

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is their proof of the kjv text before 400 A.D?

Is their proof of the kjv text before 400 A.D? - posted by bible1985, on: 2008/10/22 9:59

I was just wondering, i hear their is but is it true. I mean you have people like peter ruckman and gail riplinger defending the kjv only and you have to be in question. I need the complete truth.

Re: Is their proof of the kjv text before 400 A.D?, on: 2008/10/22 11:46

Hi folks... just got back in town. Good to see one of my favorite topics come up!

To answer your question, here is a quote from David Cloud concerning this issue:

John Burgon's research into the text of the scripture through church history has, in some ways, never been equaled. T his is particularly true of his research into the quotations from the scriptures of the church leaders of antiquity.

To discover what Scripture text the ancient church leaders were using, Burgon laboriously dug out 86,489 quotations from ancient Christian writings and compiled these into sixteen thick manuscript volumes, which are located today in the British Museum. More than 4,000 of the quotations are from writers who lived before 400 A.D. By this peerless research, Burgon was convinced that the Received Text underlying the Reformation Bibles is the very text which has been used by God's people through the centuries and is thus the preserved Word of God. He concluded: "Call this text Erasmusian or Complutensian, the text of Stephens, or of Beza, or of the Elzevirs, call it the Received or the Traditional, or by whatever name you please--the fact remains that a text has come down to us which is attested by a general consensus of ancient Copies, ancient Fathers, and ancient Versions" (Burgon, The Revision Revised, 1881).

This testimony of Burgon is not to be taken lightly. He knew as much about the Bible of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th centuries as any man who has lived in the last 200 years. When he says that the Received Text is attested by Greek manuscripts, quotations from ancient church leaders, and ancient Bible versions, he was in a position to know what he was talking about.

The vast majority of Greek manuscripts, ancient versions, and the writings of church "fathers" support the Received Text. This was a fact known by the Reformation editors. Whereas the textual critics of our day see this as a mere accident of history, the Bible-believing Reformation editors of old saw the hand of God in it. So do we.

And so do I...

Krispy

Re: - posted by bible1985, on: 2008/10/22 12:06

thank you, i just wish i could see those writings of the early church fathers and how it does compare myself.

Re: Is their proof of the kjv text before 400 A.D? - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2008/10/22 12:10

Quote:

bible1985 wrote:

I was just wondering, i hear their is but is it true. I mean you have people like peter ruckman and gail riplinger defending the kjv only and you have to be in question. I need the complete truth.

Is there evidence of the KJV before 400 A.D.-the answer is yes.

John 1:1 In the BEGINNING was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. 2The same was in the BEGINNING with God.

Re:, on: 2008/10/22 12:10

They are available... you just have to go dig for them.... in the British Museum.

... or amazon... whichever is easiest for you.

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/10/22 14:32

I've not been around for a while but it is good to see some things don't change and Krispy is still holding the fort here. ;-)

Imagine a circle with hundreds of manuscripts in it. This circle is what some would call the Byzantine textform. These manuscripts are not identical but they have a distinct family likeness which distinguishes them from that 'other circle' over there which has many fewer manuscripts and is usually called the Western Text.

In the Byzantine circle there are a small number of manuscripts which were known to the scholars of the 16th century. They used these manuscripts to create what they believed the original text had really been. Later some other scholars, with a few more manuscripts, created a document which they believed was what the original documents had looked like; this came to be known as the Received Text.

So the Received Text is based on a few manuscripts from the Byzantine family circle. There are now many hundreds/thousands of manuscripts from these ancient times but they can still, broadly speaking, be separated into the Byzantine family and the Western family.

The KJV is based on the smaller group of manuscripts within the Byzantine family circle. The NKJV is a revision of the KJV but has some information which has come from those other manuscripts in the Byzantine family circle.

Just to save anyone any possible disappointment, the main manuscripts which used to be at the British Museum were transferred to the British Library some years ago.

Re:, on: 2008/10/22 14:43

Quote:
-----Just to save anyone any possible disappointment, the main manuscripts which used to be at the British Museum were transferred to the British Library some years ago.

Next time I'm over on your side of the creek I'll keep that in mind!

Good to see you here, brother! I've missed you!

Krispy

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/22 15:34

The KJV was translated for several years and then published in 1611. This is 1211 years AFTER 400 A.D.

BTW: English wasn't even a language in 400 A.D.

I understand the argument about the superiority of Erasmus' translation known as the *Received Text* in 1516. Those who espouse to the superiority of the earlier majority texts (*majority* in the official church of the day) make a good argument. Ultimately, however, I cannot embrace that notion as undeniable. There is a very good argument for what was known as the minority texts too. You can write to the majority of text scholars as to why they also embrace the earlier Alexandrian text types. They have a compelling set of reasons that is often lost or unincluded in these sort of discussions.

:-)

Re:, on: 2008/10/22 18:52

To answer the question, you have to know that there was the Recieved text and the Approved text. Desiderius Erasmus and William Tyndale were each translating from the greek and hebrew, around 1520 A.D., but the difference is that Erasmus was using the recieved and Tyndale the approved. Also, Tyndale translated directly from the original greek and hebrew, something Erasmus didn't. To add to the mix, Erasmus was also a humanist and put writing by Plato and other philosophers on the same level as the N.T. writers. It was from Tyndale that the KJV came into being. Therefore, in answer to the original question, no, there was no KJV (the name King James should give a clue) before 400A.D. Hope this answers your question... :-)

Re:Approved version? by who, the POPE?, on: 2008/10/22 23:58

Hello MMia:

I have searched diligently for the past ½ hour for the definition of the term "Approved text". I have never heard that term applied to scripture. Approved by who? The POPE, Approved by the Gnostics?

I used Google as a search engine and typed "approved Bible versions", "approved Bible" and found the following information linked to this search:

1. This was one site:

The question posted was:

"Which is the standard bible version used by the Roman Catholic church in the UK? I know that the standard English Bible version used by the Catholic church in the USA is the New America Bible. I was wondering which was the one used in the UK and the rest of the English speaking world...Douay.Rheims, Jerusalem, REB? Thanks!"

This is one answer that lists the "approved Bible for the Roman Catholic Church"
• "Raymo is nearly correct. The New Jerusalem Bible has been approved for liturgical use.

The King James Version is not approved for use by the Roman Catholic Church.

This is another answer about "approved" Bible versions:

• We use the Jerusalem Bible published in London by Darton, Longman and Todd. **However, other versions are allowed on occasion.**

And finally, one more answer to the same question:

• Douay, and other **approved versions.**

As I went through all of the links, the only continuous reference to "Approved" Bible versions had to do with the **Catholic Church and the Roman Catholic Church.**

The Catholic Church relies on the **minority text**, created by the first textual critics, the Gnostics. These are the men behind the Catholic Bible:

1. Justin Martyr (100 A.D.) He was born a pagan, and died in the robes of a pagan priest.
2. Tatian (150 A.D.) He was a disciple of Justin Martyr. Like Martyr, he also embraced Gnosticism. His "Harmony of the Gospels" was so corrupt that the Bishop of Syria threw out 200 copies.
3. Clement of Alexandria (200 A.D.) Clement was a disciple of Tatian and taught that there was no real heaven or hell, no blood atonement of Christ, and no infallible Bible. He also used the Gnostic Scriptures to teach his students.
4. Origen (184-254 A.D.)- Origen was a disciple of Clement of Alexandria. He held to the same doctrine as Clement, plu

he taught baptism was necessary for babies to gain salvation. He also stated "The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written." He was also 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).**

5. Eusebius (260-340 A.D.) He was trained at Origen's school in Alexandria. 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. Eusebius was Roman Catholic in his doctrine (see his book, "Ecclesiastical History", Vols. 1-5). 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.**

6. Jerome (340-420 A.D.) Like Eusebius, Jerome was Roman Catholic in doctrine. 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. 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.

The following three men were the ones who used the corrupt mss of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus of the corrupt Catholic Bible to create a corrupt Bible for the Protestant Church, thus confusing the body of Christ about which version is the correct version for the PROTESTANT- the RECEIVED TEXT, directly from the believing Church, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE CHURCH?? Or the corrupted text, the "minority text", created by the Gnostics (listed above), who cut and pasted God's Word to conform to their own evil thoughts and ideas about what God should have said?:

7. Tischendorf (1869) -He was the first Protestant to find and use the mss. of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Tischendorf was a **liberal theologian**.

8. Westcott and Hort (1881)- 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. 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. 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.

Statements made by 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."

Statements made by 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."

Textual History of the Bible

<http://www.chick.com/information/bibleversions/history.asp?wpc=history.asp&wpp=a>

Many Christians are completely unaware that modern Bible versions differ from the King James Bible in a way they never expected. ... they are not translated from the same Bible text!

The "RECEIVED TEXT" down through history, long before the advent of the printing press, men made copies of the Scriptures by hand. **However, they did not all do so with the same attitude toward the Scriptures.** Many made their copies with a sense of spiritual awe, not daring to change a word, because it was the Word of God. **Archaeologists have found thousands of these copies from all over the ancient world, and been amazed at how they agree! Truly God did preserve His Word in His church. The text they give us is often called by one of the following names:**

Textus Receptus (Latin for "RECEIVED TEXT"--Received from the true Church, not Rome. The truth is always away from Rome!)

Byzantine Text - because of the part of the world in which we find it

Antiochan Text - the church at Antioch used it

The "Alexandrian Text"—**MMia, this must be the "approved text" you refer to:**

However in Alexandria, Egypt, a group of "scholars" thought they could do better. When they made their copies, they made "corrections" that they thought better presented what the Scriptures should say. Some of their errors were gross blunders (like quoting Malachi and calling it Isaiah) but others were more subtle (slight word changes to take away the deity of Christ). They removed verses they didn't like.

The Alexandrian copyists had one more characteristic... they couldn't agree with each other! Their copies differ not only from the vast majority of existing Scripture texts, but even from each other. A very small number of these manuscripts exist today. This is called the Alexandrian Text.

Choosing which text to use

All of our existing copies come from one of the two textual streams described above. **We call them "streams" because they are made of copies made from copies. By comparing them and noting their differences, it is easy to determine from which stream each copy came.**

Honest scholars understood that if God really kept His promise to preserve His Word, then we would expect to find copies all over the church at large that agree. Sure enough, they found that 95% of all existing copies agreed, coming from the Antiochan (or Byzantine) text, so it was clear that the RECEIVED TEXT, based upon these agreeing copies all over the ancient church, was the correct one. This is the text used by Luther, Tyndale, Calvin, Matthews, Coverdale. When King James commissioned his famous English Bible translation, the scholars naturally used this Received Text.

Not everyone believed God kept His promise

In the mid nineteenth century, two scholars came along who helped to change everything. Their names were Fenton John Anthony Hort and Brook Foss Westcott. From their personal correspondence, it is clear that Hort and Westcott did not hold a faith comparable to that held by millions of evangelical Christians today. Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., writes: "It cannot be said that they believed that one could attain Heaven by either works or faith, since both believed that Heaven existed only in the mind of man.

Westcott believed in and attempted to practice a form of Communism whose ultimate goal was communal living on college campus's which he called a "coenobium. "

Both believed it possible to communicate with the dead and made many attempts to do just that through a society which they organized and entitled "The Ghostly Guild."

Westcott accepted and promoted prayers for the dead. Both were admirers of Mary (Westcott going so far as to call his wife Sarah, "Mary"), and Hort was an admirer and proponent of Darwin and his theory of evolution.

It is obvious to even a casual observer why they were well equipped to guide the Revision Committee of 1871-1881 away from God's Antiochian text and into the spell of Alexandria."

From "The Answer Book" by Samuel Gipp

Gaining positions on the committee to "revise" the King James Bible, Hort and **Westcott persuaded the committee to abandon the Received Text which had been preserved by the ancient church. Instead, the committee was convinced to use the Alexandrian text, provided by the Roman Catholic Church who had preserved it.** They accepted the notion that God had not preserved His Word in the ancient Church, but had instead entrusted it to the hand of the Roman Catholic Church, the organization which had hunted and slaughtered Christians who dared possess their own copy of God's Word!

Is this any way to translate a Bible?

Having sold the Alexandrian text to the revision committee, Hort and Westcott became the gurus of Bible texts. The translators often faced an impossible problem. Having abandoned the broad evidence of history, throwing out 95% of the available copies, they had to decide exactly what each verse should say based upon only 5% of the available evidence. And there was the problem. These few texts could not even agree with each other! How do you decide which is correct?

Enter Hort and Westcott. They decided what the text should say, and the committee dutifully translated it. So instead of the authority of the Bible text coming from the broad evidence of history, it was coming from the intellect of two respected scholars. God doesn't do things that way. A study of the lives and theology of these two men helps explain why their biblical text began to have holes in it. . . . verses were missing!

It's a simple choice

All modern Bible versions are based upon the work of Hort and Westcott, using the corrupt Alexandrian text.

The King James Bible is based upon the Received Text.

If you believe that God allowed his Word to be hidden from the church for centuries, only to be revealed much later by the Roman Catholic Church, you will want a modern Bible based upon the Alexandrian text.

If you believe that God preserved His Word in His church, throughout the centuries, you will want a King James Bible, based upon the historical Received Text. The choice is yours.

<http://www.chick.com/information/bibleversions/history.asp?wpc=history.asp&wpp=a>

This is God's Word from the Bible, from the Old Testament: The WORDS of the Lord are pure WORDS, Like silver tried in a furnace of earth, Purified seven times. YOU SHALL KEEP THEM, O LORD, YOU SHALL PRESERVE THEM FROM THIS GENERATION FOREVER. The wicked prowls on every side, When vileness is exalted among the sons of men. Psalms 12:6-8

Do you believe God? Do you believe He can do anything? Do you believe God's Word, that says "The WORDS of the Lord are pure WORDS, Like silver tried in a furnace of earth, Purified seven times. YOU SHALL KEEP THEM, O LORD, YOU SHALL PRESERVE THEM FROM THIS GENERATION FOREVER."? I believe in God, and I believe God's Word, quoted above. It has been fulfilled before our eyes. We have God's preserved Word, through the believing Church, since the beginning of the Church.

We also have man's corrupt word, cut and pieced together by sons of men, the gnostics---not sons of God. All true believers are sons of God, unbelievers are sons of men!

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

MMia wrote:

To answer the question, you have to know that there was the Received text and the Approved text. Desiderius Erasmus and William Tyndale were each translating from the Greek and Hebrew, around 1520 A.D., but the difference is that Erasmus was using the Received and Tyndale the Approved. Also, Tyndale translated directly from the original Greek and Hebrew, something Erasmus didn't. To add to the mix, Erasmus was also a humanist and put writing by Plato and other philosophers on the same level as the N.T. writers. It was from Tyndale that the KJV came into being. Therefore, in answer to the original question, no, there was no KJV (the name King James should give a clue) before 400 A.D. Hope this answers your question... :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/10/23 5:53

Quote:
-----To answer the question, you have to know that there was the Recieved text and the Approved text. Desiderius Erasmus and William Tyndale were each translating from the greek and hebrew, around 1520 A.D., but the difference is that Erasmus was using the recieved and Tyndale the approved. Also, Tyndale translated directly from the original greek and hebrew, something Erasmus didn't. To add to the mix, Erasmus was also a humanist and put writing by Plato and other philosophers on the same level as the N.T. writers. It was from Tyndale that the KJV came into being.

There are really a number of misconceptions in this statement. Erasmus did not translate from Greek into anything, he compiled a Greek text on the basis of a few manuscripts from the Byzantine textform. This text became the basis for Luther's German Bible and Tyndale's English bible. Other Greek manuscripts were also available by the time that Estienne published his Greek New Testament in 1550; it is Estienne (Stephens) compilation that is usually referred to as the 'Received Text'. As Tyndale was put to death in 1536 it will be plain that Tyndale was not using the Received Text.

Erasmus' Greek New Testament was also earlier than Stephens 'Received Text' so it is also clear that Erasmus was not using the Received Text. It is true that Erasmus was a humanist but Tyndale and Erasmus were not in competition; Tyndale used Erasmus' Greek Text as the foundation of the English translation of 1526.

I have no idea what the 'approved text' means. Can you be more specific? This chronology of Bible translation might help get things into order. (<http://www.bible-researcher.com/bib-2.html>) Bible Translation Chronology. This article by Michael Marlowe may also help to explain what the 'Received Text' is and what it is not. (<http://www.bible-researcher.com/majority.html>) What is the Received Text?

Re:Desiderius Erasmus, on: 2008/10/23 20:32

MMia, you have tried to destroy Desiderius Erasmus with your untrue attack on his character, his intelligence, and his abilities, and the importance of his work in bringing the Received Text (received from the true Christian body of Christ) to the Protestant Christian Church, that was then responsible for the Reformation, that resulted in our break from the BOOT of Catholicism.

You, my friend, should be ashamed of yourself!

A very good book, that goes into great detail on the issue of Desiderius Erasmus, as well as a thorough analysis of Bible Versions is entitled "Which Version is The Bible". It is written by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones-Global Evangelism, Inc. is the publisher. This book can be downloaded for free online. Dr. Jones has this to say about Erasmus:

ERASMUS RESTORES THE RECEIVED TEXT (GREEK)

The Greek upon which the King James translation was based was first printed in A.D. 1516 at Basle, Switzerland, under the editorship of the famous Dutchman, Desiderius Erasmus. As a Scholar, Erasmus was without peer – the intellectual giant of Europe in his day. Erasmus was ever at work, visiting libraries, collecting, comparing, writing and publishing. Europe was rocked by his works which exposed the ignorance of the monks, the superstitions of the priesthood, and the general bigotry and wickedness within the Roman church.

He classified the Greek manuscripts and read the "Fathers" (letters etc. written by the early Church pastors which taken as a whole contain almost the entire New Testament). Today, many who deprecate the pure teachings of the Received Text sneer at Erasmus and pervert the facts in order to belittle his work. All this by men who could never have intellectually tied Erasmus' boot straps. While he lived, Europe was at his feet. Several times the King of England offered him any position in the kingdom, at his own price! The Emperor of Germany likewise. Indeed, the Pope offered him the position of Cardinal. Erasmus resolutely declined not being willing to compromise his beliefs or conscience. France and Spain beckoned him to their realm while Holland proudly claimed him as her most distinguished son.

Book after book came from his labors. The demand for them was overwhelming. His crowning work was the New Testament in Greek. At last, after one thousand years, the New Testament was printed in its original tongue (A.D.1516). Astonished and confounded, Europe – the intellectual, civilized cradle of the world – deluged by

superstitions, coarse traditions, and monkeries, read the pure story of the Gospel.

In a letter dated 13 August, 1521 to Peter Barbirius, Erasmus wrote:

"I did my best with the New Testament, but it provoked endless quarrels. Edward Lee pretended to have discovered 300 errors. They appointed a commission, which professed to have found bushels of them. Every dinner-table rang with the blunders of Erasmus. I required particulars, and could not have them."

(Edward Lee afterwards became Archbishop of York)

Consider and reflect upon this – the foremost scholar in the entire civilized world said the work was his "best". Such men have both egos and detractors. Erasmus would never have put his name on an undertaking which would have left him exposed and defenseless before his enemies and critics.

When Erasmus came to Basle in A.D. 1515 for the purpose of assembling a complete Greek New Testament, he had only five Greek cursive minuscules of the New Testament at his disposal. For the most part, he utilized a 15th century manuscript for the Gospels but used an 11th or 12th century manuscript on occasion. He used a 12th or 13th century manuscript for the Acts and the Epistles. Erasmus had a 15th century manuscript of the Acts and the Epistles which he also used occasionally, and he had a 12th century manuscript of Revelation. The last six verses of the Revelation manuscript were missing so he used the Latin Vulgate version to complete the chapter.

Erasmus' Greek New Testament has been often criticized on the grounds that he had so little data at his command from which to draw and that they were "late" copies. However, Erasmus did not go to the task unprepared. Although he had only five late minuscules, he had already translated a Latin New Testament and in preparation for this labor had collected and gathered variant readings from many Greek manuscripts. He journeyed all over Europe to libraries and to anyone from whom he could gather readings from manuscripts. Erasmus organized his findings and made notes for himself concerning the different readings. These travels brought him into contact with several hundred manuscripts and Erasmus divided them into two camps, i.e., those he considered spurious and those he deemed genuine and trustworthy. The spurious group was a small percentage of the whole and mainly agreed with the Latin Vulgate readings. Of the several hundred, between 90 to 95% had the same text. This group Erasmus judged to contain the true God given text.

Naturalistic critics think that the presence and availability for Erasmus' use of these five Basle minuscules was merely an unhappy accident. But these men do not reckon sufficiently with the providence of God – that God has promised to overlook His Word. The text which Erasmus published was really not his own. It was taken virtually without change from these few manuscripts which God providentially placed at his disposal. The text contained in these manuscripts eventually came to be known as the "Textus Receptus" (the Received Text).

To emphasize and demonstrate the above, we quote the late Herman C. Hoskier. Hoskier gave thirty years to the task of collating a majority of the available manuscripts containing the text of Revelation. His conclusion, based upon the 200 plus extant manuscripts he examined, was:

"I may state that if Erasmus had striven to found a text on the largest number of existing MSS in the world of one type, he could not have succeeded better ... "

As Moorman relates, this is truly a powerful example of God's guiding providence in preserving the true text though but one late mss containing the Revelation was available to Erasmus at Basle.

ERASMUS AND THE WORK HE PRODUCED

Erasmus knew almost all of the important variant readings known to scholars today – more than 470 years ago. This may be proven from a perusal of his notes. Dr. Frederick Nolan (1784-1864 A.D.) was a Greek and Latin scholar who, as an eminent historian, researched Egyptian chronology and spent twenty eight years tracing the Received Text to its apostolic origin. After surveying Erasmus' notes, Nolan recorded:

"With respect to manuscripts, it is indisputable that he was acquainted with every variety which is known to us; having distributed them into two principle classes, one of which corresponds with ... the Vatican manuscript ... the church, he was aware, was infested with Origenists and Arians; and affinity between any manuscript and that version, consequently conveyed some suspicion that its text was corrupted."

In producing his first edition, Erasmus was under an incredible work load. Due to publication problems and deadline pressure, his first edition had many typographical errors, misprints, and misspellings. This led to much undue criticism. His work was greatly disfigured only in the sense mentioned, but the Text was providentially protected. God has not preserved the Text miraculously for then there would have been no such glosses, and all the various uncials and cursives would

read the same, word for word. In the case of providential guidance, we can see that there is a human as well as a divine side to the preservation of the Text. For the most part, these errors were eliminated by Erasmus in his later editions. Such things as these are, however, not factors which need to be taken into account insofar as evaluating the "Textus Receptus" – a designation by which his work later came to be known.

The year after Erasmus published, Luther used the Textus Receptus (TR) for the basis of a German translation of the New Testament. Shortly thereafter, God – using Luther and his translation, brought about the Reformation.

Luther and Erasmus knew each other. They did not always agree. One of the chief areas of disagreement between them was Luther's conviction that the Roman church was incapable of being reformed and he thought that Erasmus should join him in leaving. However Erasmus believed that he could better bring about reform by working from within the system. He was quite wrong.

Which Version is the Bible?

Copyright 1995 Floyd Jones Ministries, Inc.

All Rights Reserved. This book may be freely reproduced in any form as long as it is not distributed for any material gain or profit; however, this book may not be published without written permission.

Erasmus was eventually Excommunicated from the Roman Catholic Church, eight years after his death.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

MMia wrote:

To answer the question, you have to know that there was the Received text and the Approved text. Desiderius Erasmus and William Tyndale were each translating from the Greek and Hebrew, around 1520 A.D., but the difference is that Erasmus was using the Received and Tyndale the Approved. Also, Tyndale translated directly from the original Greek and Hebrew, something Erasmus didn't. To add to the mix, Erasmus was also a humanist and put writing by Plato and other philosophers on the same level as the N.T. writers. It was from Tyndale that the KJV came into being. Therefore, in answer to the original question, no, there was no KJV (the name King James should give a clue) before 400 A.D. Hope this answers your question... :-)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2008/10/23 22:06

Hi walter...

Are you trying to say that Erasmus was NOT a Dutch Roman Catholic humanist?

Re: Erasmus, on: 2008/10/23 23:44

To ccchhhrrriisss:

Erasmus was a Dutchman by birth. He was born at a time in history when everyone was forced to be a member of the Roman Catholic Church. As time went on, he did not dissociate himself from it, but thought that he would be able to change it. That never happened. There seems to be some contempt in your post about Erasmus being a humanist.

The English language is a living language, because the meaning and use of words change over time. However, in earlier centuries this change in meaning took centuries to accomplish. Today, with high speed travel to every part of the earth, the meaning of our words change quite rapidly.

A humanist at the time that Erasmus lived was a person who believed in God. Today, humanists and humanism have no use for God, and are mostly God haters or atheists.

If we go back in time, the Noah Webster 1828 Dictionary of the English Language, we find what **Humanist meant then:**

HU'MANIST, n. A professor of grammar and rhetoric; a philologist; a term used in the universities of Scotland.

1. One versed in the knowledge of human nature.

Our next question then has to be, what is the definition of a "philology"?

We go to the 1828 Noah Webster dictionary again and find this:

PHILOLOG'Y, n.

1. Primarily, a love of words, or a desire to know the origin and construction of language. In a more general sense,
2. That branch of literature which comprehends a knowledge of the etymology or origin and combination of words; grammar, the construction of sentences or use of words in language; criticism, the interpretation of authors, the affinities of different languages, and whatever relates to the history or present state of languages. It sometimes includes rhetoric, poetry, history and antiquities

Next, we look under the word Philologist and find:

PHILOLOG'IST, n. One versed in the history and construction of language. Philologist is generally used.

Now, let's compare the meaning for humanism in Erasmus time (Above) to what it has changed to today, found on the internet:

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/humanist>

Main Entry:

humanism

Pronunciation:

ˈhy-m-ni-zm, ˈy-ˌ

Function:

noun

Date:

1832

1 a: devotion to the humanities : literary culture b: the revival of classical letters, individualistic and critical spirit, and emphasis on secular concerns characteristic of the Renaissance 2: HUMANITARIANISM 3: a doctrine, attitude, or way of life centered on human interests or values ; especially : a philosophy that usually rejects supernaturalism and stresses an individual's dignity and worth and capacity for self-realization through reason

—humanist \-nist\ noun or adjective

—humanistic \ˈhy-m-nis-tik, ˈy-ˌ\ adjective

—humanistically \-ti-kli\ adverb A PHILO

XXXXX

So today, the word humanist has devolved into someone who has a "individualistic and critical spirit", with a doctrine, attitude or way of life centered on human interests or values, ESPECIALLY A PHILOSOPHY THAT USUALLY REJECTS SUPERNATURALISM (GOD) AND STRESSES AN INDIVIDUALS DIGNITY AND WORTH AND CAPACITY FOR SELF-REALIZATION THROUGH REASON.

Erasmus is the opposite of the current definition of a humanist. He was a dedicated man of God, who was one of the most brilliant and intelligent men of the 15th century. With his love and deep understanding of words and of the origin and construction of language, as well as his further comprehension and knowledge of the etymology or origin and combination of words, and grammar, as well as an interest in the affinities of different languages, and whatever relates to the history or present state of languages, he was well suited for his work of restoring the true Word of God, Received Text, the Textus Receptus, to Protestant Christian Believers. The text that fu

eled the Reformation, that fueled the greatest outreach to the lost, ever. The Text fueled true Revival, that fueled brokenness, that fueled death to self.

This is from the Book "Which Version is the Bible" by Floyd Nolen Jones that addresses this issue:

AN ASSESSMENT OF ERASMUS

Erasmus was a "Christian" humanist, the illegitimate son of a Roman Catholic priest, and was himself an ordained priest. He taught Greek at Cambridge University from A.D. 1510 to 1514. He was not a "great" man of faith – but he was completely committed to the truth and reality of the Christian faith. Moreover, compared to Westcott and Hort (and a few others to be mentioned later) Erasmus was a giant of faith in that he humbled himself and his intellect, professing that the Bible was the absolute Word of God.

As to the criticism that Erasmus was a Roman Catholic – in his day, almost all of Christendom was Roman. He flourished before and at the onset of the Reformation. He did not oppose the teachings of the Roman Church, but he vehemently protested the abuses within the Church. Erasmus decried the emphasis on ritual as opposed to a simple godly life as wrong and believed that such could be corrected by placing into every man's hand the Bible in his own language. He did not want to do away with the ritual of Rome, but he wanted a genuine spirituality to accompany it. He disapproved of Protestantism, viewing it as an evil because of all the division it brought.

The Christian humanistic elements in Erasmus' thought were completely dissimilar from the contemporary connotation of "humanism", meaning instead "men eminent for human learning" – especially in relation to the revival of learning in literature and language (notably Latin and Greek). In his day the term "humanist" designated a member of a distinct 'international intellectual club' that was dedicated to studying the humanities or liberal arts. Due to his great erudition, depth of thought, elegance of style and biting irony, Desiderius Erasmus stood forth among these intellectuals as the unrivaled "prince of humanism". Erasmus' humanism found expression in his insistence to return to the original sources in order to uncover truth. Thus, his edition of the Greek N.T. was a natural manifestation of his Christian humanistic bent. By means of this text he hoped to see the Roman Church renewed from within.

As a Christian humanist, Erasmus was naturally not always consistently Christian in his thinking, nevertheless, we maintain that God providentially used Erasmus – much as God used Erasmus' contemporary Martin Luther even though Luther became bitterly anti-Semitic in his latter years. At least Erasmus was not untrue to his ordination vows as were Westcott and Hort. They neither believed nor held to the thirty nine articles of the Anglican church in which they had been ordained. They actually espoused the cause of Romanism and modernism.

Moreover, neither Erasmus' theology nor his being a Roman Catholic has anything whatsoever to do with his Greek text. In producing it, he merely followed the manuscripts which had been preserved by the usage within the Greek Orthodox Church. He knew the Vulgate was corrupt and his humanist values led him to believe that he was getting to the source of God's truth by turning to the manuscripts of the Greek Church.

One of Erasmus' greatest mistakes was his belief that the Roman Catholic Church could be reformed from within. The Lord Jesus said that you cannot put new wine into old wine skins. If Jesus the Christ could not reform the religion of Israel which originally had been the only God-ordained religion on the earth, who are we to think we can change for the better the traditions of any denomination or religious organization? By the power of the Holy Spirit we can influence and cause a positive change in the hearts of individuals be they priests, preachers or laymen – but organizations – organizations are married to their doctrines and traditions!

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi walter...

Are you trying to say that Erasmus was NOT a Dutch Roman Catholic humanist?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriisss (), on: 2008/10/24 0:27

Hi walter...

Where have you gathered your research about Erasmus? Where did you obtain your information?

The only reason I ask is because he played a crucial role in the Textus Receptus. He was a Dutch Roman Catholic/Humanist. From everything that I have ever read, he was an interesting individual (went against the flow) -- but he still managed to continually embrace the bulk of the doctrines of Rome.

By the way some websites spread libelous information about Wescott and Hort or some other modern linguistic scholars, you would think that they viewed Erasmus as a saint!

Of course, I still prefer my KJV of the Word of God. I understand and acknowledge the arguments made in favor of the supremacy of the KJV's source material. However, I also understand the arguments in favor of some of the other texts that most Bible scholars and manuscript experts prefer. Yet I noticed that much of the argument is directed at those who helped in the translation effort -- rather than simply on the manuscripts themselves. But, ironically, this sort of scrutiny is almost never directed at Erasmus.

...just a few things to think about.

Re:, on: 2008/10/24 0:51

Erasmus never "preferred the doctrines of Rome", he rejected them as spurious, and corrupt.

I have listed the book, and quoted the material. Did you actually read my post? Surely does not sound like you did if you cannot even find the references I posted.

You can download it online if you have any interest.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriisss wrote:
Hi walter...

Where have you gathered your research about Erasmus? Where did you obtain your information?

The only reason I ask is because he played a crucial role in the Textus Receptus. He was a Dutch Roman Catholic/Humanist. From everything that I have ever read, he was an interesting individual (went against the flow) -- but he still managed to continually embrace the bulk of the doctrines of Rome.

By the way some websites spread libelous information about Wescott and Hort or some other modern linguistic scholars, you would think that they viewed Erasmus as a saint!

Of course, I still prefer my KJV of the Word of God. I understand and acknowledge the arguments made in favor of the supremacy of the KJV's source material. However, I also understand the arguments in favor of some of the other texts that most Bible scholars and manuscript experts prefer. Yet I noticed that much of the argument is directed at those who helped in the translation effort -- rather than simply on the manuscripts themselves. But, ironically, this sort of scrutiny is almost never directed at Erasmus.

...just a few things to think about.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2008/10/24 3:53

Quote:

waltern wrote:

Erasmus never "preferred the doctrines of Rome", he rejected them as spurious, and corrupt.

Really? Where do you get this? I know that he was outspoken about certain things, yet he remained a Roman Catholic until the end of his life. So which things did he reject? You make it sound like he rejected them ALL, yet he remained a follower of Rome.

Quote:

-----I have listed the book, and quoted the material. Did you actually read my post? Surely does not sound like you did if you cannot even find the references I posted.

Yes, I did read your post. The book that you listed is NOT a detailed account of Erasmus. You must have a lot of faith in the author's words to accept his words without verification. Have you verified his sources? There are many works written about the life of Erasmus with detailed citations from his own writings. If we are so willing to scrutinize Wescott and Hort, can't we return the favor to Erasmus? Yet many KJV-only fans are quick to criticize modern translators without performing the same sort of personal scrutiny to the translators of the KJV...or even Erasmus.

Of course, this doesn't diminish the work that Erasmus created. But there are those amongst us who are almost willing to pass off Erasmus' work as though it was entirely perfect in every way. He was a man...flawed like the rest of us. His background has raised flags (particularly in regard to humanism and Roman Catholicism). Still, it seems like people are quick to vilify some modern translators but refuse to use that same measuring stick to those that support their translation of choice.

Not trying to be contentious here; just wanting to clarify the Erasmus claims.

Re:Is their proof of the kjv text before 400 A.D?, on: 2008/10/24 23:02

To ccchhrrriiiss:

As I look at all of the previous threads on Sermonindex in regards to Bible versions, I find the following statement of yours, similar to this one, that appears quite often:

“Of course, I still prefer my KJV of the Word of God. I understand and acknowledge the arguments made in favor of the supremacy of the KJV's source material. However, I also understand the arguments in favor of some of the other texts that most Bible scholars and manuscript experts prefer.” ccchhrrriiiss

So what you are saying above is two fold. You have a position that consists of:

#1 you prefer the King James Bible as the Word of God and also understand and acknowledge the arguments in favor of the supremacy of the King James Versions source material

#2 However, you say that you understand the arguments in favor of some of the other texts that most Bible scholars and manuscript experts prefer them.

What I notice on every one of the threads on Sermonindex in regards to Bible Versions is that you are the leader of the pack in the attack against the King James---- in defense of the newer versions, usually your post occurs first to respond in attack mode, followed then by kingjimmy, and then a few others, yet always the same pattern.

The Christian Church of the Protestant Reformation agrees 100% with your #1 position above. It totally accepts the King James Bible as the Received Text, received from the true Church, the very WORD of GOD.

However, at the same time The Protestant Church of the Reformation REJECTS your position #2 above--- vehemently, accusing those on the “revision committee” (Westcott & Hort) of plagiarism and changing the Doctrine

e.

This is what HISTORY has to say about the matter. History, the SMOKING GUN, directly from the Protestant body of Christ responding 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:

(Moderator: See follow up's for link)

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, when it started to get a little support by the Liberal's in the body of Christ. Today, people actually prefer the newer versions than they do the Authorized Protestant Bible.

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

Throughout this 1881 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 Conservative Protestants do today when comparing the King James Bible to all of the newer versions. In this article, they actually compared the changes in the 1881 revision to be identical (plagiarism) 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 Revision by Westcott and Hort was a plagiarism of the 1808 Belsham Unitarian New Testament, was that Belsham, as well as Westcott & Hort had switched the Authorized version of the New Testament and 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 CREATED by Justin Martyr, Taitan, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius & Jerome to conform to their belief of Gnosticism!

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

So cccchhhrrriiss, you have a dilemma, you have a problem. You cannot play both sides of the issue. Your two positions are in opposition to each other, and only one position is and can be true, because they are actually "opposites" of each other. A good example of someone who holds a similar dilemma to you would be a person who held the following "position":

#1 I believe in the right to life, from conception to the natural end of life, from the womb to the tomb.

#2 However, I have also studied the other side of the issue, and I also believe in Abortion and Euthanasia, in late term abortion and assisted suicide, from the womb to the tomb.

This person is on the same quick sand that you are in. They think they hold one position. In reality they hold two opposite positions, yet try to make them one.

Amos 3:3 "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?"

The Protestant Body of Christ rejected the newer versions in 1881 as being corrupt and inferior to Word of God found in the Received Text, in the Textus Receptus. You have to choose, it is either one or the other. The 1881 Corrupt, inferior version created by Westcott & Hort and the "Revision Committee" that has SPAWNED all of the newer Bible Versions since 1881-- the American Standard, Revised Standard, International Standard Version, the NIV, The NASV, The Message, etc. etc. etc.- ALL OF THE NEWER VERSIONS! One road leads directly from the early Apostles and early Church, through the dead language of Koine Greek, and is 95% consistent. The other leads directly from the Gnostics, the first Textual Critics, who cut and pasted God's Word to conform to their own beliefs, that came from Alexandria Egypt and ended up in Rome. This is where all of the error is found, with no consistency at all. One is the Word of God, that came from the true Church, the other is the word of men, that came from the Gnostics, and was accepted by Rome. Nothing good comes out of Rome.

You must choose this day whom you will serve. Is it God or is it Mammon? What will it be?

"24. No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

Matthew 6:24

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiss wrote:

Quote:

waltem wrote:

Erasmus never "preferred the doctrines of Rome", he rejected them as spurious, and corrupt.

Really? Where do you get this? I know that he was outspoken about certain things, yet he remained a Roman Catholic until the end of his life. So which things did he reject? You make it sound like he rejected them ALL, yet he remained a follower of Rome.

Quote:

-----I have listed the book, and quoted the material. Did you actually read my post? Surely does not sound like you did if you cannot even find the references I posted.

Yes, I did read your post. The book that you listed is NOT a detailed account of Erasmus. You must have a lot of faith in the author's words to accept his words without verification. Have you verified his sources? There are many works written about the life of Erasmus with detailed citations from his own writings. If we are so willing to scrutinize Westcott and Hort, can't we return the favor to Erasmus? Yet many KJV-only fans are quick to criticize modern translators without performing the same sort of personal scrutiny to the translators of the KJV...or even Erasmus.

Of course, this doesn't diminish the work that Erasmus created. But there are those amongst us who are almost willing to pass off Erasmus' work as though it was entirely perfect in every way. He was a man...flawed like the rest of us. His background has raised flags (particularly in regard to humanism and Roman Catholicism). Still, it seems like people are quick to vilify some modern translators but refuse to use that same measuring stick to those that support their translation of choice.

Not trying to be contentious here; just wanting to clarify the Erasmus claims.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/25 4:11

Hi Waltern...

Ummm, no.

I am not the "leader of the pack" in regard to the "attack" on the King James Version. I think you really need to read my posts.

Using your argument, one could accuse you of leading the attack on all other versions other than the KJV?

Brother, I don't try to have it both ways. I read the KJV -- and even prefer it -- but not because of an underlying belief that it is superior to all others. The big debate, in my opinion, is regarding source material and translation methods. In this, I haven't heard an argument that can make me ultimately cast my lot with either camp (KJV v. all others -- or TR v. AR).

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/10/25 11:30

Waltern,

Erasmus was a Roman Catholic to the end of his life. He wasn't forced to be that way, he chose to be a Catholic and defended the Roman Church and Pope to the end. His, "Discourse on Free Will" was in response to Luther's doctrine, but it was defending the Catholic Church's doctrine of free will. He most certainly was a Catholic.

Re: Is their proof of the kjv text before 400 A.D? - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/10/25 11:32

Quote:

bible1985 wrote:

I was just wondering, i hear their is but is it true. I mean you have people like peter ruckman and gail riplinger defending the kjv only and you have to be in question. I need the complete truth.

Riplinger has some major issues as far as her study methods and the way she presents some info (especially about Wescot and Hort).

Re:Is there proof of the KJV before 400 AD?, on: 2008/10/25 11:39

To: Homefree89

I have not quoted Gail Riplinger, nor used any of her work in my defense of the King James Bible.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

HomeFree89 wrote:

Quote:

bible1985 wrote:

I was just wondering, i hear their is but is it true. I mean you have people like peter ruckman and gail riplinger defending the kjv only and you have to be in question. I need the complete truth.

Riplinger has some major issues as far as her study methods and the way she presents some info (especially about Wescot and Hort).

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/10/25 11:46

Quote:

walter wrote:

To: Homefree89

I have not quoted Gail Riplinger, nor used any of her work in my defense of the King James Bible.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

HomeFree89 wrote:

Quote:

bible1985 wrote:

I was just wondering, i hear their is but is it true. I mean you have people like peter ruckman and gail riplinger defending the kjv only and you have to b e in question. I need the complete truth.

Riplinger has some major issues as far as her study methods and the way she presents some info (especially about Wescot and Hort).

I realize that you haven't quoted her. If you look at my post, you'll see I was replying to bible1985.

Re:Is their proof of the kjv text before 400 A.D?, on: 2008/10/25 12:17

To Homefree89

Yes, oh course the Catholics loved Erasmus so much--that is why they excommunicated him EIGHT YEARS after his DEATH, and placed all his writings on the Index of Forbidden Books!

(<http://transmutations.blogspot.com/2005/11/erasmus-heretic-or-humanistic-hero.html>) Erasmus: Heretic or Humanistic Hero

Luther and Erasmus were friends. Luther tried to convince Erasmus to leave Catholicism, but Erasmus thought that he could change it from within.

None of us mud balls are perfect down here on earth. There has only been one man that has ever been perfect and lived a perfect life- That man is Christ Jesus, the God man.

I choose to put my faith and my trust in HIM and in HIS WORD, that HE has promised to PRESERVE FOREVER:

"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. (Psalms 12:6-7)"

"Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the LORD God of your fathers giveth you. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you. (Deuteronomy 4:1-2) "

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

"Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar. (Proverbs 30:5-6) "

I believe that God has preserved His Word. It can be found in the Authorized Version of the Protestant Body of Christ, the King James Bible. All you need is to read and study it. It might help if you have a 1828 Noah Webster Dictionary of the English Language (you can find it online, for free)
<http://www.cbtministries.org/resources/webster1828.htm>.

The meaning of words in the King James are all frozen in time- all you need is the 1828 Dictionary to help. Also, the Strongs Exhaustive Concordance will be a help too. It can only be used with the King James Bible, and provides the exact meaning of all the Hebrew words in the Old Testament and the Greek words in the New Testament. You don't need to attend Bible College, you don't need formal training, all you need to do is to unplug your television, and spend your time feasting on God's Word!

However, if you do not believe God, and that He has the power to preserve His Word forever, then go out and get a newer version. Also purchase a Greek and Hebrew Lexicon. You will also need to attend a Bible College that teaches Textual Criticism, plus Greek & Hebrew, so that you can learn how to be a "scholar". Once you graduate, you will be able to cut and paste what you find in the newer versions to your own way of thinking, just like your predecessors, the gnostics, the first "scholars", and then create your own "bible". Once you "create" it by your "skills of textual criticism", you can copyright it, patent it, and publish it, and you will be rich and famous. There are over 90 versions out there right now--- by the time you finish your "work" you might as well shoot for 100, because there are many others out there, just like you who have graduated from a Bible College just like the one you attended, creating their versions of their own "bibles" right now!

We each have free will, and each of us must choose. Do we believe God or do we believe the words in the garden, found in Genesis 3:1-5, where we hear the words of the first "textual critic":

"3. Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made AND HE SAID UNTO THE WOMAN, YEA, HATH GOD SAID, YE SHALL NOT EAT OF EVERY TREE OF THE GARDEN?

2. And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:

3. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. 4. AND THE SERPENT SAID UNTO THE WOMAN, YE SHALL NOT SURELY DIE: 5. FOR GOD DOETH KNOW THAT IN THE DAY YE EAT THEREOF, THEN YOUR EYES SHALL BE OPENED, AND YE SHALL BE AS GODS, KNOWING GOOD AND EVIL.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

HomeFree89 wrote:
Walter,

Erasmus was a Roman Catholic to the end of his life. He wasn't forced to be that way, he chose to be a Catholic and defended the Roman Church and Pope to the end. His, "Discourse on Free Will" was in response to Luther's doctrine, but it was defending the Catholic Church's doctrine of free will. He most certainly was a Catholic.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/10/26 16:26

I got your PM of this post, but would like to respond here.

First off, in regards to Erasmus. I don't want to argue over whether or not he was a Catholic. I would encourage you to read his biography: (<http://www.scrollpublishing.com/store/more-dear-erasmus.html>) My Dear Erasmus: The Forgotten Reformer. It clearly shows his relationship with Luther (which although they were "friends" they disagreed on a lot of doctrine) and his relationship with the Catholic Church.

Second, I agree with all the verses you posted about the inspiration and preservation of God's Word. Where we disagree is how and in what form it was preserved. You believe it was only preserved in the KJV, I don't. To clarify, I do not except all modern translations, but I don't reject all of them either.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/10/27 10:52

The history of the transmission of the biblical text is really a hypothesis. We are searching for a 'best fit' explanation to the historical evidence which now exists. Robinson's hypothesis seems very reasonable to me but it is important to note that he is NOT supporting the Textus Receptus but IS supporting the Byzantine Textform.

A Greek text created by Robinson and Pierpoint is available at a great price from Amazon... (<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0759800774>) The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform 2005. For those who are into this kind of thing he provides the textual variants from the NA27 and USB4 modern critical texts in footnotes. He also provides the significant Byzantine variations in marginal notes. This is a very valuable tool and the volume also contains some 'essays' from Robinson in which he sets out very clearly his transmission hypothesis.

Re: - posted by MikeH, on: 2008/10/28 12:26

Walther wrote

Quote:

-----However, if you do not believe God, and that He has the power to preserve His Word forever, then go out and get a newer version.

The current world population is about 6.7 billion. Ethnologue, a publication by SIL International (a Christian organisation) estimates that 508m people speak English, that is 8.7% of the world population. Another typical estimate is 1 billion speak English, that is 15%, and the highest estimate is 1.8 billion or 27% of the world population speak English. Taking the best estimate, what hope do you have for the other 73% of the world's population who cannot read the KJV?

Mike

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/28 13:36

Hi walther...

Quote:

-----The meaning of words in the King James are all frozen in time- all you need is the 1828 Dictionary to help. Also, the Strongs Exhaustive Concordance will be a help too. It can only be used with the King James Bible, and provides the exact meaning of all the Hebrew words in the Old Testament and the Greek words in the New Testament. You don't need to attend Bible College, you don't need formal training, all you need to do is to unplug your television, and spend your time feasting on God's Word!

So we also need to purchase the 1828 edition of a dictionary (and possibly, a Strong's Concordance) so we can understand the language of the Bible? Isn't this exactly the OPPOSITE of the intent of the translators as recorded in their Preface to the KJV? The translators of the KJV indicated that they wanted a version of the Scriptures for which men didn't have to turn to another source (priest, Church leadership, etc...) to *interpret* or *augment* their understanding of passages -- because the new, "modern" version would be in the "vulgar" ("common") language understood by men.

Something else: I have often read/heard many of these threads over the years at SermonIndex and in books, magazines, tracts and sermons. Yet I seldom have ever come across an individual who presents BOTH SIDES of the argument. Typically, you find one who presents an extreme view of one side (KJV in the ONLY true Word of God), one side of the source material debate (for which there is a preference) or the opposite side of the debate in which most modern scholars prefer the other source texts. Like our brother indicated, more than 73% of the world does NOT speak English -- and much less understand the vernacular of early 17th Century English. My wife has difficulty with the KJV words, and most dictionaries are not very helpful (since the words have changed meaning). Yet she earned a teaching degree and a set of

graduate degrees in Spanish and ESL (English Second Language) Education. It is alarming to see individuals push for readers to need/utilize/purchase outside sources just to understand a single translation of the Word of God (although that would be a great reason to do so).

Me? I generally see myself as seeing both sides. I understand the arguments regarding the KJV (a bad argument, in my view), a belief in the superiority of the sources used for the KJV and other older texts (a much better argument) and the argument for the superiority of the other sources used for versions like the NIV. My ultimate conclusion is that I cannot, after much prayer, study and fasting, cannot ascertain the ultimate validity of the arguments for either sets of source texts. This is why my conclusion is that the KJV is a good and faithful (albeit imperfect -- as its translators indicated) translation from its sets of sources AND the NIV is a good and faithful (and albeit imperfect -- as its translators also indicated) translation from its sets of sources. Most of the time, I consult multiple sources of the same passage. I read it with the KJV. I read it with the NASB. I read it with the NIV. I even read it in Spanish. That is why I am so grateful for a website like (<http://www.biblegateway.com>) BibleGateway and its inclusion of many versions of the Bible in multiple languages. More importantly: I also urge those who read the Word of God to PRAY when they read it.

When I first met the Lord, I used to change the sign at the Church that I attended. I would find some great quotes that I would put on it every other week. Once I included these words on the sign (although I don't know if I read it somewhere or came up with it myself): **Many people read the Bible, but only a few speak with the Author.** If we would pray when we read, cannot the Holy Spirit lead us and guide us into ALL truth? After all, Jesus is the Living and perfect Word of God.

:~)

Re: - posted by paulamicela (), on: 2008/10/28 15:09

It is amazing how much people keep debating this issue.

Re: - posted by broclint (), on: 2008/10/28 18:00

Amen!

Just like Calvinism vs. Arminianism.... the quote from Job comes to mind:
Job 6:25 (KJV) 25How forcible are right words! but what doth your arguing reprove?

Job 6:25 (ESV) 25 How forceful are upright words! But what does reproof from you reprove?

Job 6:25 (NKJV) 25 How forceful are right words! But what does your arguing prove?

Regardless of what English version you read, you always have a middle man between you and the original(s). Take enough basic Greek and go to a museum and study for yourself... or more importantly as Mark Twain said, "it is not what I do not know from the Bible that worries me, but what I do know that scares me (paraphrase)".

Clint:-)

Re: The Fruit of the Text, on: 2008/10/29 2:35

To ccchhhrrriiss:

The Bible tells us:
By their fruits ye shall know them. Specifically, in Matthew 7:15-20 Jesus Christ tells us:

Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?
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. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

The "fruits" of the reformation, brought about by the Textus Receptus, has changed the world, has changed history! It has changed it by a religious revolution in the Christian Church, which ended the ecclesiastical supremacy of the pope in Western Christendom, and resulted in the establishment of The Protestant Church. It brought about the reading of scripture in the national language of the people, instead of in Latin, a language that the common man could not understand. It also brought about our Judicial System, Private Property rights, the Constitutional Republic of America, etc. etc. etc.

What is the "fruit" of Catholicism? What is the fruit of the newer Bible versions (90 and counting now) since 1881?

The Fruit of the Textus Receptus, the Protestant Bible of the reformation, the King James Bible. This is only a small sample of the "fruit" of the majority text, the Textus Receptus, that created the King James Bible:

From Encarta:

Reformation, great 16th-century religious revolution in the Christian church, which ended the ecclesiastical supremacy of the pope in Western Christendom and resulted in the establishment of the Protestant churches. With the Renaissance that preceded and the French Revolution that followed, the Reformation completely altered the medieval way of life in Western Europe and initiated the era of modern history. Although the movement dates from the early 16th century, when Martin Luther first defied the authority of the church, the conditions that led to his revolutionary stand had existed for hundreds of years and had complex doctrinal, political, economic, and cultural elements.

CONDITIONS PRECEDING REFORMATION

From the Revival of the Holy Roman Empire by Otto I in 962, popes and emperors had been engaged in a continuous contest for supremacy. This conflict had generally resulted in victory for the papal side, but created bitter antagonism between Rome and the German Empire; this antagonism was augmented in the 14th and 15th centuries by the further development of German nationalist sentiment. Resentment against papal taxation and against submission to ecclesiastical officials of the distant and foreign papacy was manifested in other countries of Europe. In England the beginning of the movement toward ultimate independence from papal jurisdiction was the enactment of the statutes of Mortmain in 1279, Provisors in 1351, and Praemunire in 1393, which greatly reduced the power of the church to withdraw land from the control of the civil government, to make appointments to ecclesiastical offices, and to exercise judicial authority.

The 14th-century English reformer **John Wycliffe** boldly attacked the papacy itself, striking at the sale of indulgences, pilgrimages, the excessive veneration of saints, and the moral and intellectual standards of ordained priests. To reach the common people, he translated the Bible into English and delivered sermons in English, rather than Latin. His teachings spread to Bohemia, where they found a powerful advocate in the religious reformer Jan Hus (**John Huss**). The execution of Huss as a heretic in 1415 led directly to the Hussite Wars, a violent expression of Bohemian nationalism, suppressed with difficulty by the combined forces of the Holy Roman emperor and the pope. The wars were a precursor of religious civil war in Germany in Luther's time. In France in 1516 a concordat between the king and the pope placed the French church substantially under royal authority. Earlier concordats with other national monarchies also prepared the way for the rise of autonomous national churches.

As early as the 13th century the papacy had become vulnerable to attack because of the greed, immorality, and ignorance of many of its officials in all ranks of the hierarchy. Vast tax-free church possessions, constituting, according to varying estimates, as much as one-fifth to one-third of the lands of Europe, incited the envy and resentment of the land-poor peasantry. The so-called Babylonian Captivity of popes at Avignon in the 14th century and the ensuing Western Schism (see Schism, Great) gravely impaired the authority of the church and divided its adherents into partisans of one or another pope. Church officials recognized the need for reform; ambitious programs for the reorganization of the entire hierarchy were debated at the Council of Constance from 1414 to 1418, but no program gained the support of a majority, and no radical changes were instituted at that time.

Humanism, the revival of classical learning and speculative inquiry beginning in the 15th century in Italy during the early Renaissance, displaced Scholasticism as the principal philosophy of Western Europe and deprived church leaders of the monopoly on learning that they had previously held. Laypersons studied ancient literature, and scholars such as the Italian humanist Lorenzo Valla critically appraised translations of the Bible and other documents that formed the basis for much of church dogma and tradition. The invention of printing with movable metal type greatly increased the circulation of books and spread new ideas throughout Europe. Humanists outside Italy, such as **Desiderius Erasmus in the Netherlands**

lands, John Colet and Sir Thomas More in England, Johann Reuchlin in Germany, and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples in France, applied the new learning to the evaluation of church practices and the development of a more accurate knowledge of the Scriptures. Their scholarly studies laid the basis on which Luther, the French theologian and religious reformer John Calvin, and other reformers subsequently claimed the Bible rather than the church as the source of all religious authority.

NATIONAL MOVEMENTS

The Protestant revolution was initiated in Germany by Luther in 1517, when he published his 95 theses challenging the theory and practice of indulgences.

Germany and the Lutheran Reformation

Papal authorities ordered **Luther** to retract and submit to church authority, but he became more intransigent, appealing for reform, attacking the sacramental system, and urging that religion rest on individual faith based on the guidance contained in the Bible. Threatened with excommunication by the pope, Luther publicly burned the bull, or papal decree, of excommunication and with it a volume of canon law. This act of defiance symbolized a definitive break with the entire system of the Western church. In an attempt to stem the tide of revolt, Charles V, Holy Roman emperor, and the German princes and ecclesiastics assembled in 1521 at the Diet of Worms, and ordered Luther to recant. He refused and was declared an outlaw. For almost a year he remained in hiding, writing pamphlets expounding his principles and translating the New Testament into German. Although his writings were prohibited by imperial edict, they were openly sold and were powerful instruments in turning the great German cities into centers of Lutheranism.

The reform movement made tremendous strides among the people, and when Luther left retirement he returned to his home at Wittenberg as a revolutionary leader. Germany had become sharply divided along religious and economic lines. Those most interested in preserving the traditional order, including the emperor, most of the princes, and the higher clergy, supported the Roman Catholic church. Lutheranism was supported by the North German princes, the lower clergy, the commercial classes, and large sections of the peasantry, who welcomed change as offering an opportunity for greater independence in both the religious and economic spheres. Open warfare between the two factions broke out in 1524 with the beginning of the Peasants' War. The war was basically an attempt on the part of the peasants to better their economic lot. Their program, inspired by the teachings of Luther and couched in religious terms, called for emancipation from a number of the services traditionally claimed by their clerical and lay landlords. Luther disapproved of the use of his demands for reform to justify a radical disruption of the existing economy, but in the interests of a peaceful settlement of the conflict he urged the landlords to satisfy the claims of the peasants. He soon turned against the peasants, however, and, in a pamphlet entitled *Against the Murdering, Thieving Hordes of Peasants* (1525), violently condemned them for resorting to violence.

The peasants were defeated in 1525, but the cleavage between Roman Catholics and Lutherans increased. A degree of compromise was reached at the Diet of Speyer in 1526, when it was agreed that German princes wishing to practice Lutheranism should be free to do so. At a second Diet of Speyer, convened three years later, the Roman Catholic majority abrogated the agreement. The Lutheran minority protested against this action and became known as Protestants; thus the first Protestants were Lutherans, the term being extended subsequently to include all the Christian sects that developed from the revolt against Rome.

In 1530 the German scholar and religious reformer Melancthon drew up a conciliatory statement of the Lutheran tenets, known as the Augsburg Confession, which was submitted to Emperor Charles V and to the Roman Catholic faction. Although it failed to reconcile the differences between Roman Catholics and Lutherans, it remained the basis of the new Lutheran church and creed. Subsequently, a series of wars with France and the Ottoman Empire prevented Charles V from turning his military forces against the Lutherans, but in 1546 the emperor was finally free of international commitments; and in alliance with the pope and with the aid of Duke Maurice of Saxony, he made war against the Schmalkaldic League, a defensive association of Protestant princes. The Roman Catholic forces were successful at first. Later, however, Duke Maurice went over to the Protestant side, and Charles V was obliged to make peace. The religious civil war ended with the religious Peace of Augsburg in 1555. Its terms provided that each of the rulers of the German states, which numbered about 300, choose between Roman Catholicism and Lutheranism and enforce the chosen faith upon the ruler's subjects. Lutheranism, by then the religion of about half the population of Germany, thus finally gained official recognition, and the ancient concept of the religious unity of a single Christian community in Western Europe under the supreme authority of the pope was destroyed.

Scandinavia

In the Scandinavian countries the Reformation was accomplished peacefully as Lutheranism spread northward from Ger

many. The monarchical governments of Denmark and Sweden themselves sponsored the reform movement and broke completely with the papacy. In 1536 a national assembly held in Copenhagen abolished the authority of the Roman Catholic bishops throughout Denmark and the then subject lands of Norway and Iceland; and Christian III, king of Denmark and Norway, invited Luther's friend, the German religious reformer Johann Bugenhagen, to organize in Denmark a national Lutheran church on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. In Sweden the brothers Olaus Petri and Laurentius Petri led the movement for the adoption of Lutheranism as the state religion. The adoption was effected in 1529 with the support of Gustav I Vasa, king of Sweden, and by the decision of the Swedish diet.

Switzerland

The early reform movement in Switzerland, contemporaneous with the Reformation in Germany, was led by the Swiss pastor Huldreich Zwingli, who became known in 1518 through his vigorous denunciation of the sale of indulgences. Zwingli expressed his opposition to abuses of ecclesiastical authority by sermons, conversations in the marketplace, and public disputations before the town council. As did Luther and other reformers, he considered the Bible the sole source of moral authority and strove to eliminate everything in the Roman Catholic system not specifically enjoined in the Scriptures. In Zürich from 1523 to 1525, under Zwingli's leadership, religious relics were burned, ceremonial processions and the adoration of the saints were abolished, priests and monks were released from their vows of celibacy, and the Mass was replaced by a simpler communion service. These changes by which the city revolted from the Roman Catholic church were accomplished legally and quietly through votes of the Zürich town council. The chief supporters of the innovations, the commercial classes, expressed through them their independence from the Roman church and from the German Empire. Other Swiss towns, such as Basel and Bern, adopted similar reforms, but the conservative peasantry of the forest cantons adhered to Roman Catholicism. As in Germany, the authority of the central government was too weak to enforce religious conformity and prevent civil war. Two short-lived conflicts broke out between Protestant and Roman Catholic cantons in 1529 and 1531. In the second of these, which took place at Kappel, Zwingli was slain. Peace was made and each canton was allowed to choose its religion. Roman Catholicism prevailed in the provincial mountainous parts of the country, and Protestantism in the great cities and fertile valleys. Substantially the same division has continued to the present time in Switzerland.

In the generation after Luther and Zwingli the dominating figure of the Reformation was Calvin, the French Protestant theologian who fled religious persecution in his native country and in 1536 settled in the newly independent republic of Geneva. Calvin led in the strict enforcement of reform measures previously instituted by the town council of Geneva and insisted on further reforms, including the congregational singing of the Psalms as part of church worship, the teaching of a catechism and confession of faith to children, the enforcement of a strict moral discipline in the community by the pastors and members of the church, and the excommunication of notorious sinners. Calvin's church organization was democratic and incorporated ideas of representative government. Pastors, teachers, presbyters, and deacons were elected to their official positions by members of the congregation.

Although church and state were officially separate, they cooperated so closely that Geneva was virtually a theocracy. To enforce discipline of morals, Calvin instituted a rigid inspection of household conduct and organized a consistory, composed of pastors and laypersons, with wide powers of compulsion over the community. The dress and personal behavior of citizens were prescribed to the minutest detail; dancing, card playing, dicing, and other recreations were forbidden; blasphemy and ribaldry were severely punished. Under this severe regime, nonconformists were persecuted and even put to death. To encourage the reading and understanding of the Bible, all citizens were provided with at least an elementary education. In 1559 Calvin founded a university in Geneva that became famous for training pastors and teachers. More than any other reformer, Calvin organized the contemporary diversities of Protestant thought into a clear and logical system. The circulation of his writings, his influence as an educator, and his great ability in organizing church and state in terms of reform created an international following and gave the Reformed churches, as Protestantism was called in Switzerland, France, and Scotland, a thoroughly Calvinistic stamp, both in theology and organization.

France

The Reformation in France was initiated early in the 16th century by a group of mystics and humanists who gathered at Meaux near Paris under the leadership of Lefèvre d'Étaples. Like Luther, Lefèvre d'Étaples studied the Epistles of St. Paul and derived from them a belief in justification by individual faith alone; he also denied the doctrine of transubstantiation. In 1523 he translated the entire New Testament into French. At first his writings were well received by church and state officials, but as Luther's radical doctrines began to spread into France, Lefèvre d'Étaples's work was seen to be similar, and he and his followers were persecuted. Many leading Protestants fled from France and settled in the republic of Geneva or Switzerland until strengthened in numbers and philosophy by the Calvinistic reformation in Geneva. More than 120 pastors trained in Geneva by Calvin returned to France before 1567 to proselytize for Protestantism. In 1559 delegates from 66 Protestant churches in France met at a national synod in Paris to draw up a confession of faith and rule of discipline based on those practiced at Geneva.

In this way the first national Protestant church in France was organized; its members were known as Huguenots. Despite all efforts to suppress them, the Huguenots grew into a formidable body, and the division of France into Protestant and Roman Catholic factions led to a generation of civil wars (1562-1598). One of the notorious incidents of this struggle was the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, in which a large number of Protestants perished. Under the Protestant Henry IV, king of France, the Huguenots triumphed for a short time, but as Paris and more than nine-tenths of the French people remained Roman Catholic, the king deemed it expedient to become a convert to Roman Catholicism. He protected his Huguenot adherents, however, by issuing in 1598 the Edict of Nantes, which granted Protestants a measure of freedom. The edict was revoked in 1685, and Protestantism was stamped out of the country.

The Netherlands

Protestantism was welcomed in the Netherlands by the powerful literate bourgeoisie that had developed during the Middle Ages. Militarily more powerful in this territory than in the German states, Emperor Charles V attempted to halt the spread of Protestant doctrines by public burnings of Luther's books and by the establishment in 1522 of the Inquisition. These measures were unsuccessful, however, and by the middle of the 16th century Protestantism had a firm hold on the northern provinces, known as Holland; the southern provinces (now Belgium) remained predominantly Roman Catholic. Most of the Dutch embraced Calvinism, which served as a potent bond in their nationalistic struggle against their Spanish Roman Catholic overlords. They revolted in 1568 and warfare continued until 1648, when Spain relinquished all claims to the country by the terms of the Peace of Westphalia. The former Spanish Netherlands then became an independent Protestant nation.

Scotland

In Scotland as in other countries the Reformation originated among elements of the population already hostile to the Roman Catholic church. The Roman Catholic clergy was held in general disrepute by the people, and remnants of Lollardy, or the doctrines of John Wycliffe, were still prevalent. The merchants and the minor nobility were especially active in furthering the Scottish Reformation as a vehicle for national self-determination and independence from England and France as well as for religious reform. Consequently, Protestantism spread rapidly despite repressive measures by the pro-Roman Catholic Scottish government. The early religious reform movement, initiated by such leaders as the martyr Patrick Hamilton, was under Lutheran influence. The actual revolution, accomplished under the leadership of the religious reformer John Knox, an ardent disciple of Calvin, established Calvinism as the national religion of Scotland. In 1560 Knox persuaded the Scottish Parliament to adopt a confession of faith and book of discipline modeled on those in use at Geneva. The Parliament subsequently created the Scottish Presbyterian church and provided for the government of the church by local kirk (Scottish word for church) sessions and by a general assembly representing the local churches of the entire country. The Roman Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots, attempted to overthrow the new Protestant church, but after a 7-year struggle, she herself was forced to leave the country. Calvinism was triumphant in Scotland except for a few districts in the north, in which Roman Catholicism remained strong, particularly among the noble families.

England

The English revolt from Rome differed from the revolts in Germany, Switzerland, and France in two respects. First, England was a compact nation with a strong central government; therefore, instead of splitting the country into regional factions or parties and ending in civil war, the revolt was national—the king and Parliament acted together in transferring to the king the ecclesiastical jurisdiction previously exercised by the pope. Second, in the continental countries agitation for religious reform among the people preceded and caused the political break with the papacy; in England, on the other hand, the political break came first, as a result of a decision by King Henry VIII to divorce his first wife, and the change in religious doctrine came afterward in the reigns of King Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth I. Henry VIII wished to divorce his Roman Catholic wife, Catherine of Aragon, because the marriage had not produced a male heir and he feared disruption of his dynasty. His marriage to Catherine, which normally would have been illegal under ecclesiastical law because she was the widow of his brother, had been allowed only by special dispensation from the pope. Henry claimed that the papal dispensation contravened ecclesiastical law and that the marriage was therefore invalid. The pope upheld the validity of the dispensation and refused to annul the marriage. Henry then requested the opinion of noted reformers and the faculties of the great European universities.

Eight university faculties supported his claim. Zwingli and the German-Swiss theologian Johannes Oecolampadius also considered his marriage null, but Luther and Melancthon thought it binding. The king followed a course of expediency; he married Anne Boleyn in 1533, and two months later he had the archbishop of Canterbury pronounce his divorce from Catherine. Henry was then excommunicated by the pope, but retaliated in 1534 by having Parliament pass an act appointing the king and his successors supreme head of the Church of England, thus establishing an independent national Anglican church. Further legislation cut off the pope's English revenues and ended his political and religious authority in England.

gland. Between 1536 and 1539 the monasteries were suppressed and their property seized by the king. Henry had no interest in going beyond these changes, which were motivated principally by political rather than doctrinal considerations. Indeed, to prevent the spread of Lutheranism, he secured from Parliament in 1539 the severe body of edicts called the Act of Six Articles, which made it heretical to deny the main theological tenets of medieval Roman Catholicism. Obedience to the papacy remained a criminal offense. Consequently, many Lutherans were burned as heretics, and Roman Catholics who refused to recognize the ecclesiastical supremacy of the king were executed.

Under King Edward VI, the Protestant doctrines and practices abhorred by Henry VIII were introduced into the Anglican church. The Act of Six Articles was repealed in 1547, and continental reformers, such as the German Martin Bucer, were invited to preach in England. In 1549 a complete vernacular Book of Common Prayer was issued to provide uniformity of service in the Anglican church, and its use was enforced by law. A second Prayer Book was published in 1552, and a new creed in 42 articles was adopted. Mary I attempted, however, to restore Roman Catholicism as the state religion, and during her reign many Protestants were burned at the stake. Others fled to continental countries, where their religious opinions often became more radical by contact with Calvinism. A final settlement was reached under Queen Elizabeth I in 1563. Protestantism was restored, and Roman Catholics were often persecuted. The 42 articles of the Anglican creed adopted under Edward VI were reduced to the present Thirty-nine Articles. This creed is Protestant and closer to Lutheranism than to Calvinism, but the episcopal organization and ritual of the Anglican church is substantially the same as that of the Roman Catholic church. Large numbers of people in Elizabeth's time did not consider the Church of England sufficiently reformed and non-Roman. They were known as dissenters or nonconformists and eventually formed or became members of numerous Calvinist sects such as the Brownists, Presbyterians, Puritans, Separatists, and Quakers.

Minor Sects

Besides the three great churches—Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican—formed during the Reformation, a large number of small sects also arose as a natural consequence of Protestant repudiation of traditional authority and exaltation of private judgment. One of the most prominent of the smaller sects, the Anabaptists, found many adherents throughout Europe, particularly in Germany, where they played an important part in the Peasants' War. They were persecuted by Catholics as well as by Lutherans, Zwinglians, and other Protestants, and many of them were put to death. Another prominent denomination, the Unitarians, included a considerable number of followers in Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands, and Poland.

RESULTS OF THE REFORMATION

Despite the diversity of revolutionary forces in the 16th century, the Reformation had largely consistent results throughout Western Europe. In general, the power and wealth lost by the feudal nobility and the Roman Catholic hierarchy passed to the middle classes and to monarchical rulers. Various regions of Europe gained political, religious, and cultural independence. Even in countries such as France and the region now known as Belgium, where Roman Catholicism continued to prevail, a new individualism and nationalism in culture and politics developed. The Protestant emphasis on personal judgment furthered the development of democratic governments based on the collective choice of individual voters. The destruction of the medieval system of authority removed traditional religious restrictions on trade and banking, and opened the way for the growth of modern capitalism. During the Reformation national languages and literature were greatly advanced by the wide dissemination of religious literature written in the languages of the people, rather than in Latin. Popular education was also stimulated through the new schools founded by Colet in England, Calvin in Geneva, and the Protestant princes in Germany. Religion became less the province of a highly privileged clergy and more a direct expression of the beliefs of the people. Religious intolerance, however, raged unabated, and all the sects continued to persecute one another for at least a century.

What is the fruit of the newer versions, that rely on the corrupt vaticanus and Sinaiticus text, used by the Catholic Church, created by the Gnostics. What is the fruit of the NIV, NASB, American Standard, Revised Standard, Living Bible, New King James Bible, The Message Bible, New American Standard, New American Standard with Apocrypha, New Revised Standard with Apocrypha? All of these newer versions (90 of them now), created since 1881 use the corrupt Vaticanus and Sinaiticus Text as the Catholic Bible. What is the fruit of the Douay-Rheims Bible, The Jerusalem Bible? The same fruit that exists in all of the newer versions of Protestant Bibles published since 1881. What fruit, you ask? The answer, there is NONE.

General William Booth (1829-1916), who started the Salvation Army in the 1800's to bring the lost to Christ, looking into the future, had this to say about Christianity of the next century:

“In answer to your inquiry, I consider that the chief dangers which confront the coming century will be religion without the Holy Ghost, Christianity without Christ, forgiveness without repentance, salvation without regeneration

ion, politics without God, and heaven without hell.Â”

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?_r3&res9D0CEEDA153BE033A25757C1A9649C94609FD7CF&orefslgin&orefslgin&orefslgin) Letters to the Editor

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, when it started to get a little support by the Liberal's in the body of Christ. Today, people actually prefer the newer versions than they do the Authorized Protestant Bible.

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

Throughout this 1881 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 Conservative Protestant Christians do today when comparing the King James Bible to all of the newer versions. In this article, they actually compared the changes in the 1881 revision to be identical (plagiarism) 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 Revision by Westcott and Hort was a plagiarism of the 1808 Belsham Unitarian New Testament, was that Belsham, as well as Westcott & Hort had switched the Authorized version of the New Testament and 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 CREATED by Justin Martyr, Taitan, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius & Jerome to conform to their belief of Gnosticism!

In 1881 the Revision committee replaced the text found in the Protestant Bible of the Reformation, the King James Bible that relied on the Textus Recetpus, the Bible that provided FRUIT. They replaced the Textus Receptus with the corrupt text of the Catholic Bible. The Protestant Church rejected this revision.

What is the fruit of the newer versions, created since 1881, ccchhhrrriiiss?

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/29 3:25

Hi waltern...

I haven't had a chance to read this entire, long post yet (although I will). However, I wanted to address the beginning and the end of it.

Quote:
-----The "fruits" of the reformation, brought about by the Textus Receptus, has changed the world, has changed history! It has changed it by a religious revolution in the Christian Church, which ended the ecclesiastical supremacy of the pope in Western Christendom, and resulted in the establishment of The Protestant Church.

This seems like an awful lot of speculation regarding the "fruit" or impact of the Textus Receptus. You make it sound like no one ever got saved BEFORE (or perhaps, apart from) the Textus Receptus. Did the Textus Receptus actually begin the Protestant Reformation? Do you have some firsthand source material for this? If memory serves me, I think that there are some Catholic versions of the Bible that are at least partially translated from the Textus Receptus -- as well as quite a few versions that are NOT the KJV.

Quote:
-----What is the fruit of the newer versions, created since 1881, ccchhhrrriiisss?

Hmmm.... Me?

I was saved and discipled using a New International Version of the Bible. I read it...and read it...and read it...cover to cover...over and over again...until the pages fell out. I then went to the KJV. I began to read it, but would often refer to the Strongs, a Bible dictionary and the NIV for passages that were unclear to my 15 yr old mind. Thankfully, I was able to obtain a Strong's Concordance, an old dictionary and a couple of years of Shakespeare to assist with my comprehension of early 17th Century English vernacular.

Yet my heart was changed and the scales fell from my eyes from reading Matthew 11:28-30...in a NIV.

I know many individuals who have -- believe it or not -- been discipled and even saved as a direct result of a modern version like the NIV. Moreover, I know many individuals who better understand passages by the words of the NIV over the KJV (although some would argue that the KJV is clear to even a child).

Yet this is how these sort of discussions morph over time. The ultimate answer to the debate isn't found in what people think the result of the KJV or NIV was. It isn't in whether someone wants to believe that the KJV (in whichever form it came from 1611 through the version we use today) is the sole "perfect and preserved" Word of God.

The real debate, in my perspective, is in regard to the source material, translation methods and the faith that we have in the translators -- from the sources Erasmus used, to Erasmus himself (the Dutch Catholic Humanist), through the translators of the KJV...as well as the same sort of Scriptural geneology used for a version like the NIV (earliest sources texts, subsequent translations, Wescott and Hort, onward to the committee that translated the NIV). Yet we go in circles. We have those who will argue to the End about the ultimate supremacy of one single version, one set of sources, or a defense of one version via an attack on every other. This bridge has been crossed, burned, rebuilt, crossed, burned and rebuilt again...and again.

I am open to the possibility of one day maintaining an assumption as to the ultimate superiority of one set of sources and/or translation methods over the other. However, that day has not come. I have researched it. Yet I have not seen anything concrete enough to render one version or set of sources ultimately superior to another -- especially enough to write long attacks on anything other than a position to which I arrived. Yet, I suppose, the debate will continue as long as people are secure enough with reaching such conclusions and basing much time in their well-meaning attacks and defenses.

Until the day arrives in which I can view one version, set of sources and/or translation methods as undeniably superior, I will continue to view the TR, KJV and NIV with an equal amount of academic, scholarly and most importantly, prayerful scrutiny.

Thanks for the long post. I will read it. I was wondering if you wrote all of it? Otherwise, is there a citation anywhere from which I can verify the source(s)?

Re:, on: 2008/10/29 11:33

To ccchhhrrriiiss:

The "fruit" of the newer Bible versions, what is it? Today more Protestant men and women are joining the Catholic Church. How could this be? The majority of the Protestant men and women over the past 60 years have all relied on the newer Bible versions- the ASB, NIV, etc. etc. These versions rely on the same corrupt text that was used by the Gnostics to create their Bible, which is the Bible of the Catholic Church. Today's Protestant does not know and understand Sound Doctrine because he is reading the work of the first textual critics, the Gnostics who cut and pasted God's Word to conform with their own beliefs. I have posted various Bible comparisons of the newer versions, AND compared them to the Protestant Bible of the Reformation. The post was locked, but was called NASB OR THE NKJV and is found in the Scripture & Doctrine section, page 4 (presently). If you look at all of the comparisons you will see the problem. All of the newer versions water down God's Word, water down God's Doctrine. So, today, when the "Protestant" Christian is reading his "Newer Version", he or she is actually reading the Catholic Bible, that waters down doctrine. Today's Christian has no understanding of Doctrine, and hence finds nothing WRONG with Catholicism.

Also today we have un-presented numbers of "Protestant Christians", who have relied on the newer versions, that have "itching ears" and have no interest in sound doctrine. They are the name it and claim it group, they grab and grab it bunch. They are also the "Christians" that fill the purpose driven churches, and accept a social gospel, rather than the shed blood of Jesus Christ to wash away their sins and to redeem fallen man back to Himself. The reason? The Bibles they are studying are absent of sound doctrine.

Just one example of this absence of sound doctrine in the newer versions. The NAS or the NIV are guilty of the following:

The alterations & discrepancies are radical changes in God's Word that attack:

1) Jesus Christ a being God 2) That Christ's blood forgives sin. 3) That Mary was a virgin 4) That Christ is prophesized as offering salvation (Zech 9:9). Col 1:14=blood; 1 Tim 3:16=God replaced by he; Isaiah 7:14=virgin replaced by young woman; Zechariah 9:9= salvation is removed; Matthew 1:25=firstborn is removed; Matthew 4:10=worshipped Him (referring to worship of Jesus Christ) replace by bowing down, and sometimes omitted!

2 Timothy 4: 1. I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; 2. Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. 3. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; 4. And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.

This is the fruit of the newer versions: 1) An exodus of the Protestant body of Christ into Catholicism 2) An exodus of the body of Christ into cults or anything else, other than a Conservative Bible Believing Protestant Church that relies on the King James Bible version--the Bible version that convicts humanity of their sin and the need of a Savior.

General William Booth foresaw this day, when he said:

"In answer to your inquiry, I consider that the chief dangers which confront the coming century will be religion without the Holy Ghost, Christianity without Christ, forgiveness without repentance, salvation without regeneration, politics without God, and heaven without hell."

Who was General William Booth? Does he sound like anyone around today?

William Booth was born near Nottingham on April 10, 1829. As a youth, he was apprenticed to a pawnbroker, but after a conversion experience he began street preaching for a Methodist chapel. In 1849 he went to London, where he worked as a pawnbroker. Three years later, however, he became a full-time Methodist lay preacher. In 1855 he married Catherine Mumford, an intelligent and determined woman. Encouraged by her in his theological studies, Booth was ordained a minister in 1858.

Booth's theology was simple and unchanging. He drew both his beliefs and his basic practice from the model set by John Wesley a century earlier. His creed required no systematic theological learning. He held that without personal acceptance of Christ as his Savior, the sinful man would die into eternal damnation. Although the opp

ortunity for acceptance was freely offered to all, it was certain to be ignored by the masses in the sordid and pa
gan slums of the new industrial towns. Thus it was necessary to reach the ignorant, the drunkard, and the crimi
nal and offer them the chance of repentance.

Driven by this purpose, in 1861 the Booths left Methodism and in 1865 established the Christian Mission in East
London. During the next 12 years Booth developed the evangelical techniques later employed in the Salvation A
rmy. Among these were the use of secular quarters and the enlistment of converted sinners as workers. Booth
was not a political or social radical; he only gradually came to accept that social uplift might have to precede co
nversion. Thus he slowly built a social program of food kitchens, housing, and communal organization. He wrot
e, however, "The Social is the bait, but it is Salvation that is the hook that lands the fish.

The conversion of the Christian Mission into the Salvation Army occurred somewhat accidentally in 1878. Boot
h had earlier expressed his evangelical zeal in military terms, titles, and concepts. This organizational style, not
unique to his army, was in tune with the current popularity of militarism and imperialism. The army's paper, the
War Cry, appeared at the end of 1879. Although the army met considerable hostility through the 1880s, by 1890
Booth had become a figure of international renown. The day-today administrative labor of the Salvation Army fe
ll increasingly to Bramwell Booth, General Booth's oldest child and his chief of staff and successor.

Mrs. Booth died in 1890, the year in which Booth wrote, with much assistance from the reforming journalist W. T
. Stead, his famous book, In Darkest England and the Way Out. In it Booth colorfully and compassionately detail
ed the misery of the "Submerged Tenth" and insisted that the "way out" must transform men as well as their su
rroundings.

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/29 14:51

Hi Brother Waltern...

It would be far more accurate and honest to say that this is your opinion, rather than calling the text "corrupt."

You make quite a few complex arguments that don't seem to hold any weight in a discussion regarding whether the KJV
is the sole "perfect and preserved" Word of God. No offense, brother, but your argument simply does not hold the weigh
t of academic scrutiny. For instance, we have covered these lies in the past:

Quote:
-----Just one example of this absence of sound doctrine in the newer versions. The NAS or the NIV are guilty of the following:
The alterations & discrepancies are radical changes in Gods Word that attack:
1) Jesus Christ a being God 2) That Christs blood forgives sin. 3)That Mary was a virgin 4) That Christ is prophesized as offering salvation (Zech 9:9).
Col 1:14=blood; 1 Tim 3:16=God replaced by he; Isaiah 7:14=virgin replaced by young woman; Zechariah 9:9= salvation is removed; Matthew 1:25=fir
stborn is removed; Matthew 4:10=worshipped Him (referring to worship of Jesus Christ) replace by bowing down, and sometimes omitted!

I could take you through the NIV and show you verses that contain such doctrines. But you know what? You probably
wouldn't listen anyway. You are so content in your disgust for a version of the Word of God (or, at least, what many vie
w as the Word of God) that you will just move on to other grounds to spew your contempt.

I have enjoyed brother Ron Bailey's perspective in regards to the sources, methods and end product of the Word. Your
argument, however, reeks of mere contempt rather than a legitimate search for truth in the matter. Ultimately, I find that
it is difficult to reason with someone who just seems to know it all. So why should I try?

Brother, I love you in the Lord. Truly. I just don't like to go around this topic over and over (...and over...) again. Nothin
g that I say seems to move you, and you usually do not comment on the things that I write anyway. You just keep postin
g long posts with what I see to be faulty reasoning. Even in this last post, it seems like you are blaming the entire state
of the Church on the acceptance of versions other than the KJV (as if those people who embrace the KJV are the only "r
ight" believers). I know quite a few faithful readers of the KJV who wouldn't know God if He stood in front of them with o
pen arms (like the Mormons). Do you see how your arguments are not clear? Do you understand that you stray off on t
angents that don't clarify the basis for your argument?

Brother, keep on reading the KJV! I think that it is a faithful translation from the set of sources that it used -- even if I am aware that it was completed with the efforts of mere men. I am aware of the preconditions, limits or mistakes that are contained within its pages. I feel the same way about the NIV too. But I feel the liberty to read the NIV -- even if you hate it so much as to spread your contempt for it. Your arguments (and even the more clear perspectives of others) just haven't caused me to dismiss the NIV as anything less than holding the same respect of it as I do the KJV. I just view them both for what they are: Faithful translations from an entirely different set of sources.

Re: - posted by bible1985, on: 2008/10/29 17:10

I am going to have to agree with Chris on this. O.k I read most of the book by D.A. Waite called *Defending the King James Bible*, the part I didn't read was basically him showing the verses that were omitted or changed. I also read James White's book called *The King James Controversy*. Even though White does not defend his own belief that much on the other versions he puts up the straw man arguments by KJV only people very good. KJV believers will say they didn't put son of God, or didn't say Jesus Christ just Jesus or they omitted this and that. One thing is this is your putting the KJV as the standard that is why your saying their is omissions in the first place. James White had to bring dozen of examples where the NIV or NASB for an example when the NIV would say something about the deity that the KJV would separate God and saviour almost as 2 different people while the other versions actually kept them as the same and one. Also their differences in the manuscripts from Beza, Stephanus, Erasmus, etc. and the other texts used to bring this together. Erasmus had to even take the book of revelation from another manuscript to put it in, so not all the books were always in the majority text. I really don't know the side of the older manuscripts Aleph and B and so I am not saying they are better by no means. I don't agree that the older is the better, because if the Byzantine texts were correctly transmitted from the beginning until now then there is no problem in saying that they are better than the Alexandrian texts. I actually believe personally that the older manuscripts are not as reliable just for the fact of the differences in the first 2 earliest ones. I use the KJV, but I think James brought up some good points in his book. My friends almost look at others who use these other versions as non Christians or heretics because of people like Peter Ruckman and Gail Riplinger and that offends me knowing so many holy Christians who don't use it. The question should be is if you have Jesus or not, all bibles give us that opportunity to know him. I am not taking away anything away from the KJV but some of their arguments are hateful and rude and many lies about other versions, I recommend James White's book to all, but I still want to say that the Holy Spirit will let you know if it is not good. The Lord let me know when I was reading the New Living Translation I believe that his spirit was not on this book as most. I feel his spirit in the KJV, NIV, and NASB.

Re: - posted by paulamicela (), on: 2008/10/29 17:32

ccchhhrrriiisss,

I think your last post was very good and I agree wholeheartedly that this debate is getting nowhere. I think it would be a very good time to end this thread!

-Paul

Re: Which Version, on: 2008/10/30 1:14

TO CCCHHRRRIIISSS:

I will address your statements, one by one:

Your first statement:

1. I could take you through the NIV and show you verses that contain such doctrines. But you know what? You probably wouldn't listen anyway. You are so content in your disgust for a version of the Word of God (or, at least, what many view as the Word of God) that you will just move on to other grounds to spew your contempt.

My Response:

I have provided documentation that proves, through the lens of history, that the Protestant Church of the Reformation of 1881 rejected the work of the revision committee of January, 1881, and called it a copy (plagiarism) of the liberal 1808 Belsham Unitarian Bible.

The Protestant Church of the Reformation REJECTED all of the changes in Bible Doctrine that occurred in the 1881 Revision.

Since you not only defend the 1881 "Revision", as well as all of the newer "versions" that have spawned from it since 1881

Since you also defend the doctrinal changes that have been found in all of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus texts, and place it of equal merit to the Textus Receptus, you ccchhhrrriiisss are in direct opposition to the Protestant Church of the Reformation of 1881. Their findings, as posted below online, prove that the "Revision" was nothing more than a copy of the 1808 Belsham Unitarian Bible- a word for word copy, and was therefore a "replacement" of the Textus Receptus with an entirely different text—"the corrupt "Vaticanus and Sinaiticus" that was created by the gnostics and then used by the Roman Catholic Church to create their Catholic Bible.

It is no longer a matter of "he said, she said", "yes it is, no it isn't"---the revision, that you support was rejected by the Protestant body of Christ 1881:

I have actually posted this at least 3 times directly to you, but you never respond.

I will try one more time:

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?_r3&res9D0CEEDA153BE033A25757C1A9649C94609FD7CF&orefslgin&orefslgin&orefslgin) Letters to the Editor

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

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

In Conclusion, Ccchhrrriiss, I have no choice but to REJECT your position as flawed on this matter, the same as the Protestant Church of the Reformation REJECTED IT in 1881. They REJECTED the "Revision Committee" and the work of Westcott & Hort, and therefore so do I! Since you support Westcott & Hort and their "revision" in regards to the changes in Doctrine found in the "revision" and all "newer versions", I also have to reject your position on this matter as well.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Source material, other than the "history" link to the 1881 New York times that proves the Protestant Church of 1881 REJECTED the Work of Westcott & Hort:

“The Revision Revised- A Refutation of Westcott and Hort’s False Greek Text and Theory- A Defense of the Authorized Version” by Dean John William Burgon. 1st Printing 1883, 2nd Printing 2000, 549 pages plus 26 page Appendix

“Which Version is the Bible” by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, 1998 Edition (16th Edition) 173 pages.

Sincerely,

Walter

Krispy posted this earlier, and I will close with that again here:

To answer your question, here is a quote from David Cloud concerning this issue:

John Burgon’s research into the text of the scripture through church history has, in some ways, never been equaled. This is particularly true of his research into the quotations from the scriptures of the church leaders of antiquity.

To discover what Scripture text the ancient church leaders were using, Burgon laboriously dug out 86,489 quotations from ancient Christian writings and compiled these into sixteen thick manuscript volumes, which are located today in the British Museum. More than 4,000 of the quotations are from writers who lived before 400 A.D. By this peerless research, Burgon was convinced that the Received Text underlying the Reformation Bibles is the very text which has been used by God’s people through the centuries and is thus the preserved Word of God. He concluded: “Call this text Erasmian or Complutensian, the text of Stephens, or of Beza, or of the Elzevirs, call it the Received or the TRADITIONAL, OR BY WHATEVER NAME YOU PLEASE---THE FACT REMAINS THAT A TEXT HAS COME DOWN TO US WHICH IS ATTESTED BY A GENERAL CONSENSUS OF ANCIENT COPIES, ANCIENT FATHERS, AND ANCIENT VERSIONS”(Burgon, The Revision Revised, 1881).

This testimony of Burgon is not to be taken lightly. He knew as much about the Bible of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th centuries as any man who has lived in the last 200 years. When he says that the Received Text is attested by Greek manuscripts, quotations from ancient church leaders, and ancient Bible versions, he was in a position to know what he was talking about.

The vast majority of Greek manuscripts, ancient versions, and the writings of church “fathers” support the Received Text. This was a fact known by the Reformation editors. Whereas the textual critics of our day see this as a mere accident of history, the Bible-believing Reformation editors of old saw the hand of God in it. So do we!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/30 2:54

Hi walter...

Please refer to my previous post. Thanks! The Lord bless you and keep you -- and may His face shine upon you and give you peace.

Re: Which Version, on: 2008/10/30 23:22

Ccchhhrrriiisss posted previously:

2. I have enjoyed brother Ron Bailey's perspective in regards to the sources, methods and end product of the Word. Your argument, however, reeks of mere contempt rather than a legitimate search for truth in the matter. Ultimately, I find that it is difficult to reason with someone who just seems to know it all. So why should I try?

My Response:

Why wouldn't you enjoy Ron Bailey's response? He is in lock step with your own position, and in total agreement with you. Both of you are in total disagreement with the Protestant Church of the reformation of 1881. Ron supports the new versions, the same as you do. In fact, as I look back at the prior battles about "Which Version" on Sermonindex, he is right there along side of you, almost everytime, agreeing with you and you agreeing with him, and both of you disagreeing that the Textus Receptus is the Preserved Word of God, and placing the inferior Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus equal to the preserved text, the Textus Receptus

You are absolutely correct, my posts reek of contempt for both of your positions on this matter, because both of your positions are the same and are in opposition to the Protestant Church of the Reformation of 1881!

God has promised to preserve His Word. He has not told us that we would need "textual critics" to read corrupted manuscripts, and then use their own human intellect to cut and paste newer "versions" of His Word.

WHAT DOES GOD HIMSELF PROMISE CONCERNING THE SCRIPTURES?

God has promised us to both give and protect His Word. These are just a small example of God's promise to us:

"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 Word 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)

Thus, on the basis of God's many promises we have in our hands the absolutely infallible inerrant Living Word of Almighty God Â– that 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 shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever." (Psa.12:6, 7)

This is a promise from God! ccchhhrrriiss, do you believe it? He says He will preserve it. He did not just promise to give the originals pure and free from error Â– 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 Â– 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 Â– even to the smallest detail Â– 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 Â– 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.

I have Scripturally demonstrated that 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 Â– it must remain accessible to the disciples of the Lord, Christ Jesus!

Ccchhhrrriiss, God has promised us that He would PRESERVE HIS WORD, while you and Ron believe that God needs fallen mankind to RESTORE his Word from the corrupt Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, that was CREATED by the first "Textual Critics", the Gnostics!.

I reject your position as well as Ron's position on this issue, just as the Protestant Church of the Reformation of 1881 rejected the work of Westcott & Hort and the Revision committee as a fraud. The men of the Revision Committee created the "first" newer version in 1881 that is used by all Bible scholars today as the basis for creating newer versions.

God is all powerful and can do anything, the very least of which is the preservation of His Word.

Sincerely,

Walter

P.S.

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?_r3&res9D0CEEDA153BE033A25757C1A9649C94609FD7CF&orefslgin&orefslgin&orefslgin) Letters to the Editor

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/31 0:23

*Sigh

Brother WalternÂ...

No offense, but you sound like a broken record. That wouldn't be such a problem if it was that you were preaching the Gospel to the lost. Rather, you are preaching your view that the Textus Receptus and/or the KJV are/is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God.

Brother, I do believe that God can preserve His Word. I simply don't think that the KJV is it. It contains MISTAKES, br other. Some of those mistakes are actually in the sources from which it was taken. I've pointed to some of these error s in the past.

So how does God preserve His Word? The Word of God says that Heaven and Earth will pass away, but the Word of G od will stand forever. You cannot destroy the Word of God - yet the many manuscripts originally written by Moses, Da vid, Paul, Peter, John, Isaiah, etc... have vanished. Yet the Word remains. If every manuscript were destroyed - the Word of God would still be preserved. Why? Because the Word of God is not confined to the translation efforts of publi cations of flawed men.

When I was a child, I remember reading a story in my classroom textbook about the "Hanoi Hilton" (the same place th at Senator John McCain was confined and tortured for over 5 years). The story was about how the captive POWs were tortured, beaten and treated inhumanely during their confinement. They were mostly isolated during that time. Yet they found ways to communicate. They would knock on the metal walls via Morse Code. They eventually transcribed as mu ch of the Word of God that they could coming solely from the memories of the POWs. They hid it from their guards. Aft er the war, one of the soldiers carried it with him. While some of the grammar and phrases were off, they were surprised to learn that they had a large portion of the New Testament written - all from memory. This "Word of God" was not contained in the leather or paper bindings of a book. Rather, it was written on the tablets of the minds and hearts of thos e soldiers, sustaining them for years.

God's Word cannot pass away. Why? Because Jesus IS the Word of God! His Word is not confined to the translation efforts and "best guesses" and "suppositions" of educated and scholarly translators. Guess what? Jesus didn't even speak English (let alone 17th Century English). Yet we are blessed to have 66 books translated into our language from various sources. Sure, some of those sources do not agree with one another in every passage. Yet we are blesse d to have these handed down through the ages! Persecution, burning, and tribulation did not stop them. Even a corrupt Roman Church that produced a text that was required in the majority of the world could not stop the truth.

Brother Walter, I am tired of going around this desert mountain. I would just encourage you to keep reading the Word. I would also encourage you to pray before you spread slander or libel about versions that don't suit your beliefs (lest you find yourself spreading slander or libel against the Word Himself). It almost seems like you are on a crusade - armed with knowledge that has been passed to you second handedly by well-meaning men with very strong convictions. Have

you really researched this on your own? Have you consulted those translators of what you consider "corrupt" version in order to ascertain just WHY they did what they did? Have you dug up ancient documents to support your conclusions? Have you visited archives to read the writings of Erasmus? Yet you seem so convinced that you cannot be wrong in ANYTHING that you write! Do you truly think that your mission is to save the souls that you don't think could possibly be saved after reading a version like the NIV?

Brother, we need to move on. You are certainly entitled to your opinion – no matter how flawed I feel it may be. Yet, ironically, I haven't arrived to an ultimate conclusion about the matter. I don't know the certainty as to which text sources are, without exception, perfect. I haven't heard an argument strong enough that would cause me to doubt the validity of the sources or methods used for versions like the NIV. Yet you have. Strangely, we have read and heard many of the same arguments, and yet I am still not convinced! Perhaps I just feel that I should not arrive to such a concrete conclusion – especially to publicly proclaim it and deride all others – unless the evidence is without a sliver of doubt.

Like I have said, I prefer to read the KJV as a good and old scholarly translation taken from a particular set of sources and the NIV as a good and newer scholarly translation taken from a different set of sources. I haven't seen anything that makes me think otherwise, yet I have studied this with great honesty and effort. I've even read your posts, and cannot cast my lot with your perception (or the conclusion of those from whom you have drawn your argument and criticisms). However, if I ever find some evidence that is so concrete – so indisputable – that would cause me to embrace such a notion with finality, I will let you know. Until then, I just feel uncomfortable with your insistence regarding any sort of final judgment on something that cannot be made on this side of having all of the facts (unless, of course, you have some sort of ancient manuscripts by which to compare Erasmus' translation efforts with).

Brother, let's just move on and agree that it isn't wise to proclaim a final verdict with such a limited amount of evidence. It would be a tragedy to find that we were actually bearing false witness against an admirable version of the Word of God.

*P.S. - If I were you, I would speak with Brother Ron Bailey before you go about saying what he thinks in this matter. You might want to read his words all over again. I have a feeling that you misinterpreted or misunderstood what he has written.

Re:, on: 2008/10/31 0:38

Well ccchhhrrriiisss, here we are again. You always post that you have studied this issue yourself, and come to the conclusion that the word of God found in the King James is the same as the Word of God found in the NIV, just "a different source".

ccchhhrrriiisss posted:

Like I have said, I prefer to read the KJV as a good and old scholarly translation taken from a particular set of sources and the NIV as a good and newer scholarly translation taken from a different set of sources. I haven't seen anything that makes me think otherwise, yet I have studied this with great honesty and effort. I've even read your posts, and cannot cast my lot with your perception (or the conclusion of those from whom you have drawn your argument and criticisms). However, if I ever find some evidence that is so concrete – so indisputable – that would cause me to embrace such a notion with finality, I will let you know. Until then, I just feel uncomfortable with your insistence regarding any sort of final judgment on something that cannot be made on this side of having all of the facts (unless, of course, you have some sort of ancient manuscripts by which to compare Erasmus' translation efforts with).

Walter continues:

Please reveal to us what books and reference material you have studied to come to your conclusions above? I have listed some of mine, but you never listed any of yours. What on earth can you have read & studied to lead you to the conclusion that the Protestant Church ever accepted the newer versions of the Bible? The version they rejected was the 1881 Revision of the New Testament by Westcott and Hort. Since all of the newer versions created today rely on the 1881 text to create all these "new" "translations" (ASB, NIV, The Message, etc. etc. etc), they also reject all the new ones as well!

Also, please post to us what Bible Scripture supports your position that God will NOT PRESERVE His Word.

You thoughtful and concise response would be appreciated.

Sincerley,

Walter

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?_r3&res9D0CEEDA153BE033A25757C1A9649C94609FD7CF&orefslgin&orefslgin&orefslgin) Letters to the Editor

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/31 4:26

Walter...

Quote:

-----Well ccchhhrrriiisss, here we are again. You always post that you have studied this issue yourself, and come to the conclusion that the word of God found in the King James is the same as the Word of God found in the NIV, just "a different source".

Yes, here we are again...and again...and again. Haven't we seen this patch of sand before? I didn't say that they were the same...word for word. I said that they are different because they are derived from different sources.

Quote:

-----Please reveal to us what books and reference material you have studied to come to your conclusions above? I have listed some of mine, but you never listed any of yours. What on earth can you have read & studied to lead you to the conclusion that the Protestant Church ever accepted the newer versions of the Bible? The version they rejected was the 1881 Revision of the New Testament by Westcott and Hort. Since all of the newer versions created today rely on the 1881 text to create all these "new" "translations" (ASB, NIV, The Message, etc. etc. etc), they also reject all the new ones as well!

Brother, I have done this enough over the past five years with you and a guy who sounded remarkably a lot like you. I don't want to have to include all of the sources for my own inquiry.

However, I did consult the translators of several versions (including the NIV). I found a list of individuals who are generally regarded as "experts" in the field of manuscripts and translation...and corresponded via email and snail mail. I viewed scanned pages from a major Archives of a first edition of the KJV. I viewed books -- from all sides of the debate -- including those very opinionated yet unacademic attacks on all non-KJV bibles.

Since I worked in a University Archives, I was able to read several biographies about Erasmus...and some of his own rare writings as well (including *The Praise of Folly*, *Handbook of a Christian Soldier*, and *Education of a Christian Prince*) which demonstrated the extent of his doctrinal views. These are also available (http://www.erasmus.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=show&CTX_ID2DDCF433F1F6C16942AA739E59DAFB8E) here for all to view. I read a translation of his work *Explanation of the Apostles Creed* in which Erasmus perpetuated a belief in "divine revelation" apart from the Bible (usually through "inspired" Roman Catholic traditions) and called anyone who objected to worship of the Virgin Mary to be blasphemers and heretics (to which, in the foreword of the translation, we find that Martin Luther responded to the work by calling Erasmus a liar and "the voice of Satan").

In addition, I contacted individuals within the Oxford University Press regarding a few questions about the KJV. I obtained a list of changes from the original 1611...viewed them in digitized images...and then compared them with today's regular KJV. I also viewed a list of "mistakes" in the KJV -- from obvious number problems to the inclusion of the pagan word "Easter" in place of "Passover."

I have read the preface to the KJV by the translators. I also read several books regarding the efforts to complete the KJV...and the predetermined "rules" implemented by King James and the official state Church hierarchy. I read biographies of (and writings from) some of the translators themselves -- including those who held to "high church" traditions (including pagan traditions regarding the Eucharist and adoration). I even read criticisms of the KJV by contemporary 17th Century scholars and Church leaders who complained that the "modern version" (the KJV) was no better than the Bishop's Bible (from which some translation was borrowed).

I read the criticisms of Westcott and Hort, and endeavored to ascertain the validity of the criticisms. I even read the cons

piracy theories from anti-NIV activists and wrote the translators and workers themselves in an attempt to find the truth (including email correspondence with the infamous woman who later became a lesbian but was consulted by the committee while she was married).

I have read other earlier versions taken from similar sources than the KJV (such as one in Spanish). I even noted the differences in rendering from the Greek into Spanish, etc...

This list could go on and on because my interest in it has gone on and on. In fact, I even considered the issue as a possible topic when I wrote my graduate thesis (since I had already performed quite a bit of research); however, the idea was rejected at the university I attended and was forced to research another topic. I later considered the topic for my PhD dissertation, but realized that I would probably be hard pressed to find how it was related to my PhD coursework.

Quote:

-----Also, please post to us what Bible Scripture supports your position that God will NOT PRESERVE His Word.

This is simply untrue, brother. I said that I believe that God does preserve His Word -- but that the KJV, Erasmus' *Textus Receptus* (or any other version) is not exclusively it. Could I say this any clearer?

As for your attached "Letter to the Editor," all I can ask is "So what?" It is just a letter from a very opinionated person. He/She sounds almost as angry as many people in 1611 were with the KJV! I wonder: Do you have a link to the actual article for which this unsigned letter writer is responding?

Yet brother, please know that I don't want to engage in an endless debate with you for which there seems to be no end. All I can do is encourage you to perform REAL research (and not just reading a few biased or opinionated books and articles). You can do everything that I did. In fact, you may even arrive at a different opinion than I did! My opinion, after all of my research, is simply that I haven't seen anything that would cause me to simply reject or dismiss either version (or sets of sources). I also would hesitate to spread slander about any version of which I am not entirely sure of its authenticity. I would hate to find myself ridiculing a work that might have been at least partially (within its 66 books, or in the case of the original KJV, 77 books) have been ordained by God.

I prefer to opt out of this discussion now. I might jump in again, but only if I feel the need. I just don't like what I see to be an attack on other versions offered as a defense of a version like the KJV. I love you, brother, but I wholeheartedly disagree with your methods and responses.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/10/31 9:04

Quote:

-----Walter's: Ron supports the new versions, the same as you do. In fact, as I look back at the prior battles about "Which Versions" on Sermonindex, he is right there along side of you, almost everytime, agreeing with you and you agreeing with him, and both of you disagreeing that the *Textus Receptus* is the Preserved Word of God, and placing the inferior *Codex Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus* equal to the preserved text, the *Textus Receptus*

This is not at all my understanding of Ron Bailey's position. I would recommend looking at Ron's

(<http://biblebasesesecondthoughts.blogspot.com/>) *CODEX Sinaiticus* Parts 1-3.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/10/31 9:50

Quote:

-----This is not at all my understanding of Ron Bailey's position.

Nor is it mine. It would behoove you to check out the link Robert provided. You are welcome to be KJV-Only and participate here, but when the KJV-O propaganda is perpetuated post after post, cut-and-pasted from other sources, and robotically thrust before our eyes in obnoxious fonts and colors, please understand that you are not going to have many sympathizers on SI.

We've been through this time and time again. Like music, this Bible version war is a huge and unnecessary divider for God's children. If the Lord is ready to move a person or convert him/her to a specific Bible version He will do so without all your cut-and-pasting and bold-font rhetoric. The truth is that when the Lord matures a person, He divorces him or her from the KJVO fallacy and, in fact, opens their eyes from this particular stance.

I am a KJV reader because I love the majesty of prose, the absolute beauty and glory the writers infused into this translation and how, above all other translations it seems (for me, at least) to exude the fragrance of Christ's deity. But as far as being the perfect Word of God, I believe this concept is absurd to apply to any specific interpretation; be it KJV, NASB, the Geneva, etc. You are free to disagree, but you are not free to turn this into an agenda and go bonkers with the fonts and colors and cut-and-pasting (especially without citing the source) and turning this into a KJV-O proselytizing camp.

Walter, please take these matters to heart, before further intervention becomes necessary.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by paulamicela (), on: 2008/10/31 10:06

Thank you very much, PaulWest!

-Paul

Re: Which Version, on: 2008/10/31 11:54

From Walter to: Paul West, RobertW, Paulamicela, &, ccchhhrrriiss

I will just have to agree to disagree with all of those against the King James Version, the Textus Receptus, as not agreeing that it is the very word of God, **preserved by God as He promised us He would throughout the Bible.**

What I have found, in my studies, is a historical link that proves, beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Protestant Church of the Reformation in 1881 rejected the Work of Westcott and Hort the same month that it was published. Does that mean anything to anyone here? I think it does matter to those that take the time to think it through. The "revision of the New Testament" was never welcomed into the Protestant body of Christ in the 19th century. You should read the criticism of it in the attached link to the 1881 New York Times! It started to get some interest in the early 1900's (20th Century). By the 1970's with Billy Grahams support of the "Living Bible" it started getting greater and greater support. Today, it is unquestioned.

The apostasy that surrounds us today is prophesized in the Bible. It was actually already taking place in Paul's time, where men were changing Doctrine, were changing the very Word of God.

God is sovereign, and can do anything to draw the lost to Himself. He can draw men to Himself by their reading corrupt Bibles that are not his preserved Word, but only parts of his preserved words, as found in the NIV and other newer versions. God meets people in their dreams, to reveal himself to them and to bring them to salvation. God sends his Angels to witness to the lost. God uses circumstances to draw the lost to Himself. He sends believers (us) out to witness to the lost, each day as we go to work or play. God can really do anything because He is God.

However, in my lifetime I have personally seen many men and women who read and study their Bibles that do not trust it to be the very Word of God ANYMORE. The footnotes in their newer versions bring doubt to their minds if they are reading the real thing (ie "not found in the oldest manuscripts, etc). To the liberal Christian, this is a good thing. Liberals always need "wiggle room". However, God's Word gives none of us wiggle room. God's Word is God's law.

This is what the Protestant Church of the Reformation, in the year 1881, had to say about the issue of the newer versions. They rejected the first revision by Westcott & Hort as not being the Word of God found in the King James Bible. Since they rejected that work, they also reject all of the newer versions that have relied on this same text. It wasn't a "nice" rejection of the Westcott and Hort Revision of the New Testament- it was an outright rejection, referring to it as a copy (plagiarism) of the 1808 Belshams Unitarian New Testament. In 1881 they were very direct when anyone changed God's preserved Word, the Textus Receptus, the King James Bible. However, today, we have to be nice and not offend anyone, lest we hurt anyone's feelings, no matter what they have done to it. So be it.

This again is the link to what the Protestant Church of the Reformation had to say about all of the newer versions, and it reflects my opinion as well. We all have free will, and we can all do as we well please in regards to this issue. As for me, I would rather read God's Preserved Word, the King James Bible:

(http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?_r3&res9D0CEEDA153BE033A25757C1A9649C94609FD7CF&orefslgin&orefslgin&orefslgin) Letters to the Editor

(Moderator correction; Long URL's make the page and subsequent following pages "wide". Please use the "URL" box in replies and covert to smaller headings/titles.)

This is the Unitarian Bible of 1808 that the Revised Version was a copy of :

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

There is a Unitarian Church not to far from my home. As I pass it each day, I notice the big sign out front supporting GAY Marriage. These are some of the beliefs of the Unitarian Church:

Unitarianism as a theology is the belief in the single personality of God, in contrast to the doctrine of the Trinity (three persons in one God). It is the philosophy upon which the modern Unitarian movement was based, and, according to its proponents, is the original form of Christianity. Unitarian Christians believe in the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, as found in the New Testament and other early Christian writings, and hold him up as an exemplar. Adhering to strict monotheism, they maintain that Jesus was a great man and a prophet of God, perhaps even a supernatural being, but not God himself. Unitarians believe in the moral authority, but not necessarily the divinity, of Jesus. Their theology is thus distinguishable from the theology of Catholic, Orthodox, mainline Protestant, and other Christian denominations which hold the Trinity doctrine as a core belief.

Some Christians hold a unitarian theology in that they see God as a single person, and are thus antitrinitarian, but because they perceive Jesus to be God himself do not fall into the general theology discussed here, which sees Jesus as subordinate to God and a finite being. Instead see: Sabellianism, Oneness theology, Oneness Pentecostalism, Monarchianism, Binitarianism.

The term "Unitarian" (with an upper case "U") usually refers to the liberal branch of this theology, but the term "unitarian" (lower case "u") is sometimes used descriptively to refer to anyone adhering to the teaching of the single personhood of God.

Liberal Unitarians sum up their faith as "the religion of Jesus, not a religion about Jesus." Historically, they have encouraged unorthodox views of God, Jesus, the world and purpose of life as revealed through reason, scholarship, science, philosophy, scripture and other prophets and religions. They believe that reason and belief are complementary and that religion and science can co-exist and guide them in their understanding of nature and God. They also do not enforce belief in creeds or dogmatic formulas. Although there is flexibility in the nuances of belief or basic truths for the individual Unitarian Christian, general principles of faith have been recognized as a way to bind the group in some commonality. Adherents generally accept religious pluralism and find value in all teachings, but remain committed to their core belief in Christ's teachings. Liberal Unitarians value a secular society in which government stays out of religious affairs.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

What has happened to the Unitarians has now happened to much of the body of Christ, who reject Sound Doctrine, as the Unitarians have done since at least 1808, and have relied on the minority text, the text also used by the revision committee, that is used in all the newer versions. Can I do anything to stop this? No, not really because God, who knows the end from the beginning prophesized of this very event in the end times. It is my purpose to only guide some to the true Word of God, the King James Bible. God has promised us throughout his Word that he will PRESERVE HIS WORD,(The Bible)and therefore His Word does not need to be RESTORED by "textual critics".

"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. 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". Hebrews 4:12-13

Sincerely,

Walter

Re:Philogos, on: 2008/11/1 0:52

To RobertW:

I applaud Ron for his post about the corrupt Sinaiticus text. However, this was only posted this month on his website, on October 15th, 2008 and surely does not represent his position held in the past. Also his current position does not agree with ccchhhrrriiiss, like it did in the past. By looking at past battles about the King James Bible, Ron Bailey (Philogos) always sided with the newer versions and took part in ending (silencing) the thread, side by side with ccchhhrrriiiss and others.

Again, I applaud Ron for his change of position on this very important issue.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

RobertW wrote:

Quote:
-----~~Walter~~n's: Ron supports the new versions, the same as you do. In fact, as I look back at the prior battles about "Which Versions" on Sermonindex, he is right there along side of you, almost everytime, agreeing with you and you agreeing with him, and both of you disagreeing that the Textus Receptus is the Preserved Word of God, and placing the inferior Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus equal to the preserved text, the Textus Receptus

This is not at all my understanding of Ron Bailey's position. I would recommend looking at Ron's

(<http://biblebasesecondthoughts.blogspot.com/>) CODEX Sinaiticus Parts 1-3.

Re: - posted by MikeH, on: 2008/11/1 9:25

Walter wrote

Quote: -----The Christian Church of the Protestant Reformation agrees 100% with your #1 position above. It totally accepts the King James Bible as the Received Text, received from the true Church, the very WORD of GOD.

Who are the "Christian Church of the Protestant Reformation"? If you are thinking of the original reformers, they would respect the Luther translation in German of 1534 or his final edited version produced in 1545. They might alternatively respect the ZÃ¼rich bible of 1531 by Zwingli in Swiss-German. But none of the original reformers would have had access to the AV since it was produced several decades after most of their deaths and in a language that many of them did not speak.

If it is not these people, then what is this group you are referring to?

Mike

PS You didn't address my earlier question that at least 73% of the world are incapable of reading the AV.

PPS Since there are about 7,000 different languages in the world of which only about 400, even today, have complete bibles, do you have a list of translations that the CCotPR approve for even 100 of these languages for those who cannot r

lead the AV?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/11/1 11:19

Hi Waltern,

Quote:

-----Waltern's; Again, I applaud Ron for his change of position on this very important issue.

You seem to have misinterpreted Ron Bailey's beliefs concerning the KJV. He is very much an AV (KJV) advocate and always has been. But he has consistently pointed out that the KJV is not a perfect translation. It is particularly bent toward a hierarchy form of Church government, which the Geneva Bible is not.

Unlike most KJV advocates I have come across, Ron is not *KJV only*. In fact, he is a very learned man that is capable of understanding and debating issues concerning the various manuscripts because he can read Greek. So he has a powerful grasp of the issues. So he can see when the KJV shifts away from the actual translation of the text.

Ron, as myself, believe the Majority Text form is the best. This is not the same as the Textus Receptus, but there is a link. What I reject is the newer critical text approach to discovering the actual original complete New Testament. Again, though very pro-KJV I am also not "KJV only" and though I share with you in my belief that God has protected His word, I do not feel it necessary to take a TR and KJV only position.

The challenge is how to be pro-KJV and then have to turn and defend against radical KJV only proponents. This is why you perceive that Ron was not KJV. It is because of the unfortunate position he has been often put in to deal with these radical ideas.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2008/11/1 13:22

Hi RobertW...

Quote:

-----You seem to have misinterpreted Ron Bailey's beliefs concerning the KJV. He is very much an AV (KJV) advocate and always has been. But he has consistently pointed out that the KJV is not a perfect translation. It is particularly bent towards a hierarchy form of Church government, which the Geneva Bible is not.

Unlike most KJV advocates I have come across, Ron is not KJV only. In fact, he is a very learned man that is capable of understanding and debating issues concerning the various manuscripts because he can read Greek. So he has a powerful grasp of the issues. So he can see when the KJV shifts away from the actual translation of the text.

Exactly. I really don't know what Brother Waltern has read from Brother Ron. From what I understand, Brother Ron is quite the advocate of the KJV and the majority text -- just not *KJV-only*. Although I don't agree with all of Brother Ron's conclusions, I think that he gives a very persuasive and articulate argument.

I think that this is why my perspective is so different. I just haven't seen anything that would cause me to reach an ultimate conclusion of the matter -- and I have performed extensive research (far more than the "common" man). I certainly strive to understand all sides in this issue. Yet I still cannot throw my lot to any side -- since there just seems to be so many unknowns in regard to the underlying question(s).

Ironically, Brother Walter speaks so highly of the Protestant Reformation. Yet the founder of the Reformation (Martin Luther) strongly opposed Erasmus (...even calling him "*the mouth of Satan*"). Why? This was due to Erasmus' stubborn beliefs that anyone who didn't believe in the "divine inspiration" of official extra-Biblical Church tradition or in the adoration and prayers to the saints and Virgin Mary was a "blasphemer!" Yet this same man (Erasmus) is almost adored by those who are willing to overlook his past for the sake of his work with the Greek New Testament. It is all a bit strange to me.

Anyway, I should simply refer back to my previous post regarding the extent of the research that I performed in this matter. Through all of this research, I just didn't find anything that caused me to ultimately conclude that one source was undeniably (and without question) superior to the other -- or just how superior one would be in the first place! So I view the KJV as a good and faithful scholarly version taken from its source and the NIV as a good and faithful academic version taken from its sources. To conclude otherwise, for me, would be less than honest.

Re:, on: 2008/11/1 13:30

Dear Mike:

I previously sent this email to you. The answer was also addressed in my post. Maybe you did not see my email?

In response to your post about the billions of mankind and the KJV, the answer is that God can use anything to save mankind. That could be a corrupt newer version Bible, like the NIV, He can send His angels, He can appear to them personally in their dreams and witness to them, He can send me or you or anyone out as a missionary. Transworld radio and others are having excellent results by broadcasting God's Word throughout the World right now, with a tremendous response from Arabic Countries. God can use anything to save the Lost.

However, if we are living in America, and have access to the Textus Receptus, the preserved Word of God, why wouldn't we want to read and study that ourselves, instead of a new, corrupt version of the Bible? My post is directed at people in America who are not using the King James Bible.

As far as the fact that the remaining people groups do not have access to the Authorized Version (AV), that is only because the various Bible Societies are too busy printing corrupt NIV's and other newer versions in foreign languages. What we need today are committed Christians who know the truth and would be willing to take on the task of translating the AV into the "languages of the people groups of the world". It would also be most critical that whoever took on this task did not copyright their work. Their reward would NOT be a monetary reward, like all of the other "Christians" who supposedly take on this task and make millions of dollars in the process-it increases the price of the Bibles because whoever copyrighted them gets a royalty (\$\$\$\$) every time one is printed. As true Christians, our reward is waiting for us in heaven!

Bibles should be printed at a cost of \$1 to \$2 each in order to send them out. But since they are copyrighted, they cost \$10-\$20 each. That is where the travesty is today, it is all about money, filthy lucre. God is not happy with this and those that are responsible for this will have to answer to HIM, very soon.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

MikeH wrote:

Walter wrote

Quote:

-----The Christian Church of the Protestant Reformation agrees 100% with your #1 position above. It totally accepts the King James Bible as the Received Text, received from the true Church, the very WORD of GOD.

Who are the "Christian Church of the Protestant Reformation"? If you are thinking of the original reformers, they would respect the Luther translation in German of 1534 or his final edited version produced in 1545. They might alternatively respect the Zwingli bible of 1531 in Swiss-German. But none of the original reformers would have had access to the AV since it was produced several decades after most of their deaths and in a language that many of them did not speak.

If it is not these people, then what is this group you are referring to?

Mike

PS You didn't address my earlier question that at least 73% of the world are incapable of reading the AV.

PPS Since there are about 7,000 different languages in the world of which only about 400, even today, have complete bibles, do you have a list of translations that the CCotPR approve for even 100 of these languages for those who cannot read the AV?

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/11/1 13:56

Quote:
-----I will just have to agree to disagree with all of those against the King James Version, the Textus Receptus, as not agreeing that it is the very word of God, preserved by God as He promised us He would throughout the Bible.

Walter,

Have you been actually reading the posts by the others? None of us are against the KJV or TR, but we're also not against some of the new versions. It's really kind of scary to see people this hyped enough over this to call others (brothers and sisters in Christ, no less) gnostics, etc.

Re: - posted by MikeH, on: 2008/11/1 18:17

Walter wrote

Quote:
-----I previously sent this email to you. The answer was also addressed in my post. Maybe you did not see my email?

No, don't check PMs very often and had missed that. I apologise, and thank you for making your answer public. Is it fair to summarise your published response by saying that God is saving people throughout the world without the AV (I'm a Brit and like to think we should refer to the KJV by the accepted moniker in the UK which is AV ;-)), but you would like Americans to read the KJV. Oh, and what about other English speaking parts of the world? In my PM to you, I mentioned that there is a significant part of the USA that now only speaks Spanish, so again I assume you are only addressing the English speaking part of America.

It would be helpful if you would attempt to answer my other questions.

- 1) Who are the CCotPR?
- 2) If you mean the original reformers, how could they read the AV as it wasn't written?
- 3) Are there any other language translations that the CCotPR approves such as Luther and Zurich and any others?

I fully agree with you on the cost of bibles and the issue of filthy lucre. But I also think you are being a little harsh on the American publishers. I found, on box or pallet quantities, KJV, NIV, NKJV, NLT, and CEV at between \$2 to \$4 each from the likes of IBS and ABS.

Since you are concerned about the issue of translating the AV into other languages, is the CCotPR currently funding such translations and if so into which languages? Has it done any in the past?

With kind regards

Mike

Re:, on: 2008/11/2 2:27

To: Homefree89

Your question to me was:

"Walter, have you been actually reading the posts by the others? None of us are against the KJV or TR, but we're also not against some of the new versions. It's really kind of scary to see people this hyped enough over this to call others (brothers and sisters in Christ, no less) gnostics, etc.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

My response to Homefree89:

Yes, I have actually been reading everyone's posts, but we disagree. **There is only one Word of God, not two. We only have one Word of God that has been preserved for us through the true Church since the beginning. Just like the true Church at the beginning, when Paul confronted the false doctrine of his day, just like the true Church of 1881 that rejected as fraudulent the work of the "revision committee" and their "new testament", we must be prepared to do the same thing and reject all of the newer versions that have spawned from the 1881 revision—all of the newer versions qualify for rejection.**

Following are some highlights to one chapter of a thorough study of this issue. I will post the entire chapter at another time.

THE ORIGINAL TEXT PRESERVED HISTORICALLY THROUGH THE TRUE CHURCH

Regarding conflation— as Dean Burgon adeptly pointed out— why, if the Traditional Text were created by 4th-century Antiochian editors whose regular practice had been to conflate (combine) Western and Alexandrian readings, could Westcott and Hort after nearly thirty years of searching throughout the Gospels find only eight supposed instances to offer as proof of their thesis? Why could they find only eight verses out of nearly eight thousand? Only a few more have been offered since by their followers.

THE QUOTES FROM THE "FATHERS"

The crucial external evidence that Westcott and Hort offered in support of their theory was that there were no Syrian readings in the Fathers' quotes prior to A.D. 350. They maintained that Chrysostom, who died in 407, was the first father to habitually use the Syrian. However, these statements are simply not consistent with the facts. In the first place, Chrysostom did not just give Syrian quotes. Furthermore, according to Edward Miller's exhaustive compilation of the writings of the church "Fathers", Origen (185? - 254?) gave 460 quotes which agree with the readings of the Traditional Text and 491 quotes siding with the "Neologian" text. In view of this, how then could Hort declare that Origen's quotations "exhibit no clear and tangible traces of the Syrian text"?

Miller's study also revealed that Irenaeus, a second century church Father who according to Hort represented the "Western" text, gave 63 quotes from the Syrian (Traditional Text) text with only 41 from the so-called "Neologian" family. It should be noted that when referring to the "Fathers", this author is not endorsing their doctrines but merely recognizing and emphasizing what they accepted and believed to be Scripture at that early date.

Miller further found that prior to Origen, the Traditional Text was quoted two to one over all others of the Fathers' quotes if we omit Justin Martyr, Heracleon, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. Why should we omit them? They were carried away with Origen's confusion. Yet even if we include them, Miller's study showed that the ratio still favored the Traditional Text 1.33 to 1. Thus it is seen that Hort lied about the quotes from the Fathers and gave no actual statistics.

Miller, posthumous editor to Burgon, made full use of Burgon's patristic citations with regard to the testimony of the ante-Nicene Fathers. His work covered 86,489 extant citations from seventy-six of these Fathers. Of those who died before 400 A.D., the Traditional Text ("twin brother" and virtually identical to the text of the Textus Recptus) wins out 3 to 2 over all the other variant readings.

Moreover, if we consider only the Greek and Latin Fathers (Syriac not included) who died prior to 400, their quotations support the T.T. in 2,630 instances whereas 1,753 support the "Neologian". Thus Miller found that in the Fathers' citations who died between 100 - 400 A.D., a span of 300 years, not only was the T.T. in existence from the first— it was predominant!

Hort's statement that none of the church Fathers before 350 quoted the T.T. is simply not true. As mentioned, even Origen occasionally cited and adopted purely Syrian readings. For example, Dr. E.F. Hills states that in John 1-14 which is covered by Papyri 66 and 75, fifty-two times the Syrian reading stands alone as to the text and Origen agreed with twenty of them. This may be quickly verified by merely scanning Tischendorf's critical apparatus.

Thus, the oft stated assertion of the critics that Origen knew nothing of the Byzantine text is simply untenable. On the contrary, these statistics demonstrate that Origen was not only familiar with the Byzantine text, he frequently adopted its readings in preference to those of the "Western" and "Alexandrian" texts. Hills goes on to report that seven of these same twenty occur in Papyri 66 and/or 75 (circa 200 A.D.).

Although Hort accused the Traditional Text as having late readings, hence it must be a "late text", his own research revealed otherwise. In his "Notes on Select Readings" which appears as an appendix in his Introduction, Hort discussed about 240 instances of variation among the manuscripts of the Gospels. In only about twenty of these was he willing to characterize the Byzantine reading as "late". Thus, by Hort's own admission, only around ten per cent of the Byzantine readings were supposedly late. Scholars today offer even less.

PAPYRI (c.200 A.D.) SUPPORTS THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS

The papyri (around 200 A.D.), which dates 150 years before Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, support the Textus Receptus readings. This may come as somewhat of a shock to those familiar with the problem of textual criticism, as most have been informed that the early papyri are listed as Alexandrian or Western. True, nevertheless the Chester Beatty and Bodmer Papyri, even though placed in those families, have many renderings which are strictly Syrian – strictly Textus Receptus.

After a thorough study of P46, Gunther Zuntz concluded: "A number of Byzantine readings, most of them genuine, which previously were discarded as 'late', are anticipated by P46". Having several years earlier already acknowledged that with regard to the Byzantine New Testament "Most of its readings existed in the second century", Colwell noted Zuntz's remark and concurred. Many of these readings had been considered to be "late readings", but the papyri testify that they date back at least to the second century!

In his recent book, the late (d.1989) Harry A. Sturz surveyed "all the available papyri" to determine how many papyrus-supported "Byzantine" readings were extant. In deciding which readings were "distinctively Byzantine", Dr. Sturz states that he made a conscious effort to "err on the conservative side" and thus his list is shorter than it could have been. Sturz lists 150 Byzantine readings which, though not supported by the early Alexandrian and Western uncials, are present in the bulk of later manuscripts and by the early papyri. Sturz lists a further 170 additional Byzantine readings which also read differently from the A-B text but are supported by Western manuscripts. These are also supported in the ancient papyri. This support may seem minimal, but nothing can diminish the fact that the total number of papyri citations favor the so-called "late" Byzantine readings against their rivals in the two lists by two to one. Sturz demonstrates papyri support for a total of 839 readings which in varying degrees would be classified as Byzantine.

This forever dismantles Hort's theory that the Byzantine text was created as an official compromise text during the 4th-century by combining readings from earlier text-types.

Hills declared that the Chester Beatty readings vindicate "distinctive Syrian readings" twenty-six times in the Gospels, eight times in the Book of Acts, and thirty-one times in Paul's Epistles.

Hills goes on to state that Papyrus Bodmer II (Papyri 66) confirms 13% of the so-called "late" Syrian readings (18 out of 138). To properly appreciate this one must consider the fact that only about thirty percent of the New Testament has any papyri support, and much of that thirty percent has only one papyrus. Thus this is seen as a major confirmation to the antiquity of the text of the Traditional Text in direct contradiction to the theory previously outlined in which the Syrian readings were said by Westcott and Hort to be fourth and fifth century. May we not reasonably project that subsequent discoveries of papyri will give similar support to readings now only extant in Byzantine text?

A most telling fact concerning the papyri is that several of them have texts of Revelation (P-47 for example). How does the destructive critic explain the fact that Vaticanus (written c.350) does not include the Book of Revelation whereas the 1611 Authorized Version (written nearly 1260 years later) contains this book? Can one reasonably explain how Erasmus' "late" manuscripts contained an entire book missing in the "pure, neutral Vatican" text? How did Erasmus know that the book of Revelation should be in the canon when the "oldest and best" manuscript did not contain it?

GAIUS, THOUGH LONG DEAD, SPEAKS

Gaius was an orthodox "Father" writing near the end of the 2nd-century (c.175-200 A.D.). Gaius named four heretics who altered text and had disciples copying them. He charged that they could not deny their guilt because the copies in qu

estion were their own handywork and that they were unable to produce the originals from which they had made their copies. As Pickering observed, this would have been a hollow accusation from Gaius if he could not have produced the Originals either! Hence, it follows that the Originals were still available at the end of the second century.

Polycarp (69 - 155 A.D.) was a pupil of John the Apostle. It is very likely that he had originals, at least the ones which John wrote. He also would have had some very near originals of the rest of the New Testament which he would have obtained from his teacher, John. Moreover, Polycarp would have had them at the time of his death in 155 A.D. Thus, around 175 to 200 Gaius must have had access to them also. Since the papyri prove the Syrian readings are at least second century, how could the original Syrian have gained dominance over the other text types (Neutral, Alexandrian, Western) if they had been corrupted when appeal to the autographs could have been made at that date? The whole W-H Theory as well as its modern counterpart is thereby clearly exposed and seen as vacuous and fallacious— "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing".

The only ancient, historical, authoritative revisions were those which occurred when Constantine commissioned Eusebius to produce fifty Bibles for him to place in the hands of the Bishops of the larger Churches in his realm and that of Jerome for Pope Damasus. Thus the recension spoken of by the text critics was not in the days of Lucian but nearly 150 years earlier when Eusebius (and later, Jerome) chose Origen's work from the library at Caesarea as his text for both Testaments.

ERASMUS VINDICATED

We are constantly being told that Vaticanus B and Sinaiticus A are the oldest extant Greek manuscripts, hence the most reliable and best; that they are in fact the Bible. The New Greek text which has replaced the Textus Receptus in the minds of the vast majority of the scholars represents the private enterprise of two men, two very religious albeit unregenerate men, Westcott and Hort. **These men based their work almost completely on Origen's fifth column for their Old Testament and his edited New Testament. Their New Testament readings are almost exclusively derived from only five manuscripts, principally from only one.**

"B" supplies almost ninety percent of the text for all the new Greek versions upon which the new translations are based. In other words, they use one manuscript to the exclusion of nearly all others! Seven percent is from Sinaiticus A, almost three percent from Alexandrinus A, a portion from Uncial D (which is extremely corrupt), and the small remainder from Codex L and a few other manuscripts.

For the most part, this is as close as the destructive critics have thus far come to "recovering" the original text. Hence, the Scriptures are seen as being in somewhat of a state of "evolution" by those who reject the fact of God's having preserved His Word for its constant availability and use by the body of believers as He indicated He would do.

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. (II Tim.3:16-17)

Thus the very same fault for which the critics have derided Erasmus so relentlessly over the years— namely, that he only used five manuscripts— is far more true of their own modern rendition of the Greek New Testament. Remember, their charge is not completely justifiable concerning Erasmus for he studied several hundred Greek manuscripts and prepared notes on the variant readings found therein. And yet Westcott and Hort basically used only five, in fact, almost only one manuscript!

Indeed, for the most part the same may be said for their modern eclectic counterparts.

As Burgon rightly perceived:

"... the whole controversy can be reduced to the narrow issue— does the truth of the text of the Scriptures dwell in the vast multitude of the copies, be they uncials, or cursive— or is it to be supposed that the truth abides exclusively with a small handful of manuscripts which differ from the great bulk of the witnesses and, strangely, also among them-selves?"

From: Which Version is the Bible, Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, 1998 (16th edition)

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

HomeFree89 wrote:

Quote:

-----I will just have to agree to disagree with all of those against the King James Version, the Textus Receptus, as not agreeing that it is the very word of God, preserved by God as He promised us He would throughout the Bible.

Walter,

Have you been actually reading the posts by the others? None of us are against the KJV or TR, but we're also not against some of the new versions. It's really kind of scary to see people this hyped enough over this to call others (brothers and sisters in Christ, no less) gnostics, etc.

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2008/11/2 6:55

Walter,

I don't think you realize what a psycho journey you are on. You are posting reams and reams of paragraphs, and I am not seeing much focus on Christ. In fact, apart from an emphasis on the Textus Receptus, the only thing you keep saying recently is that you disagree, disagree, disagree with the moderators and others on this forum. I think most people around here are looking for Christ and for revival. Continuing to hammer home a point that takes huge amounts of reading is only distracting people from looking hard and long at Jesus. Since I would like to believe you don't really want to be an agent of disunity among Christians, I would appeal to you, appeal in Jesus' name, not to keep posting without approval from the moderators.

Re: KJV for others - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/11/2 9:05

Walter,

Let me repeat this earlier exhortation from Paul West;

Quote:

-----Nor is it mine. It would behoove you to check out the link Robert provided. You are welcome to be KJV-Only and participate here, but when the KJV-O propaganda is perpetuated post after post, cut-and-pasted from other sources, and robotically thrust before our eyes in obnoxious fonts and colors, please understand that you are not going to have many sympathizers on SI.

We've been through this time and time again. Like music, this Bible version war is a huge and unnecessary divider for God's children. If the Lord is ready to move a person or convert him/her to a specific Bible version He will do so without all your cut-and-pasting and bold-font rhetoric. The truth is that when the Lord matures a person, He divorces him or her from the KJVO fallacy and, in fact, opens their eyes from this particular stance.

I am a KJV reader because I love the majesty of prose, the absolute beauty and glory the writers infused into this translation and how, above all other translations it seems (for me, at least) to exude the fragrance of Christ's deity. But as far as being the perfect Word of God, I believe this concept is absurd to apply to any specific interpretation; be it KJV, NASB, the Geneva, etc. You are free to disagree, but you are not free to turn this into an agenda and go bonkers with the fonts and colors and cut-and-pasting (especially without citing the source) and turning this into a KJV-O proselytizing camp.

Walter, please take these matters to heart, before further intervention becomes necessary.

Brother Paul

The word that comes to mind is *restraint*. We have allowed you to post *volumes* on this issue over the course of time and it is no secret your passion and opinion in this whole regard.

To your credit, up until now, had taken notice that there was something other to Waltern after all in response to subjects *other* than the great KJV ... controversy/conspiracy/abuse/neglect - however you wish to couch it. But you are reverting to old tactics and are overlooking the fact that once again you are *dominating* yet another KJV/discussion with that which has already been pointed out. Let others have a chance here, they can think for themselves - a couple of links to your previous opinions would have sufficed.

Restraint brother, it's a fruit of the Spirit.

Edit: Made a correction to your link on one* of the other pages and as a reminder to others;

Edit 2: * Make that numerous.

(Moderator correction; Long URL's make the page and subsequent following pages "wide". Please use the "URL" box in replies and covert to smaller headings/titles.)

Re:, on: 2008/11/2 11:33

Dear Koholeth:

My concern is that the tribulation is at our door. The Church today is praying for Revival, but it cannot be found. It is praying for harvest, but the harvest is nothing compared to the 1500-1800's. We are searching for holiness, but all we have is the flesh. We are searching for brokenness, but all we have is pride.

We have one Bible, that has been preserved by God Himself through the true Church. Just like Paul confronted false doctrine, we are to do the same.

How on earth can we have two "preserved by God" Words of God, two Bibles, with two Gospels that do not agree as a mirror image? "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" Amos 3:3

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Matthew 6:24

The problem with the Church today is the Bible that they hold in their hands, that they study and memorize. The word that goes from their heads to their hearts. We either have the very Word of God, or we have the word of men that have cut and pasted God's Word to their own understanding. The differences between the King James and all of the newer versions has been posted on this website.

Can you see the difference that was posted? Did you look closely and study the tremendous difference between what we are led to believe are the same Gospel by God Almighty, passed down to us from ancient history?

God can use a corrupt Bible to draw the lost to Himself for salvation. However, man needs God's very Word to "work out" their own salvation.

12. Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.

13. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.

Philippians 2:12-13

How can we "study to show ourselves approved unto God" when we are not studying God's Preserved Words, passed down through the Bible Believing Church, since the beginning, but instead we are studying the word of God that has been altered by fallen man, and is disagreement with much of God's preserved Word?

15. Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. 16. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. 17. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; 18. Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurre

ction is past already; and overthrow the faith of some.

19. Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity. 20. But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour, and some to dishonour. (2 Timothy 2:15-20)

That is my take on things. Everything in regards to Revival, Brokenness, Holiness is diminishing within the body of Christ in direct proportion to it's acceptance of the corrupted word, found in all of the newer Bible versions.

The Bible's we leave behind at the Rapture must be the very Preserved Word of God, promised to us by God Himself, throughout His Word. They must be the King James. We won't need to leave a Greek Lexicon, or Hebrew Lexicon, along with a corrupt NIV. We will not have to leave instructions on what we learned in "Bible College" and of what great importance "textual criticism" is and how to do it. **All that is needed is God's very Word.**

Christ told us that we should become as "little children" if we want to get into heaven.

And said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.

Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. (Matthew 18:3-4)

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

Kohleth wrote:

Walter,

I don't think you realize what a psycho journey you are on. You are posting reams and reams of paragraphs, and I am not seeing much focus on Christ. In fact, apart from an emphasis on the Texas Receptus, the only thing you keep saying recently is that you disagree, disagree, disagree with the moderators and others on this forum. I think most people around here are looking for Christ and for revival. Continuing to hammer home a point that takes huge amounts of reading is only distracting people from looking hard and long at Jesus. Since I would like to believe you don't really want to be an agent of disunity among Christians, I would appeal to you, appeal in Jesus' name, not to keep posting without approval from the moderators.

Re: - posted by repentcanada, on: 2008/11/2 12:42

What can anyone say to what walter just wrote?

That is truth, heavy truth.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/11/2 12:51

Quote:

-----My concern is that the tribulation is at our door.

Quote:

-----The Bible's we leave behind at the Rapture must be the very Preserved Word of God, promised to us by God Himself, throughout His Word. They must be the King James. We won't need to leave a Greek Lexicon, or Hebrew Lexicon, along with a corrupt NIV.

Brother, you really should bring it down a notch...or two. Your concern over the tribulation and rapture is that the KJV alone be left behind for the world to read? I really wonder how one comes to so radically embrace the position you and others like yourself espouse. I am not being facetious. I really wonder how it begins. What preacher(s) did you listen to, what literature did you read, and I wonder where the initial illumination came from and from whence that first revelation was sparked.

Just to clarify - so it seems I'm not picking on you: I believe the KJV is the best translation yet, and that it has never been surpassed (and probably never will be), but I am not so naive as to deny God's effectual working in other translations as well. At this point the KJVO advocates usually answer with the mundane: "Yeah, so what. God spoke through a donkey.. ." I had my first encounter with God while reading the TEV in college back in 1990. I was brought to my knees in tears having never even heard of the KJV or the TR.

After I got saved, I read the NIV for a few years...and loved it. Then I ventured out to the NKJV and loved it even more. I heard somewhere that the NASB was supposed to be the most accurate version available, and so I picked up one of those but didn't see the big deal (I really didn't care for its readability and found it said about the same as my NKJV). I then heard about the AMP version, and got one of those. I thought it was pretty neat - novelty wise - but the excitement wore off eventually. Then I got a Phillip's translation and really liked it, even though I knew it was a paraphrase. Soon after, I discovered Young's translation, which uses the same exact manuscript as the KJV, only more literally and grammatically-correct with the Greek aorist verbs conjugated more closely in their proper English tense. I still have all these versions in my library, along with the Recovery version and a few others I hardly ever read. The version I always return to is the KJV, but I am prudent to read it alongside other versions - my favorite today being the KJV/NLT parallel through which God has enabled me to mine the most precious gems.

We live at such a fantastic time in history where all these special versions are made available to us; some good, others not so good. We have Tyndale's copy and we also have Peterson's paraphrase (The Message) which, incidentally, I think at times scores a direct hit as far as conveying the nucleus of a verse's gist. It is patently absurd to declare any one of these translations or dynamic equivalents "The Preserved Word of God", and disqualify all others by default as corrupt futilities...simply by virtue of the fact that they all are (including the KJV) predecessors of other sources. And their manuscripts are predecessors of other manuscripts, and they all have broad, rich family trees with branches that extend deep into a history that God has kept a careful Hand upon. Whether it be a KJV or a NASB, a NLT or a NCV the Word of God is pulsating today just as He promised it always would, till the end of time. I see the Word of God as the One Spiritual Blood-line that runs through different sources named the KJV, the NIV, the NASB, the NLT, the AMP, etc. It runs through them all, whether you see and acknowledge it or not. And it gives life to others who read them, whether you choose to see or acknowledge it or not. These vessels may all look a bit different, and perhaps speak a different dialect, but the core DNA of God is there. As far as the manuscripts go, I see them the same way as I see the 4 different-but-same gospels in the New Testament, all saying essentially the same thing (word for word in most places), just in different dialects, and in some places seemingly contradictory; where in other places one version remains silent while the other version discloses. It's all okay. The Holy Spirit gave us four unique gospels for a reason, to teach us highminders a profound lesson in acceptance and diversity. God uses both manuscripts mightily, and as far as I can tell, without partiality. Who am I to reject that which God has accepted? I may have my personal preferences, but I will not judge others by the book they read or sway them over to my camp. They are partaking of the same bread and blood I am, though perhaps at a different table-setting.

I choose to take full advantage of the diversity and gain as much as I can from all dialects, tongues and versions...and filter it all down through the Holy Spirit, a spiritual dialysis, and incorporate it into my own walk by the providence of God. I've had no reason to be disappointed by this method yet, and it has saved me from leering off on radical fringes and becoming unreasonably biased.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/11/2 13:15

Really good post, Bro. Paul!

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2008/11/2 13:28

Walter,

Thanks for your reply.

From what I understand, your points have been posted again and again and again on this forum. Already from reading this one post, your position on the KJV is very clear. No need to post more.

I guess I have one question for you that I would like you to answer. Do you respect the other people here on SermonIndex, including the moderators?

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/11/2 15:34

We might have boxed you in here a bit Waltern, asking you to cease or at least restrain on the one hand ... But I do not think it is with the aim of silencing your opinion, just the volume of repeatable, in your words 'cut and paste' items.

But it does seem a good time to bring this back to the fore;

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

Secondly,

Quote:
-----The Bible's we leave behind at the Rapture must be the very Preserved Word of God, promised to us by God Himself, throughout His Word. They must be the King James. We won't need to leave a Greek Lexicon, or Hebrew Lexicon ...

Hold up the truth truck there. The one item that I cannot get past is this idea that the original languages, both Greek and Hebrew, which is what the very scriptures were *originally* written in are to be either discounted or somehow surpassed by any version. Unless one *is* a master at these languages then there is no basis whatsoever for a "Only" stance, it is a completely illogical and fallacious argument, it is simply conjecture and opinion.

There is nothing in scripture that ever even suggests that preservation was to occur during any era and that is a great piece of hyperbole to just stress how ridiculous this whole argument is.

And to really top this all off, it is beating a very dead dog when your audience here is primarily a KJV preferred one to begin with, there is little point to screaming that the sky is falling when it remains very much intact.

Besides, even the authors of the KJV disagree with you.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/11/2 16:52

Quote:
-----What can anyone say to what Waltern just wrote?

I would say that having the KJV as the only accepted version is no guarantee of revival. In the circles I am in we are almost KJV only and we need revival.

I would also point out that Jerome's Latin Vulgate of 405 AD was the "AV" or "KJV" of the Universal Church for hundreds of years. In fact, the translation was so good that all others were outlawed. Over time Latin died out as a language until only scholars and religious folk could read the text. This is what basically caused "the Dark Ages." The Bible was no longer in the language of the people and the consequences were disastrous.

How many people today actually understand some of the archaic language of the KJV? How much understanding is lost simply because words are used that we do not commonly understand. What typically happens to these words? They go ignored and we are cut short of our understanding. So the point is, we need and will *always* need a Bible in the language of the people that is accurate and understandable.

Re: - posted by bible1985, on: 2008/11/3 14:56

Good comment robert. I go to a bible study where there is a division between the bible version issue. Our leader uses an other version and my friends use the kjv. Many times they get in arguments. I personally get upset that they attack the group leader like that. This man travels from illinois to indiana for bible study. He runs 2 bible studies himself, then on sun day he comes from downtown chicago to lowell indiana for church. Very dedicated christian, but this whole ruckman stance against other versions is rude, ridiculous, and the holy spirit has no part in it. Peter ruckman might have knowledge but his words are hateful and he sees others as heretics or cults who use other versions, he has got my friends to like him and speak like this. I use the kjv and believe it is possibly better than the rest. The archaic language you have to take into consideration because there are 100's of words we don't even know in the revised king james, so I see no problem in making version in easier language as long as it means the same thing.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/11/5 14:44

Just for the record. I have preferred the KJV for over 50 years. Currently I use the NKJV for preaching simply because we have so many people in our church who do not have English as a first language and to expect them to learn a form of stilted 17th century English is just not reasonable.

If waltern actually wants to know my position you can find it in a series I did with a brother of similar opinion here in the UK. It is called (http://wiki.biblebase.com/index.php?title=The_Bible:_Inspiration_and_Interpretation) Which Bible? and will give you my reasons for preferring the KJV to all other versions.

However, as has been said, I have greater confidence in the Byzantine Text (AKA Majority Text) than in the Received Text. One of the unusual strengths of the NKJV is that it will actually tell you where the Majority Text and the Nestle and United Bible Society text are different.

When my preaching days are over I expect to return to the KJV!! ;-)

Re: Which Version, on: 2008/11/5 23:18

To Repentcanada:

I for one love the work of Andrew Murray. What a mighty man of God, what an example for us.

On November 1, 1888, seven years after Westcott & Hort published their "Revised New Testament" Andrew Murray, in the introduction of his new book "The Two Covenants" had this to say about "God's Word" in comparison to the newer versions that were becoming available then:

"INTRODUCTION

It is often said that the great aim of the preacher ought to be to translate Scripture truth from its Jewish form into the language and the thought of the nineteenth century, and so to make it intelligible and acceptable to our ordinary Christians. It is to be feared that the experiment will do more harm than good. In the course of the translation the force of the original is lost. The scholar who trusts to translations will never become a master of the language he wants to learn. A race of Christians will be raised up, to whom the language of God's Word, and with that the God who spoke it, will be strange. In the Scripture words not a little of Scripture truth will be lost. For the true Christian life nothing is so healthful and invigorating as to have each man come and study for himself the very words in which the Holy Ghost has spoken."

As a Protestant Christian of the Reformation, Andrew Murray knew and understood that there was only one Word of God, passed down by the true Church, since the beginning. God had preserved His Word by keeping it safe in the true Church.

Rome, and the Latin Vulgate were full of error, and Rome is not the true church, and the Latin Vulgate is not the Word of God, it is the work of Gnostics.

Is anyone aware that **The year after Erasmus published his work (which later became known as the Textus Receptus) Luther used the Textus Receptus (TR) for the basis of a German translation of the New Testament. Shortly thereafter, God – using Luther and his translation, brought about the Reformation.** (From An Introduction To The Textual Criticism Of The New Testament by A.T. Robinson and Which Version is the Bible by Floyd Nolen Jones).

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

repentcanada wrote:

What can anyone say to what walter just wrote?

That is truth, heavy truth.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/11/6 16:26

Walter,

What is the "true church"? How do you define it? Is it those who only use the KJV?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/11/10 7:15

Quote:

-----"INTRODUCTION It is often said that the great aim of the preacher ought to be to translate Scripture truth from its Jewish form into the language and the thought of the nineteenth century, and so to make it intelligible and acceptable to our ordinary Christians. It is to be feared that the experiment will do more harm than good. In the course of the translation the force of the original is lost. The scholar who trusts to translations will never become a master of the language he wants to learn. A race of Christians will be raised up, to whom the language of God's Word, and with that the God who spoke it, will be strange. In the Scripture words not a little of Scripture truth will be lost. For the true Christian life nothing is so healthful and invigorating as to have each man come and study for himself the very words in which the Holy Ghost has spoken."

This is an interesting quotation from Andrew Murray in which he advocates that 'scholars' do not become dependent upon 'translation' but should become familiar with 'the very words in which the Holy Ghost has spoken'.

It is sound advice but not an endorsement of a King James only position.

Re:, on: 2008/11/10 7:27

Homefree89, I see the true church as first those who have been born again by the hearing of the gospel with faith. Paul explains this in Galatians.

From there we have in this current age so many translations of the Bible to deal with that it is natural to ask which translation is best. I have rested, after many years, on a King James "preferred" stance. Mainly because the version does not change. The other versions will change every so many years because of copyright laws etc.

I give liberty to others who rest on a different translation but the most important thing is Has a person been born again? this is the true church.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/11/10 14:16

Hi Thingsabove,

I agree with you on the "true church". The reason I asked Walter to clarify is because I realize my view of the "true church" and his may be totally different. He appears to equate the "true church" with those saints who only use the KJV and TR, which I don't agree with. However, I wanted some clarification on it from him.

Re:, on: 2008/11/10 17:39

oops, sorry I thought it was a general question. Guess I should read these threads a little better. Talk later, john

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/11/11 16:23

Quote:

thingsabove wrote:

oops, sorry I thought it was a general question. Guess I should read these threads a little better. Talk later, john

:-) No problem.