes disclose them to be but printing oversights. Yet scholars, even fundamental conservatives, refer to the thousands of modifications made to the 1611 over the years as if they were on a par with the changes in recent versions. They are not.

Again, the overwhelming majority is either type style or spelling changes. The few that remain are clearly corrections of printing errors made due to the tedious nature involved in the early printing process

Sincerely,

Walter

P.S. I truly apologize for not researching the truth about Luther. I heard that many years ago, and have heard it repeated many times, but never checked it out for sure. Now I know the truth, and I ask the Lord for forgiveness.

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:
Hi rbanks...

Just a few responses to your post:

1. The King James Version isn't copyrighted here in the United States. However, I believe that it is copyrighted in the United Kingdom.
2. The King James Version of the Bible is not a word-for-word translation. Like anything that is translated from one language into another, the Bible translators needed to consider which words would be best representative of the languages from which they came. This can be a tricky thing...and we already know that the translators of the KJV were required to use the Bishop's Bible as a basis (along with some of the traditional historical language that had supported the hierarchy of the Church of England). They also had to align the translated words to the vernacular structure of the early 17th Century English language.
3. Finally, the King James Version is not perfect. It was revised quite a few times between 1611 (when it was first published) and the current edition finished in about 1850. This is in addition to the extensive revisions made during the translation process. Don't forget: The original 1611 KJV even contained the books of the Apocrypha! Subsequent editions removed them at the bequest of the authorities of the Church of England.

:-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/5 0:26

I came across this interesting article about Luther's translation of the Bible. It is written by the infamous church historian, Phillip Schaff. Deep in the article it talks about the texts he used:

...
The basis for Luther's version of the Old Testament was the Massoretic text as published by Gerson Ben Mosheh at Brescia in 1494. (24) He used also the Septuagint, the Vulgate of Jerome (25) (although he disliked him exceedingly on account of his monkery), the Latin translations of the Dominican Sanctes Pagnini of Lucca (1527), and of the Franciscan Sebastian Münster (1534), the "Glossa ordinaria" (a favorite exegetical vade-mecum of Walafried Strabo from the ninth century), and Nicolaus Lyra (d. 1340), the chief of mediaeval commentators, who, besides the Fathers, consulted also the Jewish rabbis. (26)

1 John 5 in the edition of 1545
The basis for the New Testament was the second edition of Erasmus, published at Basel in Switzerland in 1519. (27) His first edition of the Greek Testament had appeared in 1516, just one year before the Reformation. He derived the text from a few mediaeval MSS. (28) The second edition, though much more correct than the first ("multo diligentius recognitum, emendatum," etc.), is disfigured by a large number of typographical errors. (29) He laid the foundation of the Textus Receptus, which was brought into its mature shape by R. Stephen, in his "royal edition" of 1550 (the basis of the English Textus Receptus), and by the Elzevirs in their editions of 1624 and 1633 (the basis of the Continental Textus Receptus), and which maintained the supremacy till Lachmann inaugurated the adoption of an older textual basis (1831).

Luther did not slavishly follow the Greek of Erasmus, and in many places conformed to the Latin Vulgate, which is based on an older text. He also omitted, even in his last edition, the famous interpolation of the heavenly witnesses in 1 John 5:7, which Erasmus inserted in his third edition (1522) against his better judgment....

(<http://www.bible-researcher.com/luther02.html>)

Interesting to see even how Luther left out 1 John 5:7. Seems Luther was somewhat of an eclectic himself.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/5 0:31

There was a major change after the 1611 version was "revised:" Entire books were missing. The so-called "intertestamental" books of the apocrypha. Those books, no doubt, make a HUGE difference in doctrine.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2008/7/5 1:06

Hi walter...

Quote:

I continue to hear this statement, made over and over. Is it a true statement? Is it a fact? Or is it just a statement made, that twists the facts to a pre-determined end? What exactly are all of these changes that Ccchhhrrriisss has mentioned, and continues to mention? Are they substantial changes that affect Doctrine, or are they cosmetic, and grammar changes, that had nothing to do with Doctrine?. I hold the second point of view, based upon fact, not supposition and innuendo.

There is no "hidden agenda" behind this statement (although I might wonder the same thing about those who are so ardently KJV-only). Like I also said before, most of the revisions between 1611 and 1850 were mostly minor (although some words were completely changed -- which you can find with a quick Google search and an examination between a 1611 edition and a current KJV). In fact, you can access photographs of some of the pages of the original first print edition of the KJV at several Archives, Library and Museum websites (just to make sure that the print or online 1611 editions were not altered). And of course, the KJV originally contained the Apocrypha too.

Why did I say all of this?

Your argument seems to be built upon the premise that the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God. You even stated that God preserved it well enough so that it was correct down to the last "dot and tittle." Well, obviously this is NOT the case! The KJV needed several revisions. Like you said, most of these were minor. But it certainly dispels any argument that the KJV was "perfect" -- at least between the years 1611 until the last extensive revision was finished nearly a 140 years later.

I might add that it would be helpful to read the translator's preface to the KJV. These were the guys who performed such a "perfect" translation. Within it, they admit that their work is NOT perfect. In fact, their notes indicate that they were sometimes in disagreement regarding the wording.

So, here are some things to remember concerning the KJV:

1. It was created as a result of complaints about the current "authorized version" of the Church of England -- the Bishop's Bible -- mostly coming from Puritans.
2. The Bishop's Bible was the basis upon which the KJV was built.
3. The translators were given strict, predetermined instructions regarding the inclusion of certain words and phrases.
4. When there were disagreements amongst the translators, the Church instructed them to follow the wording of the Bishop's Bible.
5. The New Testament of the KJV is taken from the Textus Receptus -- completed almost entirely by a single Dutch Catholic humanist named Erasmus (*EDIT - yes, I am aware that he had some differences with the Pope).
6. Information is available about the lifestyles and beliefs of some of the translators of the KJV (such as anti-puritan Richard Bancroft, who was the chief overseer of the KJV; anti-puritan George Abbot, a staunch advocate of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession; anti-baptist Daniel Featley; and most controversial, Lancelot Andrewes, who was a proponent of the Eucharist, Adoration, the Divine Right of Kings, and High Church ordinances).
7. The translators were not permitted by the Church of England to publish any footnotes or marginal notes (for either commentary or possible alternate renderings).
8. The KJV was not generally accepted for many years following its publication. At the time, the public and many of the

Anglican priesthood generally preferred the older Geneva Bible.

9. Many well-established textual scholars (such as Hugh Broughton) at first largely rejected the new translation and considered it "suspect" (sound familiar?) -- even issuing a formal condemnation for failing to present a "word-for-word" translation.

10. There are more ancient manuscripts available today than those that were used for the King James Version.

Now, this is not a "cheap shot" at the KJV. I still prefer it and respect it as one of the best and most readily available editions that were translated using Formal Equivalence with the New Testament taken from Erasmus' Textus Receptus. However, I just think that the idea that the King James Version of the Bible is an entirely "perfect" translation is in direct contradiction with the testimony of the translators. Not only did the Church of England need at least 140 years to correct "dot and tittle" errors -- but there are still a few errors in it today.

In the end, I don't think that there is a person alive who can claim with absolute certainty that the King James Version (or its sources) is absolutely superior to any other version. However, this is replayed over and over again. This debate has gone on for years at SI, with many of the KJV-only advocates quoting (or copying and pasting) the same biased sources. I think that we really need to look at these things objectively before we are so quick to spit upon or condemn one version or the other.

:-)

Re: Irony - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/5 9:31

Quote:
-----I continue to hear this statement, made over and over. Is it a true statement? Is it a fact? Or is it just a statement made, that twists the facts to a pre-determined end?

The irony and duplicity ...

Quote:
-----Your argument seems to be built upon the premise that the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God. You even stated that God preserved it well enough so that it was correct down to the last "dot and tittle." Well, obviously this is NOT the case!

Precisely, moreover ...

Neither did we think much to consult the Translators or Commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek or Latin, no nor the Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch; neither did we disdain to revise that which we had done, and to bring back to the anvil that which we had hammered: but having and using as great helps as were needful, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have at length, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that you see.

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id10811&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) Preface to the King James Version 1611

In their own words.

Quote:
-----P.S. I truly apologize for not researching the truth about Luther. I heard that many years ago, and have heard it repeated many times, but never checked it out for sure. Now I know the truth, and I ask the Lord for forgiveness.

I too had heard the same and heard the same repeated many times, it wasn't until happening upon these considerations that I had ever heard it differently. Seems to make a lot more sense of it all.

Take heed therefore how ye hear Luk 8:18

Re: What translators should we be most suspicious of? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/5 9:40

There is some insightful information here! Many thanks!

Regarding the translations debate someone once noted the tendency to compare the worst of the version one doesn't like and with the best of one's preferred translation. Of course, this is not scholarly. Unscholarly strategies often get employed in debates – in an attempt to defend a position. Let's also accept that the human mind works in such a way that once a belief is set in, the mind will automatically discard anything that is incompatible with it. We are not naturally objective creatures. (That should humble us all.)

I include here at least one point that should delight all of us here: The KJV interpretation of Acts 19:2 “Have you received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?” has been used by the Pentecostals to support their belief that receiving the Holy Spirit is an event distinct from and subsequent to believing in Christ. However, translators have since realized that the use of the aorist participle would more likely suggest: “Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?” (RSV) which has become essentially the position of recent translations.

Now, is this improvement a fluke? How would one know? Certainly not from those who are against modern translations!

But more seriously, I suspect that we are battling a spiritual issue, perhaps unbelief. In other words, not trusting the God of the word to preserve his revelation to humankind in such a way that it is meaningful to any cultures – including our present one – and yes, using fallible humans committed to him.

To discount the work of God in our modern day, and cling to the past blessing or traditions is an ever present danger. Has this tendency not helped preserve all kinds of religious positions over the centuries? It is also a sure way to miss the mighty works of God in our own time among our own people. And that is an unspeakable tragedy. That is how the Jews failed to recognize the Messiah in their midst!

Someone once pointed out that we are all translators. In other words, we digest what we read through the eyes of our world view. Thus the most likely translator to be in error could very well be ourselves – not the words we read!

Diane

Re:, on: 2008/7/5 10:57

Neither. The new translations are these abominable scriptures that add and take away from the Word of GOD!

Revelation 22:18-19:

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: 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.

We are trying to update the Word of God because we are so WEAK that we have to follow the WORLD. TO agree with the world is to agree with the devil-AN ENEMY OF THE MOST HIGH GOD!
This goes against the HOLY COMMANDMENT OF THE LORD GOD!

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's. We are envious of Jesus Christ, apostles, and prophets that is why we use OUR interpretations ONLY or MOSTLY.

Proverbs 20:23 says, "Divers weights are an abomination unto the LORD; and a false balance is not good." Proverbs 20:10 says, "Divers weights, and divers measures, both of them are alike abomination to the LORD." Deuteronomy 25:13 says, "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small." WE have made a BIG of OUR INTERPRETATION/TRANSLATION AND a small of the specific, verbatim Word of God. Interpretations and notes are HELPFUL. Proverbs 30:5 says, "Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him." We will do anything to have a friend-not for Christ and His purpose-for ourselves. We want friends so that we can be the standard and inform them of our OWN BIBLE. We say, "This is what the Lord is saying. This is what the Bible is saying." Since the Word is God, we are saying that the way we say it is the Bible when we generalize things and change it around. We are not as specific as GOD and we are constantly changing; therefore, we FAIL with walking in the way of our own interpretation like Cain. It's like going to God and saying, "I like the way I say it better." Just like the translations do with stripping away the scriptures and Words. Our OWN BIBLE is filled with our experiences, ideas, opinions, life stories, et al. When our website does not have scriptures, and interpretations divided rightly or correctly, we are making our OWN Bible with our ideas to be known and popular. "But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (Matthew 4:4). When we are to be DYING DAILY, we think that we should live by our thoughts and words. HIS ways and thoughts are higher than our ways and thoughts. We should live by EVERY WORD THAT PROCEEDS OUT OF THE MOUTH OF GOD every day.

We are to search the scriptures daily (Acts 17:11). Then, we change the Word around into OUR words as if it is better. We say it in OUR words JUST LIKE THE TRANSLATIONS and change everything. Just changing a comma, adding, or taking away just ONE WORD or LETTER can change the entire meaning, which makes it false! People will not be able to understand! Some specific examples include: "Romans 8:1 says, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit". Some translations and interpretations take out, "but after the Spirit". If we read this without, "but after the Spirit", we will think that the Word should NEVER condemn us. This scripture implies that there is NO condemnation for those that WALK AFTER THE SPIRIT, the THINGS of the Spirit. Therefore, those that WALK AFTER THE FLESH SHALL BE CONDEMNED. The Word of God shows that the HOLY SPIRIT BEARS WITNESS OF JESUS CHRIST, or THE WORD.

Luke 23:43 says, "And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." "In the King James Version the comma is placed before the word 'today' makes it seem that Jesus Christ told the sinner that he would be in Paradise that same day. This means that Jesus would have to come into his Kingdom, and that Jesus, as well as the sinner, would be in paradise on that same day that he was talking about. In addition, the Jehovah's Witnesses false version of the Bible, The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures, makes Luke 23:43 say this, "Truly I tell you today, You will be with me in Paradise." The scripture is used to support own the heresies. The HOLY SCRIPTURES IS HOLY AND THE SCRIPTURES IS GOD (WORD OF GOD) .

DID GOD GIVE US HALF OF HIMSELF OR HALF A GOSPEL? THAT IS WHY WE SO PRIDEFULLY THINK THAT PEOPLE HAVE SPECIAL MESSAGES TO PREACH. PEOPLE MUST PREACH THE ENTIRE GOSPEL WITHOUT DIVERS WEIGHTS, FALSE BALANCES AND PUTTING WEIGHTS ON A CERTAIN SUBJECT. HOW CAN ANYONE BE SAVED WITH ONE PERSON ONLY FOCUSING ON TRYING TO REACH MATURE PEOPLE? PEOPLE IN THE CHURCH NEED TO HEAR THE GOSPEL TOO AND EVEN MORE BECAUSE WE CAN CONVINCE OURSELVES THAT WE ARE SAVED AND GO STRAIGHT TO HELL. When this individual rebuke the scripture, it is still wrong. The scripture truly says, "Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." This makes a huge difference. This gives the heretics the idea that Jesus Christ went to hell because Christ just said it, and did not mean that the sinner would be in heaven that very day. This gives people the idea that Christ said it yesterday, but over time, the sinner would enter into paradise. We are so ENVIOUS that we want to create our own little Bible and cut away the specific, verbatim WORD OF GOD.

We ACT and SAY it is Christian but it is mostly about US and going forth with our plans. The focus is NOT upon prayer, Word, revival, hell, Jesus Christ, God, the Holy Spirit, et al. The focus is on what WE CAN DO and our goodness-NOT what HE CAN DO to make us holy and bring souls to Him. Therefore, relationships talk positively about what we want and expect of man NOT God. Let us WAKE UP!!!! Romans 13:12 says, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light." We must cast off the works of gross darkness, the sin-let GOD TAKE AWAY OUR SINS! We need to be clothed in the armor of the Lord as Ephesians 6 indicates!

Re:, on: 2008/7/5 11:02

10+ REASONS WHY PEOPLE OF PRIDE CUT AWAY SCRIPTURES LIKE BAAL

And they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them.

Romans 13:14

But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.

We are to have the LORD Jesus Christ, the blood, as a covering on our heart, mind, body, and soul. Jesus Christ is EVERY Word out of the mouth of God. Therefore, the specific, verbatim Word of God should be in our conversations (i.e. songs, posts, sermons, talks, discussions). SINCE OUR GOD IS HOLY, OUR CONVERSATIONS MUST BE HOLY.

First Commandment

(1) "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment." (Mark 12:30).

a. The strength that GOD gives you when we recognize the Holiness of God and the wickedness, deceitfulness of our heart/sin. When we see the Holiness of God, we see the HOLINESS of His Word, the Bible, NOR walking in the way we interpret things as Cain. We are not supposed to say things to gain the approval and acceptance of men (Acts 10:29). We make sure that people will only listen to OUR interpretation and are not able to think, or question OUR salvation or the salvation of others. The Word of God is our standard, not the pope, Catholics, church growth by the thousands, outward shows, looks, denominations, or Protestants. Matthew 4:4 says, "But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." It IS by the fruits of the lips and actions that we DO know people, BUT this does not show that they are spiritual. For instance, it is by the WHOLENESS of the counsel of the LORD GOD-if there are things added or taken away from the Word of God-it is not holy. Christ DID not die so that we can gain earthly things, social acceptance, and relationships. We are to think of ourselves as a child. Job 1:21 says, "And said, Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: the LORD gave, and the LORD hath taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD." When WE came into this world, we had NO KNOWLEDGE, NO CLOTHES, and NO POSSESSIONS-NOTHING. EVERYTHING we do is learned; therefore, this does not mean that people are SMARTER than the other or knows more. EVERYTHING we have learned is from the word of GOD and it's in His name if we are studying it; therefore, it must be quoted. False prophets and false doctrines ARGUE against the Word of God and DENY Jesus Christ! Since it is of the flesh, carnal, and friends with the world/satan, these doctrines OPPOSE the Spirit. We literally are WARRING against God. The Bible does not say that we are to love God to GET, NOR DOES THE BIBLE SAY THAT WE ARE TO SEEK FOR THESE THINGS. God is our FIRST love. He must overcome the bondages and the 'fleshly' side of our lives.

b. SINCE there are not three types of loves, there is only God (love) and satan (hate), we can look at several different carnal types of love. OUR interpretations can be more man-centered. Eros-- is a man-centered, self-centered love. In our imagery, it is like an arrow with a hook in it, for it is an ultimate intent is to benefit itself, to draw something back to itself, to capture something for itself. Sometimes what we think is love is really our own selfish Eros agenda. Nomos-- is legalism. This hypocrisy is love with a hook in it, for it is selfish-- it is a form of manipulation which controls using the rules to my own advantage? This is saying and not doing. As Jeroboam, we make sure people follow our laws so that we would not be killed or gotten rid of. This is still a form of Eros (man-centered love).

c. God's love is perfect, NOT ours. That means EVERY word is perfect. Agape--is love that is focused on God because He is God. It has no hook in it, for it is given with no expectations of a reward.

The Second Commandment

(2) "And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Matthew 22:39). We focus and argue about loving ourselves MORE than loving God. We think that we MUST do this first to do something for God-this is NOT CHRISTIAN! We love the way we interpret things in OUR thoughts and words.

The Ten Commandments (EXODUS 20)

1. I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. 3Thou shalt have no other gods before me. When we are walking or writing in the way of our own interpretations and train others with such things, we are making ourselves as god. We are saying that the American or cultural way that we say it is right! We are fashioning the WORD OF GOD according to our culture. It becomes godless because the specific word of GOD is not in it, just a rewriting of the Word! We are saying, "Come read our bible (interpretation). We are trying to create a safe place so that no one will argue with us! We pick on people such as Wicca/psychic/occult, a god of Science/Education, Buddha, Muhammad, Allah, Joseph Smith of the Mormons, Joseph & Mary of the Catholic Church

& Unity Church; SATAN/LUCIFER. Word-Faith Movement, Charismatic Movement, Restoration movements, Latter Rain, Third Wave, Toronto "Blessing", Vineyard, Brownsville "Outpouring", Word of Faith, New Apostolic Reformation, World Gathering on Indigenous People, Manifest Sons of God, Seeker Friendly, Church Growth, Emerging Church, YWAM, Toronto blessing, Pensacola Revival (Brownsville), Promise Keepers, The Campus Revivals, The March for Jesus, The search for historical roots (Celtic, Hebraic, etc) and we are doing the same thing! If no one else remembers us, we are to remember GOD. This shows a childlike dependence upon the Word. Our conversations should be holy and not just a way to show off the knowledge of another.

2. 4Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. 5Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; 6And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments. (Our words become empty because we NEED the Word of God. We do not feel as if we have to run and do something without even being really trained by the Word of God. The WORD OF GOD is what convicts us and brings us to brokenness and contriteness. What would happen if we change the Ten Commandments that convict us of sin? This is the same thing that these translations/interpretations do! If WE ARE BEING TRAINED WITH THE WORD OF GOD IN STUDY, WHY ARE WE NOT DOING IT IN OUR CONVERSATIONS (I.E. SERMONS, POSTS, TALKING) TO OTHERS? DO THEY NOT NEED THE SAME TRAINING? THE ONLY ONE THAT WE ARE TRAINED BY IS GOD. PEOPLE CANNOT BE SAVED WITHOUT THE WORD OF GOD. In fact, in Rome, people leave out the second commandment; connect the reason to the first commandment. Therefore, the 3rd commandment is called the 2nd; the 4th is called the 3rd commandment. Then, to have a 10th commandment, the 10th commandment is divided into two. We do the same thing today as we commit two evils. Jeremiah 2:13 says, "For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water".

3. 7Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain. The Word of God can only be understood in the wholeness and seeing even the broadness of our wickedness! We tend to only focus on one aspect instead of conversing about what He has spoken about throughout the entire Bible. Just like we think that women can only talk about a certain thing, we would understand if we are entering into heaven as a big body and God checks off those who God is NOT going to excuse women at judgment day: "Well, woman, you are a sodomite, adulterer and liar but because you are a WOMAN, you can enter into the kingdom of heaven." Neither is He going to say, "Well, since you are not allowed to teach and preach the gospel to EVERY creature, you can enter into the kingdom of heaven even though you did not obey me or my words." It would be right if husband AND wife goes into heaven together and God says, "Well, men since you have a complete separate responsibility, you can go into heaven. Since you are united, both of you can go into heaven because the man did his part by being the preacher and the women did her part for being silent". We are not married in heaven so that is NOT correct! Matthew 22:30 says, "For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven". Each person is judged individually! Shouldn't it be the same in the pulpit as in going around evangelizing (preaching the gospel)?

4. 8Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. 9Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: 10But the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: 11For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it. We can be denying HIM and upholding our SELF interpretations/translations!

5. 12Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee. (We are NOT honoring God by using His Word specifically. If God wanted our interpretations/translations, it would be in there. All we are doing is WRITING NOTES and giving directions. That's it! We have tried to claim our rights to say work! Isaiah 30:8 says, "Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever:" We are just mail carriers; we are not to try to take the place of Christ by showing the importance of our own words. WE could not think up such things for ourselves for an entire lifetime. All the false prophets and messiahs have tried and have failed miserably. IT IS NOT OUR WORDS, nor did WE THINK IT UP. As John the Baptist was a forerunner to Christ, WE are to be preparing the way for Christ, NOT trying to be or take the place of Christ. As lawyers, we only defend the WORD and point people to Christ. We are more like mail carriers that just send the Word around whole without taking anything our or only giving people half-letters.

6. 13Thou shalt not kill. (This just shows a hatred for yourself, God, and hate others. We are PLAYING GOD. It does not matter IF WE ARE DOING it based on the Word, the false prophets use things based on the Word like Kim Clement. Due to such imbalances, divers weights, and false balances, much of it is wrong. . Thinking that we are standing on the Word of God, we stand to worship before one god. We do not feel as if we have to run and do something without even being really trained by the Word of God. Psalm 106:29 says, "Thus they provoked him to anger with their inventions: and the plague brake in upon them" and Psalm 106:39 says, "Thus were they defiled with their own works, and went a whoring with their own inventions". The golden calves were an invention just as Aaron creates a golden calf with the jewelry of the people. Since it seems as if Moses was not coming, as we do when we think that Jesus Christ has delayed His coming, we gather all the covenants, ideas, as one to make a calf. This is the melting pot of everyone's invented thoughts, which is exactly what the school of the prophets is. The schools of the prophets are those that try to prophesy and those that use the Word of God. We use all the carnal, earthen things to create our images.

7. 14Thou shalt not commit adultery. We are LUSTING after receiving money (i.e. attention, compliments, credit), which is worldliness. The way we write the words are conformed to the world which is adultery and an enemy against GOD. The way we write it isn't using EVERY WORD spoken by God. It is befriending the image of the world or a goal of peace and safety (pride) that leads to destruction. WE want to use such things to get the world to understand. We do not need to agree with the world to help people; we can rebuke the word. The only way we can truly rebuke is with the Word of God, not OUR interpretations. EVERYTHING links back to EVERY WORD that proceeds out of the mouth of God, not OUR mouth. The Word of God is wonderful on its own although interpretations are important. James 4:4 says, "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God".

8. 15Thou shalt not steal. WE are stealing precious time from the Word of God from ourselves and others. The WORD OF GOD should be the source or the person to go to NOT SELF. We just want to be the "special" person that everyone goes to. We think that we deserve the attention and credit for writing up a bunch of notes.

9. 16Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. As we add and take away from the Word, we end up LYING. WE ARE HYPOCRITES because we are saying HIS WORD and CLAIMING HIS NAME BUT WE ARE SO ASHAMED TO EVEN USE AN ENTIRE SCRIPTURE. We must make sure that the posts are scripture based and are in context with the wholeness of Scripture. Either we choose Life (scripture, King James Version Bible) or death (words said based on the way our culture interprets it or words different from the bible). Therefore, it becomes sin. Matthew 4:4 says something quite clearly that WE LIVE by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God. We can not just use words that we interpret in OUR OWN WAY. 2 Timothy 3:16 says, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:". ALL SCRIPTURE (not OUR words or interpretations that eliminate a lot of things) is used for reproof and correction. This is walking in our way in our thoughts, words, and deeds. We are known by the fruits of our lips. To use our words is to say that OUR interpretation is INSPIRED by God and HIS is not. Some people MAY be busy with family but it is better to write it WITH scriptures than not too. If we can prove that we created the world and everything, we can surely use our own words and create our own bibles with OUR experiences. However, we have not created ANYTHING including souls, therefore, we stick to the Word or do not use it at all. 2 Timothy 2:15 says, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth". We are trying to prove GOD'S word, not a preacher or a leader's opinion. It falls into the same category as the "false" prophets or those that we righteously judge. Just as they add and take away from the Word, our interpretations DO THE SAME. When we use other words and experiences other than HIS, it shows our pride and our lack of dependence on God. Luke 9:1 says, "Then he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases". How can we righteously judge others without the JUDGE? Why not use the true authority because we are not the true authority! We cannot call anyone to avoid and mark those who speak those things are contrary to the Word of God WITHOUT the WORD OF GOD! This makes us unarmed! Since Christ came not to bring peace, He came to bring a sword-the SWORD of the SPIRIT is the WORD of GOD and the TWO-edged sword. Hebrews 4:12 says, "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart". When we use thing sin our own words or based on the lukewarm culture of America, we are trying to be judge. If God wants it that way, He would have done it but He did not. The GODHEAD has authority over all devils, unclean spirits and can cure diseases. We can see that there is much "diseases" among those who call themselves "Christians" and "saved by grace". Why are we not using EVERY WORD that proceeds out of the mouth of God so that GOD can cure the diseases? Otherwise, if we use a different weapon, we are just saying such things to prop ourselves up. When we use the HUMBLE Christ's Word, all heaven and earth would shake not our modernized words and phrases. Our modernized words and phrases add and take away from the Word

of God. John 5:39 says, "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me". Jesus Christ (the Word) is our support in the beginning, and end. Everything! Proverbs 16:4 says that "The LORD hath made all things for himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil". He made our posts, words, clothes, EVERY part of the body, our lips (which makes kissing a sin), for HIMSELF. Our conversation MUST be holy! AMEN! I have been guilty of such things as well, so it's not only you. I still have to repent because it is truly my fault for doing it. God is ALWAYS right. Our words SHOULD be used for Him BUT as notes or byproducts. His ENTIRE word should be the beginning and end or it is pride.

10. 17Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's. We are envious of Jesus Christ, apostles, and prophets that is why we use OUR interpretations ONLY or MOSTLY. Proverbs 20:23 says "Divers weights are an abomination unto the LORD; and a false balance is not good." Proverbs 20:10 says, "Divers weights, and divers measures, both of them are alike abomination to the LORD." Deuteronomy 25:13 says "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small." WE have made a BIG of OUR INTERPRETATION/TRANSLATION AND a small of the specific, verbatim Word of God. Interpretations and notes are HELPFUL. Proverbs 30:5 says, "Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him." We will do anything to have a friend-not for Christ and His purpose-for ourselves. We want friends so that we can be the standard and inform them of our OWN BIBLE. We say, "This is what the Lord is saying. This is what the Bible is saying." Since the Word is God, we are saying that the way we say it is the Bible when we generalize things and change it around. We are not as specific as GOD and we are constantly changing; therefore, we FAIL with walking in the way of our own interpretation like Cain. It's like going to God and saying, "I like the way I say it better." Just like the translations do with stripping away the scriptures and Words. Our OWN BIBLE is filled with our experiences, ideas, opinions, life stories, et al. When our website does not have scriptures, and interpretations divided rightly or correctly, we are making our OWN Bible with our ideas to be known and popular. "But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (Matthew 4:4). When we are to be DYING DAILY, we think that we should live by our thoughts and words. HIS ways and thoughts are higher than our ways and thoughts. We should live by EVERY WORD THAT PROCEEDS OUT OF THE MOUTH OF GOD every day. We are to search the scriptures daily (Acts 17:11). Then, we change the Word around into OUR words as if it is better. We say it in OUR words JUST LIKE THE TRANSLATIONS and change everything. Just changing a comma, adding, or taking away just ONE WORD or LETTER can change the entire meaning, which makes it false! People will not be able to understand! Some specific examples include: "Romans 8:1 says, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit". Some translations and interpretations take out, "but after the Spirit". If we read this without, "but after the Spirit", we will think that the Word should NEVER condemn us. This scripture implies that there is NO condemnation for those that WALK AFTER THE SPIRIT, the THINGS of the Spirit. Therefore, those that WALK AFTER THE FLESH SHALL BE CONDEMNED. The Word of God shows that the HOLY SPIRIT BEARS WITNESS OF JESUS CHRIST, or THE WORD. Luke 23:43 says, "And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise". "In the King James Version the comma is placed before the word 'today' makes it seem that Jesus Christ told the sinner that he would be in Paradise that same day. This means that Jesus would have to come into his Kingdom, and that Jesus, as well as the sinner, would be in paradise on that same day that he was talking about. In addition, the Jehovah's Witness false version of the Bible, The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures, makes Luke 23:43 say this, "Truly I tell you today, You will be with me in Paradise." The scripture is used to support own the heresies. The HOLY SCRIPTURES IS HOLY AND THE SCRIPTURES IS GOD (WORD OF GOD). DID GOD GIVE US HALF OF HIMSELF OR HALF A GOSPEL? THAT IS WHY WE SO PRIDEFULLY THINK THAT PEOPLE HAVE SPECIAL MESSAGES TO PREACH. PEOPLE MUST PREACH THE ENTIRE GOSPEL WITHOUT DIVERS WEIGHTS, FALSE BALANCES AND PUTTING WEIGHTS ON A CERTAIN SUBJECT. HOW CAN ANYONE BE SAVED WITH ONE PERSON ONLY FOCUSING ON TRYING TO REACH MATURE PEOPLE? PEOPLE IN THE CHURCH NEED TO HEAR THE GOSPEL TOO AND EVEN MORE BECAUSE WE CAN CONVINCE OURSELVES THAT WE ARE SAVED AND GO STRAIGHT TO HELL. When this individual rebuke the scripture, it is still wrong. The scripture truly says, "Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." This makes a huge difference. This gives the heretics the idea that Jesus Christ went to hell because Christ just said it, and did not mean that the sinner would be in heaven that very day. This gives people the idea that Christ said it yesterday, but over time, the sinner would enter into paradise. We are so ENVIIOUS that we want to create our own little Bible and cut away the specific, verbatim WORD OF GOD. We ACT and SAY it is Christian but it is mostly about US and going forth with our plans. The focus is NOT upon prayer, Word, revival, hell, Jesus Christ, God, the Holy Spirit, et al. The focus is on what WE CAN DO and our goodness-NOT what HE CAN DO to make us holy and bring souls to Him. Therefore, relationships talk positively about what we want and expect of man NOT God. Let us WAKE UP!!!! Romans 13:12 says, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light". We must cast off the works of gross darkness, the sin-let GOD TAKE AWAY OUR SINS! We need to be clothed in the armor of the Lord as E

phesians 6 indicates!

Jesus Christ did not die on the cross that we cut HIM away, kill the gospel and put off the Lord Jesus Christ!

We need to STOP tearing away the WORD OF GOD and put on the Lord Jesus Christ!

Romans 13:14

But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/5 12:18

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:
Hi rbanks...
Quote:

By the way, thank you for your gracious post and responses. If possible, could you elaborate upon the reason that you want to call it the Authorized Version? Is it because you desire to distant it from the King or because you see it as the authorized edition for the Church of England?

Because I believe no organization, group, or individual should copyright the bible. Since we believe the word of God was given by God to the Prophet and apostles, no one should have a copyright to the word of God.

The only copyright was given by God at the end of the last letter given to the apostle John.

Re 22:18 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:

Re 22:19 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.

Re:, on: 2008/7/8 2:21

Well, here we are again. Those that support the Minority text (ccchhrrriiiss & King Jimmy), and those of us who reject the Minority text.

The Minority text was used to create the Catholic Bible. yet those that support it, continue with their mantra--Both texts are the word of God! (they tell us). But yet, they believe that neither Bibles are "**God breathed**", and both are full of errors.

Is there commonality between their text and the Majority text, the text used to create the Protestant Bible that was responsible for the Reformation, which ended Catholicism's stranglehold on much of the known world, and allowed the common man to actually read the Word of God, that had been kept from them by the Pope, his Priests and his armies?

How can both texts be the **Word of God, and of equal value?**

There is a tremendous difference between them because of the "notes" that appear throughout the minority text of all the newer versions that have printed and copyrited since 1888.

Mark 11:25-26

King James Bible

24. Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them.

25. And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses.

26. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.

Mark 11:25-26

NIV

25. And when you stand praying, if you hold anything against anyone, forgive him, so that your Father in heaven may forgive you your sins.

26. Missing (See note below)

Note at bottom of page, IN MINISCULE PRINT “26. But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father who is in heaven forgive your sins.”

There is no reason given why this verse is deleted, and why it appears in its entirety at the bottom of the page, **in MINISCULE PRINT.**

The King James provides the requirement, plain and clear---We must forgive others if we expect our Father in heaven to forgive our own sins. What the NIV does, is delete this important verse out of the requirement, and then, without any reason, print it in very small print at the bottom of the page. **This deletion by the NIV of Mark 26 changes Bible Doctrine, because of the confusion it creates in anyone who reads it, especially if they have never read the King James Bible.**

Mark 15:28

King James Bible

28. And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors

Mark 15:28

NIV

28. Missing – Deleted

29. However, if you go to the bottom of the page, we find IN MINISCULE PRINT “28 And the scripture was fulfilled, which says, And he was numbered with the lawless ones.” (Isaiah 53:12)

Why has this been ripped out of the Scripture by the "textual critics" and "Bible Scholars" responsible for creating the NIV, with no reason given. This verse proclaims that **Jesus Christ death on the cross is a fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah 53:12. Instead, we read what is shown above, at the bottom of the page and VERY, VERY SMALL PRINT.**

Are we reading the same Bible? Is one as good as the other, or is one superior to the other?

When I go to Matthew 6:9-13 in the King James Bible I read the following:

9. After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.

10. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.

11. Give us this day our daily bread.

12. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. 13. 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.**

However, when I open the NIV, or any of the other newer Translations that have been created since 1881, I find the following:

9. "Therefore, this is how you should pray: 'Our Father in heaven, may your name be kept holy.

10. May your kingdom come. May your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.

11. Give us today our daily bread,

12. and forgive us our sins, as we have forgiven those who have sinned against us.

13. **And never bring us into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.'**

To begin with, the Amen is missing from the NIV, so we can see that the prayer is not complete

If I look at the note, at the bottom of the page of the NIV, I find this in regards to the missing Scripture, that is found in the King James Bible:

:13 “or from evil: **some late manuscripts** one, / “for yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever, Amen.

So, what this is telling me in the NIV, is that someone added this later, in **“late manuscripts”**, and THAT what I am reading in the King James, the Authorized version of the Protestant Bible is suspect, and probably not even the words of Christ Jesus.

If I look at the prior page of my bible, in Matthew 5:44

I find this in the **King James Bible, the Authorized Version of the Protestant Church:**

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

Switching to the NIV, I find only this:

43. Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love your neighbor, and hate your enemy:

44. but I tell you, love your enemies, and pray for those that persecute you;

In the **tiny notes, at the bottom of the page**, of the NIV I find the following:

“44. Some late manuscripts “enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you.”

Again, the implication is that the “older manuscripts” are closer to the time of Christ, and these manuscripts of the NIV vary from the manuscripts used to create the Protestant Bible, which they are saying is a “later manuscript”.

Here is another example of the vast difference between the two—the King James and the NIV:

King James- Matthew 8:1-4

1. When he was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed him.
2. And, behold, there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.
3. And Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed.
4. And Jesus saith unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

NIV-Matthew 8:1-4

1. When he (not He) came down from the mountainside, large crowds followed him.
2. A man with leprosy (**a-see note below**) came and knelt before him (not Him), “Lord, if you are willing, you can make me clean.”
3. Jesus reached out his hand and touched the man. “I am willing” he (not He) said. “Be clean!” Immediately he was cured (see Note B) of his leprosy.
4. Then Jesus said to him, “See that you don’t tell anyone. But go and show yourself to the priest, and offer the gift Moses commanded as testimony to them..”

Note A: The Greek word was used for various diseases affecting the skin-NOT NECESSARILY LEPROSY. (Note B Greek “made clean”).

Again, as we read and study the NIV, the Minority text, we find continuous references that limit or marginalize Christ’s power and authority.

One thing that we must realize, as we study the New Testament, the first four books (Matthew, Mark, Luke & John) take place during the Old Testament period. The New Testament does not start until Jesus Christ’s death and resurrection from the dead. In regards to the footnote above “(The Greek word was used for various diseases affecting the skin-NOT NECESSARILY LEPROSY)”--- The only “Skin Disease” mentioned in the Bible that demanded the persons inspection by a priest was the skin disease of Leprosy! We find a mistake in the NIV and all of those other “newer versions” in regards to understanding the requirement in Leviticus 14.

Only in the Skin Disease of Leprosy is the person that is cured REQUIRED to come before the Priest .

Leprosy (zara ‘at)- a contagious disease translated as “leprosy”, which could infect people, leather, fabrics, and plaster or mud-covered bricks. **Only in the disease of Leprosy, was the person cured required to BRING A SACRIFICE TO THE PRIEST, AND PRESENT HIMSELF FOR INSPECTION BY THE PRIEST.** The requirements are found in Leviticus 14:1-7 :

we read... 1 Then the LORD spoke to Moses, saying, 2 “This shall be the law of the leper for the day of his cleansing: He shall be brought to the priest. 3 And the priest shall go out of the camp, and the priest shall examine him; and indeed, if the leprosy is healed in the leper, 4 then the priest shall command to take for him who is to be cleansed two living and clean birds, cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop. 5 And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water. 6 As for the living bird, he shall take it, the cedar wood and the scarlet and the hyssop, and dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water. 7 And he shall sprinkle it seven times on him who is to be cleansed from the leprosy, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose in the open field. 8 He who is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, shave off all his hair, and wash himself in water, that he may be clean. After that he shall come into the camp, and shall stay outside his tent seven days.

This ritual is performed after the healing has taken place. God has healed the leper. The leper has done nothing except to trust in God. The priest seeks out the leper. The cleansing ritual points to death of Christ which is the bird killed. The resurrection of Christ is seen in the bird dipped in blood and let loose. We see a picture of the Lord here being delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification. The blood sprinkled with hyssop on the healed leper is symbolic of faith in the atoning work of Christ. We see the fully man aspect of Christ in the earthen vessel in which the bird was slain. We see symbolism in the running water also. This would picture the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Life.

In the Old Testament it was understood that only God could heal leprosy. By the fact that the newer versions question whether this was even leprosy or perhaps merely a “skin disease” shows two things: 1) their lack of understanding of God’s commandments to the Jews in the Old Testament; 2) Questioning the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and his ability to cure leprosy---by saying that it was not necessarily LEPROSY! It had to be leprosy, based upon Christ’s command that the cured Leper show himself to the Priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

Can both of them be the Word of God?

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/8 8:02

Well, here we are again. Those that support the Minority text (ccchhhrrriiiss & King Jimmy), and those of us who reject the Minority text.

This is a mischaracterization of my position. While I am a supporter of the minority texts, I don't hold them as always superior. In fact, there are times when I believe the majority texts are more accurate. I hold to an eclectic view of textual criticism, and don't exalt one text above another. In fact, I try to, as best possible, weigh each variant in each text on its own merits. Sometimes this means a variant from the minority texts will win the day, sometimes it means the majority text will. Perhaps this means that a majority of the time I will favor the minority texts, but, such is not because I'm automatically predisposed to go along with the minority texts.

Such is the nature of an approaching textual criticism from an eclectic point of view. And such is no different than what has historically been done as long as translations have been made of the Bible, even as far back as the KJV. Even when the text that was used for the KJV was created, such was done using an eclectic method. The KJV translators simply had to choose from variants mostly among the majority texts... as none of the majority texts agree with each other, and contain numerous variants. But, they likewise, used an eclectic method.

Thus, there is no difference between methods between the translators who formed the NIV and the translators who formed the KJV. Both employed the same method. The only difference is that the NIV translators had more manuscripts available to them than did the KJV translators. Both groups did the exact same thing.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/8 12:53

Hi walter...

Yes, I agree with KingJimmy. This is a misrepresentation of what I believe...so please refrain from doing this in the future.

However, you do raise an interesting point that is seldom discussed sufficiently by the KJV-only crowd -- the source text.

Over the years on SI, the KJV-only zealots usually cut and paste quite a few Scripture passages in order to demonstrate the differences between the two texts. At this point, the accusations usually fly in which the translators of the "modern" versions are accused of removing or altering the translation (along with the Scriptural warning from the book of Revelation about adding or taking away from the words of the book). However, we almost NEVER hear the KJV-only advocates admit that these differences are almost entirely the result of the variation of source material.

Now, I realize that there are some who think that the KJV is just the latest translation that falls within what some think is a fulfillment of the notion of a "perfectly preserved" written version of the Bible. The line of succession goes from KJV to Textus Receptus for the New Testament (and other sources for the Old Testament and Apocrypha). The problem, of course, comes from the realization that the KJV was translated from a plethora of manuscripts and already existent versions. The translators were strictly instructed to use the Bishop's Bible as the base for their new version. They were also instructed to consult existing Church liturgy and language. Thus, the KJV is NOT taken from a single, "perfectly preserved" manuscript -- and to say such a thing is actually a lie. It was translated, as the translation committee explained in their preface, from a "set" of sources.

So the question revolves the source material. I've often wondered why KJV-only advocates focus so much of their attention and allegations upon the end products (the finished translated versions themselves) rather than turning their attention upon a critical analysis of the source material.

Walter, if you are so zealous for the "Majority Text," what are your reasons for it? Do you believe that the Textus Receptus is perfect? If so, why? What are your views of Erasmus, the sole person (and Dutch Catholic/humanist) who was responsible for the translation Textus Receptus? Was this man "divinely inspired" to produce a "perfectly preserved" work?

Usually, these sorts of discussions begin and end with a whole lot of copying and pasting going on. The KJV-only advocates seem to want to demonstrate the differences in the texts under the mistaken perception that everyone views the KJV as the "perfect" text. I don't. I see it as a good and faithful translation from the sources that it used -- with the added knowledge of the handicaps placed upon the translation committee by King James and the official Church of England. There are undeniable errors in the text. KJV-only advocates can attempt to reason away (with what I feel is a poor argument) things like the inclusion of the pagan word "Easter" in Acts chapter 12. However, they cannot explain away the differences between Acts 9:7 and Acts 22:9. They cannot explain away the obvious error between I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25 - or - II Samuel 24:13 and I Chronicles 21:11. In each of these examples, the modern texts (and their sources) avoid any sort of contradiction, while those in the KJV include these obvious errors.

Why am I saying this? First of all, I want to illustrate the fallacy within the argument that the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" version of the Word of God down to the last "dot and tittle" (as expressed by walter). Secondly, I want to showcase the possible benefits from an eclectic manner of translation. If all of the best possible sources are consulted, then we are not relying upon the translation abilities of a single version (or a single man, in the case of the Textus Receptus). Finally, these errors in the KJV illustrate that the error probably originated in the sources used (since the errors are also found in other translations preceding or contemporary to the KJV).

The point that I am trying to make is actually to articulate a question: Just why do you feel that the source material for the KJV is superior to that used for the NIV? Please do not copy and paste variations between the translation -- because we have tried to explain (hopefully to some avail) that the difference is resultant from the variation in source material rather than anything sinister (or the zealous opinions of a single or group of translators). If possible, could you easily identify between your own words and the words that you copied and pasted from someone else? This has been difficult in the p

ast, since I had a hard time distinguishing between your own words and the words of someone else.

Thanks!

:~)

By the way, I apologize for any sort of "hijacking" of this thread. I suppose that an examination and explanation for the preferred sources might have some merit for a discussion regarding the NKJV and NASB as well.

Re:, on: 2008/7/8 13:17

Quote:

-----However, you do raise an interesting point that is seldom discussed sufficiently by the KJV-only crowd -- the source text.

Actually, that's the *only* issue as far as I am concerned. But then, you already knew that. :~)

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/7/9 3:07

To ccchhrrriiss:

Acts 9:7

And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.

Acts 22:9

And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me.

I find no difficulty in understanding the above. In Acts 9:7 we read the men with him stood speechless, and heard a voice, but saw no man.

In Acts 22:9 the Lord gives us further clarification on what happened. Yes, the men heard the voice, and they were afraid. However, now the Lord is revealing to us that they heard the voice but they did not understand the voice that was talking to Paul. Paul is the only one who understood Jesus Christ, who was being called to be an Apostle.

The first twelve Apostles were each audibly called by Jesus Christ Himself to be Apostles. After the resurrection, the Resurrected Christ audibly called Paul, to replace Judas Iscariot as an Apostle. The other men with Paul did not understand the sound of Christ's voice because He was only calling Paul, He was only talking to Paul, and to no one else. All the others heard was noise, and were afraid.

Today, He calls each of us, individually, one by one, but He speaks to us through our hearts and HIS WORD

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiss wrote:

Hi walter...

"KJV-only advocates can attempt to reason away (with what I feel is a poor argument) things like the inclusion of the pagan word "Easter" in Acts chapter 12. However, they cannot explain away the differences between Acts 9:7 and Acts 22:9."

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2008/7/9 13:02

Hi walter...

Quote:

To ccchhhrrriiss:

Acts 9:7 (KJV)

"And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man."

Acts 22:9 (KJV)

"And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me."

I find no difficulty in understanding the above. In Acts 9:7 we read the men with him stood speechless, and heard a voice, but saw no man.

Strangely, I have heard several people point to these verses (from the KJV) as an excuse for those individuals to reject the validity of the Bible. Both of these verses seem to contradict one another. In one (Acts 9:7), the men traveling with Saul heard a voice...but didn't see a man. In the other (Acts 22:9), it says that these men saw a light...but did NOT hear the voice. You can reason all that you want, but the best case scenario is that they say the same thing using poor grammar and usage. The more obvious scenario (in my opinion) is that this passage means what it says - along with an apparent contradiction between the two verses. Yet ironically, the modern academic versions do not point to this contradiction. Consider the NIV for both of these verses:

Quote:

Acts 9:7 (NIV)

"The men traveling with Saul stood there speechless; they heard the sound but did not see anyone."

Acts 22:9 (NIV)

"My companions saw the light, but they did not understand the voice of him who was speaking to me."

The NIV does not include the apparent contradiction.

This is interesting...especially when you consider those verses for which I included earlier but you did NOT mention. They are even more apparent and inarguable mistakes than these two verses from Acts. Consider the contradictions from those verses that you did not mention, and then cross reference them with the same set of verses from the NIV:

Quote:

I Kings 4:26 (KJV)

"And Solomon had **forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots**, and twelve thousand horsemen."

II Chronicles 9:25

"And Solomon had **four thousand stalls for horses and chariots**, and twelve thousand horsemen; whom he bestowed in the chariot cities, and with him the king at Jerusalem."

Do you see the contradiction here? In one (I Kings 4:26), we learn that Solomon had 40,000 stalls of horses for his chariots. In the other, that number is reduced to 4,000 stalls. Is this reflective of a PERFECTLY PRESERVED manuscript of Scriptures? I thought that you were arguing that the KJV was a result of God preserving His written Word down to every single "dot and tittle?" Now, consider the wording of a "modern" scholarly translation like the NIV:

Quote:

I Kings 4:26 (NIV)

"Solomon had **four thousand stalls** for chariot horses, and twelve thousand horses."

II Chronicles 9:25 (NIV)

"Solomon had **four thousand stalls** for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horses, which he kept in the chariot cities and also with him in Jerusalem."

usalem.Â”

Oddly, the NIV (and other modern translations) do not contain this contradiction. Why? This was the result of the eclectic method using all of the major manuscripts available. This is identified by the footnote to II Chronicles 9:25:

Quote:

----- 1 Kings 4:26 Some Septuagint manuscripts (see also 2 Chron. 9:25 Hebrew *forty*).

Not only did the NIV present a corrected translation that does not contradict itself, but it also informs viewers (through the footnote) about alternative renderings of the words in question. Of course, this is true with nearly all passages in question in the NIV. The scholars who translated it were intent on preparing what they felt to be the most accurate translation using the best available manuscripts...but they also wanted to footnote all of the possible renderings when necessary. The translators of the KJV were forbidden to include such footnotes – even though they existed. The translators spoke about alternative renderings, but used the ones that they thought were best (which is the basis for the eclectic method of translation). Why were there no footnotes? The Church of England wanted a final “authoritative” version. The previous versions that were “authorized” for use by the Church of England included alternate renderings in the margins, as well as commentary from the translators (which was largely rejected by various sects like the Puritans).

Want another “contradiction” from the KJV that dispels the myth that the KJV is the “perfectly preserved” Word of God? Consider the contradiction between II Samuel 24:13 and I Chronicles 21:11-12.Â...

Quote:

II Samuel 24:13 (KJV)

“So Gad came to David, and told him, and said unto him, Shall **seven years of famine** come unto thee in thy land? or wilt thou flee three months before thine enemies, while they pursue thee? or that there be three days' pestilence in thy land? now advise, and see what answer I shall return to him that sent me.Â”

I Chronicles 21:11-12 (KJV)

“So Gad came to David, and said unto him, Thus saith the LORD, Choose thee Either **three years' famine**; or three months to be destroyed before thy foes, while that the sword of thine enemies overtaketh thee; or else three days the sword of the LORD, even the pestilence, in the land, and the angel of the LORD destroying throughout all the coasts of Israel. Now therefore advise thyself what word I shall bring again to him that sent me.Â”

Is it 7 years of famine or 3 years of famine? This one would be pretty difficult to explain – even by those who try to explain away the contradictions of Acts chapters 9 and 22...or the inclusion of the word “Easter” in Acts chapter 12. But here is how this same passage is worded in the NIV.Â...

Quote:

II Samuel 24:13 (NIV)

“So Gad went to David and said to him, ‘Shall there come upon you **three years of famine** in your land? Or three months of fleeing from your enemies while they pursue you? Or three days of plague in your land? Now then, think it over and decide how I should answer the one who sent me.Â’Â”

I Chronicles 21:11-12

“So Gad went to David and said to him, ‘This is what the LORD says: ‘Take your choice: **three years of famine**, three months of being swept away before your enemies, with their swords overtaking you, or three days of the sword of the LORD –days of plague in the land, with the angel of the LORD ravaging every part of Israel.’ Now then, decide how I should answer the one who sent me.”

Do you see how the contradiction doesn’t exist in these “flawed” modern translations? Then again, the NIV does include the following footnote for I Chronicles 21:11-12.Â...

Quote:

2 Samuel 24:13 Septuagint (see also 1 Chron. 21:12 Hebrew *seven*)

Again, the translators of the NIV felt it important enough to mention a possible alternate rendering – as they do every time there is such a possible alternative. Such an inclusion honestly presents the alternative possibilities in a manner that does not exist in the KJV. In this case, the NIV avoids a contradiction, while the supposedly perfect KJV includes an obvious flaw.

Why am I saying this? I am not attempting to destroy your faith in the KJV. Rather, I want to dispel the myth that the KJV is perfect in every way – down to the last “dot or tittle.” These are but a few of the “dot and tittles” that are obviously translated incorrectly in the KJV from what was certainly not flawed in the original Scripture passages. Now, was this mistake made in just the KJV or in the set of sources used for the King James Version? I don’t know. However, I do find it interesting that other versions that used similar sources and methods as the KJV include the same apparent contradictions.

I believe that our faith needs to properly rest in the eternal and living Word of God rather than the best attempts of men in translating the written Word. All of the translations -- including both the KJV and the NIV -- include admissions by the translators that their versions are NOT perfect. Why, then, do so many people today try to argue that one particular version is just the latest in a line of manuscripts that are "perfectly preserved" down to the last "dot and tittle"? If their faith is based upon such a belief -- then a single translation or version of the written Word is equated with the perfection of the Son of God. While versions like the KJV (and the NIV) are not perfect -- the living Word of God is. Our faith should only rest in Him.

:-)

Krispy...

I would NEVER place you in the *KJV-only* crowd. You certainly do not resemble that argument, and I wouldn't consider thinking of you as such. I would think of you as *KJV-preferred*. Ironically, so am I! I prefer the KJV in regard to versions using the set of sources used -- and the NIV in regard to the versions using the other set of sources.

:-)

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/9 17:36

Chris, just an fyi, the source texts say the same thing in Acts 22:7. The phrase has to do with literally "hearing a sound". Ac 9:7 says they heard a sound, Ac 22:7 says they heard not the sound of him that spoke. The translation, for sake of accuracy, is maintained in the KJV, whereas the proper "interpretation" is given in the NIV. You get the same thing either way, the NIV just does your thinking for you.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/9 20:06

Hi BeYeDoers...

Quote:

Chris, just an fyi, the source texts say the same thing in Acts 22:7. The phrase has to do with literally "hearing a sound". Ac 9:7 says they heard a sound, Ac 22:7 says they heard not the sound of him that spoke. The translation, for sake of accuracy, is maintained in the KJV, whereas the proper "interpretation" is given in the NIV.

I'm not sure as to the validity of your statement. How do you know this? Did you speak with the translators of the NIV regarding their reasons for including their words as such? Have you reviewed the source text in order to determine whether the mistake was made by the KJV translators or Erasmus? It isn't that I doubt your statement, but I haven't seen any evidence to validate the claim.

Even if the source material (Erasmus' *Textus Receptus*) for the apparent contradiction is correct, it is a terrible choice of wording on behalf of the translators of the KJV. It results in what can be pointed out as a contradiction in testimony between Saul's testimony in Acts chapter 9 and Acts chapter 22. In one, the people with Paul "heard a voice" (Acts 9:7); and in the other, they "heard not the voice" (Acts 22:9). As you can see, this is an apparent contradiction as it appears in the KJV.

The point, however, can get lost in the discussion.

There are those amongst us who would argue to their dying breath that the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God -- flawless in any way. Some of them go so far that it is the ONLY perfect translation of the Bible. Some of them argue that it is perfect down to the last "dot and tittle." This is obviously NOT true. There are mistakes in it, and I believe that the example in this case is one of them. The examples in my last post (from the Old Testament) are simply much more apparent and inarguable. Regardless of whether the mistakes are in the source material or in the completed translation, there are serious holes in the argument that the KJV is perfect in every "dot and tittle." The version was revised over a course of nearly 150 years to our present day KJV, had the Apocrypha removed, and the translators explained the handicaps placed upon them by King James and the Church of England. In addition, there are a few inaccuracies that cannot be explained away (not sufficiently, anyhow) that dispel the myth that it is a perfect translation.

The translators, in their preface, stated as much. They explained that it was a noble effort -- but undeniably imperfect. It is just that some people have a difficult time believing their testimony.

Why have I brought this up? It isn't to sling mud at the KJV (truth cannot be mistaken for mud). It is just that I fear that some people so revere the translation of a small group of men that they have almost deified the work of those men. Please understand: I realize that the Word of God is perfect. However, it takes quite a bit of blind faith to put our trust solely in the work of flawed, Anglican men (or in the case of the Textus Receptus, an independent-minded but still Dutch Catholic humanist man).

Is there such a thing as a perfect copy of the "written" (logos) Word of God? Hmm... It is my opinion that we could never know. I doubt that the original copies of the letters of Paul, Peter, James and John, as well as the Gospels or the Book of Revelation still exist. In addition, the originals written documents of Genesis, Exodus, Job, the Psalms, etc... - are probably lost to the elements in time. Most of my Bibles are falling apart - and they aren't even 10 years old! The Dead Sea Scrolls were especially preserved - but even many portions of them are lost to time. So we are forced to rely on copies. We have copies that are older than others (which do not necessarily make them superior). We have copies that are more widespread (which, again, do not make them superior). We have single editions translated entirely by one man (like the Textus Receptus). We have translations created by committee. And of course, we have many documents that have been lost in time.

I do not feel strongly enough (in all sincerity) to claim that one set of manuscripts is somehow superior to another set. Is the majority text superior to the minority - just because it is the majority? I recall a time in which the Roman Catholic Church was the only legal "Church" - and everyone else was considered to be heretics. As much as I have researched this issue, I have never seen enough evidence to make me see the supremacy of one ancient text source over another. In fact, it could be that all of the ancient sources were correct in most regards, and the minor (or even major) variations are resultant of the manner in which the documents were passed around. Thus, I cannot say with any certainty that one document is entirely superior to another (down to every last dot and tittle). And I cannot claim with complete honesty that one version of that text is perfect. So does a perfect translation of the Word of God exist on Earth...and would any of us even know which one that might be?

The Bible in I Corinthians talks about how prophecies, tongues and knowledge will pass away when "that which is perfect is come" (I Corinthians 13:8-10). Some non-Pentecostal preachers use this same passage to explain that tongues "ceased" - once the written Word of God was finished. I happen to disagree. I think that tongues (along with prophecy and knowledge) still exist. To the best of my understanding, the "*that which is perfect is come*" refers to the coming of our Lord prior to His millennial reign. In other words, the Word of God (our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ) is the "PERFECT" spoken of in this passage. Everything else - including the best efforts of translators and scribes in copying and translating the written Word of God - falls just a bit short.

As evidenced by certain passages (like the obvious contradictions between I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25, and between II Samuel 24:13 and I Chronicles 21:11-12), the King James Version of the Word of God contains at least a few flaws. There are some that we can attempt to reason away (like the inclusion of the word "Easter" in Acts 12:4 - even though the word in the Textus Receptus is the same word for Passover - or - the seeming contradiction between Paul's testimony between Acts 9:7 and Acts 22:9). But there are others that cannot be easily reasoned away and are apparent "errors" in either the translation or the sources used for translation. Regardless, the verdict is that the KJV cannot be considered PERFECT in every last "dot and tittle." To continue arguing as such, in my opinion, is an attempt to argue what cannot be proven.

My perspective? I see that the KJV is a pretty good effort taken from the sources used for translation (notwithstanding the prohibitions given to the translators by James and the Church of England regarding official rhetorical traditions). However, I also view the NIV as a faithful translation taken from the sources used by its translators. Which one is superior to the other? I just don't know. I consult both of them with regularity. I read my KJV more often, but this is on the basis of the amount of resources available, rather than upon any sort of judgment that it is vastly superior to the NIV. Lately, I find myself using the resources found on Biblegateway. This way, I can compare and contrast the KJV and NIV with a plethora of versions from English, Spanish and many other languages.

:-)

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/9 21:46

Chris, I looked at the TR (Scrivener's), the Robinson-Pierpont, and Wescott-Hort. They all say the same thing. "A terrible choice of wording" is an opinion. The KJV is more literal than the NIV, and thus more favorable (in my opinion). The NIV interprets the Greek for you, probably in order to remove the "apparent" contradiction (nothing wrong with that, just not my thing). I personally think the NIV is abundant in inconsistent translation, and also think that the Alexandrian texts are inferior. But I am NOT KJV-only, but preferred. I am full aware of its flaws (like the OT references you list; I do not know a lick of Hebrew, so I won't speculate as to how the different translators handle those contradictions in the text), but I trust it nonetheless. I DON'T trust the NIV, not because I think it's part of a mass conspiracy by devil-inhabited people to destroy the church, but simply because I think it's an inconsistent, way-too-paraphrased/"interpreted for you" translation based on an inferior set of sources.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/9 23:00

Hi BeYeDoers...

Quote:

"A terrible choice of wording" is an opinion.

You're right -- it is certainly an opinion (and I apologize if it seemed otherwise). Why do I form my opinion as such? Because in one passage, the KJV reads that the people with Saul "heard a voice" (Acts 9:7), and in the other, it says that the people with Saul "heard not the voice" (Acts 22:9). Do you see how this reads? These indicate an apparent contradiction. It seems that the text of Acts 22:9 should have probably been written that the men with Saul "understood not the voice." This would avoid a contradiction with Acts 9:7. Even in early 17th Century English, there is a world of difference between "heard" and "understood." But if I understand correctly, you are telling me that the reason that the KJV reads as it does (with the apparent contradiction) is because it is more "literal" than the NIV? I would assume that, even in ancient Greek, that there is more than one definition for any given word (just like today's English) that can only be ascertained via context or verb tense.

Quote:

"The KJV is more literal than the NIV, and thus more favorable (in my opinion)."

"The NIV interprets the Greek for you, probably in order to remove the "apparent" contradiction (nothing wrong with that, just not my thing)."

"I personally think the NIV is abundant in inconsistent translation, and also think that the Alexandrian texts are inferior."

"I DON'T trust the NIV, not because I think it's part of a mass conspiracy by devil-inhabited people to destroy the church, but simply because I think it's an inconsistent, way-too-paraphrased/"interpreted for you" translation based on an inferior set of sources."

If you don't mind me asking, upon what evidence do you base this? Why do you think that the Alexandrian texts are inferior? This is not a Catch-22 type of question. Rather, I am interested in just what evidence you base this opinion. Personally, I cannot make such a conclusion. I've corresponded with several of the translators of the NIV and several text scholars in order to ascertain the reason behind their choices in text preference. I understand their rationale, while I am also quite aware of the criticism that is ever-present from a minority of text critics. I just wondered if you could point me to some of the evidence upon which you base your opinion.

Thanks in advance!

:-)

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/9 23:15

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi BeYeDoers...

Quote:

"A terrible choice of wording" is an opinion.

You're right – it is certainly an opinion (and I apologize if it seemed otherwise). Why do I form my opinion as such? Because in one passage, the KJV reads that the people with Saul "heard a voice" (Acts 9:7), and in the other, it says that the people with Saul "heard not the voice" (Acts 22:9). Do you see how this reads? These indicate an apparent contradiction. It seems that the text of Acts 22:9 should have probably been written that the men with Saul "understood not the voice." This would avoid a contradiction with Acts 9:7. Even in early 17th Century English, there is a world of difference between "heard" and "understood."

I was going to stay out of this but I just couldn't stay away.

I have no problem understanding these two passages of scripture if you read them in context.

It is simple that the light shone around them and they could see no man only a voice but they did not hear the voice that spoke to Paul.

It is obvious that they heard Paul(a voice) but they did not hear Jesus (the voice) that spoke to Paul.

There is no contradiction here.

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/9 23:45

Quote:

-----Because in one passage, the KJV reads that the people with Saul "heard a voice" (Acts 9:7), and in the other, it says that the people with Saul "heard not the voice" (Acts 22:9). Do you see how this reads? These indicate an apparent contradiction.

In isolation, yes. In context, I think it reads out fine. Most commentators from the 18th through 20th centuries, many of whom had access to BOTH (plus Latin) "families" of Greek texts, agree that the translation may be awkward at face value, but is easily understood. The Greek words there are "akouo" where we get "acoustic" and "phone" where we get "phonic". They mean "hear" and "sound". The best translation would probably be something like "they heard a sound" and "they heard not the sound of him speaking." The word for understanding or comprehension is completely different than "akouo" in the NT. The NIV translators do give an okay "feel" to the passage...it essentially conveys what the original says (although maybe it could also read that they heard a sound of a man arriving but did not hear a voice, which would mean the NIV does NOT properly convey it). Either way, it is NOT literal. It is an interpretation (otherwise known as "dynamic equivalence", as you know). Like I said earlier, they do your thinking for you. What first turned me off to the NIV was going through Colossians in an NIV-NASB-Greek interlinear, where I discovered how awfully inconsistent the NIV was with their translation of even simple words (eg they will translate the word "all" as some, many, most, all, etc.).

Concerning "words have different definitions": I would caution this mindset, simply because it can turn into defining words how we want (I am NOT accusing you of this, but this is how the heretics and cults do it). God was not sloppy in his choice of languages or words. He was very specific. Words may have different "feels" to them, but typically not different definitions until the language devolves. Similarly, by nature, there are very few true synonyms. If two words meant the same thing, there wouldn't be two words, and the etymologies are usually vastly different (again, more synonyms pop up as a language devolves).

As far as why I choose the Byzantine texts, may I recommend Maurice Robinson's "The Case for Byzantine Priority".

Hope this helps.

ps. I wonder if your hobnobbing with the translators along with your strong passion to refute the KJV-only crowd has influenced your liking of the NIV beyond what your normal faculties would allow?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss () , on: 2008/7/10 0:29

Hi BeYeDoers...

Quote:

-----The NIV translators do give an okay "feel" to the passage...it essentially conveys what the original says (although maybe it could also read that they heard a sound of a man arriving but did not hear a voice, which would mean the NIV does NOT properly convey it). Either way, it is NOT literal. It is an interpretation (otherwise known as "dynamic equivalence", as you know). Like I said earlier, they do your thinking for you. What first turned me off to the NIV was going through Colossians in an NIV-NASB-Greek interlinear, where I discovered how awfully inconsistent the NIV was with their translation of even simple words (eg the will translate the word "all" as some, many, most, all, etc.).

Just as you warned me, I would also warn you that you might need to clarify that this is your opinion too.

As far as different meaning to a single word, a literal interpretation of my question "*Do you see how it reads?*" from my last post could be be vastly different unless the translator used some sort of "interpretation" of my word "see." The word "see" literally means to "visualize with the eyes." However, in this context, it meant "to perceive." I think that the difficulty is even more evident in English as we have a more blended language today (in terms of etymology). Each of our English words can have multiple definitions on such a basis alone, as well as the simple variations in context.

My wife (who holds a Master's degree in Spanish) has translated many things from English to Spanish and from Spanish to English. She acknowledges that it would be nearly impossible to translate something word-for-word without trying to capture the essence of the intent behind the idea, phrase or statement. Without proper care, it is possible for things to get "lost in translation" between one language to the next via a literal word-for-word method of translation. While it is easy to point the finger at the translators of the NIV regarding such matters, I have a strong feeling that the translators of the KJV were forced to do the same thing way back in the early 17th Century (in fact, they admitted to having experienced difficulty in agreeing upon a particular word or phrase from time to time).

Quote:

-----ps. I wonder if your hobnobbing with the translators along with your strong passion to refute the KJV-only crowd has influenced your liking of the NIV beyond what your normal faculties would allow?

Actually, I didn't have a preference either way when I began my search. I was open to any possible answer. I simply wanted to decipher through all of the rumor and allegation and find some semblance of truth. However, after an in-depth period of research (that continues today), I have to admit that I still cannot "buy" into the argument that one text source or translation method is vastly superior to the other. I certainly understand (and even share) the arguments and concerns on each side of this issue. But I just don't think that a final verdict should be passed based upon our limited understanding of this issue. There just doesn't seem to be enough certainty about this issue for which we could share our thoughts with the type of certainty for which people become zealots.

While I haven't read the book that you recommended, I have read similar books that cited it. I might give this one a look. Likewise, I might encourage you (and others) to write or contact some of the translators of the NIV (as well as advocates of the Alexandrian text types and eclectic methods of translation). They have a pretty interesting perspective about their reasons, as well as their regard for the KJV.

Thank you, brother! If I read the book, I'll be sure to give you an update!

:~)

Re: - posted by deltadom () , on: 2008/7/10 7:51

Quote:

-----While it is easy to point the finger at the translators of the NIV regarding such matters, I have a strong feeling that the translators of the KJV were forced to do the same thing way back in the early 17th Century (in fact, they admitted to having experienced difficulty in agreeing upon a particular word or phrase from time to time)

What you have got to be careful with in translations is goal, what is their purpose, why do they miss out certain phrases or words.

How does it change the Theology.

http://www.crossroad.to/Bible_studies/Message.html (http://www.crossroad.to/Bible_studies/Message.html) A Critic of the Message

Re:, on: 2008/7/10 13:22

Very good point, deltadom!

As I was looking at the news today, I found a story that documents your position, as well as my own. It is on Worldnet Daily. A man is suing two Bible Publishers for \$70 Million dollars for emotional distress. Why, you ask? **Because of the reference to homosexuality as sin.**

However, this reference is only made clear, and can only be found in the **King James Bible**.

The NIV, NASB, and all of the "newer versions" published since 1881 are all unclear about specific sexual sin, and have lumped them all under the heading of "**sexual sin**" (whatever that means, because the definition is not clear cut and not specific in these newer "Bibles").

Hence, the man is only suing Nelson and Zondervan for their publication of the King James Bible, and none of the other versions.

Do you wonder why there is such confusion in the body of Christ today about sin in general and sexual sin specifically? The answer is found in the Newer Version Bibles that the body of today is reading and studying. Each version, since 1881, has become weaker and weaker and weaker and weaker, AND MORE USER FRIENDLY FOR SIN, AS WELL AS THE TRUE MEANING OF SEXUAL SIN.

To see what I mean, **pick up "The Message" Bible and try to find the following words: FORNICATION; ADULTERY; SODOMY (ALL HOMOSEXUALS ARE SODOMITES); & BEASTIALITY. They are not there. Where are they? They can all be found on the cutting room floor of the Textual Critics and Bible Scholars who created the newer versions.**

Imagine what else is missing?!

'Gay' man sues Bible publishers
\$70 million for emotional distress because homosexuality cast as sin

Posted: July 09, 2008
10:52 am Eastern

Â© 2008 WorldNetDaily

<http://www.worldnetdaily.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=6914>

Bradley Fowler (RightPundits.com)

A homosexual man who has a blog on Sen. Barack Obama's campaign website is suing two major Christian publishers for violating his constitutional rights and causing emotional pain, because the Bible versions they publish refer to homosexuality as a sin.

Bradley LaShawn Fowler, 39, of Canton, Mich., is seeking \$60 million from Zondervan and another \$10 million from Thomas Nelson Publishing in lawsuits filed in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the Grand Rapids Press reported.

Fowler filed his claim against Grand Rapids-based Zondervan Monday, alleging its Bibles' references to homosexuality as a sin have made him an outcast from his family and contributed to physical discomfort and periods of "demoralization, chaos and bewilderment," the paper said.

He filed suit against Tennessee publisher Thomas Nelson in June.

Zondervan says that even if Fowler's claim is credible, he's suing the wrong party. A company spokesman told WOOD-TV

V in Grand Rapids that Zondervan doesn't translate the Bible or own the copyright for any of the translations but relies, instead, on the "scholarly judgment of credible translation committees."

U.S. District Judge Julian Abele Cook Jr. refused Monday to appoint an attorney to represent Fowler in the Thomas Nelson case, saying the court "has some very genuine concerns about the nature and efficacy of these claims."

Fowler, who is representing himself in both lawsuits, says in his complaint against Zondervan that the publisher intended to design a religious, sacred document to reflect an individual opinion or a group's conclusion to cause "me or anyone who is a homosexual to endure verbal abuse, discrimination, episodes of hate, and physical violence ... including murder."

Fowler alleges both Zondervan and Thomas Nelson, with its KING JAMES BIBLE, manipulated Scripture without informing the public by using the term "homosexuals" in a New Testament passage, 1 Corinthians 6:9. He told the Grand Rapids TV station in an interview he wants to "compensate for the past 20 years of emotional duress and mental instability."

Zondervan, he contended, is misinterpreting the Bible.

"These are opinions based on the publishers," Fowler said. "And they are being embedded in the religious structure as a way of life."

'Astounding research'

Fowler's blog on Sen. Barack Obama's campaign website features a post titled "Unleashing America from Injustice," in which he says he "was completely distraught after discovering the term-homosexual-was added to the bible, in 1976, and then removed, in 2001 and 2006, without any consideration to the many victims who committed suicide or were murdered because of their sexual preference of homosexuality."

Bradley Fowler's blog on Obama's campaign site

The Obama campaign notes the opinions expressed in its community blog section "in no way should be interpreted as endorsed or approved by the campaign."

On a separate personal blogsite, Fowler features his related book, written under the name "Bradley-Almighty," which, he boasts, contains "astounding research from within the pages of the bible, that will change the face of religion across the globe."

Titled "365 Reasons to Study the Bible," he says his "debut book" takes the reader "on a journey through time, as he shifts swiftly, yet gracefully, through the pages of religious history, slowly exposing hidden secrets bible publishers have fought feverishly to keep hidden from the general public for centuries. An avalanche of secrets that are keeping millions around the world enslaved today."

Fowler cites his interview with a newspaper called Michigan Front Page in which he said, "Lack of sincerity from bible readers has helped this conspiracy go on this long."

'Engrossed' with Scripture

On his personal blog's "About Me" page, Fowler says that while serving a sentence in the Michigan Department of Corrections, he "gained a sincere interest" in the Bible's teachings and, over a 10 year period, "became so engrossed within" the Scriptures, he couldn't do much more than eat and sleep.

In the rambling piece, he says "everything inside of me suddenly became consumed and overwhelmed by something greater than me ... that's when I found God."

Then, in an apparent reference to the complaint in his lawsuit, he says, "Discovering how much the bible has been changed through man's decisions and incorrect interpretations was hard to accept."

His discovery, he says, "proves we all have been strung along, foolishly, lost in the essence of our minds."

Fowler concludes with a description of himself as a "small business owner, part-time college student, member of the Christian Writer's Guild, freelance writer for the Michigan Front Page, and author of two new books."

Fowler, notes a post by JoAnne Thomas on RightPundits.com, explained his complaint on his blog. He writes:

In 1970, I Corinthians 6:9 read as followed-

THE KING JAMES BIBLE

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind.

In 1982, the same scripture read like this-

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites.

In 2001 the same scripture reads like this-

Surely you know that the people who do wrong will not inherit God's kingdom. Do not be fooled, those who sin sexually, worship idols, take part in adultery, those who are male prostitutes, or men who have sexual relations with other men, those who steal, are greedy, get drunk, lie about others, or rob these people will not inherit God's kingdom.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

deltadom wrote:

Quote:

-----While it is easy to point the finger at the translators of the NIV regarding such matters, I have a strong feeling that the translators of the KJV were forced to do the same thing way back in the early 17th Century (in fact, they admitted to having experienced difficulty in agreeing upon a particular word or phrase from time to time

What you have got to be careful with in translations is goal, what is their purpose, why do they miss out certain phrases? or words. How does it change the Theology.

http://www.crossroad.to/Bible_studies/Message.html (http://www.crossroad.to/Bible_studies/Message.html) A Critic of the Message

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/10 13:51

Quote:

-----Hi BeYeDoers...

Quote:

The NIV translators do give an okay "feel" to the passage...it essentially conveys what the original says (although maybe it could also read that they heard a sound of a man arriving but did not hear a voice, which would mean the NIV does NOT properly convey it). Either way, it is NOT literal. It is an interpretation (otherwise known as "dynamic equivalence", as you know). Like I said earlier, they do your thinking for you. What first turned me off to the NIV was going through Colossians in an NIV-NASB-Greek interlinear, where I discovered how awfully inconsistent the NIV was with their translation of even simple words (eg the will translate the word "all" as some, many, most, all, etc.).

Just as you warned me, I would also warn you that you might need to clarify that this is your opinion too.

No, it's not. Ask your wife what the word for "eye" is in Spanish. She will tell you "ojo". It will ALWAYS mean that. Now, within a story she may find that she needs to use a different word to convey to her readers what she thinks I meant. That doesn't change the fact that "ojo" is the word for "eye." Problem I have with the NIV is that they do this in places where there is no need to, and can actually alter the original meaning (btw, every translation I know of after the KJV and maybe the original ASV does this somewhat with manhood/womanhood; but again I must stress I don't believe there was some kind of conspiracy with "modern versions"). This is a case where there is nothing wrong with being literal. It's not a colloquialism that doesn't translate well. The NIV translators translate "akou" as "hear" in almost every other place. Because that is what it means. They translate "understand" from a totally different word, except in this case. Ask them! They read this passage in Greek, and agreed it would be best to use their "dynamic equivalency" to translate it as "understand", presumably to clear up confusion, WHICH IS FINE. But that doesn't magically change what the Greek actually said. I'm not blaming them or "pointing fingers" as you say. The Greek says what it says...it doesn't change. The translators of different versions choose to convey it differently. It is a fact that this is NOT a literal translation of this passage. It is a fact it is more dynamic. It was their opinion that it was necessary to do so for whatever reason. It is your opinion that you like it. It is my opinion that what they did was fine, but I would prefer that they not.

I fully understand that all translations (of anything) require dynamic equivalence to a degree to make things understandable. And it is a fact that the NIV used it more than KJV, Geneva, ASV, NASB (and a fact that they used it more than textually necessary, as I'm sure they would readily admit to, since one of their goals was to make it more "readable"). It is my OPINION that they used it WAY too much ;-)

Brother, I know that we both have studied this issue at length, and obviously come to different conclusions. I suppose we will continue to agree to disagree.:-)

You can find Robinson's (long) article online. Just google it and it should be one of the first things that pops up.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/10 14:27

Hi walter...

Quote:

However, this reference is only made clear, and can only be found in the King James Bible. The NIV, NASB, and all of the "newer versions" published since 1881 are all unclear about specific sin, and have lumped them under the heading of "sexual sin."

Do you wonder why there is such confusion in the body of Christ today about sin in general and sexual sin specifically? The answer is found in the Newer Version Bibles that the body of today is reading and studying. Each version, since 1881, has become weaker and weaker and weaker and weaker, AND MORE USER FRIENDLY FOR SIN.

Brother, do you have to be so misleading in your rabid attacks on the NIV, NASB and other "newer versions?" In fact, your statement above borders on a LIE.

Consider this passage from (that supposedly soft on sin version) the NIV:

Quote:

-----**I Corinthians 6:9-10**

9 Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders **10** nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

Brother, every sin that you would mention is covered in the NIV and NASB. In fact, I looked up the words "homosexual" and "homosexuality" in the Strong's Concordance (for the KJV), and I found a total of -0- entries. In fact, the lawsuit in the article alleges that the KJV uses the word "homosexual" in I Corinthians 6:9, when the word doesn't appear in the KJV (at least, none of the versions that I have or those found online).

The concept of homosexuality as a sin is found throughout the Word of God—regardless of whether you use the KJV, the NIV or the NASB. The NIV talks about gross, unnatural affection between members of the same sex. In fact, the root of the sin is fornication and lust—which is extensively covered by each of these versions. Consider these examples from Scripture as declared by each version:

Quote:

Leviticus 18:22

New International Version

22 Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable.

King James Version

22 Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.

New American Standard Bible

22 You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination.

Leviticus 20:13

New International Version

13 If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable. They must be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads.

King James Version

13 If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.

New American Standard Bible

13 If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act; they shall surely be put to death. Their bloodguiltiness is upon them.

Romans 1:24-27

New International Version

24 Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another. **25** They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen.

26 Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. **27** In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

King James Version

24 Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves:

25 Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

26 For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:

27 And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.

New American Standard Bible

24 Therefore (A)God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be (B)dishonored among them.

25 For they exchanged the truth of God for a (C)lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, (D)who is blessed forever. Amen.

26 For this reason (E)God gave them over to (F)degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural,

27 and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, (G)men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.

I Timothy 1:9-11

New International Version

9 We also know that law is made not for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, **10** for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers—and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine **11** that conforms to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me.

King James Version

9 Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,

10 For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;

11 According to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.

New American Standard Bible

9 realizing the fact that law is not made for a righteous person, but for those who are lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers

10 and immoral men and homosexuals and kidnappers and liars and perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound teaching,

11 according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, with which I have been entrusted.

Jude 1:7

New International Version

7 In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and perversion. They serve as an exam

ple of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire.

King James Version

7 Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

New American Standard Bible

7 just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh, are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.

As you can tell, the topic of the sinfulness of homosexuality is well covered by each of these versions. A difference in wording or grammar in a particular passage (or set of passages) does not equate to a removal of this doctrine from the Bible. A difference in wording could be the result of the different set of sources used, a different method of translation or simply the consensus opinion of the translators (of either the source or subsequent work).

It is a poor defense of one translation when the basis of that defense is an attack on the others. In this case, the attack is hollow and misleading. The NIV, NASB and the KJV cover this issue well only in the sense that they translated it from their original sources to the best of their abilities and skill.

:~)

Re:, on: 2008/7/10 14:45

I do agree with Walter that the KJV deals with sin much more specifically. The newer versions are not as strong.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/7/10 14:49

Well, Chris, as usual, we will have to agree to disagree.

Ask yourself, honestly, why is this man bringing a lawsuit against Nelson and Zondervan for ONLY the printing of the King James Bible version of the bibles they publish? They print them all, yet they are only being sued for the King James Bible.

It is only because the definition of sexual sin is explicit, and spelled out in detail. The King James Bible convicts sinners of their sin. The other versions aren't doing the job.

We have people today that have created "homosexual churches", and they believe that they are saved and on their way to heaven. Do you find the King James Bible in these "churches"? Absolutely not! It is usually the NIV, or one of other even newer perversions.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiss wrote:

Hi walter~

Quote:

However, this reference is only made clear, and can only be found in the King James Bible. The NIV, NASB, and all of the "newer versions" published since 1881 are all unclear about specific sin, and have lumped them under the heading of "sexual sin."

:~)

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/7/10 15:07

waltern wrote:

Quote:

We have people today that have created "homosexual churches", and they believe that they are saved and on their way to heaven. Do you find the King James Bible in these "churches"? Absolutely not! It is usually the NIV, or one of other even newer perversions.

Sincerely,

Walter

That is a stretch.

Brother, I believe you have a good heart towards the Lord, but I know many brothers and missionaries that use the NIV. These men have fully given their lives to the Lord in every aspect and way.

Now in comes Waltern and indirectly calls them "perverted" for using a Bible that you haven't authorized. These men have more faith in their big toe than most Christians have in their entire lifetime. To generalize folks and place them into a box based on no clear cut evidence other than opinion and handed down traditions of men is not of Christ.

Christ has been with us for 1610 years BEFORE the KJV, BTW.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2008/7/10 15:31

Hi BeYeDoers...

Quote:

No, it's not. Ask your wife what the word for "eye" is in Spanish. She will tell you "ojo". It will ALWAYS mean that. Now, within a story she may find that she needs to use a different word to convey to her readers what she thinks I meant. That doesn't change the fact that "ojo" is the word for "eye."

The problem with this example is that it isn't a typical example by which translators face difficulty. The example that I used was from my earlier post. I asked, "Do you see how this reads?" To translate this in a literal word-for-word method would NOT carry over the meaning of the question. The word "see" in Spanish is the verb "ver" – most of the time. However, it could also be translated as the verb "comprender" ("to comprehend"), "entender" ("to understand") or "apreciar" or "percibir" ("to perceive"), along with a few others. The exact word to use can only come about via an understanding of just what the source is trying to express. Thus, the question that I asked can be translated into Spanish in any number of ways – dependent upon what the translator assumes that I am asking. But a literal "word for word" translation (in this case, "¿Ves como se lee?") would be incorrect. The correct translation (via dynamic equivalence) would be "¿Percibes que quiere decir esto?" or "¿Usted percibe cómo lee esta manera?"

The same can be said for any language. I suppose that the necessity to understand the context of a phrase is important in the translation process into any language. It would be impossible to translate an effective version of the Bible (or anything, for that matter) without using some sort of elucidation skills. I am quite confident that the translators of the King James Version were forced to construe the meaning of certain words in order to best construct phrases into early 17th Century English. We do this in our everyday lives. When my father tells me, "I love you" over the telephone, I understand that it has a different meaning than when my wife tells me "I love you." If we were to translate the word "I love you" into Spanish, we would use "Te quiero mucho" when speaking to family members, children or friends, while we would use "Te amo" when speaking to our spouse. The translator has to realize these subtle differences in grammar and usage.

Quote:

Problem I have with the NIV is that they do this in places where there is no need to, and can actually alter the original meaning (btw,

every translation I know of after the KJV and maybe the original ASV does this somewhat with manhood/womanhood; but again I must stress I don't believe there was some kind of conspiracy with "modern versions").

Again, I have to ask just what you base this conclusion upon? Where in the Scriptures was this not needed? What did the translators say about whether or not they felt that it was needed? How do we know that the translators of the King James Version did not do the same?

Quote:
-----This is a case where there is nothing wrong with being literal. It's not a colloquialism that doesn't translate well. The NIV translators translate "akou" as "hear" in almost every other place. Because that is what it means. They translate "understand" from a totally different word, except in this case. Ask them! They read this passage in Greek, and agreed it would be best to use their "dynamic equivalency" to translate it as "understand", presumably to clear up confusion, WHICH IS FINE. But that doesn't magically change what the Greek actually said. I'm not blaming them or "pointing fingers" as you say. The Greek says what it says...it doesn't change.

I understand what you're saying...to a point. However, I looked at the same word (via Strong's and my handy Lexicon's outline for Biblical usage) and I find that the same word (akouō) can translate into English as "to comprehend, to understand." In this case, this seems to be a possible alternative rendering. The translators of the NIV and NASB seemed quite confident that this was the correct rendering, because they did not include a footnote about a possible alternative rendering when a translated phrase was in question. It might be interesting to ask someone on the NIV team about the choice of wording with this particular verse, though.

Quote:
-----I fully understand that all translations (of anything) require dynamic equivalence to a degree to make things understandable. And it is a fact that the NIV used it more than KJV, Geneva, ASV, NASB (and a fact that they used it more than textually necessary, as I'm sure they would readily admit to, since one of their goals was to make it more "readable"). It is my OPINION that they used it WAY too much

I agree that both the translators of the KJV and the NIV used dynamic equivalence to a certain extent. In fact, I would venture to guess that they used it far more than the more ardent supporters of the KJV would be willing to admit. Ironically, the *KJV-only* crowd (which I realize that you are not a part of) obstinately argue against "dynamic equivalence" until it comes to passages like Acts 12:4 (the inclusion of the pagan word "Easter"). At this point, the argument usually goes that the translators of the KJV "were the only ones who got it right" without mentioning that they felt that they used a little "dynamic equivalence" in order to arrive to such an opinion (when the Greek word is "Pascha" or *Pasover*).

Anyway, I think that we agree on much more than we disagree. I didn't mean to go into a defense of "dynamic equivalence" in the translation process, or to go about defending the NIV. However, I notice that many of the justifications for the preeminence of the KJV eventually meander into an attack on other versions. This just isn't a good defense for any version.

I suppose that I don't mind that people prefer the KJV or believe that it is a better translation than another version. However, I think that it becomes unhealthy when one assumes and attempts to advance the idea that the KJV is divinely preserved to the point of perfection. I know that this is not reflective of you (or Brother Krispy). However, there are those who have formed a very zealous and immovable opinion based almost entirely upon a rather limited scope of research.

:-{

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss () , on: 2008/7/10 15:43

Hi waltern...

I didn't think that you would admit that the NIV and NASB also include passages against homosexuality. But I will admit it for you: The NIV and the NASB both include passages that declare homosexuality to be a sin.

Quote:
-----Ask yourself, honestly, why is this man bringing a lawsuit against Nelson and Zondervan for ONLY the printing of the King James Bible version of the bibles they publish? They print them all, yet they are only being sued for the King James Bible.

Well, you yourself mentioned the lawsuit. What was the purpose of this suit from the article? It seems that the plaintiff is accusing these publishers of changing the words of the KJV in order to more explicitly proclaim homosexuality to be a sin. Consider the words from the article:

Quote:
-----Fowler alleges both Zondervan and Thomas Nelson, with its KING JAMES BIBLE, manipulated Scripture without informing the public by using the term "homosexuals" in a New Testament passage, 1 Corinthians 6:9
He told the Grand Rapids TV station in an interview he wants to "compensate for the past 20 years of emotional duress and mental instability."

Zondervan, he contended, is misinterpreting the Bible.

... ..

Fowler, notes a post by JoAnne Thomas on RightPundits.com, explained his complaint on his blog. He writes:

In 1970, I Corinthians 6:9 read as followed-
THE KING JAMES BIBLE

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind.

In 1982 ,the same scripture read like this-

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites.

In 2001 the same scripture reads like this-

Surely you know that the people who do wrong will not inherit God's kingdom. Do not be fooled, those who sin sexually, worship idols, take part in adultery, those who are male prostitutes, or men who have sexual relations with other men, those who steal, are greedy, get drunk, lie about others, or rob these people will not inherit God's kingdom.

In other words, the plaintiff is accusing the publishers of manipulating the words of the KJV in order to push an "agenda." However, I haven't found a KJV that changes the words like the one he includes. I think that perhaps he was looking at the words of a different version (like the NIV) that explicitly uses the word "homosexual" in that passage.

:-)

Re:, on: 2008/7/10 16:19

To Miccah:

It appears that you want to create a disagreement. I am not here to argue with anyone. The NIV is being used all over the world today, by most Missionaries. Is it effective? As long as the only Soul Winner, Jesus Christ is Lord. Christ is the Savior and uses everything to draw the lost to Himself .

That has nothing to do with my previous post. I gave examples of how the definition of sexual sin is not as strong in the newer versions and that is the reason we are in the position that we find ourselves in today, July 10,2008.

The NIV and all of the newer versions have minimized the focus and definition of sexual sin, and sin in general.

I will ask you the same question I asked ccchhhrrriiiss:

Find and name a "homosexual church" that uses the King James Bible

In my first post today, July 10th, if you look at the years that Fowler is using for his defense of suing Nelson & Zondervan, it is that the Bible has been changing the definition of HOMOSEXUALITY over time. The first year that he uses is 1970.

**In 1970, I Corinthians 6:9 read as followed-
THE KING JAMES BIBLE**

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind.

In 1982 ,the same scripture read like this-

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites.

In 2001 the same scripture reads like this-

Surely you know that the people who do wrong will not inherit God's kingdom. Do not be fooled, those who sin sexually, worship idols, take part in adultery, those who are male prostitutes, or men who have sexual relations with other men, those who steal, are greedy, get drunk, lie about others, or rob these people will not inherit God's kingdom.

In 2008, the KING JAMES BIBLE HAS THIS TO SAY ABOUT I Corinthians 6:9:

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind.

In 1970 most people used the King James Bible. In the early 1970's the NIV came on the scene. Today, most people read the NIV, or one of the other "newer" versions created after the NIV. By using these versions as a timeline, we can track the descent of Christianity from the correct understanding of sexual sin, to the time of today, where there is nothing but confusion of what sexual sin really means, and how devastating it is to God. **GOD HATES SIN!** Unless believers repent-that includes you and me-- (turn from, by 180 degrees) and pray to God for forgiveness for committing that sin (by thought or deed-either physically following thought with it, or even thinking about doing it), then we/they cannot be forgiven, and thus cannot be saved. We must repent of all sin, but how can we, if the Bible version we are reading and relying does not clarify sin in the eyes of God to us?

Soon, based upon the signs of the times, the King James Bible will be outlawed because of the work that it does in the hearts and minds of sinners. It actually convicts them of their sin., and will be taken down by the "Hate Speech Laws" that are on the horizon of many States in America, already enacted in much of Europe, and presently being discussed by the U.N.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

Micah wrote:

Walter wrote:

Quote:

We have people today that have created "homosexual churches", and they believe that they are saved and on their way to heaven. Do you find the King James Bible in these "churches"? Absolutely not! It is usually the NIV, or one of other even newer perversions.

Sincerely,

Walter

That is a stretch.

Brother, I believe you have a good heart towards the Lord, but I know many brothers and missionaries that use the NIV. These men have fully given their lives to the Lord in every aspect and way.

Now in comes Walter and indirectly calls them "perverted" for using a Bible that you haven't authorized. These men have more faith in their big toe than most Christians have in entire lifetime. To generalize folks and place them into a box based on no clear cut evidence other than opinion and handed down traditions of men is not of Christ.

Christ has been with us for 1610 years BEFORE the KJV, BTW.

Re:, on: 2008/7/10 16:33

To ccchhrrriiisss:

The Plaintiff, Fowler is suing the publisher for printing the King James Bible. The reason? The King James has convicted him of his sin. The King James throughout the Old Testament and the New Testament is crystal clear about adultery, murder, homosexuality, bestiality, fornication, etc. etc. etc. and those words have convinced his heart that the **book must NOT be printed.**

The other books, the NIV and the newer versions, are softer, and not as offensive.

Since Fowler has no understanding of Bible versions, and the differences between them, his conclusion about what has been going on is striking and informative. He is speaking from a Humanists point of view. In todays culture whatever sexual sin you want is O.K. **His homosexuality is offended by what the King James Bible has to say about it, but yet not offended by the other Bible versions he quoted (all of them are other versions, created after 1881).**

That is the point. It is striking!

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi walter...

I didn't think that you would admit that the NIV and NASB also include passages against homosexuality. But I will admit it for you: The NIV and the NASB both include passages that declare homosexuality to be a sin.

Quote:

-----Ask yourself, honestly, why is this man bringing a lawsuit against Nelson and Zondervan for ONLY the printing of the King James Bible version of the bibles they publish? They print them all, yet they are only being sued for the King James Bible.

Well, you yourself mentioned the lawsuit. What was the purpose of this suit from the article? It seems that the plaintiff is accusing these publishers of changing the words of the KJV in order to more explicitly proclaim homosexuality to be a sin. Consider the words from the article:

Quote:

-----Fowler alleges both Zondervan and Thomas Nelson, with its KING JAMES BIBLE, manipulated Scripture without informing the public by using the term "homosexuals" in a New Testament passage, 1 Corinthians 6:9

He told the Grand Rapids TV station in an interview he wants to "compensate for the past 20 years of emotional duress and mental instability."

Zondervan, he contended, is misinterpreting the Bible.

... ..

Fowler, notes a post by JoAnne Thomas on RightPundits.com, explained his complaint on his blog. He writes:

In 1970, I Corinthians 6:9 read as followed-

THE KING JAMES BIBLE

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind.

In 1982 ,the same scripture read like this-

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites.

In 2001 the same scripture reads like this-

Surely you know that the people who do wrong will not inherit God's kingdom. Do not be fooled, those who sin sexually, worship idols, take part in adultery, those who are male prostitutes, or men who have sexual relations with other men, those who steal, are greedy, get drunk, lie about others, or rob these people will not inherit God's kingdom.

In other words, the plaintiff is accusing the publishers of manipulating the words of the KJV in order to push an "agenda." However, I haven't found a KJV that changes the words like the one he includes. I think that perhaps he was looking at the words of a different version (like the NIV) that explicitly uses the word "homosexual" in that passage.

:-)

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/7/10 17:45

walthern wrote:

Quote:

To Miccah:

It appears that you want to create a disagreement. I am not here to argue with anyone. The NIV is being used all over the world today, by most Missionaries. Is it effective? As long as the only Soul Winner, Jesus Christ is Lord. Christ is the Savior and uses everything to draw the lost to Himself .

Hi Walthern,

I re-read my post. You are correct. I did not pray before posting and came off sounding hostile. I apologize.

I guess that I took offense (even though I do not prefer the NIV and speak against using it) with someone that calls this version "perverted". To me, this implies that nothing good can come from the NIV, which is wrong.

My apologies.

I prefer the NKJV and am very satisfied with how the Lord uses this version and His words in my life.

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/10 17:52

Chris, I admit my example is not very adequate and oversimplistic *in general*, but my example *is* good for the verse we are talking about because it is almost a direct parallel. The reason Strong's mentions "understand" as a viable translation of the word is because it is used...ONCE out of several hundred instances. But ask the NIV translators, I bet they would never backtranslate "understand" as "akouei". Why? Because the Greeks used other words for this. When you look at the Greek, Acts 9:7 says they "akou-ed" and 22:7 says they "no akou-ed". Commentators are split on whether it means they heard a sound but not a voice (The most natural, I believe), or they heard Paul's voice but not Christ's (not so natural, since "voice" isn't even a necessary translation here), or they heard Christ's voice but didn't understand it (decent, but I think it may mystify it unnecessarily). Of course, there is absolutely no discussion if you only use the NIV, because the translators do the thinking for you. You are bound to *their* interpretation. You could be completely misunderstanding the verse, if one of the other interpretations is correct (I submit ultimately it is not much of a consequence, but it *is* a consequence) "See where I'm coming from?" (that of course is more colloquial because we are sloppy with our language, and would have to be dynamically translated...I submit that God was not so sloppy with his Greek, except where He was hyperbolic or VERY INTENTIONALLY colloquial)

Quote:

-----Anyway, I think that we agree on much more than we disagree.

Agreed. :-)

Quote:

-----I think that it becomes unhealthy when one assumes and attempts to advance the idea that the KJV is divinely preserved to the point of perfection.

Amen! And to be honest, these type of KJV-only arguments wear me out and are hardly worthy of response because they don't think, but rather

Quote:

-----have formed a very zealous and immovable opinion based almost entirely upon a rather limited scope of research.

Blessings.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2008/7/10 17:55

Hi Walter...

Quote:
-----The Plaintiff, Fowler is suing the publisher for printing the King James Bible. The reason? The King James has convicted him of his sin. The King James throughout the Old Testament is crystal clear about adultery, murder, homosexuality, bestiality, fornication, etc. etc. etc. and those words have convinced his heart that the book must NOT be printed.

Actually, you might want to reread your own post. It appears that the plaintiff is upset for the word "homosexual" appearing in that particular verse. He feels that this is offensive and points out his lifestyle. In reality, the word does NOT appear in the KJV's wording of I Corinthians 6:9-10 -- but the NIV's. Consider the difference between the two:

Quote:

New International Version
9 Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders **10** nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

King James Version
9 Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind,
10 Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

So, it appears that the plaintiff is mistaken and should take direct his lawsuit toward the NIV's publishers (rather than the KJV's). Of course, this plaintiff will eventually have his day in the Court of God. His argument will surely fail -- if he were even so bold to speak!

Quote:
-----The other books, the NIV and the newer versions, are softer, and not as offensive.

This is entirely your own personal opinion. As a believer who reads both the NIV and the KJV, I wholeheartedly disagree with such an opinion.

: -)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2008/7/10 18:25

Hi BeYeDoers...

I understand your perspective about this. The underlying point that I was attempting to make is not with Acts 9:7 or Acts 22:7 -- but to demonstrate to those who would obstinately declare that the KJV is perfect or that the NIV used creative interpretation while the KJV translators used a word-for-word method. It may have been a little more word-for-word, but most translators today (including my wife) are adamant that an entirely (or even *mostly*) literal translation is inherently flawed. I feel extremely confident that the translators of both the NIV and the KJV had to often use their "best judgment" when deciding upon a particular word or phrase.

In fact, if we asked five translators to take a paragraph of modern Greek and translate it into modern English, I venture to guess that we would have five different paragraphs! While the essence of the original paragraph would probably remain intact, the wording could vary drastically from person-to-person. My wife told me that when she translates, she has to consider each word literally (including all possible tenses and alternative meanings), while at the same time understanding the context of the words within the phrase, sentence, paragraph and entire work. In addition, she says that she must consider the historical significance from which the source is translated. Some words simply change their meaning over time (like the word "knew" from Matthew 1:25 in the KJV).

Quote:
-----Of course, there is absolutely no discussion if you only use the NIV, because the translators do the thinking for you. You are bound to their interpretation. You could be completely misunderstanding the verse, if one of the other interpretations is correct (I submit ultimately it is not much of a consequence, but it is a consequence)

Of course, I disagree with your conclusion that the translators of the NIV are trying to do "your thinking for you." In fact, the same argument could be held against the KJV -- or the Textus Receptus! Even if the KJV were an entirely more literal translation, the reader must rely on the end product (unless, of course, they do as we have). In that sense, the translation

tors of the KJV put what they felt to be the most accurate representation onto the final draft -- just as the translators of the NIV did too. And just as there were differences in opinion regarding the wording of the NIV, there were also differences of wording in regard to the KJV (not to mention, pre-ordained restrictions regarding Church terminology).

Anyway, I appreciate this discourse. I am thinking about writing to my contacts from the NIV (and the publisher) regarding some of these things. It would be interesting to hear their reasons firsthand (rather than by second guessing their intentions or reasons). Just a few weeks ago, I actually received the answer from an email that I had written a couple of years ago to someone who assisted with the NIV!

:~)

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/10 18:39

Quote:

-----Anyway, I appreciate this discourse.

likewise.

Quote:

-----I am thinking about writing to my contacts from the NIV (and the publisher) regarding some of these things. It would be interesting to hear their reasons firsthand (rather than by second guessing their intentions or reasons). Just a few weeks ago, I actually received the answer from an email that I had written a couple of years ago to someone who assisted with the NIV!

How cool it is (translate *that*:-)) that we can still communicate to men who devote their lives to bring God's word from the originals (well, as close as we can get) to our language!! At that they make themselves available!

Re:, on: 2008/7/10 19:45

To ccchhhrrriiiss:

The King James says something different than all of the other "newer versions".

THE KING JAMES BIBLE

9. Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, **nor effeminate**, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, 10. Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

I truly think the one word that is missing in all of the other translations, that is found in the King James, is the word **effeminate**, that relates to the sin of homosexuality.

You mentioned earlier, Chris that you were interested in the **New King James Bible. It leaves effeminate out as well.** Here is the NKJV:

9. Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites,
10. nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will inherit the kingdom of God.
11. And such were some of you. But you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.

In my lifetime I have witnessed men turn to homosexuality. A common symptom of this sin is that men become effeminate after they turn. I also know of a guy that I went to High School with, who acted effeminate, but was not a practicing homosexual. I met him years later in a College Class, only to find him militantly gay and proud of his effemininity. I have also read about homosexual men that do not display effemininity. It is so common in homosexuality- the lisp, the walk, etc. etc. etc. that possession from an effeminate demon spirit should be considered as the cause.

Christ cast out demons from many people. Why would we think that men and women who live today are free of demon possession?

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:
Hi Walter...

Quote:
-----The Plaintiff, Fowler is suing the publisher for printing the King James Bible. The reason? The King James has convicted him of his sin. The King James throughout the Old Testament is crystal clear about adultery, murder, homosexuality, bestiality, fornication, etc. etc. etc. and those words have convicted his heart that the book must NOT be printed.

Actually, you might want to reread your own post. It appears that the plaintiff is upset for the word "homosexual" appearing in that particular verse. He feels that this is offensive and points out his lifestyle. In reality, the word does NOT appear in the KJV's wording of I Corinthians 6:9-10 -- but the NIV's. Consider the difference between the two:

Quote:

New International Version

9 Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders **10** nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

King James Version

9 Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, **10** Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

So, it appears that the plaintiff is mistaken and should take direct his lawsuit toward the NIV's publishers (rather than the KJV's). Of course, this plaintiff will eventually have his day in the Court of God. His argument will surely fail -- if he were even so bold to speak!

Quote:

-----The other books, the NIV and the newer versions, are softer, and not as offensive.

This is entirely your own personal opinion. As a believer who reads both the NIV and the KJV, I wholeheartedly disagree with such an opinion.

:-)

Re: Just how much can we blame Bibles for sin! - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/10 20:31

Quote:

----- The other versions aren't doing the job

Quote:

----- The newer versions are not as strong.

How can one objectively prove that "modern" translations are less effective in convicting people of sin? Let's admit that people's consciences tend to be moulded by their social environment. Today we lack the social restraints of the "olden days" - that is the days when there was only the KJV translation. Certainly today society holds much more authority than the Bible - even in our churches. Surely it would be a gross misdiagnosis to blame the translations for allegedly obscuring the nature of sin!

From my experience back during the KJV days, there were certain sins that tended to fly under the radar: the sins that

surround hypocrisy (like self-righteousness, cold love, legalism, etc). And yet today - like never in my past - I am meeting people who are confessing hypocrisy - even though few of them read the KJV. They have come to such awareness by cutting the umbilical cord that has kept them in an unholy reliance on the preachers and "experts" - those who have tended to place less emphasis on hypocrisy than the Bible does.) Yes, those who are being convicted have been reading their Bibles for themselves!

From my personal observations I could conclude that the KJV does not do a good job explaining the sins of hypocrisy, and yet I see, the "modern" versions as presenting hypocrisy as the most severe and deadliest of sin against God and his Church. Jesus dealt with hypocrisy more than any other sins, yes?

Is hypocrisy not still the strongest deterrent to revival - the movement of the Spirit? Who would blame the KJV for the yesteryear's pervasive blindness to such obvious, repetitive Biblical warnings related to hypocrisy?

If I seem to be a broken record here, (and perhaps have been long-ignored by now) it is because I am in deep distress over how much the Bible gets blamed for sins - blamed from all sides - ranging from the ultraliberal to the ultraconservative accusers!

It's time to learn how to be better diagnosticians of the fatal heart condition of humanity! And this process begins by seeing the Word as a mirror! If anyone can prove to me that some translations fail to provide an effective mirror, let me know! But then, how can you prove that it is not the reader who is at fault?

"Judgment begins in the house of God."

Diane

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/10 20:38

What about the perversions of the original 1611 KJV, which included the apocryphal writings, and through them endorsed such practices as praying to the dead?

Instead of talking about how the modern translations weaken attacks on sin, how about we talk about the KJV endorsement of things God considers an abomination? Hmm...

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/10 21:09

Man I am so confused now after reading this whole thread, I don't know if I could even understand "A Bible For Dummies" if they had one. :-P

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/7/10 21:53

Quote:

-----I don't know if I could even understand "A Bible For Dummies" if they had one.

[Image: http://www.whsmith.co.uk/Images/Products%5C764%5C552%5C9780764552960_m_f.jpg]

They actually do. You can find it at Wal-Mart next to the idiot's guide for plumbing and small engine repair.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/10 21:55

Thanks Brother Paul, I must get me one your the man!!

Re:, on: 2008/7/10 22:47

To King Jimmy:

As I recall, you have brought up this straw-man argument before. I never had the time to answer it, but now is as good as ever. Here goes:

What about the King James 1611 and the Apocrypha?

Over the years much has been said concerning the fact that the first edition of the King James Bible contained the Apocrypha. It is true that the publisher of the 1611 edition did insert the Apocrypha between the Testaments, **but it was never included within the Old Testament text as was so done in the Hexapla, in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (the minority text, used to create the Catholic Bible). The Apocrypha section from the Cambridge Group of the 1611 translators rendered the entire work into English but for historical purposes only – not as inspired Scripture. The Apocrypha was removed even from the space between the Testaments in the second edition; meanwhile, it in no way affected the accuracy of the texts of the Old or New Testaments.**

D.A. Waite, Defending the King James Bible,
p. 85.
Hills, The King James Version Defended, p. 230.

THE APOCRYPHA

These books are mainly the product of the last three centuries B.C., a time during which written prophecy had ceased. They were accepted as part of the sacred literature by the Alexandrian Jews and, with the exception of the Second Book of Esdras, are found interspersed among the Hebrew Scriptures in the ancient copies of the Septuagint or LXX. The godly Jews under Ezra rejected the Apocrypha as having been inspired by the LORD when they formed the Old Testament canon. Josephus (c.100 A.D.) confirms that these books were not considered as "divine" in his day. He informs us that the canon was closed c.425 B.C.

The Apocrypha gradually rose in esteem in the APOSTATE Roman (Western) Church until the Council of Trent (1546 A.D.) affirmed the canonicity of the greater part. In making this decision the Catholic Church sided with the Jews of Alexandria Egypt in considering the Apocrypha sacred.

Remember that it was in Alexandria that Mary was revered as the second person of the Trinity by the so called "Christians". Although Jerome rejected it, the Apocrypha has now been incorporated into his Vulgate by the Roman Catholic Church.

Jones, The Septuagint: A Critical Analysis, pp. 10-52.

Josephus, Against Apion (Contra Apionem,), I, 8).

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

What about the perversions of the original 1611 KJV, which included the apocryphal writings, and through them endorsed such practices as praying to the dead?

Instead of talking about how the modern translations weaken attacks on sin, how about we talk about the KJV endorsement of things God considers an abomination? Hmm...

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/10 23:09

Thanks to all of you,

After all these posts and thousands of words, I have finally found the answer to my brother's question. He wanted to know which is the better version between the NASB and the NKJV. Well brother, the answer is the NKJV.

The reason is because the NKJV came after the NASB. The NASB was the best up to date version in its day but the NKJV is even better because it actually is more in line with the KJV. Thanks to all of you I am going to read the NKJV more than ever along with my KJV. I will still probably read the NASB some just to see what words and scriptures they left out

Re:, on: 2008/7/10 23:20

Dear rbanks:

Do you realize that there are over 4000 changes in the NKJV Bible from the King James version? Before you make the final decision for the NKJV please find out what those differences are. Do they affect Bible Doctrine (Bible truth and teaching) or are they merely cosmetic? On this thread I posted one difference, that has major implications. The NKJV chose to go along with

Westcott & Hort, and all of the newer versions, and ripped **effeminite** from 1 Cor 6:9

King James Version (KJV):

9. Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor **effeminate**, nor abusers of themselves with mankind,

10. Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

New King James (NKJV)

9. Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites,

10. nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will inherit the kingdom of God.

It is quite clear, from the above comparison, that in this instance **the New King James has not maintained the integrity of the authorized version (Majority Text) of the Protestant Bible, but has succumbed to the minority text, that is behind all of the newer versions. How many of the 4,000 differences between the KJV and NKJV are of this type of error?**

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

rbanks wrote:

Thanks to all of you,

After all these posts and thousands of words, I have finally found the answer to my brother's question. He wanted to know which is the better version between the NASB and the NKJV. Well brother, the answer is the NKJV.

The reason is because the NKJV came after the NASB. The NASB was the best up to date version in its day but the NKJV is even better because it actually is more in line with the KJV. Thanks to all of you I am going to read the NKJV more than ever along with my KJV. I will still probably read the NASB some just to see what words and scriptures they left out

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/11 6:54

Over the years much has been said concerning the fact that the first edition of the King James Bible contained the Apocrypha. It is true that the publisher of the 1611 edition did insert the Apocrypha between the Testaments, but it was never included within the Old Testament text as was so done in the Hexapla, in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (the minority text, used to create the Catholic Bible).

So what? It was included into the "Holy Bible" by them just the same. That is adding to the word of God! Therefore, the translators were under a curse according to Revelation!

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/11 7:29

Quote:

----- I will still probably read the NASB some just to see what words and scriptures they left out

Has the Holy Spirit given you this purpose for reading the NASB? If so, then I trust that you have a good handle on Greek and Hebrew to help you make informed judgments.

In all seriousness, I trust that when you read the NASB, you will leave room for the possibility that the Spirit may show you some truths that you never noticed before. I trust that you will be blessed and enriched through your deepening intimacy with HIM through your reading. Countless have found the NASB to do that for them.

Can you leave room for that possibility too?

PS: By the way, there is a fair-sized group of people out there who shy away from the NASB because they believe it has an "evangelical slant" and thus can't possibly be an objective translation. Do you think it is fair to assess a version in that manner?

Diane

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/11 10:10

Quote:

roadsign wrote:

Quote:

----- I will still probably read the NASB some just to see what words and scriptures they left out

Has the Holy Spirit given you this purpose for reading the NASB? If so, then I trust that you have a good handle on Greek and Hebrew to help you make informed judgments.

In all seriousness, I trust that when you read the NASB, you will leave room for the possibility that the Spirit may show you some truths that you never noticed before. I trust that you will be blessed and enriched through your deepening intimacy with HIM through your reading. Countless have found the NASB to do that for them.

Diane

Hi Diane,

I apologize for using that last line in my post. I shouldn't have been trying to be humorous and not realizing I would be offending others.

Again I apologize if I mislead anyone, the reason I said it was in humor of all the strong posts of the different opinions on here already.

My personal fear of God concerning His word (and I can not help this) is that I lean more toward the KJV because it was here over 200 years before they found the two older manuscripts that have caused them to reevaluate in the translating of the newer versions.

Personally I have not found yet in what little I have read of the versions that made changes (words left out, scriptures left out, meaning changed) that would seem to cause me to love God more. I have a strong fear of God and if I read anything other than the KJV it is for clarity of the archaic words and some old English words to understand and communicate better. I always read the bible in context of what the Holy Spirit was saying to the original apostles who wrote what He inspired them to write.

I do realize that there are some changes in the NKJV that were effected by the minority texts. But the NKJV is still the only one more in line with the pattern of the KJV.

I can read other versions and the rule that has helped me is where there is a difference in the wording, will it cause me to love God more and will it kill more of my dreaded enemy the flesh.

Only God knows the real answers. If I will just stay filled with His Spirit He will not lead me wrong. My hope is not to lead anyone else wrong.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/11 12:21

This thread would have been a whole lot better for me with a poll and a lot less confusing, so have we figured it out yet? :-)

Re:, on: 2008/7/11 12:43

Very well, MrBillPro:

God's Word, the Bible tells me that He has magnified His Word, the Bible, above His Own Name.

Psalms 138

1. I Will praise thee with my whole heart: before the gods will I sing praise unto thee.
2. I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: **for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name.**

To honor God, based upon my understanding of the texts used that created the Bibles that we read today (The Majority Text and the Minority Text) I would have to choose the King James Bible and reject the two newer versions you are asking about.

The New King James misses the mark, over and over and over. At first read, it sounds almost identical to the King James, but after serious study, it is not.

Sincerley,

Walter

Quote:

MrBillPro wrote:

This thread would have been a whole lot better for me with a poll and a lot less confusing, so have we figured it out yet? :-)

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/11 12:51

Quote:

----- so have we figured it out yet?

Hi, MrBillPro, Glad to see you come up for air every once in a while to check the breeze!

Actually, I just made an amazing discovery regarding Bible translations and that is this: it has to be meaningful to the reader! My 2 ½ yo granddaughter is here this week, and this morning she was strutting around with her 415-page Toddler's Bible under her arm—like Little Miss Preacher. She wanted nothing other than for me to read it (yet again!). Seeing such delight in the good old Bible stories is refreshing to me. She is like a sponge. There are no barriers, no symptoms of scepticism—just pure delight.

“... as a little child.” Praise God for those who have “translated” the Bible—via pictures and minimalist language for our most impressionable citizens of society.

By the way, has anyone read, (<http://www.tniv.info/pdf/Blomberg.pdf>) The Untold Story of a Good Translation by Craig Blomberg. If anything it gives some insight into how human nature affects the battle over translations.

BTW, I don't think it hurts to rejoice in the fact that God didn't stop working 400 years ago regarding the accurate preservation of his word. Admittedly, this thread hasn't even touched on the recent translations - the ones truly modern.

Diane

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2008/7/11 19:06

Quote:

roadsign wrote:

Quote:

----- so have we figured it out yet?

Hi, MrBillPro, Glad to see you come up for air every once in a while to check the breeze!

Diane

Diane, you know me way to well don't you? that was a good response though. :-)

Re:, on: 2008/7/11 21:15

The story continues. **No, they continue to tell us, there is no real difference in regards to Bible Doctrine, Bible teaching, and Bible truth between the two Bible versions. We have the majority text, that is responsible for the KJV, and we have the minority text, that is responsible for the Catholic Bible, as well as all of the Newer versions, published and copyrited since 1881, yet the teaching in each version is no different.**

IS THAT TRUE?

I have a 10 year old Grandson who is now reading and studying his Bible everyday. What Bible does he read? The King James, of course. **You ask, how can he understand the archaic words, and even understand what he is reading?.** He is reading it at ten, the same way I did when I was ten. I really do not want him to read any other version.

After studying this analysis, tell me that it will not hurt my 10 year old gradson. Please, tell me that it will not hurt my 35 year old daughter. Please, please, please tell me that it will not hurt me to read and study the minority text, that is found in all of the newer versions--the ASV; NIV, NASB, The Message, etc. etc. etc.:

Exodus 6:3

KJV= JEHOVAH

NASB , NIV, ETC.= the Lord

2 Cor. 5:8

KJV=Jesus Christ

NASB , NIV, ETC= Christ

Acts 8:18

KJV=The Holy Ghost

NASB , NIV, ETC= the Spirit

Rev. 1:11

KJV= I am Alpha and Omega

NASB , NIV, ETC= **DELETED**

John 4:42

KJV= God, Christ, the Son

NASB , NIV, ETC= One, man

Matthew 19:17

KJV=God

NASB , NIV, ETC= only One

Joshua 22:22

KJV= The LORD God

NASB , NIV, ETC= The Mighty One

1 Cor. 16:22

KJV=Lord Jesus Christ

NASB , NIV, ETC= the Lord

Daniel 3:25

KJV=The Son of God

NASB , NIV, ETC= a son of the gods

John 9:35

KJV= Son of God

NASB , NIV, ETC= Son of Man

Acts 14:15

KJV= God

NASB , NIV, ETC= **a** God

1 John 5:7

KJV=For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.

NASB , NIV, ETC=**DELETED**

Ephesians 5:9

KJV= fruit of the Spirit

NASB , NIV, ETC= fruit of the light

Rev. 21:24

KJV= and the nations **of them which are saved** shall walk in the light

NASB , NIV, ETC= and the nation shall walk by its light

Rev. 15:3

KJV=King of saints

NASB , NIV, ETC= king of nations/ages

Matt. 28:20

KJV= end of the world

NASB , NIV, ETC= end of the age

Phil. 4:13

KJV= I can do all things through **Christ** which strengtheneth me

NASB , NIV, ETC= I can do everything through him who gives me strength

1 Tim. 3:16

KJV=**God** was manifest in the flesh

NASB , NIV, ETC= He who was revealed in the fleshg

Acts 4:24

KJV=thou art God

NASB , NIV, ETC= **DELETED**

Matt. 8:29

KJV= **Jesus**

NASB , NIV, ETC= **DELETED**

Mark 2:15

KJV=Jesus

NASB , NIV, ETC= him (no capital H—over, and over, and over)

Matt. 6:33

KJV=the Kingdom of God

NASB , NIV, ETC= His kingdom

Rev 21:4

KJV=God

NASB , NIV, ETC= He

Gal. 1:15

KJV= God

NASB , NIV, ETC=He

Matt 22:32

KJV= God

NASB , NIV, ETC=He

1 Cor 14:2

KJV= The Spirit

NASB , NIV, ETC= his spirit

Acts 22:16

KJV= the Name of the Lord

NASB , NIV, ETC= His name

Rev. 14:1

KJV= The Father's name in their foreheads

NASB , NIV, ETC= **his name and** his Fathers name in their foreheads

Phil 3:3

KJV=worship **God**

NASB , NIV, ETC= worship (see Revelation, chapters: 9, 13, 14, 16

God of the New versions/New age

Isaiah 14:12-15

Devil of the Bible & Christianity

KJV=Lucifer

God of the New versions/New age

NASB , NIV, ETC= morning star

Acts 17:22

Devil of the Bible & Christianity

KJV=(image worshippers are) too superstitious

God of the New versions/New age

NASB , NIV, ETC (image worshippers are) very religious

Mark 10:21

KJV=and come, **take up the cross**, and follow me.

NASB, NIV, ETC.= Then come, follow me.

2 Peter 1:21

KJV= **holy** men

NASB, NIV, ETC.=men

1 Peter 2:22

KJV=**pure** heart

NASB, NIV, ETC.= adequate

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Has the following created the “prosperity” crowd, the name it and claim it, the blab it and grab it bunch??

You be the judge:

2 Timothy 3:17

KJV= perfect

NASB, NIV, ETC.= **prosperity**—is this what has fueled the “prosperity heresy”?

Jer. 29:11

KJV=righteousness

NASB, NIV, ETC.= **prosper**---more of the “prosperity heresy”?

1 Timothy 6:6

KJV= godliness **with contentment** is great gain

NASB, NIV, ETC.= godliness **actually is a means** of great gain---more prosperity heresy?

Heb 3:6

KJV=rejoicing

NASB, NIV, ETC.= **boast**???

2 Cor 1:14

KJV= your rejoicing

NASB, NIV, ETC.= be proud

2 Cor 1:12

KJV=rejoicing

NASB, NIV, ETC.= proud confidence

1 Timothy 1:4

KJV= godly edifying

NASB, NIV, ETC.= furthering the administration

Psalms 8:5

KJV= For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels

NASB, NIV, ETC.= You have made him a little lower **than God**

Job 42:6

KJV=I abhor myself

NASB, NIV, ETC.= I retract

Phil 3:21

KJV= our vile body

NASB, NIV, ETC.= our humble state

Luke 4:4

KJV=That man shall not live by bread alone, **but by every word of God**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= man shall not live on bread alone

xxxxxxxxxxxx

Salvation by works, or by faith in Jesus Christ?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Mark 10:24

KJV= Children, how hard is it, **for them at trust in riches** to enter into the kingdom of God

NASB, NIV, ETC.=Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God

Luke 21:19

KJV=In your patience possess ye your souls

NASB, NIV, ETC.= by standing firm you will save yourself

John 3:36

KJV=believeth

NASB, NIV, ETC.= obey

Gal 5:22

KJV=faith

NASB, NIV, ETC.= faithfulness

Romans 11:6

KJV= But if it be of works, then is it no more grace

NASB, NIV, ETC.=**DELETED**

Romans 1:16

KJV= the gospel of Christ

NASB, NIV, ETC.= the gospel

Acts 8:27

KJV= I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God

NASB, NIV, ETC.= **DELETED**

Col 1:14

KJV=In whom we have redemption **through His blood**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= In whom we have redemption

Mark 9:42

KJV=believe **in me**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= who believes

John 6:47

KJV=He that believeth **on me** hath everlasting life

NASB, NIV, ETC.= he who believes has everlasting life

Acts 22:16

KJV= calling on the name **of the Lord**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= calling on his name

1 John 5:13

KJV= and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God

NASB, NIV, ETC.=**DELETED**

2 John 2:9b

KJV=doctrine of **Christ**

NASB, NIV, ETC.=teaching

1 Timothy 2:7

KJV=truth in **Christ**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= truth

Gal 6:15

KJV=**For in Christ Jesus** neither circumcision availeth any thing

NASB, NIV, ETC.= neither is circumcision anything

Eph 3:14

KJV= I bow my knees unto the Father **of our Lord Jesus Christ**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= I bow my knees before the Father

Gal 4:7

KJV= an heir of God **through Christ**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= an heir of God

Eph 3:9

KJV=God, who created all thing **by Jesus Christ**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= an heir of God

Col 1:2

KJV=our Father **and the Lord Jesus Christ**

NASB, NIV, ETC.= the Father

1 John 4:3

KJV= And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus **Christ is come in the flesh** is not of God

NASB, NIV, ETC.=every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God

In conclusion, I await your answer. Specifically, I would like to hear from ccchhhrrriiisss & King Jimmy on this issue.

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/11 21:34

Hi Walter...

What do you NOT seem to understand that these versions came from different sets of sources and via different translation methods? You make it sound as if there was something "sinister" at work in the creation of any other text than the King James Version.

Tell me: Do you believe that the King James Version is PERFECT and without flaw?

Do you believe that God perfectly preserved His written Word and it was called the King James Version?

I am looking forward to your answer. Thanks!

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/11 23:08

Specifically, I would like to hear from ccchhhrrriiisss & King Jimmy on this issue.

I'm not sure what you are asking me to respond to?

Re:, on: 2008/7/12 10:03

If the KJV is the only REAL translation because its the oldest or true translation? Then should we be reading the New Testament John Wycliffe wrote in the 1380's? Since that is probably the only and declared the first hand written manuscript in English?

John Colet, oxford professor, read the New testament in Greek and translated it into English so his students would UNDERSTAND. The people were so hungry to hear Gods Word they packed the church, reported over 20,000 people just to hear it in their own language they understand. Before this, around 1490 Thomas Linacre, read the New Testament in Greek and comparing it to Latin Vulgate, he wrote in his journal, "Either this is not the Gospel or we are not Christians" Meaning the original Greek. So one could only speculate if there was much debate whether they should have touch the Latin Vulgate translation? Of course I don't know only thought.

Should we be reading the Coverdale Bible...the first complete Bible printed in English.

The Geneva Bible was the first bible published, even though King Henry viii allowed the bible to be published for public use, but only to churches and was changed up in the church. It is know as the Great Bible. Of course his plans were not to honor God, but to esteem himself as the "head of the Church" threw the church of Rome out, because of disagreements. The Geneva was the bible to be claimed as the protestant bible, the first bible for personal use, the first study bible many claim. apparently it has been know that the Geneva bible was more popular than the KJV, and many say that the 1611 King James was influenced from the Geneva Bible; which also is claimed to be known as the first bible to have numbered verses.

So what should we read then? KJV or Geneva, Coverdale, Matthews-Tyndale bible?

If we all want to be picking about KJV that it is the only one to read, this is not true, if you want to be technical we should learn Greek and Hebrew and read from the original text. This whole controversy with KJV only so much sounds like those that were against the Protestants because they were reading and publishing the New and Old Testament in English...the Church was so outraged, they martyred those who challenged the "Church" writings of the Bible. Sounds to me the same spirit at work, don't challenge them about the NASB or NKJV. Its the KJV only and anything else is heresy.

Reformer

edit: OOPS!!!!I forgot I wasn't supposed to comment on this again. I forgot sorry..

Re: - posted by mackaymarsh, on: 2008/7/12 13:29

Quote:

reformer wrote:

"...if you want to be technical we should learn Greek and Hebrew and read from the original text..."

Reformer

Now, that's the best idea I've heard yet. Hebrew is a tough language to learn and there doesn't seem to be that much discussion on the Old Testament anyway; mainly on the New Testament.

Greek, by comparison, is easier language to learn and understand. Why not teach Greek in every church and end the debates?

Unless, we then would want to debate which Greek manuscripts are more accurate. Oh my, where would it end?

I still like the idea of all Christians learning Biblical Greek. Sounds like the thing to do. Why not?

I'm going to give it a try. There are some on-line courses available. Anyone know of other avenues? Personally, I'd like to see it in every Church.

Anyway, that's my 2 cents.

Wayne

edit: 'end-quote'

Re:, on: 2008/7/12 17:25

Quote:

-----Unless, we then would want to debate which Greek manuscripts are more accurate. Oh my, where would it end?

Now that is funny!!!! :-P Good one.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/12 23:41

I highly recommend Mounce's Basics in Biblical Greek. If you are going to teach yourself, be sure to get the accompanying workbook, flash cards, and CD lectures. He uses an inductive method of learning Greek, and has you interacting with Greek exercises almost exclusively from the NT (though, he does use some of the early church fathers from time to time). If you are very disciplined, you could probably be through the book/lectures within about 6-9 months. I worked through it in about 30 weeks at the graduate level in seminary. But, that was partially due to the fact I was "forced" to learn Greek in order to pass my classes. So, there was much motivation behind it.

Re: - posted by mackaymarsh, on: 2008/7/13 0:45

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

I highly recommend Mounce's Basics in Biblical Greek.

Thanks so very much. I have in fact already downloaded his MP3 courses lectures from BiblicalTraining website a while

back. Now I need to get his book and flash cards. He is a very good speaker and teacher and I really appreciate what they are doing. I also have the recommended Greek fonts for my computer as well as the Greek Bibles offered by eSword. Anything else you think is needed, please let me know.

I really want to do this and was waiting for a man locally who teaches pastors and other interested folks. But I don't believe that route is an option anymore. Please pray for me as I really want to know the heart of God and His Word.

Great idea, Jimmy! Thanks for the encouragement. You are a blessing...

Wayne

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/7/13 3:28

I began with a KJV in 5th grade, switched to NIV in 7th grade, then to NLT in 8th grade. In 9th grade I began reading the NKJV, which was standard at my church.

After bible college I was repented and believed the gospel (irony?) and within a month or two began reading the KJV again, partly out of preference and because of the Puritans I was reading. Now I read KJV, and use an electronic Strong's concordance on my PDA to check words that need "amplifying".

I also use the Geneva and Tyndale bibles.

All of my studies about Minority/Majority has left me satisfied to be content with my KJV/Majority text versions.

Re:, on: 2008/7/13 15:39

It seems that no matter how many times the newer versions are compared with the King James Bible, those that support the newer versions cannot see any difference in teaching between them.

If you were going to write a letter to your children, a letter that would help them live in such a fashion that they might have eternal life, wouldn't you make it clear and straight forward, and easy to understand and follow?

Is there a difference in Translations that **dramatically affect Bible Doctrine**? Are you one of the one's that think all Bible Translations are all good, regardless of their source?

The two sources are always the same: 1) The Majority Text, that created the Protestant Bible, and has been the text of the true Christian Church since the beginning, or the 2) Minority Text, that created the Catholic Church--with a Pope, and "celibate" "Priests" (that sin must be confessed to to be forgiven), indulgences, that are paid for, and idols that are bowed down to, and all of the other error that continues to come from Catholicism?. This same minority text (that created the Catholic Bible) was **resurrected in 1881 by the "revision committee" when they created their first "newer version"**. All of the "newer versions" since that time have relied on the same minority text, responsible for the Catholic Bible, and responsible for the Catholic Church--- with all of its error and confusion and uncertainty.

Perhaps you should think again:

I am using eight modern translations (all created by the Minority text) to compare with the King James Bible (created from the Majority Text, and as such is the Bible of the Protestant Church), as follows:

NIV New International Version
NASB New American Standard Bible
NRSV New Revised Standard Version
REB Revised English Bible
LB Living Bible
NWT New World Translation
NAB New American Bible
NKJV New King James Bible

THESE ARE JUST SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT DOCTRINES OF THE BIBLE THAT ARE BEING ATTACKED BY THE NEWER VERSIONS. IS THERE ANY QUESTION ABOUT WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE BODY OF CHRIST

T TODAY, BECAUSE OF THIS DRASTIC CHANGE IN DOCTRINE?

Isaiah 7:14

“Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.”

New versions attack the Virgin Birth of Christ by robbing Mary of her virginity. A young woman or a maiden is not necessarily a virgin:

NRSV young woman

REB young woman

NWT maiden

Luke 2:33

“And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.”

New versions attack the Virgin Birth by telling us that Joseph was Christ’s father:

NIV The child’s father

NASB His father

NRSV the child’s father

REB the child’s father

NWT it’s father

NAB the child’s father

1 Timothy 3:16

“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.”

The King James is very clear in telling us GOD was manifest in the flesh. The new versions remove God completely:

NIV He appeared in a body

NASB He who was revealed in the flesh

NRSV He was revealed in flesh

REB He was manifested in the flesh

LB who came to earth as a man

NWT He was made manifest in the flesh

NAB He was manifested in the flesh

Micah 5:2

“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.”

Christ had no beginning. As the Second Person of the Trinity, He is eternal, or from everlasting. This is denied in most modern translations:

NIV from ancient times

NASB from ancient days

REB in ancient times

NWT from the days of time indefinite

NAB from ancient times

Isaiah 14:12

“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!”

Revelation 22:16 tells us that Jesus Christ is the “Morning Star”. The King James Bible never gives this title to anyone else. Many new versions have taken the liberty to call Satan the “morning star”. Though some do not go so far as to call Satan the “morning star,” they remove the name “Lucifer.”

NIV morning star
NASB star of the morning
NRSV Day Star
REB Bright morning star
NWT you shining one
NAB morning star

Daniel 3:25

“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.”

This verse shows that Jesus Christ existed before He was born in Bethlehem. New versions will pervert it with a nother god.

NIV a son of gods
NASB a son of gods
NRSV a god
REB a god
LB a god
NWT a son of gods
NAB a son of God

Colossians 1:14

“In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.”

Satan hates the Atoning Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, so we should not be surprised to find blood missing in modern translations:

NIV redemption, the forgiveness of sins
NASB redemption, the forgiveness of sins
NRSV redemption, the forgiveness of sins
REB our release is secured and our sins are forgiven
NWT we have our release by ransom, the forgiveness of sins
NAB redemption, the forgiveness of sins

Psalms 12:6-7

“6. 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.”

The above PROMISE from the King James Bible tells us that God will preserve His words forever. New versions destroy this promise by making us think the context is Gods PEOPLE rather than His WORDS:

NIV you will keep us safe
NASB Thou wilt preserve him
NRSV You, O Lord, will protect us
REB you are our protector
LB you will forever preserve your own
NAB You, O Lord, will keep us

Romans 14:10-12

“10. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. 11. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. 12. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.”

The above verses magnifies Jesus Christ. All of us, who are saved, will stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ, and will give account to GOD. When we stand before Jesus Christ we will be standing before GOD- an excellent text on the Deity of Christ. New Versions, that all rely on the minority text, replace Jesus Christ with “God”:

NIV God’s judgment seat

NASB Judgment seat of God
NRSV Judgment seat of God
REB God's tribunal
NWT Judgment seat of God
NAB Judgment seat of God

Acts 8:37

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

This verse places a definite condition upon water baptism: one must first believe on Christ. Modern versions throw the entire verse out of the Bible:

NIV Entire Verse Missing
NRSV Entire Verse Missing
REB Entire Verse Missing
NWT Entire Verse Missing
NAB **Omits entire verse, but rennumbers the verses so you won't miss it.**

2 Corinthians 2:17

“For we are not as many, **which corrupt the word of God**: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.”

This verse is a thorn in the flesh of the modern translators who are busy corrupting the word of God. Rather than repent of their sins and get right with God, they cling to the minority that says:

NIV peddle
NASB peddling
NRSV peddlers
REB adulterating the word of God for profit
LB hucksters
NWT peddlers
NAB Trade on the word of God
NKJV peddling

2 Timothy 2:15

“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”

This is the command in the New Testament—to “study” and “rightly divide” God's word, and the Devil does NOT appreciate it. Look what he has done, through men, to corrupt it:

NIV Do your best correctly handles
NASB be diligent handling accurately
NRSV do your best..rightly explaining
REB Try hard...keep strictly to the true gospel
LB Work hard...know what his Word says and means
NWT Do your utmost handling the word of truth aright
NAB Try hard...following a straight course in preaching the truth
NKJV Be diligent...rightly dividing

1 Timothy 6:20

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of **science falsely so called**:

Science that is FALSE is NOT knowledge

NIV Knowledge
NASB knowledge
NRSV knowledge
REB knowledge
LB knowledge
NWT knowledge
NAB knowledge

NKJV knowledge

In conclusion, some will be able to "see" the truth in the above, and some will not.

Actually, those that support the new versions, the minority text, will probably not even take the time to read and study the above to compare. The reason? .

I can see a profound difference between the versions. Can you?

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss () , on: 2008/7/13 16:40

Hi Walter...

Once again, you have served well to point out the differences in translation of a select group of verses. However, the major doctrinal elements are inarguably alive and well as found in the other versions. All that you have done (like you always seem to do) is point out a few differences within some texts...and ascribe those differences as the result of something "sinister." In fact, you offer no reason as to why the KJV was correct...and that all of the other versions (in these few cases) "got it wrong." Do you see the limits of your argument? It operates upon the premise that the KJV is 100% undoubtedly perfect.

Here are a few questions for you:

1. Why is there some conflict between versions that also came from the "majority" texts?
2. Do you understand the arguments as to why so many modern scholars (a majority) actually prefer the "minority" texts? I mean...the REAL reasons and not those invented by KJV-only apologists?
3. You haven't answered this directly:
Do you believe that the KJV is a perfect written rendering of the Word of God?

Thanks in advance for your answers!

: -)

Re: Quite done yet? - posted by crsschk () , on: 2008/7/13 17:16

Quote:

-----Rev. 1:11
KJV= I am Alpha and Omega
NASB , NIV, ETC= DELETED

NKJV = I am the Alpha and Omega

Come now walter you are breaking your own hermeneutic here by not being exacting aren't you? Not to mention dishonest ...

Ridiculous? Your filling up the better part of 13 pages with the same repeated ... are you not yet out of breath? Will you continue to ignore and cherry pick only the questions that are put to you that you have some formulated answer for?

You are obstinate like it or not. No give or take no considerations but your own no hearing anything that confounds or confronts your notions. Are you a Hebrew or Greek scholar? If not then your arguments will be taken with the grains of salt they deserve, it is all just a bit much and please back off with the **SHOUTING**.

Re:, on: 2008/7/13 18:56

Quote:

ccchhrrriiss wrote:
Hi Walter...

Once again, you have served well to point out the differences in translation of a select group of verses. However, the major doctrinal elements are i
narguably alive and well as found in the other versions.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

:-)

To ccchhrrriiss:

You have made a bold statement that must be supported by fact. Please provide proof, from each and every one of the 8 New versions I quoted (NIV, NASB, NRSV, REB, LB, NWT, NAB, NKJV) that everything posted previously by me is taught **throughout the newer versions**. Please quote both New and Old Testament quotations that clearly teach the following, from each version listed above (NIV, NASB, NRSV, REB, LB, NWT, NAB, NKJV):

1. Christ's Virgin Birth, and that Mary was a virgin
2. That Joseph is not referred to as Jesus Christ's father and that Mary is referred to as His mother.
3. Clear documented teaching, in each one of the "newer" versions, that Jesus Christ is and was God manifest in the flesh.
4. Clear teaching, with Bible prooftext, from all 8 versions, with clear references to the fact that **Christ is God in the flesh and that He is the Second Person of the Trinity, and that He is eternal, and has no beginning and no end.**
5. Explain why in Isaiah 14:12 in all of the "newer versions" replaces "Lucifer" (Satan) with one of the Name's of Jesus Christ, "Morning Star", as found in Revelation 22:16
6. Provide prooftext, using each one of the 8 new versions, that clearly teach throughout their "versions" that sinners are **redeemed through/by the Blood of Jesus Christ.**
7. Provide prooftext, from all 8 newer versions, that teach the fact that **God promised us that His Words would be preserved forever.**
8. Provide prooftext from all the newer versions of clear teaching (documented) in the newer versions that: all **believers** will stand before Jesus Christ, at the Judgement Seat of Christ, and be judged by Him, and that Christ is God.

I await your written response, kind sir.

Sincerley,

Walter

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

It seems that no matter how many times the newer versions are compared with the King James Bible, those that support the newer versions cannot see any difference in teaching between them. If you are going to write a letter to your children, a letter that would help them live in such a fashion that they might have eternal life, wouldn't you make it clear and straight forward, and easy to understand and follow?

Is there a difference in Translations that **dramatically** affect Bible Doctrine? Are you one of the ones that think all Bible Translations are all good, regardless of their source? The two sources are always the same: 1) The Majority Text, that created the Protestant Bible, and has been the text of the true Christian Church since the beginning, or the 2) Minority Text, that created the Catholic Church. This minority text was resurrected in 1881 by the revision committee when they created the first "newer version". All of the "newer versions" since that time have relied on the same minority text.

Perhaps you should think again:

I am using eight modern translations (all created by the Minority text) to compare with the King James Bible (created from the Majority Text, and as such is the Bible of the Protestant Church), as follows:

NIV New International Version

NASB New American Standard Bible

NRSV New Revised Standard Version

REB Revised English Bible

LB Living Bible

NWT New World Translation

NAB New American Bible

NKJV **New King James Bible**

THESE ARE JUST SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT DOCTRINES OF THE BIBLE THAT ARE BEING ATTACKED BY THE NEWER VERSIONS. IS THERE ANY QUESTION ABOUT WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE BODY OF CHRIST TODAY, BECAUSE OF THIS DRASTIC CHANGE IN DOCTRINE?

Isaiah 7:14

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

New versions attack the Virgin Birth of Christ by robbing Mary of her virginity. A young woman or a maiden is not necessarily a virgin:

NRSV young woman

REB young woman

NWT maiden

Luke 2:33

"And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him."

New versions attack the Virgin Birth by telling us that Joseph was Christ's father:

NIV The child's father

NASB His father

NRSV the child's father

REB the child's father

NWT it's father

NAB the child's father

1 Timothy 3:16

"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."

The King James is very clear in telling us GOD was manifest in the flesh. The new versions remove God completely.

tely:

NIV He appeared in a body

NASB He who was revealed in the flesh

NRSV He was revealed in flesh

REB He was manifested in the flesh

LB who came to earth as a man

NWT He was made manifest in the flesh

NAB He was manifested in the flesh

Micah 5:2

“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.”

Christ had no beginning. As the Second Person of the Trinity, He is eternal, or from everlasting. This is denied in most modern translations:

NIV from ancient times

NASB from ancient days

REB in ancient times

NWT from the days of time indefinite

NAB from ancient times

Isaiah 14:12

“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!”

Revelation 22:16 tells us that Jesus Christ is the “Morning Star”. The King James Bible never gives this title to anyone else. Many new versions have taken the liberty to call Satan the “morning star”. Though some do not go so far as to call Satan the “morning star,” they remove the name “Lucifer.”

Daniel 3:25

“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.”

This verse shows that Jesus Christ existed before He was born in Bethlehem. New versions will pervert it with another god.

NIV a son of gods

NASB a son of gods

NRSV a god

REB a god

LB a god

NWT a son of gods

NAB a son of God

Colossians 1:14

“In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.”

Satan hates the Atoning Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, so we should not be surprised to find blood missing in modern translations:

NIV redemption, the forgiveness of sins

NASB redemption, the forgiveness of sins

NRSV redemption, the forgiveness of sins

REB our release is secured and our sins are forgiven

NWT we have our release by ransom, the forgiveness of sins

NAB redemption, the forgiveness of sins

Psalms 12:6-7

“6. 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.”

The above promise from the King James Bible tells us that God will preserve His words forever. New versions destroy this promise by making us think the context is God's PEOPLE rather than His WORDS:

NIV you will keep us safe
 NASB Thou wilt preserve him
 NRSV You, O Lord, will protect us
 REB you are our protector
 LB you will forever preserve your own
 NAB You, O Lor, will keep us

Romans 14:10-12

“10. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. 11. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. 12. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.”

The above verses magnifies Jesus Christ. All of us, who are saved, will stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ, and will give account to GOD. When we stand before Jesus Christ we will be standing before GOD- an excellent text on the Deity of Christ. New Versions, that all rely on the minority text, replace Jesus Christ with “God”:

NIV God’s judgment seat
 NASB Judgment seat of God
 NRSV Judgment seat of God
 REB God’s tribunal
 NWT Judgment seat of God
 NAB Judgment seat of God

Acts 8:37

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

This verse places a definite condition upon water baptism: one must first believe on Christ. Modern versions throw the entire verse out of the Bible:

NIV Entire Verse Missing
 NRSV Entire Verse Missing
 REB Entire Verse Missing
 NWT Entire Verse Missing
 NAB Omits entire verse, but renumbers the verses so you won’t miss it.

2 Corinthians 2:17

“For we are not as many, **which corrupt the word of God**: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.”

This verse is a thorn in the flesh of the modern translators who are busy corrupting the word of God. Rather than repent of their sins and get right with God, they cling to the minority that says:

NIV peddle
 NASB peddling
 NRSV peddlers
 REB adulterating the word of God for profit
 LB hucksters
 NWT peddlers
 NAB Trade on the word of God
 NKJV peddling

2 Timothy 2:15

“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”

This is the command in the New Testament—to “study” and “rightly divide” God’s word, and the Devil does NOT appreciate it. Look what he has done, through men, to corrupt it:

NIV Do your best correctly handles
 NASB be diligent handling accurately
 NRSV do your best..rightly explaining
 REB Try hard....keep strictly to the true gospel
 LB Work hard...know what his Word says and means
 NWT Do your utmost handling the word of truth aright

NAB Try hard...following a straight course in preaching the truth
NKJV Be diligent...rightly dividing

1 Timothy 6:20

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of **science falsely so called:**

Science that is FALSE is NOT knowledge

NIV knowledge

NASB knowledge

NRSV knowledge

REB knowledge

LB knowledge

NWT knowledge

NAB knowledge

NKJV knowledge

In conclusion, some will be able to “see” the truth in the above, and some will not.

Actually, those that support the new versions, the minority text, will probably not even take the time to read and study the above to compare. The reason? .

I can see a profound difference between the versions. Can you?

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/13 19:11

1 Timothy 6:20

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:

Science that is FALSE is NOT knowledge

NIV knowledge

NASB knowledge

NRSV knowledge

REB knowledge

LB knowledge

NWT knowledge

NAB knowledge

NKJV knowledge

G1108

947;957;969;834;963;953;962;

gno772;sis

gno'-sis

From G1097; knowing (the act), that is, (by implication) knowledge: - knowledge, science.

By the way, the text does state to *avoid* these things ...

Try answering some of the questions put to you Walter or we can just discontinue the discussion.

Re:, on: 2008/7/18 12:52

To ccchhhrrriiss:

While I have been waiting for your response, in regards to the bold claim that you made, **I did a comparison between the Jerusalem Bible, that is used by the Catholic Church, and thus represents Catholic Doctrine**, and have compared that with the **King James Bible, that represents Protestant Doctrine**. I came up with the following comparison, which provides clarification of the difference in teaching (Doctrine) between the two versions.

Also, I then looked at all of the **following newer Bible versions, and compared them with the King James Bible: NIV, NASV, TEV, RSV, NWT, THE MESSAGE**. My conclusion is that all of the newer versions, published since 1888 agree with Catholic Doctrine, as taught in the Catholic Bible, and **DO NOT AGREE WITH PROTESTANT DOCTRINE**, as taught in the Protestant Bible—THE KING JAMES BIBLE.

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt. 5:22. But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother **without a cause** shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

But I say this to you, anyone who is angry with a brother will answer for it before the court; anyone who calls a brother 'Fool' will answer for it before the Sanhedrin; and anyone who calls him 'Traitor' will answer for it in hell fire.
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt. 5:27

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

'You have heard how it was said, You shall not commit adultery.
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt 5:44

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

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

44. But I say this to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you;
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt 9:13

And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

cannot mourn as long as the bridegroom is still with them? But the time will come when the bridegroom is taken away from them, and then they will fast.
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James Bible---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt 16:20

Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was **Jesus the Christ**. Note-Jesus was his name, that meant Savior. Christ is His Title, which means Messiah!

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

Then he gave the disciples strict orders not to say to anyone that he was the Christ.
xxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt 18:2
And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them,
New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
So he called a little child to him whom he set among them.
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King JamesÂ----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt 18:11
For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.
New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
DELETED

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt 20:16 So the last shall be first, and the first last: **for many be called, but few chosen**
New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
Thus the last will be first, and the first, last."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

20:22 **But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?** They say unto him, We are able.
New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
Jesus answered, "You do not know what you are asking. Can you drink the cup that I am going to drink?" They replied, "We can."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

22:30 For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the **angels of God** in heaven.
New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
For at the resurrection men and women do not marry; no, they are like the angels in heaven.
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

23:14 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King Jamesv---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt 25:15
And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey.
New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
To one he gave five talents, to another two, to a third one, each in proportion to his ability. Then he set out on his journey.
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Matt 27:35

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.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

When they had finished crucifying him they shared out his clothing by casting lots,
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Mark:

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 1:2

As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

It is written in the prophet Isaiah: Look, I am going to send my messenger in front of you to prepare your way before you.
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 1:14

Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel **of the kingdom of God,**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

After John had been arrested, Jesus went into Galilee. There he proclaimed the gospel from God saying,
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 6:11

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 Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city.**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

And if any place does not welcome you and people refuse to listen to you, as you walk away shake off the dust under your feet as evidence to them."
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 7:27

But Jesus said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

And he said to her, "The children should be fed first, because it is not fair to take the children's food and throw it to little dogs."
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 9:44

Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 9:46

Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 11:10

Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, **that cometh in the name of the Lord:** Hosanna in the highest.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

Blessed is the coming kingdom of David our father! Hosanna in the highest heavens!"
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 11:26

But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Mark 13:14

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, **spoken of by Daniel the prophet**, standing where it ought not, **(let him that readeth understand,)** then let them that be in Judaea flee to the mountains:

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

`When you see the appalling abomination set up where it ought not to be (let the reader understand), then those in Judaea must escape to the mountains;

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 15:28

And began to salute him, Hail, **King of the Jews!**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

And they began saluting him, "Hail, king of the Jews!"

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Mark 16:9-20

9. **Now when Jesus was risen** early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. 10. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. 11. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not. 12. After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. 13. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. 14. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. 15. **And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. 16. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. 17. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; 18. They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. 19.** So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. 20. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

9. Having risen in the morning on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary of Magdala from whom he had cast out seven devils. 10. She then went to those who had been his companions, and who were mourning and in tears, and told them. 11. But they did not believe her when they heard her say that he was alive and that she had seen him. 12. After this, he showed himself under another form to two of them as they were on their way into the country. 13. These went back and told the others, who did not believe them either. 14. Lastly, he showed himself to the Eleven themselves while they were at table. He reproached them for their incredulity and obstinacy, because they had refused to believe those who had seen him after he had risen. 15. And he said to them, "Go out to the whole world; proclaim the gospel to all creation. 16. Whoever believes and is baptised will be saved; whoever does not believe will be condemned. 17. These are the signs that will be associated with believers: in my name they will cast out devils; they will have the gift of tongues; 18. they will pick up snakes in their hands and be unharmed should they drink deadly poison; they will lay their hands on the sick, who will recover." 19. And so the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven; there at the right hand of God he took his place, 20. while they, going out, preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and co

confirming the word by the signs that accompanied it.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Luke:

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 2:33

(As it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be **called holy to the Lord;**)

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

observing what is written in the Law of the Lord: Every first-born male must be consecrated to the Lord,

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 2:44

But they, supposing him to have been in the company, went a day's journey; and they sought him among their kinsfolk and acquaintance.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

They assumed he was somewhere in the party, and it was only after a day's journey that they went to look for him among their relations and acquaintances.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 4:4

And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, **but by every word of God.**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

But Jesus replied, "Scripture says: Human beings live not on bread alone."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 4:8

And Jesus answered and said unto him, **Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

But Jesus answered him, "Scripture says: You must do homage to the Lord your God, him alone you must serve."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 9:56

For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

and they went on to another village

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 11:2

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.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

He said to them, "When you pray, this is what to say:

Father, may your name be held holy,

your kingdom come;

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 12:31

But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

No; set your hearts on his kingdom, and these other things will be given you as well.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 17:36

Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Luke 23:17

(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

John:

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

John 4:42 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.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

and they said to the woman, "Now we believe no longer because of what you told us; we have heard him ourselves and we know that he is indeed the Saviour of the world."

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

John 5:4

For an angel went down at a certain season into 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.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

John 8:1-11

1. Jesus went unto the mount of Olives. 2. And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him; and he sat down, and taught them. 3. And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, 4. They say unto him, **Master**, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. 5. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? 6. **This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him.** But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not. 7. So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, **He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.** 8. And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. 9. **And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone,** and the woman standing in the midst. 10. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, **where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?** 11. She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go,

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

1. and Jesus went to the Mount of Olives. 2At daybreak he appeared in the Temple again; and as all the people came to him, he sat down and began to teach them.

3. The scribes and Pharisees brought a woman along who had been caught committing adultery; and making her stand there in the middle 4. they said to Jesus, "Master, this woman was caught in the very act of committing adultery, 5. and i

n the Law Moses has ordered us to stone women of this kind. What have you got to say?" 6. They asked him this as a test, looking for an accusation to use against him. But Jesus bent down and started writing on the ground with his finger. 7. As they persisted with their question, he straightened up and said, "Let the one among you who is guiltless be the first to throw a stone at her." 8. Then he bent down and continued writing on the ground. 9. When they heard this they went away one by one, beginning with the eldest, until the last one had gone and Jesus was left alone with the woman, who remained in the middle. 10. Jesus again straightened up and said, "Woman, where are they? Has no one condemned you?" 11. "No one, sir," she replied. "Neither do I condemn you," said Jesus. "Go away, and from this moment sin no more."

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

John 8:29

Then said Jesus unto them, **When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

he who sent me is with me, and has not left me to myself, for I always do what pleases him.

XXXXXXXXXX

Acts:

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Acts 2:30

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;**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

But since he was a prophet, and knew that God had sworn him an oath to make one of his descendants succeed him on the throne,

XXXXXXXXXX

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Acts 4:24

And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, **Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is;**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

When they heard it they lifted up their voice to God with one heart. "Master," they prayed, "it is you who made sky and earth and sea, and everything in them;

Â-Â-Â-Â-Â-Â-Â-Â-Â-Â-

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Acts 8:37

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

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Acts 15:18

Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

known so long ago.

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Acts 16:31

And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

31. They told him, "Become a believer in the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved, and your household too."

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Acts 17:26

And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

From one single principle he not only created the whole human race so that they could occupy the entire earth, but he decreed the times and limits of their habitation.

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Acts 28:29

And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

Romans:

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Romans 1:16

For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

For I see no reason to be ashamed of the gospel; it is God's power for the salvation of everyone who has faith, Jews first, but Greeks as well.

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Romans 8:1

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

Thus, condemnation will never come to those who are in Christ Jesus.

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Romans 11:6

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.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

And since it is by grace, it cannot now be by good actions, or grace would not be grace at all!

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Romans 15:8

Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers:

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

I tell you that Christ's work was to serve the circumcised, fulfilling the truthfulness of God by carrying out the promises made to the fathers.

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Romans 16:24

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

DELETED

I Corinthians:

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

1 Cor: 5:4

In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, **and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ,**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

When you have gathered together in the name of our Lord Jesus, with the presence of my spirit, and in the power of our Lord Jesus,

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

6:20

For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

You are not your own property, then; you have been bought at a price. So use your body for the glory of God.

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

1 Cor.9:1

Am I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are not ye my work in the Lord?

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are you not my work in the Lord?

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

1 Cor 10:28

But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: **for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof:**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

28. But if someone says to you, "This food has been offered in sacrifice," do not eat it, out of consideration for the person that told you, for conscience's sake, _

Galatians:

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Gal 6,15

For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

It is not being circumcised or uncircumcised that matters; but what matters is a new creation.

Ephesians:

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Ephesians 3:9

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:

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

9. and of throwing light on the inner workings of the mystery kept hidden through all the ages in God, the Creator of everything.

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Ephesians 5:30

For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

Note, this refers to Christ's resurrected body of flesh and bones

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

because we are parts of his Body.

Colossians.:

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Col 1:14

In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

and in him we enjoy our freedom, the forgiveness of sin.

1 Thess.:

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Thes 1:1

Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians **which is in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

Paul, Silvanus and Timothy, to the Church in Thessalonica which is in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace to you and peace.

1 Timothy.:

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

1 Tim 3:3

Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous;

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

not a heavy drinker, nor hot-tempered, but gentle and peaceable, not avaricious.

King James----- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

1 Tim 3:16

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.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

Without any doubt, **the mystery of our religion is very deep indeed:**He was made visible in the flesh,justified in the S

pirit,seen by angels,proclaimed to the gentiles,believed in throughout the world,taken up in glory.

Note:

As Christian believers, we are blood bought, purchased by the shed blood of Jesus Christ, and have a personal relationship with God. We do not have a **religion**. The world is full of "religions", and all of them are false.

1 John:

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

1 John 5:7

5. This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.

6. If we say that we have **fellowship with him**, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth:

7. But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, **we have fellowship one with another**, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

5. This is what we have heard from him and are declaring to you: God is light, and there is no darkness in him at all. 6. If we say that we share in God's life while we are living in darkness,we are lying, because we are not living the truth. 7. But if we live in light,as he is in light, we have a share in another's life,and the blood of Jesus, his Son, cleanses us from all sin.

Revelation:

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Rev 1:6

And hath made **us kings and priests unto God and his Father**; to him be glory **and dominion** for ever and ever. Amen.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

and made us a Kingdom of Priests to serve his God and Father; to him, then, be glory and power for ever and ever. Amen.

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Rev 1:8

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**.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

"I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, who is, who was, and who is to come, the Almighty.

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Rev 1:11

Saying, **I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest**, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

"Write down in a book all that you see, and send it to the seven churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea."

King James---- PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

Rev 21:24

And the nations of them **which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.**

New Jerusalem Bible-----CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

The nations will come to its light and the kings of the earth will bring it their treasures.

In light of this and about 5,000 other places, how can the modern version be called Protestant Bibles? Remember, they are based on Roman Catholic mms.

The Bible says.

"Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" Â—Amos 3:3

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/18 13:30

Walter, you can't stop can you?

The Catholic Church uses the New American Bible, not the Jerusalem Bible.

This thread has nothing to do with the Jerusalem Bible, but the NASB (and subsequently NIV).

How many times do we have to cover the fact that comparing Bible translations does NOTHING? They are translated from different sources, so they WILL be different!!! You are assuming that the KJV is correct, then show its differences from other translations to conclude that they are wrong. It is called circular reasoning, and is nauseating. Especially when it's the same stuff over and over from the KJV-only people.

Don't be surprised if Chris doesn't respond, because he probably won't dignify you with one. You apparently don't want a conversation, because your reasoning and dialogue isn't honest.

I love you brother, but I think it's time to put this one to rest.

Re:, on: 2008/7/18 14:13

The question isn't really "which version", but rather "which source"?

Me, I believe the TR is the preserved Word of God... and that the Alexandrian has been perverted. There are a lot of reasons for my conclusions.

What needs to be compared is not the KJV to the NASB, but a literal translation of the two different texts that underlay those versions. That's where the differences begin.

Krispy

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/18 18:54

Quote:

-----The question isn't really "which version", but rather "which source"?

exactly

Quote:

-----What needs to be compared is not the KJV to the NASB, but a literal translation of the two different texts that underlay those versions.

agreed...of course without the assumption that one is correct and then using those differences to *prove* that it is correct (circular reasoning)

When I compare them, I have *already* studied the issue and concluded that the Byzantine family is more reliable (I prefer Robinson's GNT as opposed to the TR, since it was itself incomplete). So I know when differences occur, I trust the Byzantine, but I can't use that as proof that the Alexandrians are wrong, as Walter, the post-er formerly known as Stever, and others in the KJV-only camp do.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/7/18 20:34

Hi BeYeDoers and Krispy...

I agree!

It is my belief that the root of this matter has far less to do with the current translations (KJV, NIV, NASB, etc...) as they do with the sources used and the manner in which the English versions were created from those sources.

I understand the arguments about the source texts. However, I haven't seen enough concrete evidence for which I have the faith to ultimately conclude that one set of sources is undoubtedly superior than the other. I understand the argument about the methods by which the translators worked. However, I feel that the methods were remarkably similar -- even if one is more literal than the other.

I guess that I just haven't seen any evidence that would compel me to believe that there is a vastly superior text source (or "perfect" and "preserved" text source). The TR or Majority Text argument is compelling, but I find some flaws with it (that are often reiterated by a majority of text scholars today). The matter isn't a simple preference, but an understanding as to why so many text scholars view some of the Alexandrian and minority texts as being more reliable. They also give a compelling argument.

And of course, I cannot cast my lot to the point of believing that the KJV of the Bible (whether the 1611, 1769, etc...) is "perfectly preserved." The translators themselves said that this was not so.

In the end, I am reserved enough to view the KJV as a very good translation taken from its sources, and the NIV as a very sound translation taken from its sources. If I ever were to see otherwise, I would quickly change my view. However, I have researched this matter in depth, and I just don't see any of the "evidence" as holding enough weight to derive to a final, ultimate conclusion.

:-)

Walter, I really don't feel the need to comment on your verse-by-verse comparison. Ultimately, I believe that all of those major doctrines are still found in the NIV (and some of the other academic translations). In addition, you have never answered my question: Do you believe that the KJV of the Bible is PERFECT?

Re:, on: 2008/7/20 12:16

Is the Jerusalem Bible a "Catholic" Bible?

BeYeDoers posted that it was not the Catholic Bible:

The Jerusalem Bible (JB) is a Roman Catholic translation of the Bible which first was introduced to the English-speaking public in 1966 and published by Darton, Longman & Todd. As a Roman Catholic Bible, it includes the deuterocanonical books along with the sixty-six others included in Protestant Bibles, as well as copious footnotes and introductions.

In 1943 Pope Pius XII issued an encyclical letter, *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, which encouraged Roman Catholics to translate the Scriptures from the original Hebrew and Greek, rather than from Jerome's Latin Vulgate. As a result, **a number of Dominicans and other scholars at the École Biblique in Jerusalem translated the scriptures into French. The product of these efforts was published as La Bible de Jérusalem in 1961.**

This French translation served as the basis for an English translation in 1966, the Jerusalem Bible. For the majority of the books, the English translation was an original translation of the Hebrew and Greek; in passages with more than one interpretation, the French is generally followed. For a small number of Old Testament books, the first draft of the English translation was made directly from the French, and then the General Editor produced a revised draft by comparing this word-for-word to the original Hebrew or Aramaic. The footnotes and book introductions are almost literal translations from the French.

The translation itself uses a literal approach that has been admired for its literary qualities, perhaps in part due to its most famous contributor, J.R.R. Tolkien (his primary contribution was the translation of Jonah).. The introductions, footnotes, and even the translation itself, reflect a modern scholarly approach, reflecting the conclusions of scholars who use historical-critical method. For example, the introduction and notes reject Moses's authorship of the Pentateuch.

The Jerusalem Bible was the first widely accepted Roman Catholic English translation of the Bible since the Douay-Rheims Version of the 17th century. It carries the Church's imprimatur as being correct in all matters of faith and doctrine. This means it is an official Roman Catholic Bible. The Jerusalem Bible was considered such a high quality advanced English translation of the Bible that the Holy See used it in the European liturgy and the Mass. This reference for The Jerusalem Bible can be found in the introduction page of the Roman Catholic Missals as the source reference for the readings. It has also been widely praised for an overall very high level of scholarship, and is widely admired and sometimes used by liberal and moderate Protestants. The overall text seems to have somewhat of a "Mid-Atlantic" nature, neither overwhelmingly British nor particularly American, making it acceptable to both groups in most instances. Overall, it has come to be considered as one of the better English translations of the Bible made in the 20th century.

In 1973, the French translation received an update. A third French edition was produced in 1998.

In 1985, the English translation was completely updated. This new translation — known as the New Jerusalem Bible — was freshly translated from the original languages and not tied to any French translation (except indirectly, as it maintained many of the stylistic and interpretive choices of the French Jerusalem Bible).

xxxxxxxxxxxxx
The point I was making in using the Jerusalem Bible, or any of the other "Catholic Bibles" (ie the Douay Rheims Version, or any other "Catholic Bible"), is that **there is absolutely no difference in the text of these with the newer Bible versions published by Protestants since 1888 (NIV, NASV, TEV, RSV, NWT, THE MESSAGE, etc. etc. etc.).** In other words, what I have posted, comparing the King James, the Majority Text, with the Catholic Bible, the Minority text, shows the vast difference between them. **As such, both versions (the Majority Text & the Minority text) cannot be the Word of God. Only one can be God's Holy Writ.**
xxxxxxxxxxxxx

God has promised us, in His own Word, that He will preserve His Word forever.

Ps. 12:7

Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

God's word is infallible, without error (John 17:17; Acts 1:3)

"The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." A—Psalm 12:6-7

For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. A—Matt. 5:18

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." A—Matt. 24:35

"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." A—I Peter 1:23

Man has been warned by God not to add to or take from His Word, the Bible (Deuteronomy 4:2; Prov. 30:6; Revelation 22:18-19).

Therefore, the KEEPING of God's word is GOD'S JOB, not fallible man's job.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

BeYeDoers wrote:

Walter, you can't stop can you?

The Catholic Church uses the New American Bible, not the Jerusalem Bible.

This thread has nothing to do with the Jerusalem Bible, but the NASB (and subsequently NIV).

How many times do we have to cover the fact that comparing Bible translations does NOTHING? They are translated from different sources, so they WILL be different!!! You are assuming that the KJV is correct, then show its differences from other translations to conclude that they are wrong. It is called circular reasoning, and is nauseating. Especially when it's the same stuff over and over from the KJV-only people.

Don't be surprised if Chris doesn't respond, because he probably won't dignify you with one. You apparently don't want a conversation, because your reasoning and dialogue isn't honest.

I love you brother, but I think it's time to put this one to rest.

Re: Not to change the subject, on: 2008/7/20 15:39

Has anyone heard of Jay P Green? He did the KJ in a modern translation, he kept the same words but made it easier to read. Its called the King James II Bible.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/20 20:25

Quote:
-----as Walter, the post-er formerly known as Stever,

True? Walter?

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/20 21:17

Quote:
-----as Walter, the post-er formerly known as Stever,

no, no, no...it was a list, not an appositive!

Although, their *very long* KJV-only posts seem strikingly similar...but i was not implying anything.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/20 21:50

Quote:
-----no, no, no...it was a list, not an appositive!

My apologies brother. Took that the wrong way, but the similarites are a bit uncanny. What say you Walter?

Re:, on: 2008/7/20 22:51

No, it is not true.

Walter Nagel

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Quote:
-----as Walter, the post-er formerly known as Stever,

True? Walter?

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/20 23:25

Quote:

-----BeYeDoers posted that it was not the Catholic Bible

Walter, you are correct. It is indeed a Catholic translation. I stand corrected.

Re:, on: 2008/7/21 0:17

A Chronology of the English Bible

Listing the events in the history of the English versions of Scripture, and of the place of Scripture in the church and in society. It also shows us the continuing battle between the "versions"- initially the Catholic Bible against the Protestant Bible, and continuing to this very day- the minority text verses the majority text, the Catholic "versions" verses the Protestant "version". What is the "version" that has provided "fruit"?

• 440 AD. Roman legions withdraw from Britain.

• 450. Anglo-Saxon invasions and settlement of Britain displace the native Celts in the south.

• 597. Pope Gregory sends missionaries to Ethelbert of Kent, in the southeast of Britain.

• 669. Theodore of Tarsus becomes archbishop of Canterbury, promotes episcopal hierarchy and Roman culture in the south of Britain.

• 670. The herdsman Caedmon in northern Britain composes poems based on Biblical narratives in Old English.

• 825. Vespasian Psalter gives interlinear Old English translation.

• 856. Danes begin large scale invasion of eastern Britain. Destruction of monasteries there.

• 878. King Alfred halts Danish invasion, divides Britain by treaty. Danes inhabit northeast half of Britain.

• 900. Paris Psalter gives Old English version of the first fifty Psalms.

• 924. Ethelstan becomes King and pursues conciliation and fusion with the Danes. Oda (a full-blooded Dane) appointed archbishop of Canterbury.

• 950. Aldred (Bishop of Durham) writes Old English between the lines of the Lindisfarne Gospels.

• 970. Faerman (Priest in Yorkshire) makes the first Old English version of the Gospel of Matthew in the Rushworth Gospels, based upon Aldred's gloss.

• 1000. England overwhelmed by new invasion of Danes. King Ethelred flees to allies in Normandy. Aelfric (Abbot in Oxfordshire) translates abridged Pentateuch and several other portions of Scripture into Old English. Wessex Gospels give first Old English version of all four gospels.

• 1042. King Edward, brought up in Normandy, attempts to Normanize the English Court, appoints a Norman archbishop. Godwin (Earl of Wessex) opposes him and causes the deposition of the archbishop.

• 1066. Norman conquest of Britain, sponsored by Pope Alexander II, destroys Old English literature, makes Norman French the language of the nobility.

• 1150. Old English yields to Middle English as the common language of Britain.

• 1200. Orm composes poetical paraphrase of Gospels and Acts in Middle English.

• 1300. Midland Psalter gives metrical version of the Psalms in Middle English.

- 1309. Pope Clement V moves the headquarters of the Papacy from Rome to Avignon under domination of the French King.
- 1320. Richard Rolle's Middle English Psalter.
- 1330. Birth of John Wyclif.
- 1340. Birth of Chaucer.
- 1348. English replaces Latin as the medium of instruction in schools (except at Oxford and Cambridge).
- 1360. Various gospel narratives translated into Middle English.
- 1362. English replaces French as the language of law in England. English used for the first time in Parliament.
- 1377. Pope Gregory XI moves the Papacy back to Rome.
- 1378. French Cardinals create schism in the Roman Catholic Church by electing a rival Pope and returning to Avignon. Rival popes excommunicate one another.
- 1380. Oxford professor John Wyclif publicly rejects Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, begins translating Latin Vulgate into English.
- 1381. Peasants revolt in England. They seize London, but are soon overcome.
- 1382. Wyclif expelled from his teaching post at Oxford for heresy. Completes translation of Bible with help of his students.
- 1384. Death of Wyclif. His disciples continue to preach against the clergy, copy and sell manuscripts (mostly the Gospels).
- 1388. Wyclif Bible revised by his student John Purvey.
- 1400. Death of Chaucer.
- **1401. English parliament decrees the burning of heretics. Statute is aimed against the followers of Wyclif, called Lollards**
- **1408. Arundelian Constitutions enacted by Convocation of bishops at Oxford forbids unauthorized translation, distribution, or public reading of the Scripture.**
- 1411. Bonfire of Wyclif's writings at Oxford.
- **1415. John Hus, the radical Bohemian reformer and advocate of Wyclif's anti-clerical teachings, is burned at the stake.**
- 1417. Council of Constance elects Martin V as Pope, and ends Roman Catholic schism.
- 1450. Middle English yields to Early Modern English as the common language of Britain about now.
- **1453. Moslems take Constantinople. Great exodus of Greek scholars from there to Western Europe, bringing with them Greek manuscripts of the Bible.**
- 1456. First printed book: Gutenberg Bible, containing the Latin text.
- 1466. Birth of Erasmus.
- 1476. First English book printed by William Caxton (The Recital of the Histories of Troy, translated from French).

- 1478. Caxton prints Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.
- 1483. Birth of Martin Luther.
- 1484. Birth of William Tyndale.
- 1485. Henry Tudor becomes king Henry VII of England.
- 1488. Birth of Miles Coverdale. • Hebrew Old Testament first printed by Jews at Soncino, Italy.
- 1489. Birth of Thomas Cranmer.
- 1491. Greek first taught at Oxford University.
- 1496. John Colet gives lectures on Romans at Oxford.
- 1499. Erasmus at Oxford.
- 1500. Birth of John Rogers.
- 1504. Birth of Matthew Parker.
- 1505. Birth of Richard Taverner. • Birth of John Knox. • Luther enters the Augustinian Order.
- 1506. New Cathedral of St. Peter begun in Rome (completed in 1590).
- 1509. Henry VIII becomes king of England. • Birth of John Calvin. • Erasmus professor of Greek at Cambridge University.
- 1510. William Tyndale at Cambridge.
- 1514. Coverdale ordained.
- 1515. Luther begins lectures on Romans at Wittenberg University. • Tyndale gets M.A. degree at Oxford.
- **1516. Erasmus' first Greek New Testament (First printed Greek New Testament).**
- 1517. Pope Leo X decrees preaching and sale of indulgences for the benefit of St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome. • Luther nails his 95 Theses to the church door at Wittenberg on October 31. Reformation era begins.
- 1518. Septuagint printed by Aldus in Italy. • Zwingli begins Reformation in Switzerland.
- **1519. Erasmus' 2nd Greek New Testament • Birth of Theodore Beza.**
- **1520. Luther excommunicated. • Tyndale goes home to Gloucester, begins translating.**
- **1522. First edition of Luther's German New Testament** • Parker at Cambridge. • Complutensian Polyglot (including Septuagint, Vulgate, Hebrew Old Testament) published. • Erasmus' 3rd Greek New Testament • Tyndale goes to London in search of financial help.
- 1524. Tyndale leaves England for Germany. • Peasants revolt in Germany. • William Whittingham born.
- 1525. Tyndale's English New Testament (first printed English text) published in Germany. • Rogers gets B.A. degree at Cambridge.
- **1526. Copies of Tyndale's New Testament enter England, many burned.**
- **1527. Erasmus' 4th Greek New Testament**
- **1528. Coverdale preaches against the mass, is compelled to leave England.**
- **1529. Tyndale and Coverdale work together at Hamburg. • Luther's Small Catechism. • Cranmer commissioned by king Henry to write a treatise justifying his divorce from Catherine.**
- 1530. Augsburg Confession.
- 1531. Tyndale's Pentateuch is published. • Zwingli killed in battle.
- 1533. Cranmer made Archbishop of Canterbury, approves Henry's divorce.
- **1534. Tyndale's New Testament and Pentateuch revised. • Henry VIII excommunicated by the Pope, severs English churches from Rome, becomes head of the Church of England without any intention of reforming it. • Cranmer petitions Henry for creation of an authorized English version. • Luther's first complete German Bible. • Anabaptists established.**

h short-lived socialist community at Münster. • Geneva becomes independent Protestant commonwealth.

•1535. Tyndale's last revised New Testament • Tyndale betrayed to Roman Catholic authorities, charged with heresy and imprisoned. He continues to translate the historical books of the Old Testament • Coverdale's Bible published in England. (first printed English Bible). • Erasmus' 5th edition of the Greek.

• 1536. Tyndale's New Testament reprinted in England. • Tyndale condemned. He commits his manuscript to his friend John Rogers, and is burned at the stake. • Calvin publishes his Institutes of the Christian Religion.

• 1537. "Matthew's Bible" published by John Rogers in Germany, giving Tyndale's translation of the New Testament, Pentateuch, and historical books of the Old Testament • John Calvin preaches in Geneva. • Matthew's and Coverdale's Bibles licensed for unhindered sale in England.

• 1538. Coverdale in Paris editing Great Bible. • English bishops instructed to display largest English Bible in parish churches.

• 1539. Coverdale returns to England. • Great Bible (dedicated to Henry VIII) published and authorized in England. • Taverner's Bible (a revision of Matthew's Bible) published. • English parliament adopts the Act of Six Articles, reaffirming various Roman Catholic teachings. "Lutherans" subjected to persecution.

• 1540. 2nd edition of Great Bible with preface of Cranmer, called Cranmer's Bible. • Coverdale, under pressure as a "Lutheran," leaves England again.

•1543. English Parliament bans Tyndale's version and all public reading of Bible by laymen.

• 1545. Council of Trent convened.

• 1546. Death of Luther. • Council of Trent decrees that the Latin Vulgate (with Apocryphal books) is authoritative version of Scripture. • Henry VIII bans Coverdale version. • Stephens publishes his first Greek New Testament

• 1547. Death of Henry VIII. • Edward VI becomes king of England. • Parliament repeals the anti-Protestant Act of Six Articles, and removes restrictions on printing and reading of English versions. Cranmer begins Protestant reformation of the Church of England. • Coverdale, Rogers return to England. • John Knox preaches Reformation in Scotland.

• 1549. English Book of Common Prayer compiled by Cranmer. • Stephens' 2nd Greek New Testament

• 1550. Stephens' 3rd Greek New Testament

• 1551. Last edition of Matthew's Bible. • Coverdale appointed bishop of Exeter. • Stephens' 4th Greek New Testament

• 1552. John Knox refuses offer to become an English bishop.

• 1553. "Bloody" Mary Tudor becomes queen of England. • Last edition of Coverdale Bible.

• 1554. Mary reverses the reforms of Edward and enforces Roman Catholicism in England. • Knox leaves England for Geneva.

• 1555. John Rogers burned at the stake. • Cranmer burned at the stake. • Coverdale and other leading Protestants flee England for Geneva. • Peace of Augsburg ends wars between Lutherans and Romanists in Germany, legitimizes Lutheranism.

• 1556. Beza's Latin New Testament

• 1557. William Whittingham's English New Testament published in Geneva. English exiles there begin work on English Old Testament

• 1558. Elizabeth becomes queen of England.

•1559. Elizabeth repudiates Romanism. Act of Supremacy makes her head of Church of England. Romanist bishops expelled. Coverdale and other leading Protestants return to England. Matthew Parker made Archbishop of Canterbury.

• 1560. Geneva Bible with revised New Testament published by Whittingham in Geneva. • Whittingham returns to England. • Knox's Scots Confession ratified by the Scottish parliament.

• 1563. Whittingham made Dean of Durham. • Archbishop Parker and eight of his bishops begin work on the "Bishops' Bible." • Thirty-nine Articles of Religion adopted as doctrinal standard for Church of England. • Heidelberg Catechism published. • Apostolic Constitutions (ancient book of church order and dogma, purporting to be from the apostles) published by the Jesuit Turrianus.

• 1564. Death of John Calvin. • Birth of Shakespeare.

1565. Beza's Greek-Latin New Testament

1566. Last edition of Tyndale's New Testament

1567. Mary Stuart abdicates throne of Scotland, is succeeded by her son James under Protestant regency.

1568. Bishops' Bible (dedicated to Elizabeth) published by Archbishop Parker, and authorized for church use.

1569. Last edition of Cranmer's Great Bible. Death of Coverdale.

1571. Every bishop and cathedral in England ordered to have Bishops' Bible.

1572. Bishops' Bible revised and published with the old Great Bible Psalter. Antwerp Polyglot published. Death of John Knox.

1575. Death of Taverner and Parker. Parker succeeded as Archbishop of Canterbury by the strongly Calvinistic Edmund Grindal, who actively promotes the Geneva Bible during the next eight years.

1578. Martin begins Rheims version of the New Testament (authorized Roman Catholic version, translated from the Vulgate).

1579. Geneva Bible reprinted and authorized in Scotland. Every Scotch household of sufficient means is required by law to buy a copy. Death of Whittingham.

1580. Lutheran Formula of Concord.

1582. Rheims New Testament (translated from the Latin) published by English Roman Catholics living in France. Beza's 2nd Greek New Testament

1583. Grindal succeeded by John Whitgift as Archbishop of Canterbury.

1587. Death of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots.

1588. Destruction of Spanish Armada.

1589. Beza's 3rd Greek New Testament

1592. Sixtine-Clementine Latin Bible.

1598. Beza's 4th Greek New Testament

1602. Last edition of Bishops' Bible.

1603. James I made king of England.

1604. English bishops and Puritan leaders meet with King James in the Hampton Court Conference. Revision of Bishops' Bible proposed. King James nominates revision committee of 54 scholars. First English dictionary published by Robert Cawdry.

1605. English Romanists attempt to blow up Parliament in the "Gunpowder plot," arousing great and lasting public indignation against Rome. Death of Theodore Beza.

1607. Work on King James Bible begun.

1608. Pilgrim Fathers leave England for Holland.

1609. Douay Old Testament (translated from the Latin) published by English Roman Catholics living in France.

1611. King James Bible (dedicated to James) published and authorized in England.

1615. Archbishop Abbot forbids printing of the Bible without Apocrypha.

1616. Birth of John Owen. Death of Shakespeare.

1618. Beginning of Thirty Years War on Continent.

1619. Synod of Dort condemns Arminianism as heresy, propounds five points of orthodox Calvinism.

1620. Pilgrims land at Plymouth.

1624. Elzevir's first Greek New Testament Louis Cappel publishes his opinion that the vowel points of the Hebrew

text were added by rabbis in the fifth century.

• 1625. Charles I (Romanist) made king of England.

• 1627. William Ames' Marrow of Theology spreads knowledge of Dutch Covenant Theology in England.

• 1633. Elzevir's 2nd Greek New Testament • William Laud (Romanist) is made Archbishop of Canterbury, **begins to persecute Puritans. Forbids importation of the Geneva Bible.**

•1643. Puritan Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation and Defense of Religion sworn throughout Scotland and England.

• 1642. Parliament raises an army and makes war against the despotic king Charles and his Romanizing bishops. • Brian Walton (Romanist) deprived of office. • Parliament closes theaters of England.

• 1643. Westminster Assembly convened.

• 1645. Archbishop Laud put to death.

• 1647. Westminster Confession published.

•1648. Parliament adopts the Westminster Confession of Faith, establishing Calvinistic doctrine and Presbyterianism in England. • Buxtorf assails Cappel's view of the Hebrew vowel points. • Peace of Westphalia ends the Thirty Years War on the continent, legitimizes Calvinism.

• 1649. King Charles I put to death. Cromwell rules as "Protector of the Commonwealth." • John Owen (Puritan) preferred to offices. • George Fox disrupts church service in Nottingham, begins preaching Quakerism.

•1650. Louis Cappel's book advocating critical reconstruction of the Hebrew text is published in Paris by his son Jean, after turning Roman Catholic. Publication of the work had been prevented by Cappel's opponents in Protestant lands.

• 1651. Thomas Hobbes' The Leviathan.

• 1657. Brian Walton publishes the London Polyglot with revision of Hebrew vowel points, several ancient versions, and an appendix of various readings of the Greek manuscripts.

• 1658. Death of Cromwell. • John Owen deprived of office.

• 1659. Walton's Polyglot assailed by John Owen.

• 1660. Monarchy restored with king Charles II. • Walton made a bishop.

• 1662. New England churches begin to admit unconverted members under the "Half-Way Covenant."

• 1665. Great Plague of London kills over 68,000.

• 1666. Great Fire of London.

• 1667. Milton writes Paradise Lost.

•1675. John Fell's Greek New Testament with critical annotations. • Helvetic Consensus Formula maintains verbal inerrancy of Scripture, inspiration of vowel points in the traditional Hebrew text (against Cappel and Walton).

• 1678. Bunyan writes Pilgrim's Progress.

• 1679. Publication of the first volume of Francis Turretin's Institutio Theologiae Elencticae.

• 1683. Death of John Owen.

• 1685. Death of Charles II. He is succeeded by a Roman Catholic king, James II.

• 1688. James II deposed by Parliament, and replaced by William of Orange, with regulation for Protestant succession and greatly enlarged powers of Parliament. Threat of Romanism forever ended in England.

•1689. Toleration Act of parliament grants freedom of worship to all Protestants except Unitarians. • Richard Simon (French Roman Catholic) publishes first treatise on textual criticism in Paris.

• 1690. John Locke's Essay concerning Human Understanding.

• 1695. Abolition of censorship in England.

• 1697. Blasphemy Act of Parliament bars Unitarians, Deists and atheists from public office.

• 1702. Publication in London of the first regular daily newspaper in English.

• 1704. Publication of Sir Isaac Newton's Optics marks the point at which significant scholarly work begins to appear in English instead of Latin.

• 1705. Humphrey Hody's De Bibliorum textis originalibus ("On the Original Text of the Bible") thoroughly examines the text of the ancient versions and the ancient canon of Scripture.

• 1707. John Mill's annotated Greek New Testament displays 30,000 various readings of the Greek manuscripts. • England and Scotland are united under the name of United Kingdom of Great Britain.

• 1711. William Whiston's Primitive Christianity Revived.

• 1714. Death of Matthew Henry.

• **1720. Richard Bentley publishes his Proposals for critical revision of the Greek New Testament**

• **1725. Johann Albrecht Bengel publishes his prospectus for a critical revision of the Greek New Testament**

• **1726. Jeremiah Jones publishes first English translation of several "apocryphal New Testament" books in his New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament.**

• **1729. American Presbyterians constitute first Synod in Philadelphia, requiring subscription of ministers to "essential and necessary" doctrines of the Westminster Standards.**

• 1730. Wettstein's treatise on textual criticism.

• 1734. Bengel's revised Greek New Testament with notes. • Alexander Pope's Essay on Man.

• **1739. John Wesley organizes the first Methodist Society, begins widespread preaching.**

• **1740. Frederick the Great becomes king of Prussia. German culture flourishes under his patronage. • George Whitefield draws large crowds in revivalistic preaching tour of American colonies.**

• **1741. Jonathan Edwards preaches Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God. • George Frideric Handel composes The Messiah.**

• **1742. Bengel's Greek textual commentary. • Height of "Great Awakening" revivalism in America.**

• **1743. First Bible printed in America at Germantown, Penn. (Luther Bible). • Revivalist James Davenport instigates public bonfire of Puritan books. End of "Great Awakening."**

• 1745. William Whiston's Primitive New Testament

• **1750. Jonathan Edwards forced from his pastoral office for withholding Communion from the unsaved. • Death of Johann Sebastian Bach.**

• 1755. John Wesley's New Testament revises the KJV with use of Bengel's Greek New Testament • Samuel Johnson publishes his comprehensive Dictionary of the English Language.

• **1769. "Oxford Standard Edition" of King James version published.**

• 1771. Francis Asbury arrives in America.

• 1774. Griesbach's critically revised Greek Testament.

• **1775. J.S. Semler (the German "father of rationalism") advocates re-examination of the Biblical canon in his Treatise on the Free Investigation of the Canon. • American Revolutionary War begins.**

• 1776. Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations.

• 1783. American Revolutionary War ends. • First daily newspaper in America begins in Philadelphia.

• 1784. Ethan Allen's Reason the Only Oracle of Man rejects the authority of the Bible. • John Wesley organizes Methodists as a separate denomination in the American colonies, prepares his Twenty-Five Articles of Religion for their constitution. Francis Asbury appointed as general superintendent.

• 1785. New York's first daily newspaper begins.

• 1786. Woide publishes facsimile of Codex Alexandrinus.

•1788. Birch's collation of Codex Vaticanus in the Gospels published.

• 1789. Federal Constitution ratified by American states. • French Revolution begins.

• 1790. America has eight daily newspapers.

• 1791. Death of John Wesley.

• 1793. Reign of Terror in France. • Eli Whitney invents the Cotton Gin.

• 1795. Thomas Paine's The Age of Reason bitterly attacks the Bible and Christianity.

• 1796. Griesbach's 2nd Greek New Testament

• 1797. First Sunday newspaper in America begins in Baltimore.

•1798. Birch publishes collation of Codex Vaticanus for entire New Testament • Napoleon wages war in Egypt and Palestine.

• 1800. Birth of John Nelson Darby, first theologian of modern Dispensationalism.

•1801. "Plan of Union" adopted by American Presbyterians and Congregationalists for cooperative ministry in frontier districts. • Barton Stone directs giant camp meeting revival at Cane Ridge in Kentucky, sparking "Second Great Awakening" in America.

• 1802. Marsh publishes English translation of Michaelis' Introduction (basic source of text-critical information for English scholars).

• 1803. U.S. purchases Louisiana territory (Great Plains) from France, doubles in size.

• 1804. Napoleon declared Emperor in France.

•1805. Griesbach's last Greek New Testament • Unitarian control of Harvard College becomes evident with the appointment of Henry Ware to Chair of Divinity.

• 1807. Slave trade abolished in England.

• 1812. London has 18 Sunday newspapers.

• 1813. English Parliament extends Toleration Act (cf. 1689) to cover Unitarians.

• 1814. Richard Laurence (English Archbishop) publishes defense of the traditional Greek text against Griesbach.

• 1815. Nolan publishes defense of traditional Greek text against Griesbach. • Napoleon defeated by British and German armies at Waterloo.

• 1816. Death of Francis Asbury.

• 1819. Political agitation leads to labor riots in Manchester, put down by troops. • Revivalist movement known as the Second Great Awakening underway in America. • William Channing publicly espouses Unitarianism in his "Baltimore Sermon." • U.S. purchases Florida from Spain.

• 1820. William Hone publishes in popular and inexpensive form a collection of early Christian writings under the title Apocryphal New Testament. • America has forty-two daily newspapers.

• 1821. Richard Lawrence publishes English translation of The Book of Enoch. • Death of Thomas Scott.

• 1824. Premiere of Beethoven's Choral Symphony in Vienna. • First steam-powered cylinder newspaper press in America.

• 1825. American Unitarian Association formed at Boston.

• 1826. British and Foreign Bible Society stops printing Apocrypha.

• 1827. Charles Finney emerges as leading American revivalist.

•1828. Noah Webster publishes his American Dictionary of the English Language. • Liberal English journalists called "a fourth estate of the realm" by essayist Thomas Macaulay.

• 1829. Catholic Emancipation Act removes legal disabilities of Romanists.

• 1830. Scholz's Greek New Testament published. • Revivalist movement known as the Second Great Awakening rears

ches its high point in America. Â• John Nelson Darby inaugurates Pauline restorationist Plymouth Brethren movement in Dublin. Â• **Joseph Smith publishes The Book of Mormon in New York.**

Â• 1831. Karl Lachmann publishes first thoroughly revised critical Greek New Testament

Â• 1832. English Parliament adopts Reform Bill, extending voting rights to the middle class.

Â• 1833. Abolition of slavery in the British Empire. Â• Revivalist Charles Finney conducts abolitionist rallies in America Â• American Antislavery Society formed by Christian abolitionists. Â• First "penney" newspaper begins in New York.

Â• **1835. David Strauss, Leben Jesu (Atheistic critical treatment of the life of Jesus) published in Germany.** Â• Charles Finney becomes professor of theology at newly-formed Oberlin College in Ohio. Oberlin becomes center of perfectonist teaching, feminism, and abolitionist movement.

Â• **1836. Union Theological Seminary founded by liberal-Arminian "New School" Presbyterians.**

Â• 1837. Calvinist majority in General Assembly of PCUSA abrogates 1801 Plan of Union; New School Presbyteries organize separate church. Â• Victoria made Queen of England.

Â• **1838. Romish "Oxford Movement" party in the Church of England is at its peak of influence about now.** Â• **Ralph Waldo Emerson espouses mystical transcendentalism in an address at Harvard Divinity School.**

Â• 1840. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit.

Â• 1841. Tischendorf's first Greek New Testament Â• Bagster's English Hexapla. Â• Emerson's Essays.

Â• 1842. Lachmann's 2nd Greek New Testament

Â• 1843. Greek text of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus published by Tischendorf. Â• Phoebe Palmer's The Way of Holiness.

Â• 1844. Year of Christ's return as predicted by William Miller, founder of the Adventist movement. Â• Methodists split over the slavery controversy in America.

Â• 1845. Baptists split over the slavery controversy in America. Southern Baptist Convention is formed. Â• Texas annexed by the U.S.

Â• **1846. Strauss' atheistic Life of Jesus translated into English. Â• U.S. claim to Oregon country recognized by Great Britain.**

Â• 1848. Karl Marx publishes his Communist Manifesto in England. Revolutions break out in several nations of Europe. Â• Perfectionistic Oneida commune established by John Noyes. Â• Kate and Margaret Fox of New York cause public sensation with claims of ability to communicate with the dead: beginning of Spiritualist séance craze in America. Â• Southern western territory ceded to the U.S. by Mexico.

Â• 1849. Tischendorf's 2nd Greek New Testament Â• Alford's annotated Greek New Testament Â• Cholera epidemic kills 14,000 in London.

Â• 1850. Antoinette Brown becomes first woman to complete theological course at Oberlin. Â• Ellen White begins to publicize "visions" fundamental to Seventh-Day Adventism.

Â• 1851. Great Exhibition of science and industry held in London.

Â• **1852. Greek text of Codex Claromontanus published by Tischendorf. Â• Publication of Roget's Thesaurus.**

Â• **1853. Antoinette Brown becomes first woman formally ordained as a minister in the U.S. (in an independent Congregational church in New York).**

Â• **1854. Tregelles' Account of the Printed Text. Â• Dogma of Immaculate Conception promulgated by the Roman Pope. Â• Cholera epidemic kills 11,000 in London.**

Â• 1855. Charles Spurgeon preaches to thousands in public halls of London. Â• Abolition of Stamp Tax in England removes financial burden from newspaper publishers; cheap and vulgar daily newspapers begin to flourish.

Â• **1856. Tregelles' Introduction to Textual Criticism. Â• Tischendorf's 3rd Greek New Testament Â• Wordsworth's Greek New Testament Â• Western Union Telegraph Co. formed Â• Slavery controversy rages in America. Southern scholar Albert Taylor Bledsoe's Essay on Liberty and Slavery presents a Scriptural defense of slavery.**

Â• 1857. Tregelles' Greek text of Gospels.

Â• **1858. Brief "Prayer Meeting Revival" sweeps America. Â• Act for the admission of the Jews to the Parliament adopted in England.**

• 1859. Vercellone's edition of Codex Vaticanus. • John Nelson Darby's New Translation of New Testament with critical notes. • Darwin's Origin of Species. • John Stuart Mill's On Liberty.

• 1860. Liberal scholars in the Church of England 'come out of the closet' in Essays and Reviews.

• 1861. Scrivener's Plain Introduction to Textual Criticism. • American Civil War begins. • President Lincoln attends Spiritualist séances in Georgetown, receives advice from the famous medium Nettie Colburn Maynard in the White House.

• 1862. Greek text of Codex Sinaiticus published by Tischendorf. • Young's Literal Translation of the Bible.

• 1863. President Lincoln proclaims Thanksgiving Day holiday.

• 1864. John Nelson Darby visits America for the first time, promotes fully developed Dispensationalism among Presbyterians in lecture tour. • "In God We Trust" first put on U.S. coins.

• 1865. American Civil War ends. • President Lincoln assassinated.

• 1866. Trans-Atlantic telegraph cable connects England and America. • Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution greatly increases Federal power.

• 1867. Tischendorf's edition of Codex Vaticanus. • Parliament adopts Second Reform Act, giving vote to the working class.

• 1868. Vercellone's facsimile edition of Codex Vaticanus.

• 1869. Tischendorf's 4th Greek New Testament • New and Old School American Presbyterians reunite. • American transcontinental railroad line completed • Susan Anthony and Elizabeth Stanton organize the National Woman Suffrage Association.

• 1870. English parliament asks bishops of the Church of England to form a committee for the revision of the King James version. Revision committee is formed, and work begins on the English Revised Version. • Vatican Council of the Roman Catholic Church sets forth dogma of Infallibility of the Pope. • German principalities unified under imperial crown of Prussia by Bismarck. • Manufacture of new wood-pulp paper greatly reduces cost of newspaper publishing.

• 1871. J.N. Darby's 2nd edition of the New Testament • Darwin's Descent of Man.

• 1872. Last portion of Tregelles' Greek New Testament published. • Alford's New Testament for English Readers.

• 1875. Premillennialist evangelist Dwight Moody begins sensational preaching tour of American cities. • Foundation of annual Niagara Bible Conference. • Mary Baker's Science and Health publicizes principles of Christian Science.

• 1876. Charles Taze Russell begins publication of Zion's Watchtower.

• 1878. Rotherham's English translation of Tregelles' text. • Julius Wellhausen, History of Israel. • William Blackstone's Jesus is Coming. • Ninth edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica makes critical arguments and essays on the Bible generally available in English. • First commercial telephone exchange set up in Boston.

• 1879. Robert Ingersoll attacks the Bible in popular lecture tours, publishes his Some Mistakes of Moses.

• 1881. English Revised Version of the New Testament is RED published, immediately followed by the innovative Greek New Testament of Westcott and Hort.

• 1882. Death of John Nelson Darby. • Charles Darwin buried in Westminster Abbey with full Christian rites.

• 1883. Dean Burgon leads strong conservative attack on the BLUE English Revised Version and against all critical Greek texts. The new version is eventually refused by the British churches.

• 1884. Parliament adopts Third Reform Act, granting vote to agricultural laborers. • Telephone service between New York and Boston.

• 1885. English Revised Version of the Old Testament

• 1886. Benjamin Warfield appointed Professor of Theology at Princeton.

• 1888. British Baptist Union censures Charles Spurgeon for his campaign against liberal Baptists.

• 1890. J.N. Darby's English Old Testament • Great labor strikes throughout England. • National American Woman Suffrage Association formed.

• 1893. Ecumenical and inter-faith "World's Parliament of Religions" held in Chicago. • Dwight Moody preaches to huge crowds at Chicago World's Fair.

• 1895. American Anti-Saloon League founded in Washington, D.C. • Elizabeth Stanton's Woman's Bible repudiates Biblical teaching on woman's place.

• 1898. Eberhard Nestle's Greek New Testament • Spanish-American War.

• 1899. Death of Dwight Moody, foundation of Moody Bible Institute.

• 1900. Final meeting of the Niagara Bible Conference.

• **1901. American Standard Version.**

• 1903. First edition of Weymouth's New Testament (modern English version).

• 1904. Twentieth Century New Testament (modern English version). • Sigmund Freud, Psychopathology of Everyday Life.

• 1906. Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles inaugurates modern Pentecostal movement.

• 1907. The foundation of Hollywood as a film-making center. • Walter Rauschenbusch's Christianity and the Social Crisis articulates the "Social Gospel."

• 1908. Delegates from 33 denominations meeting in Philadelphia establish the Federal Council of Churches to promote Social Gospel. • Ford Motor Company introduces the "Model T."

• 1909. First edition of Scofield Reference Bible.

• **1910. First volume of The Fundamentals is published to counter liberal theology in America. • General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. adopts "Five Point" doctrinal test (Biblical inerrancy, virgin birth, substitutionary atonement, bodily resurrection, and reality of miracles).**

• 1913. Von Soden's Greek New Testament • Moffat New Testament (popular paraphrase).

• 1914. British declare war on Germany. • Ford Motor Co. installs chain-driven assembly lines.

• 1915. Telephone service between New York and San Francisco.

• 1917. Improved edition of Scofield Reference Bible. • U.S. declares war on Germany. • Communist revolutionaries gain control of Russian Empire.

• 1918. English Parliament adopts the "Representation of the People Act," giving women the right to vote. • Treaty of Versailles humiliates Germany, ends First World War. League of Nations established.

• 1919. Eighteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibits manufacture and sale of alcohol.

• 1920. Nineteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution requires all states to give voting rights to women. • First commercial radio station in U.S. (KDKA Pittsburgh) begins broadcasting.

• **1922. Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. approves ordination of women as deacons. • Harry Emerson Fosdick preaches against Second Coming of Christ, Biblical inerrancy, Virgin Birth. • Lincoln Memorial dedicated in Washington, D.C.**

• 1923. J. Gresham Machen, Christianity and Liberalism. • Time magazine founded. • Radio becomes popular craze in America.

• **1924. Methodist Episcopal Church approves ordination of women as local preachers.**

• **1925. Major newspapers ridicule conservative opposition to theory of evolution in coverage of Scopes "Monkey" Trial in Dayton, Tennessee. • Liberals of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. overturn the "Five Point" test adopted in 1910. • Canadian Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists merge to form the United Church of Canada.**

• 1928. Moffat Bible published with Old Testament

• **1929. Exodus of conservatives from Princeton; Westminster Theological Seminary founded in Philadelphia.**

• **1930. Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. approves ordination of women as elders • First television program with sound broadcast by the BBC.**

• **1932. General Association of Regular Baptist Churches formed by fundamentalists leaving the Northern Baptist Convention.**

• 1933. Eighteenth Amendment (prohibiting alcohol) repealed.

• 1935. Moffat Bible revised.

• 1936. Orthodox Presbyterian Church founded by conservatives leaving the PCUSA. • United Church of Canada (uniting Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists) approves ordination of women.

• 1937. Charles Fuller begins weekly nation-wide radio broadcasts of "Old Fashioned Gospel Hour."

• 1939. Sigmund Freud, Moses and Monotheism. • Britain declares war on Germany.

• 1940. Lamsa translation of Peshitta New Testament

• 1941. U.S. declares war on Japan after attack on Pearl Harbor.

• 1942. National Association of Evangelicals formed by anti-fundamentalist "neo-evangelicals" in St. Louis, to promote conservative Christian involvement in public affairs.

• 1944. U.S. Army lands at Normandy. • Youth for Christ founded by neo-evangelicals in Chicago.

• 1945. U.S. Air Force destroys 2 Japanese cities with atomic bombs. End of 2nd World War.

• 1946. Revised Standard version of the New Testament published with great fanfare.

• 1947. Dead Sea Scrolls (dated c. 150 B.C. to A.D. 75) discovered in Qumran. • Conservative Baptist Association founded by conservatives leaving the Northern Baptist Convention. • Fuller Theological Seminary founded by neo-evangelicals in Pasadena.

• 1948. Communist agents discovered in U.S. State Department. "Red Scare" begins. • World Council of Churches constituted in Amsterdam.

• 1949. Billy Graham's evangelistic campaign in Los Angeles attracts national attention.

• 1950. National Council of Churches constituted in Cleveland. • Billy Graham begins television broadcasts.

• 1952. Revised Standard version of the Old Testament published by National Council of Churches. The version is severely denounced by conservatives. • One third of all American homes have television. • Norman Vincent Peale's The Power of Positive Thinking.

• 1954. Methodist Episcopal Church approves full denominational ordination of women. • U.S. Supreme Court mandates racial integration of public schools. Beginning of "Civil Rights Movement."

• 1955. United Bible Societies constituted by union of Bible societies of England, Scotland, America, Germany and the Netherlands. Committee appointed to produce a Greek New Testament • Robert Schuller opens drive-in theater church in Orange County, California.

• 1956. Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. approves ordination of women as ministers. • Christianity Today founded by neo-evangelical writers.

• 1957. Bertrand Russell's Why I am not a Christian. • United Church of Christ formed by association of various Reformed churches.

• 1958. Phillips New Testament (paraphrase) • Bultmann, Jesus Christ and Mythology.

• 1959. Revised Standard version New Testament slightly revised.

• 1960. Revised Standard Version adopted by most "mainline" congregations. • 80% of American homes have television.

• 1961. New English Bible New Testament (British)

• 1962. New American Standard Bible New Testament

• 1963. Blacks riot in Birmingham, Alabama. • President Kennedy assassinated.

• 1964. Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (southern) approves ordination of women as ministers. • Fuller Theological Seminary opens its Graduate School of Psychology. • Civil Rights Act passed by U.S. Congress.

• 1965. Catholic edition of Revised Standard Version.

• 1966. United Bible Societies' first Greek New Testament • Jerusalem Bible (Roman Catholic). • "Good News for Modern Man" New Testament published by the American Bible Society.

• 1967. New American Standard Bible Old Testament • Living Bible New Testament (paraphrase). • Blacks ri

ot in Detroit.

• 1968. United Bible Societies' 2nd Greek New Testament • Blacks and college students riot in several U.S. cities. • Martin Luther King assassinated.

• 1969. Homosexuals in New York City riot against enforcement of sodomy laws. • American astronauts land on the Moon.

• 1970. New American Bible (Roman Catholic). • New English Bible Old Testament (British) • Lutheran Church in America approves ordination of women. • Robert Schuller begins weekly "Hour of Power" television broadcast.

• 1971. 2nd ed. of Revised Standard Version.

• 1972. Neo-evangelical Fuller Theological Seminary officially renounces doctrine of Biblical inerrancy. • U.S. Supreme Court rules that all existing death penalty statutes are unconstitutional.

• 1973. Neo-evangelical scholars publish the New International Version New Testament • Chicago Declaration of Social Concern expresses neo-evangelical support for liberal political agenda. • U.S. Supreme Court legalizes abortion nationwide. • Presbyterian Church in America founded by conservatives leaving the PCUS. • Executive Council of the United Church of Christ recommends ordination of homosexuals.

• 1975. United Bible Societies' 3rd Greek New Testament • Bill Hybels organizes Willow Creek Community Church in a suburban movie theater near Chicago.

• 1976. Good News Bible (Today's English Version) published by the American Bible Society. • Episcopal Church approves ordination of women as priests. • Harold Lindsell's The Battle for the Bible exposes widespread liberalism among neo-evangelicals. • Jimmy Carter elected U.S. President.

• 1978. Neo-evangelical scholars publish the New International Version Old Testament. • Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy.

• 1979. New King James Version New Testament • American Lutheran Church approves ordination of women. • Jerry Falwell founds "Moral Majority" political lobby to promote Reagan election campaign.

• 1980. Ronald Reagan elected U.S. President.

• 1982. Hodges and Farstad "Majority Text" Greek New Testament • New King James Version Old Testament • Robert Schuller's Self-Esteem: The New Reformation.

• 1983. General Synod of the United Church of Christ recommends ordination of homosexuals. • AIDS epidemic begins.

• 1985. New Jerusalem Bible (Roman Catholic).

• 1987. Pentecostal television preacher Oral Roberts says that God had threatened to kill him if supporters did not send him 8 million dollars immediately. • Pentecostal television preacher Jim Bakker disgraced in revelations of vice and fraud. • Pentecostal television preacher Pat Robertson enters race for U.S. Presidency.

• 1988. Pentecostal television preacher Jimmy Swaggart disgraced in revelations of vice.

• 1989. Revised English Bible (British).

• 1990. New Revised Standard Version.

• 1992. Bill Clinton elected U.S. President.

• 1993. "Re-Imagining" conference of female mainline ministers in Minneapolis features worship of pagan fertility goddess. • Federal agents attack Adventist sect in Waco.

• 1995. Holy laughter breaks out at Pentecostal Vineyard Christian Fellowship church in Toronto. • Contemporary English Version.

• 1996. NIV Inclusive Language Edition published in Great Britain. • New Living Translation.

• 2000. George W. Bush elected U.S. President.

• 2001. Holman Christian Standard Bible New Testament. • English Standard Version • World Trade Center towers in New York destroyed by Moslem fanatics.

• 2002. Today's New International Version New Testament.

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: What's missing in this history? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/21 10:03

Walter, this is quite a summary of the history of the Bible. Yet, there is one element about God's word that cannot be so easily expressed in this fashion - and that is what God himself has actually been doing with it to build his kingdom. Much of God's marvelous work finds no place in such nutshell histories.

Consider these scriptures:

"You yourselves are our letter, written on our hearts, known and read by everybody. You show that you are a letter from Christ, the result of our ministry, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts. 2 Corinthians 3:2,3

These words have become vibrant to me lately - especially as I near the completion of Bill Mounce's Biblical Greek course. I am seeing that much translation involves the process of educated discernment by fallible people. Sometimes there are different ways to translate certain grammatical structures. In more cases than I have ever realized, there is simply no black and white translation. Strangely, apart from the original biblical writers, God really hasn't inspired anyone to create a perfect translation in any language. (Is that not correct?) Add to that the fact that there is really no perfect Greek/Hebrew original manuscript around. What do we make of that? Why did God not do a better job preserving his own word to humankind? Surely, that could have prevented all this fuss! All the translation wars!

Other questions are raised too: How can anyone today even know what the first century Greek words really meant, their semantic range, their meaning and use in THEIR culture, and so forth. Why, we can't even use a modern Greek dictionary because Greek, like any language has changed so much! And that brings us to another rude awakening: Language changes so drastically that words adopt entirely new meanings over time. Or they lose their original crispness. Consider now-a-days - when change is occurring more rapidly than in any other time in history. That includes our language! Surely there is a constant need for translation work!

Quote:
----- I guess that I just haven't seen any evidence that would compel me to believe that there is a vastly superior text source (or "perfect" and "preserved" text source).

Maybe God had a reason for the imperfections and uncertainties that so many have battled over. Maybe God is more in control of his word than we'd like to think. He wants his children to depend on him first and foremost! We are utterly dependent on him to make his word come alive in our hearts and understanding.

Really, what draws others to Christ: It is people! Saved, redeemed, those who are living letters! Those empowered by the Spirit. Those crucified in the flesh. Surely, God's word is going forth, not merely through written text (of any translation), but through the hearts and lives of his children: living letters! If believers resist God's Spirit which empowers the word, they fail to communicate the Good News. Period! A perfect translation could never replace God's plan, could it? (Edit: Of course I'm convinced that his word is fully trustworthy in spite of human limitations!)

God has designed his kingdom to grow through imperfect people! That is utterly amazing! But it's not about human imperfections but God's perfection!

Maybe its time to move on to the next question: Am I a living letter? Are others seeing Christ in me? Does what they see give them a thirst for God? If not, then, God please show me where I am sealing off my heart from you, where I close the door to your Spirit!

Also: Am I able to hear God's word for me as expressed through his servants in the Body? Am I responding to them? If not, then what difference does contending for any translation make?

Diane

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/7/21 18:21

(<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/25785089>) 1,600-year-old version of Bible goes online this week

I look forward to reading your comments about this bible. I am unfamiliar with this Bible and have not researched it. Is it derived from the TR?

Re:, on: 2008/7/21 23:41

Dear Diane:

Today, in this corrupt age, we see many misconceptions regarding the Holy Spirit. The doctrine of Calvinism prevails extensively among believers who often sit at the feet of denominational preachers.

Many people think that if we were in a saved state, God's Spirit would move on us to determine the proper action that we are to take in regards to what is right, and what is wrong. We are told in the Bible that the Holy Spirit will convict us of sin, and thus we would be able to determine if the action was approved of God.

Think about what this position does to God's Word. It dispenses with it. According to this view, I am wasting time searching the scriptures for spiritual direction (Acts 17:11).

If the Holy Spirit reveals directly to each person how he is to live, then why even study the Bible? Why did Paul write, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15)? We would need to cease appealing to the authority of Christ through his Word for all we do in religion (Col. 3:17). Why would God have wasted the time of Matthew, Luke, Paul, and other New Testament writers?

If the Holy Spirit directly leads us into the truth by convicting us of sin and confirming the truth from within, why did Paul need to rebuke Peter in Galatians chapter two? Where was the Holy Spirit in Peter's case? Where was the inner moving of the Spirit upon Peter?

This Calvinistic doctrine leads to the situation that existed in the days of the Judges, "In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judges 21:25). Maybe this is why our society is in such a religious quandary today. **This subjective doctrine opposes what Paul stated about the scriptures in 2 Timothy 3:16-17: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Scripture is sufficient in guiding us.**

What do we do when one person believes an activity is right and another believes it is wrong based on what they feel to be an inner confirmation or "conviction" of the Holy Spirit? God is not the author of confusion (1 Cor. 14:33), but of unity (1 Cor. 1:10). Whose Holy Spirit "nudge" are we going to believe? The Mormon's? The Baptist's? The Catholic's? There can be no unity in the Spirit with this kind of contrary authority (Eph. 4:1-6).

Solomon said, "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death" (Prov. 14:12; 16:25). There is a way that may feel right but leads to destruction. **The only way we can be sure about the right or wrong of a thing is by consulting the Bible.** Paul proclaimed, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek, for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith" (Rom. 1:16-17). Faith comes by hearing the Word of God (Rom. 10:17). It alone is our standard in religion and morality (1 Pet. 4:11). It is more than adequate in informing us about sin and salvation (2 Tim. 3:16-17). It is so complete and sufficient that it will judge me at the last day. Jesus clearly said, "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have

spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John 12:48).

Some people today, who rely on the NIV and other "newer versions" believe that a person cannot even understand the Bible to be saved without a direct operation of the Holy Spirit. This is pure Calvinism. Why would one even need to understand the Bible if the Holy Spirit will determine it for us?

The New International Version gives credence to this position in its sad rendition of 1 Corinthians 2:14: "The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Another problem with this idea is that it lays the blame of those who are lost at the feet of God. If a man cannot understand the truth that saves until Holy Spirit operates directly upon him, and if the Holy Spirit moves only at the direction of God, then whose fault is it if he is lost?

Paul told the Ephesians, "How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words, Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ)" (Eph. 3:3-4). He said nothing about how one must first have the aid of the Holy Spirit in understanding those inspired words. The only part the Spirit played in their understanding of God's Word was the revealing of it to men like Paul. This is explained in the next verse: "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph. 3:5).

The only way to know the will of God is by consulting his Word; it alone reveals his wisdom and makes us wise unto salvation (Rom. 1:16).

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

Roadsign wrote:
Walter, this is quite a summary of the history of the Bible. Yet, there is one element about God's word that cannot be so easily expressed in this fashion - and that is what God himself has actually been doing with it to build his kingdom. Much of God's marvelous work finds no place in such nutshell histories.

Consider these scriptures:

"You yourselves are our letter, written on our hearts, known and read by everybody. You show that you are a letter from Christ, the result of our ministry, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts." 2 Corinthians 3:2,3

These words have become vibrant to me lately - especially as I near the completion of Bill Mounce's Biblical Greek course. I am seeing that much translation involves the process of educated discernment by fallible people. Sometimes there are different ways to translate certain grammatical structures. In more cases than I have ever realized, there is simply no black and white translation. Strangely, apart from the original biblical writers, God really hasn't inspired anyone to create a perfect translation in any language. (Is that not correct?) Add to that the fact that there is really no perfect Greek/Hebrew original manuscript around. What do we make of that? Why did God not do a better job preserving his own word to humankind? Surely, that could have prevented all this fuss! All the translation wars!

Other questions are raised too: How can anyone today even know what the first century Greek words really meant, their semantic range, their meaning and use in THEIR culture, and so forth. Why, we can't even use a modern Greek dictionary because Greek, like any language has changed so much! And that brings us to another rude awakening: Language changes so drastically that words adopt entirely new meanings over time. Or they lose their original crispness. Consider now-a-days - when change is occurring more rapidly than in any other time in history. That includes our language! Surely there is a constant need for translation work!

Quote:
----- I guess that I just haven't seen any evidence that would compel me to believe that there is a vastly superior text source (or "perfect" and "preserved" text source).

Maybe God had a reason for the imperfections and uncertainties that so many have battled over. Maybe God is more in control of his word than we'd like to think. He wants his children to depend on him first and foremost! We are utterly

dependent on him to make his word come alive in our hearts and understanding.

Really, what draws others to Christ: It is people! Saved, redeemed, those who are living letters! Those empowered by the Spirit. Those crucified in the flesh. Surely, God's word is going forth, not merely through written text (of any translation), but through the hearts and lives of his children: living letters! If believers resist God's Spirit which empowers the word, they fail to communicate the Good News. Period! A perfect translation could never replace God's plan, could it? (Edit: Of course I'm convinced that his word is fully trustworthy in spite of human limitations!)

God has designed his kingdom to grow through imperfect people! That is utterly amazing! But it's not about human imperfections but God's perfection!

Maybe its time to move on to the next question: Am I a living letter? Are others seeing Christ in me? Does what they see give them a thirst for God? If not, then, God please show me where I am sealing off my heart from you, where I close the door to your Spirit!

Also: Am I able to hear God's word for me as expressed through his servants in the Body? Am I responding to them? If not, then what difference does contending for any translation make?

Diane

Re:, on: 2008/7/21 23:46

Hello Miccah:

This bible is based on the minority text and will be a waste of your money.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

Miccah wrote:

(<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/25785089>) 1,600-year-old version of Bible goes online this week

I look forward to reading your comments about this bible. I am unfamiliar with this Bible and have not researched it. Is this derived from the TR?

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/7/21 23:48

walter wrote:

Quote:

Hello Miccah:

This bible is based on the minority text and will be a waste of your money.

Sincerely,

Walter

Thank you for your opinion Walter. :-)

I think that people can download it for free online, but I am not sure.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/22 0:15

Walter,

Thank you for the clarification. It was an honest inquiry.

By the way, please site your sources.

(<http://www.bible-researcher.com/history2.html>) A Chronology of the English Bible

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/22 9:43

Walter, I really appreciate it when someone takes the time to respond to my post, and I certainly appreciate your thoughts here. They also help me to understand where you are coming from. I'll make a few comments on my perspectives:

Quote:

----- The only way we can be sure about the right or wrong of a thing is by consulting the Bible.

There is some truth here, but God certainly does bring conviction to the conscious in other ways too - from what I have seen and read in the testimonies of others (and myself).

And also, there is the sobering reality that even after years of hard study, we can still miss glaring truths. That is the way our nature works. Certainly we see plenty examples in scripture. This realization humbles us and helps us be patient with those who just can't see the "obvious" - or maybe - the way we see it.

Let's face it, most of us here on SI are Western, culturally speaking, and so cannot easily see how our enculturation affects our thinking. We will have a natural bent to filter the Word through our world view - unconsciously. Thus, we need to cry out the Spirit to reveal our blind spots - whatever the cost. This, to me should be one of our first prayers in our revival burdens. "Lord, begin with me!"

Quote:

----- Paul proclaimed, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth;

Is he not referring to the Good News of Christ, that is, what he actually did on the cross in giving us new life empowered by the Spirit? I fear that one of the dangers for us who have been well-churched and biblically taught (and I sure include myself!) is that we drift from our Lord, and as our vibrant relationship with him cools, we replace it with a substitute that gives us a sense of righteousness. Careful observance of the Bible can be just that. Now, before you tar and feather me for suggesting such blasphemy, I appeal to the Word itself as a defence: There were people in the Bible who did just that: Scribes - of all people!

Quote:

----- Some people today, who rely on the NIV and other "newer versions" believe that a person cannot even understand the Bible to be saved without a direct operation of the Holy Spirit.

If this is so, then why would these people even be interested in newer versions? Why not just give sinners a Greek bible and let the Spirit do the interpretation apart from mental work? (I wish!!!!!!)

Now, I do believe that salvation CANNOT be attained or even comprehended apart from the Spirit. Take myself as an example: I got saved twice: The first time with the Word only, and the Second time with the Spirit and the Word. The first time was not authentic, but I would have never realized it apart from a mighty work of the Spirit. (a long story)

Quote:

----- Another problem with this idea is that it lays the blame of those who are lost at the feet of God.

I don't see this at all in the verse you quoted, and have never heard it interpreted that way. Really blaming God arises from a foolish and darkened mind. Those who experience God's salvation in the power of the Spirit don't blame anybody. (That is of the flesh!)

Quote:

----- This is pure Calvinism.

Well, I'm not expert enough to doubt you on that. I grew up in a Calvinist environment, and years later, after reading the first few pages of his Institutes, I'd say that back then we did a very bad job representing his name AND the Word.

By the way, I empathize with your concern about "only the Spirit" being needed. However, I believe that this teaching has been misused by those who are following ANOTHER spirit and call it the Spirit. That should not cause us to undermine the New Covenant promise.

"I will put my law in their minds
and write it on their hearts.
I will be their God,
and they will be my people. Jer. 31:33

This is indeed what is happening around the world! I am in the midst of listening to sermons by Jackie Pullinger, who for many years has worked with the drug addicts, prostitutes, and gangsters in the Walled City in Hong Kong - illiterate people, the scum of the earth. When these people meet Jesus, and receive him, they are immediately filled with the Spirit, loved by him and changed - even before having ANY bible lessons, or talks about sin. It's all breath-taking!! It's about meeting Jesus! Later, as they work through Bible studies, the Spirit helps them understand.

I recommend (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/viewcat.php?cid117>) Jackie Pullinger sermons. They are here on SI. Every statement of hers is like a drop of refreshing water from heaven! Why? Because she isn't just talking doctrine in theory but from real life: what God has really been doing? (I will be referring to her ministry and teaching in other posts)

One more thought: Apart from real life experience, our understanding of God and his ways will be dull at best. The Bible did not come to us in neat tidy doctrinal creeds, but with all kinds of narrative stories from which we learn about God - through the way he interacts with humankind. That applies even today!

Amen! Amen!

Diane

Re:, on: 2008/7/22 11:50

#1

Well Ccchhhrrriiisss, here we are again. I have asked you to back up your position with Bible proof-text, specifically : ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:
Hi Walter...

Once again, you have served well to point out the differences in translation of a select group of verses. However, the major doctrinal elements are inarguably alive and well as found in the other versions.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

To ccchhhrrriiisss:

You have made a bold statement that must be supported by fact. Please provide proof, from each and every one of the 8 New versions I quoted (NIV, NASB, NRSV, REB, LB, NWT, NAB, NKJV) that everything posted previously by me is taught throughout the newer versions. Please quote both New and Old Testament quotations that clearly teach the following, from each version listed above (NIV, NASB, NRSV, REB, LB, NWT, NAB, NKJV):

1. Christ's Virgin Birth, and that Mary was a virgin
2. That Joseph is not referred to as Jesus Christ's father and that Mary is referred to as His mother.
3. Clear documented teaching, in each one of the "newer" versions, that Jesus Christ is and was God manifest in the flesh.
4. Clear teaching, with Bible prooftext, from all 8 versions, with clear references to the fact that Christ is God in the flesh and that He is the Second Person of the Trinity, and that He is eternal, and has no beginning and no end.
5. Explain why in Isaiah 14:12 in all of the "newer versions" replaces "Lucifer" (Satan) with one of the Name's of Jesus Christ, "Morning Star", as found in Revelation 22:16
6. Provide prooftext, using each one of the 8 new versions, that clearly teach throughout their "versions" that sinners are redeemed through/by the Blood of Jesus Christ.
7. Provide prooftext, from all 8 newer versions, that teach the fact that God promised us that His Words would be preserved forever.
8. Provide prooftext from all the newer versions of clear teaching (documented) in the newer versions that: all believers will stand before Jesus Christ, at the Judgement Seat of Christ, and be judged by Him, and that Christ is God.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

#2
And this is your response to my challenge for you to prove yourself by Bible Prooftext?:

Walter, I really don't feel the need to comment on your verse-by-verse comparison. Ultimately, I believe that all of those major doctrines are still found in the NIV (and some of the other academic translations).

#3
Ccchhhrrriiisss:
The bottom line is that you have made a statement that you cannot substantiate by the Bible. So, instead of admitting it, you waltz all the way around it, and then refuse to support your statement that was: **Once again, you have served well to point out the differences in translation of a select group of verses. However, the major doctrinal elements are inarguably alive and well as found in the other versions.**

Ccchhhrrriiisss, Without proving your statement that **THE MAJOR DOCTRINAL ELEMENTS ARE ARGUABLY ALIVE AND WELL AS FOUND IN THE OTHER VERSIONS by Bible Prooftext**, then what you are saying is merely your **own opinion, and is without value to those searching for truth.**

Lets look at ten Protestant Christian Doctrines, found in the Bible, and compare:

When we look at the teaching in the Majority Text, the Authorized Version, the King James Bible and compare it to the Minority Text, the Catholic Bible, and all of the newer versions created since 1888 and that are now sold as Protestant Bible

es, we see a tremendous difference in Christian Doctrine. This **change in doctrine** can be found in all the newer versions.

Lets look at the doctrinal difference between 10 verses, and compare the two versions: (when I say 'modern versions', I am referring to all other 'versions' except the Authorized King James Bible. 'Modern versions' include: the NIV, the RSV, the NRSV, the NASV, the NKJV, the TEB, the LB, the AMP, etc. etc.- I am not referring to the New King James, The Living Bible, and the Amplified. These are more "hybrid", and need to be analyzed separately.)

Get your Bible out, and lets compare Doctrines;

1) How many Gods are there?

We know there is only 1 God. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord" (De. 6:4).

Now, turn to Daniel 3:25. In this verse, Shadrach, Messach and Abednego have been thrown into the fiery furnace. However, they are not alone. Another one (a fourth) is there to help them.

Look at this verse in a "modern version". (Notice: the wording in each 'modern version' will differ from others, but the effect of what they do to Protestant Doctrine is the same).

At the end of Daniel 3:25, the 'modern' version has a reading similar to the following:

"... and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods..."

A son of the gods?! There is only one God!

Look at this same verse in your King James Bible. The Authorized (KJ) Bible says:

"... and the form of the fourth is like THE SON OF GOD". i.e. Jesus Christ.

It was Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, who was with Shadrach, Messach and Abednego. Jesus protected them from the fiery furnace; and it's Jesus who will protect you and me from the fiery furnace (i.e. hell).

Who would think there is more than one God? ? Satan does! In the Garden, in Genesis 3:5, when he spoke to Eve said:

"... ye shall be as gods ..."! 9

Satan believes there is more than one God because he believes that HE is EQUAL to God.

2) Who was Jesus' father?

The answer is that God was Jesus' father.

Let's look in a "modern" version of the Bible, at Luke 2:33.

Starting in Luke 2:27 Simeon has gone into the temple to see the baby Jesus (who is with Joseph and Mary). Again, depending on the particular 'modern' version, in verse 33, it will say something similar to:

" ... and his FATHER and mother were amazed at the things which were spoken of him" .

What do you mean "... and his father ..." was amazed at the things which were spoken of him?! **Jesus' father was NOT Joseph! Jesus' father was God!**

Now, let's look in the King James Bible, the Authorized Version. The KJV has the correct reading; in Luke 2:33 it says: **"And JOSEPH and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him".**

For a 'modern' version (NIV, NASV, RSV etc.) to say Joseph was Jesus' father is blasphemy!

Think about the doctrinal implications: If Jesus had only an earthly father and mother, then he is just any man. If he is just any man, then we are still in our sins. If we are still in our sins, then we are not saved! If we are not saved, then we have a big problem!

3. What was Jesus' purpose in coming to earth?

Turn to Matthew 18:11.

You may have a hard time finding this verse. In many new, 'modern', versions because **this verse is missing!** The verses are numbered 10 then 12, 13, 14! Or you may find verse 11 is in brackets, casting doubt as to whether it is scriptural.

Let's see what the Authorized King James says:

"For the Son of man is come TO SAVE THAT WHICH WAS LOST."

This one verse, which summarizes Jesus' entire mission to earth, is either ignored in 'new' versions; or it is put in bracket

s casting doubt on it! This verse contains a KEY piece of Christian doctrine. People have to know they are lost, i.e. that they have a problem, to know they need a saviour.

4. Noah was a great man used by God to build the Ark. To be called for such a task required Noah to be approved by the Lord, God. So, how was Noah 'justified' before God? Was Noah's justification by his own works?

For the answer, turn in your Bible to Genesis 6:8.

In a 'modern version' it says something like:

"Noah found favor in the eyes of the Lord."

Now think what the word favor implies. **Favor implies that Noah was 'better' than others. Favor implies Noah was approved by God because of his own 'good works'.**

Now compare that to the KJV. It says:

"Noah found GRACE in the eyes of the Lord".

Even though Noah was used of God, he was also in need of grace (just like all of us). Noah was NOT justified by his good works, but by God's grace.

Look at verse 9: It says Noah walked with God. Notice that Noah's walk with God occurs, in verse 9, AFTER Noah received grace from God, in verse 8. Grace precedes our walk with God. We are NOT justified (NOR saved) by our own work s.

Remember, Noah got drunk on occasion (Gen 9:21). He was in need of God's amazing grace. We are, too.

The consistent theme of the Bible is that we are saved by God's grace and NOT by our own works. Grace and favor have two totally, different, meanings.

The Authorized King James Bible is consistent with the Bible's teachings. These 'modern versions' are not.

5. Why did Jesus Christ go to the cross?

Let's look at 2 verses. Turn to 1st Peter 4:1.

In a 'modern' version it says: "... Christ suffered ..."

In your Authorized King James Bible the full reading is quoted as:

"... Christ suffered FOR US."

Notice the last two words give the FULL meaning. Leaving out "for us" misses the point entirely! This is confirmed again in 1 Corinthians 5:7.

In many 'new' versions it says:

"For Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed."

Again, the full reading is found in the **King James Bible**. It says:

"For even Christ our passover is sacrificed FOR US."

6. How did Jesus' going to the cross bring our redemption?

A 'modern' version will NOT tell you how! (in Colossians 1:14). It says (of Jesus):

"in whom we have redemption ..."

The full Christian doctrine is only included in the King James reading of the same verse. Properly stated, it says (of Jesus):

"In whom we have redemption THROUGH HIS BLOOD ..."

Without the shedding of blood there is NO remission of sins. Leaving out "the blood" misses a key point of doctrine (and leaves us in our sins).

7. Who does Jesus "call" and what does he "call" them to do?

Open your "modern" version to Matthew 9:13. It says something like:

"For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners".

Notice how the end of this verse begs the question: "... call the righteous, but sinners TO WHAT?"

Turn to the same verse in the **King James Bible**:

"... for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners TO REPENTANCE".

The last 2 words of this verse are crucial! In the end, Satan gets all the sinners who don't repent. Jesus gets all the sinners who do repent. There is a big difference in those two eternal outcomes. And, there is a big difference in these two translations.

We are all sinners, and we must all repent, to be saved.

8. What happens to those who do not receive the testimony of Jesus Christ, i.e. what happens to those who do not receive the gift of everlasting life?

In many 'modern' versions you won't find out! This is because part of the verse is missing (in Mark 6:11). Let's turn there now.

A 'modern' version reads something like:

"... shake the dust off your feet when you leave, as a testimony against them."

However, **the King James gives the full teaching:**

"... 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 GOMORRHA IN THE DAY OF JUDGMENT, THAN FOR THAT CITY".

I think the reader will agree that this verse contains important information we need to know!

9. After we repent, and are born again (come to saving grace), what else does Jesus command us to do?

There are many changes that come in our new birth/in our new nature, but the answer I'm looking for is this: **We are to make a public profession of faith. Then we are to be baptized, by immersion, in water.**

Let's look in Acts chapter 8, verses 35-37.

In Acts 8:35 Philip, the Apostle, preached Jesus Christ to the eunuch. In verse 36 the eunuch realized his need to be baptized. The eunuch then asks if he can be baptized.

Now, take a look at Acts 8:37 in a "modern" version of the Bible. Many (but not all) 'modern' versions go from Acts chapter 8 verse 35, to verse 36, then to 38. 38?! **Where is verse 37 you ask? And, what did verse 37 say?**

This key verse, properly included in the King James Bible, tells us whom should be baptized. It says:

"... IF THOU BELIEVEST WITH ALL THINE HEART, THOU MAYEST." And he answered and said: "... I BELIEVE THAT JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD."

These 'modern' versions, which leave out verse 37, **are omitting the deity of Jesus Christ. Also, they are missing the key point: We must make a PUBLIC profession of faith. We must believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. If we do not know, believe, and confess that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, our baptism only 'gets us wet'. Leaving out verse 37 omits a major portion of Christian doctrine.**

Omissions of doctrine and corruptions of doctrine are bad news. In both cases, the reader is NOT getting the correct information he/she needs to know.

10. Can you recite the Lord's prayer?

The Lord's prayer, taught to us by Jesus, and recorded in Luke 11:2-4 of the KJV, is as follows:

"... Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. 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."

Now turn to Luke 11:2-4 in a "modern" version and re-read the Lord's prayer. The wording will be similar to:

"... Father, hallowed be Thy name. Thy Kingdom come. Give us each day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive everyone who is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation".

Note this modern version states "Father" but **then leaves out "... WHICH ART IN HEAVEN ..."**. You don't know who you are praying to, your Father in heaven, or to Satan!

It also leaves out "our" as in OUR father. We were created by God who is "OUR" father. Satan is a father, but he is not "OUR" father. Satan is the "father" of lies.

And this "modern" version leaves out **"THY WILL BE DONE, AS IN HEAVEN, SO IN EARTH"**. By leaving out the fact that we are praying to our Father WHOSE WILL IS DONE IN HEAVEN, this 'modern' version is re-directing your prayer away from God and toward someone or something else (in another place).

Lastly, there is a major omission in the last half of verse 4. Verse 4 states: **"And lead us not into temptation"**. But this verse then leaves out: **"... BUT DELIVER US FROM EVIL ..."**

I want to be delivered from evil! How about you? This 'modern version' is NOT the "Lord's Prayer" you want to be praying!

In summary, if you want to be taken seriously Ccchhhrrriiss, back up your "opinion" with PROOF that "all of the doctrinal teachings in the majority text are alive and well in the newer Bible versions" (minority text with Bible PROOFTEXT). If you cannot, then be honest about not being able to do so. *Also, by continuing in your position, without Biblical Proof, it reveals your own pre-existing bias for the Minority text, regardless of your endless denials of same.*

Sincerley,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiss wrote:

Hi BeYeDoers and Krispy...

I agree!

It is my belief that the root of this matter has far less to do with the current translations (KJV, NIV, NASB, etc...) as they do with the sources used and the manner in which the English versions were created from those sources.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Deleted

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Walter, I really don't feel the need to comment on your verse-by-verse comparison. Ultimately, I believe that all of those major doctrines are still found in the NIV (and some of the other academic translations). In addition, you have never answered my question: Do you believe that the KJV of the Bible is PERFECT

Re: verses added in the KJV - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/22 14:24

Food for discussion:

Verses found in the KJV which do not appear in the NIV (nor in other contemporary translations)

The words are in the footnotes, with the note that they occur in later manuscripts. They are entirely absent from the early Greek manuscripts and papyri. So why are these words found in the KJV?

The talented KJV translators worked from 1604 to 1611 and they did a fine job with the very limited resources available to them back then. They had basically twelve ancient manuscripts which the subcommittees shared. Since that time, however, many hundreds of additional manuscripts have been found, and many of them are far older than those available to the KJV team. And of course, more ancient means closer to the originals, closer to the first inspired manuscripts which came from the mind of God to the original authors. Therefore they are also more trustworthy and reliable.

The important fact here is that in these far older manuscripts some of the words and phrases found in later manuscripts are absent. Clearly they were added somewhere along the way. How did this happen?

During the terrible persecution of the Christians under Nero, Decius, and Diocletian, all copies of the Scriptures were ordered to be destroyed. Of course, some did survive and then when Emperor Constantine became a Christian in 312, he ordered that hundreds of copies of the Scriptures should be made. And pious scribes and copyists set to work with great fervor. Occasionally they would add a word or phrase in the margin, and then the next copyist would come along and suppose that these words belonged in the text, and he would insert them. So the later manuscripts got to be a bit longer and contain material not found in the earliest and best manuscripts. And that's why translators today take those words and phrases out of the text, because they are not found in the earliest and most trustworthy manuscripts and codices.

In conclusion, you may be sure that in the NIV you will find all of the inspired text but not the words added by men, however much we might like to have those additional words. Translators must give us the very best and genuine text without any human additions. (...)

Found (<http://www.ibs.org/niv/accuracy/niv-kjv-verses.php>) here

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/22 15:00

Quote:

roadsign wrote:

In conclusion, you may be sure that in the NIV you will find all of the inspired text but not the words added by men, however much we might like to have those additional words. Translators must give us the very best and genuine text without any human additions. (...)

My sister I must disagree here.

This is absolutely not a true statement and is very misleading.

There has been a lot of thoughts from men's understanding added in this translation.

The Niv is not a word for word translation.

Furthermore you have only stated others opinion because they were not alive back then to know what they have stated to be 100% accurate.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/7/22 16:19

rbanks wrote:
Quote:

Furthermore you have only stated others opinion because they were not alive back then to know what they have stated to be 100% accurate

Sounds very similar to things that some people are saying about the TR.

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2008/7/22 17:49

Diane, your reasoning is faulty. Oldest does not automatically mean best. This is the same false reasoning that the contemporary scholars use in defending the Alexandrian text. The Byzantine and Alexandrian lines departed very early and have separate transmission histories. The Alexandrian family has much less of a "succession line" than the Byzantine family does, and is much more of an eclectic gathering. Which is part of the argument as to why the Byzantine textform has been chosen by many scholars as more reliable.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/8/1 12:31

Hi walter...

I returned from a trip and just noticed this thread. I don't want to rehash this as a deep seeded argument...but I just wanted to address a couple of things.

First of all, I feel that your questions here are almost pointless. The bulk of the differences between the KJV and the NIV are based upon two things: The sources and the translation method. I agree that the NIV is not a word-for-word translation of the sources that the translating committee used. However, neither is the KJV! As much as some people want to argue that it is "much more literal," that is just another way of saying that it isn't entirely literal (or word-for-word). When our sister claimed that the important doctrines of the Church are contained within the NIV—let me assure you that they are! The virgin birth, the deity of Christ, the Trinity, the evils of sin, etc.—they are all there! In fact, any major variation or possible alternate translations of a word, phrase or passage is found in the footnotes (something that the translator did with the KJV, but was forbidden or publication).

I don't want to spend time going over each of your questions (or are they accusations?) with a fine-tooth comb simply to find that my time was wasted because you ignored my answers or had prepared rebuttals that effectively ignored any ad

mission that these important doctrines are found in the NIV. I do apologize if this is not your intent – and if you are honestly inquisitive about finding out whether such doctrines are located in the NIV. However, the past has revealed many *KJV-only* advocates who asked questions but ignored the answers. Besides, if you want to find those things, just use an online Bible resource like (<http://www.biblegateway.com>) Bible Gateway. You can use the search feature to examine any passages or words BEFORE making blanket accusations that do not hold merit.

As for sources: While you claimed otherwise, I am not biased for either set of sources. However, I do understand the arguments for both sets of sources. I understand the arguments presented by the *pro-Textus Receptus* advocates (not to be confused with the wild claims of the more staunch *KJV-only* advocates). However, I also understand the position of the majority of scholars today who prefer a wider view of all scholarly available ancient text sources. Through my own research, I have not been able to arrive to a final conclusion as to the ultimate superiority of one source over the other.

I don't apologize at all for this opinion. However, I would urge anyone who truly researches this issue to not limit their research to sources that advocate a single side of the argument. If you want to know WHY the translators of the NIV used their sources and methods – contact them! Contact the majority of text and translation scholars and find out why they prefer the sources/methods used for an academic version like the NIV. Research the KJV and its sources (like the Textus Receptus) in its unbiased entirety. Read the preface to each translation and hear what the translators themselves said about their work. Research the life of Desiderius Erasmus (the Dutch Catholic humanist who was only guy who translated the Textus Receptus). If you feel the need to examine the rumors regarding the lives of the NIV committee, then perform similar research on the translators of the KJV and some of their pro-Catholic, “High Church” theological views.

As for translation methods: As a person who is moderately bilingual (and somewhat familiar with the Greek), I understand how some things can be lost in a literal word-for-word translation method. I also realize that there are often more possible phrases into which a foreign phrase can be translated. The greatest and most apparent example of a non-literal translation of the KJV goes with the manner in which they translated the “divine Name” (YHWH) into both “LORD” and “Lord GOD” throughout the Old Testament or through the use of traditional terms accepted by the Church of England (such as “Bishop” and “Church”). However, this has been discussed extensively in the past. There are quite a few variables that go into proper translation. Ironically, there was much trepidation and bias against the KJV when it was first translated because people did not believe that it was “literal” enough. Again, I would urge you to contact the translators of the NIV and ask them just why they used the translation methods that they did. However, don't go to them in a confrontational manner – because they would probably ignore you or assume that you are yet another *KJV-only* zealot.

Walter, in your last post, you claim that I hold a “pre-existing bias” for the minority text -- which is simply untrue and a lie. If you would have read my posts for what was written, you would understand that I am not biased EITHER WAY. Rather, I just don't see any evidence that would cause me to jump onto a final, ultimate stand for the supremacy of either set of source texts. However, I would urge you to more closely examine just which sources were used for the KJV. They didn't simply use Erasmus' Textus Receptus. They used an eclectic set of sources – including many existing English bibles (and even some contemporary French, Spanish, German translations). The translation of the KJV was not an open work: The translators had predetermined instructions for translation that came from the Church of England and its King and Vicar.

Like I have said often in the past, I don't believe that this is really a question of the supremacy of the KJV over the NIV (or vice versa). I completely discount the theory that the KJV is the only “perfect and preserved” Word of God. It had many (mostly superficial) mistakes that were corrected over 140 years. However, there are still mistakes within it today. However, I feel that it is a faithful rendering from its sources. A much more healthy debate, in my opinion, is one that discusses the sources and translation methods for which a work is taken. In my experience, I have found that a great many people who argue in favor of the “majority” texts over the “minority” texts (or on occasion, *vice versa*) have little understanding of the issues outside of the books and sermons that preach the view for which they adhere. I have spoken with people who assume that the KJV was taken from a single source called the “majority text.” That is incorrect. Like the translators of the NIV, the translators of the KJV used an eclectic set of texts (one of which was Erasmus' Textus Receptus for the New Testament) by which they examined and derived their translation.

Yet I am amazed that the bulk of discussions regarding the KJV and all of the supposedly “flawed” versions seldom mention the roots of the issue. The roots, in my estimation, are both the sources and methods used for translation. While these are usually discussed in these sort of threads, it is usually as support for another argument (such as “the KJV is superior” or “all modern versions are inferior”). It would be healthy, I think, if we could have a real discussion that truly examines the roots of this issue – rather than continued debates over just how “perfect” the KJV might be. I have

ve not arrived to a final conclusion on the matter of textual or methodic supremacy. Why? It is because I have researched both sides of this issue extensively that I cannot arrive to an ultimate conclusion. I understand both (and multiple) sides to this debate. However, I am far too fearful of pointing the finger of heresy at a single academic translation or set of sources – when, in fact, I might be wrong. Therefore, I choose to read these versions (the KJV and the NIV) knowing very well the manner, methods and sources by which they were created. I also read them with the understanding that they were produced by flawed men who admitted that their creation was not beyond flaw.

Walter, I asked you a long time ago a question regarding whether or not you believed that the KJV was the “perfect and preserved” Word of God. You never answered the question. However, I urge you to move beyond a question of “end product” perfection or supremacy and consider the issues that made up that version. Consider carefully and honestly the opposing views of the scholars and translators without viewing it as some sort of diabolic conspiracy (as some have insisted). Contact the translators of the NIV. Contact experts in the field of textual criticism and translation methods. Try to understand their perspective BEFORE accepting the conclusion that you might have been handed from a sermon or book. I did this a long time ago – gathering such information from both sides of the aisle. I presented some of this information to these men and asked for their responses. I researched the history of the versions, the sources and the men who were involved. Nothing was off limits to my investigation.

In the end, I did not arrive to an “easy” conclusion. I haven’t seen anything that makes me see one set of sources or translation methods as ultimately superior to the other. This may sound like the “easy way out” of such a discussion. However, I think that I have caught quite a bit of admonition from those on either side – since I have not cast my lot with either. In fact, my position is more of a “neutral” one than it may seem at times. However, I enter these discussions when I find people on either side throwing allegations that I find to be either over simplistic opinions or based upon rumor. This makes me appear to be a defender of “modern” translations like the NIV. In reality, I was only trying to defend fact from allegation. It is possible to reason together concerning these issues, but only if we are able to lay down our preconceived prejudices that may or may not have been placed there by men.

:-)

Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2008/8/1 17:58

REALLY!

Roadsign

Regurgitating false information put forward by others trying to discredit the KJV does not help this discussion.

Blessings Greg

:-)

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/8/1 18:39

Hi Smokey...

What part of roadsign's post consisted of "false information?" Do you have any proof that it is false? How is her "cut and paste" of this article any different than the many anti-any-other-version articles provided by KJV-only advocates?

Her reference link is from the International Bible Society, which provides "credible" information on their website too. I don't think that it "discredits" the KJV, but reveals some information that we can consider. Of course, with all of that information (like all of the gossip, rumor and allegations continually "cut and paste" by KJV-only people directed toward ANY other version), we should read it in the knowledge that it is written by opinionated and flawed men.

I have read quite a bit of information about the KJV that is worth considering or contemplating. I don't post it in many of these threads, because a defense of a modern, academic version like the NIV is not supposed to be an attack on the KJV (like is often typical regarding the other way around). I still read the KJV and regard it as my primary text for studying God's Word. However, I know the history of the translation. Much of this is recorded by its translators. That information is not meant to "attack" the work, but it does raise a few interesting points. In fact, some of the same criticism used to attack modern academic translations can be redirected at the KJV (if someone wanted to). This doesn't lessen the work of the translators, but it demonstrates the nearsighted reasoning of some ardent KJV-only advocates.

For instance, I made a list some time back that raised a few questions about the KJV. I didn't verify all of these issues, but most of them have been checked out. Here it is:

Quote:
-----The version was initially "authorized" to begin with by King James (a man of questionable moral and doctrinal beliefs) and only much later became the "authorized" edition for use in song and prayer books by the official Church of England denomination (for which it is still an "authorized" version).

The translators were given only conditional liberty in the translation process because of some prerequisite restrictions regarding the final product.

The translators of the KJV were forced to use the flawed *Bishop's Bible* as the base for their new translation.

Even before the translation work began, King James warned the Church of England about any passages that might cause the reader to question his ultimate earthly authority (in regard to both the British Empire and the official Church of England) and the concept of the "Divine Right of Kings."

The translators of the KJV were explicitly instructed to use some of the traditional language that was not faithful to a literal rendering (such as the term "Church" where it would rightfully be translated "congregation" or the term "Bishop" where it would be translated as an "overseer").

Some of the translators—including the Chief Translator and official Overseer Lancelot Andrewes—held beliefs in "High Church" ritualistic theology and tradition (including the doctrine of the Eucharist, adoration, vested Church hierarchy, etc...).

The original printings of the King James Version used Roman type variations (different from the main text) in order to signify the words that were added by the translators but were not found in the source Greek or Hebrew text. The translators added these words in order to make the version better understood according to rules for English grammar.

The original edition was purposely produced using a black letter, gothic type face which conformed to High Church (pagan and Roman Catholic) tradition. It was not intended to be purchased by common folk, only to be heard in official Church ceremonies in a more understandable common (or vulgar) language.

The translators included a very flattering dedication to King James, in which they offered constant adoration to "the most High and might Prince."

The King James Version was largely rejected by many 17th Century Biblical scholars. One of them, Hebrew linguist Hugh Broughton, wrote a letter in which he completely rejected the work, arguing that the translators had completely rejected "word-for-word equivalence."

It only became popular by the early 1700s, when the Church of England made it the official and only "authorized" version of the denomination.

The standard Authorized Version (as well as other printed editions) contained the books of the Apocrypha for over 200 years, until Bible societies began printing the version and omitting the Apocrypha around 1827.

Between the original 1611 edition of the King James Version and the 1769 standard Oxford edition, there were differences in text present in over 24,000 places.

There are several different versions of the King James Version available. Almost no one uses the original 1611 text. The most common edition today is a revised version of the 1769 standard published by Oxford University Press. The next most popular edition, published by the Cambridge University Press, also contains footnotes regarding the various source texts used by the translators for each passage, as well as the margin notes—which were prohibited by the Church of England.

Now, this is not and should not be seen as an attack on the KJV. It is just a question about some of the history and facts behind the translation. I would invite anyone who reads this list to question, research, refute and debate this information (just like others do regarding academic versions like the NIV). And of course, I would like to be corrected if this is incorrect. Of course, an attack on any version is a poor defense of another version. Rather, I mean to highlight some of the arguments against some of the modern versions that could mirror information about the KJV.

Regardless, I have noticed that the largest bit of defense regarding the KJV in these sort of threads are actually an attack on modern translations. I have often felt that we should "lay the ax to the root" of the issue and discuss both the source texts (not just Erasmus' *Textus Receptus*) and the methods by which the version was translated. There was quite a bit of controversy with the KJV when it was first published, you know, because of these issues.

:-)

Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2008/8/2 10:32

ccchhhrrriiisss

As usual you choose to bring forth "evidence" for your stand that make outlandish claims against the KJV from obscure, questionable sources that can not be checked. I have tried to steer clear of these discussions, however due to the ongoing assault on this translation, I have to challenge some of your statements. You have listed several statements in your post, and have not revealed your source in any of them. In the following statement that you have posted, please document at least 10 of these differences.

"Between the original 1611 edition of the King James Version and the 1769 standard Oxford edition, there were differences in text present in over 24,000 places".

Blessings Greg

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/8/2 12:35

Hi Smokey...

Quote:

-----As usual you choose to bring forth "evidence" for your stand that make outlandish claims against the KJV from obscure, questionable sources that can not be checked. I have tried to steer clear of these discussions, however due to the ongoing assault on this translation, I have to challenge some of your statements. You have listed several statements in your post, and have not revealed your source in any of them. In the following statement that you have posted, please document at least 10 of these differences.

"Between the original 1611 edition of the King James Version and the 1769 standard Oxford edition, there were differences in text present in over 24,000 places".

Brother, that is a bold statement! Did you even read my post(s)? So, you think that I commenced an "ongoing assault" on the KJV -- a version that is my primary choice for the study of God's Word? What part makes you think that it is an attack? You are into "sources" -- so can you please guide me to what words of mine were used to "attack" this version? Otherwise, please change the wording of your post.

I thought that I made it exceedingly clear (several times) that this was NOT to be viewed as an "attack" upon the KJV. In fact, I just brought some information about this translation that I had found over time in order to expose the fact that some of the same arguments used to discredit "modern" version can be applied in a similar fashion or direction at the KJV. It seems like nearly every defense of the KJV amounts to an attack on just about every other version. KJV-only advocates tend to question newer academic versions -- not merely because of their preferred translation methods or sources -- but even the motives, manners and conduct of the translators themselves! As I have said quite a few times over the course of the past few years, I believe that an ATTACK upon other versions is a poor DEFENSE of the one that we hold as superior (regardless of which version is being "defended").

As for the claim that there were 24,000 differences between the original 1611 edition of the KJV and the 1769 Oxford edition (from which the most commonly available edition is derived): The source is *A Textual History of the King James Bible* by David Norton and published by Cambridge University Press. The author explains that it was the chief editor of the 1769 edition himself (Oxford linguist Benjamin Blayney) who kept a written tally which noted that the 1769 edition amounted to slightly over 24,000 changes. Of course, most of these were minor edits. I have heard people claim (even one brother here at SI) tell me that this is "a lie" and the KJV has "never been changed." However, I have compared several passages from scans of a first edition 1611 KJV with today's edition and have noted many of these changes firsthand. For one instance: Matthew 26:36 reads "*The cometh Jesus...*" in the 1769 and later KJVs; however, the 1611 edition reads, "*Then cometh Judas...*" While this is almost certainly a simple error -- it is still an error. I have seen quite a few other errors -- most of which were spellings, tenses, grammar mistakes, etc... However, a few (like the one above) actually changed the meaning of a phrase or sentence. That is why there were corrections made.

But Brother, this should be clear: This is NOT to be deemed an attack on the KJV or its translators. Truth is truth; fact is fact. We cannot blindly defend a version that was created by flawed men as "infallible" unless we first examine the version. Do we know the history of the version? Do we know the men who created it? It is never an "attack" to state the truth unless that "truth" is conveyed in a mean-spirited manner. This is not my intent. I believe that the KJV of the Word of God is a faithful rendition taken from the various sources chosen for its translation and through the methods used. That is why it is my translation of choice. However, I am keenly aware that the KJV is not a "perfect and preserved" translation

n down to the last "dot and tittle" as argued by man KJV-only advocates. Even the version that we have still contains mistakes.

Do you see the problem with the type of almost blind allegiance to the version that is apparent today? I know men and women who look for reasons to discredit other versions. When a flaw is discovered in their version, instead of admitting the obvious, they try to develop answers for the flaw. Yet the translators themselves (in their preface) admitted that their version was not perfect! While I don't think that it is "perfect," I do think that it was "faithful" (if that makes sense).

When all is said and done, I don't believe that there was a conspiracy in either the KJV or the NIV committees. There are some terrible versions and translations out there. But I think that the translators of the KJV did the best that they could given the sources that they accepted and the methods that they chose (even if there were some preconditioned handicaps placed upon them). However, I believe that the same is true with certain academic versions like the NIV. Those translators attempted to produce a faithful translation of Scripture from the sources that they deemed best using the varying methods that they deemed most adequate. Because of this, I view these versions for what they are: Translations of Scriptures from different sets of sources using different methods of translation.

As such, I think that the real discussion lay with the sources and translation methods. Ironically, this was the cause of much mistrust for the KJV in its first 100 years of existence -- and the NIV for the past 30 years. However, an examination and discussion of facts should never be construed as an "attack."

:-)

Re: The Two Types of Bibles today, on: 2008/9/22 2:12

When we open our Bibles today, we are opening up one of the two "types" of Bibles. Even though today we have many Bibles to choose from, we still only have **two "types" of Bibles**. One of the Bibles has been passed down from the Christian Church, from the very beginning, and is the Protestant Bible, the Textus Receptus, the Majority Text, the **King James Bible**.

The other Bible that could be in our hands today has been passed down from Gnostic's who revised God's Word to conform to their own beliefs- it is the **Catholic Bible**. The Catholic Bible, has relied on the minority text, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

In 1881 the Westcott & Hort used the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus to produce their new Greek New Testament. This Greek New Testament is not the same as the one used for the King James Bible during the Reformation. All of the newer Bible Versions since 1881 have relied on the Greek New Testament created by Westcott & Hort, relying on the faulty Vaticanus and Sinaiticus text.

So, to clarify the issue, today, if you study the NIV, NASB, American Standard, or any of the other "newer" versions, you are actually studying the Catholic Bible.

"The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." Psalm 12:6,7

The following can be found at: http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/kjv_controversy.htm

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE BIBLE ISSUE:

I. A Biblical Starting Point.

"So then faith cometh by hearings and hearing by the word of God." —Rom. 10:17

A. The Starting point for this issue must be Scripture! "...let God be true, but every man a liar;" —Rom. 3:4

1. God's word is infallible, without error (John 17:17; Acts 1:3). In His infallible word, God promises to keep His words (note: W-O-R-D-S, not messages).

Not one word was to be in error.

"The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." —Psalm 12:6-7

For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."
 Â—Matt. 5:18

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Â—Matt. 24:35

"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever."
 Â—I Peter 1:23

2. Man was not to add to or take from God's word (Deuteronomy 4:2; Prov. 30:6; Revelation 22:18).

3. Therefore, the keeping of God's word is God's job, not fallible man's.

"...Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." Â—Psalm 12:7

4. This was the view of the translators of the King James Bible (KJB).

Note how they concluded their preface to the A.V. 1611:

"...we commend thee to God, and to the Spirit of His grace, which is able to build further than we can ask or think. He removeth the scales from our eyes, the veil from our hearts, opening our wits that we may understand His word, enlarging our hearts, yea, correcting our affections, that we may love it above gold and silver, that we may love it to the end." (See enclosed information, "Appendix 2")

If you start with Scripture, your finishing point is confidence in God's word.

"For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe."
 Â—I Thess. 2:13

B. The starting point of modern translations.

1. First the student must study Hebrew and Greek.

2. Second he must learn the major points of textual criticism.

3. Then he makes a translation of the Bible, presents it to a translational board for review and revision by scholars.

4. The outcome is a reliable translation, but not one free of error. Note how the preface to the New International Version (NIV) reads:

"Like all translations of the Bible, made as they are by imperfect man, this one undoubtedly falls short of its goals."

5. This view is also seen in the statement of Dr. William Shedd:

"Why did not God inspire the copyists as well as the original authors? Why did He begin with ABSOLUTE inerrancy and end with RELATIVE inerrancy?"

Psalm 118:8Â— "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man."

II. The Question of Final Authority.

A. If you have two authorities and they differ, you need a third authority to tell you which one is correct. (Such as in the courtroom). The same is true of translations. If the KJB says one thing and the NASV (New American Standard Version) says something else, you need a third authority to tell you which one is right (such as a pastor, teacher, scholar, etc.). When you do, then they become your final authority, not the Bible (Psalm 118:8).

B. To say there is no difference between modern translations and the KJB is not correct. The modern translations are based on Roman Catholic manuscripts and differ from the Greek text of the KJB 5,788 times! Translations such as the NASV differ from the KJB 36,000 times in the N.T. alone! (See enclosed information, "A Brief History of Modern Translations:" and "A Brief Comparison of Bible Translations.")

C. Modern translations have no real authority other than the view of some scholars. Scholarship is not a deciding factor in relation to the preservation of God's word. Our Lord does not say kind things concerning scholars. Note what Malachi 2:12 says, "The Lord will cut off the scholar, out of the tabernacles of Jacob, and him that offereth an offering unto the Lord of hosts."

D. We should take heed in how we judge God's word, for one day God's word will judge us.

"For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." —Heb. 4:12-13

Part one of 6 parts

Re: The Two Types of Bibles today, on: 2008/9/22 2:26

A BRIEF HISTORY OF MODERN TRANSLATIONS:

"Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit: but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." —Matt. 7:17-18

Note the roots of corruption.

I. Justin Martyr (100 A.D.)

A. He was born a pagan, and died in the robes of a pagan priest.

B. He was the first to mix Gnosticism with Christianity. Gnosticism was a heretical doctrine which taught that Christ was created by God the Father. Funk and Wagnall's Standard Dictionary defines Gnosticism as "A philosophical and religious system (first to sixth century) teaching that knowledge rather than faith was the key to salvation." Many scholars today place their knowledge above faith in God's word.

"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" —Rom. 10:17

C. Historian Dr. Benjamin G. Wilkinson wrote, "In the teachings of Justin Martyr, we begin to see how muddy the stream of pure Christian doctrine was running among the heretical seats fifty years after the death of the apostle John."

("Which Bible?". ed. Dr. David O. Fuller, Grand Rapids International Pub., Grand Rapids, Mich., 49501, p. 191)

II. Tatian (150 A.D.)

A. He was a disciple of Justin Martyr.

B. Like Martyr, he also embraced Gnosticism.

C. Tatian wrote a harmony of the gospels using the Christian Scriptures and the Gnostic gospels, thus omitting Scripture (such as John 8:1-11; and Mark 16:9-20).

D. His "Harmony of the Gospels" was so corrupt that the Bishop of Syria threw out 200 copies.

III. Clement of Alexandria (200 A.D.)

A. Clement was a disciple of Tatian (Remember Luke 6:40—"The disciple is not above his master: but everyone that is perfect shall be as his master.")

B. Clement taught that there was no real heaven or hell, no blood atonement of Christ, and no infallible Bible.

C. He used the Gnostic Scriptures to teach his students.

D. He founded the school of Theology in Alexandria Egypt.

IV. Origen (184-254 A.D.)

A. Origen was a disciple of Clement of Alexandria.

B. He held to the same doctrine as Clement, plus he taught baptism was necessary for babies to gain salvation.

C. Origen stated, "The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written." (Ibid. p. 192).

D. Dr. Wilkinson stated, "When we come to Origen, we speak the name of him who did the most of all to create and give direction to the forces of apostasy down through the centuries." (Ibid.).

E. Origen was one of the first textual critics. His textual work in both the N.T. and the O.T. (the "Hexapla") was the basis for two of the most corrupt manuscripts used by the Roman Catholic Church. (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus).

F. Origen developed a method of Biblical interpretation which is called "allegorization". Origen believed the Bible was only a set of stories that illustrate truth, but not literal facts. He believed Christ to be created and subordinate to the Father (the same as Jehovah's Witnesses), the pre-existence of the soul before birth (the same as the Mormons), and the final restoration of all spirits (Universal Salvation). (see Dr. Earle Cairns "Christianity Through The Centuries", Zondervan Publishing House, p. 122).

V. Eusebius (260-340 A.D.)

A. He was trained at Origen's school in Alexandria.

B. Eusebius was the editor of two Greek manuscripts (mss.) named Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. These two mss. were discredited and abandoned by early Christians as being corrupt. ("Which Bible?" p. 139,143).

These are Roman Catholic mss. and were not used by Protestant Christians until 1881. These two mss. are the basis for Roman Catholic Bibles and every major English translation of the Bible since 1901. These mss. were not the ones used for the King James Bible.

C. Eusebius was Roman Catholic in his doctrine (see his book, "Ecclesiastical History", Vols. 1-5).

D. He was commissioned by Emperor Constantine to make 50 copies of Scripture for the Roman church. Eusebius copied the Gnostic Scriptures and Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

VI. Jerome (340-420 A.D.)

A. Like Eusebius, Jerome was Roman Catholic in doctrine.

B. Jerome translated the Greek mss. of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus into Latin (called Jerome's Latin Vulgate). This was the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church.

C. The ms. Vaticanus was placed in the Vatican library, while the ms. Sinaiticus was abandoned in a Catholic monastery, and they were not used for the next 1,500 years.

VII. Tischendorf (1869)

A. He was the first Protestant to find and use the mss. of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

B. Tischendorf was a liberal theologian.

VIII. Westcott and Hort (1881)

A. They used Vaticanus and Sinaiticus to produce a new Greek N.T.. This Greek N.T. is not the same as the one used for the KJB nor during the Reformation.

B. Their Greek N.T. was the basis for the Revised Version (RV) of 1881 and the basic Greek text for all modern translations such as the RSV, TEV, NASV, N.T.V., etc.

C. The Greek text of Westcott and Hort (W & H) differs from the Greek text of the King James Bible (the Received Text) 5,788 times, or 10% of the text. (For examples, see the section "A Brief Comparison of Bible translations".)

D. Since all modern translations are based on the work of W & H, it would do us well to know the theology of these two men.

WESTCOTT: "I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry (Mary-worship) bears witness."

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did."

HORT: "Mary-worship and Jesus-worship have very much in common."

"Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary."

"The pure Romish view (Catholic) seems to be nearer, and more likely to lead to the truth than the Evangelical."

"Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue."

These men did not hold to sound doctrine; instead they have turned, "...away their ears from the truth, and she be turned unto fables." —2 Tim. 4:4

NOTE: Where the KJB and the Catholic Bible (such as the New American Bible) differ, the NIV and the NASV agree with the Catholic Bible. The Bible says, "For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: —2 Corinthians 2:17a. The prophet Amos wrote, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord." —Amos 8:11

Part two of 6 parts

Re: The Two Types of Bibles Today, on: 2008/9/22 2:52

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE AND ITS GREEK TEXT:

I. Believers at Antioch (1st. century)

A. The believers in Antioch were the first to be called "Christians" (Acts 11:26).

B. Since Antioch is in Syria, they translated the Bible into Old Syrian. This Bible agrees with the KJB and not the Catholic line of mss.

C. The believers at Antioch copied the Scriptures in both Syrian and Greek on papyrus (a paper-like material).

II. Believers in Greece (1st.-3rd. century)

A. They used the Greek text of Antioch and rejected the Greek text of Alexandria Egypt as corrupt. (Fuller, p. 194-215).

B. This is the church which departed from Rome and the Catholic church in the 4th century. History shows that the text of the KJB always goes away from the Roman Catholic Church. This being a historical fact, then why go back to Rome to make a new translation?

C. These believers copied Scripture on papyrus in both Greek and Old Latin (not Jerome's Latin Vulgate, but Old Latin). This Bible was translated in 150 A.D. and agrees in its text with the KJB, not the modern translations.

III. Believers in Northern Italy (3rd.-12th century)

A. They copied and used the Old Latin Bible and rejected the vulgate as corrupt.

B. These believers were called "Waldensens" and were known for the evangelism they did and the street preaching.

C. During the Inquisitions by the Catholic church, the Waldensens were the believers who were put to death (see

e "Foxe's Book of Martyr's")

IV. Believers in Early England and France (2nd.-17th. century)

A. They used the Old Latin Bible of the Waldensians as the official translation. They also copied the Greek text which later came to be called the Receptus.

B. These believers were very evangelistic and suffered much under Rome.

V. Erasmus (1466-1536 A.D.)

A. Erasmus compiled the Greek mss. of the believers in Greece, Italy, England, and France and the Old Syrian and Latin translations to produce the Greek N.T. the Reformers used.

B. Note, this was the Greek text of the Reformation. This line always goes away from Rome.

VI. Luther (16th. century)

A. Luther translated the Bible into German using the text of Erasmus. He rejected the Greek text of the Catholic church (the text modern translations use).

B. Luther was the father of the Reformation.

VII. The King James Bible (1611)

A. The N.T. was translated off the Greek text of the Reformation. The translators rejected Jerome's Vulgate and the Catholic Bible.

B. The translators were men of God who knew their task. Note the following concerning a few of the translators of the Y-M.

1. Dr. Lancelot Andrews He was the chairman. He spoke 20 languages. He spent 5 hours a day in prayer. (see E. M. Bound, "Power Through Prayer" p. 33).

2. Dr. John Reynolds, Puritan leader. He spoke Hebrew and Greek as well as he could English by the time he was 18 years old.

3. Dr. John Boies He spoke Hebrew by the time he was 5 Years old. By the time he was 14 years old he spoke Greek. He spent from 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. studying each day.

4. Dr. Miles Smiths He spoke Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic as well as he could English. He also served with Dr. Thomas Bilson as one of the two final editors of the whole King James Bible.

5. Dr. William Bedwell: He was called the father of Arabic studies in England. He wrote Lexicons in Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac and Chaldean. (Note: a Lexicon is like a Dictionary telling the meaning of words and their root meaning).

6. Dr. Thomas Holland: Not only was he a great Hebrew and Greek scholar, but a man of great dedication to God. His dying words were, "Come, O come, Lord Jesus, Thou Morning Star! Come, Lord Jesus; I desire to be dissolved and to be with Thee."

7. Dr. Laurence Chaderton: He was noted for his knowledge of Latin, Hebrew and Greek. He also spoke French, Spanish, and Italian. Because of his Christian faith his father cut him off from his family. People enjoyed his preaching so much that they would beg him to preach even after he had just preached a two hour sermon! He was committed to personal witnessing. He said of his household servants, "I desire as much to have my servants know the Lord as myself."

8. All the translators of the KJB suffered under the reign of Queen Mary (also called "Bloody Mary") before James

es became King of England. This is the only Bible committee to suffer persecution of their faith.

NOTE: For more information on the above translators and the others, see "Which Bible?" pp. 13-24, or the book by Dr. Gustavus S. Paine, "The Men Behind The KJB"

C. The text of the KJB is the same today as it was in 1611, (see enclosed "A Brief Summary of Some Objections to the King James Bible", V.)

D. The translators of the KJB believed they translated the pure word of God. (see Appendix 2).

E. The Greek text of the KJB is based on the majority of all Greek mss. and the line of Bible Believers throughout Church history.

F. The KJB is the Bible of the Great Awakening, the Well's Revival, the preaching of Edwards, Wesley, Moody, Caryl, Hudson Taylor, Sunday, Spurgeon, etc., and every major revival from 1611 until now! No modern translation (or its Greek text) can make the same claim.

Matthew 12:33 "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt : for the tree is known of his fruit."

1. The tree of the modern translation is corrupt, how can the translation be good?

2. The tree of the KJB is pure, how can the translation be bad?

3. The fruit of the KJB is Reformation and Revival, not Rome.

4. The modern translation says it is with error, the KJB says it is without error. Which one would you want to read???

5. The Bible always calls for choices (Josh. 24:15); this is also true in reading a Bible translation. You must choose which one you will read. Do so, not by what men say, but by the Word of God

Part three of 6 parts

Re: The Two Types of Bibles today, on: 2008/9/22 2:59

A BRIEF COMPARISON OF BIBLE TRANSLATIONS:

"Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.?" —1 Corinthians 5:6
(Leaven In the Bible is false teaching —Matt. 16:12)

I. Comparing the KJB (King James Bible) with any modern translation of the Bible will show the following:

Colossians. 1:14 "Through his blood" is omitted.

Acts 17:26 "Blood!" is omitted.

1 John 5:7 The part of the verse proving the Trinity is omitted.

1 Tim. 3:16 "God was manifest in the flesh" is changed to "He who was made manifest in the flesh," thus weakening the doctrine of the Deity of Christ.

Luke 2:33 "Joseph" is changed to "Father" thus calling Joseph the father of Christ.

John 5:4 The whole verse is omitted.

Acts 8:37 The whole verse is omitted.

Mark 9:44,46 These verses are omitted in all modern versions.

Romans 16:24 The whole verse is omitted.

Matthew 18:11 The whole verse is omitted.

Matthew 12:47 The whole verse is omitted.

Mark 11:26 The whole verse is omitted.

Mark 15:28 The whole verse is omitted.

Mark 16:9-20 This passage is either omitted in the modern versions or placed in brackets with a footnote stating that it should not be there.

John 8:1-11 This passage is either omitted or placed in brackets with a footnote stating that it should not be there.

Acts 15:34 The whole verse is omitted.

Acts 24:17 The whole verse is omitted.

Acts 28:29 The whole verse is omitted.

Romans 8:11 Half of the verse is omitted.

Romans 1:16 The phrase "of Christ" is omitted.

Matthew 6:13 Half of the verse is omitted in the modern versions.

1 Peter 2:2 The phrase "unto salvation" or "in regard to your salvation" is added to the text in modern versions to teach salvation by works.

Matthew 9:13 "To repentance" is omitted.

Mark 2:17 "To repentance" is omitted.

1 John 4:3 "Christ is come in the flesh" is omitted

John 1:18 "Begotten Son" is changed to "Begotten God" in the NASV. This is also how it reads in the New World Translation of the Jehovah's Witnesses. These are only a few of the 36,000 changes made. In light of Scripture, one change is one too many (Deuteronomy 4:2; Prov. 30:6; Revelation 22:18).

II. In reading the KJB, NIV and NASV, you can see that they do not teach the same thing:

2 Samuel 21:19

KJB: "...Elhanan slew the brother of Goliath..."

NIV: "...Elhanan killed Goliath..."

NASV: "...Elhanan killed Goliath..."

Daniel 3:25

KJB: "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."

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."

NASV: He answered and said, Look! I see four men loosed and walking about in the midst of the fire, without harm, and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods."

Genesis 6:4

KJB: "There were giants in the earth..."

NIV: "The Nephilim were on the earth..."

NASV: "The Nephilim were on the earth..."

Genesis 7:1

KJB: "And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou ... into the ark;"

NIV: "The Lord then said to Noah, Go into the ark,..."

NASV: "Then the Lord said to Noah, Enter the ark,..."

NOTE: There is a difference between "Come" and "Go". The KJB shows that the Lord was in the ark with Noah and his family.

I Samuel 13:1

KJB: "Saul reigned one year; and when he had reigned two years over Israel,"

NIV: "Saul was thirty years old when he became king, and he reigned over Israel forty two years."

NASV: "Saul was forty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned thirty-two years over Israel."

NOTE: How old was Saul when he began to reign, 30 or 40? How long did he reign, 42 or 32 years? The RSV and the New Scofield Reference Bible read, "Saul was _____ years old..."

I Corinthians 7:36

KJB: "But if any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely toward his virgin,..."

NIV: "If anyone thinks he is acting improperly toward the virgin he is engaged to,..."

NASV: "But if any man thinks that he is acting unbecomingly toward his virgin daughter,..."

NOTE: is it his virgin daughter or the virgin he is engaged to?

Part four of 6 parts

Re: The Two Types of Bibles Today, on: 2008/9/22 3:05

BRIEF SUMMARY OF SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE KING JAMES BIBLE:

The following are some objections people use against the KJB, followed by Biblical answers.

People who use the KJB only, worship a Bible and not the God of the Bible.

A. You can not make such a distinction between the Word of God in flesh (Jesus Christ) and the word of God in print (the King James Bible). If the word of God in print has error, what about the word of God in flesh? No, both are infallible.

"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." —I Peter 1:23

B. God's word is holy, there is no honor in trying to prove the Bible has error in it. Note the following Scriptures. "I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." —Psalm 138:2

"Seven times a day do I praise thee because of thy righteous judgments." —Psalm 119:164

"Jesus answered and said unto him, if a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." —John 14:23

I. Only the originals are inspired and without error, not any translation.

A. Where is this taught in Scripture?

B. In the following Scripture, Paul calls copies (not originals) inspired Scripture. Therefore, more than just the originals are inspired and without error. Any of the words God gives are inspired.

"And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which is able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus, All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." —2 Tim. 3:15-16

II. There is no difference between the KJB and modern translations.

A. The Greek mss. of the modern translations and the Greek mss. of the KJB differ about 10% of the time.

B. Ninety-six percent (96%) of all Creek mss. are of the same type as the KJB.

C. When dealing with translations themselves, there are over 36,000 differences between them and the KJB in the N.T. alone. Dr. Jack Lewis, who was one of the translators of the NIV, even stated this. When he compared the KJB and the ASV of 1909, he wrote...

"...in the end more than 36,191 corrections of various sorts were made in the N.T.. These included changes resulting from alterations in the Greek text itself, changes where the KJB appears to have chosen the poorer of the two readings, changes where the KJB is ambiguous or obscure, changes where the KJB is not consistent with itself in rendering phrases or passages that are alike or parallel, and changes that are required because of other changes made." ("The English Bible/ From the KJV To NIV"; P. 70.)

While I do not agree with Dr. Lewis's statement, he points out the number of differences between the KJB and modern translations.

IV. The KJB is too hard to understand. The modern translation is better than nothing.

A. The Bible is a spiritual book, and cannot be understood by natural means, such as changing the words. As one preacher said, the Bible needs to be reread, not revised.

B. The Bible must be revealed by the Holy Spirit, not translators using Roman Catholic mss.

"But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." —I Corinthians 2:9-10

"It is the glory of God to conceal a thing: but the honor of kings is to search out a matter." —Prov. 25:2

Fifty years ago people read the KJB and understood it. Our language has not changed that much in such a short period of time.

C. A little error counts a great deal. The Bible says, "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" —I Corinthians 5:6. Therefore, the modern translation is not better than nothing at all when we have a Bible that is 100% error free and the Holy Spirit to teach it to us.

V. The KJB we have today is not the same as the one in 1611.

A. This is not true! The KJB we have today is the same as the one in 1611. Not a word of the text was changed. The American Bible Society wrote, "The English Bible, as left by the translators (of 1611), has come down to us unaltered in respect to its text..." They further stated, "With the exception of typographical errors and changes required by the progress of orthography in the English language, the text of our present Bible remains unchanged and without variation from the original copy as left by the translators."

B. Calligraphy: This is the change in the way letters were used. For example the word "gave" would have been written as "gaue" in 1611. The reason was the letter "v" was written as "u". This is not changing the text as the NIV does.

C. Orthography: This is the change in spelling. Some words today are spelled differently than they were in 1611. For example, the word "took" was spelled "tooke". Again, this does not change the text as the NASV did 36,000 times.

"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." —John 8:32

"Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." —John 17:17

My friends, God said He would keep His words, without error, forever (Psalm 12:6-7; 119:89,140; Matthew 5:17; 24:35). If He did not do this, then the whole Bible is a lie. However, the Lord is always true to His word. Why not ask Christ which Bible honors Him the most and use the Bible with no corruption?

"Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by thy name, O Lord God of hosts." —Jeremiah 15:16

Part five of 6 parts

Re: The Two Types of Bibles Today, on: 2008/9/22 3:18

APPENDIX 1

7 UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

In the Spring of 1986 I debated two "scholars" in Dayton Ohio on the Bible issue. During the debate I raised 7 main questions which were never addressed by my two opponents and remain unanswered to this day. The following are the 7 questions.

1. According to the "science" of textual criticism (1 Tim. 6:20; Colossians. 2:8) two of the most controversial passages of Scripture are Mark 16:9-20 and John 8:1-11. Are these passages inspired Scripture?

A. If yes, why use a Bible which calls them into question by setting them aside in brackets with footnotes reading "not found in the most reliable manuscripts" ? (see NIV or RSV footnotes).

B. If no, why use a Bible which places them into the text with brackets? Why not leave them out completely? Where is your integrity?

C. If you do not know, how has your science helped you?

2. Where is the inerrant word of God today? Could you show me this infallible Bible? If you can not, how can you teach Biblical infallibility?

3. When we check modern translations in such places as 2 Samuel 21:19, Mark 1:2; Daniel 3:25; Matthew 5:22; and 2 Corinthians 2:17, we see they are less than truthful (John 17:17; 2 Thess. 2:13). How can translations which lie about the truth be more reliable?

4. Modern translations remove the names of Christ over 200 times in the New Testament. Who is it that would want you to read a translation which does not allow Christ to be as preeminent (Colossians. 1:18)?

5. Why should we use a Roman Catholic text to correct the Protestant Bible of the Reformation?

6. In 1 Thess. 5:21 we read, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good". The KJB is a good thing. Why are we not holding fast to it?

7. The Bible says, "...it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." (Jude 2b). How could anyone that loves the Lord and His word stand before a group of babies in Christ or the unsaved and question the authenticity of a text of Scripture? Is this contending for the faith that was once delivered unto us?

Those of us who believe God preserved His words without error are often accused of being devious. The Bible does encourage us to be loving in our attitude and message (Ephesians 4:15). However, in light of 1 Thess. 5:21; Jude 2 and dozens of other passages, the argument seems rather void of substance. Love in silence is a poor substitute for speaking the truth in love as the Bible commands.

APPENDIX 2

THE KJB TRANSLATORS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

The following are some quotations from the original preface to the 1611 KJB by the translators themselves as set forth by one of the translators, Dr. Miles Smith.

"The Romanist (Roman Catholics) therefore in refusing to hear, and daring to burn the Word translated did no less than despite the Spirit of grace,..." p.24 "...and all is sound for substance in one or other of our editions (a reference to translations based on the Textus Receptus), and the worst of ours (that is before 1611) far better than their (Romanist) authentic vulgar." p. 22

"Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfected at the same time (a reference to earlier English translations of the Greek Textus Receptus) and the later thoughts are thought to be wiser so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavour to make that better which they left so good,..." p. 21

"And this is the Word of God, which we translate." p. 23

"... but having and using as great helps as were needful, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have at the length, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that YOU Bee". P. 31

"If we be sons of the Truth we must consider what it speaketh and trample upon our own credit, yea, and upon other men's too." P. 25

"It remaineth that we commend thee to God, and to the Spirit of His grace, which is able to build further than we can ask or think. He removeth the scales from our eyes, the veil from our hearts, opening our wits that we may understand His Word, enlarging our hearts, yea, correcting our affections, that we may love it above gold and silver, yea, that we may love it to the end." p. 35

On pages 7-9 of the preface, the translators compared their work to David bringing in the ark and Solomon building the Temple. Also they compared the work on the KJB to men like Moses, Solomon and Stephen.

Historian Dr. Gustavus S. Paine in his book, "The Men Behind The KJV" (Baker Books) stated the following.

"Though we may challenge the idea of word-by-word inspiration, we surely must conclude that these were men able, in their profound moods, to transcend their human limits. In their own words, they spake as no other men spake because they were filled with the Holy Ghost. Or, in the clumsier language of our time, they so adjusted themselves to each other and to the work as to achieve a unique coordination and balance, functioning thereafter as an organic entity—no mere mechanism equal to the sum of its parts, but a whole greater than all of them." P. 173 (1977 edition)

By itself this does not prove what we have stated in this booklet. It does prove that the translators of the KJB would agree with the claims of this booklet, that the KJB is the inerrant word of God for the English-speaking people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

Burgon, Dean John William. The Revision Revised. Paradise, PA Conservative Classics, 1883

Fowler, Everett W. Evaluating Versions of the New Testament. Watertown WI Maranatha Baptist Press, 1981

Fuller, David Otis. Counterfeit or Genuine., Grand Rapids, MI Grand Rapids International Publications, 1980

Fuller, David Otis. True or False? Grand Rapids, MI Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975

Fuller, David Otis. Which Bible? Grand Rapids, MI Grand Rapids International Publications, 1970

Hills, Edward F. The King James Version Defended. Des Moines, IA The Christian Research Press, 1976

McMure, Alexander. Translators Revived.

Litchfield, MI Maranatha Bible Society, 1885

Paine, Gustavus S. The Men Behind the KJV. Grand Rapids, MI Bake, Book House, 1977

Pickering, Wilbur N. The Identity of the New Testament Text. Nashville, TN Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980 and

Ray, J. J. God Wrote Only One Bible. Eugene, OR: The Eye Opener Publishers, 1970

Ruckman, Peter S. The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence. Palatka, FL Pensacola Bible Press, 1976

<http://www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/king.htm>

Part six of 6 parts. Which Bible is in your hands today?

The Final Question we must ask ourselves- What good has ever come out of the Protestant Bible, the King James Version,? The Answer is the Reformation. The answer is the Protestant Church. The answer is Revival. The answer is the faith to be burned alive at the stake (first by Caesar, and later by the Catholic Church). The answer is spreading the Gospel throughout the world by Protestant Christian Missionaries, (not like the soldiers of the Vatican that were responsible for the growth of Roman Catholicism, by force and murder!) What of the many new and modern versions of the Bible today? Albert Einstein once said, "A man with one watch knows what time it is, a man with two watches is never sure." Allow me to apply Einstein's words to the Bible, "A Christian with one Bible knows what the Truth is, a Christian with two Bibles is never sure." Let us be sure of God's Truth by returning to the good old Bible, the one Bible of the great Protestant Reformation, which we have in our hands today, the King James Bible!

Now, compare the King James Bible (the Protestant Bible) to the Catholic Bible (all of the Catholic versions- the Douay-Rheims Version, the New Jerusalem Bible and others) plus the "Protestant" Bibles that have been created since 1881 that use the same corrupt text as the Catholic Bible---the American Standard, the Revised Standard, the NIV, the NASB, etc., etc. etc.---and all of the newer versions of Bibles created since 1881 and tell me--- What good has come out of them? What Revivals have resulted from them?

Name the fruit of Catholicism, name the fruit of the Catholic Bible, please.

Today, everyone is praying for revival, but true revival is nowhere to be found. Where is brokenness, in these last hours? Where is holiness in these last days? Where is true revival? It cannot be found to match the Revival of the 15th and 16th and 17th centuries!

Sincerely,

Walter :-)

Re: - posted by bible1985, on: 2008/9/22 3:31

I use the king james version but i have studied this whole issue and i believe that most kjv only people pervert things themselves. Saying that these other versions are of the devil and everything is really ridiculous. I read a book by James White called the kjv only controversy which i highly recommend. One thing that James White does have in his book to back up his belief is evidence, a lot of evidence. I was reading defending the king james bible by D. A. Waite and he did not prove that much to me at all. I love the kjv but to call these other versions perversions when their own problems with the kjv itself is wrong, if i am wrong Lord reveal it to me. I like using the kjv and if it is possible that there is no mistakes in it, than i am so grateful that it is true, but from what i have studied it doesn't look like it. My only problem though then is what about the other versions and the manuscripts they use. There are so many differences between Aleph and B. Also their were books left out. I am confused on how they got what they got today if it wasn't all in the original manuscripts. It is possible that the kjv is more safe to use for the fact that it has more evidence to be authentic, but who knows. Pray about the issue, let the Lord reveal whatever it may be.

Re: - posted by JoanM, on: 2008/9/22 14:05

I thank God He has filled me with a teacher, the best and only, who teaches me. What a wonder, what a work, He opened Christ to so many that had no "translation," in such a fullness that they loved not their lives unto the death and communicated Truth to others, down through generations, long before and long after printing presses.

Surely someone has already posted such a thought on this thread. I repeat it for perspective and balance. I am sure there are good reasons for so much discussion on this thread. Surely all these "versions" contain John 7: 15-17.

Humor from Ravenhill: Oh the wise and foolish versions of the Bible. (more than 10 by now)

Re: The Two Types of Bibles Today, on: 2008/9/24 10:27

This is a list of only some of the current **English Bible Versions**. What is of interest is the fact that in reality there are only two versions of Bibles listed, only two specific types of Bibles in existence:

1) The Protestant Bible, the King James Bible, first published in 1611.

2) All the rest are CATHOLIC BIBLES, starting with the Douay-Rheims Version of the Bible, first published in 1582, continuing to the end of the list and consisting of all new Bible versions published since 1881, that ALL rely on the corrupt Vaticanus and Sinaiticus text.

As we look at and study this list, it is important that we understand the time in history that we find ourselves in. With wars and rumors of wars and nation rising against nation, and famines and pestilences, and earthquakes in many places-- the possibility of a total financial worldwide meltdown at our door, when we find that love has waxed cold, and men are lovers of themselves--we must realize that we are indeed in the "end of the end times". The end times started the day that Jesus Christ resurrected from the dead. For the past two thousand years mankind has been living in the "end times". However, today we find ourselves approaching the end of these times, and the great tribulation is at our door.

The false Church is prepared to enter into the Tribulation, with their own Bible, prepared by the Gnostics! With their own "Catholic Bibles" that have been mass produced as "Protestant Bibles" over the past 100 years!

Today, as the Tribulation approaches, where is Revival found in the Christian Church? Where is Brokenness to be found in the Christian Church? Where is Holiness to be found in the Christian Body of Christ? Where is conformity to the image of Christ found in the Christian Church? All of us desperately seek the fruit of the early Protestant Church, but all we see is flesh, all we see is personal effort.

King James Bible (KJV) The Authorized King James Version is an English translation of the Christian Bible begun in 1604 and first published in 1611 by the Church of England. The Great Bible was the first "authorized version" issued by the Church of England in the reign of King Henry the VIII. In January 1604, King James I of England convened the Hampton Court Conference where a new English version was conceived in response to the perceived problems of the earlier translations as detected by the Puritans, a faction within the Church of England. The king gave the translators instructions designed to guarantee that the new version would conform to the ecclesiology and reflect the episcopal structure of the Church of England and its beliefs about an ordained clergy. The translation was by 47 scholars, all of whom were members of the Church of England. In common with most other translations of the period, the New Testament was translated from the Textus Receptus (Received Text) series of the Greek texts. The Old Testament was translated from the Masoretic Hebrew text.

Douay-Rheims Bible, the Douay-Rheims Version of the Bible, first published in 1582, is the best, most accurate, safest English translation that you can use. The reason is that the Douay-Rheims is a careful word-for-word translation of the Latin Vulgate Bible (the official Bible of the Church) - plus, it was compared to the original New Testament Greek. And the Vulgate is a careful word-for-word translation of the original languages. Therefore the great accuracy of the Douay-Rheims. We have observed that the other English translations of Scripture, when they try to render difficult passages, will translate "meanings" rather than words. Thus, in these "translations", one gets the translators' interpretations of the meaning of Scripture. Hence the many differences that exist in the modern translations and the general absence of impact from the Word of God when reading from them--an impact typical from reading the Douay-Rheims.

Contemporary English Version (CEV), is a completely new translation published by the American Bible Society in 1995. Originally intended as a children's translation, it uses a very simple, contemporary style. It is independent of traditional translations and free of "biblical" terms. This is an especially good translation for people who speak English as a second language.

English Standard Version (ESV) is an "essentially new literal translation" follows the tradition of the King James, American Standard Version, and Revised Standard Version. Published in 2001 by Crossway, it was developed by a translation team of more than 100 scholars, with the goal of being very accurate (word for word), and yet very readable.

Good News Bible (Today's English Version) (TEV), completed in 1976, was translated by Robert G. Bratcher with six other scholars. This very free, though very accurate, translation avoids the use of traditional biblical vocabulary and communicates especially well with youth and the unchurched. Also published by the American Bible Society.

Holman Christian Standard Bible (HCSB) is another new word-for-word translation that strives to be both literally accurate and readable. It is not as literal as the ESV or NASB, but is more so than the NIV. The Holman published by Broadman & Holman in 2003, is the product of nearly 100 scholars.

The Living Bible (LB), completed in 1971, is Kenneth N. Taylor's paraphrase of the American Standard Version. Easy to read and once immensely popular, it is often criticized for adding too much commentary to the biblical text. Published by Tyndale House, although apparently no longer available from them.

The Message (Msg) - Eugene Peterson completed this paraphrase of the entire Bible in 2002. Peterson takes great liberties with words in his attempt to effectively communicate both the original thoughts and tone of the Scripture. The result is a very earthy, informal language. Published by NavPress.

New American Standard Bible (NASB) - completed in 1971, was produced by 54 conservative Protestant scholars sponsored by the Lockman Foundation. This version is very literal in vocabulary and word order, although the resulting English is quite wooden. It often is preferred by those who want an English version that reflects the grammar of the original. A New Update was published in 1995 which seeks to use more modern English while preserving the literal nature of the translation.

New International Version (NIV), completed in 1978, was the product of 115 evangelical scholars. Within a decade it became the best-selling English version. It combines contemporary, literary English with traditional biblical vocabulary. The

e NIV is copyrighted by the International Bible Society.

New King James Version (NKJV), released in 1982, involved 119 contributors. It updates the vocabulary and grammar of the King James Version, while preserving the classic style and beauty. Although it uses the same Hebrew and Greek texts as the original, it indicates where other manuscripts differ. Published by Thomas Nelson.

New Jerusalem Bible (NJB) of 1985 revised and updated the text and notes of the Jerusalem Bible of 1966. This version, translated by two Catholic scholars, is an elegant, literary rendering (perhaps the most poetic since the KJV). The notes reflect a modern, liberal perspective.

New Living Translation (NLT), published in 1996, is the product of 90 Bible scholars from around the world, from various theological backgrounds and denominations. This is a very readable translation, while remaining more faithful to the original texts than the Living Bible (see above). Also published by Tyndale.

New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) - published in 1989 by the National Council of Churches, revises the Revised Standard Version of 1952. While following the literal tradition of the RSV, the NRSV eliminates much of the archaic language. One distinctive is the use of gender inclusive pronouns to replace male pronouns when the original writers meant both men and women. The NRSV does not change masculine pronouns referring to God, however.

Revised English Bible (REB), completed in 1989, is a thorough revision of the New English Bible. Like the original, it was translated by a committee of British scholars, representing all the major Christian traditions in the United Kingdom. The more archaic language was omitted and a more conservative approach was taken toward some of the difficult passages. Many readers find it to be an excellent translation for personal reading and study, though its British idioms make it less popular in the U.S.

Sincerely,
Walter

Quote:

JoanM wrote:

I thank God He has filled me with a teacher, the best and only, who teaches me. What a wonder, what a work, He opened Christ to so many that had no "translation," in such a fullness that they loved not their lives unto the death and communicated Truth to others, down through generations, long before and long after printing presses.

Surely someone has already posted such a thought on this thread. I repeat it for perspective and balance. I am sure there are good reasons for so much discussion on this thread. Surely all these "versions" contain John 7: 15-17.

Humor from Ravenhill: Oh the wise and foolish versions of the Bible. (more than 10 by now)

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2008/9/24 22:58

@waltern,

Good day. I hope you can enlighten me on the following issue/s:

From your last post you said,

Quote:

....."In January 1604, King James I of England convened the Hampton Court Conference where a new English version was conceived in response to the perceived problems of the earlier translations as detected by the Puritans, a faction within the Church of England. The king gave the translators instructions designed to guarantee that the new version would conform to the ecclesiology and reflect the episcopal structure of the Church of England and its beliefs about an ordained clergy. The translation was by 47 scholars, all of whom were members of the Church of England".....

Now, there is a serious allegation that the 'authorized king James version' was a result of a malevolent aversion of King James to 'Geneva bible' which was then the most popular bible among the Puritans because it is opposed to the rulership of kings and clergy over the church.

The following were excerpts from "The Great Ecclesiastical Conspiracy" <http://awildernessvoice.com/GEC.html>

...After James came to England and was crowned king, a bishop by the name of Richard Bancroft, soon to become archbishop, sought to save the church and the nation of England from the puritan "false prophets." Bancroft was aware of James' exalted view of kingship and used that knowledge to promote his own agenda. In presenting the Puritans as a threat to the crown, Bancroft solicited the king's help in suppressing this greatest threat to his position and power and in so doing made himself the highest authority in the Church of England, second only to the King himself. There can be little doubt but that the true motive behind Bancroft's intrigue was a desire to preserve the power of the unbiblical bishopric.

Alister McGrath explains Bancroft's strategy.

"Bancroft's strategy for coping with James was simple. He would persuade James that the monarchy was dependent upon the episcopacy. Without bishops there was no future for the monarchy in England." ("In The Beginning" - Pg. 152)

This political cunning played a significant role in the decision to translate a new Bible, an Authorized Version that would make all other versions unauthorized. From all appearances, the new translation was a calculated initial step toward ridding England of the despised Geneva Bible and its marginal notes. This new Bible would preserve and promote the divine right of kings and bishops to rule. Bishop Bancroft was placed in charge of the translation. This move was akin to a CEO entrusting the company finances to a known embezzler! There is little doubt that Bancroft stacked the translation panel with a goodly number of translators who shared his views.

Mr. McGrath explains,

"A further point that helped win Bancroft over to the new translation was that he was able to secure for himself a leading personal role in selecting the translators, and then in limiting their freedom. Bancroft had realized that it was better to create a new official translation that he could influence than to have to contend with the authorization of the Geneva Bible. It was decidedly the lesser of two evils. He was in a position to exercise considerable influence over the new bible, by laying rules of translation that would insure that it would be sympathetic to the position and sensitivities of the established church of England. And finally he would be in a position to review the final text of the translation, in case it needed any judicious changes before publication..."

Determined to ensure that the translation process was prudently guided, Bancroft limited the freedom of the translators by drafting fifteen rules of translation, which were approved by King James.

Two of these rules are of special importance.

1.) "The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishops Bible, was to be followed and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit."

3.) "The old Ecclesiastical words to be kept, viz. The word Church not to be translated Congregation &c."

"Having completed their recommendations for revision (of the work of the translators of the King's new Bible), the text was passed on to Miles Smith and Thomas Bilson, who were charged with the adding of the finishing touches. It is not clear whether their role was to review the overall text of the translation, or simply to comment on the specific changes proposed by the editorial committee that had met at Stationers' Hall. Then, in an apparently unscripted development, Richard Bancroft reviewed what had been hitherto regarded as the final version of the text. It would be one of his final acts; Bancroft died on November 2, 1610, and never lived to see the translation over which he had held so much sway (by order of the king). Smith complained loudly to anyone who would listen that Bancroft had introduced fourteen changes in the final text without any consultation. Yet we remain unclear to what those alleged changes might have been." (In The Beginning - Pg. 188)

This is only a sample of the kind of political jockeying that was going on behind the scenes and the ambition that sponsored the translating, editing and publication of the king's new Bible, which could not escape being tainted by such ambition.

King James prohibited his translators from removing the old ecclesiastical words that had taken generations to weave into the text. He had to make a special emphasis in order to keep them, since any honest translator would have translated them out. Bancroft and King James intended to keep them no matter what the translators discovered.

"I am convinced that the King James Translators, laboring under an 'institutional church' mentality, selected the strongest words possible which conveyed the idea that the people must submit to the authority of the clergy. In this way King James could control the people through the Church, of which he was Supreme Ruler." (Dusty Owens - quote taken from "It shall not be so among you" by Norman Park)

What can you say about this.

Re:The Two Types of Bibles today, on: 2008/9/25 16:17

Hello, Passerby:

My response is that you need to provide Biblical prooftext to prove your point. By comparing the Bishops Bible with the King James in regards to the issues that you allege, line by line, then we will have something to see in black and white, rather than accusations and innuendo. **Without proof, you offer nothing--- (That is my opinion of your post).**

Something along the lines of the following order would be perfect. Prove to us exactly how the King James Bible was changed from the Bishops Bible, verse by verse:

xxxxxxxxxxxxx

Their are two basic texts that make up our Bibles of today:

There is a great deal of difference between these two texts-- Majority text, and the Minority text, between the King James Version (Majority text), and the Catholic Bible (Douay-Rheims & New Jerusalem) and all of the newer versions of the Protestant Bible created since 1881, that rely on this flawed Minority text.

The Majority Text inspired the Protestant Bible, that inspired the Protestant Reformation and the building of the Christian Church, as we knew it before 1900. The finest version of the Majority Text is the 1611 King James Bible. The Minority Text, that inspired the Catholic Church, and is the text used to create the Catholic Bible (Douay-Rheims & New Jerusalem) is also the text used to create all of the newer versions of the Protestant Bible, that have been produced since 1881.

Grab your "favorite" version (NIV, NASV, Etc.) and let's continue our comparison through the Gospels. **Is there really a difference? You be the one to decide:**

JOHN

1:18 "the only begotten Son" is changed to "The only begotten God." Such a phrase is foreign to Scripture. It accommodates the Arian teaching that Christ was a lesser deity created by God. It agrees with the teaching of ORIGEN that Christ was not equal with God in essence and nature. Sound Fundamental doctrine concerning Christ is that he is one person of the Triune God and that he proceeds from the Father by an eternal generation and reveals God to men as the Son of God.

1:27 "He it is ... who is preferred before me" is removed.

This change removes the pre-eminence and pre-existence of Christ. John wanted us to see that though Christ came after him, he in reality preceded and ranked above him.

3:13 "which is in heaven" is omitted. This change affects the doctrine of the omnipresence of Christ. As man he was here on earth, as God he was able to be everywhere present. The omission is a corruption introduced by those who do not believe in the perfect and absolute Deity of Christ.

3:15 "should not perish" is removed. This deletion removes the opposite of everlasting life, which is to perish. The doctrine of eternal damnation is weakened by the change.

3:16 "his only begotten Son" is changed to "the only begotten Son." The word HIS marks Jesus Christ out as God's own peculiar son in a relationship that no one else has. It marks him as of the same essence and nature. The Deity of Christ is involved and is thereby weakened (3:17 also changed).

4:42 "the Christ" is left out. The purpose of John's gospel as given in 20:31 was to lead people to believe that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. That belief was to bring life to them. To omit it here is to deny the purpose of the inspired writer.

5:3b, 4 The statement regarding the moving of the water by an angel and subsequent miraculous healing is removed. Should this deletion be permitted there would be no sense to verse 7 since that verse presupposes 5:3b, 4. This is an effort to remove the miraculous from the Bible and thus accommodate humanism.

5:16 "and sought to slay him" is omitted. The Scripture teaches us that on many occasions they tried to kill Jesus but by supernatural power were kept from doing so (see John 18:6). He was omnipotent and there was no way they could take

him until his hour was come.

6:47 "on me" is left out. The object of faith has been removed here. Everlasting life does not come to those who believe, but to those who believe on Christ. This is doctrinal error of the gravest sort and has been carried over into the NASV and NIV.

7:8 The little word "yet" is dropped and the result is that the Lord appears to lie to his brothers, since he did go up to the feast. There is a world of difference between "I go not up YET" and "I go not up." The sinlessness of Christ is an indispensable doctrine of the Christian faith and lying is sin.

7:53-8:11 The whole story of the woman taken in adultery is omitted. This is one of the most blessed portions of the Word of God. It is intended by God through the inspired writer to amplify what came before in 3:17. The law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (1:17).

8:38 The words "my Father" and "your father" are intended to show the difference between his father and their father, who was Satan. By removing the word "my" and "your" there is a deliberate attempt to remove the offence and cater to the false dream of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

8:39 "If ye were Abraham's children" is changed to "if ye are Abraham's children." The Lord intended them to see that they were not Abraham's children at all. The change gives us to see that they were Abraham's children and therefore they ought to act like it. This is pure humanism and contrary to sound doctrine.

9:4 "I must work the works of him that sent me" is changed to "We must work the works of him that sent us." The uniqueness of Christ as the Sent One of the Father is destroyed and he is placed equally with the disciples as sent from God to do the work of God. This is an attack on the Person and Work of Christ and it exalts humanism. Jesus was sent by the Father and the disciples were sent by Jesus, "as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

9:35 "the Son of God" is changed to "the Son of man." The thing to be believed in John's gospel is that Jesus is the Son of God (20:31). The change by the minority texts is not warranted.

10:38 "that ye may know, and believe" is changed to "that ye may know, and understand." The union of Christ and the Father within the Godhead is that which we are to believe and rely upon for the certainty of our salvation. To understand the union is beyond human comprehension and if it could be understood, that would still not be the equivalent of salvation.

11:41 "where the dead was laid" is removed. God intends that we should know that this was the very same place where Lazarus was laid. This is an attempt to cloud the evident miracle which followed. (see also 12:2 where "which had been dead" is also removed).

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

passerby wrote:
@waltern,

Good day. I hope you can enlighten me on the following issue/s:

From your last post you said,

Quote:
....."In January 1604, King James I of England convened the Hampton Court Conference where a new English version was conceived in response to the perceived problems of the earlier translations as detected by the Puritans, a faction within the Church of England. The king gave the translators instructions designed to guarantee that the new version would conform to the ecclesiology and reflect the episcopal structure of the Church of England and its beliefs about an ordained clergy. The translation was by 47 scholars, all of whom were members of the Church of England"...

Deleted

What can you say about this.
.....

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2008/9/25 22:23

The allegations about the KJV mistranslation on ecclesiastical matters are more aptly and extensively contained in the e-book 'The Great Ecclesiastical Conspiracy'

<http://awildernessvoice.com/GEC.html>

There is a lot of other references which can be accessed through the web if one will give time to search diligently. However, I do not desire for anybody to be burdened further.

Personally, I do use KJV and prefer it more than others though with reservations especially on ecclesiology.

Re: - posted by EvangelistC, on: 2008/9/26 13:20

i read a lot of different translations.

Re: Two Types of Bibles Today, on: 2008/9/26 17:12

Quote:

.....
EvangelistC wrote:
i read a lot of different translations.
.....

Hello, EvangelistC:

What is your favorite translation? Why is it your favorite?

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: The Two Types of Bibles Today, on: 2008/9/27 0:17

Many Christians today use the **New King James Bible** as their Bible of choice. They feel that it is easier to read and understand than the King James Bible because of the archaic language found in the King James- the thee's and thou's, etc. They also feel that it relies on the same text, the Majority Text, that the King James Bible does, and that it totally conforms to the 1611 King James Bible.

Is this true?

Pull out your "New King James Bible" and let's find out what is true, and what is false. Is it equal to the KING JAMES BIBLE, or is it inferior to the King James Bible? You can be the judge!

The analysis that follows can be found at:

<http://www.av1611.org/nkjv.html>

The Preface to the New King James Version (NKJV) reads, "A special feature of the New King James Version is ITS CONFORMITY to the thought flow of the 1611 Bible. . . the new edition, while much clearer ARE SO CLOSE t

o the traditional. . ."

Among the first changes that greets the reader of the NKJV is the removal of the much maligned "thee, thou and ye". The Preface to the NKJV states, "...thee, thou, and ye are replaced by the simple you, . . . These pronouns are no longer part of our language." But "thee, thou and ye" were "NO LONGER part of the language" during 1611 either. (just read the intro to the 1611 King James, there are no "thee", "thou" and "ye"). In fact, Webster's Third New International Dictionary, says of ye: "used from the earliest of times to the late 13th century. . ." (p.2648) And yet the 1611 King James was published 400 years later in the 17th century!

So why are they there?

The Greek and Hebrew language contain a different word for the second person singular and the second person plural pronouns. Today we use the one-word "you" for both the singular and plural. But because the translators of the 1611 King James Bible desired an accurate, word-for-word translation of the Hebrew and Greek text - they could NOT use the one-word "you" throughout! If it begins with "t" (thou, thy, thine) it's SINGULAR, but if it begins with "y" (ye) it's PLURAL. Ads for the NKJV call it "the Accurate One", and yet the 1611 King James, by using "thee", "thou", "ye", is far more accurate!

By the way, if the "thee's" and "thou's" are "...no longer part of our language" - why aren't the NKJV translators rushing to make our hymnbooks "much clearer"? "How Great Thou Art" to "How Great You Are", or "Come Thou Fount" to "Come You Fount" Doesn't sound right, does it? Isn't it amazing that they wouldn't dare "correct" our hymns - and yet, without the slightest hesitation, they'll "correct" the word of God!

The NKJV claims to make the "old" KJV "much clearer" by "updating obsolete words" (New King James Version, 1982e. p. 1235)

How about that "obsolete word" - "hell". The NKJV removes the word "hell" 23 times! And how do they make it "much clearer"? By replacing "hell" with "Hades" and "Sheol"! Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines Hades: "the underground abode of the dead in Greek MYTHOLOGY". By making it "much clearer" - they turn your Bible into MYTHOLOGY! Not only that, Hades is not always a place of torment or terror! The Assyrian Hades is an abode of blessedness with silver skies called "Happy Fields". In the satanic New Age Movement, Hades is an intermediate state of purification!

Who in their right mind would think "Hades" or "Sheol" is "up-to-date" and "much clearer" than "hell"?

Matthew 16:18

KJV: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

NKJV: "And I also say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build My church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

Luke 16:23

KJV: "And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom."

NKJV: "And being in torments in Hades, he lifted up his eyes and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom."

Hell is removed in 2 Sam. 22:6, Job 11:8, 26:6, Psalm 16:10, 18:5, 86:13, 116:3, Isaiah 5:14, 14:15, 28:15, 18, 57:9, Jonah 2:2, Matt. 11:23, 16:18, Luke 10:15, 16:23, Acts 2:27, 31, Rev. 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14.

Then the NKJV decides that maybe "Hades" should be "grave"! So the NKJV makes 1 Corinthians 15:55 "much clearer" by changing "grave" to "Hades"! "... O Hades, where is your victory?" Clear as mud. . .

Another one of those "obsolete words" is "repent". They take it out 44 times! And how does the NKJV make it "much clearer"? In Matthew 21:32 they use "relent". Matthew 27:3 it's "remorseful" Or Romans 11:29 they change "repentance" to "irrevocable".

The term "new testament" is NOT in the NKJV! (see Matt. 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:20, 1 Cor. 11:25, 2 Cor. 3:6, Heb. 9:15,) The NKJV replaces "new testament" with "new covenant" (ditto NIV, NRSV, RSV, NASV). An obvious assault at the written word!

The word "damned", "damnation" is NOT in the NKJV! They make it "much clearer" by replacing it with "condemn" (ditto NIV, RSV, NRSV, NASV). "Condemned" is NO WHERE NEAR AS SERIOUS as "damned"! Damned is eternal! One can be "condemned" and not "damned". Romans 14:22 says, ". . . Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." Webster defines "condemned": to declare to be wrong, but the much more serious and eternal "damn": "to condemn to hell".

The word "devils" (the singular, person called the "devil" is) is NOT in the NKJV! Replaced with the "transliterated" Greek word "demon" (ditto NIV, RSV, NRSV, NASV). The Theosophical Dictionary describes demon as: ". . . it has a meaning identical with that of 'god', 'angel' or 'genius'". Even Vines Expository Dictionary of Biblical Words (p.157) defines "demon" as: "an inferior deity, WHETHER GOOD OR BAD". Webster defines "demon" as: "divinity, spirit, an attendant power or spirit", but "devil" as: "the personal supreme spirit of EVIL. . .".

In 2 Timothy 2:15, the NKJV (like the NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV) remove that "obsolete" word "study"! The only time you're told to "study" your Bible. AND THEY ZAP IT! Why don't they want you to "study" your Bible? Maybe they don't want you to look too close - you might find out what they've ACTUALLY done to your Bible! The "real" KJV is the only English Bible in the world that instructs you to "study" your Bible!

That "obsolete" word "virtue" is replaced with "power" in Mark 5:30, Luke 6:19, 8:46! How does anybody confuse "virtue" with "power"? Simple - by being "bosom-buddies" with the NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV! That's what they did!

One of the most absurd changes ever made is changing the word "servant" to "slave"! The NKJV in Romans 6:22, reads: "But now having been set FREE from sin, and having become SLAVES OF GOD. . ." The NKJV, in 1 Corinthians 7:22, calls the Christian, "Christ's slave". Talk about a contradiction! John 8:36 says, "If the Son therefore shall make you FREE, YE SHALL BE FREE INDEED." But isn't a Christian supposed to serve? Yes, in love. Not as a slave! Galatians 5:13 explains it, perfectly: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto LIBERTY;(not slave ry!) only use not LIBERTY for an occasion to the flesh, but BY LOVE SERVE one another."

In order to "harmonize" with the satanic New Age Movement (and of course the NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV!), the NKJV changes "end of the WORLD" to "end of the AGE"! And in it's no longer the "WORLD to come" but "AGE to come". The New Age Movement teaches a series of ages (hence the name: New AGE). See Matthew 12:32, 13:39, 13:40, 13:49, 24:3, 28:20, Mark 10:30, Luke 13:30, 20:34,35, 1 Cor 1:21.

The New Age Movement and the occult are longing for one called the Maitreya. The Bible calls him the Anti-Christ. New Ager's refer to him as the "the Coming One" - AND SO DOES THE NKJV! In Luke 7:19, 20 (see also Matt 11:3) John told his disciples to ask Jesus: "Are You THE COMING ONE. . ." In the "The Great Invocation", a "prayer" highly revered among New Ager's and chanted to "invoke" the Maitreya, says, "Let Light and Love and Power and Death, Fulfil the purpose of the Coming One."

And to REALLY show their sympathy with the satanic New Age Movement - BELIEVE IT OR NOT - in Acts 17:29 the New Age NKJV changes "Godhead" to "Divine Nature"! (ditto NIV, NASV)

And if you think the NKJV just "innocently" updated the "obsolete words", removed the "thee's and thou's" - here's what the translators proudly admit: "IT IS CLEAR that this revision REQUIRED more than the dropping of "-eth" endings, removing, "thee's" and "thou's," and updating obsolete words." (The New King James Version, 1982e. p. 1235)

AND THEY AIN'T JUST A KIDDIN'!

Here's a sampling of the required changes:

Genesis 2:18: "And the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone; I will make a helper COMPARABLE TO HIM"

Genesis 22:8: One of the greatest verses in the Bible proclaiming that Jesus Christ was God in the flesh: "God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering:" The NKJV adds that little word "for": "God will provide for Himself the lamb for a burnt offering" And destroys the wonderful promise! Where'd they get their little "for"? From

the NASV!

Genesis 24:47: The "old" KJV reads: "I put the earring upon her face". But the NKJV has different plans for beautiful Rebekah: "I put the nose ring on her nose". Where did it get the ridiculous idea to "cannibalize" Rebekah? Just take a peek at the NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV!

Ezra 8:36: The KJV reads, "And they delivered the king's commissions unto the king's lieutenants. . ." The "much clearer" NKJV reads, "And they delivered the king's orders to the king's satraps. . ." Who in the world thinks "satraps" is "much clearer" than lieutenants? The NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV - they do! They put in the same "much clearer" word!

Psalms 109:6: removes "Satan". (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV).

Matthew 7:14: change "narrow is the way" to "difficult is the way". There's nothing "difficult" about the salvation of Jesus Christ! Jesus says in Matt. 11:30, "For my yoke is EASY, and my burden is light." THE EXACT OPPOSITE! Boy, you talk about a contradiction!

Matthew 12:40: change "whale" to "fish" (ditto NIV) I don't guess it matters (what's the truth got to do with it?), the Greek word used in Matthew 12:40 is ketos. The scientific study of whales just happens to be - CETOLOGY - from the Greek ketos for whale and logos for study! The scientific name for whales just happens to be - CETACEANS - from the Greek ketos for whale!

Matthew 18:26 & Matthew 20:20: The NKJV removes "worshipped him" (robbing worship from Jesus) (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

Mark 13:6 & Luke 21:8: removes "Christ" (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

John 1:3: change "All things were made BY him;" to "All things were made THROUGH Him" (NIV, NRSV, RSV)

John 4:24: change "God is a spirit" to the impersonal, New Age pantheistic, "God is spirit" (NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

John 14:2: (NKJV 1979 edition) change "mansions" to "dwelling places" (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

John 14:16: change "comforter" to "helper"(refers to Holy Spirit) (NASV)

Acts 4:27, 30: change "holy child" to "holy servant" (refers to Jesus) (NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

Acts 12:4: change "Easter" to "Passover" (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

Acts 17:22: changes "superstitious" to "religious" (NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

Acts 24:14: change "heresy" to "sect" (NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

Romans 1:18: change "hold the truth" to "suppress the truth" (NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

Romans 1:25: change "changed the truth" to "exchanged the truth" (NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

Romans 5:8: change "commendeth" to "demonstrates" (NIV, NASV)

Romans 16:18: change "good words and fair speeches" to "smooth words and flattering speech" (NIV, NASV, NRSV)

1 Cor. 1:21: change "foolishness of preaching" to "foolishness of the message preached" (ditto NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV) There's nothing foolish about the gospel of Jesus Christ. Unless you're not saved! 1 Cor. 1:18 says: "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish FOOLISHNESS. . ." I wonder where that leaves the translators of the NKJV, NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV?

1 Cor. 1:22: change "require" to "request" (NASV)

1 Cor. 6:9: removes "effeminate" (NIV, NRSV, RSV)

1 Cor. 9:27: change "castaway" to "disqualified" (NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

2 Cor. 2:10: change "person of Christ" to "presence of Christ" (NASV, NRSV, RSV)

2 Cor. 2:17: With all the "corruptions" in the NKJV, you'd expect 2 Cor. 2:17 to change. IT DOES! They change, "For we not as many which CORRUPT the word of God" to "For we are not, as so many, PEDDLING the word of God" (ditto NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

2 Cor. 5:17: change "new creature" to "new creation" (NIV, NRSV, RSV)

2 Cor. 10:5: change "imaginings" to "arguments". Considering New Age "imaging" and "visualization" is now entering the church, this verse in the "old" KJV just won't do. (NIV, RSV)

2 Cor. 11:6: change "rude in speech" to "untrained in speech" (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

Gal. 2:20: omit "nevertheless I live" (NIV, NASV, NRSV, RSV)

Phil. 2:6: (NKJV 1979e.) change "thought it not robbery to be equal with God" to "did not consider equality with God something to be grasped". (robs Jesus Christ of deity) (NIV, NASV, RSV)

Phil. 3:8: change "dung" to "rubbish" (NIV, NASV, NRSV)

1 Thess. 5:22 change "all appearance of evil" to "every form of evil" (NASV, RSV, NRSV)

1 Timothy 6:5: The NKJV changes "gain is godliness" to "godliness is a MEANS OF gain". There are NO Greek texts with "means of" in them! Where, oh where, did they come from? Care to take a wild guess? YOU GOT IT! The NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV!

1 Timothy 6:10: The NKJV changes "For the love of money is the root of all evil:" to "For the love of money is a root of all KINDS OF evil". The words "KINDS OF" are found in NO Greek text in the world! Where did they get them? Straight from the NIV, NASV, NRSV!

1 Tim. 6:20: change "science" to "knowledge" (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

Titus 3:10: change "heretic" to "divisive man" (NIV)

Hebrews 4:8 & Acts 7:45: "Jesus" is changed to "Joshua". (NIV, NASV, RSV)

2 Pet. 2:1: change "damnable heresies" to "destructive heresies" (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

1 John 3:16: remove "love of God"; (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

1 John 5:13: The NKJV reads: "These things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may know that you have eternal life, and that you may CONTINUE TO believe in the name of the Son of God." They add "CONTINUE TO" without any Greek text whatsoever! Not even the perverted NIV, NASV, NRSV and RSV go that far! A cruel, subtil (see Genesis 3:1) attack on the believer's eternal security!

Rev. 2:13: change "Satan's seat" to "Satan's throne" (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

Rev. 6:14: "Heaven" is changed to "sky" in (NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV)

AND THAT DOESN'T SCRATCH THE SURFACE OF ALL THE CHANGES!

The NKJV removes the word "Lord" 66 times!

The NKJV removes the word God 51 times!

The NKJV removes the word "heaven" 50 times!

In just the New Testament alone the NKJV removes 2,289 words from the KJV!

The NKJV makes over 100,000 word changes!

And most will match the NIV, NASV, RSV, or RSV!

And Thomas Nelson Publishers have the audacity to claim in an ad for the NKJV (Moody Monthly, June 1982, back cover), "NOTHING HAS BEEN CHANGED except to make the original meaning clearer."

The New King James is a COUNTERFEIT!

It's NOT NEW! The changes are already in the NIV, NASV, NRSV, or RSV!

And it's certainly NOT true to the 1611 King James Bible!

<http://www.av1611.org/nkjv.html>

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: NKJV - posted by thesaintdan, on: 2008/9/27 8:32

I have heard of this before, the late Derek Prince made this point that language has degenerated as languages tend to do apparently and so we have lost an understanding of what Ye, thou, thee etc. mean and it is enriching to know this and to read the text with this extra knowledge. However I would like to guard against extremism here, I don't honestly believe that the devil inspired these other translations or anything like that, its probably true that in an attempt to make it more understandable the translators have diluted some of the original meaning but I don't honestly believe that was with malicious intent.

What must be remembered is that no translation is perfect, if you want a perfect translation then learn hebrew and greek and then read the original text in those languages....

Of course not many are scholarly enough to do that, for some new believers I would never recommend the KJ Bible because they would get bogged down and miss out on understanding the text - also it should be remembered that some people aren't particularly literate - what about these people? should they only read the KJV?

I don't think so, rather let them read the NIV and then after a while introduce them to some more literal translations such as the ESV, NASB, NKJ and finally KJV if and when they are ready.

I appreciate that you know a lot about this subject and doubtless care passionately about it, I spent a long time stressing over which translation to read but finally decided that I would use an ESV for study and an NIV for devotionals - well that's what I try and do at the moment although I do possess a King James Bible. I learnt a while back with interest that the NIV weakens the NIV (still further by your measure) by playing with the masculine pronoun 'He' although I haven't studied this myself Wayne Grudem I believe has spoken against this...

Am also planning to get a strong's concordance for the original words in greek and hebrew but would like to guard against extremism which can alienate fellow believers and cause them to struggle just because their church uses the NIV bible.

In Christ,
Dan

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/9/27 11:59

I read the NKJV. I am glad that it is not the 1611 KJV version.

These debates are seriously pointless.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/9/27 15:40

Walter,

This is an abuse of the forum privileges and you have been warned in the past.

You have an agenda - take it somewhere else.

Thread locked.

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id14144&forum13&post_id&refreshGo) MUST READ: SermonIndex Forum Disclaimer / Community Rules