

News and Current Events :: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible

For some Christians, King James is the only Bible - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2011/3/21 23:05

On its 400th anniversary, the King James version of the Bible is universally recognized as a literary masterpiece that profoundly shaped both modern Christianity and the English language.

At the Bible Baptist Church in Mount Prospect, Ill., however, it's accorded a much higher level of reverence.

"Using anything but the King James version is like shaving with a banana," said Chris Huff, the church's pastor.

The suburban Chicago church belongs to a loosely defined denomination known as the "King James Only" movement. Members believe that the King James version is not just another translation, but the indispensable underpinning of a Christian's faith. ...

read more: http://www.mercurynews.com/faith/ci_17627215?nclink_check=1

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/23 0:16

I love the KJV! It is one of the longest lasting translations of the Bible and has stood the test of time. Though I wouldn't go as far as Chris Huff, a standard Bible helps formulate doctrine and aids memorization.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible - posted by Yot36, on: 2011/3/23 0:23

The 1560 Geneva Bible is more accurate than the KJV. Consider this. In 1611 when the KJV was written and published, Catholic persecution of what they called Heretics was in full force. Take a look at Mark 10 Verse 19. The KJV says - Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother.

The word defraud means *apostere* (to deprive); to despoil: - defraud, destitute, kept back by fraud.

From *G575* and *G963*; (to deprive); to despoil: - defraud, destitute, kept back by fraud.

The same passage in the Geneva Bible says this - Mar 10:19 Thou knowest the comandements, Thou shalt not commit adulterie. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steale. Thou shalt not beare false witsnesse. Thou shalt hurt no man. Honour thy father and mother.

The word hurt has a much broader meaning - Hurt HURT, v.t. pret. and pp. hurt.

1. To bruise; to give pain by a contusion, pressure, or any violence to the body. We hurt the body by a severe blow, or by tight clothes, and the feet by fetters. Psa 105.

2. To wound; to injure or impair the sound state of the body, as by incision or fracture.

3. To harm; to damage; to injure by occasioning loss. We hurt a man by destroying his property.

4. To injure by diminution; to impair.

5. To injure by reducing in quality; to impair the strength, purity or beauty of.

6. To harm; to injure; to damage, in general.

7. To wound; to injure; to give pain to; as, to hurt the feelings.

HURT, n. A wound; a bruise; any thing that gives pain to the body.

1. Harm; mischief; injury.

2. Injury; loss.

Why would the KJV change that?

Romans 13:13 KJV says Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying.

Geneva says Rom 13:13 So that wee walke honestly, as in the day: not in gluttonie, and drunkennesse, neither in chambering and wantonnes, nor in strife and envying.

What is the difference between Gultony and Rioting, something you might want to look up. They carry different meanings. History records that King James was a glutton. In many instances where gluttony was spoken of in the Geneva bible, the KJV changed the word to rioting. Romans 9:5, the KJV says this - Pay close attention to the punctuation in this verse. Rom 9:5 Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. Now the Geneva Version - Rom 9:5 Of whome are the fathers, and of whome concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever, Amen. This minor change in punctuation has stripped the diety of Christ. Some have estimated that as much as 18% of the KJV suffers from this kind of change. Also consider this, no one died for the King James Bible, but many thousands were persecuted unto death for the 1560 Geneva Reformers bible. History records that many of the fires that burned the martyrs were fueled with reformers bibles. Don't believe me look it up for yourself. I refer to Acts 17:11. It is difficult to get your hands on a Geneva Bible. Amazon sells them for about \$50.00 in hardcopy. They are much more difficult to read but worth the effort. There is a free program called E-Sword that has an electronic version of the Geneva Bible and many other bible translations and resources that I highly recommend that every believer use. It is a very valuable tool in Bible study. I make this post in an effort to point believers to the truth, not simply to trash a version of the Bible. God Bless

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/23 0:51

Definitely King James only for me. Or rather, what is properly called the "Majority Text" or "TEXTUS RECEPTUS" (also known as the Traditional Text", Syrian Text, Byzantine Text, The K (Kappa), and the Common Text). The new, so-called "modern" versions of the Bible are NOT based on this text and are full of heresies, as clearly revealed in numerous scripture verse by verse studies, including one 6 year study written by G.A. Riplinger (NEW AGE BIBLE VERSIONS: An Exhaustive Documentation Exposing the Message, Men, and Manuscripts Moving Mankind to the Antichrist's One World Religion").

After many years of confusion while sitting in churches wondering and asking God, "Lord, which is the REAL Holy Bible?" God led me to this answer: King James Authorized. I was not happy with that answer, having grown up on the RSV! But when I humbled myself and did the research of the scripture by scripture comparison I could not deny the truth. And I am not talking about trivial words like "gluttony" and "rioting" but rather CORE doctrinal verses dealing with the diety of Christ and with salvation. BTW, William Tyndale died for this Bible, this manuscript...

p.s. The character of King James himself is irrelevant when discussing this Bible, as it was not written by him, only dedicated to him and its printing authorized or allowed by him.

Re: , on: 2011/3/23 0:56

Oh bother. All because someone was trying to sell a Friends DVD box set. (It appears their post was deleted)

Re: - posted by Yot36, on: 2011/3/23 1:08

Tyndale wrote the Tyndale bible which preceeded even the Geneva bible. He absolutely did not die for the KJV, you facts are incorrect. Read the Difference between Romans 9:5 in the Geneva vs. KJV. Doctrinal? Is Jesus God? Is that trivial. Look, I'm just pointing out that we have to search all that is available to us to find the truth. God Bless

Re: , on: 2011/3/23 1:18

I have been unable to find enough information on the Geneva Bible and which manuscripts it derives from. It's possible it is based on the traditional Greek manuscripts but I cannot recall nor find mention to make certain.

Modern "bibles" like the NIV, NASV, ESV, Living Bible, and others are based on the 1% minority manuscripts, otherwise known as the Vaticanus manuscripts (B and C especially), Alexandrian, and other names. So when people tell you, "The Greek says...", ask them WHICH GREEK?

Re: , on: 2011/3/23 1:38

God bless you too Yot. We can help to clarify each other's info. :)

Actually King James DID indirectly die for the KJV. Here is a quote from an article:

"The Tyndale Bible, as it was known, continued to play a key role in spreading Reformation ideas across Europe. The fifty-four independent scholars who created the King James Version of the bible in 1611 drew significantly on Tyndale's translations. One estimation suggests the New Testament in the King James Version is 83% Tyndale's, and the Old Testament 76%." source: http://www.ask.com/wiki/William_Tyndale

So, while it was not Tyndale's own Bible, the KJB is descended from it.

p.s. Is it still possible to get a copy of the original Geneva Bible?

Re: - posted by mguldner (), on: 2011/3/23 3:06

"Is it still possible to get a copy of the original Geneva Bible?"

You can download a program called E-Sword for your computer and one of the bible versions you can download is the Geneva bible, I am not sure how true that version is to an original Geneva but it's a free program though the founder and creator appreciates donation, money is definitely not his push or focus.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/23 6:31

Yot36, have you forgotten that the original Greek had no punctuation?

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/3/23 6:56

Quote:

-----CyAn wrote:

BTW, William Tyndale died for this Bible, this manuscript...

I say this with all love b/c I really don't have a dog in this fight but Tyndale was burned at the stake in 1536 and did not "indirectly die for KJV."

The King James only people want to tie him to the KJV of the Bible to give them more validity, but we cannot say someone died for a version 75 years after the fact, just because the KJ scholars might have used his transcripts. That is too far away from his martyr's death, in my humble opinion.

He was tried for heresy and treason in a ridiculously unfair trial, and convicted. Tyndale was then strangled and burnt at the stake in the prison yard, Oct. 6, 1536. His last words were, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes." This prayer was answered three years later, in the publication of King Henry VIII's 1539 English "Great Bible".

The place where he translated the New Testament, is thought to have been Wittenberg, under the aid of Martin Luther.

Tyndale was a theologian and scholar who translated the Bible into an early form of Modern English. He was the first person to take advantage of Gutenberg's movable-type press for the purpose of printing the scriptures in the English language. Besides translating the Bible, Tyndale also held and published views which were considered heretical, first by the

Catholic Church, and later by the Church of England which was established by Henry VIII. His Bible translation also included notes and commentary promoting these views.

<http://www.greatsite.com/timeline-english-bible-history/william-tyndale.html>

God bless you,
Lisa

Re: For Many Christians, King James is the only Bible - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 9:25

SermonIndex,

I would like to ask you what your purpose is for opening up this thread. Are you wanting to encourage discussion on the King James Bible?

Do you have disdain for those that think the KJV is the only Bible that they want to read or are you for that? I can't figure out where you stand.

If you are opening up this thread for discussion on the KJV, I hope you are ready for some things that you may not like (if you are not a KJV'er) and then I hope you will not lock down the thread if the discussion does not go your way?

I just want to know your agenda and what I might be getting into before I post.

Would you please make your full intentions known to us as to why you opened this thread?

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2011/3/23 9:56

I found a website that gives links to where you can access various old versions of the Bible such as Tyndale, Geneva, Douay-Rheims, etc. You may want to favorite/bookmark this valuable resource:

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/links02.html>

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 10:06

I like and have used the New American Standard for a long time, it's just easier for me "personally" to understand. Would it be better for me to use a version I don't understand a lot of the words? or better if I used a version I understand, that speaks to me on "my level"? We must remember that the Bible is a spiritual book and is understandable to those who are led by God's Spirit. It is not possible for the natural man to understand it "1 Corinthians 2:14". I don't think it will be held against me at the judgment seat.

Re: Comparing the KJV to the NASB - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 10:33

Ok, I'll take the bait and see what happens.

A Comparison of the New American Standard Version (NASV)

with the Authorised King James Bible (KJB)

You will notice that archaic words are not the issue in this comparison, but rather gross omissions and changes (perversions) of the Word. The "Archaic" argument is a "Red Herring". Keep reading and you will be astonished at the omissions and changes.

The whole issue of this confusion engendered by such a multiplicity of versions is narrowed down to the following: If the reader believes the Bible to be the verbally, plenary, inspired Word of God in the original manuscripts, then of necessity he must believe that God has providentially preserved it through the ages down to the present hour. For the Holy Spirit has recorded in Psalm 138:2, "I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy loving kindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name."

The Psalmist tells us (12:6): "The words of the Lord are pure words:

as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." And again in Psalm 119:140: "Thy word is very pure: therefore

thy servant loveth it." If we believe God has, in His great and sovereign Providence, preserved His Book intact through the ages, then there's but one question left: "Which version is nearest to the original manuscripts?" We maintain with solid substantial proof that the KING JAMES VERSION is that version.

The following analysis of the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (NASV) compared with the KING JAMES VERSION (KJV) is enlightening, to say the least! And, also, disheartening! We have noted that some very fine evangelicals (a number of whom we know personally) have highly and heartily endorsed the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (NASV). We just cannot understand it, and we feel sure you will agree after reading this pamphlet. The facts are here. They cannot be denied. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that these fine evangelicals read the NASV through completely.

The reader will note in the following examples that doubt is cast again and again upon the infallibility of God's Holy Word when verse after verse is radically changed or omitted - often times without any explanation.

Leviticus 6:21 NASV: "... as a soothing aroma to the Lord." KJV: "for a sweet savour unto the Lord." (Whoever heard of soothing a sovereign God!) The same is found in Leviticus 8:28, 17:6, and 23:18.

1 Kings 19:12 NASV: "... a sound of a gentle blowing." KJV: "... a still small voice." (In the English language, there's a vast difference between "a gentle blowing" and "a still small voice!" I'm sure the reader will agree.)

1 Kings 20:38 NASV: "... with a bandage over his eyes." KJV: "... with ashes upon his face." (In English, "ashes" and "bandage" are two different words entirely.)

Isaiah 53:10 NASV: "... If He would render Himself as a guilt offering." KJV: "... When thou Shalt make his soul an offering for sin..." (This, in our humble opinion, is a very serious perversion.)

Hosea 11:12 NASV: "... Judah is also unruly against God, Even against the Holy one who is faithful." KJV: "... but Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints." (What is this but perversion!)

Matthew 12:6 NASV: "... that something greater than the temple is here." KJV: "... That in this place is one greater than the temple."

Matthew 12:42 NASV: "... behold, something greater than Solomon is here." KJV: "... behold, a greater than Solomon is here."

Matthew 19:17 NASV: "... Why are you asking Me about what is good?"

KJV: "... Why callest thou me good?"

Mark 3:5 NASV: "... and his hand was restored." KJV: "his hand was restored whole as the other. "

Mark 6:51b NASV: "... and they were greatly astonished." KJV: "... and they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered."

Mark 7:16 NASV: The verse is eliminated here and is placed in the margin in very small italicised type. KJV: "If any man have ears to hear, let him hear." (This would cause the reader to doubt the accuracy or authenticity of this verse.)

Mark 9:24 NASV: "... I do believe; help me in my unbelief!" KJV: "...

Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

Mark 9:46 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note referring to verse 43 which says, "Verses 44 and 46, which are identical with verse 48, are omitted by the best ancient manuscripts." (The "best ancient manuscripts" are Codex B and Codex Aleph, both of which are the worst of manuscripts with the most errors and have proved to be the most unreliable.) KJV: "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

Mark 10:24 NASV: "... Children how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!" KJV: "... Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!"

Mark 11:10 NASV: "... ÆBlessed is the coming kingdom of our father DavidÆ" KJV: "Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest."

Mark 11:26 NASV: Omitted entirely but placed in the margin in italics explaining that "later manuscripts add verse 26." (The later manuscripts in many cases are better by far than the earlier ones.) KJV: "But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses."

Mark 16:9-20 NASV: Gives the footnote, "Some of the oldest manuscripts omit from verse 9 through 20." (In John BurgonÆ's book, The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel of Mark, he has written over 400 pages proving conclusively that this section was in the original manuscripts. BurgonÆ's book remains unanswered and is unanswerable.)

Luke 2:33 NASV: "And His father and mother were amazed at the things which were being said about Him." KJV: "And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things that were spoken of him." (God was the father of our Lord Jesus Christ - not Joseph!)

Luke 4:8 NASV: Omits entirely, "Get thee behind me, Satan."

Luke 4:18 NASV: Omits entirely, "he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted." (ThereÆ's no explanation whatever.)

Luke 9:55, 56 NASV: "But He turned and rebuked them. And they went on to another village." In the margin they say "Later manuscripts add, `and said, You do not know what kind of spirit you are of. For the Son of Man did not come to destroy menÆ's lives, but to save them.Æ'" (Again, this casts doubt on the veracity, the authenticity of this passage.)

Luke 11:2 NASV: :And He said to them, ÆWhen you pray, say: Father, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come." KJV: "And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth."

Luke 11:29b NASV: "... but the sign of Jonah." KJV: "... but the sign of Jonas the prophet."

Luke 23:17 NASV: Omitted, but has a marginal note stating: "Some manuscripts insert verse 17, `Now he was obliged to release to them at the feast one prisoner.Æ'" KJV: "(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)" (Again, this casts doubt on a passage in GodÆ's Word.)

Luke 23:23b NASV: "... And their voices began to prevail," KJV: "And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed"

Luke 23:42 NASV: "And he was saying, ÆJesus, remember me when You come in Your kingdom!Æ" There is no explanation for leaving out "Lord, remember me" KJV: "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

Luke 24:40 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note, reading, "Some manuscripts add verse 40, ÆAnd when He had said this, He showed them His hands and His feet.Æ" (This again casts doubt on such a wonderful verse.)

John 3:13b NASV: "... even the Son of Man." KJV: "... even the Son of man which is in heaven."

John 5:4 NASV: Omitted, but refers to a marginal note which says, "Many authorities insert wholly or in part." (This injects another doubt as to the authority and accuracy of GodÆ's Word.)

John 5:16 NASV: "And for this reason the Jews were persecuting Jesus, because He was doing these things on the Sabbath." KJV: "And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day." (There is no reason given for omitting this phrase.)

John 6:33 NASV: "For the bread of God is that which comes down out of heaven, and gives life to the world.Æ" KJV: "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth Life unto the world."

John 6:69 "And we have believed and have come to know that You are the Holy One of God.Æ" KJV: "And we believe a

nd are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."

John 7:53 NASV: "And everyone went to his home". There is a marginal note here stating that "John 7:53-8:11 is not found in most of the old manuscripts." (This is not true. The British Museum has 73 manuscripts and 61 have this passage. Doubtless Aleph and B are referred to as "old manuscripts" and they are two of the worst as we have noted before.)

John 8:9 NASV: "And when they heard it, they began to go out one by one..." KJV: "And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one..." (No reason is given for omitting this phrase.)

John 8:59 NASV: "Therefore they picked up stones to throw at Him; but Jesus hid Himself and went out of the temple." KJV: "Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by" (Quite a different thought.)

John 9:4 NASV: "We must work the works of Him who sent Me..." KJV:

"I must work the works of him that sent me..."

John 9:35b NASV: "Do you believe in the Son of Man?" KJV: "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?"

John 10:30 NASV: "I and the Father are one." KJV: "I and my Father are one."

John 17:5 NASV: "...glorify Thou Me together with Thyself..." KJV:

"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

Acts 8:37 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note stating, "Late manuscripts insert verse 37, 'And Philip said, If you believe with all your heart, you may. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.'" (Both Codex Aleph and B leave this verse out and they are two of the worst manuscripts: again this casts doubt upon another section of God's Word.) KJV: "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

Acts 9:5, 6 NASV: "And he said, 'Who art Thou, Lord?' And He said, 'I am Jesus whom you are persecuting, but rise, and enter the city, and it shall be told you what you must do.'" KJV: "And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." (Truly the translators have emasculated these two verses and give no reason at all for their omission. Again they would inject a doubt into the mind of the one who believes the Bible to be the verbally inspired Word of God.)

Acts 9:20 NASV: "and immediately he began to proclaim Jesus...." KJV:

"And straightway he preached Christ..."

Acts 10:37 NASV: "you yourselves know the thing which took place throughout all Judea, starting from Galilee, after the baptism which John proclaimed." KJV: "That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judaea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached."

Acts 15:11 NASV: "But we believe that we are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus in the same way as they also are." KJV: "But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."

Acts 15:34 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note "Some manuscripts add verse 34, 'But it seemed good to Silas to remain in there.'" KJV:

"Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still." (Another doubt cast on God's Word.)

Acts 16:31 NASV: "And they said, 'Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you shall be saved, you and your household'" KJV: "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Again they omit the name "Christ.")

Acts 20:24 NASV: The following is omitted, "But none of these things move me," and no reason is given for the omission. KJV: "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy..."

Acts 24:6, 7 NASV: Most of this has been omitted and only a weak explanation is given in the margin.

Acts 28:29 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note saying, "Some manuscripts add verse 29..." (The vast majority "add" this verse. This is still another doubt cast upon the Word of God.)

Romans 1:16 NASV: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God..." KJV: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." (The translators seem to dislike the word "Christ" very much!)

Romans 15:19 NASV: "in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Spirit so that from Jerusalem and round about..." KJV: "Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God..."

Romans 16:24 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note stating, "Some ancient manuscripts add verse 24, 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.'" (The vast majority add this verse, not just "some".)

1 Corinthians 5:4 NASV: "In the name of our Lord Jesus, when you are assembled, and I with you in spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus." (In both cases the name "Christ" is omitted with no reason given. Why do the translators of the NASV dislike the name "Christ" so much?)

1 Corinthians 5:7b NASV: "... For Christ our Passover also has been sacrificed." KJV: "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." (If Christ is not sacrificed FOR US we cannot be saved!)

1 Corinthians 6:20 NASV: "For you have been bought with a price:

therefore glorify God in your body." KJV: "For ye are brought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." (Reasons for omitting this are inadequate.)

1 Corinthians 9:1b NASV: "... Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" KJV:

"... Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" (There is no reason given for omitting the name "Christ," and again they show their dislike for the name "Christ.")

1 Corinthians 11:11b NASV: "... nor is man independent of woman." KJV:

"... neither the woman without the man, in the Lord."

1 Corinthians 11:24 NASV: "and when He had given thanks, He broke it, and said, 'This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of Me.'" KJV: "And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, 'Take eat: this is my body, which is broken for you...'"

1 Corinthians 16:23 NASV: "The grace of the Lord Jesus be with you." KJV: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you." (Why do they keep insisting on eliminating the name "Christ?")

2 Corinthians 5:17b NASV: "... behold, new things have come." KJV:

"... behold, all things are become new."

2 Corinthians 10:4 NASV: "for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but divinely powerful for the destruction of fortresses." KJV: "(For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.)"

2 Corinthians 11:31 NASV: "The God and Father of the Lord Jesus..." KJV: "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." (We ask in all sincerity, "Are the translators anxious to get rid of the name 'Christ' altogether?")

Galatians 2:20 NASV: "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me." KJV: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

Galatians 6:17b NASV: "... for I bear on my body the brand-marks of Jesus." KJV: "... for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." (It seems as if they don't like the name "Lord" either.)

Ephesians 3:14 NASV: "For this reason, I bow my knees before the Father." KJV: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." (We ask in all sincerity, "Would the translators wish to get rid of the name entirely?")

Ephesians 5:9 NASV: "(for the fruit of the light consists in all goodness and righteousness and truth)." KJV: "(For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth.)"

Colossians 1:14 NASV: "in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins." KJV: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." (Why omit the blood?)

Colossians 2:2b NASV: "... resulting in a true knowledge of God's mystery, that is, Christ Himself." KJV: "... to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ."

Colossians 2:11b NASV: "... in the removal of the body of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." KJV: "... in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ."

1 Thessalonians 2:19b NASV: "... in the presence of our Lord Jesus at His coming?" KJV: "... in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?"

1 Thessalonians 3:11 NASV: "Now may our God and Father Himself and Jesus our Lord direct our way to you." KJV: "Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you."

1 Timothy 1:1 NASV: "... and of Christ Jesus, who is our hope." KJV:

"... and Lord Jesus Christ, which is our hope."

1 Timothy 1:17 NASV: "... the only God, be honour and glory..." KJV:

"... the only wise God, be honour..."

1 Timothy 3:16 NASV: "... He who was revealed in the flesh." KJV: "...

God was manifest in the flesh."

1 Timothy 5:21 NASV: "I solemnly charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus..." KJV: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ."

1 Timothy 6:1b "... that the name of God and our doctrine may not be spoken against." KJV: "... that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed."

2 Timothy 3:3b NASV: "... haters of good." KJV: "... despisers of those that are good." (Quite a difference in the meaning of the two phrases.)

2 Timothy 4:1 NASV: "I solemnly charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus." KJV: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ..."

Titus 1:4b NASV "... from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Saviour."

KJV: "... from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour."

Philemon 6b NASV: "... which is in you for Christ's sake." KJV: "... which is in you in Christ Jesus."

Hebrews 1:3b NASV: "... when He had made purification of sins, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high." KJV: "when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." (Jesus Christ did it ALONE and FOR US!)

Hebrews 3:1 NASV: "Therefore, holy brethren; partakers of a heavenly calling, consider Jesus the Apostle and High Priest of our confession." KJV: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession Christ Jesus."

Hebrews 7:21b "Thou art a priest forever." KJV: "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." (There is no explanation for the omission.)

Hebrews 10:30 NASV: "For we know Him who said, 'Vengeance is Mine, I will repay.'" KJV: "For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord."

Hebrews 11:6b NASV: "... He is a rewarder of those who seek Him." KJV:

"he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."

1 Peter 3:15 NASV: "but sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts..." KJV: "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts." (Is this another attempt to do away with the Deity of our Lord as in 1 Timothy 3:16?)

1 John 1:7b NASV: "... and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin." KJV: "... and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (Let's not stop the translators of getting rid of the name "Christ," they're on a roll!)

1 John 2:20 NASV: "But you have an anointing from the Holy One, and you all know." KJV: "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things."

1 John 3:16 NASV: "We know love by this..." KJV: "Hereby perceive we the love of God."

1 John 4:19 NASV: "We love because He first loved us." KJV: "We love him because he first loved us."

1 John 5:6, 7 NASV: The majority of both of these verses is omitted and there is no mention in the margin as to why there is an omission.

1 John 5:13b NASV: "... in order that you may know that you have eternal life." KJV: "... that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the Name of the Son of God." (No reason is given for this phrase being omitted.)

2 John 3 NASV: "Grace mercy and peace will be with us, from God the Father and from Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love." KJV: "Grace be with you, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love."

Jude 25 NASV: "to the only God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord..." KJV: "To the only wise God our Saviour be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen." (Another attempt to remove the Deity of our Lord?)

Revelation 1:9b NASV: "... and the testimony of Jesus." KJV: "...and for the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Revelation 6:17 NASV: "for the great day of their wrath has come; and who is able to stand?" KJV: "For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" (There is quite a difference between THEIR wrath and HIS wrath!)

Revelation 8:13 NASV: "... and I heard an eagle flying..." KJV: "... and I heard an angel flying..."

Revelation 15:3b NASV: "... Thou King of the nations." KJV: "... thou King of saints."

Revelation 16:7 NASV: "And I heard the altar saying..." KJV: "And I heard Another out of the Altar say..."

In this analysis we have sought to be factual and fair. The reader may have noted, or you can go over it again and check for yourself, the following: Sixteen times the Name "Christ" as applied to our Lord and Saviour is omitted with no reason

given; twelve times the Name "Lord" is omitted in connection with our Saviour and also with no reason given.

If all of these deletions of Names properly ascribed to Jesus Christ and verses or long passages, such as Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53 to 8:1-11, are to be removed from God's Holy Word, we ask, "WHERE is the doctrine of Verbal, Plenary Inspiration gone?" ALL we have left is a fallible Book, filled with errors and names and verses that should not be there. If this is the case then we are indeed "of all men most miserable."

When it comes to this blessed Word of God, and we are forced to follow the findings of the so-called critical scholars, we feel like Mary of old as she stands weeping before the sepulchre and the angels say unto her, "Woman, why weepest thou?" She saith unto them, "Because they have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid Him."

But thanks be to God this is NOT the case! We have an infallible, inerrant, verbally inspired Book to fall back upon in which we rest our weary souls for Time and Eternity. At the beginning of the Christian Era, the Holy Spirit personally supervised the collation of the twenty-seven books which comprise our New Testament and also in the arrangement of them in the Sacred Canon.

Just so, we are as firmly convinced that the same Blessed Holy Spirit was personally involved in the choosing of the men who comprised the committee of translators of the KING JAMES VERSION. They were giants in the realm of scholarship. All one needs do is to read the roster and a thumbnail sketch of each of their achievements (see Which Bible, page 13, "The Learned Men" by Rev. Terence Brown, Secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society of Great Britain).

There have been many versions of the Holy Scriptures since the KING JAMES VERSION was published but not one committee of these versions has suffered for their faith except the committee of the KING JAMES VERSION. Some were imprisoned or threatened with imprisonment. Many if not all had loved ones or friends who had gone to the stake or endured banishment or prison terms. Why? Because they believed the Bible to be the Very Word of the Living God and "loved not their lives unto the death." This fact speaks volumes, Such men had convictions and held the Bible in reverence and awe and thus handled it and translated it with the greatest care and precision, knowing they must give an account before the Judgement Seat of Christ some day.

You see, God knew what He was doing - as He always does - in the timing of the production of this greatest masterpiece in all English literature. It was brought into being before mankind was cursed with telephones, radios or televisions. They had time to think and meditate and spend Year after year (as one did) in the Cambridge Library from 4 o'clock in the morning until 8 o'clock in the evening studying the Greek language. Lancelot Andrewes, the chairman of the overall committee, was fluent in twenty different languages, the greatest linguist of his day, and spent five hours a day in prayer.

The Holy Spirit also had His hand on William Tyndale, choosing him for his remarkable ability as a linguist. His native tongue was English but he was perfectly at home in eight different languages, according to the record. He studied under Erasmus, the greatest scholar of that age or any age. The genius of Rotterdam was courted by kings was offered the cardinal's hat by the pope, which he refused, and was used of God to bring into being the Textus Receptus in which the KING JAMES VERSION is founded. Tyndale's English was so perfect in his Translation that the committee chosen by King James used well over sixty percent of it with little or no change in the wording. Had they used their own style, it is said, it would never have endured for three centuries.

We do not say the King James Version is infallible. There are changes that could be and should be profitably made, but we do say and with emphasis, there are no errors found therein. The four or five thousand extant Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, in whole or in part, agree in ninety to ninety-five percent of their contents with the text of Erasmus, while the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, founded as it was on two of the worst manuscripts, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, is filled with errors and contradictions as of necessity it must have been with such a shaky, unstable, inaccurate foundation.

No age in the history of the Christian church, until ours, has witnessed such a sustained, Satanic assault on God's Holy Word. The versions, perversions, and paraphrases of the Scriptures increase constantly. Some of these are worthwhile and profitable; others are deliberate attacks upon God's Holy Word. One does not need to understand Greek or Hebrew to learn which is the pure Word of God. Use the KING JAMES VERSION as the criterion and test any questionable passage in any other version by the KING JAMES VERSION. If it doesn't pass the test and agree with it, then discard the questionable passage and keep to the Authorised Version.

There comes to mind the poem which so perfectly describes the picture of this battle fought over the centuries.

Last eve I paused beside a blacksmith's door, And heard the anvil ring, the vesper chime.

And looking in I saw upon the floor, Old hammers, worn with beating years of time.

"How many anvils have you had?" said I, "To wear and batter out those hammers so?"

"Just one," said he, and then with twinkling eye,

"The anvil wears the hammers out, you know."

And so I thought, the Anvil of God's Word,

For ages sceptics blows have beat upon.

But tho the sound of falling blows is heard, The Anvil still remains - the hammer's gone!

HAMMER AWAY, YE REBEL BANDS!

YOUR HAMMERS BREAK - GOD'S ANVIL STANDS!

Edited by David Otis Fuller

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 10:55

Maybe we should use the original Hebrew version Moses wrote, I wonder how much wording changed from the original Hebrew version Moses wrote, until the King James. Maybe we could all say "God speaks my language, too!" My guess is if God has something "Spiritually" to say to us, he could say it while reading the Readers Digest, if the only way he is going to speak to us is through the KJV a lot of us are in a heap of trouble.

"Jesus said it is the "Spirit of truth" that teaches us all things."

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 11:37

That's interesting reasoning, Bill.

I am always amazed at how "thinking" Christians believe that Satan counterfeits every genuine thing from God, but he would never counterfeit God's Word. Oh no, he would never do that.

Hath God said?

I guess I will read the Readers Digest.

Re: - posted by Joyful_Heart, on: 2011/3/23 11:48

Quote:
-----My guess is if God has something "Spiritually" to say to us, he could say it while reading the Readers Digest, if the only way he is going to speak to us is through the KJV a lot of us are in a heap of trouble. "Jesus said it is the "Spirit of truth" that teaches us all things."

Amen Bro. Bill. Let's be careful to not put God in a box nor put others in it either. God is so big and it is by His Spirit we are taught, convicted, encouraged. We are so blessed to have His Word with so many around the world with maybe just a page of any translation.

God used a donkey with Paul and so many other ways to speak to people. I once was watching "Anne Of Green Gables" and the woman told the young girl, "being in despair was a slap in the face to God." The Holy Spirit brings that up to me if I ever begin to have a pity party. Glory and thanks to God.

Before I was born again, a JH opened the bible to me, most likely theirs, and I began to read. The Holy Spirit began to speak to me through that book and shut out her words as I read. I had been asking God which one was God's true religion. And 6 months later I was in a home Bible study, KJV, and the Holy Spirit convicted me strongly of sin and I repented and was born again. I then bought a huge children's bible and read it from cover to cover as the Holy Spirit spoke. I then came across the NIV. I was taught by the Spirit. And now I enjoy the NKJ and my Hebrew-Greek Key Study Bible NAS.

PS. I asked God which was the true religion, He took me to no denomination - He took me straight to His Son Jesus. Ask and you shall receive. All praise and thanks to God.

Most of important of all things the Lord says is to have love in our hearts. We can use any Bible, think it's the only one, and it might be for that person and that's ok too, but without love

Most important thing for us Christians in this world is to seek the Lord while He may be found. Get to know Him intimately as we will fall in love with Him more and more. And the more we fall in love with Him the more the desires of this world will fall away. Amen and glory to God.

As for Greg, SermonIndex, he gives us information all the time and it is up to us what we do with it. We can comment or read and leave it or pray. But he keeps us informed and we appreciate him and SI so very much. Most of us who are open to being changed into His likeness have grown so much by the sermons here and I for one am so deeply appreciative for SI.

For by grace you (we) have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, (ourselves) it is the gift of God; not as a result of works, that no one should boast. Ephesians 2:8-9

As for the KJV being the "the true version" I don't know and really don't care. To me it is the Holy Spirit that is important. I wasn't left in the children's Bible but used it for a season. We have to trust the Holy Spirit to guide us as we seek God in Jesus Name. Amen and Amen

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 12:01

No one is saying that the Holy Spirit is not important and as always, the content of the discussion is being changed because no one wants to face up to the gross perversions of modern bibles.

So, I guess, just like Greg, I have also given you information in the form of verse comparisons. Verse comparisons are much better than Ad Hominem. It is up to you do with it as you please.

I have no battle to win, except with my flesh, the world and the enemy.

But it still always amazes me how people dance around this subject. All these silly anecdotal stories come out about Reader's Digest, Anne of Green Gables, etc, because you don't want to address the hard facts of verse comparisons. You only make yourself look silly. Of course God can speak to us through many types of media, but let me bring you back to

what we are talking about. GODS'S Word. Thank you.

Oh one more thing. Answer this question as honest as you can.

Do you think that Satan, God's enemy (and yours) would try to create false religions and different ways to God?

That's an easy one, right?

How about this?

Do you think that Satan, would try to pervert God's written Word to us today thereby deceiving us as to what God clearly said and meant? Do you think that He would want to change God's Word to minimize the Blood, Christ's Sonship, the Power of the Cross, Christ as God in the flesh? Would you consider these changes, serious?

If your answer is yes, can you please give me some examples of how Satan has perverted God's written Word?

And finally, can we just dispense with God's Word and listen to the Spirit?

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 12:30

PassinThru, if what your saying is true, and we have watered down the Word over the years with many different versions, including the KJV, should we not all be reading and studying the original Hebrew version Moses wrote? Please give me a reason, I should not be reading and studying the original Hebrew version Moses wrote? and if you say I should be, well I you would be agreeing that even the KJV is watered down. I am listening!

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 12:36

Quote:
-----PassinThru...So, I guess, just like Greg, I have also given you information in the form of verse comparisons. Verse comparisons are much better than Ad Hominems. It is up to you do with it as you please.

So if I were a Hebrew scholar, I could do the same from the original Hebrew to the KJV, right? And I could come here and start a new thread called "For some Christians, the original Hebrew is the only Bible" just a thought. I have no dog in the fight either, but we just cannot stop at the KJV, and say all other versions are as you said are "perverted" if one is converted from the original, would it not be "perverted" also?

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 12:42

Compare the verses Bill. Don't answer my questions with questions.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 12:51

I have all the respect in the world for folks that enjoy the KJV, but how on earth can one that cannot understand most of it's words enjoy or learn anything from the book? Has anyone ever tried to read a contract written by a good lawyer? I have, and I have to take it to my Lawyer to interrupt it for me. What we all should keep in our thoughts, is we all have different levels of IQ, I am not the brightest bulb in the house when it comes to tests or book stuff, but I can fix your Air Conditioner or repair your car for you, because these were my gifts from God. I get the most out of something I understand, I understand the NASV the best, at least I am reading my Bible, when I just use to look at the pictures in the KJV because that's was all I could understand in that version.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 12:53

Quote:

-----PassinThru..Compare the verses Bill. Don't answer my questions with questions.

Why would you ask me to do something I can't do? can you compare the verses of the original Hebrew to the KJV? if so please show us a few comparisons.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 12:59

You are not serious about addressing the content of the new versions. My kids read the KJV and do fine. They know how to use a dictionary.

Would you like me to post another comparison and show you that words in the newer versions are actually more difficult?

I thought not.

I'm not posting anymore in this thread because you continue to avoid the real matter and that is what the verses say in the new (per)Versions compared to the KJV.

No one ever wants to deal with that.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 13:03

Quote:

-----PassinThru.. You are not serious about addressing the content of the new versions.

Well, You are not serious about addressing the content of the original Hebrew to anything later than it. So it looks like we both reading the wrong versions.

Edit:

And you continue to avoid the real matter and that is what the verses say in the new Versions/KJV compared to the Original Hebrew.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 13:11

Quote:

-----PassinThru... My kids read the KJV and do fine. They know how to use a dictionary.

My kids can work on a 50 ton chiller a/c system they have read the books, can yours? If not I have the books we can send them out on a job tomorrow. Look I personally think it's terrible that some can call the versions "perverted" after the KJV version, but cannot call the KJV "perverted" after the Original Hebrew, this is a double standard.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 13:14

Now I am being judged on the version of the Bible I read, I sure will be glad when the real Judgment day comes, so I can be judged by my maker, I will accept his Judgment, because he was Perfect!

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 14:31

MrBill,

Would you be willing to start with 1 or 2 passages at a time?

Re: - posted by Joyful_Heart, on: 2011/3/23 14:32

I usually don't get into these discussions but my heart is for the lost and new Christians.

If someone believes the KJV version is the closest to the true translation it is okay. But if that person has a religious spirit and says it is the only one that should be read and condemns those who read another translation - that can be very hurtful and even damaging.

I heard, even yesterday, people saying that they can't understand the KJV and don't read it as they have tried. If a person is not being able to understand or being taught by it they should go to one that they are being fed by.

Unfortunately so many who believe only the KJV should be read turn many away from reading the Bible.

My whole point is that we don't put God in a box nor others due to our personal thoughts. But let God be God in each person's lives. He is so faithful as we seek Him.

The most important thing is that people are being convicted of sin, turning their lives over to Jesus and to a personal relationship with Him and being transformed into His likeness. And how God does this is personal for each one of His.

Yes, I know I look foolish. The Lord uses the foolish to confound the wise sometimes and I will be a fool for Christ any day. I also know I am among the least of these here in most areas. But I do love my Lord, have a heart for the lost and new Christians because He gave it to me.

And I say to all. If you are being taught, your spirit being fed. Please continue. You can go to Bluebible.com, listen to sermons here on SI. At Bluebible.com there are translations to compare. There is a section on cults as well to make sure the Bible you are reading is not among them.

Please forgive me if I have offended anyone. It is not my intention at all.

Be lifted up O' God among the peoples in Your Son, Jesus Christ's Name.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 15:28

****UPDATED****

I don't hear anyone in this discussion saying KJV only.

Still just trying to compare verses.

You don't have to prove you are spiritual and love the lost just because you don't read the KJV. I am not questioning anyone's spirituality. I keep trying to bring everyone back to scripture comparison of translations, but it seems no one wants to do this. I am not saying anyone has a religious spirit and I hope you are not saying that, too.

You can be concerned with the continued changes of God's Word and still be concerned about the lost and new Christians.

ns. It does not have to be an either/or.

Does anyone at all think that Satan conspires to water down and destroy the Bible? No one seems to want to answer this question.

If you want to show someone (lost or new Christian) that God "heals the brokenhearted", don't use a "modern" version, because you won't find it.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 16:04

ok, more comparisons, if it at all interests you.

KJV vs NKJV

NKJV teaches Works Salvation

NKJV Matt. 7:14 difficult is the way

KJV narrow is the way

NKJV Gal. 5:22 faithfulness

KJV faith

NKJV 1 John 5:13 may continue to believe

KJV may believe

NKJV Eccl. 5:20 God keeps him busy

KJV God answereth him

and more...

http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/Tracts/NKJV_tract.pdf

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>

Re: , on: 2011/3/23 16:11

Maybe you're having problems with folks listening because you posted on our Recommended Books thread - the "Readers Digest"?

:)

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 16:19

MrBillPro, recommended it in this thread. :-)

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/23 16:29

I'm a lover of the KJV and believe it to be the best translation. For English I hold it to be the standard. I don't trust many of the modern versions because they change many meanings of verses. Satan tries to confuse many people by getting them to doubt God's Word by getting them to find one that agrees with their thoughts. Many of the modern versions use flawed texts. I remember when the NIV first came out, it left whole passages out and had footnotes that cast doubts on God's Word. The KJV has stood the test of time.

However, should we not compare the translations to the original rather than to each other?

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 16:29

Quote:
-----MrBillPro....Maybe we should use the original Hebrew version Moses wrote, I wonder how much wording changed from the original Hebrew version Moses wrote,

For those who missed the first part of the Movie, I ask him to compare the original Hebrew version Moses wrote, to the KJV, so for he has avoided the task by being stuck on comparing the NASB to the KJV.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 16:31

Yes, if you can compare to the original, please do.

Otherwise, like you said, the KJV is the standard.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 16:32

Quote:
-----JB1968 I don't trust many of the modern versions because they change many meanings of verses.

JB, in my opinion anything later than the original Hebrew Version is considered new/modern version, or are we going to debate the word modern now?

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 16:35

Quote:
-----PassinThru...Yes, if you can compare to the original, please do. Otherwise, like you said, the KJV is the standard.

I never said the KJV was the standard, were you talking to me? please show me were I said that, and I may have and just don't remember. Comparing the Hebrew version to the KJV is no different than comparing the NASB to the KJV, well in my world.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 16:44

Sorry about the Readers Digest thing, I was only using that as an example how God could use it to speak to us Spiritually if he wanted, like he used a donkey in the Bible, hope this clears that up. I am not comparing the RD to the Word of God.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 16:44

Here are some Hebrew comparisons, Bill.

The NIV, NASB, ESV reject the Hebrew Texts
Part One - Genesis through Psalms
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nivnasbrejecthebrew.htm>

The NIV, NASB, ESV reject the Hebrew Texts
Proverbs through Malachi
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nivnasbrejecthebrew2.htm>

Lucifer or Morning Star
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/luciferormorningstar.htm>

Ezekiel 29:7 Hebrew, Syriac or Greek? - The NKJV, NIV, NASB, ESV all depart from the Hebrew texts.
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/eze297hebgrsyiac.htm>

If you don't believe we have an Enemy, look at this.
<http://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/themagicmarker.html>

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 16:47

ok, that will keep you busy for awhile.

No biggie on the Readers Digest thing. God has spoken to me through the secular world many times and I never thought you were equating the Word of God with the Digest. A little levity is good in this disussion. We all have golden calves and need to let God melt them.

This link is amazing!!! Please seriously consider what these new modern day Scribes are doing to the Word of God.

Part I
<http://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/themagicmarker.html>
PartII
<http://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/themagicmarker2.html>

After reading this, it makes me sick to even think about reading a "modern" version. I'll take the archaic words, maybe it will edumacate me a little more if I look them up.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 16:56

I will just agree to disagree, your missing my point completely. I am not saying the KJV is not the closest to the original Hebrew, I was saying that it was also "a little" different than the original Hebrew version, as well as the NASB and all others. The KJV, however, "is not" the preserved word of God. God said he would preserve his word. He did not say that he would preserve it in all languages. Because the KJV has errors in it, we know that it is not the preserved word. It is very close. Most people in their lifetime will never study it enough to know the difference, but it still has errors. Thanks for the debate, and I understand your passion for the KJV, but most new converts, would not even make it to the KJV, if it were not for more modern versions to get them started.

Re: King James Discission, on: 2011/3/23 17:08

A friendly question. With so many persecuted pleading for Bibles are translation debates wise.

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/3/23 17:13

Derek Prince learned Greek from age 11 and studied it clear through Eton (as well as Latin - he was tri-lingual). Because he did not have an agenda to learn Greek, I trust his opinion on the original language; and he didn't get saved until he was serving in the British Army. He believed that the NASB, rough language and all, was the closest to the original Greek.

Just so you know I'm not starting an argument with anyone!!! I do, in fact, read the KJV but just because I read it doesn't mean I will adamantly make others adhere to it. Think about this.... Throughout time, God led by His Spirit (and still does) and not by the King James Bible - KJV only came into play 600 years ago. And look what a mess the church is in!

I truly believe that if they took away every one of our Bibles today, those who know His voice would not miss a beat in following Christ but the arguers would STILL be arguing over the versions even though they didn't have any to argue over!! Something to think about.

God help us to get our priorities straight!!
God bless,
Lisa

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 17:18

Quote:

-----martyr...A friendly question. With so many persecuted pleading for Bibles are translation debates wise.

I would say that any translation debate later than the original Hebrew version that God gave Moses, is just a translation debate, and proves nothing but one is later/closer to the original Hebrew version than another. To answer your question, I say no it's not wise, Bible version debates always bring out the extremest, but there all extreme from the original, so if a ll error, whats the point? Is there little lies and big lies? or is a lie a lie?

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 17:22

Quote:

-----Lysa ... I truly believe that if they took away every one of our Bibles today, those who know His voice would not miss a beat in follow ing Christ but the arguers would STILL be arguing over the versions even though they didn't have any to argue over!! Something to think about.

Ouch! as bad as I would like to disagree with you, I can't.

Re: , on: 2011/3/23 17:39

Good point. Look to China, Iran, and India. The believers there ate so thankfu to get a Bible. They do not debate the tra nslation.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/23 17:59

Billpro,

Sorry for your attitude. I was expressing my opinion. I guess I'm done conversing with you. Have a nice day.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/23 18:25

It should be noted that the texts the KJV scholars used to make their translation from has since been lost to time. Attem pts have been made to reconstruct the reconstructed texts that they used. (it should be noted, they didn't have one singl e text they translated from, rather, they had multiple fragmented texts that were incomplete) But those differ with one an other too. Which would mean, using the argument of those who take a TR/KJV only stance, God's word has forever bee n lost in its original languages. Which is very thing TR/KJV only advocates argue against.

Sigh.

KJV-only is simply a dogma. It's not based on Scripture, scholarship, or reason. Thus, arguments against the position will always fail, because those who hold to such a position aren't basing their argument on Scripture, scholarship, or rea son. It's simply a statement of faith. Nothing more, and nothing less.

edited

Re: Scripture Comparisons? - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/23 18:27

I guess I will add my two cents to this discussion if I may.

It seems unreasonable to compare English translations of the Bible, because the original texts were not written in Englis h but in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek.

Unless you know all those languages very well and can give convincing evidence that the Hebrew and Greek manuscrip ts you approve of have more weight than the others, you are being unreasonable in arguing for any particular version.

For example, you can find ommissions in the KJV as well as the NASB if you compare the two. The bottom line will com e to which Hebrew and and Greek manuscripts have more weight because they use different ones. In order to reasonabl

y assess that comparison you should know the languages and know the history of what texts are used and why.

Joyful Heart, amen to your post if you read this! God bless you.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 18:49

Quote:
-----Oracio..It seems unreasonable to compare English translations of the Bible, because the original texts were not written in English but in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek.

What seems unreasonable is us comparing God's preserved word to the KJV. God is God, if he would have wanted his preserved word to be in the KJV he very easily could have. If we both have identical cars, and we remove a lug nut from one of them, they are now different. Here we are arguing over God's word, that most of us don't understand any version well enough to argue anyway, and that is in all versions of the Bible, none know it well enough. Jesus said it is the Spirit of truth that teaches us all things, truth is the Word of God, it does not say the "Truth of the Spirit".

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 18:52

I really do not like debates and actually think they accomplish very little.

I educated myself on the Bible version controversy because young Christians ask me about Bible versions.

It is absolutely true that Satan has conspired to use men to create false religions. You would all agree. You would also agree that Satan counterfeits the Holy Spirit, signs and wonders and the gift of tongues. He counterfeits the voice of God, and dreams and visions. He counterfeits the leading of the Spirit and many other things, but very few today want to admit that he counterfeits the Word of God.

For instance, today's TNIV is extremely similar to the Jehovah Witness bible. Would you like proof? Just google it. There is plenty of hard, factual comparative research.

It is a joy to show people who are openminded the beauty and accuracy of the KJV. Also, many foreign versions come from the KJV.

For a long time there was a Spanish version that was not very good. The Reina-Valera had many, many problems but today, thanks to the work of Humberto Gomez, it is a true Textus Receptus bible. It is called the Reina-Valera Gomez 2010 (RVG).

Dr. Rex Cobb, of Baptist Bible Translators Institute, compared the RVG with other common Spanish Bibles to see how many times they departed from the traditional text (the TR). Here are the results:

- *The 1569 departed from the TR 75 times
- *The 1602 departed from the TR 57 times.
- *The 1862 departed from the TR 118 times.
- *The 1865 departed from the TR 28 times.
- *The 1909 departed from the TR 122 times.
- *The 1960 departed from the TR 191 times.
- *The 2001 departed from the TR 69 times.

*The RVG departed from the TR ZERO times.

Here are more comparisons.

<http://www.chick.com/catalog/books/comparisonchart.pdf>

I believe God's perfect words are preserved in any language wherever a few points are fulfilled:

The complete text

1. Accurate translations of the words in the target language

2. Formal equivalence as the translation strategy

3. There may be a point where one chooses to use this vs. that word, but both mean the same thing.

The key was just stated: they both mean the same thing!

But what we have today is not formal equivalence. We have wholesale, unadulterated adding to and subtracting from God's Word.

Ok, you guys are old crusty Christians and don't care about this. But, that does not change the fact that some serious destruction is being done today by our "enlightened scholars".

The persecuted church deserves the best translation we can give them. If we want the best, why would we not give them the best?

Every society deserves the Word of God from the best and most predominant manuscripts which is the Textus Receptus.

It is condescending and glib to just say, "The persecuted church is happy just to get a piece of any Bible they can get". That is a sickening statement and reveals a lot about what we think of God's Word and our persecuted brethren. We have been so dumbed down by our modern scholars that we will even read the Jehovah Witness bible which comes against the divinity of Christ and think nothing of it.

Is this what you desire for your kids, your grand-kids, the persecuted brethren, new Christians?

I know some KJV only people are very caustic and I do not agree with their attitude. It is either their way or the highway and likewise it is the same with non-KJVers. What I try to communicate is the slippery slope modern textual criticism and translation (if you can call it that) is taking us. The Word of God belongs to the Church not to a committee.

One thing I like about the KJV committee is that they did not do their work in secret. They sent copies out weekly to the area churches to review. Unlike, Westcott and Hort who did their "masterful" work in secret for 10 years (1881).

So, just realize, that I am looking at the big picture and where the written Word of God may be in 2 or 3 more decades. There is a concerted effort to malign God's Word and get rid of the KJV.

Some things I miss:

People in a small gathering singing God's Word because they all have different versions and very few know the Bible songs anymore.

Hearing people recite God's Word, because no one can memorize the new versions (the verses are longer, more wordy).

We have surely lowered the standard today.

Many Christians attempt to evade the issue of whether or not there really is a perfect Bible (as they are told from the pulpit) by piously hiding behind the statement, "I don't make an issue of Bible translations."

It is perfectly acceptable to assume such a position as long as you are consistent in your stand... or lack of it.

In other words, if the issue of a perfect Bible is a "non-issue" with you, then to be consistent, neither should be ANY of the following:

1. The virgin birth of Jesus Christ. Isa 7:14

2. The deity of Jesus Christ. I John 5:5

3. The substitutionary death for sins made by Jesus Christ. Romans 5:8

4. The bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ. I Cor 15:4
5. Salvation by grace alone without works. Eph 2:8, 9
6. The Pre-millennial return of Jesus Christ. I Thess 4
7. The existence of a literal Heaven. John 3:13
8. The existence of a literal Hell. Mark 9:42-44
9. The acceptance of Creation over the theory of evolution. Gen 1:7

These things have been taken out of some modern versions.

How on earth can a thinking, rational person make an issue or have a conviction on something that they have taken out of the Bible, but see "no issue" concerning the perfection of the Book on which they base their every issue? IF the Bible has mistakes in it, then how can we be sure that it is correct in those passages on which we base our convictions?

\Some may say, "I accept the Bible where it is accurately translated." Fine! THAT is the statement of faith of every Morm on in the world! WHO is to judge just where the Bible is "accurately translated?"

No, it is impossible to make "any issue" over even one doctrine from the Bible and claim not to make an "issue" over the Bible itself.

Why then do people make such a statement? Basically, it is out of fear of the consequences of such a stand. They are a afraid of the rejection of their friends, family, and fellow-workers.

How bold for the truth are you?

Quote by Samuel Gipp.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 18:54

KingJimmy,

"KJV-only is simply a dogma. It's not based on Scripture, scholarship, or reason. Thus, arguments against the position w ill always fail, because those who hold to such a position aren't basing their argument on Scripture, scholarship, or reaso n. It's simply a statement of faith. Nothing more, and nothing less."

This sounds good, but it is absolutely not true.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/23 18:55

Arguing the Word edifies nothing period. Why can't folks just be happy with the fact that many different versions have br ought in many lost sheep period. .

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 18:55

ok guys, I really must bow out of this.

Just a lot of irrational statements and cute anectodal stories being made now.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 19:00

You are absolutely right Bill, let's stop.

When you first post on a thread, you don't know how it is going to go. You don't know that there may be a lot of resistance. No thread starts out as an argument, right?

So, let's all stop now. There does not seem to be anybody on this thread who is genuinely interested in knowing why the KJV is the most accurate translation. For that matter, there does not seem to be anyone who would like to know why there are different translations.

So, we just have the wrong audience here and trying to explain to people that do not want explanation is vain at best and foolish at the least.

Bless you all in Christ Jesus, richly.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/23 19:20

Quote:

This sounds good, but it is absolutely not true.

>>It's not based on Scripture...

You can't defend the KJV-only position using sola scriptura.

Quote:

scholarship

>>scholarship...

If you prefer the Majority Text family, that is fine. There are decent arguments for this. But, the KJV-only crowd can't point to a single document and say "this is the only one." Indeed, no such document exists. There is not one singular text underlying the KJV translation. It was produced from a family of texts, using an eclectic method to determine which of the variants that exists within that family were best.

>>reason

KJV-only reason is entirely circular. Such, is simply not reasonable. Additionally, it forbids men to use the very same method (the eclectic method) in modern times that was used by the older scribes to produce the KJV. Any new textual discoveries are ignored. Erasmus and others, however, would've made use of these texts in the drafting of their Greek & Hebrew manuscripts. The older scribes made use of the best manuscripts they believed they had at the time. Modern scribes do the same thing.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 19:29

I never said I was KJV-ONLY and you are deflecting the conversation, again.

Why don't you read from the beginning? New people come in and think they understand what we are talking about. We are not talking about KJV-onlyism.

Let's just move on.

Everyone should understand where their Bible came from and you should have 100% faith and trust in God's Word. That is what you teach new converts, right? You do teach them that they can depend upon God's Word implicitly, right? I sure hope so. His Word is good. It is tried and proven. I don't live by rules, I walk by the Spirit.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/23 19:32

Quote:

I never said I was KJV-ONLY

I never said you were.

Re: - posted by PassinThru, on: 2011/3/23 20:13

I still would like to know the purpose of why SI (aka Greg) posted this and never showed up again? The first sentence is nice. Then it progressively becomes sarcastic. I guess, I better wise up quick if I am going to survive in this forum. It is really a shame how those that love the KJV are marginalized by sarcasm, ad hominem and condescension. I don't make fun of the KJV Only people or the people that like other translations.

Anyway, here again, is what Greg posted. For what purpose, we will never know unless he shows back up. Surely, he knew what he was doing. Seems it was a backhanded way to show disdain for KJVers. Then all his friends jump on me. Not totally unexpected, I might add.

"On its 400th anniversary, the King James version of the Bible is universally recognized as a literary masterpiece that profoundly shaped both modern Christianity and the English language.

At the Bible Baptist Church in Mount Prospect, Ill., however, it's accorded a much higher level of reverence.

"Using anything but the King James version is like shaving with a banana," said Chris Huff, the church's pastor.

The suburban Chicago church belongs to a loosely defined denomination known as the "King James Only" movement. Members believe that the King James version is not just another translation, but the indispensable underpinning of a Christian's faith. ..."

read more: http://www.mercurynews.com/faith/ci_17627215?nclick_check=1

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/23 20:30

What does it really matter the reason why Greg might have posted the thread? It is his site after all. Might he post a piece that generates discussion should he so choose?

Re: , on: 2011/3/23 22:10

Hey, it's snowing up here. Walking pass everyone on my way home not long ago, I was wishing them all a Merry Christmas. We had peeper frogs just last night. Oh well.
Peace on earth to men of good will.
They say that's the true translation of that verse.

Maybe Brother Greg posted it to get Krispy to come back outta his shell.

Come back Krispy.

Passin thru - I agree, if we don't start having a few laughs together before the Gastapo come take us - we'll wish we had.

I love the KJV because of all of the Word Study Books that are numbered to it because of the KJV Strong's. Lazy Daisy uses other's books now for the Greek, thanks to Mr. Strong.

There are a few versions that are pretty bad though. "The Message" for one. Not too keen on the NIV neither, but read it for 9 yrs at one point. Messed me up again for the KJV Strong's that I was used to using and some verses were just not right at all.

No, not saying the KJV is the version Paul used, but it is the better of them all... but martyr did bring up a good point about translating to other languages.

I've found mistakes in the KJV as well, with the Greek - so there's no perfect version but the TR has to be the source - I agree!

Again, Peace on earth to men of good will.
Merry Christmas y'all!

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/23 22:34

From what I have read(not too much), the Textus Receptus is based on many manuscripts that seem to be very unreliable to many Greek scholars because the earliest existing ones date to a much later time than the original autographs. For example, the manuscript used for the reading of 1 John 5:7 in the KJV(where the Trinity is clearly mentioned) dates to around 1200 AD. That's why even many pastors and scholars who love the KJV admit that that is most likely a spurious verse and should not have been included. And the same principle applies to many other verses that were not included in the newer versions.

Many Bible scholars say that some of the newer versions such as the NASB NIV and ESV are more reliable because they are based on more older and widely-spread existing manuscripts.

And so the debate goes on...

sigh

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/3/23 22:47

Welllll, I have not yet read any verse that says "Whosoever shall prefer the KJV over any other translation shall enter the kingdom of heaven."

Re: - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/3/24 0:28

Passin Thru,

Have you seen this? <http://www.str.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=6068>

Quote:
-----Is the New Testament Text Reliable? The phrase, "The Bible's been translated and recopied so many times..." introduces one of the most frequent canards tossed at Christians quoting the Bible. Can we know for certain that the New Testament has been handed down accurately

? Yes, we can. By: Gregory Koukl

I have laid back and not posted here. I should have not left you to be the one voice of reason. Of course the evil one has his hand in the writing of the newer versions of the Bible. Without a doubt. When you see God not being referred to as Father for fear of offending the National Organization of Women, where do you think that comes from?

Lord willing some of the posters here will feel compelled to follow the link I posted and learn why the KJV is trustworthy. How could we trust our souls to it's teachings otherwise?

I read the Revised KJV, the KJV and the Amplified Bible and Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible. If I used a translation different from KJV my Matthew Henry Commentary would be incompatible.

If I do not understand a passage I believe God can open my understanding. Or, like the in Acts chapter 8, men of God will be provided.

Quote:
-----behold, a man of Ethiopia, an eunuch of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians, . . . read Esaias the prophet. 29: Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot. 30: And Philip ran thither to him, and heard him read the prophet Esaias, and said, Understandest thou what thou readest? 31: And he said, How can I, except some man should guide me?

I have compared enough of the passages that Passin Thru provided to know I do not want to risk my very soul on any of her translation. I know in this life I will not have the opportunity to learn Greek - in the next life, I will get the Word from His mouth. How sweet that will be.

I, too, found it odd to have a moderator start the thread and then drop out. Perhaps, something has come up in his life that is preventing him from joining the thread. It is better to think that way, don't you think?

white stone

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/24 0:57

Quote:
-----Wellll, I have not yet read any verse that says "Whosoever shall prefer the KJV over any other translation shall enter the kingdom of heaven."

Very good point, Sister Ginnyrose.

Of course, I haven't seen a verse that says that anyone is condemned to Hell for reading (or even preferring) the NIV either.

Then again, some people literally believe that the KJV is THE only version of the Word of God that is "holy." I've been warned by some well-meaning people (including a few here at SermonIndex) that they "worried for my soul" because I prefer both the KJV -and- the NIV -and- the NASB.

Personally, I think that the NIV (1978, 1984) is the best academic version taken from its source texts and the NASB/KJV are the best versions taken from their set of source texts. This is my conclusion after quite a bit of research -- including having contacted scholars, experts and translators.

I often suggest to anyone who embraces a KJV-only mentality to read the translators' preface to the original 1611 edition (remember, our "current" KJV is typically either the 1769 edition or the 1850 edition). After all, the translators were very clear that their version was NOT perfect.

In addition, I suggest that such individuals read the writings of the original translators. Some of those translators believe

d some wacky, unbiblical doctrines. Moreover, there were things that those translators were instructed to do (and not to do) during the translation process (such as to exclude any "notes," "footnotes" or possible alternative renderings).

Currently, I read the KJV, NIV and NASB...alongside several other versions (like a Spanish translation that predates the KJV). As Greg has said, such versions can be helpful in our attempts to gather a different perspective or rendering regarding a particular verse or passage.

And, just as a note regarding something someone said earlier: The NIV did not "leave out" words or passages. Those things were just not found in the source texts that the translators of the NIV believed to be the most reliable. Some of those texts were older than those used for the Textus Receptus (which was completed entirely by one man -- a Dutch Catholic humanist).

I agree with what others have echoed: It is important to read the "Word of God" in the Spirit and not just read the paper version of it. Without the Spirit, the Bible (regardless of version) is just a thick book filled with paper and ink. A mere Bible can be destroyed by fire, flood, or even deterioration through age. However, the infallible Word of God is Eternal -- having created "all things" (John 1:1-5) and will soon arrive once again upon the Earth (Revelation 19:13).

We can easily ask God to guide us as we study the KJV...the NASB...the NIV...or other credible academic translations. After all, it is the Spirit that gives life (John 6:63).

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2011/3/24 1:11

What an absolutely boring argument. I am eating a Ribeye steak right now. With salt and A1.

Please, someone tell me to only eat New York Strips...

Re: - posted by mguldner (), on: 2011/3/24 1:18

"Please, someone tell me to only eat New York Strips..."

Brother it would be only proper if I may point out your obvious error, Everyone knows one who is of the Christian persuasion should only eat New York Strips. It is more godly and more accurate to the flavor of steak. ;)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/24 1:30

:-)

This made me chuckle aloud!

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/3/24 6:02

Quote:

-----by Joyful_Heart

Unfortunately so many who believe only the KJV should be read turn many away from reading the Bible.

How could you offend anyone?? You speak the truth in love (edited out a sentence).

The quote is truth. God bless you, Joyful!

Lisa

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/3/24 6:17

Quote:
-----PassinThru wrote:
You don't have to prove you are spiritual and love the lost just because you don't read the KJV. I am not questioning anyone's spirituality. I keep trying to bring everyone back to scripture comparison of translations, but it seems no one wants to do this. I am not saying anyone has a religious spirit and I hope you are not saying that, too.

Brother, that's not what this thread is about; my friend, it seems that you 'took some imaginary bait' you thought had been thrown out there. Did you even read the article Greg posted?

I don't know if you've seen it but Greg has a 'News and Current Events' section here on sermonindex and he posted an article about the 400th anniversary of the KJV. He did not post it to compare translations; I don't know him personally but I'm thinking he might have posted under 'Scriptures and Doctrine' if he had an agenda.

Submitted in love, brother.
God bless you, PT
Lisa

edited and added this comment about 1 and a half hours later:

Quote:
----- PassinThru wrote:
Anyway, here again, is what Greg posted. For what purpose, we will never know unless he shows back up. Surely, he knew what he was doing. Seems it was a backhanded way to show disdain for KJVers. Then all his friends jump on me. Not totally unexpected, I might add.

Actually, this might have gone away had you let it! But I looked back and you began posting on page 2 with "Ok, I'll take the bait and see what happens." Well, this is what happened and now you are crying foul!

And brother, no one jumped on "you," this has been a most pleasant discussion than the ones in the past. Search the previous threads on this topic and you will see that you are not a martyr in this discussion!!

God bless you, brother! No one hates the KJV.
Lisa

Re: , on: 2011/3/24 16:58

Friendly question. Does one need to read the King James Bible to go to heaven????

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/24 20:13

Oracio,

From my understanding and what I have been taught is the KJV is from a much larger family of texts that are consistent in content, whereas many of the modern texts used may be older, but less consistent in content or with more fragments missing. The family of texts for the KJV have thousands of manuscripts that are consistent, in contrast to what may be a few that are older that are inconsistent. Just because a text is older does not always imply accuracy. It is possible that some of them were faulty versions of the Gnostics or Romans.

Chris,
Quote,
"And, just as a note regarding something someone said earlier: The NIV did not "leave out" words or passages. Those things were just not found in the source texts that the translators of the NIV believed to be the most reliable."

I remember giving my Dad a NIV in the late 80's trying to witness to him since he said he had a hard time understanding the KJV. When we got to certain passages (John and I don't remember where else), it left them out entirely with a footnote saying they were not in the older and more reliable manuscripts. What a way to cast doubt upon a non-Christian. T

hat was a stumbling block. How do you harmonize that with verses that speak of adding to and taking away from the Word of God? Needless to say, that left a bad taste for the NIV. Now there is another NIV that changes even more.

My personal opinion is we do not need another translation of the Bible. We just need to obey the one we have.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/24 21:18

Hi JB1968...

Quote:

I remember giving my Dad a NIV in the late 80's trying to witness to him since he said he had a hard time understanding the KJV. When we got to certain passages (John and I don't remember where else), it left them out entirely with a foot note saying they were not in the older and more reliable manuscripts. What a way to cast doubt upon a non-Christian. That was a stumbling block. How do you harmonize that with verses that speak of adding to and taking away from the Word of God?

A common fallacy is that the translators of the NIV "left out" things. This is incorrect. The translators didn't include those passages because they weren't in the manuscripts by which most experts believe to be the oldest and most reliable. In other words, they translated the manuscripts that they deemed to be best...and those particular passages weren't contained therein.

Thus, there was no "taking away" of the Word of God anymore than the translators would have been "adding to" the Word of God by their inclusion in the finished work. After all, these translators attempted to complete an honest and accurate translation from what they deemed to be the best sources. Those passages just weren't there.

In my research, I was able to contact some of the original translators of the NIV. There are several reasons that those translators (and most modern manuscript experts) believed that those texts are more reliable. It wasn't merely the fact that the texts were older. There were certain signs that the later texts that were used to create the Textus Receptus (by a single Dutch Catholic humanist, no less) were derived from some of the texts by which the translators deemed to be older.

I urge individuals who are curious about Bible translations to avoid websites and secondhand "proclamation" sources that are often filled with more insinuations and accusations than research. Instead, we should consult sources. If someone wants to know why the translators of the NIV made decisions, they should contact the organization and those translators themselves. Even if we are to still disagree with them, it would at least give them the opportunity to answer some of the common accusations.

Quote:

-----My personal opinion is we do not need another translation of the Bible. We just need to obey the one we have.

I agree. However, I do not have just "one" version or translation. I use the KJV, NIV and NASB (along with several other editions -- including a Spanish version that predates the KJV). I prefer the language of the NIV (1978, 1984) because it fulfills the notion (shared by the translators of the KJV) of a "vulgar" ("common") language translation.

But I certainly agree that we need to obey what we receive from the Lord -- regardless which translation we use.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/24 21:28

God spoke through a donkey to wake Balaam up to the knowledge of God, and here we are arguing over Bible translations.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2011/3/24 22:31

MrBillPro.

Sometimes donkeys make more sense.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/24 22:33

Quote:

-----Miccah...Sometimes donkeys make more sense.

Amen! Amen! and Amen! can I get another Amen!

Re: , on: 2011/3/24 23:34

AMen!

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/25 0:14

I enjoyed your insights Chris. Have you had Hebrew or NT Greek?

I understand your point on why the translators did not include certain verses etc. in the NIV. Basing their translation on the minority texts which includes a small portion of all manuscripts. Even the Codex Vaticanus could be conceived as a Catholic manuscript since it was found and housed in the Vatican library, which is a minority text. Erasmus may have been Catholic, but the majority texts are based upon most of the copied texts which hold to a consistency of agreement. Unfortunately, none of the original manuscripts are available for viewing. However, since many of the modern versions have used the minority texts, it has caused some speculation and doubt concerning the infallibility, inerrancy, and inspiration of all the Bible.

Re: , on: 2011/3/25 0:21

I hope when you say sometimes donkeys make more sense that you are not speaking politically. Just a joke.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2011/3/25 2:19

I stay out of politics for the most part. Blessings!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/25 2:36

Hi JB1968,

Unfortunately, I didn't major in Biblical linguistics while in college. However, I was blessed with the opportunity to take some Bible and ancient language classes while attending college and grad school. Still, I don't pretend to be an expert in those fields.

However, I do know the importance of going to sources whenever possible -- including consulting those who are/were involved in the translation process of the versions in question. There are quite a few rumors and allegations about the NIV that have proven to be false. Yet they are still repeated on websites and books (and even "Gospel" tracts).

I wouldn't try to tell anyone just WHAT to believe. I would simply recommend that believers study the matter intently and with a prayerful and honest heart about such things (making sure to "test everything" that is presented to us).

In regard to the "Majority" and "Minority" text types, I would be the first to admit that I haven't arrived to a final conclusion on the matter -- about a supremacy of EITHER source material. I just haven't seen anything that would make me reject the Alexandrian text type or consider it in any way "inferior" or "inaccurate" compared with the other source texts. Moreover

ver, I have seen quite a few people who have loudly spoken about such things that just seemed to echo the hearsay (devoid of fact) that is repeated in NIV "conspiracy theory" articles.

Of course, I am not saying that about anyone in this thread. In fact, I didn't read most of the posts in this particular thread. However, ever-so-often, people join this website with an agenda to proclaim what they think to be true about such things. Such threads end up as back-and-forths in which the strongly opinionated will make strongly worded proclamations about translations like the NIV -- to the point where some have labeled it as "diabolic."

I think that this is a danger -- given that it is a faithful translation of a particular set of ancient manuscripts of the Word of God. It would be horrible to think that such believers were guilty of bearing false witness against the Word of God itself.

I will say that I have prayerfully studied this matter and feel the liberty to study the NIV alongside other versions (like the KJV and NASB). Not only do I believe that the NIV is the best academic translation of the set of sources it used, but I prefer the common language of the translation. Yes, there is something poetic about the language of the KJV. However, that is a period language now.

My wife, who was born in Mexico (but holds degrees from American universities and taught at the college level), doesn't understand the language of the KJV very well. She is forced to consult extra-biblical resources just to understand the King James version of the Word of God -- something that God (and even the translators of the KJV) never intended. However, she does read the NIV (in English and Spanish) and a version of Bible in Spanish that predates the KJV.

I suggest that believers simply study this matter...and avoid relying on the research (or supposed "research") of others when it comes to something that they feel to be so important.

I hope that I made my intentions a little more clear. I do not want to appear divisive about it at all.

God bless you, brother!

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/25 9:19

I've enjoyed the discussion with you as well and I understand your input. NT Greek is a wonderful language. Even though I studied it in Bible College, I am far from an expert in it. It is easy to listen to all kinds of voices and then miss the message of the Bible itself. May God give us insight to walk in the light of His Word.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/3/25 9:36

Quote:
-----It is easy to listen to all kinds of voices and then miss the message of the Bible itself. May God give us insight to walk in the light of His Word.

Amen!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/25 12:16

Quote:
-----It is easy to listen to all kinds of voices and then miss the message of the Bible itself. May God give us insight to walk in the light of His Word.

Very true...and Amen.

I think that this is the gist of it all. Unfortunately, there are many people who cannot clearly understand the early 17th Century language of the KJV or any of the languages from which it was translated. That is why it is so important that a Bible is printed in the "common" (or "vulgar" as the writers of the KJV called it) language -- that is understood by anyone willing to "listen."

Thankfully, God is found by those who seek Him with all of their hearts (Jeremiah 29:13). I just don't think that He was talking about a need of ancient languages, dictionaries or study guides. While those things are great, they are largely a modern tool that was unavailable for over a millennium -- and are STILL unavailable to most people in the world.

Again, I have no problem with those who prefer the KJV. I prefer it (alongside the NIV and NASB) over other versions. This is certainly not due to any belief in some inherent superiority of the version itself. I believe that the Word of God is Eternal and infallible -- but also that the Word of God is not limited or confined to the efforts of a handful of Church of England men from 400 years ago.

I also appreciate your thoughts and input. Too often, these sort of discussions turn into needless debate that serves to distract from what is really important -- knowing our Lord and introducing Him to a lost and dying world...and a Church to whom He is a celebrity stranger.

Re: , on: 2011/3/25 14:28

Amen. Was not the KJV built upon the work of William Tyndale. If memory serves his desire was to aee s translation of the scriptures the plough boy could understand. Is this not what the NIV and other translations are doing? Is language not an ongoing dynamic? The English that business, government, science, and commerce is not the English of 400 ye ars ago. I work in government. We communicate in modern English for understandingg. Would God not do the same in his word?

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/25 21:44

That's the case as far as I understand. Many of the KJVer's are concerned with the original texts that many of the newer translations are based upon. Fewer texts that differ more with the majority texts.

Re: , on: 2011/3/25 23:40

I think I would have liked the KJB translators. This is from their preface in the KJB, (their heart and attitude on the matter).

"Truly (good Christian reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make A GOOD ONE BETTER, or OUT OF MANY GOOD ONES, ONE PRINCIPAL GOOD ONE, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, THAT OUR MARK.Â"

I believe it did use the Tyndale, amongst others.

Like they said, their aim was to "make a good one better, or out of MANY GOOD ONES, ONE PRINCIPAL GOOD ONE". That displays a humble spirit, giving credit to "MANY GOOD ONES".

They probably had no idea that today's controversy about the KJV would exist. It was afterall, the most widely accepted version in the English world for centuries.

Here are some corrections they made and this is not a put down of the remarkable work that Tyndale did and mostly on t he run and in hiding. It was absolutely miraculous what he, as one man, accomplished.

Tyndale omitted the entire verse of Luke 17:36 - Â"Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left.Â".

Tyndale also followed the wrong text in Luke 2:22 where it speaks of Â"the days of HER purification according to the law of Moses.Â" Tyndale wrongly followed the texts that say Â"THEIR purificationÂ", which would include the baby Jesus.

Tyndale omitted the entire verse of Mark 11:26 - Â"But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven for give your trespasses. Â"

He also omitted the phrase in Mark 15:3 Â"but he answered nothing.Â" Tyndale omitted the words Â"being convicted by their own conscienceÂ" and Â"even unto the lastÂ" in John 8:9.

In John 19:38 Tyndale omitted the words: Â"He came therefore, and took the body of JesusÂ" from his text.

Amazingly, Tyndale's N.T. also omits all these words from James 4:6 - "Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble."

In 1 John 2:23 Tyndale omits the words: - "but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also."

Tyndale also followed different Greek textual readings in places like Revelation 16:5 (and shalt be vs and holy); 17:8 (and yet is vs. omit); 1 Peter 5:10 (us vs. you), 1 John 1:4 (your vs. our), and 2 Thessalonians 3:6 (he vs. ye).

In Romans 12:11 instead of "fervent in spirit, SERVING THE LORD", Tyndale followed different Greek texts which read: "fervent in the spirit. APPLY YOURSELVES TO THE TIME."

In the book of Revelation Tyndale omits the words: "And the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee" from Revelation 18:23 and the entire verse in Revelation 21:26 which reads: "And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it."!!

Most of Tyndale's translations were very good but some were absolutely horrible. For instance instead of "Not a NOVICE lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the DEVIL" (1 Timothy 3:6) Tyndale reads: "not a YOUNG SCHOLAR lest he swell and fall into the judgment of THE EVIL SPEAKER."

In John 21:5 "Then Jesus saith unto them, CHILDREN (paidia) have ye any meat?, in Tyndale was "Jesus said unto them, SIRS, have ye any meat?"

In 2 Corinthians 5:21 we read: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him", but Tyndale read: "that we by his means should be that righteousness WHICH BEFORE GOD IS ALOVED." (What?)

In Galatians 4:24 the KJB has: "Which things ARE AN ALLEGORY; for THESE are the two covenants", whereas Tyndale had "which things BETOKEN MYSTERY. For THESE WOMEN are the two covenants."

In Philippians 3:2 Paul warns of the Judaisers who would put them under the law, saying: "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of THE CONCISSION." But Tyndale translated this as: "...beware of evil workers. Beware OF DISSENSION."

In Hebrews 6:1 instead of "leaving the principles of the doctrine OF CHRIST", Tyndale has "the doctrine pertaining to the beginning OF A CHRISTIAN MAN."

In 1 Thes. 4:6 the KJB's "That no man go beyond and defraud his brother IN ANY MATTER", Tyndale had rendered as "that no man go too far and defraud his brother IN BARGAINING."

In Hebrews 9:10 the "carnal ordinances" becomes "justifyings of the flesh" in Tyndale.

In James 3:4 "whithersoever the governor listeth" was rendered in Tyndale as "whithersoever THE VIOLENCE of the governor will."

And in James 5:17 Elias is described as a "man SUBJECT TO LIKE PASSIONS as we are", but Tyndale rendered this as "Elias was a man MORTAL even as we are."

In Romans 3:19 we read concerning the condemnation of the law - "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may BECOME GUILTY BEFORE God", but in Tyndale this is rendered this as: "all mouths may be stopped and all the world BE SUBDUED TO God."

2 Timothy 2:16 in the KJB reads: "But shun PROFANE and vain babblings." But Tyndale reads: "UNGHOSTLY and vain voices pass over."

And in Revelation 7:14 we read: "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and HAVE WASHED their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." But Tyndale translated this as: "...made THEIR GARMENTS LARGE and made them white in the blood of the lamb."

To be fair to Tyndale, he had an incredible amount of pressure on himself, always watching out for his own life, he did not have the luxury of a "peaceful" setting in which to work. If he lived, I guarantee he would have been welcomed with open arms as one of the KJV translators.

And finally, it is NOT the version of the Bible that saves us, but faith in Jesus Christ.

777

For your consideration, I pray you search this out - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/3/26 12:25

<http://www.str.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=6068>
Is the New Testament Text Reliable?

<http://www.fillthevoid.org/Versions/Differences-1.html>

Satan's attacks are so subtle:

The first attack on God's word happened around six thousand years ago in the Garden of Eden. The serpent deceived Eve by first casting doubt on God's word, "Yea, hath God said" (Genesis 3:1). Then by denying it, "Ye shall not surely die" (Gen. 3:4). Compare this to what God said; "thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:17). By adding the word "not", the serpent deceived Eve, which led to the fall of the human race!

Also in Genesis 3:1 the serpent subtly takes the word "LORD" away from the word "God". The scriptures in Gen. 2:4 through 3:24 refer to "God" as the "LORD God" every time except when the serpent is deceptively speaking with Eve. This way he subtly takes authority and holiness away from God's name.

<http://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/preeminence.html>
Bible Versions and the Preeminence of Christ

This table compares various verses in the KJV, NIV, NASB, and NWT. The term "OMITTED" is used when either the phrase or word in question is omitted. This is just a small sample of over 200 verses.

Re: , on: 2011/3/26 12:41

Praise God that it is the blood of Jesus that does save us and not the translation we read. But then that begs another question. Are we reading the translation we so staunchly favor? I know that I do not spend enough time on the word as I should.

Re: - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/3/26 15:44

martyr,

Did you read 'any' of the material at the links I posted? Did you even read 'what' I posted?

Your posts are very short but filled with misspelled words as to be practically unintelligible (not easily understood). Actually, I am beginning to suspect you are purposefully trying to draw eyes away from the truth.

It could be you are simply trying too hard to join in with the SermonIndex group, if so, step back and rethink your approach. Instead of responding to the posts you are posting your own opinions and ignoring the opinions of those posts you do not acknowledge.

I am NOT forcing KJV only but I do want people to realize they can not make their own rules. God wants to be worshipped in the way he says. We can not say that he will speak to us from whatever translation we read. He will speak to us through His Word, not the world's word. If a Bible is simple to read I am reminded that 'straight is the way and narrow is the path.' I do not expect to get to Heaven on the wide, easy path. The evil one is very clever, on my own I know I would no

t stand a chance of withstanding him. Thank God, through His mercy, I have the Holy Spirit within me and the wonderful Lord Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God to shepherd me.

Go back to the post I made just before your last one and put in the time to read. You just may learn something. Then come back and post and be sure to use Firefox or Google Chrome for a browser, they have built in Spell Checkers. It is practically foolproof. :)

white stone

Re: , on: 2011/3/26 17:26

Sis, I know Brother Blain. He is legally blind and doesn't have a full keyboard nor a computer. May just have received one of those Ipad things or is still using a cellphone to type things.

He is involved with his State's Legislature and is not an ignorant man in the slightest.

I know him from his Ministry for the Persecuted Saints Worldwide. He has that phoneline where we can all pray together for the persecuted church. He'll at times go every night for 30 to 40 days at a time.

It's awful hard to see the little key-pad he's had to deal with.

I could care less how things are spelt. Even the best authors out there make "typos", nonetheless the handicapped as well as those from other countries who post here.

Anyhow - some things are more important than others - by a long shot.

Going off topic here - here's part of the latest email from our Brother martyr/Blain.

ETA: Blain made an observation earlier in this thread about the "Version" of Bibles that are used by non-English speaking folks around the world because that's where his mind is, I would suspect and I can surely see his point, they can't all have the KJV.

GOD truly Bless you dear Sister white stone.

Starting this coming Wed.TPW will convene each night for the next 40 nights thru 4/22 which will be Easter. The call will be for about an hour starting at 8pm cst. There will be prayer each night for a persecuted country. Sunday nights will focus on persecuted peoples.

Dear saints this would be a marvelous way to celebrate lent and pray for our brothers and sisters as they Undergo the sufferings of Christ. Therefore I invite each one of you to come on the call as often as you are able and pray for our brothers and sisters who are persecuted. For those of you who have not been able to make the call now is your opportunity for the next 40 nights.

Saints you have my permission to forward this email to any who love the persecuted.

The number of the call is 712-432-0031. Access code is 452614#.

Let us come and pray for the persecuted. Please pass the word out about the 40 day call.

From His Heart.

Blaine
Eph.6:18

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/26 18:34

Hi White_Stone...

Quote:

I am NOT forcing KJV only but I do want people to realize they can not make their own rules. God wants to be worshiped in the way he says. We can not say that he will speak to us from whatever translation we read. He will speak to us through His Word, not the world's word. If a Bible is simple to read I am reminded that 'straight is the way and narrow is the path.' I do not expect to get to Heaven on the wide, easy path.

I think that the problem with your statement is that it is built upon a notion that the KJV is inerrant. It isn't. After all, the KJV has been revised numerous times over 160 years -- and the one that you probably use is NOT a copy of the original 1611 edition. In addition, there are certain flaws in the text that cannot be easily dismissed. Nor do I buy into the premise that the KJV is somehow "superior" to EVERY other version available.

I do believe that the translators of the KJV (even those with some weird doctrinal views) attempted to create a faithful translation of the texts that were available to them at the time. Yet they were the first to admit that it was a flawed attempt made by fallible men.

The Word of God can be understood when it is presented in, well, plain English. After all, Jesus was often followed by little children. They hung around to the point where the apostles wanted to turn them away. There was no need to understand archaic words and phrases...a special "Bible" dictionary...or even a regular dictionary. Jesus spoke to the educated and uneducated alike.

Ironically, it was those who were supposedly "educated" in the Word of God -- the Pharisees, Sadducees, Scribes (and later "priests") -- who attempted to dictate what everyone else should believe. Thus, there is a need for individuals to read and understand the Word of God in the common language for themselves without relying on the interpretations of other men.

In 1611, the King James version of the Scriptures was simply a version that was translated to the modern tongue of the day. There are many translations before it and after it and in other languages that have attempted to do the same.

By the way, I don't think that you should accuse martyr of producing posts that are "unintelligible."

Quote:

Your posts are very short but filled with misspelled words as to be practically unintelligible (not easily understood). Actually, I am beginning to suspect you are purposefully trying to draw eyes away from the truth.

Go back to the post I made just before your last one and put in the time to read. You just may learn something. Then come back and post and be sure to use Firefox or Google Chrome for a browser, they have built in Spell Checkers. It is practically foolproof. :)

...and then...

Quote:

The evil one is very clever...

Sometimes, even "spell checkers" miss words like "cleaver."

I think that we should avoid meandering into a critique of one another's typing skills when discussing such things. After all, as our brother noted, some have a legitimate excuse for our less-than-perfect usage.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/26 19:53

Quote:
-----White_Stone...I am NOT forcing KJV only but I do want people to realize they can not make their own rules. God wants to be worshipped in the way he says. We can not say that he will speak to us from whatever translation we read. He will speak to us through His Word, not the world's word.

All translations later that the original Hebrew one Moses wrote, in my opinion is the worlds word, and it does not matter if you don't read Hebrew, it was the original. White_Stone God spoke through a Donkey, what would limit him from speaking to us from any version he want to? The God I know. has no limits, nor does his idea's or thoughts come even close to what we might think. Time to let God out of the box.

Re: , on: 2011/3/26 20:14

Quote:
-----Your posts are very short but filled with misspelled words as to be practically unintelligible (not easily understood). Actually, I am beginning to suspect you are purposefully trying to draw eyes away from the truth.

Quote:
-----It could be you are simply trying too hard to join in with the SermonIndex group, if so, step back and rethink your approach.

Quote:
-----Go back to the post I made just before your last one and put in the time to read. You just may learn something. Then come back and post and be sure to use Firefox or Google Chrome for a browser, they have built in Spell Checkers. It is practically foolproof. :)

Yikes! That's a mouthful of prideful guile if I've ever seen it on this site. I had to reread it a few times, because at first I couldn't believe what I was actually reading. Perfectly dreadful.

Re: Deepest apologies, on: 2011/3/26 20:46

I sincerely offer my deepest most profound apologies to White Stone and any other saint I may have offended through my post. That was never my intention. Also I will try to be careful about misspelled words. Please accept my sincerest apologies. Blaine aka Martyr.

Re: , on: 2011/3/26 20:50

Quote:
-----I sincerely offer my deepest most profound apologies to White Stone and any other saint I may have offended through my post. That was never my intention. Also I will try to be careful about misspelled words. Please accept my sincerest apologies. Blaine aka Martyr.

You weren't the one causing offense brother. I see no foul in your words. However the words end up being spelled does not reflect your heart.

The post directed at you was one of the most vile things I've ever had the misfortune to read on this forum. Please don't take any burden on this issue.

Re: , on: 2011/3/26 21:14

Whitestone,

This link was fascinating. Thanks.

<http://www.str.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=6068>

Is the New Testament Text Reliable?

The more I learn about how God preserved His Word through the ages, the more amazed I am at how jealous God is to protect His Word for us. There are some absolutely miraculous stories. I do appreciate you posting this link as I did not have it. It clearly explains to me how they go about reconstructing the text of the Old and New Testament from many fragments. It certainly seems very reliable. I have come to appreciate the work of a Godly translator, even though I don't have the disposition for such work. Thank God for men that dedicated their life to this work.

I know that a Donkey can speak to us. In fact, a donkey has never spoken to me, but God's Word has spoken to me many times.

I just want to say that I don't think anyone is trying to shove the KJV down anyone's throat. Not in this thread. Sure I see that approach on the Internet, and maybe that is why the knee jerk reactions. I do think people are trying to raise warning signals, though, about thoughts and meanings that are changing or being omitted, such as the Deity of Christ, the Sonship of Christ, the gender of Christ, the watering down of sin, the omission of hell, etc, etc. What is wrong with being concerned about these things?

I do certainly hope the KJV is printed for as long as Bibles can be printed. I think what people are saying is that there are some serious license being taken and many are showing examples of these actions. If people were just talking in the air, that would be one thing, but the concrete examples they show are troubling.

I agree with PassinThru, that if Satan would counterfeit everything else from God, why would he not try to malign and change God's Word? That would be the No. 1 thing that he would like to change and in fact it is the first thing he corrupted in the Garden. It completely escapes me why Christians would give Satan a pass concerning God's written Word to us. If you change God's Word a little bit in the right places, it takes on a whole different meaning.

Why are we concerned about False Prophets, False Teachers, False Signs and Wonders, and all manner of other counterfeitings of God, yet we cannot be concerned about Satan counterfeiting God's Word without being maligned?

It is ok, for people to be concerned with the changes and the erosion of meaning. Is it not? If the Church does not guard and protect the Word, we should not expect non born-again scholars to protect it. What is important to God, may not seem so important to them.

Don't you think that no matter what side you are on, the side that does not seem to care about the meaning of the Word changing more and more with each new version and the side that does care, there should be respect and grace extended. And a little understanding at why one side is concerned, would be helpful.

I am going to post some personal reasons why I like the KJV. Surprisingly, people get up in arms when you do this.

If it bothers you, may I suggest stepping back and asking God why this thing is rising up in your heart at the mention of someone talking about God's Word changing with each successive new version?

It is very valid for people to ask questions and think and wonder and even be suspicious. Nothing wrong at all with that. Let's stay in the Spirit, though.

Whitestone,

I am going to read these other two links. With a cursory perusal, they look good. <http://www.fillthevoid.org/Versions/Differences-1.html>

<http://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/preeminence.html>

Bible Versions and the Preeminence of Christ

Re: , on: 2011/3/26 23:43

Jesus-is-God has a signature with this website.

The Savior or the Scriptures

<http://www.bibleviews.com/savior-scripture.html>

It is an excellent read about Jesus Christ and the Word of God. They are not mutually exclusive and most importantly, there is no contradiction between Jesus Christ and His Word.

I think when I read this, a light turned on in trying to convey to you what our concern is.

What we are trying to say, is that with these new versions of the Bible, we are seeing contradictions that we never saw before between Jesus Christ and His "Word".

Is this not cause for concern and alarm?

I would expect someone to challenge my statement and want me to show them what I am talking about or to show me how I am mistaken.

Peace in Jesus,

777

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 0:05

I think the translators do a fantastic job. I tend to read a few different versions to try and understand some passages, it's easy now with a lot being online etc.

The King James is not necessarily more accurate, more likely less so because they have found older many older manuscripts since then. I do like the various phrases such as 'playing the fool' etc.

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 0:12

Hi andie72, do you have a link you can post and some comparisons that give an example of what you are talking about?

Thanks,

777

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 0:19

www.biblestudytools.com is one site.

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 0:30

Thanks, I appreciate the feedback, there is a lot there. Where do I go specifically to find the conversation or info about older manuscripts?

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/27 0:37

Hi anonymous777,

I think that you misunderstand: Many of us do NOT see "contradictions between Jesus Christ and His Word" even though we read and study with certain versions and translations other than the KJV.

Some of us have prayerfully studied this topic with strong academic scrutiny and purity of motivation (and without any preconceived bias). Thus, I feel no need to challenge any of your statements. However, I would urge anyone who tries to impart something into the discussion to make completely certain that their assertions are factual, correct and devoid of bias or any preconceived conclusions.

In past discussions, individuals have sometimes introduced things into these sort of discussions that they merely obtained from other websites, periodicals or other forms of secondhand source material. Some of the individuals who presented accusations about the NIV admitted that they had never attempted to contact the organization or scholars who participated in the process.

In addition, Some strong KJV-only advocates admitted to having never researched the process by which the translators undertook their endeavor...or the beliefs of the translators on the committee...or which versions by which the KJV translators borrowed phrases, words and usage...or even the history of the source material from which the KJV was partially translated.

That is quite a bit of academic neglect -- and a lot of faith in the supposed "research" of others.

I often suggest to individuals to perform as much research as possible BEFORE arriving to a conclusion or accepting the verdicts of others. Believers can contact Bible scholars, language and manuscript experts, and even Bible translation societies. Believers can research the various manuscripts and text types that were used as source material -- and what the various thoughts are regarding them (and why). Believers can study the lives of Erasmus, Wescott, Hort and others who translated texts. Individuals can even research the lives and beliefs of the translators -- including contacting the modern translators (when considering accusations about what they did or did not believe).

Anyway, there are many things that should be done BEFORE "taking a stand" on the issue of version supremacy. We just can't rely on the words, "research" and thoughts of others UNLESS we are willing to thoroughly "test" those things.

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 1:06

Hi ccchhhrrriiisss,

I do see contradictions and many others, too. That's the problem. Please keep reading, I show examples.

Appreciate your response. I was not intending on talking about translators, their lives or their motives. I think that is a dangerous road to go down and it is definitely not needed to defend the KJV. The KJV can stand on its own just fine.

I prefer to stick with comparing the KJV with newer versions and showing how the newer versions are losing the meaning of major doctrines such as the Deity of Christ, the Sonship of Christ, the teachings of the Trinity, Holiness, the importance of the Blood. The new versions teach salvation by works instead of faith, they support one world religion, etc., etc.

Here are a couple of topics:

Do You Have a Holy Bible?

NIV, NASB and most others - Men, Angels, Prophets, Apostles, Holy Ghost are not Holy anymore.

Please compare. 2 Pet 1:21, Matt 25:31, 1 Thess 5:27, Rev. 22:6, Rev 18:20, John 7:39, 1 Cor 2:13, Matt 12:31, Acts 6:3, Acts 8:18.

Also, Salvation by Works, instead of Salvation by Faith in Jesus Christ.

Please Compare a new version with KJV on these verses. Mark 10:24, Luke 21:19, John 3:36, Gal 5:22, Romans 11:6,

Rom 1:16, Acts 8:37, Col. 1:14, Mark 9:42, John 6:47, Acts 22:16, 1 John 5:13, 2 John 1:9, 1 Tim. 2:7, Gal. 6:15, Eph. 3:14, Gal. 4:7, Eph. 3:9 God, Col. 1:2, 1 John 4:3

I am still waiting for some explanation of these and many other verses already given. Why the apparent, egregious contradictions and/or omissions?

These new versions are matching up very well with the New Emerging Christianity that we are seeing today. Makes sense. Modern day scholars, translating the Word not just for "readability" but also to match modern day theology. The Emergent Church and Coming One World Religion. If you like I will show you these scriptures. Just let me know.

Peacefully,
777

“Satan cometh immediately and taketh away the word...” Mark 4:15

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/27 1:27

Hi anonymous777...

This is precisely my point. It is difficult to compare versions of the Bible that are taken from a completely different set of sources. That is why it is erroneous to claim that the NIV "deleted" something or that the KJV "added" something. Most likely, the SOURCES simply did not have those particular words.

As for your statements about the newer versions "losing the meaning of major doctrines:" This statement is fallacious if directed at strong academically accurate translations like the NIV or NASB. I can take my NIV and "prove" to you all of those sound things that you mentioned. To claim otherwise is either due to ignorance of what is contained in the version itself...or somewhat disingenuous due to preconceived notions that haven't been properly tested.

And, yes, I do have a "Holy Bible." In fact, I have a handful of them -- including versions and translations like the NIV, NASB, KJV and several editions from other languages. Those words that you mentioned -- they are all there.

Again, it does no good to compare particular verses if those verses are taken from different sets of sources. Still, one could take your argument, turn it around, and wonder whether or not the KJV (or its sources) actually "added" words -- especially since some of the sources that were used for translation were more modern than some of those used for the NIV. Of course, I wouldn't do that -- because it is not an accurate statement if used in either assertion.

So, the "explanation" that you desire will likely be found by the understanding that there were different SOURCES used for the various translations. However, I would urge you to conduct your own research and to expand that research outside of secondhand "research" attained from findings of others in books, literature, websites or hearsay. I urge you to look into this topic more studiously by going to firsthand resources whenever possible. If you have questions about the NIV or its sources, then contact the International Bible Society or the translators themselves.

Until then, it would be useful to stay away from rhetoric that pronounces final judgment upon the versions themselves or ties those versions to "emerging" philosophies of man. It would be a dreadful thing to find that our zeal led us to bear false witness upon a version of the Word of God.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." - 1 Thessalonians 5:21

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/27 1:33

Triple 7,

You concluded with some good thoughts. There does seem to be a watering down of doctrine with some of the new translations.

andie72 mentioned about older texts being found. These are the minority texts that differ somewhat with the majority texts which the KJV was translated from. Just because a couple of texts may be older and have differences in them, do not necessarily mean they are more accurate than the about 80% of all texts which are the majority texts.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriisss (), on: 2011/3/27 3:01

Hi JB...

Quote:

Just because a couple of texts may be older and have differences in them, do not necessarily mean they are more accurate than the about 80% of all texts which are the majority texts.

True. However, the reverse can be said as well. Just because the source text types are newer and were more rapidly dispersed throughout the "Holy Roman Empire" doesn't necessarily mean that they were more accurate either.

Of course, questions about the supremacy of one source text type over others is just one part of the matter. There are many other factors to consider when formulating such specific determinations and in regard to this matter as a whole.

This is where the need for the individual to really research the matter as thoroughly as possible comes in. And, in research, it is important to avoid biased material, secondhand sources and make the effort to seek out firsthand sources when ever possible. Hopefully, we are sincere enough in our desire to research and ascertain the truth of the matter that we would avoid seeking "facts" that would simply reinforce what we already believe or were taught.

This is ESPECIALLY true when an individual feels the need to loudly proclaim their own findings or declare with a degree of certainty the "supremacy" of one version (or source) over the other -- or, in some minds, that one version is "holy" and the others are not. If we are going to make such a far-reaching proclamation, we really need to get it right.

May the Lord keep each of us as we endeavor to find the truth in this matter.

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 9:06

Hi JB,

Yes, I understand the Majority and Minority Texts and where they came from. Chris says he can turn the argument around, but in actuality, he cannot. Making the statements that he makes (rhetoric) sounds really good to those that have not studied this, but he does not present anything concrete, while I do.

In fact, it is with his rhetoric, that he flippantly brushes what I present aside as if it never existed. Like someone using the air backhand to clear everything off their table.

No matter what we present, Chris will not look into it, and also, make sure with his statements that no one else looks into these things, either.

I end this thread in peace to all,

777

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/27 12:59

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

Chris says he can turn the argument around, but in actuality, he cannot.

No, I didn't say that I could turn THIS ENTIRE argument around. Rather, I could turn the question about the "just because it is older" statement about the minority text around and say something very similar about the source text types used for the KJV (i.e. "just because they are newer and were more dispersed throughout the Holy Roman Empire").

Quote:

Making the statements that he makes (rhetoric) sounds really good to those that have not studied this, but he does not present anything concrete, while I do.

Excuse me: But I do not seek to "sound really good" to anyone in this regard. I think that we should all strive to get to a point where we don't care about that sort of thing. Rather, if men are going to proclaim something as TRUTH regarding this matter -- then they had better be ready to present more than just a few verse-by-verse comparisons that they picked up from some books, websites or KJV-only teachings.

After all, a verse-by-verse comparison doesn't prove the superiority of ANY particular translation. It just highlights that these translations were taken from different sets of source manuscripts and the consensus by which the translators decided upon a set of words. Yes, each translation -- including the KJV -- was reached by consensus. That consensus is a good thing, since it helps prevent the particular views of one man from making its way into the translated text.

The only "translation" that I know of that was translated by one man was the Textus Receptus -- translated by Erasmus (a Dutch Catholic Humanist) -- upon which much of the New Testament of the KJV was based. I am not trying to imply that this was a bad thing, but it is certainly within the same vein of discussion as Wescott and Hort.

Quote:

In fact, it is with his rhetoric, that he flippantly brushes what I present aside as if it never existed. Like someone using their backhand to clear everything off their table.

Brother, what have I "flippantly brushed" aside? What have you "presented?" I've read your words in this thread since I entered the discussion. I certainly don't feel the need to visit more KJV-only websites (as I have already visited and read through plenty of them). I have already pointed out that the verse-by-verse comparison is unfruitful because it mainly points out the differences in source material. I also hope that you realize that all of those vital doctrines of the faith are easily recognizable in the NIV and NASB -- and to say otherwise is simply untrue.

Quote:

No matter what we present, Chris will not look into it, and also, make sure with his statements that no one else looks into these things, either.

This seems to be a trend found in previous discussions here at SermonIndex where some believers strongly emphasize

the KJV (some to the point of believing that it is the ONLY "Holy Bible"). They question the motives or rationale of those who disagree with them. They question the extent of research by which those who have already researched this matter extensively and feel the liberty to read versions like the NIV and NASB.

Brother, if you want to use the KJV as your primary (or only) choice of Scripture, then, by all means, do so! However, I would simply caution you when you want to proclaim your specific views about the KJV and pretty much all other translations. You just can't proclaim the superiority of the KJV or that all other translations are abominations if your words are merely lifted from the teachings of others on this matter or if the research that you present is confined to pointing out differences in verses.

Believe me: I would be the first to disregard versions like the NIV or the NASB if I found anything that prompted me to do so. At this point -- and after much prayerful research (e.g. reading firsthand sources, contacting translators, contacting language experts, etc...) -- I just can't follow your advice with a clear conscience.

Again, there is nothing wrong with esteeming the KJV as your primary choice. However, there are definite questions about someone coming into a public forum like this and proclaiming damnation on all other versions, publicly questioning the motives of the translators (or those who read those translations) or attributing all other translations to some devilish conspiracy. Yes, there is a devilish conspiracy that has been at work throughout the ages. However, I think that one of the main tactics is to distract believers from what is truly important.

May our focus be upon intimately knowing the Lord and introducing Him to billions of others who have never heard of Him.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/27 14:05

Hi all,

To Chris,

Briefly could you state what 'the Holy Roman Empire' has to do with the KJV?

Many thanks.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/27 14:44

Hi Alive-to-God,

Quote:

To Chris,

Briefly could you state what 'the Holy Roman Empire' has to do with the KJV?

There are many historians who argue that the "Majority Text/Byzantine text-type" (of which the KJV and other translations trace much of their origin) was derived from Roman Emperor Constantine's push to distribute manuscripts from a "common source." Constantine spent quite a bit of money to undertake this effort.

In other words, it is possible that the great money spent by Emperor Constantine in producing and distributing these manuscripts throughout the Roman world led to them being later derived as the "Majority Text" ("Byzantine text-type"). After all, these texts differed from the older text-types that were found in the Alexandrian text-type source manuscripts. There are a number of scholars who believe that the Majority Text manuscripts were actually derived from the source text of the Alexandrian text-types (given the different peculiar variances found in the Byzantine text-types).

This reminds me of the comparison of various versions of Leonardo Da Vinci's THE LAST SUPPER painting. Most likenesses of this artwork are quite different from the original. However, this is because they were derived from later copies. As such, they represent the "majority" of copies -- as they were printed and reproduced later and were mostly derived from later versions and copies of the work. The original painting was different. Thus, it would be incorrect to assert that the

e versions that represent the majority of images were more "accurate" to the likeness just because they are found in the majority of reproductions. The most accurate likenesses are often found in the much older versions of the painting.

An interesting read about Constantine's immense funding for the publication and distribution of Scripture can be found in Gregory Armstrong's "Church and State Relations: The Changes Wrought by Constantine" from the Journal of Bible and Religion.

I hope that this clarifies what I was trying to say.

The Lord bless you.

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 16:15

Chris,

Your response is full of assumptions regarding what I am saying. You are adding to and taking away from my words.

Are you the only one allowed to get things from websites? Why do you limit where we can get anything from? How can you virtually "shutdown" a conversation regarding where we get our material from?

Where did you get this?

"The only "translation" that I know of that was translated by one man was the Textus Receptus -- translated by Erasmus (a Dutch Catholic Humanist) -- upon which much of the New Testament of the KJV was based. I am not trying to imply that this was a bad thing, but it is certainly within the same vein of discussion as Wescott and Hort."

By the way, your knowledge of the where the majority text came from is gross error and the overwhelming facts do not support that. But since I am not allowed to give you any references you will have to take my word for it, just like you want everyone to take your word for everything you say. So, there you have it. We have an impasse. I am not allowed to provide references and you won't provide any. Or if I do provide references, you denigrate them.

You are not the right person to have this conversation with. There is no reasoning possible with you.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/27 16:32

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

Your response is full of assumptions regarding what I am saying. You are adding to and taking away from my words.

Huh?

Quote:

Are you the only one allowed to get things from websites? Why do you limit where we can get anything from? How can you virtually "shutdown" a conversation regarding where we get our material from?

I didn't say that you can't "get things from websites." I said that we shouldn't consider information that we obtained from prejudicial websites as the extent of our "research." That is NOT the type of "research" that should merit us to make ultimate proclamations about something as important as this subject.

Quote:

Where did you get this?

"The only "translation" that I know of that was translated by one man was the Textus Receptus -- translated by Erasmus (a Dutch Catholic Humanist) -- upon which much of the New Testament of the KJV was based. I am not trying to imply that this was a bad thing, but it is certainly within the same vein of discussion as Wescott and Hort."

I got that from me. :-) It wasn't copied or taken from a website. It was my opinion that came AFTER much prayerful research (that was NOT confined to KJV-only websites or books). Let me be clear: I am NOT against the KJV. It is one of my versions of choice. I simply do not buy into the argument that it is infallible, superior to all other versions or the ONLY version that is acceptable to God.

Quote:

By the way, your knowledge of the where the majority text came from is gross error and the overwhelming facts do not support that. But since I am not allowed to give you any references you will have to take my word for it, just like you want everyone to take your word for everything you say. So, there you have it. We have an impasse. I am not allowed to provide references and you won't provide any. Or if I do provide references, you denigrate them.

You are not the right person to have this conversation with. There is no reasoning possible with you.

Brother, you need to drop the agenda AND the mean-spirited and vicious nature of your responses. It does not help your cause to attack me for simply questioning some of the premises that you have introduced regarding the supremacy of one particular version (KJV) or sources over all others.

I would certainly welcome any sources that aren't just taken from some KJV-only website. Moreover, I just haven't seen you present a single evidence that consisted of "fact" that would support such a premise. Feel free to provide references. However, I would just urge you to realize that reading websites and relying on someone else's research is not the same as the type of research that I described previously.

Again, you misunderstood me. I have not "declared" any final position on this matter. I am just introducing some points that seem to be lost in this discussion. There is no "impasse" and I am more than willing to review any credible "evidence" that you have found (specifically outside of some prejudicial KJV-only website or "conspiracy theory" book regarding versions of the Bible).

These are serious allegations. If someone is going to proclaim something so far-reaching, then they should at least allow for (and even welcome) scrutiny of their assertions.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/27 16:48

anonomous777 wrote

Quote:-----Making the statements that he makes (rhetoric) sounds really good to those that have not studied this, but he does not present anything concrete, while I do.

IMO Chris has presented a much more informed and unbiased opinion on this subject while others seem clearly biased and uninformed regarding the SOURCE texts being mentioned.

Many KJV proponents can only, and often do, resort to comparing the different translations themselves without going back to the source of the issue. It is a "surface" type of reasoning.

Quote:

-----Please compare. 2 Pet 1:21, Matt 25:31, 1 Thess 5:27, Rev. 22:6, Rev 18:20, John 7:39, 1 Cor 2:13, Matt 12:31, Acts 6:3, Acts 8:18.

And you point out many more, which you say teach a works based salvation.

I am guessing that Chris has not answered for all those verses because it is a tedious task. I don't think you would want to type out each of those verses in the above quote and the others you pointed out, in each translation side by side, and after each one explain why you feel it is omitting or adding anything.

I looked at a few and I can tell you right now that there is no difference that takes away or adds anything in any essential Christian doctrine.

For example, I will compare two of the verses you pointed out to show what I mean:

2 Pet 1:21 (KJV) For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

2 Pet. 1:21 (NIV copyright 2011) For prophecy never had its origin in the human will, but prophets, though human, spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.

What is the difference of concern there?

You pointed out Mark 10:24 as teaching works based salvation.

Mark 10:24 (KJV) And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!

Mark 10:24 (NIV 2011) The disciples were amazed at his words. But Jesus said again, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!

Regarding Mark 10:24 the immediate context in the NIV clearly shows Christ has trusting in riches in mind.

verse 23 says, "How hard it is for the rich to enter the kingdom of God!"

Again, what is the significant difference?

It is that kind of comparison that seems to show a clear and unreasonable bias.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/27 16:52

removed

a question to my brother Chris, on: 2011/3/27 17:15

TO ALL, read first, this is a question to my bro Chris, and not part of this whole tedious argument.

Chris, you mentioned Constantine putting a lot of money and effort into canon, are there any Copies/Manuscripts of the New Testament that predate 315 AD?

that is before Constantine and his "Holy Roman Church" reared its ugly head. (i dont want to get into what i feel about constantine, the roman institution, popery and mary idolatry).....but are you saying that the English Translations we have in our hands have been fooled with by the hellions in rome?

let me ask this question, when was Canon "locked" into what we read now?

God bless you dear brother, neil

okay, yall can go back to fussing.

Re: a question to my brother Chris, on: 2011/3/27 17:31

how silly, nothing's changed, as far as people arguing the Things of God. i've been trying to research my own question and read this line i just read:

Quote:
----- Deemed a heretic by the First Council of Nicaea of 325, Arius was later exonerated in 335 at the First Synod of Tyre, and then, after his death, pronounced a heretic again at the First Council of Constantinople of 381

first the poor fella gets tarred as a heretick in 325, then he gets exonerated, and only to be deemed a heretick after his death....he cant win, but who can at the hands of too tightly wound religionists?

Re: a question to my brother Chris - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2011/3/27 17:34

Hi Neil,

Quote:

Chris, you mentioned Constantine putting a lot of money and effort into canon, are there any Copies/Manuscripts of the New Testament that predate 315 AD?

Yes, certain portions of the Minority Text (Alexandrian text-type) predate the 315 AD date. They include the "Papyrus 46" manuscripts of the Epistles of Paul (and Hebrews) that are dated between 175-250 AD. In addition, the "Papyrus 66" manuscripts of the Gospel of John is dated somewhere around 200 AD -- which is about 100 years following the death of John.

In fact, there are quite a few other New Testament papyri that predates Constantine and the Roman Church. Nearly half of the manuscripts on the "papyri" list predate the 4th Century.

It is interesting that you bring up the Canon too. The "Canon" of New Testament scriptures traces its initial process back to the 4th Century AD...but wasn't widely completed until the 16th Century.

I hope this helps.

Re: Causing Unnecesarry Confusion and Division Within the Body - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/27 17:48

While I would agree that some translations should definitely be rejected(New World, and the Message for example), dividing over the KJV, NKJV, NIV, NASB, ESV and others is something I am convinced grieves the Holy Spirit. It causes non-believers to stumble seeing some true believers divide over such an issue. It causes a casting of doubt on the Word of God. It also causes new believers to be unnecessarily confused. Instead we should try to explain to them how God has indeed preserved His Word despite the minor variations in some words or points.

Dearest Chris!, on: 2011/3/27 18:20

Quote:
-----I hope this helps.

God bless you brother. i've been on this computer reading about.....i don't know what to call it all....but i never knew the polity of the "church" was so disjointed, and ugly.

i'm talking POST 315 AD, from what i read prior, i always thought that Constantine was a son of satan, and that the roman institution was most definitely anti-Jewish, that whore in rome has whipped up more men to kill more Jews than hitler dreamed of, crusades, inquisitions, etc.

but now i've been reading and it sounds all so SICK, and of the flesh, these machinations of man:

Quote:
-----Constantine is believed to have exiled those who refused to accept the Nicean creed—Arius himself, the deacon Euzoios, and the Libyan bishops Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais—and also the bishops who signed the creed but refused to join in condemnation of Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea. The Emperor also ordered all copies of the Thalia, the book in which Arius had expressed his teachings, to be burned. However, there is no evidence that his son and ultimate successor, Constantius II, who was an Arian Christian, was exiled.

okay, so he's exiling people and burning books, but this is a human king and suddenly HE DECIDES he's head of the "church"?

WHAT IS THAT?????

then constantine, new chief honcho decides he's been too much of a meanie:

Quote:
-----Although he was committed to maintaining what the church had defined at Nicaea, Constantine was also bent on pacifying the situation and eventually became more lenient toward those condemned and exiled at the council. First he allowed Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was a protégé of his sister, and Theognis to return once they had signed an ambiguous statement of faith. The two, and other friends of Arius, worked for Arius' rehabilitation.

but in the 'true' spirit of love they went after the guy that got Arius exiled:

Quote:
-----At the First Synod of Tyre in AD 335, they brought accusations against Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, the primary opponent of Arius; after this, Constantine had Athanasius banished, since he considered him an impediment to reconciliation. In the same year, the Synod of Jerusalem under Constantine's direction readmitted Arius to communion in AD 336. Arius, however, died on the way to this event in Constantinople. This was the same day Arius' own bishop prayed that if his heresy was to be propagated, the Lord take him in death that night- or better, Arius. Some scholars also suggest that Arius may have been poisoned by his opponents. Eusebius and Theognis remained in the Emperor's favour, and when Constantine, who had been a catechumen much of his adult life, accepted baptism on his deathbed, it was from Eusebius of Nicomedia.

i didnt know what a "catechumen" is until five minutes ago, in fact all this "religion" is making me sick, it's got NOTHING TO DO WITH GOD!....and everything to what with is foul and unclean about the dark hearted nature of man, with his pride and ego.

a "catechumen:

Quote:
-----In ecclesiology, a catechumen (pronounced /kætɪˈtɪkən/; from Latin catechumenus, Greek κateχόμενος, instructed - from κατα, "down" + χέω, "to pour") is one receiving instruction from a catechist in the principles of the Christian religion with a view to baptism. The title and practice is most often used by Orthodox Christians and by Roman Catholics.

so constantine wasnt even water baptized, can you believe that? here this guy is playing around with the Things of God, banishing folk, etc....and he isnt even water baptized.

Now, you tell me, we didnt start locking down Canon, that is New Testament Scripture UNTIL IT WAS IN ROMAN HAND

S?

meaning, those councils, that all met, to reason, what Gospels, Epistles Revelations, are in any translation of Bible, were only started after Rome started its institution, called a "church"?

so I'm to assume, it was under the aegis of that Roman institution, that Canon came to be decided?

that just tears me up, ya'll can argue KJV this and that all you want, something much more important is at stake.

Re: Dearest Chris!, on: 2011/3/27 18:52

Natan,

That is not correct what Chris is saying about the RCC giving us our canon and KJV Bible.

With all due respect, that is the problem today. Many do not even know where we got our Bible from.

If you would like me to post the two paths for the KJV and various other Bibles, I would be glad to.

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 18:54

Oracio,

With all due respect to you, too. The variations are major not minor. I would be happy to post major variations for you if you would like.

Re: , on: 2011/3/27 18:56

Guys/Gals,

Update:

Satan won't take away and change God's Word in a major way, all at once. Remember the garden? Only a small change, but yet significant. With each succeeding new version the Word is changed ever increasingly more and more. It's like the frog in the water. A little at a time. Satan may be dumb but he's not stupid.

Why can't anyone admit, that God's Word would be a major target for Satan to counterfeit, corrupt, malign and distort through "enlightened" scholars?

Why does Satan get a pass on this particular supposed counterfeit?

Does Satan leave God's Word alone for some special reason that I am not aware of. Think!!

"BEWARE OF THE SCRIBES"

Luke 20:46

anon777, on: 2011/3/27 19:21

its neil, my name, Natan is my Hebrew name, I spent many years of my life in the First Part, the Old Testament, I DO know Where That came from, my question is when did Canon get decided on for the New Testament, because if its after 315 AD, then it WAS in the clutches of the Roman institution, was it not?

if somebody else wants your paths to the KJV and various other Bibles, that's fine, I don't really care. I'm wondering when NT Canon was locked down.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/27 19:34

Hi Chris,

Thanks for your reply.

I think it's a stretch to attribute to Constantine, a head of state, changes to scripture in association with the addition of the word 'Holy', to 'Roman Empire'.

The need 'earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints' was in the church before Constantine became a Christian. He didn't have a theological background. To what end would he have taken any interest in tinkering with scripture? More likely the churchmen of the day are at fault than Constantine - unless you have some evidence?

Regarding the Alexandrian texts, are you saying that the form in which they appear now, is MORE reliable on the basis of their AGE? How do you KNOW those copies are not altered from the original?

How do Westcott and Hort have a bearing on the discussion?

Chris, no doubt God speaks to you through the NIV and the other versions you use sporadically, but how do you know you are not missing something, by not reading the KJV until you know it as well as you know the NIV, and can properly compare them?

You don't seem to understand that many KJV readers do not reject the minority text translations because we don't like the spoken language of today in which they are written, but because the Holy Spirit is revolted by the way the choice of modern language alters what God is saying. Of course you, as an academic, put great store by what you read, but the Holy Spirit puts great store by what God has said, and upon what God is trying to speak about HIMSELF through His word.

Somewhere earlier in the thread you said something (which I can't find again,) which seemed to mean that you, personally, do not object to another believer's personal choice of Bible version to read most. (If you can find your quote, that would be helpful.)

We will know you have genuinely laid down you anti-KJV agenda, when you stop entering threads about the KJV, insisting that we all do lengthy personal research into textual origins. This may be a necessity for those whom GOD charges with that task, but at what point does a man of God become trustworthy to you? Do you trust him because it's clear He hears from God, and God speaks to you through him? Or do you lay God's word to you aside, until you've found out if the speaker has measured up to the standards of academic excellence which you espouse?

Quote:

-----I think that you misunderstand: Many of us do NOT see "contradictions between Jesus Christ and His Word" even though we read and study with certain versions and translations other than the KJV.

Some of us have prayerfully studied this topic with strong academic scrutiny and purity of motivation (and without any preconceived bias). Thus, I feel no need to challenge any of your statements. However, I would urge anyone who tries to impart something into the discussion to make completely certain that their assertions are factual, correct and devoid of bias or any preconceived conclusions.

Chris, the only difference between your preconceptions and mine, or a777's, or Oracio's, or JiG's, are that yours are yours, and ours are ours. The only way any of us become free of preconceptions, is by the renewing of our minds through the Holy Spirit. And He's not done yet.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/27 19:47

Hi Neil,

This is not a direct answer to your question, but it is a part of it.

Erasmus was a reformer. He didn't want to have to leave the Catholic church, but if you read his writings carefully - especially early after he'd gathered the best manuscripts he could find, and translated them, you'll see that he put scripture above the authority of the Catholic Church. In a few very inspired words, he separated himself from the scriptures, and while holding them as the highest authority, remained willing to submit himself temporally to Catholicism such as it was in his day. (Very unsafe for Protestants.) You see the same kind of navel-gazing in Montaigne's essays. He was a Catholic who had scriptures engraved all over the ceiling of one of his rooms, but dared not fall out with Rome, because a bloody counter-reformation was in spate nearby his estate.

A useful study is to find the Pope by Pope alterations to doctrine which began to be added to the tenets of Catholic faith. Early on, it was not so, although there were always people who wanted to do Christianity their way, and not according to scripture. This would be a huge study, but my point is, that the alterations which may have been made by the time the canon was gathered together prayerfully, were to uphold the Trinity, because Arius was attempting to dilute the deity of Christ and His equality with the Father.

We actually have no idea whether Jesus ever said 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost', Matthew 28:19.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/27 20:11

Hi anonymous777,

Quote:

That is not correct what Chris is saying about the RCC giving us our canon and KJV Bible.

Friend, I did not say that. It is difficult to have a conversation when you keep implying things that I did not say.

I simply stated that some historians have raised the possibility to explain just why the Byzantine text type may have become widespread -- even though the manuscripts used were dated between 250-950 years later (compared with the Alexandrian text types).

I didn't imply that I necessarily believe that the widespread availability of the Byzantine text type during that period by which Erasmus singlehandedly created the Textus Receptus (in 1516) was due to the funding of Constantine to produce it. Rather, I simply pointed out that there are some scholars who believe this and that they base their view upon certain historic affirmations.

By the way, I think that it is important to avoid trying to read between the lines or guessing the motives of the individuals that you disagree with. It is not helpful to the discussion.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/27 20:14

anonymous777 wrote

Quote:
-----With all due respect to you, too. The variations are major not minor. I would be happy to post major variations for you if you would like.

Before I accept that offer and we move on from my last points, could you please post a response regarding the two verses I pointed out in my last reply? Could you please say why you believe the differences there are of such significance that you would pronounce the NIV as a work of satan?

On another note, many KJV only proponents are very legalistic and cultish when it comes to this issue of division over translations.

To me it seems like boarder-line, if not idolatry to hold to a belief in any kind of divine inspiration of any particular English translation of the Bible, whether KJV or other.

When we speak of the infallibility and innerrancy of Scripture it is in reference to the original writings of the prophets and apostles, not those who later gathered the copies of the originals and/or translated those copies.

To believe that any one particular scholar/translator or set of translators were more divinely inspired than the others is placing too much confidence in men.

I can understand standing for and defending essential Christian doctrine because it is clearly revealed in all the manuscripts from what I can see in the various translations being mentioned here. All of them clearly teach the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, the atonement, the new birth, salvation by grace through faith, etc. They all agree on those essentials.

Re: Dearest Chris! - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/27 20:51

Quote:
-----Natan4Jesus...that just tears me up, ya'll can argue KJV this and that all you want, something much more Important is at stake.

I agree Brother, will the bleeding ever stop?

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/27 21:34

Hi Alive-to-God,

Quote:

hanks for your reply.

I think it's a stretch to attribute to Constantine, a head of state, changes to scripture in association with the addition of the word 'Holy', to 'Roman Empire'.

Oh, I am not trying to attribute the differences in Scripture to Constantine. Rather, some historians have attributed the widespread availability by which the later Byzantine text type became as a possible result of Constantine's production of Scripture.

In addition, I used the term "Holy Roman Empire" via the common historic connotation of the term. I certainly don't think that the Roman Empire (or its church) was "holy" by any stretch of imagination.

Quote:

Regarding the Alexandrian texts, are you saying that the form in which they appear now, is MORE reliable on the basis of their AGE? How do you KNOW those copies are not altered from the original?

Please let me be clear: I have not arrived to a final conclusion EITHER WAY in regard to the supremacy of one text type over the other. I am simply pointing out the view of the majority of experts who tend to embrace the Alexandrian (Minority) text type. There are several reasons for this -- including the more mature age of the Alexandrian manuscripts (and the fact that they agree with one another in cross examination) -- even though they were found in diverse locations.

There are other reasons why most scholars embrace the Alexandrian text type as more reliable. This is why I suggest

d previously than individuals contact them (including the translators of the NIV) during their research.

But, again, I no more "know" that these copies of manuscripts were unaltered than I "know" that the manuscripts that constitute the Byzantine text type were unaltered. I simply understand the arguments on both sides on the discussion.

Quote:

Chris, no doubt God speaks to you through the NIV and the other versions you use sporadically, but how do you know you are not missing something, by not reading the KJV until you know it as well as you know the NIV, and can properly compare them?

Again, to be clear: Unlike some, I simply cannot assert with any ultimate certainty just which version -- or source type -- is "better" or more "complete" than the other. So, I read the versions knowing that Christ is the Word of God and that my faith and hope are in Him.

I will go further: I don't think that there are really that many differences between the underlying principles in the text of the KJV and NASB or NIV. Sure, the language is as different as a conversation in 1611 would be different from a conversation in 2011. Yes, there are some changes in usage that are natural because they changed over time (just like the language of 1611 differed from the language of 1211). And, yes, there are differences that are directly attributed to the sources used for translation.

However, I completely reject the notion by some that versions like the NIV or NASB "leave out" the meaning of the text or the vital doctrines of the Church.

Moreover, I think that it is akin to "straining a gnat and swallowing a camel" to think pick and choose a few verses that differ when the entirety of each work more or less testify to the validity of one another and the original, infallible Source. It is my belief that the ONLY source by which we can honestly proclaim as being completely and utterly infallible is the Word of God that was present at the creation of this world (John 1:1-5). This "version" of the Word of God is the substance, the real thing, whereas the versions of mortal men are but "shadows" handed down and translated on paper.

Quote:

You don't seem to understand that many KJV readers do not reject the minority text translations because we don't like the spoken language of today in which they are written, but because the Holy Spirit is revolted by the way the choice of modern language alters what God is saying. Of course you, as an academic, put great store by what you read, but the Holy Spirit puts great store by what God has said, and upon what God is trying to speak about HIMSELF through His word.

Somewhere earlier in the thread you said something (which I can't find again,) which seemed to mean that you, personally, do not object to another believer's personal choice of Bible version to read most. (If you can find your quote, that would be helpful.)

Again, I think that you misunderstand my position. I don't prefer either text over the other. However, I do prefer the Word of God in the modern tongue -- because it is more readily understood by men. After all, the KJV was translated into the "modern tongue" of 1611. The NIV was translated into the "modern tongue" of 1978. But I agree with the notion -- and have said as much -- about the need of the Spirit in the prayerful study of God's Word (no matter the version) by believers.

Personally, I do not "bear witness" with the idea that the Spirit of God is "revolted" by "modern" translations of Scripture. After all, there are "new" translations of the Scriptures into languages that NEVER had a version of the Word of God. I traveled to the Tarahumara tribes of Mexico and we presented them with Bibles that were translated into their languages recently. It was a difficult endeavor for language experts to complete a version of the Word of God in a seemingly primitive language like central Tarahumara -- but it was a task worth completing. After all, there was no version of the Word of God in that language just a few decades ago. Now, the estimated 80,000 to 200,000 indigenous Tarahumara people now have at least one version of God's Word that they can understand.

Once more: I don't care which version that a person might prefer. However, I am concerned when one person (or more) feels so adequately convinced in his (or their) research that they can pronounce judgment upon a version of the Word of God. Some KJV-only folks have even called versions like the NIV "damnable" or "unholy." That is quite an accusation to make! Oddly enough, I know people who strongly prefer versions that use the Alexandrian text-type sources, but they

don't resort to such tactics in regard to versions like the NIV. Rather, they see it for what it is: An academic translation of God's Word from a different set of sources and translation methods performed in a different era.

Quote:

We will know you have genuinely laid down your anti-KJV agenda, when you stop entering threads about the KJV, insisting that we all do lengthy personal research into textual origins. This may be a necessity for those whom GOD charges with that task, but at what point does a man of God become trustworthy to you? Do you trust him because it's clear He hears from God, and God speaks to you through him? Or do you lay God's word to you aside, until you've found out if the speaker has measured up to the standards of academic excellence which you espouse?

First off, I do not have an "anti-KJV" agenda. The insinuation is FALSE and you really need to retract that statement. As I have said in nearly every thread about this topic, I cherish the KJV and it is one of my preferred versions of choice.

Secondly, I think that anyone who feels the liberty to pronounce an ultimate verdict on this matter must do so only after having extensively researched the matter. More times than not, those who are the most vocal with this have eventually admitted that they never took the time to consult with translators...or linguistic experts...or firsthand sources of ancient translators...or in the writings of Erasmus (or Wescott and Hort)...etc... Rather, they often restricted their "research" to certain books and websites that they hoped had done all of the research for them.

If someone feels the liberty to proclaim judgment on the NIV, they had better know for a fact that what they are saying is 100% true -- or they need to season their words with the salt of human and cognitive fallibility. Otherwise, they are treading on "thin ice" between "truth" and "lie." It would be a dreadful thing to be guilty of bearing false witness against ANY faithful translation of the Word of God -- whether KJV, NIV, NASB or other.

As for "academic excellence" and "trustworthiness" of man: I view men as, well, men. Every man is fallible. Every man is limited by this side of the veil looking toward Eternity. The translators of the KJV were quick to admit as much. Oddly enough, modern advocates who are zealous of the KJV (and the KJV only) often forget the words themselves of the very translators of that version.

There have even been individuals who have loudly proclaimed that the KJV was the ONLY "perfect and preserved" version of God's Word! Even after you prove to them that the KJV that we all have was revised several times over 150+ years, and point out apparent errors that are still contained within the pages -- you will still encounter individuals who propagate an "infallible KJV" argument.

All that I am saying is that individuals who feel the need to make such loud proclamations about such things should also season their words with the truth regarding the extent of their own research (or limits thereof). In addition, it is always important to convey the understanding that we could be incorrect in our thesis. I don't believe that there is ANYONE here who can say with absolute certainty that one version (or set of sources) is ABSOLUTELY superior to others (or, of course, entirely perfect).

Quote:

Chris, the only difference between your preconceptions and mine, or a777's, or Oracio's, or JiG's, are that yours are yours, and ours are ours. The only way any of us become free of preconceptions, is by the renewing of our minds through the Holy Spirit. And He's not done yet.

Another difference that I perceive is that there is a segment of believers within the discussion that feel the liberty to loudly pronounce their beliefs as undeniable truths (regarding the supremacy of the KJV and its sources). Some of these same people (and, no, I am not saying that anyone in this thread is guilty of this) are also quick to dismiss versions like the NIV, NASB and other faithful academic translations as literally being "devilish" in foundation. Talk about "preconceptions!" I think that it is highly unwise to make such ultimate proclamations -- especially if we have limited our "research" to merely accepting the "research" of others found on websites and books.

Yes, we must rely upon the renewing of our minds daily by the Holy Spirit. However, we must be quick to realize that any "notion" that we receive about something is just that -- a notion. I have even known would-be "prophets" who uttered words that later proved to be false, but who weren't willing to admit that they had made those false prophecies in the first place. We must be careful about claiming that we know the truth about a historical event (such as the translation of Scripture) simply because of a notion that we may or may not attribute to the Holy Spirit.

To be practical: We may never know on this side of Eternity just which version of the Bible (or which set of source texts) are inherently superior. As such, we must place our faith, hope and trust in the Lord. After all, tangible copies of the Word of God were in short supply for many centuries -- but people could still find and know the Lord.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/27 21:46

To Oracia,

I would like to answer the question you pose about the difference between the two versions of the verse you chose. I'm guessing a777 will answer also. But in the meantime, this is what struck me particularly - the absence of the word 'holy' as an adjective for 'men'.

If you are a reader of the version with leaves out 'holy', then they are missing a deep and serious effect of God's call on a person's life - in this case, an OT prophet.

Holiness - being set apart for God's use - is a theme which runs from Genesis 1 to the end of the Bible. It is a constant nagging theme in the New Testament.

The attention which the other version gives, to emphasising the humanity of the man (as if we didn't know about it), and then minimising the Holy Spirit's work to a 'carrying along' of the man, instead of the weighing him down with the burden of being the only person in His generation qualified to speak God's word to it, is completely lost.

The point is, GOD trusted the man to speak His word accurately. That alone qualifies him for a bit of respect. This doesn't come through AT ALL in the newer version. You could very well be left wondering why you should pay any attention at all to the words of a mere human (great failings implied) who may or may not have been inspired momentarily. There is not even a hint of the great TAKEOVER of a man's life which is succinctly expressed by 'holy men'. There was no get-out-of-jail option for them. You only need to read Hebrews 11 to apprehend their fate.

The other thing about being 'carried along', is that this is the language in the New Testament of the KJV, which describes people caught up by false doctrine and double-mindedness, neither of which are remotely implied by the declamatory tone of the KJV's wording.

My 2c.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/27 22:04

Alive-to-God, thank you for the respectful reply. I do want to respond with some detail but right now I do not have the time unfortunately.

But just briefly I will mention that I believe your reasoning and arguments against that NIV verse can be contested reasonably with a few points of consideration.

I think it is likely that many who are following this thread will agree that condemning that and the other verse over those minor differences in words is unreasonable to say the least.

Thank you Linn, on: 2011/3/27 23:03

i do appreciate your answer, the time you took.

both via your post and my reading:

got this nugget:

Quote:
-----The oldest clear endorsement of Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John being the only legitimate gospels was written c. 180 AD. It was a claim made by Bishop Irenaeus in his polemic Against the Heresies.

thats good.

y'know, i just see word "catholic" and i mark and avoid. have nothing to do with it, put in the same bin with muslims, mor mons, scientologists. i hear the word "pope" and i hear anti-christ.

i'm not talking about regular folk entrapped in that fetid religion, i'm talking about the assembly line workers that make th eir money off it, or those who stamped this scourge of satan upon the world, 'historical' romanists.

if you ever want to REALLY know why it's so hard to evangelize the Jews, just point at rome, that's the reason. History is my witness.

as far as eccesiology,

Quote:

-----although there were always people who wanted to do Christianity their way, and not according to scripture.

do you mean eccesiology? because outside of some of 1st Cor 14, there's very little in how to "do Christianity" in a traditi onal liturgy, which the way it was always 'sposed to be...the only "work" we have to do is what Jesus said:

Jesus answered them, "This is the work of God, that you believe in Him Whom He has sent."

it could really be so simple, Jesus repeatedly hit on this theme; only those with the faith of children, simple, child-like, (no t childish) would ever see the Kingdom of Heaven....or the Kingdom of God, depending on the Gospel account.

sorry to go off topic, but i believe the Church has yet to shake off and get rid of all of rome.

Re: Thank you Linn - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/27 23:32

Chris,

Quote,

"The only "translation" that I know of that was translated by one man was the Textus Receptus -- translated by Erasmus (a Dutch Catholic Humanist) -- upon which much of the New Testament of the KJV was based. I am not trying to imply th at this was a bad thing, but it is certainly within the same vein of discussion as Wescott and Hort."

I wonder if Erasmus was not so much translating the Greek texts, as he was compiling them since there were so many i ncomplete texts. Also, Eramus was more of a reformer who believed in many of the reformation doctrines and decided t o try to reform the church from within. Though he seems to have given in to compromise with the church so as not to ca use more problems for himself.

Concerning the minority texts. Don't forget the Codex Vaticanus which was found in the Vatican library (If we are worrie d about Catholic influence).

Re: anon777, on: 2011/3/27 23:58

Hi Neil, glad to know you. Will answer Oracio, first.

Hi Oracio,

Thank you for your reply and I would be happy to respond to your two questions.

Let's do this one first.

2 Pet 1:21 (KJV)For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were mov

ed by the Holy Ghost.

2 Pet.1:21 (NIV copyright 2011)For prophecy never had its origin in the human will, but prophets, though human, spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.

We have to set up some contemporary background to understand what is in my opinion an effort to minimize sin and guilt.

We all can agree that we live in an age of apostasy. We also live in a time where there is this New Age movement worldwide and the calculated (from the Putrid One)convergence of all religions into one.

The New Age Movement is called, among other things the "New Church". Jean Dixon, who I believed has passed away was quoted as anticipating "the foundation of a New Christianity". One New Age group calling itself "New Christianity", writes in its newsletter, The Good News: "Our ministry isn't into sin, guilt, disease or pain." (Larsons Book of Cults, pg 153).

This group is formulating their own code of ethics. Robert Muller, New Age spokesman, concurs calling for a:

"New code of behaviour which will encompass all races, nations, religions and ideologies. It is the formulation of these new ethics which will be the greatest challenge for the new generation". (The New Genesis, p.7)

Terms like "new ethics", "situational ethics" or "new morality", imply that ethics and morals change and can exist outside of the traditional Judeo-Christian Decalogue.

So, this is the world we live in today, Oracio. Few realize that the word "ethics" means only "customs of a nation". Morality simply means "customs, mores". The words are actually detached from any objective standard of right and wrong. For example, cannibalism and bigamy were considered "moral" and "ethical" behaviours among 19th century New Guinea bushmen. Abandoning one's tribe and territory, however, were immoral (that is, against the groups mores).

God noted that the customs of the people are vain. Jeremiah 10:3 and not to be confused with His ordinances.

Therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance, that ye commit not any one of these abominable customs..." (morals or ethics) Leviticus 18:30

The words moral and immoral (according to custom and not according to custom) are an affront to God. They imply that man himself can determine what is right or wrong. Eve became the first "moralist", as she chose to decide what is good and what is evil. Rebels like Eve and Lucifer seek the "good". Moralists always claim to adhere to "what is right".

Ye shall not do after all the things which they do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes. Deut. 12:8

God spoke these words because the heathen perennially chose their mores over the laws of God. "Taoists maintain morals are relative". The Hindu Bhagavad Gita "teaches the supremacy of freedom over morality". (A Reasoned Look at Asian Religions). Its dialogue between Arjuna and Krishna concludes:

"There can be no absolute moral values because all things are changing, evolving. A particular moral value represents only a particular perspective offered by a particular time at a particular level of evolution". (Ibid. p. 114)

What does this have to do with removing "holy men", "holy prophets", "Holy God", from the Bible? You may be starting to get it, but stick with me and you will see.

We live in a day when it is actually looked down upon to "pass judgement" on someone. Fornication, sodomy are being taken out of the Bible because it is being accepted in society and don't you dare pass judgement. The one today that "passes judgement" is the worst offender.

Someone (you can figure it out) does not want human beings to be distinguished as holy because that would imply that someone is unholy. Today, there is a move to place us all on the same spiritual level, Oracio. No one is holy. And I don't believe it is a coincidence that it is removed from new versions. New versions for a new day, a new age.

NIV, NASB, et al,

"But not for the purpose of passing judgement" Rom 14:1

Has nothing to do with the real meaning, but someone wanted to tell us not to pass judgement.

KJV - "Not to doubtful disputations"

Are these minor revisions or major revisions? Well, in number of letters, minor (maybe that's what they mean), but as far as what the thought is that is conveyed, a MAJOR revision. Please have a look.

PORN

In the battle between man's mores and God's laws, the new versions have opted for the "popular" morals of the day. They have substituted the relativistic word "immorality" for the word "fornication".

The word "immorality" carries with it no description of what is forbidden. Webster elaborates:

Immorality: State or quality of being immoral

Immoral: Not moral

Fornication: Illicit sexual intercourse on the part of an unmarried person.

The New Testament Greek word is porneau, porne, pornos, porneia.

Is a Bible being created for us for the day and age that we live in? You decide.

NASB Romans 1:29 Word for fornication OMITTED

KJV fornication

NASB - All these verses are translated immorality, whereas the KJV is properly translated Fornication.

1 Cor. 5:1, 1 Cor 6:13, 1 Cor 6:18, 2 Cor 12:21, Eph 5:3, Col 3:5, Rev 2:14, Rev 2:20, Rev 9:21, Rev 14:8, Rev 17:2, Rev 18:3, Rev 18:9, Rev 19:2, Heb 12:16,

NASB - act immorally - 1 Cor 10:8 KJV-Fornication

NASB - immoral people 1 Cor 5:9, 1 Cor 5:10, 1 Cor 5:11,

KJV - Fornicators

NASB - Immorality Gal 5:19 ---- KJV - Adultery, fornication

Young people today (yes, even Christians) don't think fornication is really wrong if you love someone. Why should they? It's not in their Bible and to them it is very moral to love someone.

The NASB calls "Natural" what God calls sin.

Natural - James 3:15 sensual (KJV)

Nature - James 5:17 passions (KJV)

A Bible for Our Times

Every young person knows the meaning of the word "whore". Webster's "whore" - to have unlawful sexual intercourse; whoremonger, lecher; a man given to whoring".

NASB

Immorality Eph 5:5 KJV whoremonger

Immoral Men 1 Tim 1:10 - KJV whoremonger

Immoral Person Rev 21:8 KJV whoremonger

Calling someone HOLY is a personal judgement and we don't distinguish in that way today, because that would imply that there are unholy people, right?

The NASB's non-judgemental translations echo the policy statement of many mainline denominations.

NASB

Homosexual 1 Tim 1:10 KJV - them that defile themselves with mankind.

The prediction by Texe Marrs is coming true. "Satan will author an unholy New Age Bible, with no restrictions on man's desire to enjoy a licentious lifestyle."

Informal polling of university students between 1985 and 1991, with the question posed, "What is immorality?" elicited responses ranging from "pollution" to political issues. The NIV and NKJV "sexual immorality" fared no better. To the query, "What is sexual immorality?" student responses ranged from "one night stands" to various situational scenarios indicative of the highly desensitized and depraved nature of mores of our current culture.

Bibles without objective standards merely reinforce the Values Clarification theories of Louis E. Baths, Merrill Harmon and Sidney B. Simon being used in the elementary schools today. The Wall Street Journal notes:

"If parents object to their children...engaging in premarital sex, the theory behind Values Clarification makes it appropriate for the child to respond, "But that just YOUR value judgement. Don't force it on me." (Wall Street Journal, April 12, 1982).

The harvest from the seeds planted in the sixties (NASB) and seventies (NIV) is ripe and rotting on the vine.

Another recent survey, done by 8 denominations, polled 1438 "evangelical" teens (those who regularly attend a conservative church). Nearly half had committed fornication; only one-third "declined to brand sex outside of marriage as morally unacceptable."

Bibles which omit a clear mandate against "sexual intercourse on the part of unmarried persons" (Webster's "fornication") leave parents defenseless in their battle for their children's chastity.

An anxious mother called Moody Broadcasting's "Open Line" program asking Pastor Cole where she could find a verse to show her son that pre-marital sex is wrong. He was unable to give one. (January 28, 1988).

One a broadcast in 1990 on the 700 Club, the author of Generations at Risk was asked why sexually active Christian kids have no sense of guilt. He responded that there was "no absolute standard of scripture" to use and so young people conclude, "If I don't feel bad, it must not be wrong". (August 8, 1990).

The use of the ambiguous word "immorality" by new versions is more a matter of Sales than Semantics. "After all, we are in the entertainment business," quips the owner of the NIV, international publishing magnate and purveyor of erotica, Rupert Murdoch. (New Age Bulletin, England, Vol V, No. 1, p. 2, June 1993).

Specific sins have become a casualty of New Age Bible Versions and thus Holy is removed, too.

Well, I did not get to your second question, but will, later. It is a very important one as well. I am tired and you are probably, too.

Food for thought, Oracio. Just think about it is all I ask.

Credit for some info to G.A. Riplinger, New Age Bible Versions, David Daniels, Look What's Missing and Did the Catholic Church Give us the Bible.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/28 14:19

a777, thank you for your reply. I must say you pointed out a powerful argument against the NASB. I found it strange that they did not translate the Greek word "porneia" to "sexual immorality" like the other newer translations, but only to "immorality". However, I did notice that "porneia" is translated "fornication" in the NASB in other places.

As far as translating it to "sexual immorality" I can understand the possible reasoning behind it. It could be that the translators felt "fornication" would narrow or limit the meaning "porneia" too much, since it has a broader meaning than just pre-marital sex between two unmarried heterosexual persons.

I might try to contact the Lockman Foundation to ask them why they translated that word as such.

Chris, any thoughts?

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/28 15:26

Alive-to-God, you wrote

Quote:
-----If you are a reader of the version with leaves out 'holy', then they are missing a deep and serious effect of God's call on a person's life - in this case, an OT prophet.

With all due respect, I do not see that as a convincing argument against the newer versions. The newer versions do not include that word because it is not in the source text being used or consulted. However, the term "holy prophets" is used in numerous passages in the newer versions.

Regarding the words "carried along by", I do not see much of a difference from "moved by". If you look it up in the Greek it can be translated either way.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/28 15:30

Hi Oracio...

Quote:

I might try to contact the Lockman Foundation to ask them why they translated that word as such.

Chris, any thoughts?

I haven't contacted the Lockman Foundation about this particular verse(s). I did contact them previously in regard to some other things, but not about this word in particular. I would suggest that someone contact them about it.

It could be as you suggested -- that the translators simply felt that this particular word was best translated with a more encompassing scope. After all, "fornication" would definitely fall under the umbrella of "wickedness." I did notice that the translators of the Reina-Valera version (published before the KJV) in Spanish includes a footnote that the word "fornicación" doesn't appear in that form in other manuscripts.

I do know that there was an update for the NASB in 1995 in which "recent research on the oldest and best Greek manuscripts of the New Testament has been reviewed, and some passages have been updated for even greater fidelity to the original manuscripts." This could be result of such a revision, as other translations render the word as "depravity."

On the other hand, it could be nothing more than a poor or hasty literal translation of the word (akin to the word "pascha" being translated as "Easter" in the KJV's rendering of Acts 12:4).

Still, this would be merely speculation on my part. I agree that the best starting point would be to contact the Lockman Foundation and the translators who were involved in the rendering of that particular passage(s).

Re: , on: 2011/3/28 15:48

I am reminded of a Christmas card that said the Word did not become a philosophy, a theology, or a concept to discuss, debated, or pondered. But the Word became a person to be followed, loved, and enjoyed.

Re: , on: 2011/3/28 15:59

For those of you interested in the new Reina-Valera Gomez Spanish Bible this is a good read. Is it a carbon copy of the KJV or not?

Dr. Gomez believes that the accurate base text is the Received Text (Hebrew Massoretic text and the Greek Textus Receptus). This is the textual type used by faithful believers throughout the centuries.

"I have not seen a single one of Dr. Gomez's critics state what they believe the base text for a Bible translation should be. If they have a standard text, they are not making it known." Dr. Phil Stringer

RVG 2010 — New Translation or Revision?

The new Reina-Valera Gomez Spanish Bible is not a new translation of the Bible in Spanish, but simply a revision of the beloved Reina-Valera used by God for over 400 years, says author Emanuel Rodriguez in his new book, *God's Bible in Spanish: How God Preserved His Words in Spanish through the RVG*. Here is an excerpt from the English edition:

A misconception is that the goal of Dr. Gómez was to produce a KJV in Spanish. This is not so. He has publicly, and on numerous occasions, made it clear that his firm conviction is that God gave the Spanish-speaking world the Reina-Valera Bible, the greatest literary work in the history of the Spanish language.

This traditional form of the Bible has been and should continue to be the standard format for the Spanish-speaking people. God has placed his stamp of approval upon it. This is evidenced by its fruit, and the loyalty of Hispanic Bible believers that it has enjoyed.

The Reina-Valera Bible is part of our heritage. To try and replace it would be to dishonor what God has done for the Spanish-speaking world. Others have tried to replace the Reina-Valera by starting a whole new Spanish translation of either the KJV or one of the other ancient Spanish Bibles (such as Enzina's New Testament). Despite how noble their intentions may have been, there is a good reason why their efforts were not successful.

We did not believe that replacing the form of the Reina-Valera was the answer. Dr. Gómez's effort was revision not replacement. Thus, the Reina-Valera Gómez is not a Spanish carbon copy of the English KJV but rather a version of the Reina-Valera that is equivalent to the KJV, yet true to its root form. In fact, many of the changes that were made were simply readings that already existed in the original 1602 Valera. Thus, in many places the RVG has actually returned to its original form as rendered over four hundred years ago.

For example, in Luke 23:42 the KJV says: And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. The RV 1909 and 1960 both omit the word "Lord" (Señor). Yet that word "Lord" was included in this verse in the original 1602 Valera just like it is rendered in the KJV. Dr. Gómez and his collaborators reinserted the word "Lord" back to its rightful place in Luke 23:42 in the RVG, thus returning to its original rendering.

Another example is in Mark 1:2. The KJV says: As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The RV 1909 and 1960 change "written in the prophets" to "written in Isaiah the prophet..." (The NIV, ASV, RSV, and most other Alexandrian-based Bibles in English do the same thing). This is a gross error because both quotes in Mark 1:2-3 are not from the prophet Isaiah. One does quote Isaiah (40:3) but the other quotes Malachi (3:1).

So both the RVG and KJV are correct in saying "in the prophets." The original 1602 is also correct for it says "in the prophets." Dr. Gómez and his collaborators changed Mark 1:2 to read "in the prophets" (en los profetas) returning to its original wording as in the 1602 Valera and consequently matching the KJV and Textus Receptus. Many other verses in the RVG have also been returned to their original reading as they stood in the 1602 Valera.

Download the RVG on E-Sword and read more info about the RVG on www.reinavalera Gomez.com

Re: , on: 2011/3/28 16:19

For detailed examples on the Reina-Valera Gomez Spanish Bible versus the 1602,1865,1909,1960 spanish bibles, view this.

<http://www.paraguayforjesus.com/images/allspanishbiblesvs.pdf>

What a blessing that Humberto Gomez fixed these errors.

Both Reina and Valera invited others to revise their work.

Note from Valera:

He says "Would to God that by his infinite mercy inspire the heart of the King to command pious men throughout his coasts, learned in Hebrew and Greek to look into and revise this translation of the bible, who excitedly with a pious and sincere desire to serve God and do well to their nation, would compare it and confront the Hebrew text, that God dictated to his holy prophets before the coming of Christ, and with the Greek text, that the same dictated to his holy apostles and evangelists after the coming of Christ in the flesh."

Re: - posted by TimmyJoe, on: 2011/3/28 17:21

I haven't read many of the previous posts. But I will say this, when I first got saved I attended a pentecostal church that believed kjv was the only translation you should read, I had a new century version (ncv) that I, as a new christian, could actually make some sense of, but when I heard I was only supposed to use the kjv that's what I did. It is a good translation and I grew in my walk with the Lord, but when I left and went to an A/G church, they gave me an NIV bible. As I read and studied, I found myself learning so much more and growing in obedience to the Lord! I could actually understand so much better what I was reading. Now I feel the same way when I teach or preach, when I use the kjv, people tend to lose focus and miss what the scripture is saying, but when I use a more modern translation they are more alert and attentive because they comprehend so much better!

With that said I think anyone who only uses kjv is greatly hindering their own walk with the Lord and others, simply because no one talks like that any more. But I do love the KJV!

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/28 17:50

Quote:
-----TimmyJoe...I think anyone who only uses kjv is greatly hindering their own walk with the Lord and others, simply because no one talks like that any more. But I do love the KJV!

Great post Timmy, I wonder what folks would be saying about the KJV if the NIV was come before it? My guess is they would be saying, who on earth wrote this, I can't hardly understand it. Then they would be fighting over the KJV, not being the best version, and that everyone should be reading the NIV. Is the disagreement about first versions? or the most understandable versions? If it's about first versions, well Moses might have a different opinion about the KJV than most Pro KJV folks here. Bottom line, there is no winner in these kind of disagreements/debates, my guess is no one participating or reading this debate will ever change their version of the Word they read. We should use our lives to change people through Christ, not what Bible version they read.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/28 17:59

okay, so I sent an email to the Lockman Foundation asking them why they translated the Greek word "porneia" to simply "immorality" in some passages.

After some further research and consideration I came to a few conclusions.

The Greek word porneia can be applied to illicit sexual conduct of any sort. The English word fornication means Illicit sexual intercourse on the part of an unmarried person, so it is more limiting in meaning.

Could it be that the NASB translators did not want to narrow the meaning too much in some passages, while considering the context in their decision to use "fornication" in others?

As to why they did not use the term "sexual immorality", it is possible that they wanted to keep the translation in a "word for word" format without adding any words. So "immorality" may have been chosen for both of those reasons. From what I have heard the NASB is the most literal word for word translation of the NU text.

I do still think they should have at least used "sexual immorality" or something to that effect which specifies more. The fact that they did not specify enough does concern me a bit and will probably cause me to stay away from using it much.

So right now the bottom line for me is this: While the NASB does not use "fornication" or "fornicator" in some passages it does use it in others, which shows that there was no hidden agenda against that word.

As to why the ESV translators did not use "fornication" at all but instead used "sexual immorality", it could be a matter of choosing the best term that would be faithful to the original Greek word "porneia". In some passages "fornication" may not be the best translation because of its limitation in meaning.

Re: - posted by Solomon101, on: 2011/3/28 18:48

I won't rehash any of the original language discussions as they have been fairly well covered. However, here is a different perspective that may not have been considered.

I originally cut my teeth on the KJV, as did many others. I memorized massive quantities of scripture from the KJV in that time. I also know Biblical languages so I was comfortable with them.

HOWEVER, when preaching or teaching I kept noticing something very concerning to me. When quoting a passage I would often have to stop and explain what the English word used in the passage meant. Not explaining the meaning of the Greek...but actually defining the ENGLISH as the word was not one in common use any longer. What would make the situation even worse was when the English language had changed so much since the writing of the KJV that the words now meant EXACT OPPOSITES.

Classic example is in 2 Thess 2:7 which states in the KJV

Quote:

----- 7For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.

Well that was fine several hundred years ago when the understanding of the word "Let" was , "To stop, hinder, keep from coming to pass". However, TODAY it means , "To allow, or permit". The original Biblical language had not changed...but our English language has been changing so rapidly that the words translated by the KJV translators no longer meant the same thing. In effect by using the KJV you could get 100% wrong information unless you did good word studies. Well ...folks shouldn't have to worry that the Bible they are reading is misleading them simply because of an English language change over some 100's of years.

I cringed every time I had to explain that the word in a particular instance did not mean what they understood it to mean. It was in effect telling people that their Bible was wrong. I felt that could do nothing but destroy peoples faith so I switched

d to a more modern translation. One I was comfortable with the accuracy of and that the English words used meant what the original writer of scripture intended for us to understand by them.

I love the KJV. Cut my teeth on it. However, I found it a flawed tool for ministry today for one simple reason. The archaic words often do not convey accurately the message intended because our English language has changed so much since the KJV was translated.

Blessings!

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/28 18:53

Thank you Solomon101 for your post. Very good point.

Re: , on: 2011/3/28 19:31

That's interesting Solomon. What Bible version did you switch too?

Re: Christ Jesus, or just Jesus. Is Christ important?, on: 2011/3/28 23:58

Hi Oracio,

I promised to answer your question on "them that trust in riches" and WORKS Versus Believing.

I just wanted to say, as I was thinking about this today, I realized that if people cannot understand why something is taking place, they lose interest very quickly. Consequently, they don't think this is an important subject. There are a lot of dots to pull together to paint a complete picture. The attack on God's Word has been going on for a long time. The changes and in many cases, entire omissions in the Word are keeping in lockstep with the changes of the present world philosophy. But it takes some diligence to connect the dots. When you see even part of the picture you realize what the whole picture is going to look like. A large part of the picture is finally being seen, today.

There are going to constantly be detractors that don't understand or don't want to understand and they will pop in and take a shot here and there. At some point, if they keep popping in on this thread, they may begin to see a part of the puzzle coming together that gets their attention. One can only hope.

Ok, to your question.

The King James Bible always encourages "children to come unto" Jesus Christ and the "kingdom of God". Throughout the NT Jesus said that believing "in me" or "on me" is the key to entering the kingdom of God. The NT is about the heart and what or who the heart trusts in. Imagine telling a little child, as new versions do, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!"

Yep, that's it. How HARD it is to enter the Kingdom of God. This along with other verses that I provided but did not write out for you paint a picture of works based salvation. I will write those verses out for you later.

By omitting the part of the verse that says "for them that trust in riches," new version editors of the Holman Christian Standard Bible, TNIV and others "take away from the words of the book." It is no longer about what or who you trust or believe in, but rather the implication is that it is just "HARD WORK" to enter the kingdom of heaven. As I said, this is only verse. There are many others that were changed and they now communicate WORKS.

New International Version (©1984)

The disciples were amazed at his words. But Jesus said again, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!

New Living Translation (©2007)

This amazed them. But Jesus said again, "Dear children, it is very hard to enter the Kingdom of God.

English Standard Version (©2001)

And the disciples were amazed at his words. But Jesus said to them again, "Children, how difficult it is to enter the kingdom of God!

New American Standard Bible (©1995)

The disciples were amazed at His words. But Jesus answered again and said to them, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!

International Standard Version (©2008)

The disciples were startled by these words, but Jesus said to them again, "Children, how hard it is for those who trust in their wealth to get into the kingdom of God!

GOD'S WORD® Translation (©1995)

The disciples were stunned by his words. But Jesus said to them again, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!

Is this consistent with older pre-KJV versions?

Gothic pre-A.D. 350 *paim hugyandam afar faihau* (to trust in riches).

Anglo-Saxon pre-A.D. 700 - *on (in) heora (their) feo (fees, riches) getruwigeap* (trust).

Wycliffe 1389 - *men tristyne in richessis*

Tyndale 1526-34 - *for them that truste in their ryches*

Geneva 1560-1599 - *for them that thrust in riches*

Bishops 1568 - *for them that trust in ryches*

KJV - *for them that trust in riches*

NIV, TNIV - OMIT

NASB - OMIT

NKJV - OMIT

JW Bible - OMIT

Catholic - OMIT

HCSB, ESV, NLT, NRSV, RSV, NCV, etc, OMIT

People that have taken the time and educated themselves on this subject see that the direction we are heading in with New Bible Versions for a New Age, is a picture of darkness for the seeking soul. Others that don't see it now, may in time "see", when we are down the road 5 or 10 more revisions later it will be painfully obvious. It is painfully obvious for many of us right now.

Is it important to believe ON ME (Jesus)? You decide.

John 6:47 *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth ON ME hath everlasting life.*

NASB, Catholic Version, NIV, TNIV, Jehovah Witness Version, NKJV all omit ON ME.

Without ON ME.

John 6:47 ... *He that believes has everlasting life.*

Believes what????

Was it just a mistake? Did versions that pre-dated the KJV include ON ME?

Gothic pre-A.D. 350 *du mis* (on me)

Anglo-Saxon pre-A.D. 700 *on me gelyfb* (pronounced *gelievth*)
on me believeth.

Wycliffe - 1389 *beleueth in me*

Tyndale/Coverdale 1526-1534 - beleveth on me
Geneva 1560-1599 - beleueeth in me
Bishop's 1568 - putteth his trust in me
KJV - believeth on me

It's ok, to believe, but I guess not on Jesus Christ.

What does the title CHRIST mean to you? It encapsulates the New Testament theme of "GOD, Our Savior" (Jude 25). Consequently, when asked "What must I do to be saved?" The apostles responded, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved..." (Acts 16:31). Christ said, "I am the door", but the devil dares not open the door for his prisoners (Isaiah 14:17). He darkens the door in the New Versions. His shadow falls over the word CHRIST.

This is not the Christ, is it? John 4:29 NIV, NASB, et al.
Is not this the Christ? KJV

NIV.....Verse.....KJV
Jesus.....Acts 19:4.....Christ Jesus
Jesus.....1 Cor 9:1.....Jesus Christ
Jesus.....1 John 1:7.....Jesus Christ
Jesus.....Rev 1:9.....Jesus Christ
Jesus.....Rev 12:17.....Jesus Christ
Jesus.....Heb. 3:1.....Christ Jesus
Jesus.....Acts 9:20.....Christ
OMIT.....John 6:69.....Thou art that Christ

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

Evidently they are ashamed of the gospel of Christ, because they omit "of Christ" in this very next verse.

Rom 1:16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

NIV, NASB, et al.....KJV
the gospel.....the gospel of Christ

Who is a liar? But he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ. 1 John 2:22

The ultimate campaign against Jesus is to deny that he is the Christ. The editor of the Christian Research Journal observes:

"For scholars agree that it was exactly this error, (separating the man Jesus from the divine Christ), as promulgated by early Gnostics that the apostle John was indicating when he coined the term antichrist." 1 John 2:18-23). (Crash Course on the New Age, p. 229)

John judged, "Now are there many antichrists". 1 John 2:18.

He calls the Antichrist's accomplices 'antichrists' also. As accessories to the crime. New version editors alter 1 John 2:22 so that it appears this is a "one man job".

NIV, NASB, et al.
Who is THE liar, but THE ONE who denies that Jesus is the Christ?

THE and THE ONE did not come from the Greek.

NIV, NASB, et al Phil 4:13
I can do everything through him who gives me strength
KJV
I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.

You see people get upset at what they think are minor things and a waste of time to talk about. But once you connect the dots with the New Age beliefs that we are living in, you begin to see that these truly are New Age bibles for the "New Age".

Hindu - "Jesus is the son and Krsna is the Father"

Islam - "Jesus (Isa) is a prophet, a nabis or 'messenger of god'.

CULTS -

JW : Jesus is the archangel Michael

Mormon: Jesus is the brother of Lucifer

Edgar Cayce: Jesus is the reincarnation of Adam

Unification Church: Jesus appeared to moon telling him to start the Unification Church.

New Age

Channeled Books:

1. A Course in Miracles was channeled to Helen Schucman by an entity calling itself 'Jesus'.
2. The Jesus Letters by Jane Palzere and Anna Brown was channeled from 'Jesus'.
3. The Aquarian Gospel of Jesus the Christ was channeled to Levi Dowling by 'Jesus'

Channelers:

1. The Aetherius Society (U.F.O.s) is receiving messages from "Master Jesus" (Aetherius is Venus, which is Lucifer's planet)
2. Elizabeth Claire Prophet channels "Jesus" along with Buddha and Merlin the Magician.

Satanism:

1. Kurt Koch reports hearing demons say "I am the unholy Jesus, the Jesus of Satan.
2. Johanna Michaelson, author of Beautiful Side of Evil, spoke with a demon calling itself "Jesus".

Satan assaults the throne from two vantage points. First, he denies Jesus' claim to Godhood. If that fails, he denies the uniqueness of Christ's claim saying that there are many "Christs". Texe Marrs warns, "New Age leaders believe and will spread the apostasy that Jesus is neither Christ nor God." New version editors become "New Age leaders" by his definition. Sure, I don't know and won't say if any of this is intentional. Whether it is or not, these men are being influenced (knowingly or not) by the spirit of this age.

If you want references on any quotes, just request it.

Next time: False Christs

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/29 0:26

This same argument goes back to what greek texts are being used. I checked with the Textus Receptus for some of the verses listed and it agrees with the KJV. Most modern translations use Westcott Hort which are the minority texts and they are different. Why are key doctrines different with WH text? Why are words and verses left out or changed? My son and I had this same discussion tonight with Phil. 4:13. Christ is omitted in WH, but not in Textus Receptus. Interesting. Makes you wonder why.

E-Sword is a free download that has all these translations and text. A great resource.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/29 0:40

a777, have you considered the context of Mark 10:24 in the modern versions? It would seem as if not since you have not mentioned anything about that. The immediate context clearly shows Christ referring to the rich and clearly states that it is "impossible" for them to enter except by the grace of God. There is no works based salvation being taught there brother.

Here is how the NIV reads, and the NASB, ESV, NLT and others are similar:

"Jesus looked around and said to his disciples, "How hard it is for the rich to enter the kingdom of God!"
24 The disciples were amazed at his words. But Jesus said again, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!
25 It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."
26 The disciples were even more amazed, and said to each other, "Who then can be saved?" 27 Jesus looked at them and said, "With man this is impossible, but not with God; all things are possible with God."

Just be careful not fall into a legalistic trap brother. God bless.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 0:41

JB, I will show why and where Lord is left out, also and replaced by the "The One" or "One". This phrase is known by New Agers and Luciferians, alike. Christ is gone, Lord is gone and now we have "The One".

How did this all happen? Are "Scholars" above being influenced by the spirit of the world? Of course not.

It seems that as the spirit of the age evolves, these new bible versions are "evolving" right along with it.

You could actually say, devolving.

Later...

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 0:45

Oracio, a little here, a little there. Not all at once.

This is one occurrence in one verse supported by many other verses (changes). Why would they take something out that is supported by the Textus Receptus and much older versions before the KJV?

That's what you have to ask yourself.

You can no longer quote that one verse and quote it correctly. It is not right, too.

You can't say, "How hard it is to enter the kingdom of heaven".

Ok, I see works, but don't get stuck on that. Why don't they leave our Bible alone? Is this all just a big accident?

Re: Peta wants more animal friendly language in the Bible., on: 2011/3/29 9:14

You probably did not know that secular organizations petition Bible Translation Committees all the time to "change" things. Spirit of the World influencing the translators. Read this. You can find it on freerepublic.com

PETA Wants More Animal Friendly Language in the Bible

After they heard that the latest translation of the New International Version of the Bible will now use gender-inclusive language such as "he or she" instead of just "he", PETA saw an opportunity to change one other thing. The organization has

s petitioned the Committee on Bible Translation to suggest that its next translation remove "speciesist" language, by referring to animals as "he or she" instead of "it." "When the Bible moves toward inclusively in one area...it wasn't much of a stretch to suggest they move toward inclusively in this area. Language matters. Calling an animal 'it' denies them something. They are beloved by God. They glorify God," Bruce Friedrich, PETA's vice president for policy, told CNN.

PETA said it hopes the switch to include more gender-inclusive language will spark translators to readdress the ways animals are referred to in the Bible. "Updating the Bible's language regarding animals would not only reflect modern writing trends but also reinforce the idea that animals are living beings valued by God, not inanimate objects. Jesus taught us the importance of mercy and compassion, and this update would encourage mercy and compassion for all God's creatures—including those who have feathers, fins, and fur," Friedrich wrote.

But David Berger, the dean of Yeshiva University's Bernard Revel graduate school of Jewish studies, said shifting the language would be difficult, given the original Hebrew: "In Hebrew all nouns are gender-specific. So the noun for chair is masculine and the noun for earth is feminine. There's simply no such thing as a neutral noun. It's unusual to have a noun that would indicate the sex of the animal."

David Lyle Jeffrey, a professor at Baylor University who teaches about ancient texts and the Bible's relationship to literature and the arts, sympathizes with PETA, but isn't sure if it would be true to the text: "When you get to the point when you say, 'Don't say it, say he or she' when the text doesn't, you're both screwing up the text and missing the main point you addressed."

End of article.

Wow. Who else petitions these translations committees?

Today's Bible versions are keeping in lockstep with the evolving spirit of the world. "Readability is the trojan horse".

Soon, they will have a gender neutral, green bible, inclusive language (tolerant of all sins) that is animal friendly, with LOL instead of Hallelujah and OMG instead of O My God, I trust in Thee. If you think this is funny, OMG and LOL just made it into Webster's Dictionary.

It's a business and big business at that. You only sell products that people want and the editors and publishers are giving people what they want and some of us, what we don't want. On the same front, denigrating the best selling and most accurate Bible of all time, does not hurt the sales of the New Age Bible versions, either.

I will show you what I mean by the Trojan horse of readability being used to slip in additions, deletions and changes.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2011/3/29 13:52

Hi JB1968...

Quote:

Most modern translations use Westcott Hort which are the minority texts and they are different. Why are key doctrines different with WH text? Why are words and verses left out or changed?

I think that you may be misunderstanding just what the "Westcott and Hort" entails. They were simply textual critics and translation experts. Their "New Testament in the Original Greek" was simply a translation that took more than 28 years to complete and came from most of the Greek manuscripts that they had available at the time and was completed in 188

1. Contrary to rumor, Westcott and Hort did consult texts other than the Alexandrian text-type. They identified and consulted four separate text-types -- the Byzantine text-type ("Majority text" via the Erasmus's Textus Receptus). However, they favored the Alexandrian text-type (as do most scholars and experts).

Although their translation methods were novel at the time (and a lightning rod for criticism), they are standard techniques for translation of both modern and ancient text today. There aren't any contemporary versions of the Bible that are complete or literal translations of Westcott and Hort's work. There were, however, subsequent critical texts produced AFTER Westcott and Hort -- using the same sources -- and nearly every one of them was very close to the Westcott and Hort product.

I also think that it is important to make it clear that most modern translations are NOT reproductions of Westcott and Hort or entirely based upon their texts.

There is a difference between Westcott and Hort's "New Testament in the Original Greek" and the "Minority Text." Westcott and Hort's work was merely a critical text translation completed in 1881. The Minority Text is actually the "Alexandrian text-type." It is the name of a set of the earliest texts and manuscripts. No one really calls it "minority text" except to distinguish it from the Byzantine text-type that was often referred to later as the "majority text."

The Alexandrian text-type is a set of manuscripts that comprise the majority of the earliest known manuscripts. They date from as early as 200 AD -- which was about 100 years after the death of John the apostle. Most of those early manuscripts that are considered a part of the "Alexandrian text-type" (even though many of them were not found in Alexandria) and are from the same passage tend to agree with one another in what was written.

The language of many of the Alexandrian text-type manuscripts is known as "Koine Greek" (or "Biblical Greek"). It is the type of Greek that was spoken between ~350 B.C. through ~350 A.D. -- a period of about 700 years. For an idea of what this means, Jesus and the apostles were born somewhere in the middle of this period. This language differs somewhat from the later "Medieval Greek" (or "Byzantine Greek") which was spoken after ~325 A.D. and upon which all of the texts of the Byzantine text-type were based.

As for the differences of the Westcott and Hort, you can probably look at the work yourself at your local library (or university library). In addition, you can look at the actual work itself online by clicking on the following link:

<http://www.archive.org/stream/newtestamentinor00westrich#page/n523/mode/2up>

I would be very clear that Westcott and Hort (or academic versions like the NIV) did not "omit" words -- because the translators simply did not find those words in the manuscripts that they deemed to be the most reliable. Again, I think that it is a stretch to say that "key doctrines" are changed by some of the differences between the source manuscripts and subsequent descendant translations. Some "conspiracy" theorists often accuse versions like the NIV of changing vital doctrines of the Church -- but those doctrines are obviously found throughout the Word of God (often in the very passages that differ slightly).

As someone else pointed out, the text-types actually AGREE on the vast majority of things. I truly believe that the eternal essence of the Word of God is preserved regardless of whether a word appears or not within the context of a particular passage. While we can easily "strain a gnat and swallow a camel" over a difference in words (because of the sources used), we know that the concepts and promises of God remain intact.

I agree with what others have said. We need the Lord to guide us as we study His Word. Otherwise, we would receive no more truth from it than the Mormons -- who rely on the KJV in addition to their additional phony "scriptures."

Quote:

Christ is omitted in WH, but not in Textus Receptus. Interesting. Makes you wonder why.

Do you have any proof that Westcott and Hort "omitted" this particular word? Have you read this in their "New Testament in the Original Greek?" Is it possible that the source manuscripts from which they gathered their work may have used

a different way of translating this verse? Moreover, does the use of the word "Christ" or the pronoun "Him" (which obviously refers to Christ) change the dynamic of the essence of what this verse means?

Just something to think about.

Re: How important are words with only a few letters? , on: 2011/3/29 14:01

One 3 letter word removed from the Bible makes Jesus a liar. Are words important? You decide.

John 7:8 Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up ****YET**** unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come.

John 7:9 When he had said these words unto them, he abode still in Galilee.

John 7:10 But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.

YET is not italicized. Therefore we should be able to find it in the original Greek.

Modern Bible Versions translate that He is declaring, that He is just not going up to the feast but then He goes.

New Living Translation (©2007)

You go on. I'm not going to this festival, because my time has not yet come." (But then He goes.)

English Standard Version (©2001)

You go up to the feast. I am not going up to this feast, for my time has not yet fully come."

New American Standard Bible (©1995)

"Go up to the feast yourselves; I do not go up to this feast because My time has not yet fully come."

American Standard Version

Go ye up unto the feast: I go not up unto this feast; because my time is not yet fulfilled.

Douay-Rheims Bible

Go you up to this festival day, but I go not up to this festival day: because my time is not accomplished.

Darby Bible Translation

Ye, go ye up to this feast. I go not up to this feast, for my time is not yet fulfilled.

Weymouth New Testament

As for you, go up to the Festival. I do not now go up to this Festival, because my time is not yet fully come."

The word YET is supported in the earliest manuscripts and papyri. The Byzantine manuscripts supports it and all the following manuscripts.

I am not yet going up to this feast

I am not (OUK) is NOT in these earliest manuscripts.

EVIDENCE in these early manuscripts: p66 p75 B L T W X Delta Theta Psi 0180 f1 f13 28 700 892 1010 Byz Lect two la t syr(p,h,pal) one cop(north) cop(south)

Was this an accident or was it intentional? Kind of leaves you rubbing your forehead.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 14:13

UPDATED

Chris says,

Quote:
----- Contrary to rumor, Westcott and Hort did consult texts other than the Alexandrian text-type. They identified and consulted four separate text-types -- the Byzantine text-type ("Majority text" via the Erasmus's Textus Receptus). However, they favored the Alexandrian text-type (as do most scholars and experts).

So many other things that you say are so patently incorrect. I don't know where to begin. You continue to use rhetoric without any sources of proof for what you are saying and just like the modern scribes and textual critics, you are expecting people to just accept everything you say.

I won't and don't.

If Westcott and Hort used the Textus Receptus and Byzantine Texts why did they leave out YET in John 7:8 which makes Jesus out to be a liar. I just posted something on this. Check it out. I will have a lot more to say about Westcott and Hort.

Gotta love this quote from you:

"However, they favored the Alexandrian text-type (as do most scholars and experts)".

That is true, they favored the Alexandrian manuscripts, but they also favored the Codex Vaticanus, kept under lock and key by Rome and responsible for over 36,000 changes in modern bibles. We only get to see a few pages here and there. Why does Rome keep it under lock and key? And for that matter, why do we accept our modern bibles being based on Rome's corrupt Codex Vaticanus?

Because many average day people don't know about it.

Scholars and Experts!! Don't know about that. They have proven to be expert at changing God's Word, though.

Re: For natan AKA Neil., on: 2011/3/29 14:58

If anyone knows Neil, would you let him know that this entry in the thread is for the question that he asked regarding "what is the Roman Catholic Church's involvement in our modern day Bibles?). Thanks.

Just a short paragraph and then onto Neil's answer.

This is about as concise as I can make it folks.

The KJV was translated word-for-word (formal equivalency) from the best manuscripts. The modern versions are a paraphrase (dynamic equivalency, meaning that the person doing the translating feels he can tell you what the words are trying to tell you, thereby taking the place of the Holy Spirit), from all the best manuscripts AND including questionable manuscripts.

Ok Neil. Your question about the RCC involvement in today's bibles.

Most of the Modern Bibles have been created from the Alexandrian Manuscripts. Chris is right about that. I will tell you the short story about these manuscripts.

Of these "Alexandrian" manuscripts, two--the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus (Vaticanus--Vatican, get it?)--are the most famous and what Westcott and Hort used for their 1881 version that all new versions are based on. The Codex Sinaiticus was a REJECTED Greek manuscript discovered in an ancient TRASH CAN by an archeologist on an excavation on the Sinai Peninsula! I repeat--it was discarded as TRASH! I guess that's because that's what it was!

The Codex Vaticanus--the most complete of the two--was supposedly locked away in a vault in the Vatican for hundreds of years, until it was OPENED by the Pope in the late 19th Century and released to the public. That's when the "modern" versions started appearing.

They're from the VATICAN; they're CATHOLIC!

MATTHEW 1:25

King James reading: "And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS."

Modern versions: Take out the word "firstborn," in accordance with the Catholic doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary .

It is believed Mary NEVER had any children by natural means; but that's NOT TRUE. After Jesus, she had SEVERAL children by her husband Joseph (Mark 6:3)--sons AND daughters. She did NOT remain a virgin!

Subtle, isn't it?

There are many more verses that now coincide with Catholic doctrine. I can show them to you.

Neil, here are more facts about the Codex Vaticanus which is owned by the Roman Catholic Church and kept under lock and key. It is considered to be the most authoritative of the Minority Texts, although it is responsible for over 36,000 changes that appear today in the new versions.

This manuscript was "found" in 1481 in the Vatican library in Rome (that's interesting), where it is currently held, and from whence it received its name. It is written on expensive vellum, a fine parchment originally from the skin of calf or antelope. Some authorities claim that it was one of a batch of 50 Bibles ordered from Egypt by the Roman Emperor Constantine; hence its beautiful appearance and the expensive skins which were used for its pages. But alas! this manuscript, like its corrupt Egyptian partner Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph) is also riddled with omissions, insertions and amendments.

The corrupt and unreliable nature of Codex B (that is what Vaticanus is called) is best summed up by one who has thoroughly examined them, John W Burgon: "The impurity of the text exhibited by these codices is not a question of opinion but fact...In the Gospels alone, Codex B(Vatican) leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times. It bears traces of careless transcriptions on every page..."

According to The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible, "It should be noted . . . that there is no prominent Biblical (manuscripts) in which there occur such gross cases of misspelling, faulty grammar, and omission, as in (Codex) B."

Being a former Catholic, I don't want my Bible to be built from anything from ROME. I know not to trust them.

Consider these facts and oddities relating to the Codex Vaticanus:

It was corrected by revisers in the 8th, 10th, and 15th centuries (W. Eugene Scott, Codex Vaticanus, 1996).

The entire manuscript has been mutilated...every letter has been run over with a pen, making exact identification of many of the characters impossible. Dr. David Brown observes: "I question the 'great witness' value of any manuscript that has been overwritten, doctored, changed and added to for more than 10 centuries." (The Great Unicals).

In the Gospels it leaves out 749 entire sentences and 452 clauses, plus 237 other words, all of which are found in hundreds of other Greek manuscripts. The total number of words omitted in Codex B in the Gospels alone is 2,877 as compared with the majority of manuscripts (Burgon, The Revision Revised, p. 75).

Vaticanus omits Mark 16:9-20, but a blank space is left for that section of Scripture.

The following testimony is by John Burgon, who examined Vaticanus personally: "To say that in the Vatican Codex (B), which is unquestionably the oldest we possess, St. Mark's Gospel ends abruptly at the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter, and that the customary subscription (Kata Mapkon) follows, is true; but it is far from being the whole truth. It requires to be stated in addition that the scribe, whose plan is found to have been to begin every fresh book of the Bible at the top of the next ensuing column to that which contained the concluding words of the preceding book, has at the close of St. Mark's Gospel deviated from his else invariable practice.

HE HAS LEFT IN THIS PLACE ONE COLUMN ENTIRELY VACANT. IT IS THE ONLY VACANT COLUMN IN THE WHOLE MANUSCRIPT -- A BLANK SPACE ABUNDANTLY SUFFICIENT TO CONTAIN THE TWELVE VERSES WHICH HE NEVERTHELESS WITHHELD. WHY DID HE LEAVE THAT COLUMN VACANT? What can have induced the scribe on this solitary occasion to depart from his established rule? The phenomenon (I believe I was the first to call distinct attention to it) is in the highest degree significant, and admits only one interpretation. The older manuscript from which Codex B was copied must have infallibly contained the twelve verses in dispute. The copyist was instructed to leave them out -- and he obeyed; but he prudently left a blank space in memoriam rei. Never was a blank more intelligible! Never was silence more eloquent! By this simple expedient, strange to relate, the Vatican Codex is made to refute itself even while it seems to be bearing testimony against the concluding verses of St. Mark's Gospel, by withholding them; for it forbids the inference which, under ordinary circumstances, must have been drawn from that omission. It does more. By leaving room for the verses it omits, it brings into prominent notice at the end of fifteen centuries and a half, a more ancient witness than itself." (Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel of St. Mark Vindicated*, 1871, pp. 86-87)

Similar to Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus identifies itself as a product of gnostic corruption in John 1:18, where "the only begotten Son" is changed to "the only begotten God," thus perpetuating the ancient Arian heresy that disassociates the Son of God Jesus Christ from God Himself by claiming that the Word was not the same as the Son. John's Gospel identifies the Son directly with the Word (John 1:1, 18), but by changing "Son" to "God" in verse 18, this direct association is broken.

Linguistic scholars have observed that Codex Vaticanus is reminiscent of classical and Platonic Greek, not Koine Greek of the New Testament (see Adolf Deissman's *Light of the Ancient East*). Nestle admitted that he had to change his Greek text (when using Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) to make it "appear" like Koine Greek.

Codex Vaticanus contains the false Roman Catholic apocryphal books such as Judith, Tobias, and Baruch, while it omits the pastoral epistles (I Timothy through Titus), the Book of Revelation, and it cuts off the Book of Hebrews at Hebrews 9:14 (a very convenient stopping point for the Catholic Church, since God forbids their priesthood in Hebrews 10 and exposes the mass as totally useless as well!).

If you look at the Codex Sinaiticus, found in a wastepaper basket in St. Catherine's Catholic Monastery, it seems to me that it was an earlier attempt at creating the Codex Vaticanus.

Consider these facts and oddities relating to the Codex Sinaiticus:

The Sinaiticus was written by three different scribes and was corrected later by several others. (This was the conclusion of an extensive investigation by H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat of the British Museum, which was published in *Scribes and Correctors of Codex Sinaiticus*, London, 1938.) Tischendorf counted 14,800 corrections in this manuscript (David Brown, *The Great Uncials*, 2000). Dr. F.H.A. Scrivener, who published *A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus* in 1864 testified: "The Codex is covered with alterations of an obviously correctional character—brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional, or limited to separate portions of the manuscript, many of these being contemporaneous with the first writer, but for the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century." Thus, it is evident that scribes in bygone centuries did not consider the Sinaiticus to represent a pure text. Why it should be so revered by modern textual critics is a mystery.

A great amount of carelessness is exhibited in the copying and correction. "Codex Sinaiticus 'abounds with errors of the eye and pen to an extent not indeed unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first-rate importance.' On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness. Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled; while that gross blunder, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament." (John Burgon, *The Revision Revised*) It is clear that the scribes who copied the Codex Sinaiticus were not faithful men of God who treated the Scriptures with utmost reverence. The total number of words omitted in the Sinaiticus is

n the Gospels alone is 3,455 compared with the Greek Received Text (Burgon, p. 75).

Mark 16:9-20 is omitted in the Codex Sinaiticus, but it was originally there and has been erased.

Codex Sinaiticus includes the apocryphal books (Esdras, Tobit, Judith, I and IV Maccabees, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus) plus two heretical writings, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. The apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas is filled with heresies and fanciful allegorizing, claiming, for example, that Abraham knew Greek and baptism is necessary for salvation. The Shepherd of Hermas is a gnostic writing that presents the heresy that the "Christ Spirit" came upon Jesus at his baptism.

Lastly, Codex Sinaiticus (along with Codex Vaticanus), exhibits clear gnostic influence. In John 1:18 "the only begotten Son" is changed to "the only begotten God," thus perpetuating the ancient Arian heresy that disassociates the Son Jesus Christ with God Himself by breaking the clear connection between "God" of John 1:1 with "the Son" of John 1:18. We know that God was not begotten; it was the Son who was begotten in the incarnation.

WHY ARE THESE TWO TEXTS REVERED BY MODERN "SCHOLARS AND EXPERTS?"

Hope this helps.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 15:13

Brother anonymous777....

Quote:

So many other things that you say are so patently incorrect. I don't know where to begin. You continue to use rhetoric without any sources of proof for what you are saying and just like the modern scribes and textual critics, you are expecting people to just accept everything you say.

I won't and don't.

"Patently incorrect?" Actually, you can easily verify the things that I said if you would look to "sources" that aren't confined to some KJV-only publications or websites. You can read Westcott and Hort's actual work via the link provided (or at your local university library). This is covered in the forward of their subsequent editions.

Quote:

If Westcott and Hort used the Textus Receptus and Byzantine Texts why did they leave out YET in John 7:8 which makes Jesus out to be a liar. I just posted something on this. Check it out. I will have a lot more to say about Westcott and Hort.

First of all, it is difficult to accept your premise that they would "leave out" anything. That is quite an accusation that you cannot possibly verify or state with any degree of CERTAINTY. You need to be VERY CAREFUL because the finality by which you are making such judgments is apparently limited by your personal "research." According to their own testimony, they simply translated as best as they could from the ancient manuscripts available to them at the time.

Secondly, you are blaming Westcott and Hort for something that just isn't found in many of the earliest manuscripts that are often deemed most reliable.

Moreover, those "modern" versions that you refer to so negatively didn't just translate Westcott and Hort's work. In this instance (John 7:8), the translators of the NIV include the word "yet" -- but footnote it with honesty to indicate the fact that

some early manuscripts do not have the word.

It almost seems like you think that Westcott and Hort were part of some diabolic conspiracy when they translated the Word from the manuscripts that they deemed best at that time. Sadly, there are actually people who are given to these sort of conspiracy theories -- and with so little "evidence" upon which their entire premise is based!

Quote:

Gotta love this quote from you:

"However, they favored the Alexandrian text-type (as do most scholars and experts)".

That is true, they favored the Alexandrian manuscripts.

Scholars and Experts!! Don't know about that. They have proven to be expert at changing God's Word, though.

So, what are you basing all of your "research" upon? If we can't rely upon scholars and experts in their fields and our own prayerful consideration of it -- then what, pray tell, are you basing all of your opinions upon? Gail Riplinger?

Again, I suggest that individuals who really want to study this topic in an unbiased search for truth should go to credible, firsthand sources whenever possible. You can easily contact the various Bible societies, translation experts, and language scholars. I am NOT saying that you have to believe them (far from it, actually), but it is important to know what they actually believe...why they believe it...BEFORE we go about dismissing their views or attributing them to some Satanic conspiracy.

By the way:

Have you ever posted on this website under an alias? This isn't an allegation. It just seems like there are several strongly opinionated KJV-only folks who have attempted to use this website as a means by which they can proclaim their views.

I have to say that the attitude and hostility that you have conveyed in your posts (especially directed at those who either do not accept your claims or who present something that differs from your own opinions) is remarkably similar to some of the other KJV-only guys who frequented (and departed) SermonIndex in the past.

I would urge anyone to NOT believe the things that I write -- or that ANYONE ELSE writes for that matter -- in regard to translation/version supremacy. I simply would urge believers who are interested in this to conduct their own research...and avoid (whenever possible) the biased secondhand sources that are often the catalyst for much of the rumors and calumny regarding this subject. Whenever possible, go to the sources and VERIFY what you read or hear.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 15:29

Here is the Introduction of the New Testament in Original Greek from 1881. It is a very interesting read. It explains many of the details behind Westcott and Hort's attempt...and how is mirrored somewhat the previous attempt by Erasmus.

<http://www.archive.org/stream/newtestamentinor00westrich#page/n9/mode/2up>

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 15:47

Chris, thank you (finally) for a link. I will look at this.

And please, have a look at this link. It is also a very good read.

Let's read and consider both sides.

<http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/CriticalTexts/dbs2695.htm>

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 16:12

You're welcome, but I included links and references previously. I also encouraged individuals to go to LIBRARIES to look up the information for themselves -- as much of it isn't found online.

In addition, I am always hesitant to read biased, secondhand sources like the website for the link you provided.

In just a few minutes on that website, I have already had to sift through rhetoric and theories that reek of KJV-only propaganda (such as making unsubstantiated allegations about Westcott and Hort on their HOME PAGE). For example: "He believed, unlike Westcott and Hort, in basing all conclusions on the solid foundation of facts rather than the sand of theory."

However, I will read through the page that you provided, although I won't buy any of the things sold on that website (for a "gift").

*EDIT - By the way, could you let me know if you have ever visited this website under a different alias (as I asked earlier). Again, I am not accusing you of this. I am just interested in how your words strongly resemble those of other KJV-only advocates who frequented SermonIndex in the past with similarly written posts.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 16:28

Chris,

biased, judgemental, discretionary, discerning are not bad words.

God Himself is biased. You're biased, we are all biased based on what we believe to be true. We are all partial to what we think is the truth.

Burgon says many good things just like you believe Westcott and Hort, do. Have you ever entertained anything negative about Westcott and Hort?

I have several friends that frequent SI and I have never posted KJV articles. Many Pro KJVers post the same arguments just like many non-KJVers do.

I really would like to post about other things to tell you the truth.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 16:49

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

biased, judgemental, discretionary, discerning are not bad words.

God Himself is biased. You're biased, we are all biased based on what we believe to be true. We are all partial to what we think is the truth.

There is a difference between the Eternal, undeniable truth of God...and the opinions of individuals regarding the supposed supremacy of one version, translation or set of sources over others.

There are also questions about whether some biased sources have preconceived conclusions. In other words, instead of looking for unbiased truth in the matter, some could be simply searching for any words that would somehow validate their pre-conceived opinions.

Quote:

Burgon says many good things just like you believe Westcott and Hort, do. Have you ever entertained anything negative about Westcott and Hort?

I think that you misjudged me (again). I did NOT say that I "believe" Westcott and Hort. In fact, I simply see them as flawed individuals -- just like you, me, Erasmus, Burgon and the translators of the NIV and KJV. They simply appear to have translated a version of the New Testament from ancient manuscripts (like Erasmus).

Since we don't have all of the documents that Erasmus used, it is difficult to apply the same type of scrutiny to his Textus Receptus. However, many other people have done EXACTLY what Westcott and Hort did for years after they completed their work -- and the agreement between their efforts seems to have validated one another's work.

I would like to mention (again) that many of those contemporary translations of Scripture consulted Westcott and Hort's text AS WELL AS other manuscripts, texts, text-types and original source material.

Quote:

I have several friends that frequent SI and I have never posted KJV articles. Many Pro KJVers post the same arguments just like many non-KJVers do.

I really would like to post about other things to tell you the truth.

I'm not understanding the answer to my question. So you haven't used a different alias here at SermonIndex at all?

Again, this wasn't an accusation at all. My question about this wasn't due simply to the things that you post from similar websites. Rather, it was the methodical approach by which you posted it and the hostility that you seem to express toward those who either question your information or basis for research...or who simply have an opinion or conclusion that differs from your own.

I have no problem with you sharing or your ability to share. I just hope that we can mingle our words with the salt of realization that we are still residing on this side of the "glass darkly" (I Corinthians 13). None of us are "all knowing" in regard to the supremacy of one translation or source texts over others. However, there is quite a bit of rhetoric that tries to convey an ultimate verdict in the matter. I would quickly question any such verdict if the person (or persons) responsible for it have limited their research to secondhand sources in nearly every situation.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 17:19

UPDATE

Chris,

You are the only one that has called me hostile. I just don't think you like the message. I wouldn't say you are hostile (that is a really strong word), but as far as the written word goes, you seem to talk down to me.

You are making this about me and it's not about me. It is about the evidence that I am showing everyone.

I show comparisons of scriptures but you discount the comparisons.

I show where Christ, Lord, Hell are removed and additions or subtractions are made to cause the Bible to fall in line with Romish doctrine, and you discount it all.

I am a common man. Not a "Scholar". I will continue to show what a common man would show. What is missing in the Bible. You want to tell me that what is missing is OK and that it is GOOD according to the "scholars and experts".

Fine, but you are not my final authority.

Since you are making this about me, I think it best if I just present my data and you present your data. Let's not converse with each other, because you have labeled me hostile towards you, so right there you won't be open to receiving anything.

g from me.

Oh well,
777

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2011/3/29 18:07

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

You are the only one that has called me hostile. I just don't think you like the message.

I didn't call you a "hostile." I simply said that you react with hostility toward me and others who disagree with your KJV-only views. I can actually go back and reference those from the thread...but it is just as easy for you to go back and read your own posts and how you respond to those of us who disagree with you.

As for "the message:" I simply disagree with your views.

Quote:

I show comparisons of scriptures but you discount that.

I don't "discount" this -- but I have simply explained that you are comparing "apples" and "oranges" and fail to explain that the vast majority of those "differences" is due to the differences in SOURCES used for each translation. However, you seem to imply that any such difference is somehow "incorrect" or an "omission" from the KJV -- even though those things are simply and typically not found in the sources used for the KJV.

Quote:

I show where Christ, Lord, Hell are removed and additions or subtractions are made to cause the Bible to fall in line with Romish doctrine.

"Subtracted" is the WRONG word, brother. How are these words "subtracted" if they weren't found in the original sources used for translation of such verses in the first place? Do you see the fallacy of such an allegation?

Moreover, your rhetoric sounds like the contemporary translations were created via some conspiracy to "cause the Bible to fall in line with Romish doctrine" -- when, ironically, the text that you prefer was largely based upon a single translation of one Catholic man! Besides, I find it ridiculous to say that any difference in source text equates versions like the NIV or NASB as an attempt to align them with the harlot Roman church. I really think that you are connecting dots incorrectly here.

Quote:

I am a common man. Not a "Scholar". I will continue to show what a common man would show. What is missing in the Bible. You want to tell me that what is missing is OK and that it is GOOD according to the "scholars and experts".

It doesn't matter whether you are a "common" man or a "common" man with multiple degrees. Rather, the issue is more about the weight of evidence that we place in our sources.

Also, again, you are placing words in my mouth and attributing ideas to me that I did not say. I did not tell you that "what is missing is OK." Rather, I am saying that most of those things that you are pointing out are not in some versions and translations BECAUSE they weren't found in the sources used by those translators.

Those Alexandrian text-type manuscripts used are much, much older than what is found in the Byzantine text-type. MOST scholars and experts feel that they are not only older, but more reliable (for several reasons). I would urge you to contact those experts (at Bible societies, colleges, universities, etc...) in order to find out the reasons WHY they feel as they do.

I do think that this is much more reliable than simply consulting books and articles written by an interior decorator (Gail Ripplinger) -- who, ironically, also relies on scholars and experts...but only a handful that she chooses to be more reliable. Of course, you haven't told me just what you are basing all of your research upon. Are there ANY scholars, experts or original writings upon which you are basing your opinions? I mentioned Gail Ripplinger previously because you cited her. Her work, ironically, relies upon citations of others -- and even much of that comes from biased (right or wrong) KJV-only sources.

Quote:

Since you are making this about me, I think it best if I just present my data and you present your data. Let's not converse with each other, because you have labeled me hostile towards you.

I am not making this about "you." I simply asked you a question about whether or not you have had a previous alias/username here on SermonIndex because your posts echo some of the other KJV-only advocates. However, that isn't necessarily a bad thing. I was just attempting to get some perspective into this discussion.

I totally support your right to believe as you wish -- particularly after you have researched the matter. I do question the extent and type of research that you have performed (because you haven't stated it explicitly). However, I am not trying to make you my "disciple" or trying to force my opinion about this matter upon you.

Like I have said, I do not have a final opinion about this subject. I do not know with absolute certainty just WHICH versions, translations or sources are ultimately superior than the others. I was simply showing you what others feel about the matter...and why I understand their views. As a result, I regularly use the KJV, NASB and NIV.

By the way, I do feel that you have reacted with hostility toward me. You have put words in my mouth and implied what I believe and what I am trying to do -- which happened to be incorrect. You called me out by name. I don't mind you pointing out something that I have said or written. However, I think that you may go too far when you read between the lines and assume that I believe or said something that I did not say at all.

I am not KJV-only. I prefer the KJV -- alongside the NASB and NIV. I do understand many of the views on each side of this topic. I just happen to lean toward a more scholarly approach that I feel that most text experts, translators and scholars hold. They do make some valid points. However, if we refuse to hear those points in their entirety, we can't really weigh all of the evidence, can we?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2011/3/29 18:19

Hi anonymous777...

In reference to your update:

Quote:

I wouldn't say you are hostile (that is a really strong word), but as far as the written word goes, you seem to talk down to me.

I apologize if it came across that way. I don't mean to even appear to talk down to you at all. I just have to question the final verdict type of argument that you are presenting. You simply are not leaving ANY room for being incorrect in any of your proclamations.

I hope that I am not coming across that way. As I have said several times before, I do NOT know with any certainty whether one version is somehow superior to all others. I do NOT know with any certainty whether one set of sources is somehow superior to all others.

However, I do tend to question those who make such proclamations that come across as "absolute certainty." I don't believe that you know with absolute certainty that the KJV is superior to all other versions of the Bible. I don't believe that you know with absolute certainty that the source texts in the lineage of the KJV is superior to all other sources. So, in a sense, I believe that we are all in the same boat.

WE should season our words with this salted admission that we just aren't absolutely certain -- especially if we are aware of the limited extent of our own research. We just can't rely solely on the research of others if we haven't "tested" it and "verified" whether it "holds water" of truth or not. Again, I am not saying that you (or I) have done this either. I will say that I have read through many KJV-only books that just wouldn't hold up to normal, peer-reviewed scholarly scrutiny in much of their claims, verdicts and even "research."

May the Lord lead us to Him.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 18:29

Quote:

So many other things that you say are so patently incorrect. I don't know where to begin. You continue to use rhetoric without any sources of proof for what you are saying and just like the modern scribes and textual critics, you are expecting people to just accept everything you say.

Everything Chris has said is something every first year seminary student will learn, be it in a conservative or liberal school. It's easily verifiable. All you need to do is read.

Quote:

If Westcott and Hort used the Textus Receptus and Byzantine Texts why did they leave out YET in John 7:8 which makes Jesus out to be a liar. I just posted something on this. Check it out. I will have a lot more to say about Westcott and Hort.

Do you really want to know why? Or are you just asking for rhetorical purposes?

Quote:

That is true, they favored the Alexandrian manuscripts, but they also favored the Codex Vaticanus, kept under lock and key by Rome and responsible for over 36,000 changes in modern bibles. We only get to see a few pages here and there. Why does Rome keep it under lock and key? And for that matter, why do we accept our modern bibles being based on Rome's corrupt Codex Vaticanus?

Just because Westcott, Hort, and others "favor" a certain text, doesn't mean they use it exclusively. There are over 5,000 manuscripts that compose the Greek New Testament. None is complete, none is without error, and there are no two that completely agree. Not even the multiple texts that formed the KJV translation.

Scholars, ancient and modern, have devised various methods at trying to deduce from the 5,000 manuscripts laid before them, which parts are the best and most like the originals. There are entire verses out there with literally a dozen or more variants.

In textual criticism, words or verses are "left out" or "added" depending on what the Scribe think the best composition of a verse is, based off his examination of the 5,000+ texts available to him. Such has never been as easy as saying Majority Text, Minority Text, or "Western" Text. Even within those three major families, there are great deviations from one another.

Quote:

Scholars and Experts!! Don't know about that. They have proven to be expert at changing God's Word, though.

Have you ever stopped to consider that the KJV authors perhaps added some verses? I mean, the original 1611 KJV Bible did include the Apocrypha. A whopping 6 additional books of the Bible.

Maybe the textual critics of today aren't taking away words and verses, as you charge, but perhaps they are actually just properly compiling the Greek manuscript to more accurately reflect the original autographs? Autographs which have been lost to time. And in the process, they decided to drop the apocrypha from their translations.

So, exactly who is adding and who is taking away here? Hmmmm....

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 18:46

Additionally, critical Greek texts of the New Testament today, namely UBS4 and NA27, decisions as to which variants are to be favored are decided by a committee of scholars. And these committee's have published brief comments on most of the major variants, and why they decided what they decided. They note even their disagreements with each other. They then report how many people voted one way or the other, and "grade" the likelihood that a variant reflects the original. There are no conspiracies here. It is a very transparent and open process.

And the awesome thing about all of this, is that even after all this has been done, the individual scholar, student, and layman can freely agree or disagree with the decisions made. Indeed, when I studied in school, there were times I disagreed with the choices the scholars made as to the final composition of the text.

Such is a pretty awesome thing to participate in. I would highly encourage you to learn enough Greek to look at these things with your own eyes. It's not an easy thing to learn, but with a few months of intense study, it can be done.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 18:51

Jimmy,

You have bundled competing facts and information together to create some new "fact" that is not true. In essence, you are co-opting a genuine fact of the KJV and attributing it to new versions. That's not nice.

The 5,000 Greek manuscripts you refer to support the KJV, not the New Versions.

There are currently over 5000 extant Greek manuscripts of the New Testament in one form or another (minuscules, unicals, lectionaries).

Approximately 99% of them agree with each other and the KJV; the remaining 1% disagreeing with themselves as often as the majority. The four centuries since the KJV was translated have provided no "deluge" of new material. In fact, almost every non-KJV reading found since 1611 was known before 1611 and were rejected by the KJV translators.

Here is some modern reasoning.

(Modern versions) The oldest surviving manuscripts must be the most reliable. Therefore, when determining what manuscripts to depend on, the Vaticanus (350 AD) and the Sinaiticus (about 350 AD) should be accepted as correct (even if 998 other manuscripts disagree with them).

The Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus disagree with each other over 3,000 times in the Gospels, alone.

Modern versions are based on the Vaticanus and look what is omitted.

Genesis 1:1 through Genesis 46:28
Psalms 106-138
Matthew 16:2-3
The Pauline Pastoral Epistles
Hebrews 9:14-13:25
Revelation

The Vaticanus was available to the translators of the King James Bible, but they didn't use it because they knew it is unreliable.

And all the comparisons I am displaying for you are showing exactly why it is unreliable.

The Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts are the oldest, but they are not the best manuscripts!!!

That's where the modern translators went wrong! They foolishly accepted the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus simply because they were old.

They did not attempt to find out why they were so vastly different from the Greek text that real Christians have known to be the infallible Word of God.

When the modern versions say in the footnotes, "Some of the oldest mss. do not contain vv. 9-20," or "This verse not found in the most ancient authorities," they are taking their information from the corrupt and unreliable Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts!

By the way, we have to take the Catholic Church's word for how old the Vaticanus is. Do you think they would have any selfish motive to make sure it is given a very old date?

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 19:00

Quote:

-----There are no conspiracies here. It is a very transparent and open process.

Here are two processes. Which one is the most open?

The King James Committee submitted their work to the area churches weekly for review. They believed the Word of God belongs to the people.

Westcott and Hort, kept their work secret for the first 10 years. (Well documented and not biased).

Where can I get a pair of glasses like you are wearing?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 19:02

Quote:

You have bundled competing facts and information together to create some new "fact" that is not true. In essence, you are co-opting a genuine fact of the KJV and attributing it to new versions. That's not nice.

Brother, I have read these Greek manuscripts with my own eyes in Greek. I have studied many variants... variants both in all of the families, including disagreements amongst the text that made up the KJV.

Quote:

The 5,000 Greek manuscripts you refer to support the KJV.

You can say this if you want. But it is not factual. These 5,000 manuscripts disagree at times with the text that underlies the KJV. Not always. There is a lot more agreement among the texts than disagreements. But there are literally thousands upon thousands upon thousands of variants amongst all of these texts. Some are simple misspellings and such.

Quote:

The four centuries since the KJV was translated have provided no "deluge" of new material

Actually, many manuscripts have since been found. And because of technological advances, scholars are always a click away from being able to examine at once all the variants for themselves. The KJV scholars did not have this advantage. They were limited to the texts immediately within their possession. That's not to say they were greatly handicapped by any stretch of the imagination. But they definitely were working with less.

Quote:

Here is some modern reasoning.

(Modern versions) The oldest surviving manuscripts must be the most reliable. Therefore, when determining what manuscripts to depend on, the Vaticanus (350 AD) and the Sinaiticus (about 350 AD) should be accepted as correct (even if 998 other manuscripts disagree with them).

That is not how it works brother. I fear you don't understand the actual process of these things. But more than that, I fear you really don't care about how the actual process works.

Quote:

Modern versions are based on the Vaticanus and look what is omitted.

No modern version is "based" on the Vaticanus or any other particular text. They simply consider the Vaticanus as one amongst many other texts available for consideration. Favor may be given to certain text types when weighing these things. But I promise you this is not how it works.

When I was in seminary, I was given a verse. For one verse, I had multiple pages of charts weighing the pro's and the con's of each variant. I would literally consult dozens of texts, across 1600 years of Greek texts. Sometimes I agreed with older minority texts. Sometimes I agreed with the "majority" texts.

The "eclectic" process of textual criticism keeps you from doing what you are inaccurately depicting as happening.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/29 19:05

Chris,

Quote:
-----Do you have any proof that Westcott and Hort "omitted" this particular word? Have you read this in their "New Testament in the Original Greek?" Is it possible that the source manuscripts from which they gathered their work may have used a different way of translating this verse? Moreover, does the use of the word "Christ" or the pronoun "Him" (which obviously refers to Christ) change the dynamic of the essence of what this verse means?

Yes, here is some proof:

Here is the TR with "Christo" as the last word: (GNT-TR) παντα ισχυω εν τω ενδυναμουντι με χριστω

Here is WH with the the last word Christo missing: (GNT-WH+) παντα ισχυω εν τω ενδυναμουντι με

Obviously the texts differ. I am no NT Greek scholar, but I have had Koine Greek in Bible College. This is just the example of Phil. 4:13. As to changing the meaning of the verse? No, I do not think so. If the text says Christo, it should be Christo, not Him. But, to tamper with Scripture, one has to be very careful. This has happened over and over by textual critics. Does that mean there should be no textual criticism? I am not saying that, but one needs to be careful.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 19:06

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

Here is some modern reasoning.

(Modern versions) The oldest surviving manuscripts must be the most reliable. Therefore, when determining what manuscripts to depend on, the Vaticanus (350 AD) and the Sinaiticus (about 350 AD) should be accepted as correct (even if 998 other manuscripts disagree with them).

You keep saying that this is "modern reasoning" -- but I have never met or communicated with a single textual critic or scholar who implied this.

The reason that most scholars favor the Alexandrian text-type isn't limited to the fact that most of those texts are much OLDER. There is a belief that the manuscripts that make up the Byzantine text-type were actually derived from manuscripts that resembled the Alexandrian text-types.

Of course, if you haven't made an effort to contact modern scholars, textual critics or language experts, then HOW can you know just WHAT they believe and WHY they believe it?

And, yes, there is some weight given to the age of the earliest known manuscripts. First of all, the various manuscripts are obtained from diverse locations and the text largely agrees with one another. There are some Alexandrian manuscripts of Paul's epistles and the Gospels that are dated at ~200 A.D. -- approximately 100 years from the time that the authors were actually alive. That is akin to the time difference of a copy of a manuscript that was written in around 1911.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 19:09

Quote:

The King James Committee submitted their work to the area churches weekly for review. They believed the Word of God belongs to the people.

Which is fantastic. But they didn't ask the Puritans now, did they? The Church of England didn't like those guys you know. Indeed, they even killed some of them.

And the decisions they made, and why they made them, have been forever lost to time. Where are their notes? Heck... forget the notes... where is their Greek manuscript?

Quote:

Westcott and Hort, kept their work secret for the first 10 years. (Well documented and not biased).

Again, the UBS4 and NA27 scholars have published commentaries that explain almost every decision they made. And they did so in a book. We can read their Greek text, and we can read the commentary they left us to explain the decisions they made. The KJV scholars left us no such work. Indeed, the Greek manuscript they compiled for the purpose of their translation has since been lost to time... which is why scholars in later years have attempted to reconstruct that text.

So... who is open? The people who actually published all of their work, to be continually studied, examined, and debated, and when necessary, revising?

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/29 19:09

Triple 7,

Interesting quote,

"Gotta love this quote from you:

"However, they favored the Alexandrian text-type (as do most scholars and experts)".

That is true, they favored the Alexandrian manuscripts, but they also favored the Codex Vaticanus, kept under lock and key by Rome and responsible for over 36,000 changes in modern bibles. We only get to see a few pages here and there. Why does Rome keep it under lock and key? And for that matter, why do we accept our modern bibles being based on Rome's corrupt Codex Vaticanus?

Because many average day people don't know about it.

Scholars and Experts!! Don't know about that. They have proven to be expert at changing God's Word, though."

Good point. Most people don't realize this.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 19:13

By the way, if you wanted to study why the scholars made the decisions they made, you can simply read: *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, published by the United Bible Society, to compliment the 4th edition of their critical Greek text.

http://www.amazon.com/Textual-Commentary-Greek-Testament-Ancient/dp/1598561642/ref=pd_sim_b_9

It's rather dull reading. Have a cup of coffee on hand.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/29 19:17

King Jimmy,

"Have you ever stopped to consider that the KJV authors perhaps added some verses? I mean, the original 1611 KJV Bible did include the Apocrypha. A whopping 6 additional books of the Bible.

Maybe the textual critics of today aren't taking away words and verses, as you charge, but perhaps they are actually just properly compiling the Greek manuscript to more accurately reflect the original autographs? Autographs which have been lost to time. And in the process, they decided to drop the apocrypha from their translations.

So, exactly who is adding and who is taking away here? Hmmmm...."

My understanding of the apocrypha being added was that it was not considered inspired writings by the translators, but helpful reading to understand some Jewish history etc.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 19:18

Quote:

My understanding of the apocrypha being added was that it was not considered inspired writings by the translators, but helpful reading to understand some Jewish history etc.

Whatever the case, it was published as a part of the original 1611 KJV of the Bible. That's enough to destroy any notion of the KJV being perfect and without error.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 19:23

Hi JB1968...

Quote:

Yes, here is some proof:

Here is the TR with "Christo" as the last word: (GNT-TR) παντα ισχυω εν τω ενδυναμουντι με χριστω

Here is WH with the the last word Christo missing: (GNT-WH+) παντα ισχυω εν
: τω εν-δυν-αμουν-τι με

Okay...but, as I said, this doesn't prove that Westcott and Hort OMITTED the word. It could simply mean that the ancient sources that they used...that they honestly deemed to be the most reliable...simply did not have the word in the first place.

ce.

In other words, they weren't reproducing the Textus Receptus and omitting words that they didn't believe should be there. Rather, they were doing the SAME THING that Erasmus did when he created his work -- and producing an entirely new version from the sources that they deemed to be the most reliable.

Quote:

Obviously the texts differ. I am no NT Greek scholar, but I have had Koine Greek in Bible College.

Interestingly, the manuscripts found in the Byzantine text-type are not written in Koine Greek, but in Medieval Greek. Koine Greek (also known as "Biblical Greek") is the prevalent language of the era from about 350 B.C. through 350 A.D. Many of the manuscripts in the Alexandrian text-type are from that Koine "Biblical Greek" era. The manuscripts from the Byzantine text-type are mostly from the later Medieval Greek period.

Quote:

This is just the example of Phil. 4:13. As to changing the meaning of the verse? No, I do not think so. If the text says Christo, it should be Christo, not Him. But, to tamper with Scripture, one has to be very careful.

Every translator must "tamper" (so to speak) with language. The translators of the KJV were just as required to "tamper" with language as the translators of the NIV. In fact, the translators of the KJV wrote that they had certain language requirements that they had to adhere to.

However, I think that the fallacy in all of this is the allegation that certain contemporary translators "tampered" (as in some sort of effort to impart their own views) with their translations by "omitting" words or verses.

This is the caution that I am trying to suggest. WE shouldn't be given over to allegations that just don't have any evidence to substantiate them. If someone is using honest academic and scholarship to faithfully translate a version of the New Testament from ancient manuscripts that differ somewhat from the Textus Receptus and Byzantine text-type, we should expect that there are some differences. This is not because of a conspiracy -- but because the text sources differ.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 19:28

Jimmy, please.

It is a well known, unbiased fact that the 5300 plus manuscripts for the Textus Receptus agree with each other 99% of the time and the Vaticanus (from Rome) and the Sinaiticus (from the trash can at St. Catherine's Monastery) disagree over 3000 times in the Gospels alone.

Here is some of the fruit of using corrupt manuscripts.

First of all, much of Hebrews is missing in the Vaticanus, especially the part that would expose the Mass.

Matt 1:25 Firstborn missing (very Catholic)

Matthew 2:11, 9:18, 14:33, 20:20, Mark 5:6

"Worship" has been altered to "Kneeling down" or "knelt" or "did obeisance" (very Catholic) by NIV (Matthew 9:18, 20:20, Mark 5:6), NKJV (Matthew 20:20), RSV (Matthew 9:18, 20:20), GN (Matthew 9:18, 20:20, Mark 5:6), LB (Matthew 14:33, 20:20, Mark 5:6), AMP (Mark 5:6), NASV (Matthew 9:18, 20:20, Mark 5:6), NEB (all five verses), NWT (all five verses), JB (all five verses).

Matthew 5:22 - without a cause removed.

Jesus said, If you get angry without a cause. Now, "without a cause" is removed, so when Jesus got angry I guess he sinned.

Matt 5:44 "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, despitefully use you," omitted by RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV marg., RSV, GN, LB, AMP, NASV, NEB, NWT, JB.

Matt 6:33 "God" is omitted by RV, Ne, NIV, RSV, LB, AMP, NASV, NWT, JB.

Matthew 16:3

"O ye hypocrites" omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV marg., RSV, GN, LB, AMP, NASV, NEB, NWT, JB.

Matthew 17:21

"Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting" omitted by RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV marg., RSV, GN, LB marg., NSRB marg., NEB, NWT, JB. AMP italicises the verse, NASV brackets the verse.

Matthew 18:11

"For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost" omitted by RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV marg., RSV, GN, LB marg., NEB, NWT, JB. AMP italicises the verse, NASV brackets the verse.

Matthew 19:16-17

"Good master" and "Why callest thou me good" is changed to "Teacher" and "Why do you ask me about what is good," or similar by RV (v.16 as AV), Ne, NIV, NKJV marg., RSV, GN, LB (omits question in verse 17), AMP, NASV, NEB, NWT, JB.

Matthew 23:14

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation" omitted by RV, Ne, NW, NKJV marg., RSV, GN, NSRB marg., NEB, NWT, JB. AMP italicises the verse, NASV brackets the verse.

I haven't even finished with Matthew and there is so much more.

You can read more on your own. I have nothing to hide.

http://ecclesia.org/truth/manuscript_evidence.html

Jimmy, have you ever really looked into what is missing in the modern bibles?

You should pick up a book by David Daniels called, "Look What's Missing". It will instantly raise your consciousness level about 10 miles.

<http://www.chick.com/catalog/books/1271.asp>

Or google him and watch his videos.

Look, I was raised Catholic and I don't want to read Catholic bibles in a Protestant binding.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 19:35

Quote:
-----Every translator must "tamper" (so to speak) with language. The translators of the KJV were just as required to "tamper" with language as the translators of the NIV. In fact, the translators of the KJV wrote that they had certain language requirements that they had to adhere to.

What do you mean by "tamper"?

KJV committee used "formal equivalence" in translating. That means word for word.

Westcott and Hort and committees since then use something called "dynamic equivalence". What they feel the word means.

At least tell people or give a link to explain the difference in translation techniques that were used. We don't have anything to hide, do we?

This is a very good explanation of these two methodologies.

<http://www.chick.com/information/bibleversions/articles/translation.asp>

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 19:50

Brother,

Quote:

What do you mean by "tamper"?

The selective "tamper" word was not my choice...but JB's. However, the process of TRANSLATING a word from one language to another requires for individuals to CHOOSE which word best fits -- even if they claim to believe solely in "formal equivalence."

Of course, the "formal equivalence" argument is moot -- because the text itself must be rearranged so that it can be understood by the reader in the language era for which it is being translated.

My wife obtained a graduate level degree in a language and worked as a professor. However, she has often been asked to translate many documents (including Gospel tracts). Often, she would translate one document alongside another person. If dynamic equivalence was so "cut-and-dry," there would NEVER be any variance. However, this just isn't the case. My wife would often translate a document word-for-word from a source...and a colleague would do the same. However, they would often have translated documents that just weren't entirely the same.

Even the translators of the KJV recognized alternative possible translations for words and phrases. However, they weren't permitted to include those in the margins of their work like other translations have done.

By the way, I think that you misunderstand "dynamic equivalence" and "formal equivalence." Most translators use a combination of both -- even if they rely on one form more readily.

Still, I am interested in just WHERE you are getting your information about Wescott and Hort's methods. Did you find this out from reading Wescott and Hort's own words about their techniques -- or did you obtain this elsewhere? This is what I mean about the importance of going to the sources.

Moreover, most modern versions (like I said) use a balance between the two forms of approach to translation. And, again, contemporary translations like the NIV were not a reproduction of Westcott and Hort's work anyway.

Quote:

At least tell people or give a link to explain the difference in translation techniques that were used. We don't have anything to hide, do we?

What are you trying to insinuate? Do you see what I mean about the "hostility" by which you approach those who don't agree with your "absolute" nature of your conclusions/proclamations in this subject? By the way, I tend to stay away from Jack Chick's website. While I do like some of his tracts, and I used to read quite a bit of his material as a teenager, I realize the flaws in much of the "absolutes" that he proclaims. Ever read "HE CAME TO SET THE CAPTIVES FREE" by Dr. Rebecca Brown? Wow.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 20:16

Quote:

It is a well known, unbiased fact that the 5300 plus manuscripts for the Textus Receptus agree with each other 99% of the time and the Vaticanus (from Rome) and the Sinaiticus (from the trash can at St. Catherine's Monastery) disagree over 3000 times in the Gospels alone.

Brother, based off my reading of the Greek text and examination of the variant manuscripts, with my own eyes, this is not true.

Quote:

Jimmy, have you ever really looked into what is missing in the modern bibles?

I've read the Greek manuscripts with my own eyes. Have you?

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/29 20:29

Belated reply to Neil,

Quote:

-----Quote:
although there were always people who wanted to do Christianity their way, and not according to scripture.

do you mean ecclesiology? because outside of some of 1st Cor 14, there's very little in how to "do Christianity" in a traditional liturgy, which the way it was always 'sposed to be...the only "work" we have to do is what Jesus said:

Jesus answered them, "This is the work of God, that you believe in Him Whom He has sent."

I had in mind John 10:1 Truly, truly, I say to you, He who does not enter into the sheepfold by the door, but going up by another way, that one is a thief and a robber.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/29 20:44

Quote:
-----Whatever the case, it was published as a part of the original 1611 KJV of the Bible. That's enough to destroy any notion of the KJV being perfect and without error.

I disagree King Jimmy. We have many Study Bibles that have more helps than is contained in the Apocrypha. But that is not inspired, only the Bible is. God will preserve His Word.

On a side note, we were at Walmart today and they are selling a 400th anniversary edition of the 1611 KJV minus the Apoc. It has the original study helps in it etc. It is a facsimile of the original 1611. Even the f's for the s's. All for \$4.95.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/29 20:57

Chris,
I was taught koine Greek, which is the common language of the NT world.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 22:02

Jimmy, you might want to tell the whole story about the KJV and the Apocrypha.

Everyone, it is true that the King James Bible when first printed contained the Apocrypha.

Many critics of the KJV Bible like to point out that the original King James had the Apocrypha in it as though that fact compromises its integrity. But several things must be examined to get the factual picture.

First, in the days in which our Bible was translated, the Apocrypha was accepted reading based on its historical value, though not accepted as Scripture by anyone outside of the Catholic church. The King James translators therefore placed it between the Old and New Testaments for its historical benefit to its readers. They did not integrate it into the Old Testament text as do the corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts.

That they rejected the Apocrypha as divine is very obvious by the seven reasons which they gave for not incorporating it into the text. They are as follows:

1. Not one of them is in the Hebrew language, which was alone used by the inspired historians and poets of the Old Testament.
2. Not one of the writers lays any claim to inspiration.
3. These books were never acknowledged as sacred Scriptures by the Jewish Church, and therefore were never sanctioned by our Lord.
4. They were not allowed a place among the sacred books, during the first four centuries of the Christian Church.
5. They contain fabulous statements, and statements which contradict not only the canonical Scriptures, but themselves; as when, in the two Books of Maccabees, Antiochus Epiphanes is made to die three different deaths in as many different places.
6. It inculcates doctrines at variance with the Bible, such as prayers for the dead and sinless perfection.
7. It teaches immoral practices, such as lying, suicide, assassination and magical incantation.

If having the Apocrypha between the Testaments disqualifies it as authoritative, then the corrupt Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts from Alexandria, Egypt must be totally worthless since their authors obviously didn't have the conviction of the King James translators and incorporated its books into the text of the Old Testament thus giving it authority with Scripture.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 22:03

Jimmy, you read all 5487 greek manuscripts from all over the world with your very own eyes? And cross-checked and compared them? My apologies. I am impressed!

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 22:27

Quote:

Jimmy, you read all 5487 greek manuscripts from all over the world with your very own eyes? And cross-checked and compared them? My apologies. I am impressed!

No. But the texts of NA27 and UBS4 have all the major variants documented in the Greek text. IF you ever look at a "critical" Greek New Testament, the amount of variants listed on each page often consume more page than the actual text under consideration. These things are very well documented. It will tell you the variants, and list in what manuscripts these variants exist. And having spent quite a bit of time in both the NA27 and UBS4 Greek texts, while far from being a PhD in my knowledge of these things, I know enough to spot something that's simply not true.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 22:30

Hi JB1968...

Quote:

Chris,
I was taught koine Greek, which is the common language of the NT world.

Yes, that is what I meant in my previous comment about it. I was just pointing out that many of the Alexandrian text-type manuscripts are written in Koine "Biblical" Greek, but none of the Byzantine text-type "Majority text" manuscripts were written in that variant of the language. Instead, the manuscripts contained within Byzantine text-type were written in Medieval Greek.

In other words, I was merely pointing out that many of the Alexandrian text-type manuscripts were of the same language era as Koine "Biblical" Greek...and the Byzantine text-type manuscripts were written in a later variant of the language.

I apologize for any confusion.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 22:40

Ok, I want to get back to basics. The common, everyday Christian is usually not interested in most everything we are talking about regarding manuscripts. But explain to them what is missing in their Bibles or what is added, you may get their attention and then their motivation. It takes a lot of motivation to study where we got our Bible from. You have to cut through a lot of junk and I do mean junk.

Now I remember Neil's question. "How was the Canon of the Bible" formed or did it come from the Catholic Church? The quick answer is NO. Reference this link, Neil.
<http://www.anabaptists.org/history/howwegot.html>

I used to always hear people talk about Codex this and Codex that and I did not have a clue what they were talking about. If you would like a very easy to read (with pictures) book on where our Bible came from, I suggest this book:

Did the Catholic Church Give Us the Bible? David W. Daniels

There is not one history of the Bible, but two. One is a history of God preserving His words through His people. The other is of the devil using the Roman Catholic church to pervert God's words through her "scholars."

I think this is the single best little book for the everyday person to understand where their Bible came from.

And I have finally found what I was trying to find regarding the two lines of the Bibles we have today.

<http://kjbv.landmarkbiblebaptist.net/2texts-2.html>

Ok, happy reading and good research. Find out for yourselves.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 22:41

In case you missed it.

Two Lines of Bible Manuscripts. I don't know about you but too much writing and reading blurs my vision. I appreciate concise charts and pictures and hope this helps you.

<http://kjbv.landmarkbiblebaptist.net/2texts-2.html>

Is the KJV Harder to Read?

<http://www.av1611.org/kjb/kjveasy.html>

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 22:48

Quote:

The common, everyday Christian is usually not interested in most everything we are talking about regarding manuscripts

This is no excuse to be a bad student, or to make comments about things you don't understand. In my opinion, if you have never read Greek, you really have no place whatsoever at the table discussing textual criticism. It's like arguing with a nuclear scientist on how to make a better bomb without ever having taken a physics class.

You might find that offensive... but common... honestly, how can you talk about what translations are better translations if you don't even know the Greek alphabet, and some basic parts of Greek grammar? Let alone if you've not examined an ancient Greek manuscript... in Greek.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/29 22:51

Nice charts triple 7.

I remember hearing in Bible College the liberal beliefs of W and H. Makes you wonder.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 22:52

Quote:

-----Two Lines of Bible Manuscripts.

There are actually three "lines" of manuscripts, by the way.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:03

Quote:

-----<http://kjv.landmarkbiblebaptist.net/2texts-2.html>

The problem with this chart is that it doesn't take into account the "cross-pollination" of text families. Texts are grouped into three major families, the majority, alexandrian, and western texts. In the hundreds and thousands of texts that make up each individual family, there are unique qualities that make them generally distinct from one another.

However, with that said, there is also a great deal of overlap. It's like if you drew three circles on a piece of paper, that overlap one another some. There are some features of the majority texts that come up in the alexandrian, and western, but likewise, some of the western that make their way into the alexandrian and majority... and everything in between. There are lots of idiosyncrasies in these manuscripts. A clear distinction between families isn't always clear... especially when you just have some documents that are but fragments of the original.

For fun, do a little experiment. Take a few paragraphs of anything, and give it to friends and family. Tell them to make a hand written copy of the document. Then if you can, have them repeat the process with another group of people. Then, if you can, gather together all the copies everybody made, and compare them side by side to the original.

What will happen is that you will find that errors are introduced into the copies. People will leave out words, misspell things, or get word orders wrong. Repeat this process over and over again for 1600 years, across various geographies... and see what you come out with...

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 23:05

Quote:

I remember hearing in Bible College the liberal beliefs of W and H. Makes you wonder.

I just have to ask: Did you actually "hear" this from a secondhand source, or did you read this from Westcott and Hort's own writings?

It would be quite awful if a professor "taught" something that was either hearsay or based solely upon something that was handed down to him from someone else.

In many KJV-only websites and books that I have read, there have been some nasty things written that amounted to nothing more than libelous rumors...typically taken from quotes that are taken from books that in turn take things from quotes that are supposedly taken from books. In two instances, one website actually quoted another website...and vice versa.

It makes you wonder just how easily persuaded some believers might be. After all, the Word of God reminds us, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (II Timothy 2:15). Yes, this is speaking of the Word. However, in everyday things, we shouldn't be quite so selectively limited when we approach any matter.

If we are going to entertain slanderous allegations and accusations about people (or even the translation efforts of individuals), we either need to be ENTIRELY certain that such things are true...or be VERY CAREFUL before we go about repeating those things or presenting them as absolute certainties.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 23:08

Three lines? Could you post the 3rd line, please. At least you don't deny the two lines.

There are plenty of Westcott and Hort's own writings on the web that people can see how they indict themselves. Here are some links, with quotes and references for the quotes.

Some information on Westcott and Hort the Fathers of the Modern versions. With quotes from their son's biography of them.

Chris wanted me to research their own words. Here you go.

<http://www.febc.edu.sg/VPP47.htm>

The Hidden Motives of Westcott and Hort, in their own words.

http://preservingthebible.org/hidden_motives_of_westcott.htm

WestCott and Hort: Translator's Belief's with references.

<http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/wh-heretics.htm>

More quotes from Fenton John Anthony Hort (the most outspoken of the two). <http://www.elijahproject.org/hort.html>

When you find out what is going on you begin to realize that it is no wonder that people have sprung up all over the place to defend the King James Bible.

There is a lot of info, I know.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:13

Quote:

Three lines? Could you post the 3rd line, please. At least you don't deny the two lines.

The third line, as I have noted, is called "The Western Text." The so-called "Western Text" is about 10% longer than any of the Alexandrian/Majority texts. To put that in perspective, the extra verbiage in the Greek western texts would be like having 2.8 more chapters in the book of Acts.

Quote:

There is a lot of info, I know.

Don't you think it would be more profitable, perhaps, to actually study Greek and read the manuscripts for yourself, than spending time pouring over silly conspiracy theory websites? You know, actually study and show yourself approved?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 23:14

Quote:

Chris wanted me to research their own words. Here you go.

<http://www.febc.edu.sg/VPP47.htm>

The Hidden Motives of Westcott and Hort, in their own words.

http://preservingthebible.org/hidden_motives_of_westcott.htm

Westcott and Hort: Translator's Belief's with references.
<http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/wh-heretics.htm>

More quotes from Fenton John Anthony Hort (the most outspoken of the two). <http://www.elijahproject.org/hort.html>

Hmmm...I really, really hope that you don't think that this is "researching their own words."

Rather, this is merely reading "selections" (if that) from websites that are biased on the matter. In fact, it is merely the REPEATING of hearsay IF you haven't really tested and verified the allegations for yourself.

Quote:

When you find out what is going on you begin to realize that it is no wonder that people have sprung up all over the place to defend the King James Bible.

All of those rumors, insinuations, and statements that attack other versions and translators just really isn't a proper "defense" for some strange premise that the KJV is the best version (or the only "perfect" version) of God's Word.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:16

Quote:

The Hidden Motives of Westcott and Hort, in their own words.

I hate to burst your bubble, but as impactful as Westcott and Hort were in the field of textual criticism, today's Greek manuscripts and modern translations are not based off their work. Their work may have influenced the field, in conservative and liberal schools, but, there have been many revisions to what they first published many years ago.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:20

And by the way, when I was actually being a good Greek student and actively doing textual criticism in seminary, Westcott and Hort were not really ever in my mind. Indeed, I can't think of a thing I ever did that was based directly off anything they said. I simply looked over the Greek manuscripts myself, and "established the text" as I saw fit, independently of them. Which is why the NA27 and UBS4 are so awesome. I don't have to rely on what other men have said. I can determine things in the privacy of my own study by myself. I can agree and disagree with them all day long, and submit my findings to be reviewed by my peers.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:23

To put this in perspective... relying on Westcott and Hort would be like me relying on the maps Christopher Columbus drew when he discovered America. Not a bad start... and I am thankful for the contribution. But lately, I use Google Maps on my Droid to get around town. What Columbus discovered, while influential, is well... a bit dated. Kinda like Westcott and Hort. We've moved on.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 23:25

****UPDATED****

Oh, I don't disagree, that Modern Bible Versions are a result of several revisions of the Westcott/Hort text. But in my estimation, Westcott and Hort are still the fathers or grandfathers or great-grandfathers of base text for today's versions. Oh yeah, Jimmy. You have moved way on from Westcott and Hort. They would really be proud of what has been accomplished.

Ok, I checked out your Western Text. Let's let everyone know about it.

First off, it is called the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis
(D - Gospels and Acts)

The Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis is so called because at one time it belonged to Theodore Beza, who in 1581 gave it to the University of Cambridge (Latin Cantabrigia), where it is now kept.

The codex is a Greek and Latin diglot, the Greek text being on the left hand page and the Latin on the right. It contains only the four Gospels and the Acts, with some gaps from loss and mutilation of its pages. It is a thought to be from the fifth or sixth century. The Greek text is quite peculiar, with many interpolations found nowhere else, a few remarkable omissions, and a capricious tendency to rephrase sentences. (For a list of the more interesting readings in English, see Cunningham 1926). The Latin text is also peculiar.

There is much disagreement among critics as to the relationship of the Greek to the Latin text, but most consider the Greek text to have developed independently and prior to the Latin, although sometimes later conformed to the Latin, while the Latin text is seen as originating in a poor attempt to translate the Greek. In general the Greek text is treated as an unreliable witness, and rightly so; but its very peculiarity, which suggests that it descended from an early offshoot of the manuscript tradition, makes it an important corroborating witness wherever it agrees with other early manuscripts.

Readings of the manuscript first appeared in the margin of Estienne 1550 and then in Beza's notes (see Beza 1565). It was collated for Walton's Polyglot by Archbishop Ussher (see Walton 1657) and fully translated into English by Whiston (see Whiston 1745). Kipling 1793 was the first to present the text in full. For later editions see Hansell 1864, Scrivener 1864, and Cambridge 1899. Full collations are in the apparatus of Tischendorf 1869 and Tregelles 1857.

I think, I will stick with these two lines.
<http://kjv.landmarkbiblebaptist.net/2texts-2.html>

Did you know that Islam says there are 4 lines?

Chapter 8: Westcott and Hort
http://www.chick.com/reading/books/157/157_08a.asp

And now my disclaimer for Chris' benefit.

"I do not know Jack Chick, I am not related to Jack Chick, I have not read everything that Jack Chick has published and therefore I cannot say that I agree or disagree with his material that I have not read, but I do agree with the material that I have read".

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:29

Quote:

I think, I will stick with these two lines.

Unfortunately, you cannot do that. It is a part of the manuscript evidence, and every line must be considered on its own merits. There are sometimes when it appears, based off my examination, that the Western text is actually to be favored. Such is rare. But not entirely. It has its place though.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:31

They may be great grand fathers of modern textual criticism, but with that said, we are all free to agree or disagree with their conclusions, as scholarship has been doing since they first published their works. That is the beauty of textual criticism, and reading Greek for yourself.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/29 23:32

Quote:

I hate to burst your bubble, but as impactful as Westcott and Hort were in the field of textual criticism, today's Greek manuscripts and modern translations are not based off their work. Their work may have influenced the field, in conservative and liberal schools, but, there have been many revisions to what they first published many years ago.

Exactly.

And those who are so quick to repeat the words that they hear about Westcott and Hort are usually the same ones who fail to apply the same level of criticism to Desiderius Erasmus (the Dutch Catholic humanist who singlehandedly created the Textus Receptus) up or any of the translators of the KJV.

Some of those translators of the KJV had some pretty interesting beliefs (including some who, from their own writings, admitted to holding certain anglo-catholic "High Church" traditions -- including a belief in the adoration of saints).

Erasmus was also quite a character when you read his own writings and contemporary biographies of his life. While some would like to argue that he was a "reformer," it is quite shocking to read Erasmus's own words about a belief in "sacred tradition" as a source just as valuable as the revelation of Scripture. He accused those who opposed the worship of Mary to be "blasphemers."

This could be alarming, given the fact that he was singlehandedly responsible for the Textus Receptus -- the work that the New Testament in the KJV is largely based upon.

Still, I am NOT saying that any of Erasmus's views (or the views of other translators of the KJV) made its way into their works. Similarly, I wouldn't say that Westcott and Hort's views (whatever they may have been) ever made it into their works either.

I just find it interesting that some people will "strain a gnat" in regard to versions that are NOT the KJV...but refuse to admit to "swallowing a camel" in regard to the same level of scrutiny of the KJV or its set of sources.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:36

Quote:

in regard to the same level of scrutiny of the KJV or its set of sources.

What many fail to note is that Erasmus was simply doing the same thing modern scholars do today. He had a body of manuscripts before him, and realizing they were all different, he engaged in textual criticism. And as is the nature of textual criticism, you must engage in some form of eclecticism in order to produce a text which you wish to serve as the basis of your translation.

The first rule of translation is: establish a text. And Erasmus did exactly that. You could be intellectually lazy and just translate one manuscript. But, when you start noticing differences between manuscripts, you are forced to make hard, thoughtful, prayerful decisions.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/29 23:38

Quote:

And now my disclaimer for Chris' benefit.

"I do not know Jack Chick, I am not related to Jack Chick, I have not read everything that Jack Chick has published and therefore I cannot say that I agree or disagree with his material that I have not read, but I do agree with the material that I have read".

Are such attempts at wit really all that necessary? I never accused you of any of these things.

In fact, as I said, I like some of Chick's materials (including some of his tracts). However, I couldn't care less if you were Jack Chick, related to Jack Chick or read everything that Jack Chick has ever published.

More importantly, I would simply urge you to NOT limit your "research" to things found in books by Jack Chick's publishing company...or Gail Riplinger...or the Google search for 5 minutes in order to "research" the Western Text type at KJV-only websites and then copy and paste it here.

Do you not understand what it means to really study and research this issue?

It isn't just finding information that agrees with your own views. It is testing everything that you hear...have been taught...or have read...and verifying whether or not it is true. If you haven't read Westcott and Hort's own words, then you haven't verified whether they really said anything that your "sources" accuse them of.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/29 23:40

Quote:

-----You might find that offensive... but common... honestly, how can you talk about what translations are better translations if you don't even know the Greek alphabet, and some basic parts of Greek grammar? Let alone if you've not examined an ancient Greek manuscript... in Greek.

When I read the above I just had to post a quick comment of agreement. That is why I stated that it is unreasonable for someone who does not know the original languages to completely approve of or condemn the English translations being discussed. If you don't know any of those languages all you can do is prayerfully consider second hand information, which is what Chris has been reasonably pointing out. That's why I do not want to get into this debate that much. I would be dishonest and unreasonably biased to completely approve of or condemn any of these translations because I don't know any of the original languages and cannot read the manuscripts or texts for myself to do an honest evaluation of the matter.

(phewww, that was a mouthfull)

KingJimmy, finally someone who actually knows some NT Greek has shown up. Where have you been?:). JK.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:41

If you really want to understand textual criticism, read the works of F.F. Bruce and Bruce Metzger. If you've never read their writings for yourself (from cover to cover), you've never really studied the issues at hand with textual criticism. Metzger is probably the most important person you could read for modern NT scholarship.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/29 23:44

Quote:

KingJimmy, finally someone who actually knows some NT Greek has shown up. Where have you been?:). JK.

LOL. There are a few others on here. But my Greek is a bit dated. It's been about 4 or 5 years since I've even touched a grammar or my flash cards. At the end of my limited days, I've always been pretty happy with the NASB. When I would translate something, I often found my translations were very close in agreement with the NASB. So, unless I'm doing a serious in depth word study, I seldom crack into my Greek anymore. I would like to get back into it just to flex my brain a bit. But working 55 hours a week makes it hard to do :-)

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 23:47

I see that the Catholic Church is really taken with this Codex Bezae.
<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04083a.htm>

The Western Text ie Codex Bezae : These originated in the East and are the least trustworthy due to copying changes (to be honest it was a bit slap dash!). They tended to put more emphasis on the Latin copies and the famous Latin Vulgate comes from these texts. They were used a lot in Roman world.
<https://marcustutt.wordpress.com/tag/codex-bezae/>

Westcott and Hort relied on the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus only because they were said to be older. I have no idea why Protestants boast in these Romish manuscripts. I think they have been sold a bill of intellectualism. The RCC is very good at that. And the modern bibles bear the bad fruit of it.

Re: , on: 2011/3/29 23:51

****UPDATE****

Jimmy, thanks for being honest about what version you prefer. I have read this link, and it just makes me sick.

A Comparison Between the King James (KJV) & The New American Standard (NASB) Bibles

http://www.hissheep.org/kjv/a_comparison_of_the_kjv_nasb.html

By the way, Jimmy, you don't have to know Greek to understand this controversy and what is going on. There is plenty of information on this as you well know. And you also know that we little people are capable of understanding it.

Good night, now.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 0:00

Folks, it has been very interesting. I think it is time to stop. If I have proven anything, I hope that I have shown that there is plenty of info available for us non-Greek speaking people to understand what is going on.

Also, plenty of links and recommended books for you to check into.

One final question: Which Bible is your final authority in all matters of faith and practice?

Just want to expose one more myth.

Is the King James Bible Harder to Understand?

"In the last days. . .men shall be HEADY, HIGHMINDED" II Timothy 3:4

<http://www.av1611.org/kjv/kjveasy.html>

God bless you all as you pursue Him. It is quite an adventure we are on.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 0:02

Quote:

Westcott and Hort relied on the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus only because they were said to be older. I have no idea why Protestants boast in these Romish manuscripts. I think they have been sold a bill of intellectualism. The RCC is very good at that. And the modern bibles bear the bad fruit of it.

...and you know this because, uh?

Have you EVER read any writings of Westcott and Hort...or do you really have such faith in the words that others tell you about them?

Do you see the weird form of logic that you are extrapolating? You take what you perceive to be a "fact" (that Westcott and Hort used certain manuscripts) and somehow "conclude" (via an announcement of "absolute certainty") that Westcott and Hort relied on those manuscripts simply "because they were said to be older." Yet, you haven't even said just WHAT evidence that you are basing your opinion upon.

Moreover, you are accusing some manuscripts that PREDATE the Roman Catholic "church" as being "Romish" -- but you don't convey the same level of scrutiny toward Erasmus -- who WAS undoubtedly a Catholic AND a humanist! Why do you not offer the same scrutiny to Desiderius Erasmus...or even Lancelot Andrewes.

By the way, I think that it would be best if we all could include evidence of our research (whether from websites or books) that are NOT "KJV-only" in their agenda. In fact, if you decide to avoid quoting solely from KJV-only websites, I will do my best not to quote any NIV-only websites.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/3/30 0:04

Quote:
-----They tended to put more emphasis on the Latin copies and the famous Latin Vulgate comes from these texts. They were used a lot in Roman world.

Apparently you are not aware that Erasmus used the Vulgate to complete some of the TR(see wikipedia entry on the TR).

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 0:08

I can't believe how many pages have built up on this thread.

Just wanted to say that what convinced me more than two decades ago were Comparison Charts of the different versions and if I was in doubt as far as which version had it right, I'd just check the Greek and thus far, I've never found any of the Comparison Charts that White_Stone and 777 and whomever else have posted prove the KJV was the version that was in error -- besides the reasons I gave on pg 7.

Nice number.

Good night to you too.

Now git off'a this thread and help us on some others y'all. :)

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 0:13

Chris,

I got that from the www.westcotthort.com website. I did not want to get this from a KJV website, because I know you don't like that.

"What is perhaps the strongest argument in favor of the Westcott-Hort text vis-a-vis the textus receptus, is the fact that it has firm support from the oldest extant Greek manuscripts, plus the earliest of the versions or translations, as well as the early Christian writers of the 2nd through 4th centuries. Age of manuscripts is probably the most objective factor in the process of textual criticism. When Westcott and Hort compiled their text, they employed the two oldest then-known manuscripts, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as their text base".

Vaticanus was controlled and locked up by the RCC. I won't take their word on how old it is.

Oracio, I am extremely aware of Erasmus. I love that guy!

"Over the years, Erasmus became intimately acquainted with biblical manuscripts available throughout Europe, particularly of the New Testament. Because the Word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, it is evident as Erasmus began to search the Scriptures, they had a profound effect upon his life. By the time of his death, the theology of Erasmus had shifted closer to that of the Ana-baptists than that of Rome. This will shortly be documented."

Erasmus's Shift in Theology

The more Erasmus became involved in the study and editing of the New Testament, the more his theology and convictions began to change. He came to reject the typical Roman Catholic interpretation of Matt. 16:18 establishing papal primacy. He began to vehemently attack the abuses and scandals of the Roman Catholic clergy, particularly as they violated their vows of celibacy. He even attacked celibacy as fallacious (171).

Critics of Erasmus have been quick to point out that he dedicated his first edition of his Greek New Testament to Pope Leo X. However, there is more to that than meets the eye. The long established Catholic position was that the Latin Vulgate was the official church Bible. There was a hostility toward anything that threatened that primacy. Erasmus knew that and he knew the opposition his Greek text would receive. Therefore, without the pope even knowing it, he dedicated it to him and at the same time had his friend in Rome, Bombasius, obtain formal approval of his publication because it had been dedicated to the pope. Thus, when the Catholic establishment in central Europe began to vehemently attack his work, Erasmus produced the approval of the pope. Erasmus was not a separatist, but he was shrewd.

After having done an end run around the Catholic establishment in central Europe, he was accused by powerful elements of the church of being even more dangerous than Luther (174). Contrary to conventional Catholic dogma of the day for bidding laymen from the reading of the Scriptures, Erasmus rather invited all men to read the Bible. This drew great wrath upon him from French Catholic authorities (180). It was such deviation from Rome's dogma which prompted Catholics

across Europe to soon utter the proverb, "Erasmus laid the eggs and Luther hatched the chickens" (209). In other words, Erasmus was the root of the Protestant Reformation. Though Erasmus had no personal influence upon Luther, his writings certainly did, especially his Greek Testament and his commentaries. Ironically, because Erasmus never officially left the Catholic Church, he soon came to be attacked by Luther and other of the Reformers. The attacks accordingly developed into a war of words between Erasmus and the Reformers.

Read the whole story here, Oracio. Erasmus was an awesome person.
<http://av1611.com/kjbp/articles/sorenson-ch10-1.html>

Ok, all, I bid you adieu.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 0:16

Ok, JiG, I'm trying. :-)

Thanks for weighing in.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2011/3/30 0:20

Brethren,

Here are my thoughts on this long thread.

I appreciate the people on here who sincerely fear and love God and his everlasting unaltered Word. I must say that I have not done any real research concerning how all the different versions came about. The only thing I do know is that most of the modern versions use (what they say are) the 2 oldest manuscripts which have recently been discovered within the past 120 years.

I thank God for all the people who have read any version of the bible and were saved by the marvelous grace of God. There is enough of the gospel in most any version of the bible to save and bless people who read it. I can read most any version along with the KJV and be blessed and also not be so blessed. The reason I said and also not be blessed is where words are left out and in some places whole verses are even left out and even in some places the meaning has changed. Now in my love for God and His pure Word, I have to make a decision concerning what version I am going to rely on as the most accurate to what God has inspired to be written down. Brethren I must say that God has given me real peace about this and I do not even have to argue with others who see it differently, for we will all have to give our own account on that day of all God has said to us. The decision for me was easy when I considered the greatness of our God and the fact that he said He is the Lord and changes not and that His Word endures forever.

In the book of revelations he says that we are not to add to the word or take away from the word or there would be serious consequences. It came to me one day that the KJV came about because of a real need to get the word of God to the English speaking people and what a blessing it would be if somehow it could be updated without changing the meaning or leaving out any verses. The NKJV is the only modern version that follows close to the KJV. The sad reason that we don't have major publishers to update the KJV is because of the 2 recent manuscripts that they have found to be older than the majority. Also and I could be wrong but money is probably another reason. It is serious consequences to add to or take away from the true Word of God.

This is how I have come to have peace in relying on the KJV where there is a real change in meaning or something is completely left out. The first main reason is that for almost 300 years there was no doubt concerning the accuracy of the bible among most of Christendom because there were no 2 oldest manuscripts to question the accuracy of the bible. Also if you will notice that the very words and verses that are left out of the many modern versions are pure and powerful words that don't need to be left out. They are sacred words that have powerful meaning. They are words like Christ, Holy, repentance, and blood just to name a few. Now if one was to add to the word or take away from the word wouldn't it be the meaning of what God was saying to us and we all know that God is holy and to be revered above everything else. Why would God almost 300 years later and many saints gone to glory try to get these new versions out to let us know that for several 100 years the word of God had been added to and now we need to take out words and verses that don't need to be in there? If you memorized Colossians 1:14 (KJV) In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: and you loved to quote and meditate on that scripture and then you picked up a more modern version

because it was easy to read but you came across words and verses left out and you found that 'through His blood' was left out of col 1:14 you wouldn't think that God would want that part of the verse left out because of the precious blood of Christ. I would immediately think that if I'm going to err with a version of the bible then it will have to be the one with the precious blood of Christ. Some will say I believe that the KJV has been added to and we don't need all those words and verses but I would say have you read all those words and verses and if you have which ones do you think needs to be left out. I had rather stand before God on that Day believing that He was able to get the correct manuscripts to the people who wrote the bible in English to the common people for around 300 years than to believe that for 300 years they had the wrong manuscripts.

The word of God is clear about 'professing themselves to be wise they became fools' and God also said not many wise or noble men are called. God never said that we need to be well educated to know what is of God and what is not of God but we are to be filled with the Holy Spirit and that the Spirit of truth would lead us in to all truth.

Brethren I got to quit for now but praise God I love the Lord because he first loved me.

Blessings to all!

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/30 0:28

@ anonymous777...

Yes, Westcott and Hort consulted the Codex Vaticanus during their work. However, it seems that you are under some mistaken idea that Westcott and Hort LIMITED their research to a couple of texts like that. They didn't.

They consulted MANY texts in addition to the Codex Vaticanus -- which, by the way, is dated to roughly the same time as the advent of the heretical Roman Catholic Church (throwing doubt into the notion that there was any "Catholic" influence in the text).

And, as Jimmy pointed out, Westcott and Hort's work only played a minor role in an early translation of the Greek. Others came along who did the same. It is misleading to claim that versions like the NIV relied largely on the work of Westcott and Hort -- when they used an entirely eclectic set of sources for their translation of the New Testament.

Still, are you also willing to apply the same level of scrutiny that you direct at Westcott and Hort to Erasmus...or Lancelot Andrewes...or other translators of the KJV?

As for Westcott and Hort (or the translators of other versions): I really feel that you need to RESEARCH THEIR WORK instead of formulating your conclusions largely from the research and opinions of others.

The Fruit of the Spirit is Peace - posted by Jeremy221, on: 2011/3/30 2:22

I think the debate surrounding the King James is foolishness. The divisions that emerge, for it or against it are a sign of carnality in the Church. Christ came that He might set us free from our sin and that we should bear good fruit by the Holy Spirit. Christ is the end of our faith, unseen and eternal, the Word of God the Father, the only begotten Child and Son. He is spirit and from His mouth comes a sharp double edged sword that divides soul and spirit, not only now but for eternity. If we do not die with Him now, we will perish because of the testimony He has given. The Father has given us the Law that we might be brought to death through repentance and baptism and to life through faith in Jesus Christ the Messiah who has sent the Holy Spirit who will teach us all things. Our end is God Almighty to be united with Him and taught by Him and to walk as He walks in righteousness and holiness. Only then will He be to us The Prince of Peace and LORD.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 6:09

By the way, Jimmy, you don't have to know Greek to understand plenty of information on this as you well know. And you already understand it. Good night, now.

Without sounding like an intellectual snob, but just being truthful, unless you have a basic ability to read some thing Greek, you cannot even begin to understand this subject with any level of understanding. And this comes from somebody who

o is your fellow little person. Humbly let me say if you've not cracked open a UBS4 or NA27, you absolutely have next to no understanding either.

The reason why your arguments don't move me in the slightest is because I realize you are simply don't understand this subject at all. I say this as your brother who spent over a year of my life in intense masters level studies, wrestling with original manuscripts in Greek. And by intense, I mean: almost every waking moment apart from a part time job... into the wee hours of the morning. I've read thousands of pages of in depth scholarly works on the subject. And from my position, as a lay student, I must say you don't have even a basic understanding.

Don't use your ignorance as an excuse to still be ignorant brother.

Lord willing, because I do love you, later I will attempt to show you these books mentioned earlier in the flesh via Photoshop.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 6:26

Duplicate post removed

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/30 7:13

Triple 7,

I have enjoyed your insights you have brought up concerning the modern translations based on certain manuscripts. And no, I do not believe you have to know the original languages to understand the issue at hand. That would be arrogance. However, it is helpful to have an understanding of NT Greek. It is a wonderful language and I understand why God must of chosen it for the NT.

King Jimmy, it has been over 20 years since I have had it. I delve into it in Bible study and sermon preparation, but it would be good to have a refresher course. Needless to say, I believe God has preserved His Word because He said He would in the Bible. If the Bible is full of mistakes, it is like no other book.

Chris and others have also brought up some good insights which give stimulative thoughts.

Someone mentioned earlier about translating word for word and by thoughts. I think these go hand in hand because of the differences in languages. It must be done to a certain extent to make it understandable. Anyone else have a thought?

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/30 8:15

Good post rbanks.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 8:52

****UPDATE****

Yeah, people use the "Bible Idolatry" label all the time.

I don't think people that discuss this very important issue are carnal. I would not even level the accusation of carnality against the brothers on the other side of this discussion.

Also, Rbanks, I enjoyed your post and not to argue, but please do a google search of KJV vs NKJV. They are nothing alike. I won't provide links as they will only be maligned and I will be called carnal, but you will be educated and astounded at the same time.

And Thomas Nelson Publishers have the audacity to claim in an ad for the NKJV (Moody Monthly, June 1982, back cover), "NOTHING HAS BEEN CHANGED except to make the original meaning clearer."

In light of their statement The New King James can only be called a COUNTERFEIT!

And it's certainly NOT true to the 1611 King James Bible!

UPDATE

On second thought, let them malign.

<http://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/themagicmarker.html>

<http://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/themagicmarker2.html>

NKJV Tract

http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/Tracts/NKJV_tract.pdf

NKJV - Bridge to More Corrupt Versions

http://libertytothecaptives.net/nkjb_trans_bridge_modern.html

<http://www.av1611.org/nkjb.html>

Incredible, isn't it?

King James Version -

2 Corinthians 2:17 "For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God" changed to "peddling the word of God" (like the NIV, NASV and RSV)

Peddling is not the same as corrupt. But since they are corrupting the Word of God, I can see why they took it out.

Our God is not so small that He has not kept this promise to preserve His Word: I believe the Lord's promise. Do you?

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

This is my final word. You all know how to use Google and if you care anything about what you are reading and taking in to your spirit, then the means are available for you to educate yourselves.

I am always astounded at the opposition of this subject especially after laying out clear comparisons. It always comes down to "the scholars and experts have good reasons for doing what they did".

777

P.S. These are money makers. Read about the NKJV Derivative Copyright Law.

http://libertytothecaptives.net/nkjb_deriv_copyright.html

Great discussion on NKJV

<http://www.prophecyfellowship.org/showthread.php?t=133052>

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 9:12

i read, eat, meditate on Scripture, the ESV.

i put my glasses on, pray to be filled with the Holy Spirit, pen in hand for revelations.

i get on my knees to talk to God.

Mazel Tov, to get to KNOW the Word, but on our knees we get the excellency of knowing and being Known by God.

careful about Bible idolatry.

\

that is all i have to say, because i have utter peace with God on this issue.

in Jesus love, neil

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 9:26

****UPDATE****

Neil, being Jewish and probably knowing a little bit about the Hebrew language, you will appreciate what the KJV translators did. Many people don't understand why the Ye's and Thous and have just been told they are archaic and have no meaning. Read more about it here.

<http://www. SovereignWord.org/index.php/will-kinneys-king-james-bible-defense-articles/145-why-qthouq-and-qyeq-are-more-accurate-and-should-be-retained>

Most languages have a singular and a plural form of the second person - the person being spoken to - "you". There is the singular "you" and then there is the plural, like "you all". This is found in the Hebrew and Greek languages as well as Spanish, French, Italian and many other world languages.

In English this distinction is expressed by "Thou" meaning "you singular, and you alone" and "Ye" meaning "all of you, plural". This distinction makes a big difference in hundreds of passages in the Bible.

For instance, in Luke 22:31-32 the Lord says to Peter: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have YOU, that he may sift YOU as wheat: But I have prayed for THEE, that THY faith fail not: and when THOU art converted, strengthen THY brethren."

Here the word YOU is plural in both the Greek and the English, meaning Satan was going to sift all of the disciples, "you all"; but Jesus is letting Peter know that He had prayed for him (thee) specifically as an individual.

In John chapter four, the Samaritan woman at the well is speaking to Jesus and says: "Sir, I perceive that THOU art a prophet. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and YE say (all you Jews) that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship."

Then the Lord says to this individual: "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when YE shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. YE worship YE know not what: we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews." Here the YE means "all of you who are Samaritans", not just the individual woman to whom He was speaking.

Neil, I answered your question by the way about where our Canon came from. Not the RCC!

But new versions use their manuscripts. Vaticanus/Sinaiticus.

Roman Bibles in Protestant Bindings, yech!

Google search if you are interested, ESV vs KJV.

I'm done. Got other things to do and you all know how to research.

In Jesus,
777

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/30 9:55

Good insight triple 7 on the thee's and thou's. What precious truth on how God cares for His people. I learned this distinction when taking NT Greek.

One of the problems with excessive textual criticism is the explaining away of what God says.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/30 10:23

Hi a777,

May I differ?

'Satan hath desired to have YOU, that he may sift YOU as wheat'

The use of 'you' is singular. If He meant all the disciples, He'd have said YE.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 11:11

Absolutely, AtG!

That was a good catch. The KJV got it right, yet Will Kinney just used the wrong verse for this example.

I think with the volume of his other examples he makes the point very well, that the KJV translators were very wise in using thee, ye, thine, dieth, etc. Some of those pronouns were used 400 years before the KJV and not actually in use during their time, but they wanted to make it an accurate translation since the Hebrew and Greek used these types of pronouns. They were right in what they were doing.

The NKJV probably should have translated "ye" to "you all", but they chose to make the plural singular in all cases. But as important as pronouns are in speech, it is relatively minor compared to all the other incorrect things that the NKJV did. It really has nothing to do with the KJV and should not be called the NKJV. Pretty sneaky.

If you find any other discrepancies on Will's site, you may want to shoot him an email. I really appreciate the incredible time and work he has expended.

If everyone, just "rolled over" and accepted everything "scholars and experts" gave us, we would be in a real mess.

By the way, I was kind of tongue on cheek joking about Bible translators giving us a "Green" bible, but a friend called me and said one exists.

Why am I surprised? The evidence is pretty clear that the spirit of the age is dictating the translations.

<http://greenletterbible.com/http://greenletterbible.com/>

777

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/30 12:10

Thanks :)

Here is an example of Jesus speaking to one man, while addressing the onlookers plurally.

John 4: '... And there was a certain nobleman, whose son was sick at Capernaum. 47 When he heard that Jesus was come out of Judaea into Galilee, he went unto him, and besought him that he would come down, and heal his son: for he was at the point of death. 48 Then said Jesus unto HIM, Except YE see signs and wonders, YE will not believe. 49 The nobleman saith unto him, Sir, come down ere my child die. 50 Jesus saith unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 12:12

It is not arrogant to say a knowledge of Greek is required to have an opinion on textual criticism. What is arrogant is to think one can have an opinion of any value without being able to read Greek, and without being able to examine original documents. That would be like a cop handing you a speeding ticket without having used a radar detector, but simply saying, "It looks like you were 20 mph over the limit to me." Without a radar detector, he has no tool to prove his claim. Likewise, without reading the original manuscripts on Greek, you have no tool by which to make a claim.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 12:33

I just said "you don't have to know Greek to understand the issue".

We are at the mercy of revisionist "experts" if honest men who do know Greek and Hebrew hid this information from the church.

Do you consider yourself an expert?

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 12:37

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

If everyone, just "rolled over" and accepted everything "scholars and experts" gave us, we would be in a real mess.

Then I have to ask: WHAT are you basing all of your information upon?

If "scholars are experts" are so wrong -- then why are you using limited "research" from books and websites that also cite their own particular set of "scholars and experts" who happen to agree with their views?

Sometimes, I fear that some people gather around them "sources" that will tell them exactly what they want to hear.

We should not be so easily persuaded by the teachings of man. But this is how it appears. Instead of actually researching the works of Westcott and Hort, some rely upon what others have said about them (through biased secondhand books and websites). Instead of researching the actual source text-types, some are relying upon what others have told them about such things. Instead of applying scrutiny to translations methods, some rely upon what others have told them. Instead of contacting Bible societies, translators and language or manuscript experts, some prefer to rely upon what other KJV-only folks have told them about such things.

Why is it so difficult to go to the sources (when possible) in order to test the certainty of what we read or hear?

As I have said before: I don't have any problem with individuals who have studied this issue and prefer the King James Version of the Word of God.

However, I am concerned with individuals who have such incredibly limited "research" yet still feel the need to loudly proclaim such things WITH ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY.

I am amazed by those who ridicule the notion of researching through manuscripts, documents, original writings, or consulting with individuals who are actually trained in matters of ancient languages, manuscripts and translation methods. I am perplexed when someone finds all the time in the world to extensively consult some biased KJV-only websites -- but refuse to test or verify the things found via credible research. I am disturbed by individuals who will entertain all sort of gossip about certain translators -- and then REPEAT IT -- without feeling a need to research whether such things are even true.

I once met a person who believed in a "conspiracy theory" about doctors. This person preferred "holistic alternative medicine." When asked why, this person would state a belief that "medical research" is an industry that is motivated by mon

ey. They refused medicine as "placing too much faith in experts." So, that same person based all of the evidence upon a few holistic websites that, ironically, sell alternative forms of medicine and treatment. Those websites, ironically, relied heavily upon "research" (not peer-reviewed, of course) as a means to appear credible to patrons.

Now, I do believe that research proves that there are some viable forms of alternative medicine. However, it was just perplexing that someone would be so moved into "conspiracy theories" about medicine, doctors and medical research to the point of relying entirely upon the words of individuals who peddle alternative forms of the same thing based upon, well, non-peer reviewed and unverified "research."

Once again, I would simply urge the brethren to TEST EVERYTHING that they read or hear.

If someone makes an allegation about something -- test it! However, don't limit your research to the "research" that others claim to have performed. We shouldn't be so easily persuaded. Instead, study the matter for yourself. Go to a library. Contact Bible societies. Contact language experts. Contact manuscript scholars, archivists and historians. If you want, take some courses in Biblical Greek. If someone wants to attack a translation, source text or translator, question why they don't provide equal scrutiny to the translation, source text or translator involved in the version that they prefer.

Nearly every time that I have spoken to a congregation, Bible study or Sunday school class, I have stated that it would be an HONOR if those who were listening just didn't believe me. Instead, I urged them to test and question everything that I say and prayerfully study in order to determine whether what I said was true. After all, this is a noble Berean characteristic (Acts 17:11).

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 12:43

AtG,

I have no problem with Jesus speaking to one man, yet making it applicable to all by including all of the crowd with "ye".

That is very common. I have done that many times in classes I have taught, although, I would say "you all" or "indeed everyone" or something similar.

777

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/30 12:56

Here's a question. Does it bother anyone (besides the KJV only people) of the differences between the TR and other texts. esp. concerning omissions about the blood of Christ etc.? If not, why?

Is there an agreement that an over amount of textual criticism casts doubt upon the Word of God?

Does someone have to know the original languages to understand, interpret, apply and live the Bible? No, of course not. "walk in the light" the Bible says. Also, Pro. 3:5-6

Amen Chris,

Quote:
-----Nearly every time that I have spoken to a congregation, Bible study or Sunday school class, I have stated that it would be an HONOR if those who were listening just didn't believe me. Instead, I urged them to test and question everything that I say and prayerfully study in order to determine whether what I said was true. After all, this is a noble Berean characteristic (Acts 17:11).

Re: The Tyranny of the Experts, on: 2011/3/30 13:07

****UPDATE****

Chris,

Here is an expert for you. I guess it comes down to which expert you want to believe.

Love his paragraph, "1,881 Years, Without the Experts".

This too, is worthy of consideration:

"Machen had it right and so did Spurgeon. Textual criticism by the "experts" is a horde of little popelings who by their assumed infallibility have the gall to tell us what is God's Word and what is not. Such is the tyranny of the experts."

<http://www.baptisttranslators.com/content/view/51/50/>

Now, this is not so hard to understand for the non-greek speaking man or woman. I think he covers the bases.

Why the King James Version?

Written by Charles V. Turner, Ph.D.

The Preservation of the Bible By Faithful Churches

From Biblical Bible Translating by Charles V. Turner, Ph.D.

The English language New Testament is a result of translating a Greek text into English. However, there are several different Greek Texts, each one different from the other. Which one is the translator to translate into another language? For example, the 1973 edition of the United Bible Societies Greek text by Aland, Black, Martini, Metzger, and Wilgren is very much different from the 1881 Greek text of Westcott and Hort. The Westcott and Hort text is different from the American Bible Society Greek text by Nestle, and the Nestle text is different from the Greek text by the Trinitarian Bible Society. There are many Greek texts are represented by even more English translations. There are over two hundred different translations of the New Testament in the English language. Which one is a translator to use as the basis for his translation into another language?

The Need for a Standard

Someone has wisely said that a man who owns only one watch knows what time it is, but a man who has two watches is never quite sure. This certainly is the case as far as the translations of the Bible are concerned. Because there are so many translations of the Scriptures, all claiming to be God's Word, many people are not sure "what time it is." That is to say, they are not sure which translation is truly God's Word. There was a time when there was a translation in the English language that was accepted as the Bible. It was the King James Version. When we wanted to know what God had said, we went to our Authorized Version and read there the words of God, but now there are many "Bibles" all claiming to be the words of God. Now no one is quite sure which translation is the Word of God.

When there are many biblical authorities the result is that there is no authority at all. When we select which version of the Bible is authoritative for us, the Bible loses its independent authority. The only authority remaining resides in the selector and his personal basis for selecting this version or that version. By so doing we undermine all biblical authority and we ourselves become the authority instead.

The situation today, where many translations all claim to be God's Word, exists largely because of the amount of money to be gained by publishing yet another trendy translation of God's unchanging Word. One can make a lot of money by making a catchy, clever translation of God's Holy Word. Why does the English language need over two hundred translations when there are over 3,000 ethnic languages that do not have one word of Scripture? I suppose the money that should have been used to publish God's Word in these languages has been used up on English language readers who want their ears tickled by yet another trendy translation. The fact that there are so many translations of the Bible in English, while 3,000 Bibleless nations have nothing, reflects a serious sickness in the spiritual condition of English-speaking Christians.

The Erosion of Authority

However, there is an even more serious issue involved. It is the matter of authority. The authority of God's Word in the English language has been eroded because of these many translations. There are many translations, all claiming to be God's Word. Who decides which one is God's Word? You do. You choose which one you believe to be the Word of God. However, there is a problem with this. Who put you in charge of deciding which translation is the Word of God? If one translation does not suit your prejudice, you can usually find one that will. God's Word no longer has authority over you. You have, due to your picking and choosing of translations, become the authority over God's Word! When there are two or more authorities, the result is there is no authority at all. Your feeble judgment becomes the authority as to which translation is right. This is the reason for the severity of the many English translations problem. The many translations have robbed the Word of God of its authority and left man's intellect in charge of deciding whether he would have this version or that version to rule over him. The result is the deplorable state of modern man where "every man is doing that which is right in his own eyes." Each man becomes an authority unto himself, and confusion reigns.

There must be Only One Authority

Because of the confusion caused by so many translations in English, the King James Version stands out more than ever as the one authoritative Bible in the English language. We do not accept the King James Version because of some sentimental connection to it nor because of its old-fashioned Elizabethan English, nor because it is the oldest translation in use today. We accept it because it is the most accurate and reliable translation in the English language today. There are some tried and true reasons for accepting the King James Version as the standard for English speaking people.

First, the King James Version, New Testament, is a translation of the Textus Receptus Greek text. This leaves the King James Version as the only translation of the New Testament that is based entirely on the Textus Receptus. All other English language translations since 1881 have followed modern "scholarship" and based their translations on texts other than the Textus Receptus Greek text. There are good reasons why the Textus Receptus, and the King James Version which is a translation of it, is the only valid text of the New Testament that should be translated into other languages.

The Textus Receptus, hereafter referred to as the T.R., is the only Greek text of the New Testament that has not been badly mangled by subjection to the presuppositions of modern intellectualism. Modern Greek scholars have, because of the criteria they set up themselves, deleted many verses, phrases, and words from the original Greek text.

Examples of Deletions

For example, in Matthew 6:13, the last part of the verse reads, "For thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory, forever. Amen." In all the above Greek texts, except the T.R., these words are deleted. They are considered by modern Greek scholars as invalid. They have deleted them from their text. If a translator were to translate from any other text but the T.R., he would leave these words out of his translation because in the other texts these words are not there to be translated. If they are there, they have been relegated to a footnote that implies that these words are not a part of Scripture.

Again, in Colossians 1:14, the King James reads, "In whom we have redemption, through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." The words "through his blood" have been deleted by every text except the Textus Receptus.

Again, in Romans 8:1, the words "who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit" have been deleted in all the Greek texts except the T.R. There are many other such deletions. The Textus Receptus is the only text that has not been badly mutilated by such deletions. All the other texts have been growing shorter and shorter over the years as "scholars" took their lead from the rationalism of Lachmann and whittled away more and more of the New Testament Greek text. Because of this deleting of more and more of the New Testament Greek text, it has now become obvious that this cutting down of the New Testament Greek text is not genuine scholarship but prejudiced rationalism working under the disguise of textual criticism.

The Development of Textual Criticism

How then has such a situation developed? It came about in this way. When the books of the New Testament were originally written at the hand of Luke, Paul, and others, they became the precious possession of local churches. These churches recognized these writings as different from commonly written communications. The churches recognized the apostolic books and letters as the inspired Word of God. The letters and books of the New Testament began to be copied and passed around to other churches in the first, second and third centuries. Of course, in the copying of these books and letters, there were small errors made in the copying. They were much like the typographical errors we make while typing. In

addition to this, the copies were worn out with constant use resulting in the words nearer the edge of the parchment or papyrus being worn off the page. Some times, especially in the first and second centuries, false teachers deliberately changed the text in an effort to support their false teachings, but it was always a simple matter to correct an errant text by comparing it with the faithful inerrant copies held in trust by many faithful churches. This brought the errant copies back to the standard set by the original text. The only thing the churches had to do was check with several other churches and find out what the reading was in the other church copies. By doing this, the churches insured a valid text, and by this means, the text was preserved in its original form.

Identifying the Correct Text

This process continued down through the centuries until the present day. Faithful churches would decide the validity of the Greek text by consulting the church copies of the particular text under question and would judge its validity based on the copies held in trust by the other churches. If one church had an erroneous copy, the six or seven valid copies that were kept in trust by faithful churches soon corrected it. The six or seven correct copies, that all said the same thing, were judged the correct reading. This reading was used to correct the deviating copies.

The Biblical Basis for Textual History

The above scenario is based on the Scriptures that show that this indeed happened as described above. For example: II Peter 3:15, 16 says, "even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." In these verses Peter clearly says that the words of Paul were equated with "the other scriptures." Peter believed the words of Paul to be the inspired Word of God. Peter wrote this in a time when there were those who did "wrest" the Scriptures. That is, those who took some words in Paul's letters and wrested them. To wrest them has the meaning of, "to put them on the rack of torture" in order to force them to say what their torturers wanted them to say. This clearly shows that the early churches were on the look out for those who would pervert their Scriptures. The early churches were aware of this problem and took great care to avoid the twisting of their Scriptures by false teachers who would deliberately try to change the original reading of Scripture. Peter warned the Christians to watch out for this very thing.

The Churches Circulate Scriptures

That these Scriptures were passed from one church to another church is clearly indicated in Colossians 4:16 where it says, "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea." This verse shows that there was a sharing of copies of the Word of God from church to church. Because such a prominent leader as Peter considered the words of Paul as Scripture and said that he knew about those who would wrest the Scripture, is it not evident that the churches would take even greater care to watch over these Scriptures? This is obviously the case because the early churches, led by the Holy Spirit, rightly concluded that the words of Paul were the inspired Word of God. They took every precaution to watch over these Scriptures by comparing them with faithful copies held in trust by other churches. Although false teachers deliberately changed the text in an effort to support their false teachings, it was a simple matter to correct a text and bring it back to the original reading.

Naturally, when the first Greek New Testament was printed in 1516, the readings, which varied with the majority of the other texts, were disallowed and the readings of the majority were accepted. This is how the churches had preserved the Word of God for 1,516 years. By this simple, but completely accurate method, the Word of God was watched over by the Holy Spirit who worked through the churches who were faithful custodians of the Scriptures they cherished.

Karl Lachmann the Rationalist

This process of preserving the pure Word of God through faithful local churches continued on without interruption until 1831 when Karl Lachmann, a German rationalist, began to apply to the New Testament Greek text the same criteria that he had used in editing texts of the Greek classics. Lachmann had been studying such Greek classics as Homer's Iliad. These Greek writings were mere stories, but Lachmann was trying to get back to what Homer and other Greek authors had originally written. The Greek classics had been thoroughly altered over the years. So many alterations of the Greek classics had been made that no one was sure what the original author had written. Lachmann wanted to know what the original text had been, so he developed a textual criticism process whereby he would try to sort out the original text from the badly corrupted modern text.

After this, someone got the "bright idea" that Lachmann's process should be applied to the New Testament. Lachmann had set up a series of presuppositions and rules for arriving at the original text of the Greek classics that were hopelessly corrupted. He now began with these same presuppositions and rules to correct the New Testament. He began with the presupposition that the New Testament was as hopelessly corrupted as the Greek classics. He had made a very dangerous mistake. A similar process in the copying of the Greek classics did not match the loving and reverent care given to the copying of the Word of God by faithful churches. The Greek classics were hopelessly corrupted but this was not true of the New Testament. Extremely careful scribes had taken great pains to copy New Testament manuscripts. These scribes knew the exact number of words and letters that were in the original copies. They counted the words and letters each time a new copy was made to insure that nothing had been added or deleted. In addition to this, faithful churches carefully guarded their precious copies of Scripture to protect them from heretical changes that may have been inserted in other copies of the text.

The Greek New Testament

Before Lachmann, a Dutch theologian named Desiderius Erasmus had published the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament in 1516. Erasmus had collected all the available manuscripts of the Greek New Testament books and had decided which variant reading was the original one based on the reading in the majority of the texts. He followed the same method that had been used by the churches through the centuries, namely, correcting an errant reading by the reading in the majority of the texts, which had been preserved by the churches. This text became known as the Textus Receptus. The words, Textus Receptus, are Latin words meaning the Received (Accepted) text. When Erasmus published the TR., the churches accepted it as the only valid text of the Greek New Testament. Though the text of Erasmus was revised slightly in later editions, there were no rival texts, which claimed to be based on better scholarship and better manuscripts, until Lachmann came along in 1831.

Pandora's Box Opened

Following Lachmann's lead, B.T. Westcott, and F.J.A. Hort produced their first textual critical edition of the Greek New Testament in 1881. It was based almost entirely upon the same presuppositions of Lachmann's textual criticism. These two men used most of Lachmann's rules of textual criticism and came up with a few of their own. They applied these rules to the Greek text of the New Testament as produced by Erasmus and came up with a different Greek New Testament based on the scholarship of Lachmann and that of their own. The point of departure had been made. No longer were the majority of manuscripts, preserved by faithful churches, the basis for recognizing the original reading. From now on, the learned professors would deliver the Christian world from their "ignorance" and by their expertise would deliver to the churches a purer text of the New Testament. Dr. Gresham Machen, the greatest Greek scholar and theologian in American history, called this kind of scholarship "the tyranny of the experts."

Similarly, Charles H. Spurgeon preached the same theme in a sermon entitled, "The Greatest Fight in the World." He said, "We have given up the Pope, for he has blundered often and terribly; but we shall not set up instead of him a horde of little popelings fresh from college. Are these correctors of Scripture infallible? Are we now to believe that infallibility is with learned men? Now, Farmer Smith, when you have read your Bible, and have enjoyed its precious promises, you will have, to-morrow morning, to go down the street to ask the scholarly man at the parsonage whether this portion of the Scripture belongs to the inspired part of the Word, or whether it is of dubious authority. We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized, that only a few of the most profound will know what is Bible, and what is not, and they will dictate to all the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy: they will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed. This same reign of terror we shall not endure, for we still believe that God revealeth himself rather to babes than to the wise and prudent, and we are fully assured that our own old English version of the Scriptures is sufficient for plain men for all purposes of life, salvation, and godliness. We do not despise learning, but we will never say of culture or criticism, "These be thy gods, O Israel!" Machen had it right and so did Spurgeon. Textual criticism by the "experts" is a horde of little popelings who by their assumed infallibility have the gall to tell us what is God's Word and what is not. Such is the tyranny of the experts.

After Westcott and Hort, the Pandora's box had been opened and all the evils of German rationalism began to tear at the Foundation of the Faith, the Holy Scriptures. This has continued until this day in both the higher and lower forms of textual criticism. Today the situation involves almost as many different texts of the Greek New Testament as there are scholars. Each scholar decides for himself what he will or will not accept as the Word of God. Consequently, each new edition of the Greek New Testament has led to a smaller and smaller New Testament. If Satan has his way, this would continue until all of the New Testament would cease to exist.

1,881 Years Without the Experts

Until 1881, the churches had accepted one text of the New Testament, the one preserved by faithful churches in the majority of the manuscripts. Since 1881 and the Westcott and Hort text, there has not been a text accepted by all Christians. Since 1881 there has been controversy and confusion (which by the way, is reflected in the many modern translations all claiming to be the Word of God and all different from each other). Some say it is the United Bible Society's Greek text and the English translation of it that is God's Word. Others say, no, it is the Nestle Greek text and the English translation of it that is God's Word. Now it comes down to the tyranny of the experts. What do the scholars say? Each scholar says something different than the other. This leaves the King James Version standing like a lighthouse on the storm swept shore, for it is the only English translation of the New Testament based entirely upon the text that has been passed on to us by faithful churches.

It comes down to two choices: accept the text handed down by faithful churches for two thousand years or accept the findings of modern textual critics, no two of which fully agree. If we go with the scholars, there is no text that is accepted by all of them. Confusion reigns. There is no standard. We are left like a ship at sea without a rudder to guide it.

Since 1881, all the critical texts of the Greek New Testament are a little shorter than the one published before it. Westcott and Hort had a few hundred variant readings. Metzger's edition has three to four thousand variant readings, many of which he has deleted from the text without so much as a footnote to tell you it has been deleted. The modern critical texts have steadily become shorter and shorter. This is a clear indication that there is a "snake in the woodpile somewhere."

The Rules of Modern Textual Criticism

These textual critics have rules that they follow in deciding if a word, phrase, or sentence should be allowed in or taken out of Scripture. To give you an idea of some of the rules, here is one of them:

In general, the more difficult reading is to be preferred, particularly when the sense appears on the surface to be erroneous, but on more mature consideration it proves itself to be correct.

This statement is very vague. It says "In general:" which means sometimes but not always. Who decides when the rule applies and when it does not apply? On what basis is such a decision made? We are not told. Then it says, "The more difficult reading." Who decides when a reading is more difficult than another one and on what basis? Again, we are not told. Then the rule says, "particularly when the sense appears on the surface to be erroneous." Who decides when this "sense" or that "sense" is "on the surface" and "erroneous?" The scholars do. Then it says in a question begging statement that "on a more mature consideration it proves itself to be correct." Who decides which consideration is the mature one? Naturally, the same self-appointed scholars do. This "rule" allows a textual critic to read the Greek New Testament variants and decide which reading is the more difficult, which sense is the surface meaning and which consideration is the mature one. Somehow, these experts get down into a "deeper knowledge" that allows them to include or exclude a verse of the Greek New Testament. Their decisions to include or exclude words and verses from the Bible are based on what the scholars think. It is no longer the Word judging them. They can now judge the Word. This is nothing more than the old first century Gnosticism which feeds on the pride of man in his intellect and leads to the destruction of the Faith that was once and for all delivered to the saints.

Another rule followed by textual critics says:

In general, the shorter reading is to be preferred.

If a textual variant is the longer reading, then choose the shorter textual variant as the most valid one. Who says so? The scholars do. In textual criticism, you can make up your own rules and follow them to your own preconceived ends.

Another rule of textual criticism says:

That reading which involves verbal dissidence is usually to be preferred to one which is verbally concordant.

This vague language means that one should choose the variant reading which clashes most with the grammatical structure of the book rather than the reading which is most in harmony with its grammatical structure. This meaningless jargon allows each scholar to choose whatever he wants.

Therefore, it comes down to accepting what the scholars say or accepting what the majority of the manuscripts say. One must either accept the correct reading based on the majority of manuscripts, or he may follow a few manuscripts that have a reading that is different from the majority of the manuscripts. On the other hand, one can ask the scholars which variant is the right one and they will say, "Well, for certain reasons the few manuscripts with the variant reading are right." They base their decisions on the "external evidences" and "internal probabilities" developed by German rationalism. This is just the old first century Gnosticism warmed over and is not the right way to go about deciding the text of the Holy Scriptures. The textual critic is flying into the face of thousands of years of history when the text of the New Testament was preserved, not by scholars, but by faithful churches. For nearly two thousand years, the churches never applied these vague rules of textual criticism in order to determine what the correct reading of Scripture was. Faithful churches preserved accurate copies of the New Testament that had been passed on to them. Eighteen hundred years later the scholars came along and said, "No, your text is as corrupted as the Greek classics, and besides you cannot determine the right reading on the basis of the majority of the manuscripts. You must now determine the correct reading on the basis of scholarly principles."

No Two Greek Scholars Agree

So now, the correct reading is "up for grabs." One Greek scholar says one reading is right, while another says it is not. There is mass confusion much like the ridiculous uncertainty of modern art. Well, that is how the situation came to be, but that does not mean that is what it should be. God is not the author of confusion. God inspired the Scriptures by causing them to be written by holy men of God who were controlled by the Holy Spirit (II Peter 1:21). Moreover, after God inspired His Word, he did not abandon it to be protected by mere man's scholarship. Through faithful churches, He watched over the transmission of the Scriptures from one century to the next. True, this transmission was done by copyists who made mistakes in their copying, but there was always the checking of manuscripts with those of other faithful churches to insure that the text was transmitted without error. God not only took great care to inspire men to write the Scriptures under the control of the Spirit, He also took great care to preserve those Scriptures. When God sent His Son into the world as the Living Word, he did not abandon Him but preserved His life until it was time for Jesus to die on Calvary. Even then, he raised Him from the dead to triumph over all His enemies. Similarly, God did not send His written Word into the world and abandon it to the whims of men. He watched over His Word to preserve it just as He preserved the Living Word. Without the preservation of Scripture, the inspiration of Scripture would be in vain. God guarded his Word through faithful churches who carefully checked their copies of manuscripts with those of other churches. The result is that today there are over 5,000 manuscripts of various books of the Greek New Testament and some complete New Testaments all of which, in the majority of manuscripts, agree. If we need to decide what is the right text, we can go by what the reading is in the majority of the manuscripts.

Because of the extreme care taken by Scripture copyists and the reverent care of faithful churches over their Scriptures, God has preserved a text in the majority of the manuscripts that is the same as the original Greek New Testament!

Which Books are Canonical? (Authentically a Part of Scripture)

Churches formally affirmed the canon of the New Testament in 397 AD. However, all the books of the New Testament had already been judged by faithful churches to be authentic a long time before that. The churches rejected other books as not being Scripture. Those rejected books were the unauthenticated books that claimed to have a special vision of God's truth. These apocryphal books were rejected by the churches as not being drawn from the "wells of salvation." There was no mark of divine inspiration on them. The churches decided the issue of which books were a part of Scripture under the leadership of the Holy Spirit.

Since God, through the churches, took great care to preserve which books should go into the New Testament, He most certainly preserved, through faithful churches, which words and verses should go into that New Testament. Because we know that God, through the churches, preserved the larger units (the books of the New Testament), it follows that He also preserved the smaller units of that New Testament (the individual verses). The smaller part of the New Testament (the verses) is part of the larger part of the New Testament (the books). Since we know that the books of the New Testament were preserved when the churches decided which books should be a part of the Canon of Scripture, therefore we know that God has also preserved the smaller part of the New Testament (the verses). God preserved individual verses by preserving the majority of the manuscripts that were without error and by using the churches to correct the few erring manuscripts by the majority of correct ones.

The Majority of Manuscripts Agree

For example, it is quite reasonable to assume that at the scene of an accident, nine people witness it and report it accurately to the police. One person for some reason says it happened differently. Normally the account given by the nine is considered the true one. This is especially true when the witnesses are reliable and have no reason to falsify the facts. It is the same with 5,000 manuscripts of New Testament books that exist today. The overwhelming majority of these manuscripts agree as to what a variant reading should be. Faithful churches for over 1,900 years have accepted this evidence as final. So should we.

What Did the Author of the Book Say?

However, more important than these reasons is the word of the Lord Jesus on the matter. In Matthew 4:4 Jesus quotes from the Old Testament in Deuteronomy 8:3 which says, "Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." In this verse Jesus sanctions every word of Scripture as God's Word. He says every word comes out of the mouth of God, not only from men's minds. In Matthew 24:35 Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." He declared that his words would not pass away. We have his promise on it. We may believe Jesus or the textual critic whose basic assumption is that the New Testament is hopelessly corrupted. In Matthew 5:18 Jesus said that not "one jot or one tittle should pass from the law." This is speaking of the Old Testament but is equally applicable to the New Testament because the Author of both is the Holy Spirit. In this verse, Jesus declares that it is easier for heaven and earth to be destroyed than it is for the smallest part of a letter of Scripture to be destroyed. The jot and tittle are small marks that go under a letter. Jesus said that not even these would be lost. His argument is that if the smallest part of Scripture (the jot and tittle) would be preserved, then certainly the larger parts (the words) would be preserved as well.

In John 10:35 Jesus bases his argument on a single letter in a word. The whole argument is based on the difference between theos "God" and theoi "gods." This is the difference between the last letter being an -s or an -i. The suffix -s indicates singular and the suffix -i indicates plural. The Lord based his argument on the single letter -i. This proves that Jesus was conscious of the fact that not only were the words of Scripture preserved without error, he was also conscious of the fact that the very letters and even the small jots under the letters were preserved without error. If Jesus bases an argument on a single letter in Scripture, and he says that not even a part of a letter will be destroyed, then He must know more about Scripture than we do.

Should We Believe the Scholars or Jesus?

One can accept the vague musings of scholars or the clear words of Jesus who said that the smallest particle of God's Word would not be destroyed. Jesus said that God would preserve His Word, and that is exactly what has happened. God not only inspired holy men to write His Word, he used faithful churches to preserve that Word even unto the present day. We have God's unerring Word in the Textus Receptus, because it is based on the majority of manuscripts preserved by the churches.

Since 1881, many Christians have followed Westcott and Hort into error. Even many of the major Bible societies have fallen into this error. As for Baptist Bible Translators Institute, we stand with those faithful churches that have preserved God's Word through the centuries. We stand on the Word of God in the King James Version, because it is the only translation in the English language that is free from the presuppositions of modern Gnosticism. There is no reason for us to move into the Gnostic's camp where it is a matter of one opinion versus another opinion. We must not follow anyone's opinion. If we do, we will be shifting constantly and every man doing that which is right in his own eyes-the deplorable state of modern man.

The Conclusion of the Matter

It is clear that God has preserved His Word through the centuries down to our present day. We have the many manuscripts that have been preserved by God through His faithful churches. It is a simple matter of reading them and finding what is the correct reading in the majority of the manuscripts. We accept it on that basis. God has seen to it that faithful churches have by this method preserved these manuscripts and kept them pure through the centuries unto the present time. Therefore, we can know beyond a shadow of doubt that we have the Scriptures down to the very word, to the very letter, and to the smallest part of a letter. The Lord Jesus said we would. Whom do you believe?

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 13:47

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

Chris,

You are very interesting.

Thank you. I suppose that I am "peculiar" (I Peter 2:9). :-)

Quote:

I have a question for you. Why do you discount those "experts" that have gone to the sources for Westcott and Hort and others?

I am not "discounting" those "experts." I am questioning why YOU are so quick to believe what those "experts" say yet refuse to test and verify those things. I am questioning why YOU are willing to read secondhand sources from people who supposedly researched the matter...but you won't test and verify whether their research is accurate. I am questioning why YOU are willing to accept "experts" who agree and proclaim your opinion on the matter...but refuse to contact or research elsewhere.

Besides, this is far beyond a discussion about Westcott and Hort. After all, most Bible translations consider their work as one of MANY texts to be scrutinized and compared.

Rather, it is why you feel so comfortable by the mere "research" of others that you would proclaim such things publicly as an ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY.

Quote:

What do you say to those people who are knowledgeable in Greek and Hebrew who have gone to those sources and published them in books and on the web for our benefit?

I would say, "Thank you. Now, let me go and verify the things that you claim." I certainly wouldn't embrace their views as a "truth" just because they claim it to be true.

Quote:

No, you discount everything anybody has to say, if they themselves, do not know Greek.

Brother, I never said this. I don't discount "everything" that "anybody" has to say if they don't know Greek. However, I would question what they say if they haven't consulted those who actually DO know Greek. I would question what someone says if they are willing to make claims about Westcott and Hort, the translators of scholarly translations, and others if they haven't read the works, personal writings or contacted those individuals. If I simply repeat something that I read from a book or website about someone, then I am guilty of GOSSIP or HEARSAY (even if it is "in the name of Jesus").

Quote:

Do you regard experts existing only on the Westcott/Hort side of things? Surely, with all your learned, academic research that you have implied, you have looked at their claims. From all your words, you have obviously discounted them ALL.

I don't understand what you are asking. As I have said before, I have looked into Westcott and Hort's own works. I have read plenty of allegations about them and their work (often from the same websites that cite one another) and I have found that much of what is alleged is false. Still, again, Westcott and Hort really aren't even that important in this discussion since no work being discussed is based solely upon their work. I have explained to you what they did...which was simply compiling a New Testament in Original Greek (which was the same thing that Erasmus did).

I find it odd that you and other KJV-only folks are willing to scrutinize those two men...but refuse to apply the same level of scrutiny at Erasmus (who provided plenty of things for scrutiny).

Quote:

I have not heard one iota of information from you where you expose something that Westcott and Hort did (and there is plenty) or are in agreement with any material that we have supplied from experts on the KJV side. You either discount them as experts or bring it back to me, not knowing Greek.

I am not asking you to learn Koine Greek. I just question why you are willing to trust others who may or may not know it either. You are placing your trust in the "research" of men, websites and books that are decidedly KJV-only -- and yet much of that information can be tested and verified WITHOUT a working knowledge of Greek. You could easily contact individuals that DO speak Greek. You could email the allegations that you read to some of the Bible societies, translators and language/manuscript experts and just find out what their response might be.

After all, this is a very loud "absolute" proclamation that you are making here. All that I am asking is that you take the time to verify those things that you read and hear BEFORE you loudly and publicly proclaim them as "truth."

Quote:

You betray your protestations about your supposed affinity for the KJV. At least that is what I am seeing in your text that you type. I could be wrong.

Betrayal? I do not have to believe in the absolute perfection or superiority of the KJV to embrace it for what it is -- merely a translation from a committee of scholars of the Church of England who endeavored to create a faithful translation in the common, modern language of 1611. Their own words (found in the preface of the KJV) repudiate the claims of most KJV-is-perfect websites and books. It is just amazing that some people are so willing to dismiss their own explanation in an attempt to make the translation into something that it is not.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 14:13

AMEN and AMEN, Anonymous777! Your research and work on this matter is very helpful to me.

It is as the Lord said, "Set up a standard!" You can't just say one version is "better" or "most reliable." How long halt ye between two opinions? Do you believe God's word is still holy? Anything less than perfect is not holy.

God's word is the foundation of everything. "If the foundation be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" Again, "my word shall not pass away..."

I'm quick to extol the integrity of God in this matter, as well as any other matter. It is against His justice to give the patriarchs and the apostles perfect standards and then leave us with "damaged leftovers."

This is a good discussion. It's very important to know the truth about God's word. Of course, it is also important to re-

arch the research of others, and so forth.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 14:24

I like the insight one person gave of Deuteronomy 30.11-14:

"For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off .

"It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it?

"Neither is it beyond the sea , that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it?

"But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth , and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it."

The Greek is obviously not in the mouth of most people.

Just some food for thought.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 14:44

Quote:
----- I am questioning why YOU are so quick to believe what those "experts" say yet refuse to test and verify those things. I am questioning why YOU are willing to read secondhand sources from people who supposedly researched the matter...but you won't test and verify whether their research is accurate. I am questioning why YOU are willing to accept "experts" who agree and proclaim your opinion on the matter...but refuse to contact or research elsewhere.

You really do not know how quick I am to believe, do you?

Do you know how much research I have put into this? I didn't think so.

Why don't you stop talking and show us some things? Why don't you prove the things that I have shown are wrong? We are waiting.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/30 15:17

Anonymous777,

You are the one who said that you don't feel a need to research this with any look at what experts or scholars feel in regard to this topic. You have admitted that you haven't contacted translators, Bible societies...or read the works of Erasmus, Westcott and Hort, or the views of scholars and translators.

Yet you have consulted (and copy/pasted) plenty of information from KJV-only websites. You appear to give more weight to the words of KJV-only advocates than any "expert" in Greek...the firsthand writings of men that you repeat allegations about...or even the testimony of men who actually translate Scripture.

Quote:

Why don't you stop talking and show us some things? Why don't you prove the things that I have shown are wrong? We are waiting.

The fallacy in this is that the burden of proof does not rest with me. YOU are the one who is making allegations. You are making allegations FOR the supremacy of the KJV and its sources...and AGAINST any other version, sources or trans

lators.

The burden to "prove" your statements in a public forum lay entirely with you. I have already pointed out the more obvious errors with your statements -- especially the limits of your "research" -- but you still feel the need to proclaim your KJV-only position with absolute certainty.

It would be a terrible thing to be guilty of uttering things that are either partially or fully untrue.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 15:37

Appreciate your comments rusaved1.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 15:47

Chris, it's not going to work.

People should not allow themselves to be shutdown by you.

I never said some of the things you attribute to me.

You are clever in the way you are trying to discredit what I am showing, but I think if I can see through it, others can, too.

You should bring some statements or research from your experts to refute what I am presenting. Of course it's kind of hard to, since what I am showing is right out of all the corrupt modern versions. You really can't so you keep attacking the messenger, very imperfect, though I am.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 15:56

Hi anonymous777,

I am not trying to "shut" you down. I am merely cautioning you about proclaiming things with ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY when you have said that you don't feel a need to extend your research to firsthand sources.

Now, again, you are attempting to turn your KJV-only and ("anti-other versions") argument around by insinuating that I am trying to "shut" you down or prevent the truth from coming forth.

I don't know how to make you understand that you are relying largely upon the apparent "research" of others in order to so cement your positions (and accusations) enough to loudly and publicly proclaim these things.

By the way, there really aren't any ulterior motives to "see through." However, I welcome -- and encourage -- all individuals to test the things that I have said and verify whether or not they are true. But let me make it clear: It is NOT ENOUGH to simply gather your "research" from opinionated and biased websites that agree with what you already have concluded.

Test. Prove. Verify.

Simply go to the sources whenever possible. If you are going to make allegations about Westcott and Hort -- good or bad -- then you need to have at least studied their writings FIRSTHAND. If you are going to make statements about Erasmus -- good or bad -- then you need to have studied his life, writings, beliefs and methods.

If you are going to insinuate things about the various source texts and manuscripts, then you need to have studied those things in depth BEFORE you go about making absolute proclamations about the supremacy of one or alleging inferiority of others.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 16:00

You should bring some statements or research from your experts to refute what I am presenting. Of course it's kind of hard to, since what I am showing is right out of all the corrupt modern versions. You really can't so you keep attacking the messenger, very imperfect, though I am.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 16:14

Quote:

You should bring some statements or research from your experts to refute what I am presenting. Of course it's kind of hard to, since what I am showing is right out of all the corrupt modern versions. You really can't so you keep attacking the messenger, very imperfect, though I am.

First of all, the burden of proof lay with YOU since you are the one making the accusations against the translations, the translators, the source texts and pretty much anything and everything else associated with versions that are NOT the KJV.

Secondly, you haven't presented any research. You are presenting what appears to be the writings and insinuations of a few others who you agree with.

Next, I have already explained that verse-by-verse comparisons are NOT resultant of "omitting" words or phrases -- but of the lack of those words and phrases in the SOURCE manuscripts and texts that the translators considered the most reliable.

Finally, I have asked you several times to stop attacking me. You placed words in my mouth over-and-over again in this thread. I asked you to stop. Now, you are accusing me of attacking you. I have not "attacked" you. Since when is asking you to test and verify your own sources considered an "attack?"

Brother, you are making VERY SERIOUS ACCUSATIONS in your "defense" of the KJV (even though no one is attacking it) and your "attacks" on other versions, sources and translators. Given the very public nature of your "absolute" accusations, don't you understand the importance of getting it right? This is why I have asked you to look into it a little more intently and away from those same KJV-only websites and books.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 16:22

****UPDATE****

The common man can read what the experts say on both sides and understand the issues. You accuse me of reading only one side, yet you don't know. I have never accused you of reading only one side. It sounds like you have, but I won't say for sure, because I really don't know.

The common man should and does have something to say about what is taking place with the Word of God, today.

Neither the experts on the KJV side or the experts on the Non-KJV side should shut down, a non-expert in gathering the facts. You do not have to be an expert in Greek to understand the issues and that God's Word is being changed, terribly.

Anyone, can research online from both sides. You do not know where I have researched, but continue to accuse me of only researching one side.

Chris, you are being dramatic, in your rhetoric.

Chris, you are making this about me and my lack of "scholarship or research". Why don't you educate me and everyone else? You say the burden of proof is on me, but that is just an easy way out.

It's time to go. Bye. You can have the last word.

May the Lord bless you and your family abundantly above all you could ask or think.

777

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2011/3/30 16:25

777,

I appreciate your zeal for the true Word of God and all the diligent research you have discovered and made available for us. I am one of those who believe there must be a standard and that God's word is the final authority empowered by the Holy Spirit.

So far in this long thread your seriousness along with a few others has been an encouragement.

The difference is obvious; we have a few who believe that there must be a standard that we can rely upon when it comes to the Word of God. There are others who believe and seem to be satisfied with believing 'we just can't know for sure' and 'I mean we really don't know' or 'God doesn't want us to make a decision' when it comes to which bible to rely upon or it doesn't matter.

So the argument goes on, and because these modern versions are easier to read many will be happy because they can actually understand it, not really caring that there is another version (because it is outdated to them) that has words and verses in them that the modern versions don't have in them. Oh, we have learned better they say because the experts have discovered the real manuscripts and they didn't have all those extra words in there.

Then there are others who say well the modern versions are so much easier to read and I'm not sure anybody can really know which versions are correct so I'm sure God doesn't really mind which version we read as long as we understand what we are reading. So everybody gets to decide for themselves and we don't have to read that outdated version if we don't want to because the experts have told us it's not the most reliable anymore.

So now we have a larger number who are calling the people who believe there is a standard such things as 'KJV only and mean-spirited' because they have made a decision when it comes to what bible they mainly rely on. Brethren if we don't take a stand then we can fall for anything. (I realize there are mean-spirited people on both sides)

I have a question why don't some major publisher out there take the Authorized Version (kjv) and update it without changing the meaning or leaving out words and verses so that they can make it more understandable to today's language. Don't tell me this is what they did in making the NKJV because it is not an updated Authorized Version (kjv). I am thinking that the last update to the KJV was in the 1800's.

Blessings to all!

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 16:43

Quote:
-----I have a question why don't some major publisher out there take the Authorized Version (kjv) and update it without changing the meaning or leaving out words and verses so that they can make it more understandable to today's language. Don't tell me this is what they did in making the NKJV because it is not an updated Authorized Version (kjv). I am thinking that the last update to the KJV was in the 1800's.

Rbanks, just what is it that needs to be updated in the KJV? It has been evaluated at a 6th grade readability level. I actually started reading it when I was seven years old and by the time I was twelve and even younger, I had no difficulty with the words because I either looked up the meaning or asked my parents. The "thee's" and "thou's" are not difficult like the "experts" say. If they are hard for some individuals, then they can learn. Just because the culture and therefore the language degrades does not mean God's word has to follow suit. God does not need to change His word so we are more comfortable with it; we need to be changed ourselves until we accept His standard.

Have you ever considered that divine language would not be the same as the world's language?

Re: Why Thee, Thou, Thy, Thine & Ye?, on: 2011/3/30 16:49

Hi rbanks,

Thank you for your grace and fairness (not to imply anything about anyone else).

I could not have said it any better myself.

Although, this was excellent.

<http://www.baptisttranslators.com/content/view/51/50/>

If you have not read it, please do when you get a chance.

To your comments. There is another KJV. It is called The American King James Version. I just found out about it when a friend sent me the link. They sought to make it more "easy" to read so they took out the Thees, Thous, Ye, etc.

Very sincere people did this and we all know you can be sincere yet sincerely wrong. I think that is the case with many translators.

Experts have already shown the importance of the plural pronouns in the Hebrew and Greek, of which common English, has none. That is why Ye, Thou, Thee, Thine and many of the other so-called "archaic" words are important.

Changing a plural pronoun to singular, changes the audience.

I will give you an example: (There is a Phd. in this quote, if anyone needs an expert)

One of the major arguments favoring the multitude of new version Bibles is the elimination of words such as "thee, thou, thy, thine and ye." This sounds like a good argument, especially since most people in this generation no longer use these words. However, when we consider the importance of retaining the intended meaning of scripture the argument loses merit. To the surprise of many, the old English has a much more specific meaning than would first appear.

For example look at Exodus 16:28,

First look in the New International Version (NIV):

Then the LORD said to Moses, "How long will you refuse to keep my commands and my instructions?"

Taken out of context, it might appear that God is saying, "Moses, you are continuing to refuse to keep my commandments and my instructions."

Notice the similarity in the New King James Version (NKJV):

And the LORD said to Moses, "How long do you refuse to keep My commandments and My laws?"

Same thing. It sounds like Moses is the one refusing to obey. This is because in modern English, "you" is often singular, something the new version translators failed to deal with.

Now look at the accuracy of the Authorized Version (AV) or King James Version:

And the LORD said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?

Here it is more apparent that it was the people, not Moses, whom God was upset with. In the very specific English of the era of King James, both "Ye" and "you" mean more than one person. But in modern English, "you" is often singular. "Ye" is always plural. "Thee," "thou," "thy," "thine," mean only one person.

How do we know? Pronouns that begin with "y" are plural. Those beginning with "t" are singular.

Now you know what Jesus meant when He said to Nicodemus, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (John 3:7).

What Jesus meant was, "Nicodemus, marvel not that I said unto thee, all of you need to be born again." This is very important. Everybody, including Nicodemus, needed to be born again. That's why Jesus used the plural YE. New versions which indiscriminately use the word "YOU" often miss the point.

According to Dr. Richard E. Bacon, "'thee and thou, etc.' are not archaic or obsolete English... 'thee and thou' were never common street English, including that of Queen Elizabeth I and King James I. Neither are they the equivalent of 'du' in German. That is, they are not familiar as opposed to formal."

Common "street language" is often unclear as to its exact meaning. And modern English (unlike the romance languages such as Spanish and French) is lacking in ability to fully express such clear meaning. For example the word "you" in modern English can mean either one person or several – singular or plural.

Suppose I would say to my grandsons, "Jon, I want you to show Ben and Timothy the creek and I want you to be back within one hour because I have work for you to do." It could easily be misunderstood that I only expected Jon to be back within the hour, even though what I really meant was that they all be back within the hour.

This is one of the inherent problems with our common modern English. It is also a problem with most modern new translations of the Bible for the same reasons. The "Old English" of the Authorized Version (AV), commonly known as the King James Version, virtually eliminates this problem by correctly using "Thee, Thou, Thy, Thine, and Ye," and whenever appropriate, "You."

To read more: http://chriswillard.multiply.com/journal/item/549/Why_Thee_Thou_Thy_Thine_Ye

Thanks again for your encouraging reply.

777

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/30 16:54

Hi anonymous777...

I am only going by what you have said. You have NOT read Wescott and Hort's works and writings -- but you spread quite a few accusations that you gathered from websites that share your view of them. It makes me wonder how you came to a conclusion about them in the first place.

So, now I will ask you (*since you say that I don't know).

- Have you read any of Wescott and Hort's own works (rather than clips found at other websites)?
- Have you contacted the translators of the versions that you speak badly of?
- Have you compared texts in order to ascertain which texts are better?
- Have you contacted textual experts in order to determine what they feel about text sources?
- Have you contacted the Bible societies and translators of the NIV and NASB that you claimed are "corrupt?"
- Have you read the firsthand writings of Erasmus, Lancelot Andrewes, and other translators of the KJV line?
- Have you visited libraries and archives to see manuscripts?
- Have you compared the revisions of the various editions of the KJV text itself (revised several times between 1611 and 1769)?
- Have you consulted language, text and manuscript scholars in order to determine WHAT they actually believe and

WHY?

You see, research isn't really "research" when you limit it to a select group of books that have reached (often predetermined) conclusions.

Maybe I have misunderstand the things that you have said. I thought that you asserted that you did not do any of these things. The accusations that you include and the "evidence" that you have used to validate it has simply been cut and pasted from KJV-only websites. But, with all of your claim that "experts," "scholars" and "textual critics" aren't needed -- you have relied on the works of others who claim to have relied on their own select group of "experts" and "scholars."

Quote:

Chris, you are being dramatic, in your rhetoric.

You recently signed up on this website...and -- PRESTO -- declare the KJV as the only acceptable translation in English and that other versions are CORRUPT. You made allegations and insinuations about Westcott, Hort, and the translators of other versions (*not to mention those of us who disagree with your conclusions). You implied that some of those non-KJV texts are Satanic. You even accused me of engaging in an "attack" on the KJV (even though it is one of my versions of choice).

That isn't being "dramatic?"

Brother, I am simply cautioning you about proclaiming as "absolutes" these things that are merely your conclusions from the things that you said that you researched. Are you that TOTALLY and ABSOLUTELY CONVINCED that you are 100 % correct in your assertions, allegations, accusations and claims?

Quote:

Chris, you are making this about me and my lack of "scholarship or research". Why don't you educate me and everyone else? You say the burden of proof is on me, but that is just an easy way out.

No, no I am not. I am not insinuating that you lack "scholarship or research." I have simply asked you about it because of your very loud and absolute claims.

Yes, the burden of proof falls on you because you are the one making the claims to begin with. I simply questioned the validity of those claims. That is not an "attack" or even insinuating a lack of scholarship or research.

You have stated your research...and even that you don't need to contact the very Bible societies and translators that you speak against. You have said that you don't need to read or understand Greek...even though you trust a few views about "corrupt" versions of Greek. You made claims about Westcott and Hort that you acknowledged to have not seen the firsthand sources for those things. You don't seem to understand (or acknowledge) that variance in SOURCE is the main reason why some words appear differently between the various translations (like the KJV and NIV).

All that I am saying is that you are making very serious, public allegations.

If you feel the need to make such broad, sweeping accusations at translations, translators, source texts and methods -- then I highly suggest that your research is not limited. You should be VERY DETAILED with your accusations if you want the rest of us to test and verify their validity. It is not enough to simply copy and paste material from a few websites...especially if those accusations on those websites from which you have gathered aren't tested, verified or properly cited either.

Quote:

May the Lord bless you and your family abundantly above all you could ask or think.

Thank you. May the Lord do the same for you.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 16:55

Yes, rusaved1,

The KJV does not need to be changed and this is what really makes the scholars hair stand on end. It really is a beautiful translation in every way. It has been good to celebrate it's 400th year in this thread.

The KJV starts off at a 4th grade level and increasingly goes up till in Revelation it is at about the 8th grade.

Perfect book for homeschooling or teaching them to read (of course along with writing, math, chemistry, etc).

<http://www.av1611.org/kjv/kjveasy.html>

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 17:00

Chris,

How will answering any of those questions, discredit these websites and their research that I show everyone. Many of them, in their words, have done the things you asked. In your eyes it may discredit me, (big deal, I have no reputation to protect), but you cannot discredit anything I have presented. Sorry, you took so much time to type all that.

Your reasoning is strange. It's like I can't quote what my professor in college said, because I didn't gather the material myself.

Why don't you just celebrate the 400th year of the God's Word in English with the rest of us?

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2011/3/30 17:02

Hi rbanks...

Quote:

So now we have a larger number who are calling the people who believe there is a standard such things as 'KJV only and mean-spirited' because they have made a decision when it comes to what bible they mainly rely on.

This is not what any of us are saying.

Rather, in fact, I actually ENCOURAGE individuals to not believe anything that they read or hear about the matter. Instead, we should go to the sources...and really research this matter.

I have no problem with a person embracing the KJV as their version of choice. It is one of my favorite versions.

However, I do have a problem with someone who comes to this website and pronounces a series of accusations and allegations about other versions, translators and source texts...and then grows frustrated when we try to test and verify the things that they claimed.

Is this what God has called us to do?

We gather a few very serious allegations, accusations and insinuations and publish them as ABSOLUTE TRUTH about other versions, translations, translators and sources?

I actually don't have a problem with someone doing this...if they include the evidence for which they base their views. However, it isn't really "evidence" if a person is proclaiming something as "truth" and can only "validate" those slanderous and libelous accusations by copying and pasting a few things from a few KJV-only websites (that happen to make many wild conspiracy-type claims about other versions and translators).

Why would someone be upset if we gave pause and questioned those type of allegations, accusations and absolutes that are being loudly proclaimed on this website? We should never be afraid or offended when someone wants to "test" what we claim.

I hope this makes sense...and clarifies our participation in this matter.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 17:06

****UPDATE****

Hey Everyone,

Don't let Chris intimidate you. If these websites are being libelous and slanderous, they would be sued and off the internet. Why aren't they being sued? What I am presenting is not confined to a handful of websites or books. Yes, even in books and these authors are not being sued. This is general knowledge all over the internet and in many, many books (by experts).

These are still just tactics by Chris, in my opinion to shutdown the common man talking about this issue.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 17:10

Chris,

Most folks don't have the time to do such extensive research following your nine points, would you not agree? But it's apparent that God has raised up various brothers and sisters for this very cause. One author spent six years, six hours a day doing almost everything you have suggested and then wrote the book New Age Bible Versions. If you have not read his book, I would encourage you to do so. It is not mere speculations; on the contrary, it is resplendent with footnotes, citing just about every claim made. This book has been bashed by many, but I haven't found any critic's notes on a follow-up analysis.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 17:20

Yes, rusaved1, Mrs. Riplinger, has been slandered and maligned mercilessly. New Age Bible Versions is a one of its kind. Thank God, for her courage.

You are right. No fair minded rebuttal has ever been given about her work. Just really nasty stuff towards her.

Have you read her book, "In Awe of God's Word". Absolutely amazing. I fell in love all over again with the Word of God.

Here is a link:

https://shop.avpublications.com/product_info.php?products_id=51

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 17:21

Quote:

-----We should never be afraid or offended when someone wants to "test" what we claim.

Right on, Chris. I say respectfully, that the article that was posted is up for testing for anyone who wishes to look into it themselves. On my part, I've seen many scholars who aren't KJV-only acknowledge most of those claims; only, they come to a different conclusion.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/30 17:22

Anonymous777,

Quote:

How will answering any of those questions, discredit these websites and their research that I show everyone.

I didn't say that it would. I didn't imply that it would. I don't even understand why you even ask.

You said that we don't know the extent of your research (even though you mentioned it within the body of some of your other posts). I just was wondering if your research did extend past those few KJV-only websites and books.

I am saying, however, that you can't just rely on the research of others. You can't rely on my research. You can't rely on the research of KJV-only folks. If you are going to entertain (and repeat) the serious allegations and accusations that you have done, I would urge you to look all of this up for yourself.

If you hear an accusation about Westcott and Hort: Don't just read a few quotes and then believe it. Go to the library, check out the books and see if they are true. IT would be nice if we could just take everyone's word for truth. However, too many people disagree with one another on the same matters. And, unfortunately, there have been some fallacious statements made by zealous Christians in order to validate their arguments.

If you hear accusations about translators of the NIV or NASB -- then contact them. I did. You would be surprised just how many of them will actually contact you in an honest effort to "set the record straight." Does it mean that I accepted or agreed with everything that they said? Of course not. It just means that I took the time to verify the accusations that were written or were told to me.

Quote:

In your eyes it may discredit me, (big deal, I have no reputation to protect), but you cannot discredit anything I have presented. Sorry, you took so much time to type all that.

That is a silly thing to insinuate! No one is trying to "discredit" you. I am just questioning the proclamations that you are making.

Quote:

Your reasoning is strange. It's like I can't quote what my professor in college said, because I didn't gather the material myself.

First of all, you shouldn't quote a professor if his area of expertise is not in the subject. For instance, Gail Riplinger is oft

en quoted by KJV-only advocates. She is not a textual critic. She is not a translator. She is not an expert in Greek. She holds degrees in Art, Home Economics and Interior Decorating. Yet individuals quote her and her books (even you did earlier) as if she were an "expert."

Secondly, you shouldn't quote a professor if he only has "hearsay" to interject. If a professor is going to be quoted about Westcott and Hort, then you should look at the evidence and source that HE based his opinion upon and review it.

Finally, as someone who has taught at the university level: A "source" for a dissertation, thesis or journal article has to be able to withstand the scrutiny of "peer review." While writing my own thesis and dissertations, I was sometimes asked to remove sources because they couldn't withstand such academic scrutiny. I didn't get upset about it...or feel that I was being unfairly attacked. I simply realized that my source had to be firm enough as to not impart doubt into what I was writing.

Again...

All that I am saying is that you need to provide undeniable proof if you are going to make such serious absolute accusations about these matters. After all, we will all be judged by God and be required to give an account of everything we say. We should make every effort to get it right.

Quote:

Why don't you just celebrate the 400th year of the God's Word in English with the rest of us?

Ahh...I do rejoice and celebrate 400 years of the King James Version of God's Word. I also rejoice for 40 years of the New American Standard Bible version of God's Word. I also rejoice for 33 years of the New International Version of God's Word.

:-)

BTW, in all seriousness, I do love you brother. I do not want to come across as "attacking" you or thinking and wanting anything but the best for you (and others). I also feel the need to participate only given the seriousness of the allegations and accusations too. I think that we can all welcome a desire for the truth to be uncovered.

As I said earlier...

Nearly every time that I have spoken to a congregation, Bible study or Sunday school class, I have stated that it would be an HONOR if those who were listening just didn't believe me. Instead, I urged them to test and question everything that I say and prayerfully study in order to determine whether what I said was true. After all, this is a noble Berean characteristic (Acts 17:11).

May the Lord guide each of us.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 17:23

- 1) Plato wrote his famous "Republic" in a highly polished classical Greek.
- 2) I can't read classical Greek.
- 3) There are variants in the copies of Plato's "Republic."
- 4) I don't have access to Plato's "Republic" in Greek, let alone the variant manuscripts.
- 5) Therefore, not reading classical Greek, nor having read Plato's "Republic," I am able to decide which variants in the various manuscripts are best.

And if I actually believed this, such would be absurd.

My point: If you can't read the primary sources, you have no right or authority to think you can discern which primary sources are best.

edited

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 17:25

Quote:

****UPDATE****

Hey Everyone,

Don't let Chris intimidate you. If these websites are being libelous and slanderous, they would be sued and off the internet. Why aren't they being sued? What I am presenting is not confined to a handful of websites or books. Yes, even in books and these authors are not being sued. This is general knowledge all over the internet and in many, many books (by experts).

These are still just tactics by Chris, in my opinion to shutdown the common man talking about this issue.

Whoa brother. You are going to far here. I am not trying to "intimidate" anyone. I am just urging those who are willing to make such bold, absolute accusations about such matters to get it right.

You should welcome any "test" of what you proclaim.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 17:25

Chris,

This is what is silly.

Quote:

-----That is a silly thing to insinuate! No one is trying to "discredit" you. I am just questioning the proclamations that you are making.

The proclamations I am making are public domain, tested and proven by experts. Surely, you have heard of them and surely you have questioned them?

Have you ever questioned them? What are your conclusions?

We really want to know, but you won't say.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 17:27

Hi 777!

Yes, praise God she has fulfilled God's calling on her life-it has helped me so much!

I have In Awe of Thy Word, but haven't yet read it cover to cover; what I have read was, yes, absolutely amazing!

For me, it's precious to have something, especially in this day and age, to hold onto, come what may!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 17:28

Hi rusaved1,

Quote:

Most folks don't have the time to do such extensive research following your nine points, would you not agree?

You could be right. But those who don't have time to do this should not be the ones shouting such things from the rooftops.

We can't just trust in the research of others so much that we decide against testing what they proclaim/teach...or enough to proclaim such things as "absolutes" when we state such allegations, accusations and insinuations from a public forum like this.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/30 17:28

Chris, I have a question about this quote:

Quote: -----
-----Next, I have already explained that verse-by-verse comparisons are NOT resultant of "omitting" words or phrases -- but of the lack of those words and phrases in the SOURCE manuscripts and texts that the translators considered the most reliable.

Why do these texts omit words? Why are they considered most reliable? This is an honest question, asked in sincerity.

Thanks,
JB

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 17:32

rusaved1,

She is willing to go out on a limb and make a choice, you are willing to do the same and to state your reasons why.

Praise the Lord.

Her new book "Hazardous Materials", is sure to bring fresh, unmerciful attacks and persecution to her. Her courage is refreshing in a day and age when it is missing so much. No one will take a stand for anything.

https://shop.avpublications.com/product_info.php?products_id=253

I wonder how much of our lack of revival and taking a stand for anything has to do with the new Bibles.

They all say something different and confusion abounds.

No longer fornication in the Bible, it's immorality and immorality just means not moral, which is different from society to society. No longer sodomy, it is homosexuality, which is accepted in most English speaking countries, today.

This has crossed my mind several times. As God's Word gets watered down, I think it is a possibility that the Christian can become just as anemic. I am praying about it and considering it.

You are what you eat and "as a man thinketh, so is he".

777

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 17:33

Again, anonymous, I don't know how to make you understand that the burden of proof is in YOUR hands. You are the one making the accusations.

You can't just allege vile things about translators, translations, source texts and manuscripts and translation methods as "absolutes" and then only cite a few KJV-only websites or claim that such things are in the "public domain" and "proven by experts" when you admit to having neglected to consult.

If you haven't researched this for yourself, you shouldn't proclaim it.

Now, that doesn't mean that you can't share it. However, your words should be salted with the admission regarding the limits of your own research.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 17:35

Quote:

Why do these texts omit words?

It could be equally as asked, why do the majority and western texts "add" words? Why is it assumed that the minority texts are omitting words, when words could be just as easily added by ancient scribes.

And we have evidence to suggest they did both... across all the text families.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 17:37

Hey Jimmy, you probably just got off work, but if you get a chance you may want to read this, which was posted earlier.

<http://www.baptisttranslators.com/content/view/51/50/>

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 17:41

777,

Quote:

-----I wonder how much of our lack of revival and taking a stand for anything has to do with the new Bibles.

Good point. We NEED a standard or

Quote:

-----confusion abounds

Quote:

-----You are what you eat and "as a man thinketh, so is he"

Wow, let's "choose the things that are excellent" (400 years is a good testing period, is it not?!).

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 17:41

Quote:
-----Now, that doesn't mean that you can't share it. However, your words should be salted with the admission regarding the limits of your own research.

Chris, it is obvious that I am sharing what others are proclaiming and what others are proclaiming, I wholeheartedly agree with.

I admit to the limits of my research. I have not read every single work on both sides and not even 50% of their voluminous works.

Thanks for encouraging me to share that.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 17:49

Hi JB1968,

Quote:

Why do these texts omit words? Why are they considered most reliable? This is an honest question, asked in sincerity.

I mentioned this several times previously in this thread, as did KingJimmy and someone else.

First of all, it is unreasonable to assume that they "omitted" anything. The source texts and manuscripts that the translators used and considered to be most reliable typically did not have those words or phrases to begin with. So, they weren't "omitting" something if it wasn't there in the text to begin with. Remember: The translators of the NIV didn't consult the text of the KJV. So, there was no cross comparison for reasons of authenticity.

In addition, I think that you should contact the translators and text experts themselves for that answer (which is what I have been urging all along). You can easily contact the organizations that translated the NIV or NASB. You can contact textual critics and experts in ancient languages and manuscripts to ascertain their views on which manuscripts and text-types are most (or more) reliable. I can tell you what I have learned...but I should be no more trusted than any other "hear say" source.

I will say this: The translators, text critics and language/manuscript experts that I spoke with each seemed to echo one another with a view that the manuscripts of the Alexandrian text-type are much older than those in the Byzantine text-type. They are written in different period languages -- with the many of the manuscripts and texts of the Alexandrian text-type being written in Koine Greek (which is the "Biblical Greek" of the time of Christ and the apostles). Moreover, many of them explained a belief (for several reasons) that the text of the Byzantine text-type was descended from the text of the Alexandrian text-type. I don't have any specific anecdotes for this view that were provided to me on this particular computer, but I can provide them to you at a later time.

Very importantly, I have tried to make it clear that I do NOT accept the premise that the Alexandrian text-types are superior to the Byzantine text-types (or other...or vice versa). I simply understand the views and perspectives of the majority of text critics, scholars and language/manuscript experts who happen to hold to this particular view. Many of their points do make a lot of sense.

I have no problem saying that I do not embrace one text source as irrefutably superior to the other. In fact, I realize that Erasmus had to sort through texts to come up with his own wording. I suspect that others have always had to do the same. After all, we do not have the actual articles written by the apostles in front of us. They have been translated many times over about two thousand years.

This is why I have no problem with embracing the KJV as a good, reliable translation from its set of sources. I embrace the NASB as a good, reliable translation from its set of sources. I embrace the NIV as a good, reliable translation from its

s set of sources. I also use a few others, including one in Spanish that predates the KJV.

When I study God's Word, I often read the KJV or NIV. If I feel the need, I will consult other versions. In fact, I have discovered that I do this quite a bit on my Nook (eReader) and via www.biblegateway.com. It just offers a unique perspective from various translators as they translated from their sources.

I hope this helps. I do urge you to contact those translators and scholars if you have the opportunity. They may tell you what they have explained to me. They may tell you something else that you could share here too.

May the Lord bless you.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/3/30 17:50

Brother, please read this all the way through, if you guys want to believe the King James is unadulterated word of God, that is ok but tell me, please, how we got from Adam and Eve to 1611 without the King James Bible? That's right, the Holy Spirit, He led then and He leads now with or without a Bible.

Do you not realize that no one can come to knowledge of God but first God opens their eyes? Do you truly believe His sovereignty stops after drawing us to Him if we don't read the KJV?? Really? That His truth can only come from ONE VERSION????

I say this with all love brothers, "It's a narrow way, not a narrow-minded way." Because I've known quite a few Christians who were adamantly KJ and they beat their wives, they would have slept with me (them married and me not) "if" I had said yes, and they do drugs recreationally.

So the truth my friend is clearly not in the KJV.

God bless,
Lisa

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 18:00

Quote:

Hey Jimmy, you probably just got off work, but if you get a chance you may want to read this, which was posted earlier.

<http://www.baptisttranslators.com/content/view/51/50/>

Thanks for passing along the link. I read it and found it rather disappointing. And you should too.

The author argues the KJV is the best because the TR is the best. And the TR is the best because the majority texts all agree with each other.

But the fact of the matter is, the majority texts don't perfectly agree with each other 100% of the time, or even close to it. Which is in part why the TR was compiled by Erasmus to begin with. Because Erasmus, like Biblical scholars today, had Greek manuscripts he used that differed with one another. Therefore, he created the TR, which at the time, would've been a modern critical Greek text. And of course, because he lacked the last few verses of Revelation in his copies of the Greek, he had to invent the Greek for that by reverse translation.

In a nutshell, the author of this article makes inaccurate claims, and leaves out a great deal of simple historical truths. All in the name of exalting a particular translation.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 18:05

I am disappointed you were disappointed. :-)

Oh, well. The article was right about the Tyranny of the Experts.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 18:06

By the way, later this evening it is my hope to show you, so you can see with your own eyes, a photoshopped version of a critical Greek reader, to show you places I shall choose at random where the majority texts disagree with one another.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 18:07

Hi Lysa,

I agree with everything you say.

We are not saying that "Truth can only come from one version".

I guess, to simply put it, we are talking about ERROR, in the New Versions getting worse and worse.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 18:10

Jimmy, we have already presented material that the Majority texts (5210 of them), disagree with each other in 1-5% of places (so experts say). That means unlike Sinaiticus and Vaticanus which disagree in over 3,000 places, the Majority text agrees in at least 95% (experts have stated).

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 18:12

Lysa,

Quote:
-----Do you truly believe His sovereignty stops after drawing us to Him if we don't read the KJV?? Really? That His truth can only come from ONE VERSION????

No, I don't, and I doubt most of us KJV'rs do. Other versions are still Bibles, but they can't be counted "holy" because they're not without fault (Read New Age Bible Versions, please).

Your comments about the character of those who upheld the KJV have nothing to do with the nature of its purity itself. You can dig up any thing you want about people, but you have to look at the facts and at how they stand.

Those folks weren't right, grant it. But don't base your conclusion on that (single) radical example. Satan will try to poison every well.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 18:13

Quote:

Jimmy, we have already presented material that the Majority texts (5210 of them), disagree with each other in 1-5% of places (so experts say).

Oh ok. Fair enough. But I think it would be helpful for you to see it with your own eyes.

So, how do you decide which versions of the majority text are the best?

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 18:23

Hi rusaved1...

Quote:

o, I don't, and I doubt most of us KJV'rs do. Other versions are still Bibles, but they can't be counted "holy" because they're not without fault (Read New Age Bible Versions, please).

Are you saying that you believe that the KJV is "without fault?"

You are aware that the manuscripts of the Byzantine text-type that comprised the Textus Receptus differed in up to 5% of text? 5% is not something that you can ignore.

Moreover, are you saying that there are no mistakes within the text of the KJV? The translators of that version themselves refute that in the preface to the KJV itself.

BTW, I don't know Gail Riplinger or if all of those allegations about her are true (that I read, oddly enough, at KJV-only websites). I have read through her book previously, but I did not find much evidence in it -- especially enough to withstand peer review or solidify her argument. It just looks like a lot of the same rhetoric that is found in KJV-only websites.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 18:25

Because I only have a moment, consider reading this very brief essay I wrote in seminary that has about a page or two of textual criticism, and my own translation work. The essay altogether is only 6 pages.

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

Nothing earth shattering here. I just want to show you what real textual criticism looks like. Granted, this is very elementary, and I apologize for not having the attached amendments in this essay. Those were on hand drawn charts that I drew, and did not have the chance to scan.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 18:30

Jimmy, thanks, I will read it.

I just would like to thank everyone for considering everything that has been offered from both sides and really appreciate all the feedback. I have been getting many PMs of encouragement and I appreciate those, but I really am going to stop now. Not because I don't want to continue, but more for practicality reasons such as living and working and raising a family.

Those of you that have encouraged me and had such great input, it's your turn.

God bless everyone, and may we all seek Him with all of our heart, soul, mind and strength.

777

Rest in Him.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 18:35

Blessings brother.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 18:40

Hi Chris,

The variations among the Majority text are minor, "like the varieties of doves," though I don't ignore them. From what I know, the translators would use whatever portion had the most manuscripts for it. Don't you agree with this?

Furthermore, I believe God can work through the imperfect translators to produce a perfect result. It would be high-minded of the translators if they had declared it perfect before it had been proved. Again, 400 years is ample proving time.

Yes, I wholeheartedly believe that God's pure and holy word is in the KJV, with no mistakes.

Is your point that God has NOT left us with a Holy Bible? Paul said that Timothy knew the HOLY SCRIPTURES from a child. Whatever Timothy had was surely copies, right?

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 18:43

Great thoughts, 777.

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 18:45

ok, real quick. ;-)

rusaved1, Amen and amen!!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 18:54

Hi rusaved1...

Those variations may be "minor" (in most cases) -- but even "minor" differences do not equate to "perfection."

Still, are you saying that you believe the KJV to be perfect? There are obvious mistakes found in it. Although many of them are minor, their very existence make it so that the KJV is just what the translators said it is -- NOT perfect.

Quote:

Is your point that God has NOT left us with a Holy Bible? Paul said that Timothy knew the HOLY SCRIPTURES from a child. Whatever Timothy had was surely copies, right?

First, if you think that the KJV is the only perfect version of God's Word -- where was that "preserved perfection" in the ~1600 years before it was completed? After all, the sources from which it comes did not agree with one another 5% of the time.

Secondly, I have no doubt about the existence of the "Holy Bible." However, I do not believe that it is confined to the King James Version. God is Spirit -- and those who worship Him must do so in Spirit and Truth.

To be clear: I personally find the entire premise of the KJV as the only perfect and preserved version of God's Word to be illogical.

Once a person understands the process of translation and textual criticism, the different text sources from which the KJV was obtained, the constraints and requirements placed upon the translators (from their own admission), the fact that the

translators sometimes disagreed with one another in the translation process (but were forbidden from including those things in footnotes or margin notes), the differences in the text sources from which it was translated, the obvious mistakes that are still contained within its text and the various revisions that were completed from its initial publication in 1611 to the one that most of us now have -- it is difficult to embrace a "perfect and preserved" argument of absolute perfection in every single "dot and tittle."

So, I see the KJV for what it is: A faithful translation of Scripture by a group of translators that was taken from its own particular set of sources. I cherish it as a version of the Holy Bible -- but only a VERSION of it. I do the same with the NASB and NIV for the aforementioned reasons.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 19:01

Quote:

From what I know, the translators would use whatever portion had the most manuscripts for it. Don't you agree with this?

While this is "a" factor in translation, it is not the only factor. After all, just because there are a thousand copies of a mistake doesn't make the mistake correct. One has to consider things like the immediate grammatical context (as in the essay I wrote, when deciding which variant was best). Is something better grammatically, i.e. tense, gender, plurality? Could the eye of the scribe slipped as he was copying, resulting in him copying a neighboring word twice? In theologically loaded passages, or passages that quote other verses of the Bible, does the variant seem to make something "more acceptable" and "softer?" Should a longer reading be preferred over a shorter reading?

All of these things, and many more variables, are questions every scribe who comes across a variant-- no matter the text family-- has to consider when attempting to "establish a text." And only once a text has been established does the scribe translate his work.

Quote:

Yes, I wholeheartedly believe that God's pure and holy word is in the KJV, with no mistakes

Which KJV? There have been several revisions. With the majority in circulation today not being the original 1611.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 19:05

Quote:

Yes, I wholeheartedly believe that God's pure and holy word is in the KJV, with no mistakes.

And if I might ask, what is the basis of this belief?

Re: , on: 2011/3/30 19:06

Jimmy, have to weigh in.

No revisions, just editions (editing to fix some spelling and grammar mistakes). It has a clean bill of health, but never any revising of it.

In one edition they removed the apocrypha, which was between the OT and NT. It was always considered historic and never considered inspired. OT and NT, never gone thru any revision.

But, you should know this and probably were just asking a trick question.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 19:07

Quote:

No revisions, just editions (editing to fix some spelling and grammar mistakes). It has a clean bill of health, but never any revising of it

Those revisions are revisions just the same. Again... which KJV is the perfect one? Will the real KJV please stand up?

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/30 19:15

Hi Chris,

I'm trying to catch up on this thread, having been away.

In the meantime, please could you answer a very simple question for me?

Have you ever listened to the first half hour of Paul Washer's address to the Deeper Conference, (before his 'sermon' starts)? If not, please could you stop for half an hour and do so? It will assist our discussion, I believe.

Here it is: the portion ends with '... gospel. Eze 37...'
<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=17392>

Many thanks.

(If you recall the content, there is no need to listen again.)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 20:12

Hi Alive-to-God,

Yes, I have heard this message before. In fact, I am listening to it again right now.

I am not sure why you bring it up here except for, perhaps, the mention of his points about "truth" and "absolutes." Still, in this sense, I do agree with what Brother Paul is saying here.

I do hope that someone doesn't try to incorrectly read between the lines when I mention my concern for those who declare certain things to be "absolutes."

To be clear: I have no problem with declarations of ABSOLUTE TRUTH -- if they are indeed absolute truths. There are undeniable truths found in God's Word. These can be proclaimed boldly, without apology and with the realization that they are absolutely certain.

But this isn't what is going on here.

We are talking about whether or not someone has the right to enter a public forum and proclaim "absolutes" in regard to things that are OUTSIDE those absolute truths from God's Word. After all, there is a difference between "allegations" and "absolute truths."

In this thread, there have been some ALLEGATIONS presented as ABSOLUTES. For example:

- One version (and only one), the KJV, is being proclaimed as superior to all other versions of God's Word -- and even irrefutably "perfect" to the last jot and tittle.

- Translators (like Westcott, Hort and the translators of versions like the NIV and NASB) are alleged to have tampered with Scripture or had some ulterior motives for their choice of words.
- Some of those translators are alleged to have been less-than-godly men and rumors are repeated about what they believed or wanted to accomplish by their work.
- Entire text-types -- containing many copies of God's Word -- are being proclaimed as "fraudulent" and even "unholy."
- The motives of entire Bible societies are called into question as having possible "liberal" agendas.
- The methods by which texts are translated are condemned as inaccurate or, even, having devilish motives.

This list could go on (or be corrected, depending on the views of each person).

Do you see the difference between the absolutes of God's Word -- that are undeniable and PROVEN by the Word of God itself -- and how this differs from someone coming into this forum and loudly proclaiming AS AN ABSOLUTE a particular set of controversial doctrinal views, accusations, allegations, insinuations or even unsubstantiated claims?

In this thread, I am simply attempting to caution those who feel the impudence to proclaim things that just aren't verified by Scripture itself. In fact, I am also cautioning against proclaiming such things as "absolutes" that aren't even properly researched to begin with. In this case, we have some who are relying upon the research of others in order to repeat insinuations about translators, translation methods and textual accuracies and proclaim all other versions of the Bible to be "unholy."

Now, I have made it clear that I do not disagree with the right of someone to share a view in any matter.

But there is a difference between someone sharing their views on speaking in tongues -- and someone who comes in and proclaims their view of the subject as "absolute truth." The same can be said about every controversial subject that has even been argued here in this forum. Believers can share our views on such matters -- even controversial matters. But, our words should be seasoned with the knowledge of our own errancy and fallibility when it isn't completely proven by Scripture. After all, we are all currently confined to this side of Eternity...this side of the "glass darkly" where we still only know "in part" regarding some matters.

I have heard men stand up and proclaim as "undeniable" that the mark of the beast was some numeric code for the name "George Walker Bush." One of them sat in my living room and told me that the Scriptures revealed that we were in the middle of the great tribulation and that the physical return of Christ was to happen by the end of 2009. He explained that he is often rejected by "false believers" and "false churches" because they don't want to "hear the truth." So, he went about preaching this to anyone who would listen.

No matter how "certain" that he may have felt -- they should NOT have made such a proclamation. I am not saying that this brother didn't have a right to discuss it with others. Rather, he proclaimed a lie...and he did so thinking that it was a truth.

I later saw the brother who said Jesus was returning by the end of 2009. He never admitted that he was wrong. He just looked embarrassed and stated that his "calculations were slightly off." He is now trying to recalculate the return.

In this matter, I certainly do not embrace a proclamation that the KJV is the only "perfect and preserved" version of the Word of God. More importantly, I don't embrace the manner in which it is proclaimed. It is NOT absolutely true. It is highly interpretive (at best). Yet it is packaged and presented as an absolute truth...even with an admission that it hasn't been fully researched, tested or verified.

Do you see how a proclamation about the absolute supremacy of the KJV of the Bible over all other versions (including the Greek from which it was partially translated)...is quite different from proclaiming a Biblical absolute (e.g. that homosexuality is a sin, Jesus rose from the dead, water baptism is subsequent to salvation, Hell exists, etc...)?

These extra-biblical notions are the "absolutes" that I caution about. They just aren't the absolutely true. They aren't even embraced by many believers. Yet they are presented as if there is no reason to even discuss the matter -- because they truly feel that they are right and any discussion would thus be wrong.

There are undeniable and inarguable truths that should be proclaimed boldly, tirelessly and as often as possible. However, some sectarian notions that the KJV of the Scriptures is the ONLY holy version of the Word of God...or that the translators had ulterior motives...or rumors that some translators and textual critics were fraudulent believers...are NOT any of

them.

I hope that you understand what I am trying to say.

By the way, I appreciate the message that you recommended. I have heard it before...and it is a very timely and much needed word.

Re: Happy Birthday Tribute to the Lord for the KJV, on: 2011/3/30 20:39

A proclamation for all with deepest gratefulness to God.

Psa 12:6 The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.

Psa 12:7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

Psa 12:8 The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted.

I believe God's Words in the KJV are pure words, tried seven times. I believe the Lord has preserved His Word to us from generation to generation and we have it in the form of the KJV.

I believe God's promise, that He preserved His Word and I have no doubts at all about each jot and tittle that I read. I have complete confidence in His preserved Word.

If you don't have a Bible that you can say this about, you need to get with God and find that Bible, because He said, He would preserve His Word.

If you have a Bible that you can say that about, then God bless you. You need to have a Bible that you can believe without hesitation that it is the Lord's complete and preserved Word, down through the generations, to you.

What a mighty God we serve. Is anything too small for God?

I believe our Mighty God could even influence men through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to use the chapters and verses that He wanted. Why not? Is anything too hard for our God. It's all about faith brothers and about "seeing" and about being childlike, not about intellectualism and man's wisdom. Do you have this faith in the God of the Bible that you read and base your very existence now and eternally, on?

How could, God, even influence chapters and verses? I don't know, that's His business. He has a lot of gold nuggets like this in His Word where He delights in us finding them out. It speaks of His might and to us personally, that nothing happens to you, unless the Lord allows it. Look, at how He regards His Word even above His name. He watched over His Word and protected it through the centuries. Men have tried to tamper with it, but He would not allow it.

I do know that Isaiah has 66 chapters in it which may be the Lord's built in stamp on the canon of 66 books. Far-fetched? Here is something that you may find interesting and even be blessed by. The perfection of God's Word.

Isaiah has 66 chapters and the entire Bible has 66 books. The 66 chapters of Isaiah is said to be a miniature bible. And Looking at chapter 40 verse 3 we can associate that to book 40 (Matthew) chapter 3 where John the Baptist is identified as the voice in the wilderness spoken about in Isaiah 40:3. Still far fetched? Keep reading.

God is the divine engineer and could it be that He even inspired the men that divided up the Bible into chapters and verses? Of course!! He is in control of everything, especially when it comes to His Word. You should take comfort in the fact that even the smallest parts of our lives are very important to Him.

Look at Genesis 14 (note the number 14) and the 14th Epistle (Hebrews). The author writes in details on Melchizedek mentioned only twice in the OT.

Or, the Psalm 43 prayer is answered in Book 43, the Gospel of John. "Send thy light and thy truth"; "My Father hath sent me", "I am the Light of the world", "I am the Way the truth and the life".

Wow!! Is it possible, that the Lord Jehovah even supervised the ordering of the books? This must be a coincidence,

eh?

Back to Isaiah:

With its sixty-six chapters forming a one-to-one correspondence with the sixty-six books of the Bible, Isaiah presents a complete image of the Bible within the Bible. This idea is not new. Many previous authors have acknowledged the relation between Isaiah and the Bible. Consider these words from the Introduction to Isaiah found in Thomas Nelson's New King James Version:

Isaiah is like a miniature Bible. The first thirty-nine chapters (like the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament) are filled with judgment upon immoral idolatrous men. Judah has sinned; the surrounding nations have sinned; the whole earth has sinned. Judgment must come, for God cannot allow such blatant sin to go unpunished forever. But the final twenty-seven chapters (like the twenty-seven books of the New Testament) declare a message of hope. The Messiah is coming as a Savior and a Sovereign to bear a cross and to wear a crown.

The similarities and parallels between Isaiah's 66th chapter and the 66th book of the Bible have been well noted amongst scholars, but it still amazes me every time I think about it.

It is very appropriate for the last Chapter of the book of Isaiah to be tied thematically with the last book in the Bible, but what makes these connections so stunning is that reading Isaiah 66 is like reading a condensed version of Revelation. Look at these amazing similarities.

Isa. 66:1 Thus saith the LORD, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest?

Rev. 4:2 And immediately I was in the spirit: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and sat on the throne.

Isa. 66:3-4 He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol. Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations. I also will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because when I called, none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear: but they did evil before mine eyes, and chose that in which I delighted not.

Rev. 18: 4 And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

Rev. 18: 7 How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her: for she says in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow....9) And the kings of the earth, who have committed fornication and lived deliciously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning.

Isa. 66:6 A voice of noise from the city, a voice from the temple, a voice of the LORD that rendereth recompense to his enemies.

Rev. 11:19 And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament: and there were lightning's, and voices, and thundering, and an earthquake, and great hail.

Rev 16:1 And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth.

Isa. 66:7 Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a man child.

Rev. 12:2 And she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.... 5) And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and His throne.

Isa. 66:12 For thus saith the LORD, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream: then shall ye suck, ye shall be borne upon her sides, and be dandled upon her knees.

Rev. 21:24 And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory

ory and honor into it.

Rev. 22:1 And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb.

Isa. 66:15 For, behold, the LORD will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. . . . 16) For by fire and by his sword will the LORD plead with all flesh: and the slain of the LORD shall be many.

Rev. 9:9 And they had breastplates, as it were breastplates of iron; and the sound of their wings as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle. . . . 18) By these three was the third part of men killed, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone, which issued out of their mouths.

Isa. 66:18 For I know their works and their thoughts: it shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues; and they shall come, and see my glory.

Rev. 14:6 And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people,

Isa. 66:19 And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal, and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles.

Rev. 15:1 And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvelous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God.

Isa. 66:22 For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain.

Rev. 21: And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.

Isa. 66:23 And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD.

Rev. 15:4 Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest.

Isa. 66:24 And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.

Rev. 19:20-21 And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of Him that sat upon the horse, which proceeded out of his mouth (Jesus Christ): and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.

Did this bless you? It did me. Do you think we have an amazing God? Yes, He is amazing. He is Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God is He.

Ah Lord God, thou hast made the heavens and the earth by thy great power. Nothing is too difficult for thee, nothing is too difficult for thee, Ah, great and mighty God, great in power and mighty in deed, nothing, nothing, absolutely nothing, nothing is too difficult for thee.

HAPPY 400th BIRTHDAY to the AUTHORIZED KING JAMES BIBLE

and of course..... it is the Spirit that gives life, but His Words are spirit and they are life.

Alive-to-God,

Thanks for that sermon by Washer. Sophistry is the word I keyed in on.

Blessings to all,
777

Variants Image - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/30 21:13

Ok, here is something I just put together really quick. If you go to: <http://www.iamadisciple.com/articles/papers/Bible-Variants.jpg> you will see what a critical edition of the Greek New Testament looks like. If you've never seen this before, let me explain to you what is going on (as it is a little overwhelming at first). I've tried to color code things to help.

In the top part of the graphic, you have the Greek text that the United Bible Society has come to consensus on. In the bottom part, you have the foot notes indicating the variants of reading. In footnote 3, you see one of the variants for one phrase under dispute. I've highlighted this in yellow.

Reading the Variants:

Variant 1 -

The {B} symbol you see at first is the "grade" the scholars have given the variant, and the level of disagreement that exists between them. An "A" rating would indicate almost complete consensus, with "B" being strong support, and "C" being sharp disagreement.

Following this, you have one of the alternative Greek variants for verse 11. Immediately after that, you will see a Hebrew Symbol, Greek Letters, and a series of numbers. These represent the various manuscripts that have this particular variant in them. Generally speaking, letters represent the older texts, usually of the Alexandrian texts. I have drawn a black line on top of these Alexandrian texts. Numbers represent the individual manuscripts coming from the Majority texts that support this variant. I have drawn a black line underneath these Majority texts.

In the first variant in yellow, you will notice that this particular reading is supported by a variety of Alexandrian and Majority texts. It is also supported in other fragmented works.

Variant 2 - Highlighted in blue is another reading of the debated Greek phrase. Again, this alternative reading has support in some Alexandrian texts, but it also has support in the Majority texts. And this variant, supported by both text families, but agreeing with one another, disagree with the reading of Variant 1. Each text family has considerable agreement and disagreement with each other in these first two variants.

Variant 3 - Highlighted in green is another less attested reading of the debated Greek phrase, within the Alexandrian family. And within the Alexandrian family, there is at least one document where this third rendering actually is missing an entire word.

Which one is best? Well, because of tools like this, the scholars have empowered you to sort through the manuscripts and decide for yourself. In other words, you don't have to take the words of the "experts" and "scholars" for yourself. They are letting you make your own decision as to which rendering is best, and from there, you can establish your own translation. You can agree or disagree with them.

So, for those of you have never seen this sort of thing before with your own eyes, it is my hope that by exposing you to the actual Greek texts, that you can once and for all do away with silly arguments that amount to conspiracy theories. Because in the privacy of your own study, without even reading a word of Westcott and Hort, and knowing nothing of Erasmus, you can decide for yourself what is the best variant to use on any given verse, and translate the New Testament

tirely for yourself, without consulting anybody else whatsoever.

Re: Variants Image, on: 2011/3/30 21:20

Thanks for doing all of that, Jimmy! This may take some time, so be patient with me.

777

Re: Do New Versions have Greek Expository Dictionaries like Vine's., on: 2011/3/30 22:00

I have a question:

Do Modern Bible versions have Greek Expository Dictionaries for reference or Hebrew Lexicons.

For example. A Vine's for NASB or NIV or NKJV?

Is there a Strong's concordance equivalent? Hebrew Lexicon equivalent?

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 22:15

Hey I'm back now.

KingJimmy,

Quote:
-----While this is "a" factor in translation, it is not the only factor. After all, just because a there a thousand copies of a mistake doesn't make the mistake correct. One has to consider things like the immediate grammatical context (as in the essay I wrote, when deciding which variant was best). Is something better grammatically, i.e. tense, gender, plurality? Could the eye of the scribe slipped as he was copying, resulting in him copying a neighboring word twice? In theologically loaded passages, or passages that quote other verses of the Bible, does the variant seem to make something "more acceptable" and "softer?" Should a longer reading be preferred over a shorter reading?

Yes, as a matter of fact, some of these were my presuppositions that I didn't really elaborate on.

Quote:
-----Quote: Yes, I wholeheartedly believe that God's pure and holy word is in the KJV, with no mistakes. And if I might ask, what is the basis of this belief?

The basis of this belief is in the Scriptures. Ask yourself this question: did the apostles struggle with a belief that there were errors in the Bible they carried in their hands as they preached the gospel with the Lord Jesus Christ? God has clearly expounded in his Word time and again that "heaven and earth shall pass away but my WORDS shall not pass away." If his words (not message or ideas or meaning, but WORDS) have not passed away, and if you believe God meant what he said, where are his words today? Has God preserved his words in totality, without error (ie. perfection) today or not? If not, how do you back that up with Scripture? I am more than happy to show you the numerous references throughout the Scriptures that support my position, but I find none to support yours. Step back from the entire "textual criticism" aspect of things and ask yourself, do you believe God and his promise? If so, where is that perfect copy today? And if you do not believe him, why do you not? Why do you not believe that God can or would preserve His word in perfection for us all today? Why is that such an impossibility? Abraham asked the Lord thousands of years ago, Is anything too hard for the Lord? Do you believe this is something that is too hard for God to do? Especially when he promised he WOULD do such? I encourage you to meditate on this.....

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/30 22:26

777,
Great post! Thanks so much for the effort you put into it. It is quite a blessing, indeed. Very God-glorifying!

Re: Gail Riplinger - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2011/3/30 22:46

Gail Riplinger, author of New Age Bible Versions, and the more recent Hazardous Materials is not a Hebrew or Greek scholar. She can't even read Greek or Hebrew. Her degrees, her teaching, and her writing, are all in one area: interior design. Mrs. Riplinger did indeed teach at Kent State, but she did so in the Home Economics department, teaching classes in interior design. Here is what Wikipedia says about her:

In 1993, Riplinger wrote a comparison of modern Bible translations to the King James Version. She also wrote "The Language of the King James Bible", "Which Bible is God's Word" and "Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers".

Within her books, Riplinger has misquoted many different men in order to support her assertions, often using ellipses to hide the words that expose her misrepresentation. S. E. Schnaiter reviewed her book, New Age Bible Versions, in a published journal article. He stated, "Riplinger appears to be another of those who rush to defense, alarmed by the proliferation of its modern rivals, armed with nothing more than the blunderbuss of ad hominem apologetic, when what is needed is the keenness of incisive evaluation." He later stated, "For whatever rationale on Riplinger's part, she has produced not an exposé but rather a diatribe, often quite vitriolic, based on dogmatic, predispositional, and, more often than not, blatantly fallacious propaganda techniques rather than real evidence, carefully weighed and judiciously presented." She repeatedly misquotes, misrepresents, and inaccurately cites many people, including, Arthur Westcott, Brook Foss Westcott, Fenton John Anthony Hort, Kenneth Taylor, Wilbur Pickering, Norman Geisler, and many others.

James White has done a thorough critique of her and her work on his website:
<http://vintage.aomin.org/NABVR.html>

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2011/3/30 22:51

Quote:
-----The basis of this belief is in the Scriptures. Ask yourself this question: did the apostles struggle with a belief that there were errors in the Bible they carried in their hands as they preached the gospel with the Lord Jesus Christ? God has clearly expounded in his Word time and again that "heaven and earth shall pass away but my WORDS shall not pass away." If his words (not message or ideas or meaning, but WORDS) have not passed away, and if you believe God meant what he said, where are his words today? Has God preserved his words in totality, without error (ie. perfection) today or not? If not, how do you back that up with Scripture? I am more than happy to show you the numerous references throughout the Scriptures that support my position, but I find none to support yours. Step back from the entire "textual criticism" aspect of things and ask yourself, do you believe God and his promise? If so, where is that perfect copy today? And if you do not believe him, why do you not? Why do you not believe that God can or would preserve His word in perfection for us all today? Why is that such an impossibility? Abraham asked the Lord thousands of years ago, Is anything too hard for the Lord? Do you believe this is something that is too hard for God to do? Especially when he promised he WOULD do such? I encourage you to meditate on this.....

Praise God brother!

This is the very reason I can not and will not accept the modern versions over the KJV because no human being on earth being an expert or a novice can ever convince me that God almighty would allow us to have an incorrect bible for almost 300 years before He could find someone smart enough to get us the right one's.

Blessings to you brother and the diligence of 777.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 22:58

Hi rbanks...

Quote:

This is the very reason I can not and will not accept the modern versions over the KJV because no human being on earth being an expert or a novice can ever convince me that God almighty would allow us to have an incorrect bible for almost 300 years before He could find someone smart enough to get us the right one's.

What about the ~1600 years from the time of Christ until the King James Version? If you don't think that God would allow 300 years go by without a "perfect" translation, then what about all of those years when the sources that the King James Version relied upon weren't unified (or in total agreement)?

I am just amazed that many people will embrace the work of the translators of the KJV (well, minus the Apocrypha that it originally contained and after all of the revisions between 1611 and 1769)...but will not believe what the translators themselves wrote in their preface. They stated that, although an honest attempt, it wasn't a "perfect" work.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 23:07

Hi TrueWitness,

I don't know whether all of the allegations written about Gail Riplinger are true. Oddly enough, I first read them in King James-only websites.

But, like the allegations raised by Gail Riplinger herself regarding Westcott, Hort and the translators of the NASB and NIV, I think that it is best to contact her and ask if anyone feels the need.

Now, she may not respond to questions about those allegations. She did write a response to some allegations posed by another KJV-only website. Her response, however, didn't include any answer to the specific allegations.

However, I still think that it is best to not believe any of those things until AFTER she has an opportunity to answer them anyway...or (in regard to the nature of her work) until we have actually read her own firsthand works and the validity of those things for ourselves.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2011/3/30 23:25

Hi Chris,

It is not the perfection of a translation that concerns me but the leaving out of words and entire verses.

Lets just take phil 4.13 for an example. Let say you wanted to just meditate on this scripture in your mind or even say it out loud. Now let's be honest, which had you rather hear or meditate on "Christ who gives me strength" or "him who gives me strength". What about col. 1.14 where it mentions "redemption through His blood" or just "redemption" and why would God not want us to think on Christ giving us strength or redemption through His blood.

I know you will be honest because I believe you to be that type of person.

Blessings to you!

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/30 23:35

Quote:
-----by ccchhhrrriiisss... What about the ~1600 years from the time of Christ until the King James Version? If you don't think that God would allow 300 years go by without a "perfect" translation, then what about all of those years when the sources that the King James Version relied upon weren't unified (or in total agreement)?

I agree! It's like some folks just choose to skip over the 1600 years, or they don't want to consider anything previous to the KJV. This is interesting, The KJV is an EXCELLENT translation, but not the ONLY excellent translation. In over 90 percent of the New Testament, readings are identical word-for-word, regardless of the family. Of the remaining ten percent, MOST of the differences between the texts are fairly irrelevant, such as calling the Lord "Christ Jesus" instead of "Jesus Christ," or putting the word "the" before a noun. Less than two percent would significantly alter the meaning of a passage, and NONE of them would contradict or alter any of the basic points of Christian doctrine. What we have, then, is a dispute concerning less than one-half of one percent of the Bible. The other 99.5% we all agree on!

Because there are over 14,000 manuscript copies of the New Testament we can absolutely be confident of its accuracy. With this large number of manuscripts, comparing manuscripts easily reveals any place where a scribe has made an error or where there is a variation. There are approximately 150,000 variations in the manuscripts we have today. However, these variations represent only 10,000 places in the New Testament (if the same word was misspelled in 3,000 manuscripts, that is counted as 3,000 variations.) Of these 10,000 places, all but 400 are questions of spelling in accord with accepted usage, grammatical construction, or order of words. Of the remaining variations, only 50 are of significance (such as two manuscripts leaving out Acts 2:37). But of these 50, not one alters even one article of faith which cannot be abundantly sustained by other undoubted passages. There are some manuscripts that date as early as 130 AD, very close to the completion of the New Testament. These manuscripts are nearly identical to those dating 900 years later, thus verifying the accuracy of the scribes.

These advocates reject all other Bibles that post-date the KJV.

They believe that the KJV is not only inspired in the original language, but also in the translation process.

This claim of an inspired translation process is not made for any other Bible translation.

Only a very tiny fraction of people who use the KJV actually believe that the translation process was inspired by the Holy Spirit.

The KJV is to be classed as one of several major standards of Bible translations including, NASB, RSV, NKJV, ASV, NIV. All these translations are equal in quality and all should be used for Bible study.

The TR itself was based on a very few, late scripts, not one of which contained the entire Greek New Testament and none earlier than the 12th century. In the matter of the book of Revelation, a missing page was translated from the Latin Vulgate BACK to the Greek. Acts 9:6 although found in the Latin Vulgate, and thus the TR is found in no Greek manuscript at all. In light of its obvious shortcomings, a greater number of older and more complete manuscripts were used in the translation of subsequent versions.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/30 23:55

Hi rbanks...

Thank you for your kind words. Sometimes, I really do feel misunderstood in what I am trying to say. I am not saying these things to be contemptuous. And, I don't mind it if someone still chooses to prefer the KJV as a more accurate or scholarly translation.

I am more concerned about the reasoning that is sometimes used when declaring it to be the only "perfect" version...or the conclusive statements made where there may not have been enough research to make such definitive final verdicts on the matter.

Sometimes, I think that refraining from a final decision on a matter is much better than making a hasty (or incorrect) decision.

By the way, I certainly understand your point and concerns. However, the fact remains that the translators/translation could not have "left out" words or phrases that just weren't found in the ancient source texts and manuscripts that they felt are most reliable.

As Jimmy pointed out, we can no more say that the translators of the NIV "left out" words than we can claim that the tran

slators of the KJV "added" them to their translation.

Yes, I understand that the word "Christ" in Philippians 4:13 is stronger sounding -- because it includes a title of our Lord. Yet, I know who the "Him" is in the NIV and NASB (and other) versions is referring to. It is "Him" -- Christ Jesus our Lord and Savior - the King of Kings and Lord of Lords -- that this pronoun refers to.

Again, it is difficult to assume that this word was "left out" if the word itself just wasn't in the ancient texts used by the translators (or those that may have been deemed as most reliable). But more importantly: How many of those who are very concerned about the difference in this particular passage have actually contacted the translators or Bible societies and asked just why it doesn't appear?

The Lord bless you too, rbanks.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 0:46

Yes, that is true, Chris. Very fair minded of you about Gail. I have read her whole book and she has a bibliography and accounts for sourcing of each statment that makes Wikipedia look like child's play.

She does not need anyone to defend her, that's for sure. She does quite well herself, but also does not think that she has to defend herself on every little thing that is being said about her. She defends her work, and is not really worried about defending herself.

James White said many things and I won't characterize them, but Mrs. Riplinger wrote a very good rebuttal that I don't believe has been answered.

She does not hide anything and on this link you will find the James White controversy that she publishes. You and others can read for yourself how he carried himself. On the same page, she answers David Cloud.

I have read all of this and James White's critique and David Cloud's critique and it is very interesting. You (meaning anyone) can learn a lot from it.

I thank God for people that have not just accepted the status quo (many publishers wish the controversy would go away), otherwise many of us would not have learned what we have learned and we all would have let the KJV die and just been happy reading versions where we would keep accepting progressive changes here and there every year or so.

<http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/resources.html>

You can wrap all of these Bibles into one today for they exist and you would have a Homosexual friendly, green bible that is concerned about climate change, gender neutral, and soon to be animal friendly.

If you like your Bible keep a close eye on it, NASB, NKJV, NIV, NKJV, RSV, ESV, etc, etc. Not to mention new versions of them. They may be going through more changes. The KJV won't be going through any changes.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/31 1:47

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

Yes, that is true, Chris. Very fair minded of you about Gail. I have read her whole book and she has a bibliography and accounts for sourcing of each statement that makes Wikipedia look like child's play.

She does not need anyone to defend her, that's for sure. She does quite well herself, but also does not think that she has to defend herself on every little thing that is being said about her. She defends her work, and is not really worried about defending herself.

James White said many things and I won't characterize them, but Mrs. Riplinger wrote a very good rebuttal that I don't believe has been answered.

Thanks. I don't feel a need to delve too deeply into all of those allegations about her. I understand what is said about her, but I would withhold any consideration about the validity of those things or repeating them in public until I have taken the time to contact her about them (if I felt the need).

However, I also think that it would be good if Gail Riplinger urged and displayed the same caution about accusatory rhetoric toward certain textual critics and translators as she and her defenders would have everyone else show toward her.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/31 5:51

This thread moves quick, so I thought I'd preposterous a post from earlier. I would really encourage you to check out the link containing a copy of the critical Greek text I put together. It will explain once and for all why different versions of the Bible have some disagreements with each other.

Ok, here is something I just put together really quick. If you go to: <http://www.iamadisciple.com/articles/papers/Bible-Variants.jpg> you will see what a critical edition of the Greek New Testament looks like. If you've never seen this before, let me explain to you what is going on (as it is a little overwhelming at first). I've tried to color code things to help.

In the top part of the graphic, you have the Greek text that the United Bible Society has come to consensus on. In the bottom part, you have the foot notes indicating the variants of reading. In footnote 3, you see one of the variants for one phrase under dispute. I've highlighted this in yellow.

Reading the Variants:

Variant 1 -

The {B} symbol you see at first is the "grade" the scholars have given the variant, and the level of disagreement that exists between them. An "A" rating would indicate almost complete consensus, with "B" being strong support, and "C" being sharp disagreement.

Following this, you have one of the alternative Greek variants for verse 11. Immediately after that, you will see a Hebrew Symbol, Greek Letters, and a series of numbers. These represent the various manuscripts that have this particular variant in them. Generally speaking, letters represent the older texts, usually of the Alexandrian texts. I have drawn a black line on top of these Alexandrian texts. Numbers represent the individual manuscripts coming from the Majority texts that support this variant. I have drawn a black line underneath these Majority texts.

In the first variant in yellow, you will notice that this particular reading is supported by a variety of Alexandrian and Majority texts. It is also supported in other fragmented works.

Variant 2 - Highlighted in blue is another reading of the debated Greek phrase. Again, this alternative reading has support in some Alexandrian texts, but it also has support in the Majority texts. And this variant, supported by both text families, but agreeing with one another, disagree with the reading of Variant 1. Each text family has considerable agreement and disagreement with each other in these first two variants.

Variant 3 - Highlighted in green is another less attested reading of the debated Greek phrase, within the Alexandrian family. And within the Alexandrian family, there is at least one document where this third rendering actually is missing an entire word.

Which one is best? Well, because of tools like this, the scholars have empowered you to sort through the manuscripts and decide for yourself. In other words, you don't have to take the words of the "experts" and "scholars" for yourself. They are letting you make your own decision as to which rendering is best, and from there, you can establish your own translation. You can agree or disagree with them.

So, for those of you have never seen this sort of thing before with your own eyes, it is my hope that by exposing you to the actual Greek texts, that you can once and for all do away with silly arguments that amount to conspiracy theories. Because in the privacy of your own study, without even reading a word of Westcott and Hort, and knowing nothing of Eras

mus, you can decide for yourself what is the best variant to use on any given verse, and translate the New Testament entirely for yourself, without consulting anybody else whatsoever.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/31 7:16

Chris

Maybe my last post or so, was not clear. Why do you think the non TR family of texts are more reliable? You have said that the translators have deemed them most reliable. What do you think?

JB

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 8:32

Well, all I can say Chris, is that Gail Riplinger's book, "New Age Bible Versions", has been in the public domain now since 1993. Almost 20 years.

Her bibliography is very extensive. Her "rhetoric" includes sourcing for even Westcott/Hort. She has not done anything in the dark and people are free to go to her website and even contact her.

You don't sound like you have read the book.

Anyway, have a good, day.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 8:38

****UPDATE****

JB, some things just don't pass the "simplicity" test.

Don't you think this subject has been made difficult to make people feel like they could never understand the issues? So, we should just lap up what we are spoon fed and stop asking questions?

I appreciate the various authors that condescend to the public by taking the time to explain it. I think one of the things that has made it complex is the confusion that has been introduced by the Jesuit manuscripts, otherwise known as Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

One thing that is seldom talked about in these discussions is the role of spiritual warfare. And, what role do people think the powers of darkness play in this saga called, protecting and preserving God's Word?

Or, does everyone just think this is purely an "intellectual" battle and the Enemy of God, just doesn't have time to trifle with such things?

Re: The Crux of the Matter - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/31 9:13

Textual criticism can go on and on and on...but it's necessary to get down to the bottom line. This post got pushed down, but I would like to hear an answer. KingJimmy and/or Chris and anybody else, what do you say?

Quote:
-----Quote: Quote: Yes, I wholeheartedly believe that God's pure and holy word is in the KJV, with no mistakes. And if I might ask, what is the basis of this belief?

Quote:
-----The basis of this belief is in the Scriptures. Ask yourself this question: did the apostles struggle with a belief that there were errors in the Bible they carried in their hands as they preached the gospel with the Lord Jesus Christ? God has clearly expounded in his Word time and again that "heaven and earth shall pass away but my WORDS shall not pass away." If his words (not message or ideas or meaning, but WORDS) have not passed away, then the Bible is the Word of God.

ssed away, and if you believe God meant what he said, where are his words today? Has God preserved his words in totality, without error (ie. perfection) today or not? If not, how do you back that up with Scripture? I am more than happy to show you the numerous references throughout the Scriptures that support my position, but I find none to support yours. Step back from the entire "textual criticism" aspect of things and ask yourself, do you believe God and his promise? If so, where is that perfect copy today? And if you do not believe him, why do you not? Why do you not believe that God can or would preserve His word in perfection for us all today? Why is that such an impossibility? Abraham asked the Lord thousands of years ago, Is anything too hard for the Lord? Do you believe this is something that is too hard for God to do? Especially when he promised he WOULD do such? I encourage you to meditate on this...

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/31 9:23

KingJimmy,

While your post is very interesting and scholarly, it doesn't seem very scriptural. Take your quote:

Quote:
-----Which one is best? Well, because of tools like this, the scholars have empowered you to sort through the manuscripts and decide for yourself. In other words, you don't have to take the words of the "experts" and "scholars" for yourself. They are letting you make your own decision as to which rendering is best, and from there, you can establish your own translation. You can agree or disagree with them.

This is nothing else than "every man did that which was right in his own eyes." It comes back to the fact that we need a STANDARD. Without a standard, confusion abounds. Otherwise, every man's interpretation would be good enough for him, but WHAT DOES GOD SAY??

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 9:43

That is exactly correct, rusaved1.

And every translator is doing what seems "good" to them, too.

That is why we have this controversy, about God's written words.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/31 12:23

Hi JB1968...

Quote:

Chris

Maybe my last post or so, was not clear. Why do you think the non TR family of texts are more reliable? You have said that the translators have deemed them most reliable. What do you think?

I thought that I made it exceedingly clear enough for you in my response to your previous question:

Quote:

I mentioned this several times previously in this thread, as did KingJimmy and someone else.

First of all, it is unreasonable to assume that they "omitted" anything. The source texts and manuscripts that the translators used and considered to be most reliable typically did not have those words or phrases to begin with. So, they weren't "omitting" something if it wasn't there in the text to begin with. Remember: The translators of the NIV didn't consult the text of the KJV. So, there was no cross comparison for reasons of authenticity.

In addition, I think that you should contact the translators and text experts themselves for that answer (which is what I have been urging all along). You can easily contact the organizations that translated the NIV or NASB. You can contact textual critics and experts in ancient languages and manuscripts to ascertain their views on which manuscripts and text-types are most (or more) reliable. I can tell you what I have learned...but I should be no more trusted than any other "hearsay" source.

I will say this: The translators, text critics and language/manuscript experts that I spoke with each seemed to echo one another with a view that the manuscripts of the Alexandrian text-type are much older than those in the Byzantine text-type. They are written in different period languages -- with the many of the manuscripts and texts of the Alexandrian text-type being written in Koine Greek (which is the "Biblical Greek" of the time of Christ and the apostles). Moreover, many of them explained a belief (for several reasons) that the text of the Byzantine text-type was descended from the text of the Alexandrian text-type. I don't have any specific anecdotes for this view that were provided to me on this particular computer, but I can provide them to you at a later time.

Very importantly, I have tried to make it clear that I do NOT accept the premise that the Alexandrian text-types are superior to the Byzantine text-types (or other...or vice versa). I simply understand the views and perspectives of the majority of text critics, scholars and language/manuscript experts who happen to hold to this particular view. Many of their points do make a lot of sense.

I have no problem saying that I do not embrace one text source as irrefutably superior to the other. In fact, I realize that Erasmus had to sort through texts to come up with his own wording. I suspect that others have always had to do the same. After all, we do not have the actual articles written by the apostles in front of us. They have been translated many times over about two thousand years.

This is why I have no problem with embracing the KJV as a good, reliable translation from its set of sources. I embrace the NASB as a good, reliable translation from its set of sources. I embrace the NIV as a good, reliable translation from its set of sources. I also use a few others, including one in Spanish that predates the KJV.

When I study God's Word, I often read the KJV or NIV. If I feel the need, I will consult other versions. In fact, I have discovered that I do this quite a bit on my Nook (eReader) and via www.biblegateway.com. It just offers a unique perspective from various translators as they translated from their sources.

I hope this helps. I do urge you to contact those translators and scholars if you have the opportunity. They may tell you what they have explained to me. They may tell you something else that you could share here too.

May the Lord bless you.

First, I never said that I personally think that the non-TR family of ancient manuscripts are necessarily more reliable. I simply said that I understand the view of the vast majority of translators, textual critics and language/manuscript experts who consider the manuscripts of the Alexandrian text-type to be more reliable.

I explained (in a nut shell) why this was so several times in several posts within this thread. They view those manuscripts to be more reliable than Erasmus's TR (or the Byzantine text-type manuscripts from which it was largely gathered). Most of the manuscripts are much older. Many are written in Biblical Koine Greek (opposed to the Medieval Greek of Byzantine text type). Early leaders of the various churches appear to have quoted directly from them. Moreover and most importantly, most text experts believe that later texts and manuscripts were derived from the manuscripts in the Alexandrian text-type.

As I have said, I think that the BEST thing for you -- in order to verify what I am saying -- is to contact those sources themselves. You can contact the translators, language/manuscript experts and Bible societies. You can even read the writings of dead text critics and language experts (like Westcott and Hort) to find out what they really believed.

And, importantly, you can read the writings of Erasmus and the translators of the King James Version. I believe that those translators would have consulted those other texts if they had been readily available to them. Even in their preface, the translators of the KJV stated their directive: "Out of the Original Sacred Tongues, together with comparing of the labours, both in our own and other foreign languages, of many worthy men who went before us, there should be one more exact translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue." In other words, they consulted and compared multiple texts and already existent versions during the completion of their work.

In fact, the translators -- even in their preface -- admitted to having to use personal judgment and consensus to translate ideas because they couldn't just translate it word for word...and when the sources that were consulted often differed. They said, "Another thing we think good to admonish thee of (gentle Reader) that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere, have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified that same in both places (for there be some words that be not the same sense everywhere) we were especially careful, and made a conscience, according to our duty."

JB1968, I hope that you understand that I am not proclaiming one set of sources as necessarily superior to others. I am just saying that most text experts, manuscript experts, scholars, language experts and translators feel a certain way...an

d they give ample reasons for it. I do suggest that you contact them and allow them to tell you what they feel and why they feel that way. This would be much better than me trying to convey what they have written or what they have told me in our correspondence.

I hope that this is a little more clear.

Re: king Janes Debate, on: 2011/3/31 12:36

Guys! Guys! Guys! Brothers some sanity please. You have been at this for weeks. Why not agree to disagree and get about the business of winning the lost. Besides what does this have to do with revival? Why not focus on and encouraging and edifying one another. Are we not to draw the sword to fight the devil not one another? I implore you please put this controversy to rest.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/31 12:41

Hi anonymous777...

Yes, I have read through her books...but it has been a while. I know that I disagree with what she says. I am thinking about contacting her. I don't really feel a need to ask her about all of the allegations that have been spoken about her or questions about her credibility. I know that even some other KJV-only have "broken ties" with her because of those things (and some even provide scanned and photocopied "evidence" in an effort to validate their claims). However, I am not really interested in those things.

Rather, I would prefer to ask her about questions regarding her claims about her educational background, claims of being an "expert" and the extent of her research into many of these matters. I would also like to read her books again. Unfortunately, they aren't found at any of the Stanford University libraries or in any of our local libraries. I don't think that I feel comfortable enough to actually purchase those things either. I may try to find a copy online or for my eReader. I would like to just look at her "extensive" bibliography and see just what she bases her opinions upon.

Like I said, I don't feel a need to delve too deeply into all of those specific allegations about her. Although some of those things are very serious, I would certainly withhold any consideration about the validity of those things or repeating them in public until after I have taken the time to contact her about them if I ever felt the need.

But, again, I think that it would be good if Gail Riplinger displayed the same caution about accusatory rhetoric toward certain textual critics and translators as she would have everyone else show toward her in light to the allegations that are repeated even amongst KJV-only organizations, advocates and websites.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 12:41

Does anyone think we possess the inerrant Word of God to us, today? Chris, bilpro, martyr??

Martyr, this is a "family" discussion and it most certainly concerns the lost, and many other important subjects. Do you mind if we continue to talk about this?

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/3/31 13:14

Quote:
-----Guys! Guys! Guys! Brothers some sanity please. You have been at this for weeks. Why not agree to disagree and get about the business of winning the lost. Besides what does this have to do with revival? Why not focus on and encouraging and edifying one another. Are we not to draw the sword to fight the devil not one another? I implore you please put this controversy to rest.

martyr,

This is important, really. It has been said that the battleground for truth is the bloodiest battle ever fought and has lasted the longest of every other battle-it's still going on today! It started with the serpent in Gen 3 with "Yea hath God said...?" It is Satan who tries to take away the word (Mark 4), so I'm very concerned about anyone trying to take it from me or any one else for that matter.

We're not fighting one another; we're fighting for the truth.

If you want to settle for an average Christian life, then choose an average Bible. But if you're talking about revival, if you're talking about God coming down, if you're talking about a pure church, if you're talking about a holy bride, if you're looking for God to do something great in your life, then why would you settle for anything less than God's best and perfect (holy) word??

As 777 said, you are what you eat.

Taking a stand for righteousness (what is right) is not popular today, but it's desperately needed. Don't expect revival to come unless God's people want to do right IN EVERY MATTER.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/31 13:28

Thanks Chris,
A lot to weed through. Have been busy, but I was wanting to know your opinion, rather than the experts. You seem to think that both are good reliable texts, and one is not necessarily superior to the other. Is this right?
Thanks,
JB

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/31 13:34

Quote:

Does anyone think we possess the inerrant Word of God to us, today? Chris, bilpro, martyr??

Yes, but the inerrant Word of God is NOT confined to the KJV of the Scriptures. Even the translators of the KJV emphatically stated as much.

BTW, I do understand martyr's concern.

Such discussions have a tendency to turn into a never-ending "back and forth" that can serve as a distraction to not only young believers -- but those who participate in the discussion.

However, I feel prompted to respond to those claims from those who feel a need to publicly declare their view as "absolute." This is especially true when any attempt to test or question such "absolute" public claims -- including the research, logic or evidence that is called into question -- are met with very adamant disdain.

I just do not think that it is wise for people to make absolute claims about this matter.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/31 13:34

King Jimmy,
There seems to be little difference in the variance. Right? Refresh my Greek. What is the reference.
Thanks,
JB

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/31 14:10

Hi JB1968...

Quote:

A lot to weed through. Have been busy, but I was wanting to know your opinion, rather than the experts. You seem to think that both are good reliable texts, and one is not necessarily superior to the other. Is this right?

My opinion is first and foremost that most people who are heavily engaged in this topic just don't know what the experts think about this...but only the innuendos that many KJV-only books and websites have made about what those experts think.

Instead of relying on what others SAY that those sources think of the matter, we should go to them and ask (whenever possible) or read their own works firsthand.

As for my opinions:

I think that the source texts are simply what they are -- source texts. Erasmus had a limited selection of later Byzantine Greek texts that came from what is now described as the Byzantine text-type. He didn't even have an entire version of the New Testament. He did the best that he could with the texts that were available to him.

About a hundred years later, the translators of the KJV relied heavily -- but NOT exclusively -- upon Erasmus's translation of those many Byzantine text-type manuscripts. However, they consulted other versions and translations too (including some in other languages). They also consulted other texts as well. Sometimes, the translators had a tough job when deciding upon certain phrases and words. Those translators did not always agree, but reached a consensus according to their responsibility within the text. I feel that those KJV translators did the best that they could with the texts that were available to them == and they explained what their conclusions in the preface to the original 1611 editions.

Most scholars today have even older manuscripts available - many of which were written in the actual New Testament language of Koine Greek. The vast majority of scholars and translators prefer many of those manuscripts over the later Byzantine text-type manuscripts for diverse reasons (that I mentioned previously...especially a belief that the later Byzantine texts were actually derived from the older Alexandrian texts) -- but they consulted those Byzantine texts nonetheless.

So, my ultimate conclusion in the matter is that I simply understand the various views on the matter. There is no "war" between the translators of the KJV and others. There is no war between Byzantine text-type versus Alexandrian text-type. There was no conspiracy by translators of the NIV or NASB to "change" or "omit" words from the KJV. Those translators simply wanted to create a modern translation in today's English from the best sources available today. Nothing more. Nothing less. The only "war" that seems to exist appears to be the one that is loudly proclaimed by the more adamant KJV-only advocates.

My conclusion, so to speak, is quite simple.

I cannot claim with absolute authority the supremacy of one version, translation, set of texts or set of manuscripts as invariably superior to all others.

I also feel a need to question the rationale, logic, "evidence" and "research" of those who feel the need to wage their very public war on other translations that are not the KJV. I have no problem with those who feel the KJV is superior, better or even those who would believe it to be the only "perfect" edition of God's Word. However, I do have a problem when they feel that they must loudly proclaim -- without any doubt in their words -- that all other views are "unholy," "devilish," or part of some Satanic conspiracy.

Why even discuss this?

In the past nearly eight years that I have been a part of SermonIndex, we have occasionally had brethren who felt so strongly opinionated about a particular subject that they would announce it to be the only acceptable or Biblical opinion.

Like I said before, there is a need for the preaching of Biblical truth. However, I think that our understanding of "truth" is sometimes skewed. This leads to disputes when individuals proclaim certain sectarian views as the only ones worth considering. Sometimes, any questioning of the presented opinion is met with hostility -- even if the "testing" of those teachings are done in honesty and humility. People argue over music, calvinism (or its alternatives), the extent of the gifts of the Spirit, eschatology, Bible prophecy, particular measures of modesty, politics and, of course, the most correct Bible version(s).

I think that all of these things are perfectly acceptable things that can and, if necessary, should be discussed. However, I think that we need to be very careful about making loud proclamations of one particular view as "truth." I mean, we are n't talking about undeniable doctrines of the faith. We are talking about sectarian views that are chronically discussed... and argued...and discussed...and argued over and over again.

In this case, I do not believe that a person should enter a public forum like this and proclaim the KJV to be the ONLY acceptable version of the Bible. They may believe it. They may base their belief on whatever research that they base the belief upon. However, it just isn't necessary to proclaim it in a manner as if it were beyond dispute. Moreover, no one should become upset if their claims, evidence and research are tested and scrutinized. In fact, we should WELCOME it when anyone wants to test the evidence upon which we personally arrived to our opinions. After all, others may be equipped to help us in our never-ending search for the truth in such matters.

Anyway, I digress (and apologize). I didn't mean to write another long post. I just hope that you understand where I am coming from. Thank you for your prayers.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 14:29

****UPDATE****

Chris, are you a Bible Agnostic? Just asking. A lot of Christians today don't believe in the Inerrant Word of God.

It may not be wise in your estimation to declare absolutes, however, my all-wise Father declares absolutes about His Word being pure and preserved. It is downright foolish, to not believe that God can preserve, His inerrant Word to us. Your philosophy of all of this in my opinion is ever shifting sand depending on the latest translator.

Here is an absolute for you. Modern Bible Versions will continue to change!

I don't put much stock in education when it changes "corrupt the Word of God" to "peddle the word of God". In the Greek that underlines the KJV, it is corrupt, adulterate, not peddle.

The Publishers peddle the word for \$\$\$\$\$ and the corruption continues to take place for \$\$\$\$\$. Sell, sell, sell.

2Co 2:17 For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.

Joh 10:27 My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me:

Joh 10:5 And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers.

These Modern Versions of the Bible are "strangers" to me and many that know the voice of the Father and how He speaks about His Son. He does not communicate this way. His voice is changing and many of us recognize the change. It is the voice of someone else.

The image of Jesus as God Incarnate, the Christ, the Holy One of God and ONLY Son of God, are slowly being removed.

Yes, all of these most important descriptive words of Jesus. The Cross, the Centrality of the Christian Life and the Blood that was shed for us, by our loving Saviour, whose very title of Saviour is even being removed along with Cross and Blood.

Sure, you can still recognize Jesus in some of today's modern versions, but you have no assurance that the Textual Criticism and tampering with God's Word by the "educated, scholars" is going to cease. Do you? Do you, Chris. You cannot say absolutely will complete assurance that God's Word which you love, will stop changing. That is sad.

All you need now is a tiny preposition to be removed and you will not have "the Savior", but "a Savior", not "the God" but "a god". Welcome to Satan's One World Order and Religion.

If what has happened in our present day modern Bible versions is any indication, then that is where we are heading brothers and sisters. Our Bibles will finally be pleasing to the world.

The KJV contains the TRUTH of God and it will become anathema to the religious world that is embracing the spirit of this age which is being reflected in Modern Bible versions. They will say it is intolerant and hateful and why don't you use the modern version or that one. They will try to eradicate all hateful books and chief on the list will be the KJV. The KJV will not be hated because it has some archaic words in it, it will be hated because it exalts Jesus Christ, His Blood, His Cross, and His Incarnation.

And WHO do you really think is behind all of this?

Some of you need a couple more Bible revisions to really see the light. My fear is that as the spirit of the age/world infiltrates translation committees that the same spirit of the age will be influencing Christians at the same speed, along the way. And in that way, the "Christian" will never really notice the glaring corruption of their new bible versions. They will be walking in lockstep with the spirit of the age that is also influencing mere men, on committees. And they will think that the new Bibles are becoming more "relevant".

The all important question to ask yourself is this: Are you a Bible Believer or a Bible Agnostic?

May God be pleased to open the blind eyes and grant His gift of faith to believe the greatest Book on the earth, the Authorized King James Holy Bible.

Accepted in the Beloved, - Ephesians 1:6, (not bestowed upon)

Thank you Jesus that we are Accepted in the Beloved.

Inerrancy of Scriptures:

<http://av1611.com/forums/showthread.php?t=398>

Rebuttal to James White's "The King James Only Controversy".

This is another rebuttal by George R. Theiss.

<http://www.tulipgems.com/WhichBible5.htm>

Gail Riplinger has her own rebuttal on her site and in printed form that you can get at www.avpublications.com.

James White's critique is here:

<http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/CriticsCritiqued.html>

I encourage you to read James White's critique, also.

www.aomin.org

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/31 14:46

Quote:

Chris, are you a Bible Agnostic?

That is uncalled for.

Please refrain from such incendiary language. And, please refrain from repeatedly putting words in my mouth.

I do believe that God has eternally preserved His Word -- but it isn't called the King James Version. It existed for the approximate 1600 years before the KJV was completed. In fact, God's Word is eternal.

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men." John 1:1-4

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 14:47

Quote:

-----Chris, are you a Bible Agnostic?

i will EXULT when the moderators finally step in and shut down this unfruitful, unprofitable, divisive and unseemly thread.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/31 14:51

Chris,
I understand how you came to your conclusions. I just wanted to know your own view, rather than the experts. Discussions like these can be good if every one can think sensibly, and if need be "agree to disagree".
Thanks,
JB

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 14:52

Bible Agnostic is not incendiary. You are getting melodramatic again. It means, you don't necessarily know if the Word is inerrant or not today.

Let me rephrase.

Is God mighty enough to preserve His inerrant Word and deliver it to us today? And has He? Which version is it?

If your answer is No, thank you, I have no further comments.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/3/31 14:58

It is uncalled for.

Quote:

-----That is uncalled for.

Quote:

-----Please refrain from such incendiary language. And, please refrain from repeatedly putting words in my mouth.

Quote:

----- I do believe that God has eternally preserved His Word -- but it isn't called the King James Version. It existed for the approximate 1600 years before the KJV was completed. In fact, God's Word is eternal.

In this case Chris is right. God's Word is eternal. It was originally written in Hebrew and Greek. English, Spanish, Swahili, and what have you are all translations. But God preserves His Word in each language. That is the mystery of it all. The Bible IS the written Word of God, not just containing the Word of God.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 15:02

so full of fleshly pride and tightly wrapped religion.

I AM GETTING SO SICK OF RELIGION, "religion" has NOTHING to do with God, with Faith, with Jesus Messiah and Him crucified.

NOTHING!

i see stuff like i'm going to quote and i see the same poisonous, tightly wrapped religiousity that propels islamic jihadi's to kill each other. the only reason some of yall dont do that, is one, you'll go to jail, and two, you aint got no stones, hiding behind a computer keyboard.

Quote:
-----This is important, really. It has been said that the battleground for truth is the bloodiest battle ever fought and has lasted the longest of every other battle-it's still going on today!

yeh! "really".

Quote:
-----We're not fighting one another; we're fighting for the truth.

bovine scat, you're fighting one another, dont attach such noble motives to this cyber scat.

Quote:
-----If you want to settle for an average Christian life, then choose an average Bible.

just garbage. moderators, dont you think its time to put this sad spectacle out of its misery?

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 15:04

Yes, JB, that is the mystery of it all.

My apologies to Chris in particular if Bible Agnostic was offensive. It would not have been to me. It is a short way of asking what your views are on inerrancy, but obviously it was a bad choice of words.

Apologies to all if this was offensive to anyone else, also.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 15:05

i read, eat of the ESV, anonymous 777...you got a problem with that?

anything slanderous, accusatory you want to tar me with?

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 15:08

No, Neil, you can eat whatever you like.

I am questioning if Bible Versions are ever going to stop changing and at each change, more and more of the Lord Jesus Christ is being disfigured.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 15:18

Quote:
-----I am questioning if Bible Versions are ever going to stop changing and at each change, more and more of the Lord Jesus Christ is being disfigured.

Jesus being "disfigured"? y'know son, you are veering very close to the unpardonable sin, and if i was you, i would prayerfully consider my words and ways.

patience though, i do believe the mods will step in right soon and shut this uselessness down.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 15:28

Neil,

You have not been reading.

Let me explain just a bit. We have mentioned where Christ, God, Savior, Cross, Blood, Holy have been removed.

Now, all in all we are doing ok, but thanks for your help. It has been passionate, but none of us are enemies as you put it.

you're right, on: 2011/3/31 15:38

Quote:
-----You have not been reading.

no, i havent coz its an empty fig tree.

i been around this forum since 02 and i've seen countless "KJV only" threads. i've seen poster after poster, utilizing the same palaber, the same vociferocity as you, and it's all to no profit, and whats REALLY sad, you cant see that.

Re: you're right, on: 2011/3/31 15:42

In deference to you, Neil, I will refrain from talking about the KJV in this thread. You won't be offended anymore.

May the Lord bless you,
777

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 15:49

Just seems to me that cccchhhrrrrriiisss and 777 and the others are merely having a peaceful discussion.

Neil - some versions Have in fact attempted to take away from the Deity of Christ, remove mention of His Blood and changed important words that are actually HIS Words.

Live and let live, maybe?

Since 2002, have you not yet learned where making a ruckus when there need not be one, keeps anyone here very long ?

I see no fault in this discussion and no one throwing of "damnation" on another, as you just have to 777.

eta- I truly wish you Shalom and the ability to not misread anyone else. Shalom~Shalom in truth.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/31 16:49

Quote:

While your post is very interesting and scholarly, it doesn't seem very scriptural. Take your quote:

Quote:

-----Which one is best? Well, because of tools like this, the scholars have empowered you to sort through the manuscripts and decide for yourself. In other words, you don't have to take the words of the "experts" and "scholars" for yourself. They are letting you make your own decision as to which rendering is best, and from there, you can establish your own translation. You can agree or disagree with them.

This is nothing else than "every man did that which was right in his own eyes." It comes back to the fact that we need a STANDARD. Without a standard, confusion abounds. Otherwise, every man's interpretation would be good enough for him, but WHAT DOES GOD SAY??

Rusaved1,

This begs the question, why do you insist that the KJV is "the standard?" It wasn't the first English translation, and wasn't the last English translation.

Is it because it was based on the TR? Well, prior to Erasmus, there was no such thing as the TR. He created it after studying various Greek manuscripts, noting where they differed in the Greek, as not one Greek manuscript is in perfect agreement with any other. And where he lacked a Greek text, he recreated it by backwards translating it from Latin. Erasmus in his work, created a completely original and unique document that did not exist before. He reconstructed the text using the exact same methods modern scholars do.

So, how is it that you insist the 1611 KJV, of all the translations, and of all the thousands of manuscripts out there, is the one authoritative standard that we are to use? What Jesus said about the preservation of God's word exists in modern translations too.

How do you know? What makes the 1611 KJV utterly unique?

My guess is that you really probably don't know how to know this. You have a feeling and a hunch at best. And that feeling and hunch has caused you to make a dogmatic assertion of faith, one without basis whatsoever in the Scriptures, or in the history of the Church. Indeed, a KJV only stance is not more than a few hundred years old at best. It's what one would call a novelty.

Re: Do we possess the inerrant word of God????, on: 2011/3/31 16:52

To answer an earlier question I do not know which translation is without error. I suppose to a degree most translations do have some errors date I say even the KJV. But before I am stoned here ask if the errors take away from the message of salvation. Whether KJV, NKJV, NASB, NLT, NIV, etc. the message is still salvation by faith in Christ. In the NIV in Acts 20:21 Paul says I have declared to both Jews and Greeks that they must turn to God in repentance and have faith in our Lord Jesus. I am sure this message is the same in all of our translations. I might add that the only inerrant Word is Jesus who dwells in us.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/31 17:19

Let me phrase this a certain way:

- 1) The KJV was a compiled text, basing itself partially on previous translations of the English Bible, along with its own fresh translation.
- 2) The Greek manuscripts that these English translations were based upon, of which the KJV is based on, come from flawed manuscripts that are incomplete and disagree with each other, having many variants.
- 3) The creation of the 1611 KJV was based on the same fundamental approach to textual criticism that is practiced today. The only difference is that the KJV translation relies more heavily upon a certain set of Greek texts than today's scholars usually do.

Knowing these three things, which are historical facts, on what basis does one come along say the approach of modern scholars is wrong, and that the KJV is the English standard? And that it is 100% infallible in its textual decisions and translations, and entirely without error? Where does this notion come from? On what authority do you base such a statement?

Did Jesus speak about infallible translations for every language? Did Jesus speak about the KJV and a certain line of Greek documents? Did somewhere else in the New Testament speak of these things? What about the Old Testament? Has the Holy Spirit spoken to you about these things? If so, what did He say? I would like to know exactly what He told you.

Re: Kingjimmy, on: 2011/3/31 18:00

Are you asking your question to me or someone else?

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 18:06

Definitely to someone else Martyr :o)

Have never seen him get so hot under the collar neither.

Don't make me move back down there Jimmy, with a cup of water to cool ya off with. Smiling. Hope you r 2.

With Love!

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/31 18:08

I'm actually quite cool and content right now. Just issuing some pointed questions and making some strong statements. I'll take a cup of water just the same though :-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/31 18:10

Quote:

Are you asking your question to me or someone else?

To anybody and everybody who is KJV only... or close to that camp.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 18:11

Suthurn hospitality. Amen!!

I'll git that drink rite down to ya bruther.

Thanks - I sure do miss it down there. These dang yankees.
Ain't got no manners at all.

GOD Bless ya! :)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/31 18:14

Last I checked, in the greater Charlotte area there are far more yanks than natives. We even have ice hockey.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 18:21

Yes, you're right about Charlotte. They sure did northernize that area. I lived far enough away in Stanley. Just the out-skirts. Loved it there.

I visited a few churches in Charlotte while down there though. Like Loren Livingston's and Hickory Grove, but it took an hour to get there just from Stanley.

Really do miss the spiritual climate mostly. New York is New York. Oh well, GWBD!

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2011/3/31 18:40

Chris,

Thanks for your kind reply also. I also like the way you and Jimmy have been cordial in your dialog with others.

I also think that I haven't communicated what I'm really trying to say as of yet either. This is very serious for those of us who really fear and love the Lord. I mean those of us who esteem His Word supreme above everything else.

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

I understand what you are saying about those who have created the modern versions that they did not take out verses and words from the KJV because they were never in the manuscripts that they used and that the reason that they used them was because they were older and they had a reason to believe that they were more reliable. I just felt to clarify this to you and I hope I have communicated this to you well enough so that we want keep beating a dead horse. This is not my issue with them at all and their sincerity in thinking they are more correct. I have talked to JW's and Mormons who are very sincere and think very highly that they are right in their belief also. (I only use them as an example as being sincere but most of us know they are wrong)

Chris I am glad you have a peace concerning the position you have chosen and I do hope others come to a peace in what they have chosen that is not divisive. I have a peace in the Lord and I am not divisive with others who read different versions. If someone asks me my opinion I tell them that I am not against anyone reading any version but that I have to always read the authorized version (KJV) before I come to a conclusion concerning what God is communicating to me. I tell them that every Word of God must be meditated on for an enlightened understanding of what God is trying to convey to us.

Here is some food for thought; why would anyone who is mainly in the modern version camp want to be against the KJV when it comes to saying that those words and verses are unnecessary because they say they were added, when they are words and verses that are needed for better understanding in what God is communicating to us. They are telling us that the modern versions are so people can understand the word of God better but they are mainly relying on the 2 older manuscripts that don't have a lot of the words and verses that the KJV relied on. So are they really trying to help people get a better understanding of the word of God or are they only helping people understand what they believe are the right manuscripts. I mean what is wrong with those precious words that are in the manuscripts used by the KJV. Do they really believe that the manuscripts used by the KJV are incorrect and that we need to move away from the words found in the KJV. Why the accusation of words and verses that were added because it doesn't make sense when those words and verses only aid sound doctrine. The modern versions' leaving out words and verses is like watering down sound doctrine.

Let me say this in another way, what if the 2 older manuscripts found almost 300 years after the manuscripts used by the KJV was in reverse order. What if the multitude of manuscripts used for the KJV didn't have all the words and verses in them and then around three hundred years later 2 older manuscripts were found and a modern version was published with extra words and verses in it. Let's say that someone had been quoting "I can do all things through Him who gives me strength" and then they pick up a newer version that says "I can do all things through Christ who gives me strength" would there be the same concern, I don't believe there would to those who fear and love the Lord because it would make sense without adding to the word. I wouldn't get so upset because the "Him" is Christ but to take "Christ" out and put "Him" there is more upsetting to people who value the Word of God.

Here is another scenario. Since the beginning of the days of the Apostles God's plan and pattern for His church was laid out and written down and much has been lost through the years that God is restoring back to the original. Why would God get us to 1611 with the wrong manuscripts used to create a bible version that has extra words added to it that don't need to be there, I mean even the Geneva bible has those words and verses in there. This has helped me, when the Geneva Bible has those verses and words in there, to believe that God was leading them to the right manuscripts.

These are just some thoughts I have concerning the reason why I believe that God did lead them to the right manuscripts to use in creating the bible in English and almost 300 years later I don't believe we need to forsake them either but that is exactly what most of the modern versions are doing and it seems like a growing number of people just don't care anymore.

Anyway, may God Bless everyone who reads His Word no matter what version they read is my prayer. Blessings to all!

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/31 18:54

Quote:

Why would God get us to 1611 with the wrong manuscripts used to create a bible version that has extra words added to it that don't need to be there, I mean even the Geneva bible has those words and verses in there.

A slight oversight in this question is the fact that every translation, be it KJV or NASB, is based on flawed manuscripts. There is not a single manuscript that exists without some sort of error in it. Only the original manuscripts were inspired and without error. And those seem to have been lost to time.... unless God has them hidden away somewhere as when the Law was hidden away in the temple and only rediscovered in the reign of Hezekiah.

edited

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2011/3/31 19:01

Also, as I pointed out in an earlier post, of which I drew a pretty picture for...

:-)

...sometimes the Greek texts which the KJV are based on disagree as to what should be added or omitted. But the KJV translators did not point out these textual variants as did some modern translations such as the NASB sometimes do.

For reference: <http://www.iamadisciple.com/articles/papers/Bible-Variants.jpg>

If you notice in this image, the majority texts disagree which variant is correct. So far, I've not seen much interaction around this key piece of evidence. I'd love to hear some KJV'ers take on this.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/31 19:22

The inspired word of God was and is free from error, being the work not merely of men, but of men directed by the Spirit of God (2 Pt. 1:20-21, Acts 1:16, 2 Tim. 3:16). Translations of that word, however, are subject to the limitations of human ability, and therefore, are imperfect. If someone can't understand this, how on earth can they possibly understand any version of the Bible?

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/31 20:19

Quote:

-----If someone can't understand this, how on earth can they possibly understand any version of the Bible?

MrBill, that is pure rhetoric!

The Holy Ghost is still at work in believer's hearts, even if not every translator was submitted to Him. That's 'how' we understand.

:-)

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/31 20:43

You read "way" to much into what I said.

I said

"Translations of that word, however, are subject to the limitations of human ability, and therefore, are imperfect"

And I meant that, what I said above, if you don't understand that, how on earth can they possibly understand any version of the Bible? Take a deep breath and re read what I said, not what you thought I meant.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/31 21:02

Okay.

Quote:

-----I said "Translations of that word, however, are subject to the limitations of human ability, and therefore, are imperfect"

So, is it your opinion that this is why we need the Holy Spirit to help us?

You don't think He could help the translators?

(Imho, unless He does help them we have a proper problem - not just a discussion!)

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/31 21:07

The fact that the translators placed into the margin alternate manuscript readings PROVES BEYOND ANY DOUBT that they WERE NOT GUIDED by the Holy Spirit as to which one of the two readings were correct.

The very first KJV had marginal notes. TAKE A SECOND LOOK AT THEM!!!!

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/31 21:12

To Chris,

Quote:

-----My opinion is first and foremost that most people who are heavily engaged in this topic just don't know what the experts think about this...but only the innuendos that many KJV-only books and websites have made about what those experts think.

This is an assumption on your part. You have had little idea of how people arrive at preferring the KJV - only that you disagree with them.

If we depended on your method, we would all be reading the NIV more often. But we're not. We reached a decision a different way, (most likely), and we're comfortable with that. (People use websites because it's quicker and cheaper to get a quote, not because we haven't read books.)

As for your well-proclaimed suspension of choice, are you aware this is a modern exercise in Pyrrhonism. Are you happy about that, despite it being opposed to Paul's exhortations away from worldly wisdom? Maybe you can be comfortable with it for yourself, but I do have a problem with your insistence that the rest of us should adopt it. (It was revived by Montaigne, and used by Erasmus under pressure from the Catholic Church to dampen his ardour for internal reform.) As you have repeated your adherence to not stating absolutes many times in this thread, I feel free to mention it. I see it as a different matter completely, from a group of translators scrapping over which words to use in a sentence. In fact, they made decisions.

If you were honestly happy about everyone working out their own salvation as the Lord leads them, would it bother you that some people don't have an NIV, or don't want one, and find it unnecessary to contact translators before making their decision? Or do you genuinely believe we are missing a greater joy, and simply conclude we must be operating sloppy logic and unscholarliness? All the best academic minds in the world, with nounction from the Holy Ghost, will degrade the word of God without even trying.

Mark 7:21 For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, 22 Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: 23 All these evil things come from within, and defile the man.

To some of us, it is plain that this is happening, regardless of using 'better' manuscripts. Yet your only repost to those who are concerned, is that it's because they're based on a different set of manuscripts. While very relevant from one point of view, it is probably less relevant than whether or not God was being heard during the process.

The translators of the KJV were indeed very learned, as well as spiritual. According to David Daniell, who edited Tyndale's New Testament into modern English spelling (without altering any of Tyndale's sentences or paragraphs), his grasp of Greek was so excellent, that the distinctions between the individual voices in the New Testament come through in his choice of English phraseology.

In that Tyndale was translating for 'the ploughboy', his English IS easier to follow than some of the changes added to the

KJV. This is not to say there weren't places I needed a good dictionary - but there were not many. The love of God truly shines through, and Tyndale's Prologue sets the stage uncompromisingly for what it means to adopt the word into one's life. His regard for truth, and to discharge his burden from the Lord to finish the translation if at all possible, fell in an era more controversial than our discussion has been!

WE have all been given the Holy Spirit to know the truth when we find it. This is how anyone 'chooses' to stay with the KJV, or CHANGE to the KJV, from another translation - which respectable people do do. No pressure on you while you're finding loads of truth in the NIV. That's great!

I am struggling to put something into words here, and I realise if you are taking the words at face value you can easily knock them down intellectually. But I'm trying to convey something spiritual. It's again that from some translations the love of God shines through palpably more than others.

I think this is also a function of the translation being left more open with regard to tenses. The more that everything historical has been put in a past tense, and the verb 'to be' has been changed 'to do', the more that God seems distant. One of the beauties of the KJV is God being brought nigh by the use of the present tense in places one might think it didn't belong (but presumably it's in the Greek). In Young's also, this stands out.

In an earlier post (p14) you said

Quote:
-----I no more "know" that these copies of manuscripts were unaltered than I "know" that the manuscripts that constitute the Byzantine text type were unaltered. I simply understand the arguments on both sides on the discussion.

If this is the case, and we are all equally dependent on the Holy Spirit for what we do 'know', then why does it bother you so much that God has led some of us to prefer the way He communicates Himself through the KJV? You have given literally hours to writing the same things again and again, which don't make any difference to our opinions. As you have clearly stated, you are offering an 'opinion'. So are the rest of us. Isn't that fair?

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/31 21:14

MrBill

Quote:
-----The fact that the translators placed into the margin alternate manuscript readings PROVES BEYOND ANY DOUBT that they WERE NOT GUIDED by the Holy Spirit as to which one of the two readings were correct.

Ah! Fair point. But God can guide US!

Yes?

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/31 21:18

Quote:
-----Alive-to-God...Ah! Fair point. But God can guide US! Yes?

Not going to argue that point sure he can.

Imagine this, The KJV translators specifically dispel any notion that they were specially guided by God in the preface, but it didn't know that what they wrote in the preface was wrong. God was inspiring their choices of manuscripts!

Unanswerable question: "If the translators died not knowing they were inspired, HOW DID YOU FIND THIS OUT"???

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/3/31 21:32

MrBill said

Quote:

-----Imagine this,

I think you are not catching the idiom of the era in which they were writing - even if they did distance themselves from claiming inspiration.

Furthermore, they were presenting their efforts to the originator of the 'divine right of kings'. It is most unlikely they would have tried to compete with him for inspiration!

Quote:

-----Unanswerable question: "If the translators died not knowing they were inspired, HOW DID YOU FIND THIS OUT"???

Mr Bill, you ought to be able to answer this question by now, especially as I know you read your Bible.

:-D

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/3/31 21:47

Sorry for bailing out, but I said "to myself" I would not post back in here again, it's way beyond my scope of anything I know, I will just read my NASB and leave this to the scholars.

Re: , on: 2011/3/31 21:50

I was extremely edified and encouraged by what you said Alive-to-God.

2Ti 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

2Ti 3:17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, that the man of God may be perfect (thoroughly, furnished unto all good works).

Thank you!

777

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/3/31 23:25

Hi Alive-to-God,

Quote:

This is an assumption on your part.

An assumption? Not by the strict definition of that word. An opinion? That is exactly what I called my statement.

Quote:

You have had little idea of how people arrive at preferring the KJV - only that you disagree with them.

Actually, I have a pretty good idea how KJV-only advocates arrived to their opinions (for their conclusions are also just opinions) WHEN they have explained their reasons in this thread...or in books and websites that detail their reasons.

Quote:

If we depended on your method, we would all be reading the NIV more often. But we're not. We reached a decision a different way, (most likely), and we're comfortable with that. (People use websites because it's quicker and cheaper to get a quote, not because we haven't read books.)

I don't think that is accurate. I am not asking people to use "my" method. I am asking people to refrain from ABSOLUTE DECLARATIONS until they are ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN. And, no, I do NOT think that it is enough to trust in the words and teachings of men on this subject. Simply looking at some KJV-only websites is no more "research" than if I went to some other controversial website and then declare the views of those who created the websites as "truth."

I am not saying that people should refrain from those websites (not at all). I am saying that people should not just accept what those websites teach or conclude...or that the secondhand claims contained within those sites should not be presented as "evidence" for such conclusions -- particularly if those things have not been tested and verified for accuracy.

Quote:

As for your well-proclaimed suspension of choice, are you aware this is a modern exercise in Pyrrhonism.

Actually, that is an utterly RIDICULOUS thing to claim about what I am saying! Pyrrhonism teaches that there are no absolutes...no truths...and that no certainty can ever be ascertained.

That is the EXACT OPPOSITE of what I am doing. It is unwise for you to make such a absurd accusation too -- especially after I clarified in detail what I am saying several times.

I have NEVER claimed that there are no truths. I am just questioning the logic of making absolute declarations in a matter when the weight of evidence is faulty (at best) or in which there are so many honest, sincere believers and trained experts in this matter who hold a very different view.

Do you think that the KJV is the ONLY acceptable version of the Word of God...and the only one that is 100% correct...so much so that your claims leave no room for doubt or human error?

You see, the only truth that we can be sure of is the Word of God itself. Unfortunately, that means that an issue about the supremacy of the translation of one version over all others just can't be determined by looking at the text of the Word itself in one version (like the KJV). It must be researched.

Unfortunately, I am finding that the people who are the loudest and most vocal proponents of the KJV-only opinion are also the ones who seem to know the least about actual textual criticism, the history of manuscripts, the etymology of ancient Greek, and the actual study of the writings and claims of everyone from Erasmus to Westcott/Hort to the modern translators involved in good academic versions of God's Word (like the NASB and NIV). Many have even boasted about being so "common" that they have limited their research or place little faith in "experts" or "scholars" (other than the ones that share their views). Yes, this is my own observation...even from the testimony of some individuals within this thread.

How is it that men can claim that the KJV is the ONLY acceptable version of the Word of God if it is based upon so little tangible evidence? How is it that men are so certain of their opinion -- enough to claim other versions are "devilish" -- even though they haven't studied the matter beyond a few biased books and websites or verified the actual "evidence" within those claims? How is it that men will scrutinize and attack other versions (even by verse-by-verse comparisons), translators and sources -- but refuse to apply that same level of criticism, skepticism and scrutiny toward the KJV, its translators and sources?

ators or its sources?

Do you see what I am saying? Are we really supposed to be so easily convinced of such things?

Quote:

Are you happy about that, despite it being opposed to Paul's exhortations away from worldly wisdom? Maybe you can be comfortable with it for yourself, but I do have a problem with your insistence that the rest of us should adopt it. (It was revived by Montaigne, and used by Erasmus under pressure from the Catholic Church to dampen his ardour for internal reform.) As you have repeated your adherence to not stating absolutes many times in this thread, I feel free to mention it. I see it as a different matter completely, from a group of translators scrapping over which words to use in a sentence. In fact, they made decisions.

Again, your accusation is without merit. I am not opposed to absolutes. However, I am opposed to someone claiming that their opinion is an "absolute" -- to the point that they will spew vile statements on other faithful versions of the Word of God, their translators or their sources.

Quote:

If you were honestly happy about everyone working out their own salvation as the Lord leads them, would it bother you that some people don't have an NIV, or don't want one, and find it unnecessary to contact translators before making their decision? Or do you genuinely believe we are missing a greater joy, and simply conclude we must be operating sloppy logic and unscholarliness? All the best academic minds in the world, with nounction from the Holy Ghost, will degrade the word of God without even trying.

I don't even understand the basis for your question. First of all, I don't like it when someone questions whether or not I am "honestly happy" about such a thing. It can be viewed as a subtle insinuation posed in the form of a question.

And, of course I am not bothered if someone doesn't use or embrace the NIV! At the same time, I am not bothered if someone doesn't use or embrace other versions of God's Word -- such as the NASB, KJV or other credible translations that were honest and scholarly in their attempts.

However, it does bother me when someone is willing to spew all sort of accusations and claims about the NIV, its translators, its translators beliefs, or its sources but having refused to contact those Bible societies and translators in the first place. It is akin to "spiritual gossip" when we refuse to validate our own claims enough to go to the sources -- even about something as important as a discussion of acceptable versions of the Word of God.

Yes, academic minds without the Holy Ghost lack the power of God to work. However, the problem of your statement is in an underlying belief that the translators of the KJV -- some who held heretical "high church" views -- were somehow more attuned to the Holy Spirit than the translators or versions like the NIV and NASB. And, more perplexing, is that someone could make such a claim if they never contacted those translators of the NIV or read the views, thoughts and writings of the translators of the KJV (or Erasmus) either.

Is it "blind faith" to trust those translators...or is it just "blind?" After all, we are instructed by God to TEST EVERYTHING (I Thessalonians 5:21). Believers should welcome that desire to prove their words, claims and opinions. No one should be fearful if their views are put to the test. While we must first test by the Word of God, we can also test the claims of others (when they make claims about the translators, sources, manuscripts, etc...).

Quote:

Mark 7:21 For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, 22 Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: 23 All these evil things come from within, and defile the man.

To some of us, it is plain that this is happening...

I don't understand the context of what you are saying. What are you saying this in reference to? All versions other than the KJV?

Quote:

Yet your only repost to those who are concerned, is that it's because they're based on a different set of manuscripts. While very relevant from one point of view, it is probably less relevant than whether or not God was being heard during the process.

You are incorrect in saying that this is my "only repost to those who are concerned." I have stated explicitly -- time and time again -- what my concerns are and why they concern me. It isn't just about the manuscripts -- but that those who are making the argument in the first place (of the total supremacy of the KJV over all other versions -- or the utter devilish nature of all other versions). They are making a BOLD claim (voiced not as an opinion, but as "absolute truth"). So, are we supposed to just let them make their claims -- even if we perceive much of those things (after honest research) to be utterly false or misleading?

At the same time, I could turn that same argument around and easily use it against the claims of KJV-only advocates. I could ask them to explain why they embrace the KJV as the only acceptable version of the Word of God. Do you think that they could "prove" it? Should I counter every claim they make and dismiss the need to rely upon the "research" of these so-called experts upon which those claims are based? It is not just the manuscripts, Alive. It is the fact that many of these "experts" quoted by the KJV-only websites and books are not only standing outside of the realm of peer-reviewed scrutiny, but that many of them also base their premises upon the claims of one another (rather than actual firsthand anecdotes, examples or proof texts).

Moreover, you are accepting that all of the translators of the KJV were attuned to the Spirit of God. Were all of the KJV translators even saved? Was Erasmus a true believer? If you assume that the answer is "yes," then how do you know this to be true? Because your spirit bears witness? This is the same rationale that some men and women follow phony preachers and false doctrines today. So how do we "test" such things?

How would you know that Erasmus, Lancelot Andrewes and the other translators were pious unless we have actually studied their lives and writings? Do we believe it because someone else told us it is so? After all, I know some people who think that Benny Hinn is the bees knees -- but I won't be sending him a "love offering" anytime soon.

You see, there are things that we can test and verify in regard to the claims of KJV-only advocates (regardless of whether it is FOR the supremacy of the KJV or attacks and accusations about other versions, translators and sources). We can easily read firsthand accounts. We can easily contact translators and ancient text/ancient language experts. We can do much more than take someone else's research as "truth."

Quote:

WE have all been given the Holy Spirit to know the truth when we find it. This is how anyone 'chooses' to stay with the KJV, or CHANGE to the KJV, from another translation - which respectable people do do. No pressure on you while you're finding loads of truth in the NIV. That's great!

Thanks. At the same time, many respectable and sincere believers also prayerfully have moved from the KJV to versions like the NIV and NASB. I am one of them. I know quite a few others too -- including many longtime members here on SermonIndex. :-)

Quote:

I am struggling to put something into words here, and I realise if you are taking the words at face value you can easily knock them down intellectually. But I'm trying to convey something spiritual. It's again that from some translations the love of God shines through palpably more than others.

I understand your concern. But let me make it clear: Regardless of my education or degrees (which I count as dung any way) or the time and research that I have spent in regard to this...I am not looking to knock down things intellectually. Just because I may have an advanced education or have spent more time in researching this matter (or not), it isn't right to assume that I am missing the "spiritual" matter that is the essence of it all. In fact, that is EXACTLY what I am trying to make as an emphasis.

I think that no one is spiritually entitled to come into SermonIndex and declare as an absolute certainty that the KJV is the only acceptable (or "holy") version of God's Word than some other believer would be entitled to pronounce some obscure doctrine to be true....or that the world is flat. It isn't "spiritual" to make absolute claims things that are just opinion. A KJV-only advocate is no more "spiritual" in their attempt to declare their opinion as beyond all uncertainty than a Calvinist to declare their view as supreme and all others are believing lies (or vice versa). There is nothing "spiritual" about that.

And, by the way, I feel the love of God via the NIV just as much as I have from the KJV and NASB.

Quote:

If this is the case, and we are all equally dependent on the Holy Spirit for what we do 'know', then why does it bother you so much that God has led some of us to prefer the way He communicates Himself through the KJV? You have given literally hours to writing the same things again and again, which don't make any difference to our opinions. As you have clearly stated, you are offering an 'opinion'. So are the rest of us. Isn't that fair?

Yes, it is fair to regard all that any of us post to be "opinions." I do think that it is interesting that you are calling me out for "given literally hours to writing the same things again and again" (even when you seem to have missed some of the things that I wrote in this very post that I am replying to)...but the same caution isn't urged to the guy who registered to our forum a few days ago and spent time belittling me and others in his attempt to proclaim his KJV-only views as absolute truth (and not mere "opinions").

Do you see the difference?

I do appreciate all of those who have privately contacted me with words of encouragement into this matter. For a while there, I thought that my words were totally misunderstood. The encouragement is much appreciated. Thank you.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2011/3/31 23:27

Brothers, sister, small farm animals...

I love you all. I read the NKJV. It works great for me.

Just thought I'd share. blessings!

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/3/31 23:34

Hi rbanks...

Thank you for your post.

I will say this: If I had seen anything that made me to believe that the KJV was superior to all other translations, I would use it exclusively.

However, after much prayer, study and research (including considering the claims of KJV-only advocates) -- I haven't found anything that would make me believe that the KJV-only position is correct.

As for the texts to the point of the 1611 manuscript (and subsequent revisions over an additional 168 years): There were thousands of manuscripts that weren't in total agreement. I am not talking Alexandrian v. Byzantine v. Western text-type

s. I am talking about the Byzantine text-type exclusively. If God "preserved" that text line...and that text line alone...why did he wait 1500 years for a Catholic humanist (Erasmus) to decide for everyone which texts from the various manuscripts were correct? Why did they wait for another 100 years for a group of Church of England translators to determine which words and phrases Erasmus got right...and which words and phrases that the other texts that were consulted was right?

As I said before, I still "prefer" the KJV as a great translation taken from its sources. However, I use it alongside the NASB and NIV as good, honest translations taken from their sources (many of which were the same as the ones consulted for the KJV, NASB and NIV).

I do believe that God is using all of those translations of His Word.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/4/1 0:05

King Jimmy,
I'm still waiting for:

Quote:

-----There seems to be little difference in the variance. Right? Refresh my Greek. What is the reference?

<http://www.iamadisciple.com/articles/papers/Bible-Variants.jpg>

Unless I missed it somewhere in this set of "Modern Church Fathers". :)

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/4/1 0:22

Quote:

-----Psalms 119:89 For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.

I still believe His Word is inspired, infallible, and inerrant.

Quote:

-----2 Timothy 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

Quote:

-----Matthew 5:18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

Quote:

-----Psalm 19:7-9 The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes.

We can debate about manuscripts, but His Word lives on! He changes lives. Hallelujah!

Re: , on: 2011/4/1 0:32

post removed.

Public apology, on: 2011/4/1 11:16

anon 777, and to anyone i might have offended, i beg you in the Lord, please forgive any intemperate verbiage on my part regarding this issue.

my default setting in Jesus Christ, is that His Grace, His Love be on you all, that is my constant prayer.

i'm just thankful to God that Bible ownership in this land is still legal, because i see a day, when earthly powers and authorities in America, make Bible ownership illegal.

Many say i'm "crazy"...in fact, nobody agrees with me on this, but i did not receive this revelation from my imagination, mind, or man, but from Jesus Who lives in me.

and i welcome that day, because the devil, as always, OVERSTEPS his foul schemes, and the day, worldly powers pull it his....you watch, the Church will become so vibrant and strong in this land.

Bibles will once again become so Preciousto many.

my many Bibles, are so Precious to me, and this poster, and if it seems like i'm boasting, i boast in the LORD, has a beautiful, perfectly servicable 1834 KJV's New Testament....my guess is that it was a farm wife's NT, she signed her name on the cover, and you can actually see splashes of what may be stew on a few pages, as she might have read while having supper. i have KJV's, NKJV's, ESV's, NIV's and i have a English/Korean Bible (side by side translation, as i read, write and speak Korean)

i've read them all, but if i just "read to read", it is nothing to my soul. During my morning devotional readings, i always ask God the Holy Ghost to open the eyes of my heart, for This Word is spiritual Food, and It is precious.

Now, to that end, i will be moving, God willing, soon, to the Amish areas of Wis. i'm here now, putting an offer down on a small farmette, Praise God! i have it in my soul to buy about 100 hard cover "pew" Bibles...for two reasons, one, in preparation of what i've seen, and to bless and evangelize my Amish brothers, meaning their Bible is in a very old dialect of German, that NONE of them can read.

and God willing, that will change, as i do His Work. The place i'm buying was built by Amish, i need some more work done on it, and believe me, once they realize, i'm not just some secular "English", i will more than happy to give them a Bible, or three. For this, they could actually get excommunicated, shunned, for the act of reading an "english" Bible. Yesterday, i was driving a lonely country road, and i saw an Amish brother walking home on the other way, and God said to me, "see neil?...if you had those Bibles, you would flip around and see if the brother needed a ride, engage in conversation, and possibly give him a Bible".....to which i praised God, and said "thank You Father!"

forgive my blithering, but i wanted to share whats in my heart, and to beg forgiveness for seeming to be of a hard heart, for my only desire is to bear the Sweet Fragrance of Messiah, whether it be on a country road, or a website i dearly loveand frankly, i don't always succeed, to my grief.

so, if Led, just get on your knees and see if my foresight, meaning Bible ownership being made illegal is true, if so, start buying and stocking Them NOW!!!

in Jesus' love, neil

Re: Public apology, on: 2011/4/1 12:10

I thought the Amish were anabaptist type protestants. I saw another post also about evangelising them. What is the situation with this?

Re: , on: 2011/4/1 12:31

Hi Neil,

I don't need to forgive you, because I tell you in truth, I was not offended, but am deeply sorry if I offended you.

I do agree that it is a good idea to have a few bibles hidden. That is not as crazy as some people may think. It will be outlawed for any number of reasons that the "authorities" decide to latch onto.

The greatest sign of the End Times are not earthquakes, tsunamis, political upheaval or such, but a little spoken about phrase often overlooked, in Matt 24:12. The Love of Many shall wax cold.

This has been a sign of apostasy for some time now, regardless of all the natural disasters.

May we all keep ourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life. Jude 1:21.

May the Lord bless you abundantly and others up there in Amish land.

777

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/4/1 13:01

andie,

They were and some still are. Some (Amish, Mennonite, etc.) still hold to an orthodox Christian faith. Many others have just a form and no longer believe in justification by faith. Also, many do not realize that there are many branches of the Amish, just like the rest of protestantism.

Re: Public apology - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/4/1 13:04

Nathan, I trust we are all for Jesus. Discussions like these can easily be misunderstood because we are reading and cannot "feel" how the words were spoken. Truly He is the One who knows all things and may each of us follow the light that He gives.

JB

Re: Annoymous, Natan, JB, Andie, on: 2011/4/1 18:28

Brothers I so commend your beautiful spirit of dialogue on such a heated issue. Your post so refresh my soul. I do agree to hide the Bibles in whatever translation. Persecution is coming and the Bible will be outlawed or declared illegal. Also I would encourage you to hide the word in your heart. Memorize it. They may take the word out of our hand but never out of our heart and mind. Our brothers and sisters know this in persecuted lands.

Re: The Amish, on: 2011/4/2 0:20

On another note it seems God is working among the Amish. I am aware of a brother who is quietly working with the young Amish people and many of them are coming to Christ. They have to meet secretly for Bible studies and be baptized at night. You would think this is a story out of a Voice of the Martyrs magazine but actually happening in Pennsylvania.

Re: Public apology - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/4/2 8:35

No problem Neil, I haven't felt offended at all. If anyone else feels I have offended them, please forgive me, for that was never my intention.

Yes, hiding Bibles is a good idea. God bless your evangelizing among the Amish! So many of them are held in a fear of "disobeying the bishop" or of being excommunicated and shunned that it's hard for them to step out of all of that and ask, "What does God say?"

Good point, 777, about the love of many shall wax cold. It's so important for us to watch ourselves concerning that.

Re: Illegal book, on: 2011/4/2 10:16

Voice of the Martyrs has a Bible cover that says this book is illegal in 52 countries. Will America make 53????

Re: , on: 2011/4/2 11:10

Could be, martyr. Is VOM's conference in Bartlesville
Coming up soon?

Re: Could those interested continue discussing? - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/4/2 11:20

Hello all!!

I realize that some of you don't wish to discuss the KJV issue. I would respectfully ask if those still interested could continue to "pleasantly talk it over." :) I owe an answer to KingJimmy and I'd like to hear what Chris and JB have to say about it as well. This is not the only thread in this forum, so only those interested in edifying one another concerning this issue need to participate.

At the same time, I wish God's very best to every one here.

Re: Could those interested continue discussing? - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/4/2 11:26

Quote:
-----Rusaved1, This begs the question, why do you insist that the KJV is "the standard?" It wasn't the first English translation, and wasn't the last English translation. Is it because it was based on the TR? Well, prior to Erasmus, there was no such thing as the TR. He created it after studying various Greek manuscripts, noting where they differed in the Greek, as not one Greek manuscript is in perfect agreement with any other. And where he lacked a Greek text, he recreated it by backwards translating it from Latin. Erasmus in his work, created a completely original and unique document that did not exist before. He reconstructed the text using the exact same methods modern scholars do. So, how is it that you insist the 1611 KJV, of all the translations, and of all the thousands of manuscripts out there, is the one authoritative standard that we are to use? What Jesus said about the preservation of God's word exists in modern translations too. How do you know? What makes the 1611 KJV utterly unique? My guess is that you really probably don't know how to know this. You have a feeling and a hunch at best. And that feeling and hunch has caused you to make a dogmatic assertion of faith, one without basis whatsoever in the Scriptures, or in the history of the Church. Indeed, a KJV only stance is not more than a few hundred years old at best. It's what one would call a novelty.

Hi KingJimmy!

How do I know? Well, I believe that God has written a Book. Secondly, I believe that He has put it within my reach to find. From what you've written, it appears that you also believe God has written a Book. However, you don't believe it's the KJV.

(That's fine with me, by the way. But if you'll hear me out on what I'm trying to express, I would be very obliged. Remember, this is no way an "attack" on you or anyone else; we just want to discuss this a little further. If you don't wish to do so, that's fine with me also. One thing I'd like to clarify here, first. When I use ALL CAPS this does not in any way signify a raised voice or that I'm worked up, am yelling, etc. :) (smiling) All it means is that I'm trying to make a point that will stand out.)

Do you believe that there are any corrupt texts or versions? I look in Scripture and Paul says "We are not as many which corrupt the word of God." Paul lived in the same time as did the apostles and as did Christ. So they all had to choose something that wasn't corrupted, agreed? Even historically, this is recognized, concerning corrupt manuscripts. So if folks were purposefully corrupting God's word then, I don't see it as much of a surprise that they would also do it today. This is not to say that every corruption is on purpose; but it dispels the idea that is a ludicrous assumption or accusation (of course, accusations must be verified and confirmed, etc and etc).

I find it very significant that even among the perversions of God's word some two thousand years ago, the apostles and disciples still had THE WORD OF GOD. It had been copied over and over by MEN WHO WEREN'T PERFECT, yet somehow they still had the word of God. So it appears that God can overcome a copier's probable mistakes and still present His people with His perfect word. We don't see them saying, The best reading is this...or I like how this one version says it...or anything like that. What did they say? THUS SAITH THE LORD... They didn't have any problem finding God's word, even though there were many corrupt ones around.

From what you've written (correct me if I'm wrong), it appears that you don't believe that God can preserve His perfect word through a translation process. If you believe He can, then HAS HE? And if so, WHERE IS IT??? In Scripture, God shows that He does make inspired translations as shown when Christ, Paul, and Peter quoted the Old Testament in their preaching, writings, etc. Obviously, they had an INSPIRED TRANSLATION that they believed in. Another example would be when Moses wrote what Pharaoh said; Pharaoh did not speak Hebrew! But God inspired that translation and it became God's perfect word. Parts of Daniel are said to have been written in Aramaic and so forth and so on... There are other examples, but do you get what I'm saying? So through just the Bible God shows us that He can overcome all the weaknesses of HUMAN TRANSLATORS and we still get something without error in the end.

When we say "KJV only," we're talking about the here and now and not anything else. I would totally agree that, yes, before the KJV, there was something else, because God said HIS WORD WON'T BE BROKEN. But that does not mean His word will always be in one language, in even one copy; even history itself shows this. But it does mean that God can produce a perfect translation. Grant it, many KJV-only'rs can go overboard and say nothing else has ever mattered, but I think we all recognize the error in that. Some people say that Christians have gotten along fine for so many thousand years without the KJV. That's not correct reasoning, for God has always had a perfect word; it doesn't have to have the name KJV or TR slapped onto it to be perfect. You can call it a novelty, but the point is, God has always preserved His word, and TODAY, it is somewhere...I believe it's in the KJV, you believe it's elsewhere (I would be very interested to know where that is).

No, it isn't the first English translation, but you must agree that it is very significant that it is the SEVENTH translation in to English. In this manner, it totally fulfills the scripture that says "purified seven times." The translations before it were not useless, but they were all stepping stones to what God was doing—creating a perfect translation in English. There are books today that point out the imperfections of those translations.

I believe the KJV is the standard today because it is as accurate as accurate can be. Even the italics are being vindicated by recent findings. Do you see that as coincidence? I don't understand what you find wrong with the TR. Is your problem with it simply that it was put together by Erasmus? I've heard so many people say, "Well, didn't you know that this was supposed to be that and that was supposed to be this," but they won't tell you what Greek they're looking at! If your final authority is the lexicons, so be it. They really haven't proved themselves and many of them have proved to be corrupt. But I look even at the history of the past 400 years and I see ONE BOOK standing alone, which all the other newer versions seem to collectively agree against in their differences, and against which they inevitably measure themselves up to, strangely enough... "Compared to the KJV" ... "This one is better than the KJV" ... "They don't say" ... "than the Bishop's, than the Geneva" ... if someone does, it's so rare, that the exception only proves the rule. Again, is this a coincidence??

You said, "What Jesus said about the preservation of God's word exists in modern translations too."

Are you saying that He'll preserve it in a new one every year? Or that He'll all of the sudden give us one hot off the press that is His new standard? Theoretically, perhaps He would do that. But your statement seems to imply that something is wrong with the KJV again. Is it the translators, the text, the result...what is it that you have a problem with the KJV about?

God's word tells us how to find the truth on a matter in Prov 2. "He layeth up sound wisdom for the righteous..." so

if IÂ'm doing right, then IÂ'll find the truth. Fair enough? God doesnÂ't give us a Â"laundry listÂ"  of what we have to do to find the truth. He says, Do right in everything and youÂ'll find it! And, seriously, learning Greek, and committing how many years of my life to researching all the different texts, all the different translators, and anything else, just isnÂ't what God says to do to find the truth. Where is that in Scripture? ThereÂ's nothing wrong with learning all that stuff, but too often, folks believe in their findings more than in GodÂ's promise that His word wonÂ't ever be broken. God warns of those who are ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. ThatÂ's very serious, but if you look at the context, itÂ's because they werenÂ't doing right. This is not to say anything about you; I just want to lay out the dangers of making all of that more absolute or somehow Â"totally logicalÂ" when God says something different.

What makes the 1611 KJV utterly unique? I could recommend a book to you (if you wished) that outlined a good answer to this question. But looking even at history, it has been used extensively in the great revivals of the West and so forth and so on. This is not to say Â"so this proves it!Â"; it is just a side note that adds to the case for the purity of the KJV. If some of what IÂ've written hasnÂ't sufficiently answered this question for you, IÂ'll say just a bit more. There was a time when I really wasnÂ't sure where GodÂ's word was. But I believed that HE HAD ONE and that HE WOULD SHOW ME WHAT IT WAS. If I went into all the specifics of just why I believe the KJV is superior above all others, it would be immensely tedious laying out how it reads Â"this way there, but here it readsÂ...how itÂ's supposed toÂ...Â" There are books that do this, as you know.

My time on here will be sporadic but IÂ'll definitely be interested in your response. May God bless you!!

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/4/2 11:26

I feel those who lived two thousand years ago understood Biblical passages better than we do today. Over the centuries Satan has been working hard to obscure the true details of Biblical teachings. With the changes in languages, word usage and cultural understandings, what the Bible(s) have to tell us has been somewhat lost to antiquity. It is through the study of antiquity we will regain what has been lost.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/4/2 11:35

BillPro,

Quote:
-----what the Bible(s) have to tell us has been somewhat lost to antiquity. It is through the study of antiquity we will regain what has been lost.

So you're saying that God's word has been broken? That His words have passed away? That we get damaged leftovers compared to what they had? That's not what God says. Where does Scripture support your point?

Remember, this is a very cordial discussion; I just want to know what you believe.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/4/2 11:39

Quote:
-----rusaved1...So you're saying that God's word has been broken? That His words have passed away?

Yes, some of it, through "mans" interruptions.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/4/2 11:43

If the KJV can "correct" the inspired originals, did the Hebrew and Greek originally "breathed out by God" need correction or improvement?

Re: - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/4/2 11:55

Dear MrBillPro,

Quote:
-----I feel those who lived two thousand years ago understood Biblical passages better than we do today. Over the centuries Satan has been working hard to obscure the true details of Biblical teachings.

I believe you are on to something there but from what I have observed Satan does this obscuring by 'dumbing down' the readers, not the material. This became glaringly clear once I began to read Matthew Henry's Commentary (the full work not the condensed version). Never had I seen thoughts expressed in such detailed clarity. From there I read many of the Puritan's works. (The Mystery of Providence, for example). I see how far the level of written expression has dropped, not just in this Country, but throughout the entire world. Even when this Country was forming the Bible and Pilgrim's Progress were used to teach reading. Now many people struggle to read and understand either. This is due to the corruption of the education system, NOT a problem with the written Word.

Consider, if Satan can not corrupt the Word, he can easily corrupt humans reading it.

I thank God for giving me a hunger for reading and an eye to appreciate the beauty of the written word when it was used as it should be and a heart to hear it. I realize, not everyone has been given this gift (which I consider it to be). I was not given the opportunity to learn Greek or to go on to higher schooling but that does not stop me from what I can do.

You are on the right track when you say,

Quote:
-----It is through the study of antiquity we will regain what has been lost.

THE OLD PATHS are the way.

kind regards,
white stone

Re: , on: 2011/4/2 11:58

Double post, my apologies.

Re: , on: 2011/4/2 12:02

The King James translators did not correct the inspired originals. Whoever said that?

Brief History of the King James Bible
<http://www.av1611.org/kjv/kjvhist.html>

If you are really interested, you ought to read this.
Their main text was the Bishop's Bible.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/4/2 12:09

Who publishes the "inerrant KJV"?
Since the revisions of the KJV from 1613-1850 made (in addition to changes in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling) many hundreds of changes in words, word order, possessives, singulars for plurals, articles, pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, entire phrases, and the addition and deletion of words - would you say the KJV was "verbally inerrant" in 1611, 1629, 1638, 1644, 1664, 1701, 1744, 1762, 1769, or 1850?

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/4/2 12:13

I have so many questions but not much time to address this, I have to go on a service call, maybe that's God way of getting me away from this discussion.

If God gave us the KJV as an inspired translation, why would God not repeat the process again in modern language in each language?

If God supervised the translation process so that the KJV is 100% error free, why did God not extend this supervision to the printers?

Re: , on: 2011/4/2 12:18

Hope your service call goes well.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/4/2 12:30

BillPro,

Quote:

-----Yes, some of it, through "mans" interruptions.

So you're saying that man can overthrow God's promise that His word WILL NOT be broken?

Let me bring up my quote that shows how God has worked "'through 'man's' interruptions.'" (I don't believe it's "man's interruptions;" but the hand of God working just as He has before as is shown below.)

Quote:

-----In Scripture, God shows that He does make inspired translations as shown when Christ, Paul, and Peter quoted the Old Testament in their preaching, writings, etc. Obviously, they had an INSPIRED TRANSLATION that they believed in. Another example would be when Moses wrote what Pharaoh said; Pharaoh did not speak Hebrew! But God inspired that translation and it became God's perfect word. Parts of Daniel are said to have been written in Aramaic and so forth and so on... There are other examples, but do you get what I'm saying? So through just the Bible God shows us that He can overcome all the weaknesses of HUMAN TRANSLATORS and we still get something without error in the end.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/4/2 12:40

BillPro,

Quote:

-----If God gave us the KJV as an inspired translation, why would God not repeat the process again in modern language in each language? If God supervised the translation process so that the KJV is 100% error free, why did God not extend this supervision to the printers?

Your questions are legitimate, but first things are first. One way to keep this thread from becoming complicated is to not continually jump from one subject to another before addressing the one at hand.

So, is your conclusion that God did write a Book, and that it is available today? If not, then the issue of "100% error-free" printing of that Book is irrelevant.

God bless your service call!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/2 13:28

I will likely opt out of this thread soon. I do hope that individuals can refrain from proclaiming an absolute in regard to their opinion of this matter (as has been done) which is limited to their own study of the subject.

As for the question about whether or not we think that God could preserve His Word 100% error free...

This is more a question about the Word of God itself, and not necessarily the King James Version (whether the 1611 edition of the subsequent 1769 edition that most use now).

The thought that God preserved a perfect word-for-word (logos-for-logos) version of His Word (in English, no less) is an interesting thing to consider...but it doesn't provide any evidence that the KJV is that perceived "perfect and preserved" edition (or that other versions are hellish).

So, I do have a few questions for those who believe as much. I do have a difficult time with the contention of such a KJV-only perspective -- especially when it is apparently (and, often, boldly so) from a limited amount of research and study. Anyone can feel free to answer them.

Hopefully, these questions would help me to see just how KJV-only advocates address what seems to be, at least to some of us, "holes" in the reasoning regarding this issue.

I would very much hope to see answers to these questions in the person's own words -- and not something that amounts to information that is copied and pasted from a website or book. I would also not like to see an answer to these questions that amount to questioning the validity of other versions. Thanks.

1. Since there is a belief that God eternally preserved His written Word to the last jot and tittle...and a belief that the KJV is the only perfect and preserved version of the Word of God...and since we know that the KJV was gathered together by sifting through many different manuscripts...which version of the Bible would you have recommended to people in the ~1600 years BEFORE the KJV was published?
2. Which version of the KJV is "perfect and preserved" -- the 1611 edition, the currently common 1769 edition, or any of the other revisions?
3. Do you believe that men like Erasmus (a Catholic and humanist) and the translators of the KJV (some who embraced "high church" Catholic-lite doctrinal views) were INSPIRED BY GOD when they, via committee, poured through all of the different documents to decide upon which ones to use and how to translate it into Greek or English?
4. Why should we not believe the translators when they stated that their version was not perfect?
5. Were there any word-for-word "perfect and preserved" manuscripts of the Word of God BEFORE 1611? If so, why did the translators of the KJV decide against consulting them exclusively?
6. Which is more accurate -- the Textus Receptus or the KJV? After all, both of their New Testament translations cannot be "perfect" because they disagree quite a bit.
7. Are there ANY errors in the text of the KJV -- whether from previous mistranslations from sources used...or from the mistakes or missteps of the 1611 translators?
8. We know that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (II Timothy 3:16). Now, God did not give this Scripture ORIGINALLY in English (whether 1611 or current English), and the KJV translators were forced to pour through many, many different subsequent documents to decide on what to translate and how to translate it. So, when did God "give" the word-for-word "perfect and preserved" Scripture of the KJV? Was this "given" for the 1611 edition, or the 1613, 1629, 1638, 1644, 1664, 1701, 1744, 1762, 1769 or 1850 editions?
9. Which version of the Word of God is word-for-word "perfect and preserved"...in Spanish? In Chinese? In Hindi? In Arabic? After all, God cares for the entire world (not just English speakers) and the vast majority of the world does not speak English.

weak English. Which version(s) are "perfect and preserved" for everyone else?

10. If the translators of the KJV were "inspired" or chose to sort through texts to find "perfection," why did they consult and rely upon the renderings found in some of the previous "Authorized" editions for England -- like the "Great Bible" and the "Bishop's Bible?"

Thanks for reading through the questions. I am not looking for any sort of contention (just like those who have raised this issue repeatedly over the years in the forums here at SermonIndex). Rather, I would genuinely like to know how some reason these sort of questions in regard to their verdict that the King James Version (or one of its revisions) was the only "perfect and preserved" -- to the last jot and tittle -- version of God's Word.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/4/2 15:27

Some good and well thought out words again Chris. We know that God will preserve His Word. He promised to. To blindly say KJV only can limit God, because God speaks Spanish, Chinese, etc. too.

I believe that God guides the translators as they translate. Sometimes, not because of their lives and beliefs, but in spite of them. Paul talked about those who preach Christ out of contention. I think that is in Gal. 1. God has promised to preserve His Word. The Bible plainly teaches this. With that said, Satan has sought to corrupt the Word of God to cast doubt on it. Isaiah talks about the way of holiness being a way that even the wayfaring man can find. Since it is a simple way, Satan seeks to make it a confused way. Without a doubt some modern translations have muddied the water of the Word of God. We must be careful to hold a standard of the Word of God and be true to what it teaches.

I am out of time to talk more.

King Jimmy, I'm still interested about the Greek work you talked about.

In Christ,
JB

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/4/2 15:28

I'm still catching up with this thread, but wanted to make this observation. On p39 Rusakov said

Quote:
-----We don't see them saying, The best reading is this...or I like how this one version says it...or anything like that. What did they say? THUS SAITH THE LORD... They didn't have any problem finding God's word, even though there were many corrupt ones around.

I am always struck by the simplicity of Paul's definition of knowing God,

Romans 1:19 Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed unto them. 20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: 21 Because that, when they knew God, they glorified not as God, neither were thankful;

And that he reverted to it in Acts 14:

14 when the apostles, Barnabas and Paul, heard, they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, 15 And saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein: 16 Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. 17 Nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness. 18 And with these sayings scarce restrained they the people, that they had not done sacrifice unto them.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/2 15:50

Hi JB1968...

Quote:

Some good and well thought out words again Chris. We know that God will preserve His Word. He promised to. To blindly say KJV only can limit God, because God speaks spanish, chinese, etc. too.

Thanks. I agree that God preserved His Word...eternally. I believe that he preserved it long before the KJV. I believe that it is preserved outside of the language of 1611 English too.

No one is blindly saying that the KJV can limit God either. However, a KJV-only philosophy confines a "perfect-and-preserved-down-to-the-last-jot-and-tittle" claim to a single text translated from many manuscripts that is written in a language (early 17th Century English) to a world that nearly everyone else who has ever lived does not understand.

I remember speaking with a couple of Mormon cult-members ("missionaries") when I was a teenager. They were saying that John chapter 10 (in their KJV Bible, no less) states that Jesus physically visited America because Jesus "had other sheep, which are not of this fold" that he had to visit. I remember my comment to them. I asked why Jesus cared so much about the few people living in ancient America -- but not about those living in Australia...or Central Africa...or China...or Europe. Why didn't he physically visit them? Those Mormons usually had no answer for it. This is because the basis of their premise was inherently flawed.

So, yes, I believe that an argument about the Word of God being preserved in English...and English only...is fundamentally flawed and an incorrect interpretation of Galatians 1 and other passages used to make such a claim. Why would God choose to wait until 1611 (or one of the years of the subsequent KJV revisions) to "preserve" a text of His Word that was deciphered from multiple copies, manuscripts, texts and previous Bible versions?

Now, I do believe that the Word of God is eternally preserved. That is not even in dispute. However, many of us do not embrace an argument that claims that the 1611 KJV (or any of its revisions) is the only "preserved" manuscript of the Word of God.

I, too, am out of time to talk more. I have some important things to attend to today. However, I would appreciate if anyone could address the questions that I mentioned a bit earlier (in their own words and without first consulting KJV-only websites/books for some type of answer).

The Lord bless you exceedingly, brother.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/4/2 16:40

You all have good points that should be answered but only after we deal with the basics.

True, this isn't necessarily dealing with the KJV. But it must be dealt with if we're going to get anywhere talking about the KJV or any other Bible for that matter. So these questions are not regarding the KJV, just the word of God in general.

Before any further posts, I would ask if these questions could be answered. Did God write a Book? Do we have it today? WHERE IS IT??

Psalms 119:160 Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever.

John 10:35 If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;

2 Corinthians 2:17 For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.

1 Peter 1:23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the WORD OF GOD, WHICH LIVETH AND ABIDETH FOR EVER.

Where is that word that can never die, "pass away" or be broken?

Re: , on: 2011/4/2 16:54

I believe the Word of God is also preserved in the Reina-Valera Gomez Spanish Bible. So, that would mean I am not KJV-only.

Re: - posted by rusaved1, on: 2011/4/2 17:08

Right, right, 777.

We're talking about the standard English translation; however, I do believe that God can and does inspire translations into other languages as well. I hardly know any Spanish, but I hear that the Gomez Bible is MUCH more accurate than the Reina-Valera. I would enjoy learning more about other languages' translations after we get established as to where everyone is on the basics.

Thanks for your comment!

Re: , on: 2011/4/2 17:17

Yes, sorry to deviate, but wanted to answer to the continual charge of KJV-only.

Ok, looking forward to hearing the answer to your questions.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/2 19:06

Hi anonymous777,

Quote:

I believe the Word of God is also preserved in the Reina-Valera Gomez Spanish Bible. So, that would mean I am not KJV-only.

Then how do you account for the various differences between the KJV and the Reina Valera? Which one is right and which one is wrong?

*EDIT -- Are you fluent in Spanish? Otherwise, how are you qualified to make such a conclusion?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/2 19:09

Hi rusaved1...

Quote:

You all have good points that should be answered but only after we deal with the basics.

True, this isn't necessarily dealing with the KJV. But it must be dealt with if we're going to get anywhere talking about the KJV or any other Bible for that matter. So these questions are not regarding the KJV, just the word of God in general.

Before any further posts, I would ask if these questions could be answered. Did God write a Book? Do we have it today? WHERE IS IT??

Psalms 119:160 Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever.

John 10:35 If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;

2 Corinthians 2:17 For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.

1 Peter 1:23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the WORD OF GOD, WHICH LIVETH AND ABIDETH FOR EVER.

Where is that word that can never die, "pass away" or be broken?

I am going to answer this with the PM that you sent me...with the response that I provided to the PM. I hope that it clarified my view on this matter.

Quote:

rusaved1 wrote:
Hi Chris!

You don't have much time, you said, but I wanted to know the answer to one question.

KJV-onlyism beside,

You've said you do believe God has preserved His word, that it's not limited to the KJV, or to the English language. That's legitimate. But where is it? What is it? Can any of us get it? I sincerely want to know what it is. Because if I'm in error, I want to know where the right one is. NO ONE one this thread has said where it is, what it is, etc. Do you believe there is an absolute truth to be known on this matter?

I look forward to hearing from you. God bless!

rusaved1

My response:

Yes, I believe that God has preserved His Word.

Which version?

Personally, I do not believe (at least, at this time) that it is preserved in ONE single text. Rather, I believe that the Word of God -- which is Eternal -- is preserved in the "rhema" of the spoken word that is preserved as the voice of God. I believe that it is found in a gathering of the many various eclectic texts of the Word.

After all, the KJV is a single text that was gathered from MANY texts. The Textus Receptus is a single text that was gathered from MANY texts.

The translators were forced to gather as many texts that they had available, sort through them, confer with one another, and create a consensus upon which set of words and phrases were the most accurate or likely to be correct. Then, they were forced to translate that particular text into English.

The translators, in their own writings, admitted that there were times where a unanimous consensus could not be reached. Thus, they relied upon a plurality of opinion for the consensus which ultimately made it into the work.

Not only did the translators of the KJV rely upon the Textus Receptus and other Greek manuscripts, they also relied upon other translations -- including previous "Authorized Version" Bibles from the Church of England (like the Great Bible and the Bishop's Bible).

The translators gathered what they thought was best and combined all of it into one text. In 1611, that text included the books of the Apocrypha...which even the translators believed were "inspired" at the time. There were obvious errors in the 1611 text, which is why it was subsequently revised (but not re-translated) a handful of times until we arrived to the 1769 Cambridge version and the 1850 Oxford version that are most common today.

So, one has to wonder just why God would have waited about 1600 years to FINALLY preserve His Word (and in old English, no less).

If you believe that a particular text was "preserved" in one edition, what text was "perfect and preserved" BEFORE 1611 (or the years of the subsequent revisions)?

Do you see the disconnect here?

You are claiming that God would preserve His Word...and conclude (for whatever reasons that you have) that the KJV is that version. So, was God's promise void in the 1600 years until it was completed? Which version or revision of the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" version?

Re: - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/4/2 19:36

Chris said:

Quote:
-----Personally, I do not believe (at least, at this time) that it is preserved in ONE single text. Rather, I believe that the Word of God -- which is Eternal -- is preserved in the "rhema" of the spoken word that is preserved as the voice of God. I believe that it is found in a gathering of the many various eclectic texts of the Word.

It seems that God, in your opinion, has shut me out of hearing His perfect word. This is most disturbing. This does not 'feel' right and I can not be made to believe my Father would treat me like a red headed stepchild. Is the Word of God only for those whom His Providence favors with a 'higher' education?

I know God is my Father and can not accept that He does not feed me on His Word in the KJV. Jesus is the Word of God, I know He is perfectly preserved and easily accessible to any who call on His Name.

I was waiting for you to say the true Word is preserved in some expensive publication and I would have sold all I had to buy that book. Now, you say it is not even available. . .

This does not add up with any Scripture I have ever read, of course, I am only able to read imperfect representations, since I can not read it in the original languages.

Are you telling me that all the Scripture I have memorized may not even be God's words? Do you even realize what you have said/implicated? Or, how it can effect those on this forum?

As much as I felt you would say what you did, I expected better after 41+ pages white stone

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/2 20:08

Hi White_Stone...

Quote:

It seems that God, in your opinion, has shut me out of hearing His perfect word. This is most disturbing.

If this is how it "seems" to you, then you totally misunderstood what I wrote.

In no way did I suggest that God has "shut out" anyone of hearing His perfect Word.

Quote:

This does not 'feel' right and I can not be made to believe my Father would treat me like a red headed stepchild.

First of all, you need to be careful about what you "feel."

Secondly, no one said that God our Father would treat you like "a red-headed stepchild." In fact, I don't even know how you can go from what I said to such a sentiment.

Quote:

Is the Word of God only for those whom His Providence favors with a 'higher' education?

Of course not. It is also not limited to people who speak English. It is also not limited to people who can properly understand and speak with a 1611 English vernacular.

By the way, I don't even know where you would obtain such a perception...since nothing that I wrote would indicate that God "favors" anyone with a "higher education."

Quote:

I know God is my Father and can not accept that He does not feed me on His Word in the KJV.

No one implied any differently. To suggest otherwise is simply a mis-perception or a flat-out distortion.

Quote:

Jesus is the Word of God, I know He is perfectly preserved and easily accessible to any who call on His Name.

This is exactly what I (and others) have been saying. Still, "King James" is not an alias for the Lord either. The Word of God is eternal...preserved...and available to ANYONE who calls out to the Lord in truth (and not just those who can read or speak 1611 English).

Quote:

This does not add up with any Scripture I have ever read, of course, I am only able to read imperfect representations, since I can not read it in the original languages.

What does not add up? Even if you believe that God has "preserved His Word" perfectly -- down to the last jot and tittle -- what evidence have you amassed that makes you think that the KJV in 1611 (or any of the subsequent revisions) is the best version?

After all, the translators of the KJV did read many manuscripts in the original languages -- and they did NOT have any documents that were in total agreement. So, they carefully pieced together the text that they thought were the best (at the time) and then carefully attempted to translate those words into common language of the time (1611 English).

Quote:

I was waiting for you to say the true Word is preserved in some expensive publication and I would have sold all I had to buy that book. Now, you say it is not even available. . .

Again, you are totally misconstruing what I said. I didn't say that it was UNAVAILABLE. In fact, I said nothing like that.

I said that the Word of God is ETERNAL. It was with God in the beginning (John 1:1-4). However, the "written" Word of God that is found in the King James Version was gathered from numerous different sources that did not agree with one another in many instances. The translators, then, had to select from all of those sources which words that they felt were the most accurate. Then, they had to translate those selections into English. During that time, they also consulted existing English versions -- including a couple of previous "Authorized Versions" of the Church of England.

Thus, I believe that the Word of God is preserved...but not confined...to a particular version in the English language.

Quote:

This does not add up with any Scripture I have ever read, of course, I am only able to read imperfect representations, since I can not read it in the original languages.

Again, I never implied differently. However, I agree that you are correct that we are each confined to many, many different representations of Scripture that were compiled, written, copied and translated into many different languages by imperfect men. The translators of the KJV totally agreed with the notion that their work was an imperfect representation of the Perfect Word of God.

I think that the original translators were better equipped to speak of their work than any modern day men who would proclaim that the King James version (regardless of whether the original or one of the subsequent revisions) is not only perfect but that all other attempts to do just what those KJV translators did was less accurate or even unholy.

Quote:

Are you telling me that all the Scripture I have memorized may not even be God's words?

No.

Quote:

Do you even realize what you have said/implicated?

Yes, but it appears that you do not.

Quote:

Or, how it can effect those on this forum?

If it prompts those who loudly proclaim that the KJV is the ONLY acceptable version of the Bible to stop proclaiming their opinions as "facts" and the only view that matters...or if it prompts anyone interested in proclaiming anything about this to study this issue more intently, then perhaps this is a good effect.

Quote:

As much as I felt you would say what you did, I expected better after 41+ pages

How kind of you. However, I didn't write 41+ pages in this topic. Moreover, you misunderstood and then misconstrued what I said. You might want to be more careful of doing so in the future.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/4/2 20:09

I want to back up rusaved's point about the word of God being corruptible by men, because the gospels clearly lay out the lengths to which the religious leaders were willing to go to pervert truth at many levels, while maintaining their respectable exterior.

Chris, this is why I quoted the verses from Mark 7 about 'out of the heart'. I accept that perhaps not everyone on the KJV translation 'committee' was born again, but it is impossible to read Tyndale, and think he was NOT born again.

Part of the fawning nature of the Preface to the King James Bible, is the nearby history. Before Elizabeth had become queen in 1545, both her young brother (who died young) and her older sister Mary had been on the throne. Mary, a Catholic, had had a five year killing spree against non-Catholics. Whatever Elizabeth's faults, she did not order a killing spree against Catholics when she acceded to the throne.

When James IV of Scotland became James I of England succeeding Elizabeth 1 of England, no-one was entirely sure what to expect. Elizabeth had ordered her Archbishop Hooker to write a treatise on the reasonableness of the (non-Catholic) faith, but a majority in Parliament were Presbyterian, and wanted James to make Presbyterianism law in England. Until 1688 the national religion in England changed with the monarch, and this continued to lead to bloodshed. No doubt English Christians were very relieved that James wanted to promote Bible reading in English, as it widened the difference between Catholics and Protestants.

Hooker's language is almost impenetrable compared with (the earlier) Tyndale's. The fanciest part of what the KJV translators added, has been explained in previous threads. It could be taken that they changed meanings, but only if one doesn't understand the rest of what the epistles say.

This brings me to another point, which is that I have been amazed that there are people who can read the Bible and understand it WITHOUT the Holy Spirit. This seems to me to be almost a curse rather than a blessing, for they will be more than without excuse for unbelief if they don't repent. Whereas someone like me who was totally lost when I began reading it (without the Holy Spirit), am much more concerned by the concessions to carnal thinking made by the newer translations, than by the difficulties of seeking and waiting for revelation from on high.

It seems to me far more of a danger to a Christian to THINK they know what God is saying to them, when actually the text has been made so easy they aren't listening to God at all, or, they are assuming He thinks like they think, instead of having to relearn how to think, period. I don't know why I seem to be particularly conscious of the duplicity of the language in places in modern translations, but I am. We are indebted to Paul and the other NT writers for drawing out the major doctrines from the OT for us, regardless of the language. (I don't mean translation.)

If someone like Paul can write in 2 Corinthians 4:1 Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; 2 But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, NOR HANDLING THE WORLD OF GOD DECEITFULLY; but by MANIFESTATION OF THE TRUTH commending ourselves to every man's conscience IN THE SIGHT OF GOD', it matters very much that anyone translating scripture from whatever manuscript or codex, should know Him personally. I believe it is essential. This probably goes for the copyist too. How tempting it would be to make little alterations, because of unbelief, or one's own opinion.

I have read your questions, and am not sure whether I will attempt to answer any.

Your fanaticism over whether a person reading the KJV 'thinks' it is 'perfect' or not, prompts the question 'what do you mean by perfect'. The word in English comes from two Greek words. Most often the one meaning 'complete' is used, and the one meaning utterly 'flawless', I believe, only twice.

My tiny contribution to answering this, is to say that all translations - reproductions of the word of God written down - are a bridge between God and man, over which He wishes to meet us. The KJV seems to be a bridge which works very well for Him. That's how I would put it. I have no idea how He finds the other translations, or, whether there is as much revelation for a reader of the NIV or NASB who really prefers them and rarely or ever would open a KJV, as that same reader would find if they persevered with the KJV.

I have read the NIV from cover to cover, and I found it helpful at a superficial level, but the more I went back to it hoping for something deeper or to add to the KJV, the more I was disappointed, until I stopped recommending it to people who seriously wanted to go on with God.

I don't feel the same way about the NASB, but because I know the KJV, I find the NASB tiresomely similar but confusing, because of the way the sentences have been constructed. When I've compared them, I can see the content is pretty similar, but to me at least sometimes, I feel the original emphasis has been shifted.

Clearly, this is not an academic comment. My preference is not to read a Bible which is harder work, but to read one which leads to my knowing God better and better, even if it IS 'hard work'. In general, no matter which translation I'm reading, if the Lord speaks to me from it, I'm likely to look at an interlinear, KJV, Strong's, Young's and possibly Tyndale's if I can find my copy, depending on what more I want to know.

The translators of the KJV did change Tyndale's punctuation in places, and while they may have thought it didn't make a lot of difference, particularly in Romans 11, what they did to the clauses preceding 'and thus all Israel shall be saved', has led to endless controversy. (This is not to say it would not have happened anyway, but it was when reading Tyndale that I 'saw' what Paul was saying.) But, the same words were all there. Just the punctuation had been changed.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/4/2 20:11

I want to bump this so that it doesn't get lost. If anyone can address these questions, it would greatly help my understanding of the opinions of those who feel that the KJV is THE "perfect and preserved" edition of the Word of God.

=====

I will likely opt out of this thread soon. I do hope that individuals can refrain from proclaiming an absolute in regard to their opinion of this matter (as has been done) which is limited to their own study of the subject.

As for the question about whether or not we think that God could preserve His Word 100% error free...

This is more a question about the Word of God itself, and not necessarily the King James Version (whether the 1611 edition or the subsequent 1769 edition that most use now).

The thought that God preserved a perfect word-for-word (logos-for-logos) version of His Word (in English, no less) is an interesting thing to consider...but it doesn't provide any evidence that the KJV is that perceived "perfect and preserved" edition (or that other versions are hellish).

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

So, I do have a few questions for those who believe as much. I do have a difficult time with the contention of such a KJV-only perspective -- especially when it is apparently (and, often, boldly so) from a limited amount of research and study. Anyone can feel free to answer them.

Hopefully, these questions would help me to see just how KJV-only advocates address what seems to be, at least to some of us, "holes" in the reasoning regarding this issue.

I would very much hope to see answers to these questions in the person's own words -- and not something that amounts to information that is copied and pasted from a website or book. I would also not like to see an answer to these questions that amount to questioning the validity of other versions. Thanks.

1. Since there is a belief that God eternally preserved His written Word to the last jot and tittle...and a belief that the KJV is the only perfect and preserved version of the Word of God...and since we know that the KJV was gathered together by sifting through many different manuscripts...which version of the Bible would you have recommended to people in the ~1600 years BEFORE the KJV was published?
2. Which version of the KJV is "perfect and preserved" -- the 1611 edition, the currently common 1769 edition, or any of the other revisions?
3. Do you believe that men like Erasmus (a Catholic and humanist) and the translators of the KJV (some who embraced "high church" Catholic-lite doctrinal views) were INSPIRED BY GOD when they, via committee, poured through all of the different documents to decide upon which ones to use and how to translate it into Greek or English?
4. Why should we not believe the translators when they stated that their version was not perfect?
5. Were there any word-for-word "perfect and preserved" manuscripts of the Word of God BEFORE 1611? If so, why did the translators of the KJV decide against consulting them exclusively?
6. Which is more accurate -- the Textus Receptus or the KJV? After all, both of their New Testament translations cannot be "perfect" because they disagree quite a bit.
7. Are there ANY errors in the text of the KJV -- whether from previous mistranslations from sources used...or from the mistakes or missteps of the 1611 translators?
8. We know that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (II Timothy 3:16). Now, God did not give this Scripture ORIGINALLY in English (whether 1611 or current English), and the KJV translators were forced to pour through many, many different subsequent documents to decide on what to translate and how to translate it. So, when did God "give" the word-for-word "perfect and preserved" Scripture of the KJV? Was this "given" for the 1611 edition, or the 1613, 1629, 1638, 1644, 1664, 1701, 1744, 1762, 1769 or 1850 editions?
9. Which version of the Word of God is word-for-word "perfect and preserved"...in Spanish? In Chinese? In Hindi? In Arabic? After all, God cares for the entire world (not just English speakers) and the vast majority of the world does not speak English. Which version(s) are "perfect and preserved" for everyone else?
10. If the translators of the KJV were "inspired" or chose to sort through texts to find "perfection," why did they consult and rely upon the renderings found in some of the previous "Authorized" editions for England -- like the "Great Bible" and the "Bishop's Bible?"

=====

Thanks for reading through the questions. I am not looking for any sort of contention (just like those who have raised this issue repeatedly over the years in the forums here at SermonIndex). Rather, I would genuinely like to know how some reason these sort of questions in regard to their verdict that the King James Version (or one of its revisions) was the only "perfect and preserved" -- to the last jot and tittle -- version of God's Word.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/2 21:04

Hi Alive-to-God...

Quote:

I have read your questions, and am not sure whether I will attempt to answer any.

Your fanaticism over whether a person reading the KJV 'thinks' it is 'perfect' or not, prompts the question 'what do you mean by perfect'. The word in English comes from two Greek words. Most often the one meaning 'complete' is used, and the one meaning utterly 'flawless', I believe, only twice.

Fanaticism?

So, I am "fanatical" for questioning the loud claims that all other versions of God's Word are "unholy," "impure" and "heresy?"

So, I am given to "fanaticism" -- but not the person who joined SermonIndex a few days ago and spends his time propagating a view that versions of God's Word like the NIV and NASB are "unholy" (his words) while also spewing all sort of rumors and gossip about the translators of those versions (but never feeling the need to contact those who are the objects of the gossip for the sake of truth and clarity)?

It appears that you are quite selective with your definition of "fanaticism."

As for the word "perfect," it is not the one that I chose to use...and it is not a Greek word either.

Moreover, the word is used to conjure a view that the KJV is "perfect" while all others are "flawed." So, it is obvious what they mean when they use the word "perfect."

Quote:

My tiny contribution to answering this, is to say that all translations - reproductions of the word of God written down - are a bridge between God and man, over which He wishes to meet us.

No one has said any differently. In fact, this is an underlying essence of what I have said. God's Word is perfect...and preserved. No one said differently. I wholeheartedly agree that faithful translations of God's Word are a bridge between God and man! This can be the KJV, the NIV and the NASB.

However, I am not the person who would have a problem with this statement. The brothers who joined this forum a few days ago are the ones who loudly proclaim as "truth" that other versions of God's Word cannot even be considered "God's Word."

Quote:

The KJV seems to be a bridge which works very well for Him. That's how I would put it. I have no idea how He finds the other translations, or, whether there is as much revelation for a reader of the NIV or NASB who really prefers them and rarely or ever would open a KJV, as that same reader would find if they persevered with the KJV.

I have read the NIV from cover to cover, and I found it helpful at a superficial level, but the more I went back to it hoping for something deeper or to add to the KJV, the more I was disappointed, until I stopped recommending it to people who seriously wanted to go on with God.

I don't feel the same way about the NASB, but because I know the KJV, I find the NASB tiresomely similar but confusing, because of the way the sentences have been constructed. When I've compared them, I can see the content is pretty similar, but to me at least sometimes, I feel the original emphasis has been shifted.

This is fine...for you. However, this isn't what is happening here. This isn't about whether or not you "got as much" out of the NIV or NASB. This is about a couple of guys who joined our the SermonIndex community recently and spent the bulk of that time proclaiming that other versions of God's Word -- like the NIV and NASB -- are unholy works. It isn't about "PREFERENCE" for whatever reasons. It is a PROCLAMATION that other versions are damnable.

You see, you didn't prefer the NIV or NASB for your own set of reasons. That is perfectly understandable...and acceptable. It is admirable that you acted on a matter of conscience or preference. However, you didn't proclaim those versions that you do not prefer to be a "heresy." You didn't pour through KJV-only websites and paste that information here as "proof" that those versions are "devilish works."

Quote:

Clearly, this is not an academic comment. My preference is not to read a Bible which is harder work, but to read one which leads to my knowing God better and better, even if it IS 'hard work'. In general, not matter which translation I'm reading, if the Lord speaks to me from it, I'm likely to look at an interlinear, KJV, Strong's, Young's and possibly Tyndale's if I can find my copy, depending on what more I want to know.

The translators of the KJV did change Tyndale's punctuation in places, and while they may have thought it didn't make a lot of difference, particularly in Romans 11, what they did to the clauses preceding 'and thus all Israel shall be saved', has led to endless controversy. (This is not to say it would not have happened anyway, but it was when reading Tyndale that I 'saw' what Paul was saying.) But, the same words were all there. Just the punctuation had been changed.

Very good points.

However, your presentation and opinions are somewhat different than the emphasis of a couple others that I am trying to point out.

There is an underlying premise that is presented first -- that the KJV is "perfect and preserved" down to the last jot and tittle.

A secondary premise in their argument is that all other versions (or, in one case, all versions outside of a new version of the Reina Valera in Spanish that was recently modified by one man) are either flawed or "devilish" and heretical.

As "evidence" to proclaim their version as superior, a branch-theory is presented in which those who advocate all of this attack the translators, language experts, text critics, and sources that differ from the original thesis about KJV supremacy.

When it really gets down to "proving" the original thesis that the KJV is "perfect and preserved" down to the last jot and tittle, a series of comparison verses are presented (which have been repeatedly explained as differences in SOURCE TEXT rather than word or phrase choice).

Other words are often copied and pasted from websites and books that do little -- other than to show differences (as pointed out earlier as a proof of difference in SOURCE) or to malign the translators, sources, or views of language/manuscript experts or text critics.

Personally, I cannot find any credible evidence that would even remotely substantiate their original premise of a "perfect" KJV down to the last jot and tittle.

Really, I don't care too much about what a few KJV-only advocates believe. My cousin is one...but he also thinks that it is a sin for his family to eat ham, pork or catfish. He tells me that I would agree if I would switch to KJV-only as well and "burn" my "Satanic" versions. Ironically, he first formed his opinion by listening to a certain "minister" who "revealed" this to him and by using "evidence" from the same KJV-only websites and books that are cited in this very thread.

So why do I even comment in threads that morph into KJV-only arguments?

I have a real problem when someone joins our community and spends great amount of time proclaiming some sectarian view as if it were not only "truth" -- but the only truth that matters. Yes, we need to be keenly aware that others are watching -- including young believers who have been "spoken to" by God via versions like the NASB and NIV.

These versions may not be your own preference -- but no one has the right to join this forum and propagate a continuous rant that these versions are "unholy."

This is what has happened here in this thread (and, apparently, a couple of others). This is what has happened in the past when individuals would join our community of believers in the past...and loudly proclaimed such a sectarian view.

I am thankful for people who have a difference of opinion about such things and can share it without rhetorically spitting upon the views that they disagree with. Like I said before, I don't have a problem with individuals who arrive to an opinion about this that may differ from my own. I am, however, perplexed when someone proclaims their views as the only one that matters or who resort to questionable tactics when they are trying to propagate their own views...and tear apart the translators, Bible societies, source texts, and experts who disagree with those views.

I hope that makes sense.

It would be very easy to ignore the opinions of some new member(s) of this wonderful community. After all, I have gotten to the point where I rarely involve myself in many of the other squabbles about often-debated controversial subjects here at SermonIndex. I think that "I don't know" is perfectly acceptable in regard to some issues that aren't completely and firmly established by Scripture. I also think that refraining from proclaiming absolutes about certain subjects that are far from absolutely certain is better than proclaiming them. After all, it would be horrible to find that our loud proclamations were the equivalent of "lying" for God (or what we think to be for God).

So, I felt inclined to participate in this matter because of the method by which the opinion was proclaimed by an individual who just joined. In the past, there have been individuals who used similar time, means, words and methods to proclaim their views about the KJV and other versions. I even had to look twice to make sure that I wasn't seeing the same men who have departed our community -- because the manner by which they proclaimed their views was almost identical.

I would still like to return the conversation to the "basics" by finding the answers to the questions that I asked. If someone thinks that the KJV is "absolutely perfect," then -- regardless of what they think of other versions -- they should be prepared to explain just why. They shouldn't have to rely to things that they copy and paste from other websites. They should be able to write in their own words their views. I feel that what appears to be obvious but overlooked flaws in the reasoning of the original implied thesis needs to be fully explained BEFORE we meander into offshoots and branches of the matter.

May the Lord bless you...and each of us...with the Wisdom to consider this matter properly.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/4/2 21:16

Quote:

-----ccchhhrrriiiss....

So, I am "fanatical" for questioning the loud claims that all other versions of God's Word are "unholy," "impure" and "heresy?"

No Brother, your not "fanatical", matter fact I personally think if we all were to have a "world" poll on the closest to the original text, I bet the NASB and the KJV would be neck to neck, I truly believe this. I also believe the NASB has a greater understanding, but this is just my opinion.

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/4/2 22:41

Hi Chris,

It's very late here (tomorrow, actually), and I don't have the processing power to read your latest post to me properly, so I will do that tomorrow.

I've been trying to figure out why you feel so strongly about this, because to be frank, it doesn't make sense. I won't use the 'f' word again, as obviously you think your attention to this matter is cooler than that, but your posts don't read that way (fyi).

You have asked a lot of questions to people who trust the KJV more than newer translations. You have given your reasons for why you trust what you believe to be the older manuscript family, and while brushing my teeth I've come up with just one main question for you.

Where I live, there is a church called 'English Martyrs', in a street where the side streets commemorate four of them.

On recalling that millions and millions of people died in Europe during the Reformation, and Counter-Reformation, over the rejection of the traditions of the Rome, and the translation of scripture in languages other than Latin, why would you ever trust a version of scripture which Rome claims to have preserved (or discovered), regardless of its age?

(If you have perused the work of the Council of Trent, you will know they are not bent on promoting truth. I'm sure you know now that during the 1800s, Rome began to remove the scriptures from its people again. Now, why would they do that unless they didn't like the results within their ranks?)

My parenthesis aside, I look forward to your explanation.

Many thanks.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/2 23:54

Hi Alive-to-God,

Quote:

I've been trying to figure out why you feel so strongly about this, because to be frank, it doesn't make sense. I won't use the 'f' word again, as obviously you think your attention to this matter is cooler than that, but your posts don't read that way (fyi).

I suppose that you don't know me very well if you think that I am "fanatical" about this matter. Like I said, I couldn't care less about what each individual believes regarding the supremacy of one particular version over another (or even all others). However, like I also said, this is NOT what is being done here.

My concern -- whether you want to label it fanaticism or not -- is when one person joins this community and immediately begins publishing continuous rhetoric that not only proclaims the KJV as "perfect and preserved" down to the last jot and tittle, but that all other versions are "unholy."

In fact, I found it odd that you called me out for "fanaticism" when, by the rhetoric that I have read, there almost seems to be a degree of "fanaticism" present when some join this community and declare versions of God's Word to be "devilish" simply because their own very limited amount of study into the matter causes them to believe such.

There is a difference between such thoughts. One urges caution about declaring such a thing. The other pronounces all (or most) other alleges all sorts of conspiracy theories regarding translators, translations, text/manuscript/language experts, and sources. This view even declares emphatically that some faithful versions of God's Word are downright "unholy."

Quote:

You have asked a lot of questions to people who trust the KJV more than newer translations. You have given your reasons for why you trust what you believe to be the older manuscript family...

Just to clarify (again): I did NOT say that these are MY reasons to trust "the older manuscript family."

First of all, the matter of OTHER versions (those that are not the KJV) is a divergent matter from the initial claims that the KJV is the only "perfect and preserved" version of the Word of God "down to the last jot and tittle." An attack on all other versions is NOT an explanation as to why someone thinks that the KJV is absolutely flawless. This is very important when you consider the fact that the KJV itself was translated from many manuscripts, versions and even existent English translations that the translators had to sort through and determine what they thought to be the best.

Moreover, I have not claimed any opinion that the majority of scholars, text/manuscript experts, linguistic experts, and translators who embrace certain texts as more reliable over others...are necessarily correct. I simply understand their view and perspective. I would not propagate that view as the only one that matters.

In addition, I think that you might not have grasped just why they feel the way they do either. It isn't just about the age of the manuscripts that they deem to be most reliable. Yes, many of those Alexandrian text-type manuscripts and texts are the ONLY ones available that were actually written in the Koine Greek of which the original autographs were written. But, there is more. It is also the fact that many of those experts believe that the later manuscripts belonging to the other text-types were DERIVED FROM those early manuscripts. They have reasons for this...and I have asked anyone who is interested to contact those manuscript experts, language experts and translators for the anecdotal reasons why.

Quote:

...and while brushing my teeth I've come up with just one main question for you.

On recalling that millions and millions of people died in Europe during the Reformation, and Counter-Reformation, over the rejection of the traditions of the Rome, and the translation of scripture in languages other than Latin, why would you ever trust a version of scripture which Rome claims to have preserved (or discovered), regardless of its age?

I don't understand what you are claiming here. What "version" are you claiming is a version of Scripture that Rome claims to have "preserved or discovered?" If you are speaking of the Codex Vaticanus, it is just one of many texts lumped into the Alexandrian text-type...and not at all mutually exclusive. Its origin possibly predates the creation of the Roman heretical "church." Moreover, it was ALSO consulted by Erasmus (a Catholic and a humanist) when he single-handedly completed the Textus Receptus -- the text heavily relied upon for the KJV.

However, perhaps I am misunderstanding which "version" that you are speaking about. I apologize if I misunderstood your question.

Moreover, I must remind you that arguments about other versions are mere diversions from the original thesis of the "perfect and preserved" claims about the KJV. Someone could try to lay out an anti-NIV, anti-NASB or even anti-Alexandrian text-type argument -- but that is not the same as validating their claims about the KJV as the only acceptable version of God's Word.

For the boisterous claims propagated by some to be true, they must FIRST prove that the KJV is absolutely perfect down to the last jot and tittle. We can talk about the other versions later.

This is why I would like to hear answers to the questions that I have asked previously. I am still waiting for answers that do not contain cut-and-paste material lifted from KJV-only websites and books.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/4/2 23:56

Alive to God,

Quote:
-----The translators of the KJV did change Tyndale's punctuation in places, and while they may have thought it didn't make a lot of difference, particularly in Romans 11, what they did to the clauses preceding 'and thus all Israel shall be saved', has led to endless controversy. (This is not to say it would not have happened anyway, but it was when reading Tyndale that I 'saw' what Paul was saying.) But, the same words were all there. Just the punctuation had been changed.

I don't know if you are familiar with NT Greek, but punctuation is one thing translators have to decide upon. If I remember right from Greek class, it was written with no punctuation. That was decided upon based on the sentence structure, gender, tenses, etc.

Another thing about words. If any one has ever had a foreign language, you will remember that you cannot always translate word for word, because it may not make sense. Many times it may be phrase by phrase and then rearranging the sentence for the new language.

Re: Charge: Erasmus was a Humanist and a "good" Catholic., on: 2011/4/3 12:58

Let's deal with one of the questions that have been asked.

We often hear the charge from people that "Erasmus was a humanist!" And of course everyone is expected to automatically use today's definition of a humanist when they hear that charge.

In Erasmus' day, a humanist was one who didn't want to burn you at the stake if you disagreed with the Roman Catholic Church's dogma. But people today want you to believe that Erasmus should be put into the same category as Charles Darwin. The bottom line is that Erasmus was a humanist when being a humanist meant something altogether different than what it means today. A humanist in Erasmus' day did not want to burn people at the stake. Unlike the other "religious leaders" of his time, Erasmus preferred to study rather than to kiss the Pope's ring or roast people at the stake.

Today's humanist is very much different than a humanist in Erasmus' day. They are God-rejecting (Erasmus loved God) people that elevate humanity and worship humanity.

WAS ERASMUS A "GOOD" CATHOLIC

The next charge is that Erasmus was a "good" Catholic and he gave us the Textus Receptus (Majority Text) that underlies the King James Bible.

Let's look at what history RECORDS.

Did Erasmus' contemporaries believe he was a Catholic?

The following are quotes from various researchers:

"In the midst of the group of Protestant scholars who had long been his truest friends, and so far as is known, without relations of any sort with the Roman Catholic Church, he died." 1

"He died at Basel in 1536, committed to neither party, but amid an admiring circle of friends who were all on the , Reformed side."2

"ex monk ... a Protestant pastor preached his funeral sermon and the money that he left was used to , help Protestant refugees."3

"In 1559 Pope Paul IV 'placed everything Erasmus had ever written , on The Index of Forbidden Books."4

"e was branded an impious heretic, and his works were forbidden , to Catholic readers" 5

"The Council of Trent , condemned Erasmus' translation"6 of the Bible. It is clear that his Bible was not a perverted Roman Catholic Vulgate translation at all.

In 1527, Spanish "monks of the Inquisition began a systematic scrutiny of Erasmus' works, with a view to having condemned , as a heretic."7

In his (ERASMUS) own words

Listen to Erasmus explain his own views:

"All I ask for is the leisure to live wholly to God, to repent of the sins of my foolish youth, to study Holy Scriptures, and to read or write something of real value. I could do nothing of this , in a convent."8

In 1505 he wrote, "I shall sit down to Holy Scriptures with my whole heart, and devote the rest of my life to it... all these three years I have been working entirely at Greek and have not been , playing with it."9

Here are some other quotes, cited by Riplinger:

"As to me, all I have sought has been to open my contemporaries' eyes and bring them back from ritual to true Christianity

ty."

"Read the Gospels Â... and see how we have degenerated."

"A man of piety would feel that he could not employ his time better than in bringing little ones to Christ."

"We must forget ourselves, and think , first of Christ's glory."10

Are these the words of a Roman Catholic?

The judgment of history

Even historian Will Durant wrote of him that by 1500 (when he was 34 years old), he had "formed his resolve to study and edit the Greek New Testament as the distilled essence of that real Christianity which, in the judgement of reformers and humanists alike, had been overlaid and concealed by the dogmas , and accretions of centuries." 11

These facts and others lead us to believe that Erasmus did not believe in the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion. We see why he worked so hard to find God's preserved words and publish them for all to read. A copy of the second edition of Erasmus' Greek New Testament ended up in a school in Wittenberg, Germany, where a monk named Martin Luther found it. That Greek text helped Martin Luther to start the Reformation, which brought us the King James Bible.

Erasmus, who was counted by everyone around him as a Christian, not a Catholic, helped to bring about the resurrection of the preserved Bible (not the Roman Catholic perversion), which in turn helped bring the Protestant Reformation.

I would BEWARE OF ANYONE DENIGRATING ERASMUS.

Don't get ERASMUS confused with another person called EUSEBIUS. People have it backwards. They denigrate ERASMUS and laud EUSEBIUS.

EUSEBIUS is sometimes called "Father of Church History" or the "Father of Textual Criticism."

In one word, what do you do, when someone speaks well of, or cites Eusebius as an esteemed expert - RUN, or at least crank up your spiritual antenna a couple extra notches.

If Constantine was bad, then Eusebius had to be worse. Because he was Constantine's religious court theologian. In fact, Eusebius was probably the greatest promoter of the Arian heresy of all time. The Arian heresy is the spiritual cyanide, that denies the biblical doctrine of the Trinity, and teaches that Jesus was a lesser god, and IN FACT denies the deity of Messiah.

I could say much more about Eusebius but better keep this short. References for quotes about Erasmus are below.

The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1909), vol. I., p. 166
[Return to text](#)

Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics (New York: Scribner's, 1928), Vol VI, p. 83.
[Return to text](#)

Owen Chadwick, A History of Christianity (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), p. 198. Riplinger notes of Erasmus, "He was buried at a Protestant church in Basel" (p. 1).
[Return to text](#)

Roland Bainton, Erasmus of Christendom (New York: Scribner's, 1969), pp. 277-278
[Return to text](#)

Will Durant, The Story of Civilization: The Reformation (New York: MJF Books, 1957), Vol. 6, p. 437.
[Return to text](#)

Will Durant, The Story of Civilization: The Reformation, Vol. 6, p. 285

[Return to text](#)

Will Durant, p. 435

[Return to text](#)

J.A. Froude, The Life and Letters of Erasmus (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894), p. 25.

[Return to text](#)

J.A. Froude, The Life and Letters of Erasmus, p. 87.

[Return to text](#)

J.A. Froude, The Life and Letters of Erasmus, pp. 260, 356, 118, 349.

[Return to text](#)

Will Durant, The Story of Civilization: The Reformation, Vol. 6, p. 273.

[Return to text](#)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss () , on: 2011/4/3 13:48

Hi anonymous777...

Or are you basing your conclusions about Erasmus upon what others wrote about him? If you want to know what he believed in detail, you should read HANDBOOK OF A CHRISTIAN KNIGHT, THE EDUCATION OF A CHRISTIAN PRINCE and, his last completed work, A PLAIN AND GODLY EXPOSITION OR DECLARATION OF THE COMMON CREDE. Each of these has been translated into English and are available at many public and university libraries. They may also be available at Google Books.

Still, my question wasn't about whether or not Erasmus was a Catholic (his writings indicate that he was), a humanist (his writings indicate that he was) or even whether or not he was ever truly saved (I have no idea). While Erasmus was certainly not a "typical" Catholic and humanist in certain areas, he still embraced ideology that is firmly within the boundaries of Catholicism and humanism.

My question was:

>>> 3. Do you believe that men like Erasmus (a Catholic and humanist) and the translators of the KJV (some who embraced "high church" Catholic-lite doctrinal views) were INSPIRED BY GOD when they, via committee, poured through all of the different documents to decide upon which ones to use and how to translate it into Greek or English?

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/4/3 15:07

Well, I've known and probably most of us do know of some outstanding Greek/Hebrew Scholars that were/are nowhere near saved.

Is there a modern version, where all the translators were saved, filled with His Spirit and held no doctrinal biases, I wonder?

Re: , on: 2011/4/3 15:34

I will have to check that book out about Erasmus. I did like his own personal quotes. Whether Erasmus was inspired or not is not as important as the fact that God honors His promises in the Word that I read.

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

That is what is important, Chris.

That God has preserved His Word to us, despite men. That He is all powerful and wise enough to do it in a form we can read today.

You start from Psalm 12. You start from God's point of view, believing that it exist for you, today, then you proceed to find the preserved Word, sifting through all the ones that say, "choose me, choose me".

The true Word of God WILL stand up!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/3 15:53

Hi Jesus-is-God,

This is one of the reasons that I asked those specific questions.

The first thesis introduced in this discussion is that the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" version of the Word of God down to the last "jot and tittle."

Whether or not other versions are perfect, also perfect, more accurate or faithful versions is simply a secondary discussion.

So, it would be helpful to stick with examining the primary, major claim before we deviate into some secondary discussion about other versions.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/3 16:00

Hi anonymous777,

Quote:

I will have to check that book out about Erasmus. I did like his own personal quotes. Whether Erasmus was inspired or not is not as important as the fact that God honors His promises in the Word that I read.

That is actually three books. He has quite a few more that you can also sort through (translated into English), but this would be a good start. It would also help you verify whether or not the quotes that are attributed to him are accurate, or are accurate reflections about what he believed regarding the various Roman heresies. I suspect that you will discover that he embraced many of those heresies and even propagated them. You will also find the various conflicts that he had with men like Martin Luther in regard to Catholic teachings.

Quote:

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

That is what is important, Chris.

That God has preserved His Word to us, despite men. That He is all powerful and wise enough to do it in a form we can read today.

You start from Psalm 12. You start from God's point of view, believing that it exist for you, today, then you proceed to find the preserved Word, sifting through all the ones that say, "choose me, choose me".

No one has ever said that God did not preserve His Word.

However, your premise isn't just that God preserved His Word. Your premise is that God preserved it -- perfectly down to the last jot and tittle -- and it is called the King James Version.

The reason for my specific questions is so that we can examine and test the primary claim about the KJV.

Re: , on: 2011/4/3 16:06

Hey Chris,

Correct me if I am wrong.

Is your premise that God only preserved His words in the original manuscripts? I mean, the copies of them since there are no true 1st penned originals. But anyway, the Hebrew/Greek manuscripts, only?"

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/3 16:16

Quote:

Is your premise that God only preserved His words in the original manuscripts? I mean, the copies of them since there are no true 1st penned originals . But anyway, the Hebrew/Greek manuscripts, only"?

No.

Re: - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/4/3 16:31

After reading the Preface to the 1611 KJV I have renewed confidence in the translation and the men who did the work.

It is a lengthy read, for that reason I posted below the parts that were my personal favorites.

It is glaringly obvious how the art of written expression has deteriorated in these 400 years.

kindly,
white stone

<http://www.piney.com/DockJVPref1611.html>

excerpts from the Preface to the 1611 KJV:

Quote:
-----it hath pleased God in his divine providence, here and there to scatter word and sentences of that difficulty and doubtfulness, not in doctrinal points that concern salvation, (for in such it hath been vouched that the Scriptures are plain) but in matters of less moment, that fearfulness would better beseech us than confidence, and if we will resolve upon modesty with S. Augustine, (though not in this same case altogether, yet upon the same ground) Melius est debitare de occultis, quam litigare de incertis, "it is better to make doubt of those things which are secret, than to strive about those things that are uncertain." There be many words in the Scriptures, which be never found there but once, (having neither brother or neighbor, as the Hebrews speak) so that we cannot be holpen by conference of places. Again, there be many rare names of certain birds, beasts and precious stones, etc.

Many other things we might give thee warning of (gentle Reader) if we had not exceeded the measure of a Preface already. It remaineth, that we commend thee to God, and to the Spirit of his grace, which is able to build further than we can ask or think. He removeth the scales from our eyes, the vail from our hearts, opening our wits that we may understand his word, enlarging our hearts, yea correcting our affections, that we may love it to the end. Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before the mine with the wicked Jews.

Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine that tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things. Say not to our Saviour with the Gergesites, Depart out of our coast; neither yet with Esau sell your birthright for a mess of pottage. If light be come into the world, love not darkness more than light; if food, if clothing be offered, go not naked, starve not yourselves.

Remember the advice of Nazianzene, "It is a grievous thing" (or dangerous) "to neglect a great fair, and to seek to make markets afterwards:" also the encouragement of S. Chrysostom, "It is altogether impossible, that he that is sober" (and watchful) "should at any time be neglected." Lastly, the admonition and menacing of S. Augustine, "They that despise God's will inviting them, shall feel God's will taking vengeance of them." It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God; but a blessed thing it is, and will bring us to everlasting blessedness in the end, when God speaketh unto us, to hearken; when he setteth his word before us, to read it; when he stretcheth out his hand and calleth, to answer, Here am I, here we are to do thy will,

O God. The Lord work a care and conscience in us to know him and serve him, that we may be acknowledged of him at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the holy Ghost, be all praise and thanksgiving.

Re: King James Debate, on: 2011/4/3 20:05

Let's see here. Over 3000 believers are in shipping containers in Eritrea. Several thousand Christians in death camps in N Korea. Saints imprisoned in China. Our spiritual family martyred in India. And we in America are debating the King James. What is wrong with this picture???

Re: , on: 2011/4/3 21:42

Quote:
-----That is actually three books. He has quite a few more that you can also sort through (translated into English), but this would be a good start. It would also help you verify whether or not the quotes that are attributed to him are accurate, or are accurate reflections about what he believed regarding the various Roman heresies. I suspect that you will discover that he embraced many of those heresies and even propagated them. You will also find the various conflicts that he had with men like Martin Luther in regard to Catholic teachings.

I wonder if when I have read this 3-volume set and I come back to you and tell you that some of those quotes were right on, if you would accept it? Something tells me NO. You will then want to know if I am qualified to know what I have just read and ask me to produce a Phd. in Latin Literature. This is the attitude you have displayed. You reject anything anyone says, if they have not read the source.

Chris, there are people that have read those works and many others by and about Erasmus, and we have provided bibliography and sourcing and you disdain what they say by your very remarks.

So, why would you accept anything I have to say? And indeed, you don't accept anything that anyone has to say on this subject. You have clearly displayed a closed mind on the issue, despite your protestations to the contrary.

You are in effect saying to us, that you "have read everything on the subject and nothing that we are producing is true. And if you don't believe it, then read everything on the subject like I have and you will know. And if you read anything to the contrary of what I am telling you, then it is because you don't understand what you are reading."

I am sure I will read those works, and I will check out all the quotations, but I won't be reporting back to you only to hear, that what I read is "SUBJECT TO INTERPRETATION" or "YOU ARE NOT QUALIFIED TO UNDERSTAND".

Gotta run, martyr is watching how much time we spend on this.

Does this person sound familiar?

https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=38255&forum=34&0

Have a good night.

777

Re: , on: 2011/4/3 21:45

Yes let's not get off track. We need to spend (waste) much more time on Bible versions.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/3 22:40

Good point, martyr.

Of course, it might be a bit more accurate to say that individuals are arguing that the KJV is "perfect and preserved" and ALL OTHER VERSIONS are "corrupt" or "devilish."

There is so much evil in the world today. It is amazing to me that we have so much time to read bold, sectarian claims about particular Bible versions, translators, ancient source manuscripts and text experts, but not enough time to properly test and verify those claims.

All the while, the world around us is going to Hell. We have ~6 Billion people in the world -- the majority that do not speak English and have even heard of Jesus Christ -- and yet we exert so much energy to what we think is "contending for the faith" that might be better described as "arguing over conjectures."

Right now, someone is dying. That person is probably dying without ever knowing Jesus. If a translation of God's Word in that person's language -- or in a more understandable version of a language -- can penetrate the heart, then I am happy.

Re: , on: 2011/4/3 22:47

I must admit, you guys are more noble than I am.

However, the ENERGY that you refer to IS being EXERTED in CHANGING God's Word, WATERING it down and CORRUPTING the meaning of it which affects doctrine.

A whole lot of energy at that.

This has already proven to be getting worse. (i.e. TNIV).

You can minimize this by implying that I am not doing my share in the Kingdom of God, (my astonishment is that you don't see it), and that's OK.

Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God.

You may not see it now, it seems many don't, but a generation from now many will see it for how blatant it is and it has everything to do with people going to HEAVEN or HELL.

Peace to you brothers. I really mean that.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2011/4/3 23:21

Does it matter to anyone that the Bible is being translated to death? Gender neutral Bibles, this Bible, that Bible, etc. What will be next, gay bible, trans gender bible, divorce bible, dog owners bible, etc. We just need a Holy Bible. It does get weary of not having a uniformity in church of the same Bible. In my years of ministry, the multiplicity of different translations has seemed to create less memorization of His Word, and more questioning of God's truth.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/3 23:41

Hi anonymous777...

Quote:

I wonder if when I have read this 3-volume set and I come back to you and tell you that some of those quotes were right on, if you would accept it? Something tells me NO. You will then want to know if I am qualified to know what I have just read and ask me to produce a Phd. in Latin Literature. This is the attitude you have displayed. You reject anything anyone says, if they have not read the source.

This is untrue. Why do you feel a need to react in such a way? I didn't ask for your commentary about what you suppose my reaction would be if you read those works. I simply suggested/asked if you have read any of them -- especially if you are going to make such broad assertions about Erasmus. If someone hasn't read any of his works, how can they make such assertions about the man?

As for my "attitude:"

I am not the person who joined this forum ten days ago and immediately began proclaiming that pretty much every other version of the Bible -- other than the KJV -- is fundamentally flawed. You also made specific allegations about translators, sources, text/language experts, and translations. When I asked for evidence to substantiate your claims, you only present content that you obtained from other KJV-only books and websites. When I asked if you have verified the information from those websites...or researched the materials that they supposedly quote...you tend to have the same reaction.

Quote:

Chris, there are people that have read those works and many others by and about Erasmus, and we have provided bibliography and sourcing and you disdain what they say by your very remarks.

There are many more people who have read the works and many others by and about Erasmus and have a very different opinion than the one espoused by KJV-only advocates. Who are you going to "trust?" I am suggesting that you don't trust ANYTHING that anyone says on the matter -- whether me or KJV-only websites -- and go to the sources to validate whether that information is true.

Quote:

So, why would you accept anything I have to say? And indeed, you don't accept anything that anyone has to say on this subject. You have clearly displayed a closed mind on the issue, despite your protestations to the contrary.

I didn't tell you to accept anything. I just questioned the validity of YOUR statements. YOU are the one accusing translators, translations and sources. YOU are the only who make very specific claims about the KJV. I simply have called into question the information and judgment that you loudly proclaim.

As for being "closed minded:" Is it simply because I don't accept your claims (or the opinions/claims of the KJV-only preachers that you have posted)? Or is it that I have asked you to research/test/verify all of the things that you have so loudly proclaimed?

Quote:

You are in effect saying to us, that you "have read everything on the subject and nothing that we are producing is true. And if you don't believe it, then read everything on the subject like I have and you will know. And if you read anything to the contrary of what I am telling you, then it is because you don't understand what you are reading."

Utter nonsense. I am NOT saying that people should accept my views on this matter. I am simply suggesting that those who would espouse such loud and damning claims on this matter (to the point of accusing translators and calling other translations of God's Word "hellish," "corrupt," and "devilish") to be able to have shown that they were willing to conduct real research about such things before making such specific accusatory claims.

Quote:

I am sure I will read those works, and I will check out all the quotations, but I won't be reporting back to you only to hear, that what I read is "SUBJECT TO INTERPRETATION" or "YOU ARE NOT QUALIFIED TO UNDERSTAND".

I am only suggesting that you should have read those things BEFORE you were willing loudly proclaim a conclusion on the matter based upon what others wrote about him (and other matters in this discussion).

Quote:

Does this person sound familiar?

https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=38255&forum=34&0

Care to enlighten us?

Look, brother, I am not asking you to believe as I do. In fact, I haven't really told you exactly WHAT my views are on this matter. I have said that I simply understand the various arguments. I will say that I find that many KJV-only advocates seem quite willing to spend a lot of time reading books and websites on the matter. I just hope that individuals aren't so easily convinced that they accept such things without "proving them."

After all, the Bereans were considered more noble than other believers because they didn't immediately believe what Paul the Apostle preached -- and he was the vessel of God who wrote 2/3 of the New Testament! We shouldn't be so quickly moved by claims presented in biased books and websites. I suppose that it is okay to read those things, but we should be willing to test and verify the ideas and notions that those people claim.

This is why I asked those ten questions. This would provide some clarity and greater understanding of the positions (and reasoning behind them) that are often propagated.

Brother, this may come as a shock to you, but I care for you deeply. I also care for those who happen upon this forum and read all of our words. I also care for truth. More importantly, I care for God's Word. You have made some very serious claims about translators, sources, and translations of God's Word. It is extremely important -- given the gravity of those claims -- that they be properly tested and verified.

Over the years, there have been a few KJV-only advocates who joined the website and then proceeded to proclaim their opinions in a very similar way that you have. I participated in many of those threads. I participated partially because I know young believers that I have recommended this forum to who use versions like the NASB and NIV. Suddenly, those individuals loudly proclaimed their opinions (stated as "facts") that those versions are NOT faithful translations of the Word of God.

Those new members (who aren't a part of this forum any longer) didn't season their posts with the realization of their own human frailty and flaws (that "glass darkly") on this side of Eternity. To them, their opinions were a "fact" upon which "life and death" and "Heaven and Hell" depended. So, they loudly proclaimed those opinions -- and did what they could to cast doubt on all other versions of God's Word. That is quite an impact on young believers who have been instructed in God's Word through versions like the NASB and NIV.

Since then, I have continued to research this topic. I tested the claims that those previous KJV-only advocates presented...and determined that most of them were either false or skewed. That is not to say that I found everything that they claimed to be wrong. However, the most important thing that I gained from testing their claims was that I could not, with a clear conscience, accept their initial and underlying premise -- that the KJV is the only acceptable version of the Word of God -- as valid.

However, I would invite others to take the time to test those claims as well. Such a test is not done by looking at other KJV-only websites. It involves taking the thesis and specific claims from those who hold such a view and examining them. If the underlying claims are either flawed, incorrect, subjective or interpretive, then I think that the underlying thesis cannot be proclaimed as a fact.

Anyway, I do hope this make sense. I do care for you brother. I wouldn't participate in a thread like this otherwise. I pray that you do not feel belittled by anything that I say...even if I question the validity of your beliefs about the KJV and other versions. We are all on the same pilgrimage through this life (or, as Bunyan called it, the "wilderness of this world").

Moreover, like I said earlier, this world is going to Hell. We need to present truth to the Billions of individuals who do not know our Savior. For many thousands of years, there was no gathered set of Scriptures. If individuals who cannot read or write can find Jesus, I do believe that God can use versions like the KJV, NASB and NIV (and other faithful translations from their sources) to not only win the lost, but allow them to know our Lord.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/3 23:50

Hi JB1968...

Quote:

Does it matter to anyone that the Bible is being translated to death?

Yes. In fact, many people rejected the KJV when it was first translated for that very reason. It took a while before it was widely accepted.

Quote:

It does get weary of not having a uniformity in church of the same Bible. In my years of ministry, the multiplicity of different translations has seemed to create less memorization of His Word, and more questioning of God's truth.

That is why I suggest that we all only use the NIV.

:-)

Just kidding (of course)...but I still love using the NIV, NASB and KJV as faithful translations from their respective sources!

Re: , on: 2011/4/4 0:14

Chris,

By your logic, you don't trust any "experts" and have read all the original manuscripts yourself. Or did I miss something? Who was it that you trust?

I am happy to trust the KJV and the Spirit of God.

I cannot trust any of the new Modern Versions.

And I don't trust any of the new ones that have not come out yet. I can already tell you that they will be corrupt and perverted without even seeing them.

I don't believe my first post was on the KJV, by the way, or my second or third. Nice try. You marginalize well. That's ok, I can be played the fool.

Not only have I made specific claims about the KJV, but I made specific claims about other versions and you always stayed away from what I said about them. Possibly, you could not refute them. You erected the straw man of KJV-Only. I never said I was KJV-Only.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/4 0:35

Anonymous777...

Quote:

By your logic, you don't trust any "experts" and have read all the original manuscripts yourself. Or did I miss something?

You missed something. I didn't imply this at all. I simply said that we must not trust any claims of men (including me), but that we must verify what is being said. I never said that I read ALL of the original manuscripts myself.

You made very specific claims about Erasmus, the translators of the KJV, the translators of the NIV, the source manuscripts, text experts and the translations. If you and anyone else are going to make such specific claims, you should welcome a "test" to see if what you are claiming is true. You and others can easily contact translators, manuscript experts, Bible societies...and read the works of Erasmus, and even read the firsthand works of the translators of the KJV. This would be a good first step.

Quote:

I am happy to trust the KJV and the Spirit of God.

I cannot trust any of the new Modern Versions.

You have made this clear...and much more. Not only do you not trust those other versions, but you have made specific claims about them, the translators and the sources used.

You have also made specific claims about the KJV -- which is the primary premise in your thesis. That is the reason that I asked those ten questions. Hopefully, you will be able to answer them in your own words and provide me some understanding of your reasoning.

BTW, I apologize if I incorrectly stated that you were KJV-only. Your earlier posts in the ten days that you have been here seemed to indicate as much. Perhaps you can clarify your position? Which other specific versions do you believe are also "perfect and preserved" versions of God's Word?

I know that you mentioned that "new" re-working of the Reina Valera by Mr. Gomez in an attempt to "correct" the 1569 text to line up more with the Textus Receptus/KJV (which, ironically, still does not agree with the KJV in several places). If there are other versions that you think are "perfect" like the KJV, I would appreciate your letting me know.

When you have the time, I would greatly appreciate it if you -- or anyone else -- could address those ten simple questions that I asked earlier. Thanks.

Re: , on: 2011/4/4 0:41

I know you did not say that you read all the original manuscripts.

You just act like you did.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/4 0:57

Is that really necessary, brother?

I went to great lengths to make it clear what I have researched. I never implied such a thing and have no reason to "act" like anything.

You may not agree with me or the fact that I disagree with your opinions on this matter. However, we all should avoid any vain speech.

Re: , on: 2011/4/4 1:11

What I am saying is that by your logic and line of argumentation, no one will be able to arrive at a conviction on ANYTHING.

Thank the Lord for the witness of the Holy Spirit!

Everyone can read this thread for themselves.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/4 2:21

Anonymous777,

The logic behind my reasoning is that if we don't know with absolute certainty that something is true, we shouldn't declare it as such.

In other words, I am urging caution.

We should be very careful about making allegations -- and never just accept and repeat the allegations that we hear or read. If we feel the need to utter or write allegations about translators, translations, source texts, text critics, manuscript experts, etc... -- it should only be after extensive research.

We should always verify the claims of individuals, books and websites that are making such far-reaching claims. Otherwise, we should remain silent (at least, about proclaiming those specific allegations) until we have done as much.

This is why I asked those ten questions earlier...for which I am still waiting for some answers.

As I pointed out, it seems that there are two underlying theses being presented here. The first is that the KJV is "perfect and preserved" down to the last "jot and tittle." A second, which sometimes seems to supplant the first in focus, is that all (or most) other versions are "corrupt" (or worse).

The weight of this topic is so pressingly important that these allegations should NOT be proclaimed as "truth" until we are absolutely certain about the matter. Hopefully, our "absolute certainty" doesn't come cheap...or after being convinced by hearsay, rumor or even presentations that have gone unverified.

By the way, there are a lot of false doctrines out there propagated by people who blamed their beliefs on the "witness of the Holy Spirit." The greatest witness of the Holy Spirit is, of course, the Word of God.

Still, I think that we need to be EXTREMELY CAREFUL if we choose to blame the Holy Spirit for each and every one of our specific views. After all, the Bereans weren't noble characters for some ability to simply "rely on the witness of the Holy Spirit." They TESTED what Paul the Apostle preached.

It is important that we don't accuse the Holy Spirit of giving us "witness" to something that ends up being incorrect. What a dreadful thing to discover that we inadvertently (even with good intentions) bore false witness against the Holy Spirit!

I know that no one would ever want to do that...but it has happened. Sometimes, we may even think that "God showed us" something that we simply and suddenly "figured out" (or think we did).

I have known people who told me that the Lord "showed" them some interesting things (one even insisted that dental floss is part of some conspiracy to make money for dentists and dental floss companies). There have been people who told me that they listened to Christian rock and roll music because of the "witness of the Holy Spirit." Then, I have heard the exact opposite too. More often, you hear two opposing sides on doctrinal controversies claim that "the Lord showed them" the "truth." So, who was lying about "the witness of the Holy Spirit?"

So, we do need to be careful about attributing our views to the witness of the Holy Spirit if we aren't absolutely certain that it really is the Holy Spirit that bore witness to our views.

I would appreciate someone addressing those ten questions that I posted earlier (in their own words). I think that this would help us focus upon the original premise and claim about the KJV. The claim of a "perfect and preserved" KJV (down to the last "jot and tittle") is the underlying thesis, whereas the status and reliability of other versions, source texts, and translators is a secondary discussion and premise.

let it go , on: 2011/4/4 9:45

Chris, this is not only to you, you wrote:

Quote:

-----I would appreciate someone addressing those ten questions that I posted earlier (in their own words).

Brethren, just let it go, ya'll going in circles, the whole exercise just smacks of pride, and it really is looking quite foolish and silly.

and what if..by this vain exercise, you stumble just ONE saint?...is that worth it?

and please, nobody answer that question with the standard, "I'm just standing for the truth".

Moderators...come on, don't you think it's time to take this old dog behind the barn, and put it out of its misery?

Jesus went to the Cross, for more than this...amen?

neil

Re: let it go , on: 2011/4/4 9:57

Neil, your logic can be used to shutdown many threads.

Is that a good thing to start?

You don't have to read this, you know.

I have received IMs from Saints saying they have learned a lot.

777

If the Moderators shutdown everything you did not like, and gave you that kind of power of censure, what kind of place would this be?

Re: , on: 2011/4/4 10:06

The 10 questions are being worked on.

Please be patient.

Re: , on: 2011/4/4 10:15

This thread must live on! (and on and on and on...)
It is so illuminating that I do not need daylight in my home.

Re: , on: 2011/4/4 11:08

Quote:

-----Neil, your logic can be used to shutdown many threads.

as you go by a number, 777, i dont your name, but rest assured this is not the first KJV battle on this forum, and they alw
ays end bad.

nor are you the first poster, to "stand for the truth", in your KJV only posture...most of them are gone, not because of thei
r KJV only stance, but because they didnt play nice with the other kids.

as far as some censorious attitude you think i might have, i have put my life on the line, and would happily die, to preser
ve the right of every American's 1st amendment right of free speech. secular or saint.

as far as reading this palaber, i skim it, because you all are just saying the same things, same talking points over and ov
er.

do what you want, i would wager that the majority of your 100 plus posts have been expended on this thread, i can tell y
ou this in all clarity, from reading your stuff, i would neither want a conversation with you on ANY of the Deep Things of
God, nor would be desirous of fellowshiping with you in any real sense, which is sad, because this forum has been a bl
essing to me, in meeting some dear saints.

but go wild, have your fun, have no consideration if you stumble anybody.

Re: , on: 2011/4/4 11:45

Neil, in your skimming, did you see where we answered your question about the Canon?

KJV does not use the Roman controlled manuscripts.

I don't really plan on leaving unless the Lord tells me to. I did not come here to talk about the KJV. It was a topic that SI
started.

Quote:

----- i would neither want a conversation with you on ANY of the Deep Things of God, nor would be desirous of fellowshiping with you i
n any real sense

Ok, well, I guess you have served notice to everyone in this forum to stay away from me. That my friend, is a public cens
ure and short of getting this thread closed down, you still managed to censure me.

If I had not read some of your past posts and anger at other people, I would not understand where you are coming from.
I am comforted in that I am not the only one that has been censured by you and probably will not be the last.

Sorry, I am not worthy of your fellowship.

Peacefully,
777

Re: - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/4/4 13:26

Chris,

Quote:
-----By the way, there are a lot of false doctrines out there propagated by people who blamed their beliefs on the "witness of the Holy Spirit." The greatest witness of the Holy Spirit is, of course, the Word of God.

Which you have done your best to convince me, as I read it in the KJV, is not reliable. I asked you to direct me to that 'jot & tittle perfect' written Word, to which I, as a common person, may have access and you did not choose to do so. You have done your best to make the KJV appear to be the Bible of the unlearned.

I ask you, how can I approach the witness of the Holy Spirit you speak of, if God has not provided me access to His Perfect Holy Word?

Quote:
-----So, we do need to be careful about attributing our views to the witness of the Holy Spirit if we aren't absolutely certain that it really is the Holy Spirit that bore witness to our views.

There is meat in this statement.

As for your 10 questions:

The Bible is my proof.

30+ years of answered prayers and guidance walking the minefields of this Earth are my proof.

I would not be alive, were it not for His many interventions and mercies. I could not be posting here but by His Grace. The ability to see his Hand in events in our daily lives have left my husband & I with no doubt of His guidance. He cares enough about little things in our lives, such as giving us fencing for a dog - which we did not even know we were to be getting, how much more does He care about our soul and our relationship with Him.

I believe the Word I read in the KJV is His Word and we feed upon it daily.

Looking forward to the day I receive the promised
white stone

Re: For some Christians, King James is the only Bible, on: 2011/4/4 13:34

Good afternoon Chris,

Thank you for your courteous replies to my posts.

I have been trying to get some perspective on the circumlocution in this thread and have been searching it for quotes from you, to try to reflect back to you and comment upon what you are saying. This is not to be unduly contentious on my part, nor to justify a KJV-only stance, but rather to indicate to you where I believe your thesis is flawed, even though

it has much merit with regard to going to original documents if possible.

Quotes are not in chronological order. I believe they are representative of the reasoning you have presented, bearing in mind you have also said, 'In fact, I haven't really told you exactly WHAT my views are on this matter. I have said that I simply understand the various arguments.'

Before the other quotes, I want to remind you that you have referred to the DIFFERENCES in manuscripts as 'errors', more than once, using this as a key plank of why no translation could be deemed 'perfect' (by you).

This has the effect of leaving the reader - with the Holy Spirit's help - trying to decide which of the biblical texts can be trusted at any time - whether ancient or modern translation - even including the Hebrew and Greek which we do have available.

Consequently, you present yourself as one who believes only the parts of the Bible which you personally have verified from outside sources (although you do not state this).

I realise that to discover anything in any version which doesn't seem to match up with doctrine, or seems to misrepresent what we have read in a different version - especially if God spoke to us from a previous reading - is an identical challenge. The modernisation of the language of a translation, (to anyone who was familiar with the KJV before the NIV or NASB existed - and this is something I ask you to accept as a prompt to further Bible study), does obfuscate some themes which run more clearly through the language of the KJV. This is not to say the KJV has used word-for-word in every case; it has not, and it requires further Bible study, to discover the themes running through the original languages and modes of thought. To what extent these have been translated into modern English, I don't make a claim to know. Nevertheless, I don't feel the need to check up on God (as it appears you do), to the extent that you recommend.

Associated with your 'opinion' that others have reached their 'opinion' after only -

Quote:

-----a limited amount of research and study

, is the notion that THE way to reach a change of opinion, or a more correct opinion, is to consult men. This has bemused me considerably, on two counts.

The first is, that you have stated over and over how important it is to you, to contact people whose opinion you wish to consult for the basis of your opinions, and yet you don't seem to have made any contact with other posters in this thread, to put your mind at ease on this matter privately - some of whom may have given as much time to the task as the Holy Spirit guided them to do.

The second is the overarching emphasis you put on extra-biblical witnesses (I will add to this point lower down), while stating:

Quote:

-----we do need to be careful about attributing our views to the witness of the Holy Spirit if we aren't absolutely certain that it really is the Holy Spirit that bore witness to our views.

The Holy Spirit cannot bear witness to 'our views'. According to Jesus, He can bear witness only to Christ and His things. (John 16:13 - 15). It's up to us to change - our views into line with His.

To anonymous777 you have said:

Quote:

-----I didn't tell you to accept anything. I just questioned the validity of YOUR statements. YOU are the one accusing translators, translations and sources. YOU are the only who make very specific claims about the KJV. I simply have called into question the information and judgment that you loudly proclaim.

Quote:

-----If you and anyone else are going to make such specific claims, you should welcome a "test" to see if what you are claiming is true.

It may not be given to you to make such claims, but you don't really 'know' they are not true. Rather, your research methods led you to different conclusions, and these other opinions call into question the 'validity' of your own research.

hing. Why should this be a problem? Don't you relish the opportunity to have your thesis tested? Doesn't your question cut both ways, brother?

Quote:

-----If someone hasn't read any of his works, how can they make such assertions about the man?

Well, in English Literature, the idea that you can know anything about an author through what he has written, (apart from an autobiography, perhaps), is a bit of a taboo, so if anyone reading anyone is going to reach a 'valid' conclusion about the integrity of an author's heart and workmanship with God's word, it is going to be by testing it against scripture, mainly, with the help of the Holy Spirit. Otherwise, you are showing unwarranted faith in human nature, unless you omitted to share that you always submit such findings to the Lord for final authority to accept them? (Please forgive my questions. I think I picked up the style from listening to sermons!)

Quote:

-----As for being "closed minded:" Is it simply because I don't accept your claims (or the opinions/claims of the KJV-only preachers that you have posted)? Or is it that I have asked you to research/test/verify all of the things that you have so loudly proclaimed?

I don't accept your claims... This is fine. But on what basis do you have authority to demand that others accept your direction? To whom does it matter if we don't agree with you, if it doesn't matter to us?

Quote:

-----Still, I think that we need to be EXTREMELY CAREFUL if we choose to blame the Holy Spirit for each and every one of our specific views. After all, the Bereans weren't noble characters for some ability to simply "rely on the witness of the Holy Spirit." They TESTED what Paul the Apostle preached.

I think 'blame the Holy Spirit' is a little strong.

Quote:

-----After all, the Bereans were considered more noble than other believers because they didn't immediately believe what Paul the Apostle preached --

This is not exactly what Luke records.

Acts 17:10 And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea: who coming went into the synagogue of the Jews. 11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, and SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, whether those things were so.'

This strongly implies that they had had that inner recognition of truth when they heard it, which Paul mentions in Romans and Corinthians.

Furthermore, they did not search in extra-biblical sources.

Dr Phil Goble, who spent thirty years translating the Orthodox Jewish Bible from the original Old Testament (not sure about the New which he uses), for a modern readership amongst Orthodox Jews, has this to say in regard to researching outside scripture to verify scripture. (This is an extract from his talk entitled Empty Tomb, which is available online in both audio and transcript. He is speaking to Jews in NYC, I believe.)

'... Begging your pardon but, please, what is wrong with your rationality? Are you in a cult? Have you received a spirit? Are your eyes glazed over? Stop being brain-washed and think. (If you are being brain-washed, don't be so acquiescent; your brain-washers won't be around to help you when you awake to the voice of Moshiach Ben Dovid. So sit down and think and use the brain God gave you. Your hatred of Moshiach is irrational. Why don't you hate your sin and repent? Moshiach is not your enemy, I don't care what any ignoramus did in his Name. Your enemy is the person looking at you in the mirror who will have himself or herself to blame for all eternity for his or her cavalier dismissal of the testimony of the Hebrew Bible. How dare you go to extra-Biblical sources to augur out who is the Moshiach! What witchcraft!')

Chris, you put so much store on your own research, in this way having what appears to be a great advantage over those who cannot contact the translators of the KJV any more, nor (because of the Counter-Reformation), read the manuscript available in the 1400s, that it appears as if you place undue value on current 'experts'.

You have referred to Erasmus using a Latin Vulgate, as if this is problematic. I don't see the problem, as Erasmus was trying to correct the Roman Vulgate (was he not?) and he did indeed find that which required correction, when compared with Jerome's and the Greek. Yes?

The other thing I wondered, is your apparent rejection of the Byzantine manuscript group, partly because it was in Media

val Greek, making it appear to be less old. If so, I don't understand how someone who is willing to go to these lengths to defend translations in the latest English, would be concerned about Greek text having been updated for its readership. It makes no sense.

Overall, what you have shared places your faith squarely in your personal intellectual ability to research to a high standard of personal satisfaction, your access to the very people who finalised the texts you examine, and your sense of who to believe. Put another way, you believe a scientific approach is more valid than a spiritual approach.

Before you tell me this is not what you believe, and it's not what you've said, it is, nevertheless, what you have communicated, and it's one of the reasons, added to verses such as Hebrews 4:12, and Romans 10:17, that you may not have received the responses which would have delighted you. I have even wondered if you truly believe only the gospels, (because of what you've quoted from John 1).

I have heard of new converts in foreign countries being left with the New Testament to support their young faith. When missionaries returned, they had been reading. What they wanted to know was not, 'how do we know this book is true?' but, 'where is the book which came before this one?'

Oughtn't it to be simple enough for babes? Matthew 21:16

Thank you for your patience and perseverance.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2011/4/4 14:48

Hi White_Stone,

I will likely choose to opt out of this thread soon. I don't think that it is getting anyway...fast (so to speak). I also have a lot of responsibilities in this life as well (with work, my wife, family, church, etc...). I understand the caution that Neil and other have urged in squabbling over something that is so controversial to some well-meaning believers.

My main concern -- and motivation for involvement in this thread (and that I hope has been illustrated in many of my posts) -- is that individuals should not be willing to make such serious accusations (about translators, translations, sources, etc...) UNTIL AFTER they have thoroughly studied and researched this matter. We should NOT make such bold public claims until after we have verified the things that we have been taught.

I hope that this make sense.

Quote:

Which you have done your best to convince me, as I read it in the KJV, is not reliable. I asked you to direct me to that 'jot & tittle perfect' written Word, to which I, as a common person, may have access and you did not choose to do so. You have done your best to make the KJV appear to be the Bible of the unlearned.

I'm not sure what you are saying here. I never implied that the KJV is "not reliable." I have never implied that the KJV is "the Bible of the unlearned." This very accusation is repugnant to me!

After all, I am not the one who made any of the initial claims about the KJV (or other versions). I am simply questioning the validity of the very bold pronouncements made by a brother who recently joined this forum and has appeared to use it as a catalyst to propagate his views.

In fact, I have repeatedly stated that the KJV is one of the versions of choice that I use. I typically read four different versions of the Word of God -- including the KJV, the NIV, the NASB and a Spanish translation. I sometimes read other versions as well, just to see how those translators worded a particular word, phrase, or passage. However, I have repeated

stated my opinion that the KJV is a good and honest academic translation taken from its own particular set of sources about 400 years ago. My view has not changed.

Quote:

I ask you, how can I approach the witness of the Holy Spirit you speak of, if God has not provided me access to His Perfect Holy Word?

That is an interesting question. I wonder if you would agree with the "witness of the Holy Spirit" that others claim who prefer other versions of the Bible?

Yet, the caution that I urge isn't in regard to whether or not the KJV is accurate. It is in the supposed "witness of the Spirit" in which someone joins this forum and loudly pronounces that the KJV of the Bible is perfect down to the last "jot and tittle" (which the translators of the KJV themselves did not believe) AND that all other versions are "corrupt," "hellish" or "devilish."

Where in the KJV does it say that someone should rely upon the "witness of the Holy Spirit" in order to loudly propagate an opinion as a FACT in which they do admit to having studied...but only to a limited supply of KJV-only literature and websites?

You see, this is about whether or not someone should loudly proclaim "heresy" upon other faithful versions of the Word of God while simultaneously proclaiming that their version of choice is absolutely perfect -- down to the last "jot and tittle." They are quick to present their "proof" as well -- but often slow to mention that they didn't verify the information that they are providing as "proof." It is simply cut and pasted information from sources that they agree with...or hearsay.

Do you see how claims of the "witness of the Holy Spirit" might be misused in a controversial subject like this?

Quote:

As for your 10 questions:

The Bible is my proof.

30+ years of answered prayers and guidance walking the minefields of this Earth are my proof.

That is fine and all, but it doesn't answer my question or address the claims of those who proclaim the KJV as the absolutely perfect down to the last "jot and tittle." It also doesn't address any of those mistakes that are contained in the KJV either. I am not just talking about obvious translation errors (like the pagan word "Easter" appear in Acts 12 -- even though some people actually try to "explain away" this word and claim that the KJV is the only version out of all of the languages that "got it right"), but also some of those mistakes between texts that have been passed down as well (such as varying numbers in parallel passages).

However, if someone is going to make specific claims about the translators, translations and sources -- they really need to rely upon something other than the "witness of the Spirit" enough to boldly repeat and proclaim the allegations that they read elsewhere.

Yes, God cares about us. He leads us and guides us via prayer and study of His Word. However, some would suggest that the Holy Spirit is leading them to embrace and repeat allegations about translators, translations, text/manuscript experts and even the sources from which all translations (including those in English) are derived.

This is why I suggest caution in such cases.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/4/4 14:59

Hi Alive-to-God,

Quote:

I have been trying to get some perspective on the circumlocution in this thread and have been searching it for quotes from you, to try to reflect back to you and comment upon what you are saying. This is not to be unduly contentious on my part, nor to justify a KJV-only stance, but rather to indicate to you where I believe your thesis is flawed, even though it has much merit with regard to going to original documents if possible.

Brother, I think that the mistake in all of this is that you think that I have introduced a "thesis" to begin with. I have not. I am simply questioning the primary thesis (that the KJV is perfect and preserved down to the last jot and tittle), the secondary thesis (that all other versions are corrupt) and any of the branch theses that are heralded into the discussion -- often distracting from allowing the initial primary thesis to be verified.

This was why I asked those ten questions. I would really like to address the initial, primary claim BEFORE meandering into branches, secondary claims or sub-theories.

If the initial claim -- about the absolute perfection of the King James Version of the Bible (down to the last jot and tittle) cannot be properly verified, then all of the subsequent claims will be null because the initial claims are unproven.

I will try to address more of your post later (when I have more free time), but I hope that you understand that I am not making a bold thesis claim here. It is one brother (anonymous777) who joined this forum less than two weeks ago and suddenly took it upon himself to propagate his views as "truth" -- and then seemingly became agitated when any of us questioned his initial premise.

BTW, I would like to address several of the misconceptions that you have written regarding to my views in the context of your post (e.g., that I "apparently reject" the Byzantine manuscript group, etc...).

I am out of time for now, but I hope to address it. I would also very much appreciate anyone who can simply address those ten questions that I presented in their own words WITHOUT copying and pasting text (or even lifting ideas) from other biased KJV-only websites. This would help establish a base for what is actually believed...well enough that we can consider them more adequately.

May the Lord bless you.

Re: , on: 2011/4/4 15:47

****UPDATE**** at the very bottom.

Thank you AtG, this and the rest of your text below, sum up and encapsulate quite well what I have been trying to say about Chris. In fact, you go far beyond what I have been trying to reveal about Chris' debating STYLE.

Thank you for the voice of true reason.

1. Bottom line: We are not allowed to go to our sources, but he can go to his sources, whatever they are. He does not tell us but it can be surmised that they are not in favor of the KJV being a faithful and correct translation.
2. He will never receive anything from us, solely because, he is biased for his view from the start. Why? We don't know. He wants us to gather all this information for him, yet, he already discards what we have shown him, by denigrating the source and saying we have not done the proper research, whatever PROPER means. It is subjective to Chris. He makes the rules of study and research and who or what we use.
3. In the end ANYTHING we show him, will not be accepted. We know this ahead of time, because that is what he has communicated over and over to us.

Some of your concise quotes.

Quote:

From Chris:

If you and anyone else are going to make such specific claims, you should welcome a "test" to see if what you are claiming is true.

From AtG:

It may not be given to you to make such claims, but you don't really 'know' they are not true. Rather, your research methods led you to different conclusions, and these other opinions call into question the 'validity' of your own researching. Why should this be a problem? Don't you relish the opportunity to have your thesis tested? Doesn't your question cut both ways, brother?Quote:

From Chris:

If someone hasn't read any of his works, how can they make such assertions about the man?

From AtG:

Well, in English Literature, the idea that you can know anything about an author through what he has written, (apart from an autobiography, perhaps), is a bit of a taboo, so if anyone reading anyone is going to reach a 'valid' conclusion about the integrity of an author's heart and workmanship with God's word, it is going to be by testing it against scripture, mainly, with the help of the Holy Spirit. Otherwise, you are showing unwarranted faith in human nature, unless you omitted to share that you always submit such findings to the Lord for final authority to accept them? (Please forgive my questions. I think I picked up the style from listening to sermons!)Quote:

From Chris:

As for being "closed minded:" Is it simply because I don't accept your claims (or the opinions/claims of the KJV-only preachers that you have posted)? Or is it that I have asked you to research/test/verify all of the things that you have so loudly proclaimed?

From AtG:

I don't accept your claims... This is fine. But on what basis do you have authority to demand that others accept your direction? To whom does it matter if we don't agree with you, if it doesn't matter to us?

And lastly, from AtG: (But please read her whole post)

The other thing I wondered, is your apparent rejection of the Byzantine manuscript group, partly because it was in Medieval Greek, making it appear to be less old. If so, I don't understand how someone who is willing to go to these lengths to defend translations in the latest English, would be concerned about Greek text having been updated for its readership. It makes no sense.

Overall, what you have shared places your faith squarely in your personal intellectual ability to research to a high standard of personal satisfaction, your access to the very people who finalised the texts you examine, and your sense of who to believe. Put another way, you believe a scientific approach is more valid than a spiritual approach.

Before you tell me this is not what you believe, and it's not what you've said, it is, nevertheless, what you have communicated, and it's one of the reasons, added to verses such as Hebrews 4:12, and Romans 10:17, that you may not have received the responses which would have delighted you. I have even wondered if you truly believe only the gospels, (because of what you've quoted from John 1).

****UPDATE****

The answers to Chris' 10 questions are being prepared, but I don't really see any point in presenting them as they will not be accepted.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2011/4/4 16:16

You all crack me up.

I'm with Neil. Come Lord Jesus!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss () , on: 2011/4/4 18:11

Anonymous777...

Sigh.

Do we have to go through this over and over again?

Quote:

1. Bottom line: We are not allowed to go to our sources, but he can go to his sources, whatever they are. He does not tell us but it can be surmised that they are not in favor of the KJV being a faithful and correct translation.

Hogwash. Nonsense. A lie?

I did not say that you "are not allowed to go to your sources." These are incorrect words that you are placing into my mouth for which you will give an account to God for.

I simply said that a website that makes a claim is NOT a firsthand source.

Those websites that you quote are making allegations, accusations and negative claims about translators, sources, text experts, manuscripts, manuscript experts and, of course, the finished translations. Quoting their allegations -- or even citing unverified sources that they include in their accusations -- is NOT THE SAME as going to the source.

For instance...

One of the KJV-only websites that you quoted earlier in this thread also raises allegations about "Gail Riplinger" -- a prominent and often quoted KJV-only advocate (that you also mentioned previously). That KJV-only website (and many other websites) raise specific allegations about her. They claim that she was married three times. They claim that she falsified her educational background and academic claims. They claim that she is nothing more than an interior decorator who claims to be a translation expert. They claim that she falsified some of the "evidence" that she uses for her KJV-only arguments. They raise several other allegations about her.

If I were to come to this website and simply yet loudly repeat the allegations that I read in the other website that you quoted, I believe that it would be an injustice to Gail Riplinger.

Why?

I did not take the time to examine the "sources" for those claims. Several websites even include her various divorce and marriage certificates. Several websites include her curriculum vita. They point out to inconsistencies in her teachings supposedly taken from her books, website and audio teachings. However, I have not verified whether those things are real...or whether or not they actually pertain to this same Gail Riplinger. Thus, it would be unwise for me to repeat those allegations as if they were absolutely certain "truths" -- because they are merely hearsay that remains unverified.

If I truly wanted to try and "get to the bottom" of the Riplinger story (which I don't think that I do), I should have contacted her in order to hear her side of the story. I could have asked her or her ministry about the allegations. I could have asked her about the extent of her education and compare it with what she states in her books, website and teachings. There are several other ways to verify some of the allegations that are uttered about the woman BEFORE I felt that they were important enough to "proclaim" as being absolutely the truth.

In this thread, you have accepted the words of men of like mind as being "truth." You (and they) have uttered accusations

ns about translators, translations, text experts, sources and other thing. I have asked you the extent by which you have verified their claims. I have urged caution in regard to loudly repeating and publishing claims that have gone unverified. It is an easy thing to contact those translators, Bible societies, language experts, manuscript experts and even the very writings of men like Erasmus, Lancelot Andrewes, and other translators. You can even go to certain libraries and view digital images of a first printing of the KJV (for comparison's sake).

So, ultimately, I am urging caution in this matter. I am NOT saying that you cannot read those "sources" that are effectively men who make claims. Rather, I am urging you to TEST those claims (including their quotes) given the serious nature of the accusations that you repeat.

Does that make a little more sense? Does it give a proper answer to the accusation that you just made about me?

Quote:

2. He will never receive anything from us, solely because, he is biased for his view from the start. Why? We don't know. He wants us to gather all this information for him, yet, he already discards what we have shown him, by denigrating the source and saying we have not done the proper research, whatever PROPER means. It is subjective to Chris. He makes the rules of study and research and who or what we use.

Brother -- this is NONSENSE! How dare you pretend to know whether or not I am "biased" from the start! If I were biased, I would loudly proclaim a particular verdict about certain versions and quote only other men who have the same opinion on that I do.

But I didn't do that.

Rather, I urged that those who are going to make such far-reaching and slanderous/libelous claims to have TESTED those claims before they enter this forum and proclaim their view as the truth.

The burden of proof is with YOU.

YOU made the initial claims.

YOU repeated accusations about translators, translations, sources and language/manuscript experts.

So, if you are going to make those sort of far-reaching accusations, then I am asking that you have first tested those things...and cease from merely quoting men who also repeat those same accusations...and go straight to the sources about them. I have asked the extent of the research that you performed in studying these accusations before you publicly proclaimed them, but you then tell me that I only want sources that I approve of. This is almost laughable. It really would be akin to me publicly declaring Gail Ripplinger to be a harlot and relying on a few websites that declare her background.

Yet, you have declared specific allegations about other scholarly translations of God's Word...and the translators...and the sources...and the views of text/manuscript/language experts. Yet, so far, all of the "proof" that you present are repeating what you have heard/read from others. Even the "sources" that they cited to you appear to have gone untested. That is a lot of trust that you are demanding for your view...and a lot of trust that you are giving to those men that you cite.

Do you not see what concerns me? If we are going to make such bold claims, then we really need to get it right. If we aren't willing to test the things that we read or hear, then we shouldn't be making such slanderous accusations to begin with.

Quote:

3. In the end ANYTHING we show him, will not be accepted. We know this ahead of time, because that is what he has communicated over and over to us.

Sigh. Brother, I first approached this entire subject years ago without any prejudice either way. I heard claims like yours from individuals who remind me of you. However, I noticed that they all seemed to quote the same few sources...which, in turn, were a little shallow in their own sources. As I went about testing those claims, I started finding that many of the things that were claimed were either flat out embellishments, or highly interpretative assumptions based upon material that didn't pass novice scrutiny, or demonstrative of a lack of understanding of the translation process of both the KJV and the versions that they constantly berate.

This is why I asked the questions previously. They are simple questions meant to give a better understanding of your views.

After all, the primary premise that you claim lay in a belief in the complete and utter perfection of the King James Version of the Bible (or one of its several revisions). All of those other things, until this is affirmed, are secondary concepts, accusations and theses. We don't want to get sidetracked by a straw man or circular reasoning. We want to approach the primary claim that you loudly present and examine/test it to see if it withstands honest consideration.

Quote:

UPDATE

The answers to Chris' 10 questions are being prepared, but I don't really see any point in presenting them as they will not be accepted.

Who said that I HAVE to "accept" your answers? After all, those answers will be merely what you think in the subject. I am not asking you to copy and paste material from other websites or "sources." I am not asking for a book for each of those questions. They are just your own opinions that can be stated simply and concisely without material lifted from any other place. They're simply YOUR answers to those questions.

I do have some points for each of those questions too. However, there are varying degrees of belief regarding this matter. I would like to see what you (simply) believe regarding those ten simple questions before we can address your primary thesis regarding the KJV.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/4/4 18:19

By the way...

I would not be nearly as interested in this thread if the brother who recently joined this online community had simply presented his accusations and claims as a "possibility" rather than an absolute certainty.

I am beginning to rethink whether or not I should have entered the discussion.

However, it is disappointing to think that there are many people -- including new believers -- who come to this forum each day who might read such claims. Those claims amount to attacks upon many translations of God's Word...and the translators, ancient manuscripts, sources and language experts who desired to create a faithful translation of the Word of God into an understandable language that people speak.

I just don't think that this is way we are supposed to go about such topics. I think that these issues and opinions are perfectly acceptable topics for consideration and discussion...but not the type to be declared here as if they are "undeniable truths" to a lost and dying world.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/4/4 18:28

ccchhhrrriisss, In my opinion all this thread has accomplished is a lot of confusion, where does confusion come from?

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2011/4/4 18:38

I agree, MrBillPro.

However, my underlying motivation in this thread is to urge caution to those who are willing to so easily spread accusations, allegations and insinuations about faithful versions of God's Word.

This has happened in the past with other new members who feel that the forums on this website -- which has a specific goal of promoting genuine Biblical revival -- as a means to proclaim their sectarian views.

I suspect that I will be opting out very shortly. I am less interested in trying to "convince" anyone as I am in trying to hasten caution about issues that are so very serious and far-reaching.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2011/4/4 19:03

ccchhhrrriisss, sorry, I also meant to state that my statement was not directed at anyone.

God Bless

Brother

Re: - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/4/4 19:17

chris,

Quote:
-----After all, the primary premise that you claim lay in a belief in the complete and utter perfection of the King James Version of the Bible (or one of its several revisions)

This is not true! The Brother did not lay these claims.

Why do you continue to repeat false accusations?

Why, instead of replying to my questions, do you use the opportunity to post more attacks on Brother anonymous777?

The Lord rebuke thee.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2011/4/4 19:45

Quote:

chris,
This is not true! The Brother did not lay these claims.

Why do you continue to repeat false accusations?

Excuse me?

I could go back and copy and paste the words themselves. However, why don't you just go back through this thread and look at this man's claims.

He (along with a couple of others) joined this community less than two weeks ago and has repeatedly presented a very

specific view in which he claims that God supernaturally perfectly "preserved" His Word and that an end result of this is the King James Version. He may not have used those specific words, but the underlying premise still appears to be the same.

He also has posted (or reposted) material that insinuates and outright accuses other translators, sources, language/manuscript experts and, ultimately, other translations of God's Word.

However, for clarity's sake, I asked ten simple questions in order to ascertain the original primary thesis for such a claim. Too often, a claim about the KJV is quickly turned into attacks on other versions (and their translators, sources, textual criticism, etc...) -- which has happened in this very thread.

I have asked those questions in order to understand the perspectives that each person (including anonymous777) has regarding this issue.

Quote:

Why, instead of replying to my questions, do you use the opportunity to post more attacks on Brother anonymous777?

White_Stone, I am NOT attacking this person. Rather, I am actually asking HIM to STOP repeating the attacks of other versions, translators, source manuscripts, text-types, language experts, etc... -- unless he has completely verified his sources. At times, this discussion seems to have meandered from a declarative position on the KJV...to an attack on other versions, sources, translators, etc...to questioning the motives and honesty of those who examine his own position, claims and words that he quotes from other websites and books.

Besides, right now, I don't even know what questions that you are asking of me. Perhaps I missed something?

Quote:

The Lord rebuke thee.

The Lord rebuke "thee?"

Okay...enough. We need to stop with this sort of repulsive, offensive and extremely ridiculous nonsense.

I think that some may be incorrectly "reading between the lines" here.

I am not the person going about loudly proclaiming views that faithful translations of Scripture are "hellish," "corrupt" or part of some conspiracy to add or remove words from God's Word. I am simply urging caution about using THIS FORUM to loudly proclaim such things as if there is no need for a discussion since the websites that a few people have consulted have indicated what some are convinced is the truth.

If you are so "free" as to go about spewing a vicious "the Lord rebuke thee" -- then there is nothing more that I can say to you.

However, you really need to stop spewing such nonsense -- especially if you aren't quite understanding a particularly simple cautionary point that is trying to be made.

May the Lord BLESS you.

Re: God's Word is still being "burned" today, one word at a time., on: 2011/4/5 0:57

Thanks for setting the record straight, Chris.

What I am posting now is for those of you that are interested in what is changing in the Modern Bible Versions.

My first post was about 10 pages in and I was applauding Tyndale for the difficult times he endured and what a great job he did. I applauded the KJV translators for desiring "to improve an already good translation and not to create a new one".

My second post and my original thesis was my concern for the contradictions that we never saw before in translations which we are seeing now.

A poster recently said, that I should have come in and said everyone should be cautious about modern versions and the changes that are taking place.

That is exactly what my 2nd post was all about.

Here is my 2nd post.

Quote:

-----Jesus-is-God has a signature with this website.

The Savior or the Scriptures

<http://www.bibleviews.com/savior-scripture.html>

It is an excellent read about Jesus Christ and the Word of God. They are not mutually exclusive and most importantly, there is no contradiction between Jesus Christ and His Word.

I think when I read this, a light turned on in trying to convey to you what our concern is.

What we are trying to say, is that with these new versions of the Bible, we are seeing contradictions that we never saw before between Jesus Christ and His "Word".

Is this not cause for concern and alarm?

I would expect someone to challenge my statement and want me to show them what I am talking about or to show me how I am mistaken.

Peace in Jesus,

777

This original question and thesis has been obfuscated over and over. I spent time showing many examples. But mainly one person kept trying to detract from what my main, initial point was all about.

When someone asks me what my final authority is in matters of faith and practice, I don't say, "usually the NIV, but I like the NASB and KJV, too". I would really be saying, "I have no final authority", if I said that.

I leave you with what I believe are red alerts that you should be concerned with. The skeptics will not read these. They will only draw your attention once again to a strawman that they are mercilessly beating on, instead of taking the chance that you might read and educate yourself about major doctrines being demolished. Here are some examples and remember, the additions/changes/deletions have not ended, for New Versions are pumped out every year and there will continue to be more "burning" of God's Word, word by word, until it will be on life support needing a couple of IVs.

Once you read these, I am confident that you will see what this battle is all about and what is at stake.

Some will claim that the weaker reading in the new Bible versions is unimportant because for example, the NIV and NASB include the stronger reading in the margin. The question is why the seed of doubt should be allowed to be planted by contradicting the text in footnotes, and how long it will be before the footnote is removed entirely. Don't think the footnote will not be removed someday, then you will not only not have the verse but the footnote about the missing verse.

Which Bible verses did the NIV delete?
<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/nivdelet.htm>

NIV BIBLE QUIZ
<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/nivquiz.htm>

These can all be found here:
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>

IN THE BIBLE THAT YOU READ:

Are you washed in the Blood?
Rev 1:5

Was GOD manifest in the flesh?
1 Timothy 3:16

Does your Bible teach the Trinity.
1 John 5:7

Who is in control of the world, God or Satan? Can't be both. Matthew 6:13 ends with: "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever, Amen." This phrase is in brackets in the NASB and removed in the NIV, RSV and ESV. Jesus either said it or he didn't; they can't all be right.

The Grace of God Destroyed
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/graceofgoddestroyed.htm>

Is Jesus the Eternal, ONLY Begotten Son
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/eternalonlybegottenson.htm>

How to Destroy Messianic Prophecies - Three examples
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/messianicprophecies.htm>

Does Your Bible Teach Racism?
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/mvsandr racism.htm>

Rejoice or Be Proud - Pride taught as a Virtue
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/mvsprideasvirtue.htm>

Lucifer or Morning Star?
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/luciferormorningstar.htm>

The Deity of Christ
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/deityofchrist3verses.htm>

The SPIRIT ITSELF
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/thespirititself.htm>

Godhead or Deity - Is James White Right?
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/godheaddeityschoolmast.htm>

Fornication or immorality - Sodomites or something else?
<http://brandplucked.webs.com/fornicationimmoral.htm>

Are Some of God's Word's Lost

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/1samuel131wordslost.htm>

Do Ghosts Exist?

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/ghosts.htm>

How Old Was Jehoiachin, 8 or 18?

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/jehoiachin8or18.htm>

And many more:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>

What kind of Sword do you have? Is it turning into a butter knife?

The only thing that I ask is that you be open about this and educate yourself on this subject.

I am glad to be here and thankful for the new friends that I have and do not consider anyone an enemy.

777

P.S. The 10 questions that a poster asked are easy to answer, but since it is a strawman that takes away from the original subject I sought to talk about, I won't be answering those questions. It is just a distraction. No doubt, the poster already knows the KJV view and answer to his questions, already.

Amo 8:11 Behold, the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the LORD:

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/4/5 2:00

Hi anonymous777,

I am now opting out of this thread.

It is apparent that you cannot (or are unwilling to) validate any of your claims about the supremacy of the KJV. That was the first major thesis in this whole matter that is unproven.

In addition, you cannot (or are unwilling to) substantiate any of the allegations that you make about other versions, other translators, the sources, textual criticism, ancient manuscripts, etc... through firsthand source examination and presentation. And, apparently, you are either unwilling to validate the information that you read in biased books or websites...or you are unwilling to identify the extent of that research for each accusation that you make that has been contained here.

"That poster?" I guess that is me. It is ironic that you called my ten questions to you (and anyone else) a "straw man" -- when I was merely trying to get to the essence of the underlying premise that you make about the KJV. Unfortunately, any examination of that claim is treated with "suspicion" or a subtle personal accusation. It is impossible to get to the heart of the issue if we "dance around it" with back-and-forth innuendo and finger pointing.

At this point, and since you said that you are new to this SermonIndex community, all I can do is make a few suggestions:

- You should NOT use this website's forum to make allegations about the translations, the translators, the sources, the ancient manuscripts, the text experts, the language experts, the Bible societies, etc... Such public allegations -- especially when unsubstantiated -- are outside of the mission of this ministry.

- If you read an allegation about such things in a book or website, or if you hear someone else tell you them, you should verify those things for complete accuracy and authenticity before repeating them. You can read firsthand source material in university and public libraries. You can contact translators. You can read the writings of the accused. You can read the writings of the translators of the KJV, Textus Receptus, New Testament in the Original Greek, etc... Someone menti

oned "time constraints" -- but that shouldn't be a problem given the amount of time people use to read the allegations or the time that they spend on public forums actually repeating the accusations.

- You should welcome anyone who wants to test the things that you claim. If it is really truth, it will withstand the scrutiny that comes from true believers who honestly want to prove those things.

- "I don't know for certain" is an acceptable position...if we aren't entirely certain of a matter, allegation, accusation or claim.

- You should refrain from subtly implying that those who do not agree with your beliefs about the supremacy of the KJV are a result of a famine of hearing the words of the Lord...or are unwilling to know the truth. Many of us prefer to hear HIS words above all else -- and we are willing to study in order to test those things that are claimed by others (even if their claims are presented as "fact").

Anonymous777, I do hope that you will truly be willing to verify those things that you read from others. I also hope that we are "slow to speak" regarding claims and accusations that aren't fully researched, tested and verified. It would be a terrible thing to find that out on that Day that we were wrong with such loud public proclamations about faithful translations of God's Word. After all, we will all give an account.

And, my prayer is that the Lord of Truth will lead and guide all of us.

With this, I am opting out of this thread. If further accusations or well-meaning "rebukes" are made toward me, they will go unanswered.

no!, on: 2011/4/5 8:17

Quote:

-----What kind of Sword do you have? Is it turning into a butter knife?

NO, It, meaning Scripture, which is on this table, is an ESV translation and in the LORD, I can assure you is no "butter knife" and to imply otherwise, as I am led, is veering perilously close to committing the unpardonable sin.

This Book will cut chunks out of the devil.

Brother, it is One Thing to know the Bible, what about the excellency of Knowing God?

the reason I ask this, is that there is one teaching by Len Ravenhill, on this site, "The Excellency of Knowing God"....turned me upside down. I hope you like dear Len, I am almost afraid to post it up, for I don't even know, if you think Len is ok.

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=20421>

It's a very very anointed bit of teaching, I think you'll like it, I don't consider you "enemy", and you wrote of the friends you've made here, but let me ask this, I don't know of any friend I would call "trip seven". Back in my military service, that might have been a call sign, but here...?

I use my name...many posters don't, I understand, the internet is a very dicey place, but I have no fear of such things, or of man.

anyway, despite what you may believe, I am comfortable in the knowledge that my ESV translation of God's Word is not a "butter knife".

brother trip seven, the only translation I have little regard for is the TNIV, but I guarantee you, that version is NOT a big seller. The reason I think it's a bit off, is its all too earnest stance on being "gender neutral"....just even writing "gender neutral" makes me laugh, but it's 2011, and we live in the new "Roman" empire, people can tell you who won the newest "American Idol"...WAY before they can tell you of the different uses of the Greek word "love" in recommissioning of Peter, at

the end of the Gospel of John, which i find fascinating....so if the most hardened secular atheist even picks up a TNIV (!!!) to read, i bless God!

thats a start, a baby has to learn to crawl before they can walk, and i am fully confident in the Holy Ghost, that over time, such a person, (please LORD, bring them) will relize there are more "figs" on a better Tree...if that Tree is a KJV, Bless God, if its an ESV, NASB, whatever, Bless God!!

do you see what i'm saying?

Even within the Ekklesia, most followers of Jesus are Bible illiterate....they dont make it a discipline, to get to in the Word everyday....and/or they dont make it a discipline, an offering pleasing to the LORD to get on their knees and praise and speak to the Master of the Universe, everyday, and in transparency, i myself am guilty of neglecting this discipline, which is a daily private prayer ministry, but The Holy Ghost is dealing with me on this issue, and God willing, may i reconstruct a private ministry of secret prayer in my life, which used to be vibrant.

What more can be better? than talking with God, communing with Jesus?

Therefore i implore you, brother, beg you....just a little Grace.....please. Grace is Grace, it is not compromise.

search your heart, i searched mine, and i dont think saying, i "wouldnt fellowship" with ANY dear saint is a good thing to write, i'm sorry. If it seems like "anger"....ah, maybe, its more "passion" than anything. i'm not Paul, but look what that dear saint wrote in Galatians about the circumscion crowd?.....i'm sure you know, he wished they'd go all the way, and emasculate themselves!

lets just veer towards a heart of Grace, heart of Mercy, heart of Jesus.

May the Grace of the Lord be with you and all here, neil

Re: no!, on: 2011/4/5 8:52

Hi Neil,

That was my last post, brother.

Thank you for your kind words.

777

Regarding grace on the subject. The first scripture that came to my mind was God's opinion regarding the adding and subtracting of His words from HIS WORD. I think it was GRACE that HE WARNED US.

We'll see you around.

May the Grace of the Lord be with you and everyone else, also.

Are The New Versions Really New?

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EIXS5Ydbrsk>

Catholic Church- Mother Of Corrupt Bible Versions 1/9

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ySheyYPB4Qo>

A777

King James Only - Where did the term originate? - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/15 13:10

Ahh, I found this gem of a thread...

This was the original topic as posted by SermonIndex.

Quote:

"On its 400th anniversary, the King James version of the Bible is universally recognized as a literary masterpiece that profoundly shaped both modern Christianity and the English language.

At the Bible Baptist Church in Mount Prospect, Ill., however, it's accorded a much higher level of reverence.

"Using anything but the King James version is like shaving with a banana," said Chris Huff, the church's pastor.

The suburban Chicago church belongs to a loosely defined denomination known as the "King James Only" movement. Members believe that the King James version is not just another translation, but the indispensable underpinning of a Christian's faith. ..."

Today, the term "King James Only" is mostly a derogatory term, but it was not always that way...

King James Only - Where did the term originate?

The term "King James Only" has a tremendous history to it. Over time, the term has become a derogatory accusation by proponents of the modern versions. It has become synonymous with the understanding that King James Only means a bunch of King James nuts dancing around a King James Bible and worshipping it. Those who are totally void of reality in their lives will honestly believe that it is a worship of the King James Bible. Nothing could be farther from the truth but since most Christians get their understanding of Bible history from the comic pages, it is necessary to give a brief understanding of this term and how it came to be and the extreme wisdom behind it.

In 1603 when King James VI of Scotland was about to ascend to the English throne as King James I, something called the Millenary Petition was given to him. It was the signatures of over one thousand Puritan ministers who were thoroughly repulsed by the serious spiritual decline in the Church of England.

The Petition reached its high point with the Hampton Court Conference where the outcome was a suggestion by King James for a new Bible version. Up to the time of 1603, the churches in England were using several versions of the Bible, they were the Geneva Bible of 1560, The Bishops Bible of 1568, The Great Bible of 1539, Matthew's version of 1537, Tyndale of 1526, and the Coverdale of 1535 (burnt according to the decree of Henry VIII in 1546). What was happening in the churches of England was there were many translations of the Bible and there was some confusion, even though they were from the same manuscript line which led up to the King James Bible 1604-1611.

1 Thessalonians 1:10

(Tyndale 1526) and for to loke for his sonne from heven whom he raysted from deeth: I mean Iesus which delivereth vs from wrath to come.

(Matthews 1537) and for to look for his son from heaven, whom he raised from death: I mean Iesus which delivereth us from wrath to come.

(Geneva 1560) And to looke for his sonne from heauen, whome he raised from the dead, euen Iesus which deliuereth vs from that wrath to come.

(Bishops 1568) And to tary for his sonne from heauen, whom he raysted from the dead: euen Iesus which delyuereth vs from the wrath to come.

1 Thessalonians 1:10 gives us a good look at the four versions which convey the same message but with different English in some places. It must be kept in mind that the English language was still in flux in the sixteenth century and that is why there was much difference in translations into the English. By 1604, the English language had started to become solidified and this is where the wisdom of King James came in concerning the term "King James Only."

What King James wanted to do, was to unify all the churches in England with one Bible version so there would not be any confusion. King James was a strong Christian but was weak in body. He wanted unity in the churches between the pulpit and congregation, and between churches. That is the history behind the term "King James Only." In fact, even up to 100 years ago here in the United States, there was unity of Bible usage as the King James Bible was still in use. The 1881 RV and the 1901 ASV never really made any serious inroads into the churches. The first serious threat to Biblical unity in Christianity was the Revised Version of the Communist Group National Council of Churches completed in 1952, then in 1959 came the New American Standard Version, and then Satan's crowning achievement, the New International Version in 1973.

Now, not only do you have absolute confusion in bibles when you go from church to church, but now within every congregation in every church is a number of modern versions, all saying something different and you never get past, "What does your version say?" With Christian approval, Satan now marches into every church with a new version every six months, each one being more corrupt and neutralized than the one before it.

Now do you see the extreme wisdom of "King James Only?" It was for the purpose of making sure Christians can grow in the faith and when the Bible is discussed or preached, all will be on the same page with the same words and therefore no confusion in the mix. How many times I have heard preachers preaching from a modern version and then have to state in their sermon, "Well the NIV states it this way," and "The Message states it that way." King James was more prophetic than he realized when he wanted one translation for unity in the churches.

Now you know what "King James Only" stands for and the next time you hear it used derogatively, you will know the person is ignorant about it and you can correct him or her. Let us not continue to believe a lie!

By Dr. Ken Matto

Re: King James Only - Where did the term originate? , on: 2011/7/15 13:33

And here we go again.

Re: , on: 2011/7/15 14:13

I just spoke about intimidation in Robert Wurtz' thread, martyr. Is your comment meant to deride and produce subtle intimidation? I don't understand, can you explain what you mean?

I find it interesting where KJV Only originated, don't you? Does that pose a problem for you?

We would like to know what you mean by "here we go again" or would your perfect world be one where no one is allowed to speak about this subject anymore?

I found nothing offensive in Sarah's post.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/15 14:57

Hi Julius21,

I took martyr's statement only as a reference to the fact that this topic has been discussed EXHAUSTIVELY in MANY divisive and hotly debated threads here at SermonIndex. I don't think that he meant disrespect, and I don't think that it is wise to publicly contemplate whether martyr meant to "deride and produce subtle intimidation."

As for the author of this article's claims:

What is presented in this little article is NOT the origin of the "KJV-Only" term as understood today regarding a handful of very vocal critics of ALL other versions besides the KJV.

Quote:

I found nothing offensive in Sarah's post.

I didn't find anything offensive by Sarah, but I did not agree with the highly divisive nature of some of the rhetoric within the article that was quoted, such as...

Quote:

"Those who are totally void of reality in their lives..."

Quote:

...but since most Christians get their understanding of Bible history from the comic pages...

Quote:

"King James was a strong Christian but was weak in body." (???)

Quote:

...and then Satan's crowning achievement, the New International Version in 1973.

Quote:

Satan now marches into every church with a new version every six months...

Quote:

...you will know the person is ignorant about it and you can correct him or her.

Quote:

Let us not continue to believe a lie!

That last part doesn't sound like even the author of the article even wants an actual discussion. After all, he is convinced that his "research" is correct and everything else is a "lie."

That is the danger in these sort of discussions. I don't have a problem when someone discusses the issue of translation

s -- but there is a danger in meandering to the point to where it is a way to publicly proclaim something with an attitude that no discussion is necessary or that any criticism or analysis of such claims is the equivalent to "believing a lie" of the devil. That can be quite "intimidating" in and of itself.

I welcome such discussions. However, I think that we should present a view with meekness and we should always be willing to check and recheck our views, sources and manners by which we make loud public proclamations.

Re: , on: 2011/7/15 17:03

Hi Julius21

I believe the United States Constitution guarantees one the right of free speech. Thus you may speak what you wish provided the SI guidelines are observed. I believe Chris more than elegantly explained what my statement meant. It was a statement with no offense intended.

Re: - posted by savedtoserve, on: 2011/7/15 20:39

Great post, Sarah. Thanks so much.

Quote:
-----Now you know what "King James Only" stands for and the next time you hear it used derogatively, you will know the person is ignorant about it and you can correct him or her. Let us not continue to believe a lie!

It is a greatly needed clarification, even here on this forum. Yes, I would also consider this a gem of a thread!

Martyr, allowing those who disagree with such discussion is important, but I don't see the need for it to stop just because you disagree. I mean, some of us disagree just as much with you that it indeed ought to be discussed, don't you see? If you don't wish for it to stop, then please forgive my assumption.

Chris, I know it has been discussed before, but everyone has questions and material that has not always been shared. And providing the spirit is kept in check, it's good for a Christian to be able to defend whatever he believes. I know this has been shot down before, but it really is true.

I find it so disheartening that whenever someone wants to discuss either the KJV or something that will closely define where you stand, someone else has to come and throw a bucket of water on it and say, Shame on you! I'll not be ashamed for standing up and saying, "I have a Living word from Heaven (the Bible)," just as I'm not ashamed to say, "I have a Living Word (Jesus Christ) in Heaven!" And Christ won't be ashamed of me either.

Our idea of the Bible is saying the same thing of Jesus Christ, whether or not we realize it. Does it not matter to you to have God's word in it's purity (no matter what you think which one is pure)? If yes, then you have a false idea of who Christ is.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/7/15 22:40

Hi savedtoserve...

Quote:

Chris, I know it has been discussed before, but everyone has questions and material that has not always been shared. And providing the spirit is kept in check, it's good for a Christian to be able to defend whatever he believes. I know this has been shot down before, but it really is true.

I find it so disheartening that whenever someone wants to discuss either the KJV or something that will closely define where you stand, someone else has to come and throw a bucket of water on it and say, Shame on you! I'll not be ashamed for standing up and saying, "I have a Living word from Heaven (the Bible)," just as I'm not ashamed to say, "I have a Living Word (Jesus Christ) in Heaven!" And Christ won't be ashamed of me either.

Yes, I do agree that this can be discussed in humility, meekness and gentleness of spirit while sincerely seeking the truth. Unfortunately, many such discussions are convoluted with the type of comments made reminiscent to those found in the article that our sister posted. The author of that article included accusations and even derogatory comments against those who might not agree with his position (which is why I highlighted them).

Quote:

Our idea of the Bible is saying the same thing of Jesus Christ, whether or not we realize it. Does it not matter to you to have God's word in its purity (no matter what you think which one is pure)? If yes, then you have a false idea of who Christ is.

I don't understand what you mean. Perhaps you could elaborate what you are saying here. I think that those of us who feel the liberty (after much study and prayer) to use versions other than the KJV are also convinced that the Word of God is pure. I have been greatly blessed by our Lord through the study of His Word...and that study has included versions that are often targeted by KJV-only brethren (like the NASB and NIV). This understanding of Christ is not a "false idea" - and the essence of that character as presented in those versions is readily reinforced by the KJV.

Re: , on: 2011/7/15 23:05

The reason why men have made other versions is not to make the bible easier to read. That would be a good motive, but it's not true. It's an attempt to weaken the testimonies of God. Every time the bible gets revised it's edited more and more, but in subtle overtones so that even the avid reader doesn't quite notice and it's done over a long period of time, not at once as it would be rejected instantly.

We know this to be true in the advertising industry. If we see something long enough we'll eventually accept it into our thinking as "okay". When we've started watching movies, we'd pick the more innocent and overtime our taste buds wanted something with a little more action and finally we find ourselves watching horror and gore. To see nudity doesn't cause us to blush. The same is happening with the bible.

If anyone says, "I don't read the KJV because it's hard to read", or "I read another translation because it's easier to read". In doing the easier we are compromising.

I agree the KJV is hard to read, but it's nothing to change the old English, and when you read the ETH at the end, it's not as old English as you might think. The ETH is a verb meaning it's "continual". You don't want to compromise with the newer versions by removing that because there is nothing added in the newer versions to suggest that we should "continually" do a thing. For example;

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

The ETH on Believeth means to continually trust or believe, it's not a one time event.

Have you heard people say, "I've tried to believe in Jesus and it didn't work". What they didn't understand that it just didn't stop at receiving Christ but continually trusting. And that is VERY important that people understand that.

When I read "ye", or "thou", I just read it as "you" and when I read it out loud in a congregation I read it as "you". It's not hard to get around. But if you already have illiteracy issues, I can understand your dilemma.

We don't read an easier translation or version so that our mind can readily grasp its meaning. The bible was not written for this mind to understand, it never will. The Spirit takes the words out of the bible and makes them alive in us so that we don't live by the letter, but by the Spirit. Its intention is to set us free from the law of sin and death, not live by what our carnal understandings might glean from its pages. All that produces is an enemy to the cross and all that Christ accomplished there.

Re: , on: 2011/7/15 23:16

Hi savedtoserve,

Brother I believe I indicated to Julius that you are free to discuss whatever in this forum provided this ministry's protocols are observed. If the moderators want to open up this thread again I abide by their decision. I have to agree with Chris that such discussions go beyond heated and get ugly. Then comes the name calling. This violates Eph.4:29-30. Believers are free to have discussions and disagree in a spirit of dialogue. But when saints tear down one another because of views or practices not contrary to the gospel this is a poor witness for Christ .

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/7/15 23:59

Quote:
-----by savedtoserve
Martyr, allowing those who disagree with such discussion is important, but I don't see the need for it to stop just because you disagree. I mean, some of us disagree just as much with you that it indeed ought to be discussed, don't you see? If you don't wish for it to stop, then please forgive my assumption.

I know you were speaking directly to martyr but I just wanted to share what I thought when I opened up SI tonight... I got home from work and saw this old thread brought back up AGAIN, the same sentence went through my head and for the reasons that Chris said!

Now, if I thought that and martyr had the audacity to write it, I think it's safe to say that other people on SI wondered the same thing when they saw it back up again!! LOL I'm not making a judgment call about KJO but just sayin.... that's all!

God bless you savedtoserve!!
Sister Lisa

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 0:51

Quote:
-----Does it not matter to you to have God's word in it's purity (no matter what you think which one is pure)? If yes, then you have a false idea of who Christ is.

I assume that you mean those who can read Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic, and fully understand the cultural, historical, and literary background, as those are really the only "pure" options available.

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 1:16

That's a great post, Approved. Thanks for having the courage to stand up and say that.

When I became a new Christian I did not know what agape or ekklesia meant. I learned and we all learned, right.

20 years ago I did not know what google, windows, java meant or how to use a computer, but we learn.

I am constantly amused and insulted at the same time when grown people say they cannot understand the KJV.

It is called LEARNING.

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 7:39

Ok. The church is on sin and worldliness because she has left the KJV for the newer translations. Are you saying if one had the KJV they will not be drawn to sin and Sstan? Then what about the Mormons? They accept the KJV to be the word of God equal to their Book of Mormon. Yet Mormonism is a Satanic system similar to the Masonic lodge. For that matter how many other cults and abberant groups have gotten started with a KJV Bible. My post is not to say the KJV is evil. But to say that a church falling into sin and worldlinrss is not a Bible translation issue. The issue is the people not being taught the word of God period.

Re: - posted by savedtoserve, on: 2011/7/16 7:54

Chris, you talk about a double standard as pure. How can two things that contradict each other be pure? Its like saying to your wife, I love you honey, but I also love Susie Q too.

EverestSamo, no, I mean the opposite of what you said. That all that learning is unnecessary. I believe that there is a pure Book available today in our English language and that it happens to be the AV.

I probably wont be around for most this week due to schedule. God bless!

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 9:32

The majority text or Textus Receptus is also in many other languages, not just english.

What is always troubling in these discussions is the focus is always deftly switched to the messenger and the message of the Word being slowly yet methodically changed is lost.

Re: - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/7/16 9:42

Julius21:

Quote:
-----What is always troubling in these discussions is the focus is always deftly switched to the messenger and the message of the Word being slowly yet methodically changed is lost.

AMEN

Re: - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/16 10:13

From martyr,

Quote:
-----If the moderators want to open up this thread again I abide by their decision.

When I found this thread is was already open. The moderators obviously never locked it.

Quote:
-----Ok. The church is on sin and worldliness because she has left the KJV for the newer translations. Are you saying if one had the KJV they will not be drawn to sin and Sstan? Then what about the Mormons? They accept the KJV to be the word of God equal to their Book of Mormon. Yet Mormonism is a Satanic system similar to the Masonic lodge. For that matter how many other cults and abberant groups have gotten started with a KJV Bible. My post is not to say the KJV is evil. But to say that a church falling into sin and worldlinrss is not a Bible translation issue. The issue is the people not being taught the word of God period.

Gee, I wonder why Satan saw fit to change God's Word when he spoke it to Eve. Was it just a mistake or intended? Satan is a brilliant being with a great memory, how could he have made that mistake and not given Eve the pure Word of God? Food for thought?

Mormons may "accept" the KJV but they don't read it. I asked my Mormon "friend".

martyr, go and find out why homosexuals and feminists "accept" the NIV and TNIV. Show me that you are serious about this, if not, there are other threads that may interest you.

With love,
Sarah

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 10:16

Quote:

----- I believe that there is a pure Book available today in our English language and that it happens to be the AV.

And I wholeheartedly disagree, as do those whom I've met who are able to read the original languages. But I do like the KJV nonetheless. :)

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 11:48

Sara homosexuals and feminist reject the word of God period. The issue is not a Biblical translation but a heart issue. They, along with the rest of the church and country, reject Jesus Christ. Returning to the KJV is not the solution. The answer is the sinner needs to come to Christ. May I suggest that the focus be on the Living Word who is Jesus Christ and not a Biblical translation.

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 13:12

Sister Sarah. You say that feminist and homosexuals accept the newer translations. I addressed that in previous post. But I also know of godly believers who use newer translations such as NASB, NKJB, NIV, ESV, etc, who are serving the Lord in places where their lives are in danger. Yet they are bringing people to Jesus. Also some of our finest preachers such as Dr. John MacArthur, Charles Stanley, A. N. Martin preach from other Bible translations other than KJV, yet bringing people to Christ. I simply suggest in all humility that the issue is a heart response to the word of God, not a Bible translation. In blessing.

Blaine

Re: - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/16 13:19

My point exactly. They reject the Word of God.

I would also like to point out that corrupting God's Word is a heart issue and not a translation issue.

Have you found out why they prefer the NIV, yet?

With love,
Sarah

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 13:30

Sister my calling is not to homosexual ministry but to the persecuted church. So to answer your question I cannot tell you why homosexuals and feminist accept the newer translations. Ok. Let us say your assertion is true. Then I would say PRAISE GOD they are getting truth. But people who do work on homosexual and gay ministry say the issue is a heart choice and not a Biblical translation. With blessing. Blaine

Re: reedited, on: 2011/7/16 14:06

My sister you seem to be reasonable in this discussion and that is to be commended compared to some on this forum. Though I perceive you are KJO. That is fine. But in all humility may I ask some questions of a KJO person. You know of Wycliff Bible Translators. Their work is to translate the scriptures in the vernacular of indigenous people groups. As far as I know they do not use the KJV. Is their work wrong? We send Bibles to the persecuted lands in Chinese, Arabic, Farsi, Chinese, etc. Are we to say this is wrong? If you say that the KJV is the only pure translation, then are you saying that these other nations need to learn 16th century English?

These questions are posed in a spirit of dialogue. For if your premise be true that the KJV is the one pure translation and all other translations be corrupted then this will have profound implications for missions, world evangelism, and the persecuted church.

So far the above questions have never been addressed on this thread. With

Re: - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/16 14:31

Hi martyr,

I do appreciate the spirit of dialogue as I believe more can be accomplished.

I know there are many foreign versions of the Bible based on the Majority Text (Textus Receptus). I don't think your assertion about foreign versions being in the 1600 century English is correct. We are English speaking. It is not the English, but the underlying Greek text that is used and the Masoretic Hebrew for the OT.

As far as Wycliffe is concerned, I cannot speak to that because I do not know anything about their methods or what underlying Texts they use.

Thank you,

Sarah

Re: reedited, on: 2011/7/16 14:41

Thank you Sarah. Appreciate you addressing the posed questions. Now in honor to you do you know of links that gays and feminist are accepting newer translations. Would like to check this out. This is normally an area I don't get into. But your assertion has gained some curiosity on my part. With blessing. Blaine

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/16 14:51

Hi savedtoserve,

Quote:

Chris, you talk about a double standard as pure. How can two things that contradict each other be pure? Its like saying to your wife, I love you honey, but I also love Susie Q too.

That is a flawed statement because there is no "double standard." The premise that you make apparently suggests that the KJV is a "standard" by which ALL OTHER versions of the Bible are judged. Yet, the KJV is NOT the original. It is a copy. It is derived from many sources...including (but not limited to) the Textus Receptus -- which was itself translated out of MANY sometimes conflicting sources by ONE man -- a Dutch Catholic humanist named Erasmus. The KJV was revised several times over a period of more than 150 years to the edition that most use now.

So, in accordance with your analogy, it is more akin to having two photographs of the same woman and a man stating emphatically that he loves his wife.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/16 15:37

Hi sarahsdream,

Quote:

I would also like to point out that corrupting God's Word is a heart issue and not a translation issue.

Then you have some knowledge about the hearts of the translators of the KJV? Some of them held some very peculiar and downright erroneous views in terms of doctrine. Lancelot Andrewes, who oversaw the translation of the KJV, held too many "high church" beliefs. His writings reflect an embrace of the Catholic view of the "sacrament" and even the "adoration" of the saints. Yet he oversaw the translation.

Unfortunately, we cannot contact the translators of the KJV, because they died nearly 400 years ago. Of course, many critics of versions like the NIV and NASB have never even attempted to contact the translators that draw their criticism.

There are many misconceptions that are uttered in regard to the issue of Bible translations and versions. Sadly, many of those are merely things repeated from opinionated books and websites on the subject rather than by realistic firsthand research.

I believe that there is a legitimate argument about why someone might choose the KJV. However, I don't believe that it has anything to do with the hearts of translators as much as it does the legitimacy of the translation process. And, I think that it would be unwise to insinuate that those of us who choose to read the KJV and other versions (like the NASB and NIV) have "heart issues." Many of us sincerely seek the Lord (even in regard to this issue) and prayerfully study His Word daily.

Quote:

Have you found out why they prefer the NIV, yet?

As someone else said, it is odd to even claim that homosexuals "prefer" the NIV or such versions. First of all, you don't have any citation to validate such a claim. There are a few homosexual-friendly denominations, and some of those use different versions (including the KJV) according to their websites. I had a homosexual English teacher in high school who loved Shakespearean-era English and he quoted the KJV quite often because of the "majesty" of the language.

Moreover, the same question can be posed about the cults and sects that strictly use the KJV -- like the Mormons. While someone can claim that they "don't read the Bible" (even though it is quoted throughout their meetings and throughout their literature), it is just as easy to question whether homosexuals even read the Bible at all (regardless of the version). They obviously don't understand it. After all, even those versions that are oft maligned by KJV-only believers (like the NIV) clearly demonstrate the sinfulness of homosexuality. Of course, most homosexuals tend to dismiss Christianity in its entirety and the Word of God -- regardless of the version.

Re: - posted by savedtoserve, on: 2011/7/16 15:45

Perhaps that was not the closest illustration for you but my point is that they contradict each other. Any thoughts on this?

Re: - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/16 17:19

Hi Martyr,

It is not possible for me to conclude 100% that all homosexuals and sodomites only read the NIV and TNIV so in that I am wrong and will withdraw that statement. It is only safe to say that the NIV and TNIV are homosexual friendly because of their revisions.

I have to withdraw my statement because of this link:

http://www.gaychurch.org/The_Word/the_word.htm

Looking at all these gay sermons they do get the majority of their scriptures from the NIV. But some also from RSV and NKJV and a few from KJV.

Sounds just like our churches, today!!

In Christ,
Sarah

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/7/16 17:39

Hi savedtoserve...

Quote:

Perhaps that was not the closest illustration for you but my point is that they contradict each other. Any thoughts on this?

Could you be a little more specific? What things are you saying contradict each other?

Thanks,
-Chris

Re: - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/16 17:44

That is very interesting Chris. I have just finished looking at Lancelot Andrewes on the web. I looked at many, many links and was nothing but blessed by what I read regarding Lancelot Andrewes. So, I would like to thank you for bringing up his name. I was very, very blessed to know that a man of his character and learning oversaw the KJV.

I can provide many links to you however I don't see you providing any.

From what I read people say only wonderful things about him.

Here are some:

<http://theav4ever.blogspot.com/2011/01/lancelot-andrewes-adding-beauty-and.html>

<http://www.gracechurch.org/ministries/Posts.aspx?ID=132&MinistryID=30>

Bishop Lancelot Andrews - Proficient in 20 languages including Greek Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac and conversant in 15 of those languages

William John Bois - His father taught him Hebrew at age 5 and by time he was 6, he could write it. At the age of fifteen, he was a student at St. John's college, Cambridge. (At 5 years old, I was playing with Lincoln Logs and Lionel trains.)

Dr. Miles Smith - He had a knowledge of Greek and Latin fathers and an expert in Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew.

These are the men that James White, Stewart Custer, D.A. Carson, Bruce Metzger, Kenneth Barker, Don Wilkins, and other modern translators believe that they are smarter than. These guys do not have 1/100 of the knowledge that the King James translators possessed. That is because the modern translators bask in their education and self-esteem, while the King James translators were all godly men who basked in Calvary.

Taken from: <http://www.scionofzion.com/haw.htm>

In Christ,
Sarah

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/16 17:45

Hi sarahsdream...

Quote:

It is not possible for me to conclude 100% that all homosexuals and sodomites only read the NIV and TNIV so in that I am wrong and will withdraw that statement. It is only safe to say that the NIV and TNIV are homosexual friendly because of their revisions.

How are you able to draw such a "safe to say" conclusion?

Quote:

Looking at all these gay sermons they do get the majority of their scriptures from the NIV. But some also from RSV and NKJV and a few from KJV.

How much research did you conduct into this that allows you to say that homosexuals like this "get the majority of their scriptures from the NIV?"

Did you contact those homosexual churches or perform extensive research? Or are you guessing on the basis of a few online searches?

The point is that we need to be very careful about our claims when we declare them. It is easy to repeat the things that we have heard or read from others. However, we need to be as pure as possible in both our words and intentions when we make such public declarations.

Personally, I think that it is unwise to declare the NIV to be "homosexual-friendly" just as it would be unwise to declare the KJV to be "cult-friendly" given the Mormons and other cults that specify its use. After all, the NIV that I use quite frequently (alongside the KJV and NASB) is quite specific that homosexuality is an immoral and ungodly lifestyle.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/16 17:52

Hi sarahsdream,

Quote:

That is very interesting Chris. I have just finished looking at Lancelot Andrewes on the web. I looked at many, many links and was nothing but blessed by what I read regarding Lancelot Andrewes. So, I would like to thank you for bringing up his name. I was very, very blessed to know that a man of his character and learning oversaw the KJV.

Was it Lancelot Andrewes' embrace of the Roman Catholic eucharist/sacrament or his adoration of Mary and the saints that you found so compelling?

I am not here to assassinate his character or even levy unsubstantiated allegations about him. These are things that I found in his OWN WRITING -- and not some website that either praise or vilifies him. He was certainly a scholar with a great understanding of the languages of the texts that he consulted during the translation of the KJV (including the first portion that he oversaw -- the Apocrypha -- which he insisted remain a part of the KJV "Scriptures"). Still, it is odd that some would point the finger or question the motives of translators of academic versions like the NASB and NIV (without contacting them) when the same thing can be done with the translators of the KJV from their own writings.

As a small suggestion, you might want to broaden your field of research to go outside of KJV-only websites (like that "scionofzion" website) and perhaps go to a library, archives or university that houses firsthand source material.

May the Lord bless you in your search.

Re: - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/16 18:17

Hi Chris,

Can you please provide a link. Do you just go to anti-KJV websites? You may want to broaden your research too.

By the way, you cannot contact Westcott and Hort as they are dead. But, in their own writings you can find some extremely troubling things about them. And they are the ones that developed the Greek manuscript that modern versions come from if you did not know.

Thank you in advance,
Sarah

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 18:27

Hi Sarah,

My sister appreciate your honesty and spirit of dialogue. I cannot discourse as Chris can. I do not have his training. But you do love the word and have a noble heart. I will ruinate on our conversation. Be blessed in Jesus. Blaine

Re: - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/16 18:32

Thank you martyr. Yes, please give some honest and open thought to what is being said. May you be blessed in Him, to day and always.

In His love,
Sarah

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/16 20:24

Hi Sarah,

Quote:

Can you please provide a link.

I have posted a link below. I imagine that you may find more if you use Google -- or, more presumably, Google Scholar. As I said, the best research is often performed by going to libraries, archives or universities that contain such material. Lancelot Andrewes may not be available in many public libraries. However, if you live near a strong academic university, you may find it available for your research.

<http://libguides.calvin.edu/content.php?pid=47579&sid=427323>

Quote:

Do you just go to anti-KJV websites? You may want to broaden your research too.

Again, the best research is NOT performed by going to secondhand works or opinions of men. Instead of going online and just viewing what others claim to have gathered, it is best to go to the sources whenever possible. By the way, I don't know that I have ever visited any "anti-KJV" websites. Most of the most vocal websites that I have seen on the matter are the ones that seem to correlate with one another -- often quoting the website rather than the actual firsthand source.

Quote:

By the way, you cannot contact Westcott and Hort as they are dead. But, in their own writings you can find some extremely troubling things about them. And they are the ones that developed the Greek manuscript that modern versions come from if you did not know.

Likewise, you can look over the writings of men like Lancelot Andrewes (who oversaw the translation of the KJV) or Desiderius Erasmus (the Dutch Catholic humanist who singlehandedly created the Textus Receptus from many multiple texts) and view the weird things that they believed as well. Does it take away from the academic integrity of what they were trying to do? Like Westcott and Hort, it is difficult to make any such judgment about those men when we don't have evidence of personal literary injection.

I will say that much of the things that I have seen presented in many of the KJV-only websites and books (and here by proponents of a KJV-only view) seem to demonstrate an enormous amount of scrutiny toward other translators, texts and versions that is not likewise levied toward the KJV, its translators or its collection of lineage texts. If we are to do this with honesty and sincerity, we need apply all such scrutiny with an equal and sincere amount of exploration.

The Lord bless you.

Re: , on: 2011/7/16 21:54

Quote:
-----Are you saying if one had the KJV they will not be drawn to sin and Satan? Then what about the Mormons? They accept the KJV to be the word of God equal to their Book of Mormon. Yet Mormonism is a Satanic system similar to the Masonic lodge.

Good point Martyr.

The difference here is they don't have the Holy Spirit, and we know they don't because their gospel is a gospel of works with the addition of some weird tale that Joseph Smith dreamt up.

Oh they put their best foot forward in saying that salvation is by grace, the JW's say that too, but that is the lure to get you into their doors. It all looks good on the outside but it stinks with rot!

One may never read the KJV, but if you have one or able to get one, use it, or at least use it as a reference in conjunction with what you're using. There are many versions that people start out with and I don't condemn anyone for not reading the KJV. It still is the Holy Spirit that leads us into all truth. When it comes to the closeness and even scholars today will admit that the LXX is as close as your going to get to the original. Sadly they will only admit as a side note and not in their official documents. *sigh*

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/7/16 23:23

Chris,

Do you read anyone's research?

Or is all your research, original?

If so, you must have some papers or books you have written on the subject.

Is there something wrong with reading someone else's research, especially if their research is copiously documented?

Just asking.

Mike

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/16 23:49

Hi mikey2,

Yes, I have read the research from others. However, I do my best to TEST EVERYTHING (I Thessalonians 5:21) in order to ascertain the truthfulness of what is presented.

No, I haven't written a book, thesis or dissertation on this particular subject. After all, not everyone who researches an issue or claim actually feels the need to write a book on the subject.

And no, there is nothing wrong with reading someone else's research. However, I do find something wrong with relying solely upon someone else's research on matters that are so divisive or dogmatically partisan. It is about testing the things that we read or hear.

If we are going to entertain an accusation about a version of God's Word, the translators, the texts or the methods by which something is translated, then we must be willing to test the validity of what is claimed -- and apply the same level of scrutiny to the version and translation that we might personally approve.

I hope that clears things up a bit.

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/7/17 9:20

Hi Chris,

That actually tells me quite a bit.

I was beginning to think you were an expert or something on this subject.

Call me crazy, but to me you have a sly way of besmirching all the scholarly pro-KJV sites. It is clear, even though you say KJV is one of the bibles you read that you don't have much credibility on this because your stance is so obviously biased. You want to make it sound like you are balanced, but in case you did not know, it does not come across that way.

How do you know that others do not do their best "TO TEST EVERYTHING"? (Your implication).

How do you know that others are relying "solely" on other's research? (your implication).

Again, to me, there is nothing wrong with giving links to very well researched, documented sites by actual experts on the languages and the issue.

Thanks again, you cleared a lot of things up.

Mikey

Re: , on: 2011/7/17 9:27

Quote:
-----Call me crazy, but to me you have a sly way of besmirching all the scholarly pro-KJV sites. It is clear, even though you say KJV is one of the bibles I read that you don't have much credibility on this because it your stance is so obviously biased.

I've never gotten this vibe from Chris. He's never smeared the KJV translation that I've ever read. His message on this subject I've always seen to be very open ended, and more or less challenging readers not to use double standards when deciding what translation to use. And though I'm not sure if he's mentioned it on this thread, from what I know, he's probably done a VAST more amount of personal research on the subject than most (if not all) on this site, I'd be willing to bet. He's even personally contacted translators if my memory serves me right.

Honestly, the only people he seems to ruffle up are those with 1611 sized chips on their shoulders. Just saying.

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/7/17 10:46

Quote:
-----He's never smeared the KJV translation that I've ever read.

Seems to me that he plays a "shell game". Please don't play the same game he plays. I did not say he smears the KJV translation. What it looks like to me that he does is smear and/or cast doubt on pro-KJV sites, even the ones that are scholarly. Smearing the source of information is what I am talking about.

Quote:
-----And though I'm not sure if he's mentioned it on this thread, from what I know, he's probably done a VAST more amount of personal research...

I don't know what you know, but I do observe that he makes it a point to make that known, although I don't see much substance. Just the usual besmirching of KJV sources.

Quote:
-----He's even personally contacted translators if my memory serves me right.

That sounds impressive but does not make one authoritative.

He knows the pro-KJV people cannot contact a dead KJV translator so anything can be said about them.

Quote:
----- Honestly, the only people he seems to ruffle up are those with 1611 sized chips on their shoulders.

You make my point that he is unbalanced. Sounds like you are biased too, as I never read where Chris has characterized the pro-KJV people as having "1611 sized chips on their shoulders". Another smear on those ignorant KJV people.

They are so disgusting aren't they? Why don't they just get in line with the rest of the christian world and enjoy these new versions and shut up? Aren't they annoying? How much better the christian world would be if they would just go away.

That is the message that the anti-KJV people seem to transmit.

I am seeing big differences in the versions, myself.

Just saying...

Thanks,
Mike

Re: , on: 2011/7/17 12:45

Quote:

-----You make my point that he is unbalanced. Sounds like you are biased too

Pretty broad brush you got there. :)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/17 14:44

Hi Mikey2,

Quote:

I was beginning to think you were an expert or something on this subject.

I never claimed to be an expert on the KJV. My academic background is not in the fields of language or textual criticism. However, I do have an extensive background in research. I have spent quite a bit of time looking into this. I have read extensively on this matter -- including going past a "surface level" of casual research.

I have read contemporary writings of the translators of the KJV. I have read the writings and views of Erasmus (creator of the Textus Receptus). I have read plenty of firsthand accounts regarding the rationale, processes and explanations in to the creation and subsequent revisions of the KJV. I have read allegations and accusations about individuals who contributed to versions outside of the KJV. I have even contacted translators from the NIV, manuscript experts, linguistic scholars and textual critics. And, yes, I have even read through plenty of KJV-only websites.

I don't disagree with EVERYTHING that those KJV-only websites say. However, most of those websites have a strict agenda. Not only do they often try and proclaim that the KJV is "perfect" (and the ONLY "perfect" translation), but they also spend an even greater amount of time attacking nearly all other versions. I am taken aback by the amount of credence given to innuendo, accusations and loudly divisive rhetoric that isn't based upon credible scholarly research.

Quote:

Call me crazy, but to me you have a sly way of besmirching all the scholarly pro-KJV sites.

I won't call you crazy. However, I do ask that you refrain from accusing me of being "sly" in any of this. I have been open and quite up front with my words, so I do not appreciate someone trying to publicly insinuate that there is any ulterior

motive in this except that the truth be seen for what it is. I don't think that any of my words deserved such consternation.

It is unfortunate that such attitudes can be prevalent in the Body of Christ. As sincere believers, we all desire to know the truth about such matters. But, unfortunately, some harsh words and insinuations are thrown out when a discussion meanders into areas where one person (or group) doesn't hear what they believe to be correct based upon their own exploration of the subject.

In the article that Sarah posted, there were accusations that were either simply incorrect or were quite divisive -- of which I highlighted through quotes in my first response to that posted article.

Quote:

It is clear, even though you say KJV is one of the bibles you read that you don't have much credibility on this because your stance is so obviously biased. You want to make it sound like you are balanced, but in case you did not know, it does not come across that way.

Clear? Credibility? Hmmm. What makes you think such a thing? I certainly use the KJV -- and probably use it MORE than any other version. If you look through my posts here at SermonIndex, they are almost always accompanied with passages as they appear in the KJV. Perhaps you would need a photo of my well-worn KJV Bible to convince you that I read it?

Of course, I don't feel the need to "convince" anyone about whether or not I read the KJV. Whether you believe it or not, I do read the KJV...daily. Still, I read it alongside the NASB, NIV and several other versions (including non-English versions). I consider the KJV a very good academic version taken from its sources and methods, and I feel similarly about versions like the NASB and NIV.

Quote:

How do you know that others do not do their best "TO TEST EVERYTHING"? (Your implication).

I never said otherwise. However, it isn't about our own "best" efforts to "test everything." It is about whether or not that "testing" was done without bias and from an adequate amount of credible verifiers. Too often, unfortunately, it seems that many believers can be "too easily convinced" about a matter. They pick up a few Chick publications, a couple of books and look at a few websites for validation without testing the validity of the sources upon which the authors base their positions. In addition, one can easily ask if the SAME amount of intense scrutiny paid by KJV-only advocates toward other versions of the Word of God was applied to the KJV itself. How does that same amount of scrutiny of the grammar, wording, revisions, translation, translators, text/manuscripts, rationale (by the translators), its lineage and such -- how does the KJV perform under the same amount of straining scrutiny?

Someone wants to insinuate things about Wescott and Hort. Okay. However, have they offered that same amount of scrutiny to Erasmus, the Dutch Catholic humanist who SINGLE-HANDEDLY created the Textus Receptus out of many, many manuscripts (that often conflicted with one another)? Differences and similarities between passages are often worded as being "changes" (when NOTHING was actually changed since they were translated originally from source texts) or "embellishment." Okay. What about the similarities and differences between the sources used for the KJV (like the Bishop's Bible)?

Do you see what I am saying?

Of course, the premise of most KJV-only advocates comes from an insistence that the version is perfect and preserved down to the last "dot and tittle." If there is one mistake...or flaw...or translation error...or poor choice of noun, verb, etc... -- then it isn't "perfect" and the entire premise is broken (regardless of what one thinks about other versions). Of course, it is interesting to note that the translators of the KJV were the first to admit that their efforts were NOT perfect (see the preface to the KJV) and the fact that the KJV was revised many times between 1611 and 1769 or 1850 (the versions most readily available today).

Quote:

How do you know that others are relying "solely" on other's research? (your implication).

I didn't imply this about everyone or specifically regarding anyone here. There has been certain individuals who admitted to having arrived to their positions only after researching KJV-only websites and books with little-to-no firsthand research. My admonition was meant to simply encourage everyone to NOT rely on the research (or claims of research) from others -- especially if we are going to feel charged enough to "shout it from the rooftops" (or "online forums"). We need to make every attempt to get it right before we go about shouting something so incredibly important.

Quote:

Again, to me, there is nothing wrong with giving links to very well researched, documented sites by actual experts on the languages and the issue.

I didn't say that there was anything wrong with it. However, it is BETTER to quote the sources rather than the conveyor of those websites. In the academic world, a thesis or research paper would be rejected if a person didn't go straight to the sources and provide verifiable citations. How much more careful should believers be if they are going to make such far-reaching proclamations? How can someone verify or "test" our words if we simply cite another website that is just as vague with the source material for its premise?

Thanks again, you cleared a lot of things up.

I hope that this does a better job in clarifying such matters since it wasn't as "clear" as thought. After all, we are all looking for the truth about such matters. We shouldn't be afraid of being challenged to "prove everything" if we feel so commissioned to proclaim such things in public.

Re: Chris. reedited for spelling, on: 2011/7/17 15:22

I lack the academic training to comment on the ongoing KJV discussion. (At least I hope it is that.) But I have read enough of Chris's post to see they are fair and researched. To you S I newcomers go back and look at this brother's earlier post before you judge him. I also implore you to please maintain civility on this or any other thread. Our enemy is the devil not each other. Satan would like nothing better than to see us slashing one another with our swords than taking up the sword of the spirit to defeat him.

Re: Happy Birthday Tribute to the Lord for the KJV - posted by savedtoserve, on: 2011/11/4 10:34

Just wanted to bump this wonderful article by a former member, A777. Also with memories of Alive-to-God...both of your valuable inputs on this forum are missed!

Read and be blessed!!

A proclamation for all with deepest gratefulness to God.

Psa 12:6 The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.

Psa 12:7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

Psa 12:8 The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted.

I believe God's Words in the KJV are pure words, tried seven times. I believe the Lord has preserved His Word to us from generation to generation and we have it in the form of the KJV.

I believe God's promise, that He preserved His Word and I have no doubts at all about each jot and tittle that I read. I have complete confidence in His preserved Word.

If you don't have a Bible that you can say this about, you need to get with God and find that Bible, because He said, He would preserve His Word.

If you have a Bible that you can say that about, then God bless you. You need to have a Bible that you can believe without hesitation that it is the Lord's complete and preserved Word, down through the generations, to you.

What a mighty God we serve. Is anything too small for God?

I believe our Mighty God could even influence men through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to use the chapters and verses that He wanted. Why not? Is anything too hard for our God. It's all about faith brothers and about "seeing" and about being childlike, not about intellectualism and man's wisdom. Do you have this faith in the God of the Bible that you read and base your very existence now and eternally, on?

How could, God, even influence chapters and verses? I don't know, that's His business. He has a lot of gold nuggets like this in His Word where He delights in us finding them out. It speaks of His might and to us personally, that nothing happens to you, unless the Lord allows it. Look, at how He regards His Word even above His name. He watched over His Word and protected it through the centuries. Men have tried to tamper with it, but He would not allow it.

I do know that Isaiah has 66 chapters in it which may be the Lord's built in stamp on the canon of 66 books. Far-fetched? Here is something that you may find interesting and even be blessed by. The perfection of God's Word.

Isaiah has 66 chapters and the entire Bible has 66 books. The 66 chapters of Isaiah is said to be a miniature bible. And Looking at chapter 40 verse 3 we can associate that to book 40 (Matthew) chapter 3 where John the Baptist is identified as the voice in the wilderness spoken about in Isaiah 40:3. Still far fetched? Keep reading.

God is the divine engineer and could it be that He even inspired the men that divided up the Bible into chapters and verses? Of course!! He is in control of everything, especially when it comes to His Word. You should take comfort in the fact that even the smallest parts of our lives are very important to Him.

Look at Genesis 14 (note the number 14) and the 14th Epistle (Hebrews). The author writes in details on Melchizedek mentioned only twice in the OT.

Or, the Psalm 43 prayer is answered in Book 43, the Gospel of John. "Send thy light and thy truth"; "My Father hath sent me", "I am the Light of the world", "I am the Way the truth and the life".

Wow!! Is it possible, that the Lord Jehovah even supervised the ordering of the books? This must be a coincidence, eh?

Back to Isaiah:

With its sixty-six chapters forming a one-to-one correspondence with the sixty-six books of the Bible, Isaiah presents a complete image of the Bible within the Bible. This idea is not new. Many previous authors have acknowledged the relation between Isaiah and the Bible. Consider these words from the Introduction to Isaiah found in Thomas Nelson's New King James Version:

Isaiah is like a miniature Bible. The first thirty-nine chapters (like the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament) are filled with judgment upon immoral idolatrous men. Judah has sinned; the surrounding nations have sinned; the whole earth has sinned. Judgment must come, for God cannot allow such blatant sin to go unpunished forever. But the final twenty-seven chapters (like the twenty-seven books of the New Testament) declare a message of hope. The Messiah is coming as a Savior and a Sovereign to bear a cross and to wear a crown.

The similarities and parallels between Isaiah's 66th chapter and the 66th book of the Bible have been well noted amongst scholars, but it still amazes me every time I think about it.

It is very appropriate for the last Chapter of the book of Isaiah to be tied thematically with the last book in the Bible, but what makes these connections so stunning is that reading Isaiah 66 is like reading a condensed version of Revelation. Look at these amazing similarities.

Isa. 66:1 Thus saith the LORD, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest?

Rev. 4:2 And immediately I was in the spirit: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and sat on the throne.

Isa. 66:3-4 He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol. Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations. I also will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because when I called, none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear: but they did evil before mine eyes, and chose that in which I delighted not.

Rev. 18: 4 And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

Rev. 18: 7 How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her: for she says in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow....9) And the kings of the earth, who have committed fornication and lived deliciously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning.

Isa. 66:6 A voice of noise from the city, a voice from the temple, a voice of the LORD that rendereth recompense to his enemies.

Rev. 11:19 And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament: and there were lightning's, and voices, and thundering, and an earthquake, and great hail.

Rev 16:1 And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth.

Isa. 66:7 Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a man child.

Rev. 12:2 And she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.... 5) And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and His throne.

Isa. 66:12 For thus saith the LORD, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream: then shall ye suck, ye shall be borne upon her sides, and be dandled upon her knees.

Rev. 21:24 And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it.

Rev. 22:1 And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb.

Isa. 66:15 For, behold, the LORD will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire....16) For by fire and by his sword will the LORD plead with all flesh: and the slain of the LORD shall be many.

Rev. 9:9 And they had breastplates, as it were breastplates of iron; and the sound of their wings as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle....18) By these three was the third part of men killed, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone, which issued out of their mouths.

Isa. 66:18 For I know their works and their thoughts: it shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues; and they shall come, and see my glory.

Rev. 14:6 And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people,

Isa. 66:19 And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal, and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles.

Rev. 15:1 And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvelous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God.

Isa. 66:22 For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain.

Rev. 21: And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.

Isa 66:23 And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD.

Rev 15:4 Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest.

Isa. 66:24 And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.

Rev. 19:20-21 And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of Him that sat upon the horse, which proceeded out of his mouth (Jesus Christ): and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.

Did this bless you? It did me. Do you think we have an amazing God? Yes, He is amazing. He is Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God is He.

Ah Lord God, thou hast made the heavens and the earth by thy great power. Nothing is too difficult for thee, nothing is too difficult for thee, Ah, great and mighty God, great in power and mighty in deed, nothing, nothing, absolutely nothing, nothing is too difficult for thee.

HAPPY 400th BIRTHDAY to the AUTHORIZED KING JAMES BIBLE

and of course..... it is the Spirit that gives life, but His Words are spirit and they are life.

Blessings to all,

777