

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: You Can Memorize the New Testament in 5 years****You Can Memorize the New Testament in 5 years - posted by Abe_Juliot (), on: 2008/10/11 0:53**

http://www.greatpreachers.org/bible_memorizing.html

John Piper has a very practical article on Why we should memorize scripture and the benefits of this practice.

http://www.desiringgod.org/ResourceLibrary/TasteAndSee/ByDate/2006/1799_Why_Memorize_Scripture/

Also, here is a link to John Piper sharing on "How to Memorize scripture"

http://www.desiringgod.org/ResourceLibrary/AskPastorJohn/ByTopic/54/1795_How_do_you_memorize_Scripture/

You may find this site to be of some help also:

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

God bless you! -Abraham

Re: You Can Memorize the New Testament in 5 years - posted by awakenwithin (), on: 2008/10/11 2:41

that is amazing and should be a delight for God's people, is not God's word our delight, this is really cool,

In Christ charlene

Re: You Can Memorize the New Testament in 5 years - posted by awakenwithin (), on: 2008/10/11 2:49

brother are you working on 5 year plan/ This would really neat if there was other brothers and sister in our own fellowship doing this, that one could go over verse with. With Christ we could do this !!
charlene

Re: You Can Memorize the New Testament in 5 years - posted by repentcanada, on: 2008/10/11 12:48

thank you for this brother, this is amazing. I just went a brother last weekend who has memorized 6 NT books, and I wanted to get on this. the first link you sent should help me get on track with this.

God bless us to memorize His Holy Word and esteem it more than our necessary food

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/10/11 14:18

I wonder if there is real value in memorizing the entire NT when you could just as easily pick up a copy and read it aloud? I could see the value of memorizing many key verses and passages of the NT, including verses that have had much personal meaning/impact for you... but the entire thing? Considering some things, such as that 90% of the gospel of Mark is found in Matthew and Luke, such seems a bit redundant, don'tcha think?

Re:, on: 2008/10/11 17:48

With most people practicing Scripture memorization that I have known, it was a mental exercise or an evangelistic prep tool at best. Some knew the verses well, they could recite them out loud and impress people who liked such stuff (or anger others), but they often had no idea what the verses quoted meant (there was no depth to their understanding), and the truth spoken was not a reality in their lives as a result. Thus, to learn or memorize God's word is not enough. We must also *keep it in a pure and sincere heart*. The psalmist said:

With my whole heart *I have sought You*,
Oh, let me not wander from Your commandments!

Your word I have hidden in my heart,
That I might not sin against You! (Psalm 119:10-11)

I believe that memorizing the word of God should not be a goal in itself (because then the focus is on us and its end will be self-serving), but rather that we should hide His word in our hearts in order to KEEP it (not just to have it memorized). Then by His Spirit this word will be made flesh in us; it will be living and powerful, and easily recalled.

There is a common misapprehension in the church that knowing large portions of Scripture "by heart" is surely beneficial and constitutes some higher spirituality. There certainly could be a correlation between the two. But I believe the Lord is more concerned with the condition of the heart which holds the Word than with the quantity of verses memorized or the amount of time spent reading. Many theologians nowadays know the Bible through and through, but many of those also have not known the One of whom it testifies.

May such a heart be found in us that we may bear much fruit:

Luk 8:15 But the ones that fell on the good ground are those who, *having heard the word with a noble and good heart*, keep it and bear fruit with patience.

In Christ,
Slavyan

Re: You Can Memorize the New Testament in 5 years, on: 2008/10/11 18:10

Thanks for posting the memory information. I know many of us appreciate it. God bless!

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/10/11 19:59

"Considering some things, such as that 90% of the gospel of Mark is found in Matthew and Luke, such seems a bit redundant, don'tcha think?"

Mark and the Holy Spirit thought otherwise. Every scripture is inspired and, I am confident, holds value worth memorizing.

Corrie Ten Boom, author of *The Hiding Place*, suffered in a Nazi Death Camp for several years. In retrospect she lamented that she had not memorized more scripture, and that others had memorized none. We do not know where we may be in twenty years, or twenty days.

I have heard of whole villages in the Alps dividing and memorizing the bible from house to house, so that when the scriptures were confiscated and destroyed by the Roman Catholic Church, the villages had a mental copy to re-write from. Because five or ten people in each house would all memorize the same section, they had a way of comparing and preserving the purity of the text. Again, we do not know where we may be in twenty years, or twenty days.

Re:, on: 2008/10/12 4:12

Quote:
-----Corrie Ten Boom, author of *The Hiding Place*, suffered in a Nazi Death Camp for several years. In retrospect she lamented that she had not memorized more scripture, and that others had memorized none. We do not know where we may be in twenty years, or twenty days.

Falling into a concentration or death camp, to use the words of the apostle Paul, would rather test not "our word" (or the verses we have memorized) but "our power" (or our character). So the issue, if God is willing to send us to such a horrible place, is whether our faith is solid. Whether in this trial we will remain faithful and *still keep that word*, even though we don't have a Bible any more for daily reading (no Scriptures are in sight) and we are tortured for our faith constantly. I believe that while it is day, while there is no persecution or imprisonment to hinder us, we need to get ourselves in such a place with God individually and collectively (while we also have the privilege of enjoying His written Word) that when the tribulation comes, we may be counted worthy to endure it without falling away. For what would such a departure from the faith be but a proof of our inadequate or mere intellectual knowledge of the Lord, Who can be real to us at church meetings?

gs and services but so distant when those outward conveniences are taken away from us? But may the Lord have mercy on us to keep us even after we have failed Him, for surely many of us will fall, but they shall be raised again:

Dan 11:35 And some of those of understanding shall fall, to refine them, purify them, and make them white, until the time of the end; because it is still for the appointed time.

So, to respond to your quote about Corrie Ten Boom, brother Michael, I don't think that having much Scripture memorized will be of much help then. I've heard some Richard Wurmbrand testimonies of the dungeons in Romania where he was tortured and brainwashed for fourteen years without a Bible at his disposal. There *the reality* of his faith was tested because under such *real* conditions the whole Scriptural knowledge he'd had had to become more than theory. Many saints of old had no Bibles; they attended no Bible studies and followed no Bible-reading plan (Abraham, the father of our faith, had no Bible). Let us not forget that. Yet, these men and women *were* faithful to the Lord in dire circumstances because His Word was written in their hearts and they knew His voice so that the absence of a Bible, even in their memory, could not destroy their faith. In this sense, if we have done the will of God, we must rejoice when we're persecuted for it because this is God's time appointed for our refinement.

In Christ,
Slavyan

Re: You Can Memorize the New Testament in 5 years - posted by Will (), on: 2008/10/12 4:28

Thanks a lot for these links Abe_Juliot! Now, let's get to memorising!

Re:, on: 2008/10/12 8:36

Quote:
-----There is a common misapprehension in the church that knowing large portions of Scripture "by heart" is surely beneficial and constitutes some higher spirituality.

Dude....Please! God gave us a brain; let's use it. I don't know how it is in Bulgaria, but here in America, as a whole, we have stopped using our brains. So, if someone wants to challenge themselves and memorize scripture then I applaud them.

Re:, on: 2008/10/12 9:08

notme, kingjimmy and any others. I saw this thread start on a simple non essential issue. I thought ah excellent, who can argue this.

Then a couple of "balancing"? posts enter to keep us from pride and focus on what really matters? I see your points but maybe they are not really needed.

The primary goal in SI is revival. However I see again how debate rises on simple non essential issues "straining at the gnats" as I see it.

Bottom line, good grief let people enjoy having some success in memorising Gods word.

Re: on the contrary - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2008/10/12 9:49

Hi everyone,

Dear Slavyan,

"Thus, to learn or memorize God's word is not enough. We must also keep it in a pure and sincere heart."

Maybe you should consider your own admonition here?

I think there is a form of religious hatred that looks for or sees what is false under every rock.

Chris

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/10/12 14:57

The primary goal in SI is revival. However I see again how debate rises on simple non essential issues "straining at the gnats" as I see it.

While there may be many who are contentious on SI, I don't think any of the comments thus far have been offered in that spirit. SI's goal is to seek and to promote genuine Biblical revival, and the practices that lead to and issue from revival. It's an on-line community where from time to time there is some abrasiveness due to contrary opinions coming from precious saints at different levels of maturity. This should be something that is welcomed, even on seemingly trivial matters.

I applaud anybody who attempts to memorize the Scriptures. Indeed, failure to memorize any Scripture would be something that would be of grave concern. I for one have, at times, committed to memorizing large portions, and once, even an entire chapter of Scripture.

Personally speaking, I have received greater edification and long lasting results having simply slowly read over a passage many times and simply meditated upon it, attempting to grasp the "spirit" of the passage I was reading. Indeed, to this day I could tell you more about the argument and flow of Romans 1-11 than I could tell you about any other lengthy passages of Scripture I have memorized. Why? Because I have effectively chewed through Romans 1-11, and digested more of it, than say, James 1, which I have committed to memory.

5 years is a long time to commit to trying to memorize all of the NT. I think, perhaps, one would be better at first mastering the contents of the NT before committing it entirely to memory. Yes, one should memorize small verses and passages here and there while doing such. But, I think memorizing large chunks of Scripture would be beneficial more-so to those who are already sufficiently mature in the faith, than those who still are drinking the milk of the word.

Re:, on: 2008/10/12 15:07

Not saying contentious. Let's all press on in liberty and freedom in Christ!

Re: - posted by Will (), on: 2008/10/12 20:18

I've memorised the first 8 chapters of Romans and I can say my understanding has definitely increased. Once you've committed large portions to memory you suddenly pick up parallels through scriptures.

I think benefits of memorisation come afterwards. It is then that your heart can start cross-referencing passages instead of using the columns in your bible ;-)

Re: - posted by Will (), on: 2008/10/12 20:18

I've memorised the first 8 chapters of Romans and I can say my understanding has definitely increased. Once you've committed large portions to memory you suddenly pick up parallels through scriptures.

I think benefits of memorisation come afterwards. It is then that your heart can start cross-referencing passages instead of using the columns in your bible ;-)

Re: - posted by Will (), on: 2008/10/12 20:18

I've memorised the first 8 chapters of Romans and I can say my understanding has definitely increased. Once you've committed large portions to memory you suddenly pick up parallels through scriptures.

I think benefits of memorisation come afterwards. It is then that your heart can start cross-referencing passages instead of using the columns in your bible ;-)

Re: - posted by repentcanada, on: 2008/10/13 3:09

there are two excellent ideas from the NT memorization plan:

1) the plan which includes reading the NT once a month

2) by memorizing 4-6 verses a day from NT you can memorize it in 5 years. well even by just memorizing 2 verses per day, in 15 years that is the whole NT committed to memory. that is outstanding

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/10/13 8:27

Just a practical consideration: Memorizing 6 verses a day will take at least 1 hour of your time in the beginning, and compound when you factor in review of previous material. I remember when I was memorizing James 1, I was up to 2-3 hours a day reviewing previously memorized verses and learning my new verses. This is not counting personal devotion time either.

Once again, not trying to discourage anybody who feels inclined to memorize the Scriptures... just trying to share with you the costs of doing such. I'd like to memorize more myself... but working 60 hours a week makes it hard to do.

Re:, on: 2008/10/13 8:55

Quote:
-----I wonder if there is real value in memorizing the entire NT when you could just as easily pickup a copy and read it aloud? I could see the value of memorizing many key verses and passages of the NT, including verses that have had much personal meaning/impact for you... but the entire thing? Considering some things, such as that 90% of the gospel of Mark is found in Matthew and Luke, such seems a bit redundant, don'tcha think?

I'm sure there were many Christians in pre-Communist Russia that thought the same thing... and then one day it was all gone. It could happen here in the US. There are millions of Christians in China who would love to have a copy of what we have, but can't. Given the opportunity they would memorize the whole NT because it's the only way for them to have God's Word...

Krispy

Re: You Can Memorize the New Testament in 5 years - posted by repentcanada, on: 2008/10/15 10:54

Here is a comment I received on my blog:

What a blessing to discover that someone else is working to memorize the New Testament! I have prayed that God would raise up many young men and women who would be students of God's Word and who would take memorization seriously. You are an answer to that prayer. If one day Bibles should no longer be available we who have it internalized may find that we are called upon.

Ricky keep working at it. Don't give up. Once you get through your first book you'll never look back. God bless you

his blog is: <http://eccevideocaelosapertos.blogspot.com/>

Re: Memorizing the New Testament, on: 2008/10/15 11:12

I have been working on this analysis for many years, and it has finally come together within the past 30 days. I thought that you might find it of value in regards to memorizing Scripture.

Which Version are we memorizing?

Today, believers can find no difference between various Bible versions. In fact, the newer versions are seemingly preferred over the Protestant Standard, the Protestant Bible, the Approved Version, the King James Bible of 1611.

I have often thought about what history has to say about this matter. What was the response of the Protestant body of Christ to the work of Westcott and Hort and their revision committee in their "revised New Testament" in February, 1881?

Please see attached Letters to the Editor from the February 8, 1881 edition of the New York Times:

http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?_r=3&res=9D0CEEDA153BE033A25757C1A9649C94609FD7CF&oref=slogin&oref=slogin&oref=slogin

What was their response in 1881? Similar to the response by conservative Christians today. The conservative Protestant Church of 1881 REJECTED the "1881 revision" (it was not a "revision", it was a replacement!). They rejected it as being a plagiarism of the 1808 Belsham's Unitarian Testament. It was rejected until the early 1900's, and still had very little support from the Protestant body. Today, people actually prefer the newer versions than they do the Authorized Protestant Bible.

The story line in the Feb. 8, 1881 New York Times starts as follows: "Certain striking coincidences discovered- a comparison with the Unitarian Version Published in London in 1808"

Throughout this article they note all of the Scripture (Doctrine) that has been changed or eliminated in this 1881 Revision in comparison to the Protestant Bible- the King James (just like many Conservative Christians do today). They actually compared the changes in the 1881 revision to be identical on a verse by verse basis with the liberal 1808 Belsham's Unitarian New Testament, concluding as follows:

"These striking coincidences of sense, and even of phraseology, as well as the omissions and changes made in the text, would seem to indicate that the revisers must have had constantly in their view the Unitarian version of 1808, if they did not, indeed, make it the basis of their revision. It would hardly seem as if such coincidences could have been accidental. If the rest of the revised New Testament corresponds closely with the Unitarian version of 1808 as the examples given in the THE TIMES of Jan. 1881, the work will be a remarkable tribute to learning and skill of Mr. Belsham and his coadjutors whose version was gotten up three-quarters of a century ago."

Belsham's Unitarian New Testament (1808) can be found here:

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/belsham.html>

The 1808 Belsham Unitarian New Testament "included a valuable introduction on the progress and principles of textual criticism, anticipating many judgments later adopted in the Revised Version of 1881"; but drew the fire of the Orthodox by omitting as late interpolations several passages traditionally cited as pillars of Trinitarian doctrine (to Protestant Believers).

What none of the Protestant critics knew in 1881, when they published their discovery that the 1881 Revised Version by Westcott and Hort was a plagiarism of the 1808 Belsham Unitarian New Testament, was that Belsham, as well as Westcott & Hort had REPLACED the Authorized version of the New Testament with the corrupt Vaticanus and Sinaiticus used to create the Catholic Bible. Even today, I don't think people are aware of what really happened--the SUBSTITUTION of the very Word of God, passed down by the Church with the corrupt text CREA

TED by Justin Martyr, Taitan, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebiusas & Jerome to conform to their belief of Gnosticism!

What is the fruit of Caholocism? What is the fruit of all the over 90 newer Bible Versions created since 1881. Today, the Protestant is crying out for Revival, but it is nowhere to be found. The Protestant Church is crying out for Brokenness, but it cannot be found. It is crying out for a "real" prayer life and a real personal walk with Jesus Christ, but again, it cannot be found!

Do these facts have interest to you? They have great interest to me, yet there seems to be no interest from the Body of Christ in these last days.

When we open our Bibles today, we are opening up one of the two "types" of Bibles. Even though today we have many Bible versions seemingly 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, that 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 Gnostic Doctrine, as found in the Catholic Bible and the Catholic Church.

"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-avior.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." —Matt. 5:18

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." —Matt. 24:35

"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

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." —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." —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 118:8— "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 discerner of the thoughts and intents of the 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

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.

Like Martyr, he also **embraced Gnosticism**.

B. 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). 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 they have been turned into 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

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 "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 Waldensens 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.

(1453) Moslems take Constantinople. Great exodus of Greek scholars from there to Western Europe, bringing with them Greek manuscripts of the Bible.

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. Bond, "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 Boise 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 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, Carry, 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

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.

I 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.

I 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.

I 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?

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

e 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 Greek 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

7 UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The following are the 7 unanswered questions:

1. According to the "science" of textual criticism (I 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.

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 Be e". 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

McMlure, 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 ad

Ray, J. J. God Wrote Only One Bible. Eugene, DR: 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>

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!

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 conf

ormity to the thought flow of the 1611 Bible. . . the new edition, while much clearer ARE SO CLOSE to 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 slavery!) 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)

In His Victory,

Walter

Re:, on: 2008/10/15 12:19

waltern, I appreciate the info in your post. I will reread it again later. However I hope that this particular thread does not shift into "versions debate mode". I think the info contained in your post would be great for a new thread for those who want to discuss it.
God bless, John

Re: - posted by Ruach34 (), on: 2008/10/15 13:51

Waltern has written a very good exposition...

I am NASB and have only chosen that translation because I found that my dad used it and a Christian bookstore told me it was the most accurate in word.

I know this is not the thread to discuss translations, and I am not intending to, but if what Waltern has written is true, will we not honor God by choosing KJV? If there are still arguments or holes in this argument then open a new thread or reply to an old one, BUT, if this expose has taken all debate out of your mouth, then delay no longer, pick up KJV and do not pick up another.

Waltern, to save this thread from diverging to another topic, I will email you a response.

Re:, on: 2008/10/18 10:47

Quote:

-----ChrisJD wrote:

"Thus, to learn or memorize God's word is not enough. We must also keep it in a pure and sincere heart."

Maybe you should consider your own admonition here?

I think there is a form of religious hatred that looks for or sees what is false under every rock.

I think you are right on, brother Chris. I have often been guilty of that. Perhaps it is a result of impatience or just not knowing my (whole) heart.

Quote:

-----KingJimmy wrote:

Personally speaking, I have received greater edification and long lasting results having simply slowly read over a passage many times and simply meditated upon it, attempting to grasp the "spirit" of the passage I was reading. Indeed, to this day I could tell you more about the argument and flow of Romans 1-11 than I could tell you about any other lengthy passages of Scripture I have memorized. Why? Because I have effectively chewed through Romans 1-11, and digested more of it, than say, James 1, which I have committed to memory.

This has also been my experience.

As for the thread's original focus, as *thingsabove* pointed out, it is good to not dilute or hijack it with things that may be related but unnecessary.