

## Articles and Sermons :: Errors in Other Bible Versions - Verse a Day from the KJV

### Errors in Other Bible Versions - Verse a Day from the KJV , on: 2011/7/16 1:14

This is a tribute to the KJV and it's 400th birthday.

This thread is only to look at one scripture a day in the KJV and compare it to others. Approved wrote a good post in another thread about subtle changes, little by little.

Here they will be presented, objectively compared for readers to view.

Some people don't understand this debate and think it is nonsense. When you see these verses, you will be able to decide for yourself.

These were all done by Dr. Ken Matto.

### Genesis 12:18-19, on: 2011/7/16 1:15

Genesis 12:18-19

(KJV) And Pharaoh called Abram, and said, What is this that thou hast done unto me? why didst thou not tell me that she was thy wife? {19} Why saidst thou, She is my sister? so I MIGHT have taken her to me to wife: now therefore behold thy wife, take her, and go thy way.

(NIV) {18} So Pharaoh summoned Abram. "What have you done to me?" he said. "Why didn't you tell me she was your wife? {19} Why did you say, 'She is my sister,' so that I TOOK her to be my wife? Now then, here is your wife. Take her and go!"

(NASV) {18} Then Pharaoh called Abram and said, "What is this you have done to me? Why did you not tell me that she was your wife? {19} "Why did you say, 'She is my sister,' so that I TOOK her for my wife? Now then, here is your wife, take her and go."

(ESV) {18} So Pharaoh called Abram and said, "What is this you have done to me? Why did you not tell me that she was your wife? {19} Why did you say, 'She is my sister,' so that I TOOK her for my wife? Now then, here is your wife; take her, and go."

(1901 ASV) {18} And Pharaoh called Abram, and said, What is this that thou hast done unto me? why didst thou not tell me that she was thy wife? {19} why saidst thou, She is my sister, so that I TOOK her to be my wife? now therefore behold thy wife, take her, and go thy way.

(CEV) {18} Finally, the king sent for Abram and said to him, "What have you done to me? Why didn't you tell me Sarai was your wife? {19} Why did you make me believe she was your sister? NOW I'VE MARRIED HER. Take her and go! She's your wife."

(HCSB) {18} So Pharaoh sent for Abram and said, "What have you done to me? Why didn't you tell me she was your wife? {19} Why did you say, 'She's my sister,' so that I TOOK her as my wife? Now, here's your wife. Take her and go!"

(RSV) So Pharaoh called Abram, and said, "What is this you have done to me? Why did you not tell me that she was your wife? Why did you say, 'She is my sister,' so that I TOOK her for my wife? Now then, here is your wife, take her, and be gone."

(NAB-Roman Catholic) {18} Then Pharaoh summoned Abram and said to him: "How could you do this to me! Why didn't you tell me she was your wife? {19} Why did you say, 'She is my sister,' so that I TOOK her for my wife? Here, then, is your wife. Take her and be gone!"

#### Affected Teaching

This is one of the more subtle, yet major abominations in the modern versions. In the KJV we read the single word in ver

se 19, "might." This means that Pharaoh did not yet take Sarah to be one of his wives. The modern versions omit the word "might" and teach that Pharaoh took Sarah to be his wife which would make Sarah an adulteress. This would also mean that the plagues which God sent on the house of Pharaoh would have been fruitless (verse 17). The reason that God sent those plagues was to prevent Pharaoh from taking her as his wife. According to the KJV, Pharaoh did not take Sarah as wife and returned her to Abraham who was rebuked by Pharaoh for lying about Sarah. When one little qualifying word is omitted, it changes the entire meaning of the passage which also affects the teachings of other passages and the continuity of the flow of Scripture. All the modern versions above use the word "took" which means that the action of taking Sarah as wife had already been completed, as the word "took" is the past tense of the word "take." The CEV states plainly that Pharaoh married her.

A quick English lesson:

I may take the one on sale - It means the possibility exists that I may take the item on sale.

I took the one on sale - This means a definite action on my part has already taken place.

This is the seriousness of the change in Genesis 12:19!

## 2 Samuel 21:19, on: 2011/7/16 9:57

2 Samuel 21:19

(KJV) And there was again a battle in Gob with the Philistines, where Elhanan the son of Jaareoregim, a Bethlehemite, SLEW THE BROTHER of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(NIV) In another battle with the Philistines at Gob, Elhanan son of Jaare-Oregim the Bethlehemite KILLED GOLIATH the Gittite, who had a spear with a shaft like a weaver's rod.

(NASV) There was war with the Philistines again at Gob, and Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim the Bethlehemite KILLED GOLIATH the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(THE MESSAGE) At yet another battle with the Philistines at Gob, Elhanan son of Jaar, the weaver of Bethlehem, KILLED GOLIATH the Gittite whose spear was as big as a flagpole.

(ESV) And there was again war with the Philistines at Gob, and Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim, the Bethlehemite, STRUCK DOWN GOLIATH the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(CEV) There was still another battle with the Philistines at Gob. A soldier named Elhanan KILLED GOLIATH from Gath, whose spear shaft was like a weaver's beam. Elhanan's father was Jari from Bethlehem.

(1901 ASV) And there was again war with the Philistines at Gob; and Elhanan the son of Jaareoregim the Beth-lehemite SLEW GOLIATH the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(HCSB) Once again there was a battle with the Philistines at Gob, and Elhanan son of Jaare-oregim the Bethlehemite KILLED GOLIATH the Gittite. The shaft of his spear was like a weaver's beam.

(RSV) And there was again war with the Philistines at Gob; and Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim, the Bethlehemite, SLEW GOLIATH the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(NAB-ROMAN CATHOLIC) There was another battle with the Philistines in Gob, in which Elhanan, son of Jair from Bethlehem, KILLED GOLIATH of Gath, who had a spear with a shaft like a weaver's heddle-bar.

(NWT-JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES) And war arose once again with the Philistines at Gob, and Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim the Bethlehemite got to STRIKE DOWN GOLIATH the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like the beam of loom workers.

Affected Teaching

This is one of those modern version quagmires which needs very little commentary. The question arises, WHO KILLED GOLIATH? (1 Sam 17:49 KJV) And David put his hand in his bag, and took thence a stone, and slang it, and smote the Philistine in his forehead, that the stone sunk into his forehead; and he fell upon his face to the earth. David was the one who killed Goliath as the Scriptures so plainly teach but as we see in the modern versions, they say that Elhanan killed Goliath. How do they arrive at that? In the King James Bible we see the words "the brother of" in italics which gives clear meaning to the verse and causes no confusion but continuity of the Scriptures concerning the death of Goliath's brother. The modern version editors did not believe it was necessary to keep these words to allay any confusion. Instead of including them, they omitted them and have caused confusion in the biblical narrative about Goliath and his brother. Now here is an interesting addition to the confusion that anyone who uses a modern version will encounter. The parallel verse to 2 Samuel 21:19 is 1 Chronicles 20:5 which reads:

(1 Chr 20:5 KJV) And there was war again with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair SLEW Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spear staff was like a weaver's beam.

Let's look at this verse in the modern versions I have mentioned:

(NIV) In another battle with the Philistines, Elhanan son of Jair killed Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, who had a spear with a shaft like a weaver's rod.

(NASV) And there was war with the Philistines again, and Elhanan the son of Jair killed Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(THE MESSAGE) In another war with the Philistines, Elhanan son of Jair killed Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite whose spear was like a ship's boom.

(ESV) And there was again war with the Philistines, and Elhanan the son of Jair struck down Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(CEV) In another battle against the Philistines, Elhanan the son of Jair killed Lahmi the brother of Goliath from Gath, whose spear shaft was like a weaver's beam.

(1901-ASV) And there was again war with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(HCSB) Once again there was a battle with the Philistines, and Elhanan son of Jair killed Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite. The shaft of his spear was like a weaver's beam.

(RSV) And there was again war with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Ja'ir slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(NAB-ROMAN CATHOLIC) Once again there was war with the Philistines, and Elhanan, the son of Jair, slew Lahmi, the brother of Goliath of Gath, whose spear shaft was like a weaver's heddle-bar.

(NWT-JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES) And there came to be war again with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Ja'ir got to strike down Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like the beam of loom workers.

Here are two parallel verses referencing the same narrative and both are saying something totally different. In one account, they are saying Elhanan killed Goliath and then in the parallel account, it states that Elhanan killed the brother of Goliath. Well which is it? Can you imagine a new Christian using an NIV or ESV and then comparing the accounts of who Elhanan killed? The King James translators added "the brother of" in the 2 Samuel account so there would be a continuity of truth and no doubt in the reader's mind as to who killed the brother of Goliath.

(2 Sam 21:19 KJV) And there was again a battle in Gath with the Philistines, where Elhanan the son of Jaareoregim, a Bethlehemite, slew the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

(1 Chr 20:5 KJV) And there was war again with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, whose spear staff was like a weaver's beam.

When using the King James Bible, there is no question who Elhanan killed. The answer agrees in both accounts thus engendering truth and not contradiction and confusion as in the modern versions. Once again the superiority of the King James Bible shines through.

**Re: 2 Samuel 21:19 - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/16 10:58**

Thank you for doing this. A serious student of God's Word should be interested in accuracy. I know that I am.

I think that many people are exasperated at the "debate" purely because these debates somehow veer off course and a way from looking and comparing just the scriptures. That was my case but then I started wondering about it and decided to have a deeper look. I was shocked to say the least, but I do understand the emotional aspect of this issue and why people just want it to go away. Once I looked into it from more than a superficial view, I realized that this is as old as the garden and will never go away. Satan is the chief counterfeiter and he certainly has a stake in corrupting the Word of God.

The Church should be safeguarding the Word of God, not secular publishers and unbelievers. They have shown that they are untrustworthy. They have no stake in safeguarding it. But God has protected His Word.

Thanks again for showing us the inaccuracies. This one in 2 Samuel 21:19 is very clear. I look forward to each one, daily now.

With love,  
Sarah

**Re: Matthew 1:25 - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/7/17 1:01**

duplicate post

**Re: Errors in Other Bible Versions - Verse a Day from the KJV - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/7/17 1:17**

Hi Julius21...

Quote:

-----  
This thread is only to look at one scripture a day in the KJV and compare it to others. Approved wrote a good post in another thread about subtle changes, little by little.  
-----

Just a friendly reminder: Differences in wording of verses (or even the content of certain verses) is NOT the same as "changes." Rather, it is the result of differences in what is found in source texts and/or the translation approaches used during the creation of the versions in question.

Quote:

-----  
Some people don't understand this debate and think it is nonsense.  
-----

I do pray that you don't assume that anyone here thinks that this is "nonsense." Some may not agree in regard to textual or version supremacy, but that is not the same as equating it to nonsense.

I agree that it is very important to understand how the various translations came into existence -- including popular versions like the KJV, NIV, NASB, etc... and even the ones that predate those.

However, it is quite clear that each version differs according to the various texts that were used in their creation and the linguistic methods by which the various translators arrived to their particular conclusions. Those are not the result of a translator trying to "change" something found in one version (the KJV) but from many other factors that really have little to do with any particular English version.

The Lord bless and encourage you!

**Re: Matthew 1:25 - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/7/17 9:11**

Matthew 1:25

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

(1611 KJV) And knewe her not, till shee had brought forth her first borne sonne, and he called his name Iesus.

(1560 Geneva Bible) But he knew her not, til she had broght forth her first borne sonne, & he called his name Iesus.

(1526 Tyndale) and knewe her not tyll she had brought forth hir fyrst sonne and called hys name Iesus.

Modern Versions

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

(ESV) but knew her not until she had given birth to a son. And he called his name Jesus.

(NASB) But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son. And he gave him the name Jesus.

(HCSB) but did not know her intimately until she gave birth to a son. And he named Him Jesus.

(1901 ASV) and knew her not till she had brought forth a son: and he called his name JESUS.

(CEV) But they did not sleep together before her baby was born. Then Joseph named him Jesus.

(RSV) but knew her not until she had borne a son; and he called his name Jesus.

(NRSV) but had no marital relations with her until she had borne a son; and he named him Jesus.

(NAB-Roman Catholic) He had no relations with her until she bore a son, and he named him Jesus.

(NWT-Jehovah's Witness) But he had no intercourse with her until she gave birth to a son; and he called his name Jesus.

Textus Receptus

kai ouk eginwsken authn ewV ou eteken ton uion authV ton prwtotokon kai ekalesen to onoma autou ihsoun

Hort-Westcott Critical Text

kai ouk eginwsken authn ewV eteken uion kai ekalesen to onoma autou ihsoun

Corrupted Manuscripts

This verse is corrupted in the following manuscripts:

Aleph 01 - Sinaiticus - Fourth century

B 03 - Vaticanus - Fourth century

1 (miniscule) - Seventh century

13 (miniscule) - Eighth century

33 (Miniscule) - Ninth Century

Affected Teaching

The Greek word for "firstborn" is omitted in both (B) and (Aleph). By removing this word in the modern versions, it endorses the Roman Catholic doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary. The word "firstborn" automatically indicates that Mary did have other children and the Bible tells us that she did in the following:

(Mark 6:2-3 KJV) And when the sabbath day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing him were

he astonished, saying, From whence hath this man these things? and what wisdom is this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands? {3} Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joseph, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him.

By removing the word "firstborn" it can also set up erroneous beliefs that Mary had children before she had Jesus. That word "firstborn" is pivotal to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. The removal of this word is a serious breach of truth and can lead to the denial of the Virgin Birth of Christ. If Christ was not born of a Virgin, then we will still be in our sins and bound for Hell. The modern versions, along with the Jehovah's Witness version, all agree with the Roman Catholic Institution's teaching that Mary was a perpetual Virgin. For someone to say that the modern versions do not stem from Roman Catholic Manuscripts is willful denial of the truth, keep in mind the two manuscripts which omit "Firstborn." The two are Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, both manuscripts were in the hands of the Roman Church, yet have become the primary manuscripts underlying the modern versions.

So tonight or tomorrow when your Pastor reads the narrative about the birth of Jesus from the book of Matthew in a modern version, then realize he is perpetuating the Roman Catholic error of the perpetual virginity of Mary which has caused many true Christians to be put to death under their inquisition because they refused to believe what was false in light of Mark 6:1-3.

**Re: , on: 2011/7/17 9:13**

Thanks Mikey. I'm not discouraged by Chris, by the way.

**Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/7/17 9:23**

No problem, take it from here. I like that website, by the way. I never knew some of this. How could "experts" make these kind of mistakes?

But, when you think about how the manuscripts came from Rome, it makes a lot of sense. Rome has an agenda. They are always changing God's Word.

Mike

**Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2011/7/17 12:03**

Quote:  
-----Just a friendly reminder: Differences in wording of verses (or even the content of certain verses) is NOT the same as "changes." Rather, it is the result of differences in what is found in source texts and/or the translation approaches used during the creation of the versions in question.  
-----

Yes.(Edit: comment removed)

We know that the original Scriptures were not written in English, but in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. From those original autographs there were multiple copies into those languages first, then into other languages. English Bibles are translations from copies of the original autographs in the original languages.

To consult English Bibles and compare them to one another without consulting the Hebrew and Greek manuscript evidence is unreasonable to me and others here. I really don't want to be offensive here. It is just sad and grieving for me to see much unfounded divisiveness on the part of KJV-only proponents. The enemy wants us to divide over Bible translations while the world around us is going to hell. May the Lord help us all!

**Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/7/17 16:33**

What is sad is that reason is always given for this particular discussion but not about other "pointless" discussions.

Pointless is in quotes for a reason because pointless is in the eyes of the beholder.

Too bad that you think only the original autographs (which are not originals) are accurate and what we have today is not.

Mike

**Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/7/17 16:45**

Hey, does anyone know what the standard is so we know whether the Bible is being corrupted or not?

Seems like anything goes.

Does God have a standard or not?

Why did he waste His time telling us not to add to or subtract from the Bible, or else?

What standard tells us if we are adding to or taking away from God's Word? Something we can judge all versions by. Does anyone know what standard God uses? This is not a trick question so no tricky answers, please.

Seriously.

**Re: mikey2 - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/7/17 18:01**

Brother, it's a narrow WAY not a narrow-minded way.

God be with you,  
Lisa

**Re: Genesis 12:18-19 - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2011/7/17 19:56**

Hello Julius 21,

Regarding your post on Genesis 12. I am assuming you are looking for the truth.

(KJV) And Pharaoh called Abram, and said, What is this that thou hast done unto me? why didst thou not tell me that she was thy wife? {19} Why saidst thou, She is my sister? so I MIGHT have taken her to me to wife: now therefore behold thy wife, take her, and go thy way.

In the Hebrew the word "might" is not there. In that case KJV is not accurate, and the other versions are more literal than KJV.

Please review the text in the Hebrew.

Ge 12:19 Why saidst thou, ? so I might have taken her to me to wife: take her, and go thy way.

the word "laqach" means ((took)), not ((might have taken)).

If we are to say ((might have taken)), we must add the word "m@`at" to the word "laqach" to mean "almost took"

or mial {meh-awt'}; from 4591; a little or few (often adverbial or compar.):--almost (some, very) few(-er, -est), lightly, little (while), (very) small (matter, thing), some, soon, X very.

You see that in Genesis 26:10 when Isaac did the same with his wife when he lied about her to Abimelech and said she was his sister.

Ge 26:10 And Abimelech said, What is this thou hast done unto us? one of the people might lightly have lien with thy wife, and thou shouldest have brought guiltiness upon us.

The word translated "lightly" means it was about to happen but had not yet.

But if you notice in Genesis 12 the word "TOOK" is not preceded by that word, but in the past tense.

It is the same word as in the following verses.

Ge 2:15 And the LORD God, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. {the man: or, Adam}

The word simply means: took, take, was taken, has taken....

But not might have taken. it speaks of a definite action past, present, future, or a command, but not a possible action.

**Re: Question for thought, on: 2011/7/17 21:53**

Come a day in the not too distant future when we are in prison for Jesus, will this discussion really be relevant? If we are in a concentration camp and we find other believers are we going to ask then what translation of scripture they read? I imagine yourself in a concentration camp. You are KJV only. You find a fellow saint. He is thrown into prison with you. But horrors he has read The Message. Yet he is suffering for Jesus as you are. Are you going to withhold fellowship from that believer? Something to think about.

**Re: , on: 2011/7/17 22:43**

Hi Untobabes,

That is very interesting what you point out and I am doing research on it.

I did not mean to raise a ruckus and have to answer martyr that of course this does not matter if we are in prison. But, then again, many of these discussions on SI won't matter, right? But, as someone already said, that reasoning is never held up to other discussions. I don't think it is a fair characterization what martyr has said and these characterizations don't seem to stop regarding those that believe God has a standard.

I don't know anyone that loves the KJV that does not fellowship with others. Maybe there are some who do that. Not liking a certain translation does not mean that you don't love the Body of Christ but that seems to be the characterization.

It grieves me that this issue raises such ridiculous and harmful comments, so I willingly withdraw this thread because this will only continue.

I liked what Untobabes posted and that is the kind of discussion that should take place. To be honest, I had not found the answer yet, but am only starting my research.

I may just take it privately with Untobabes.

I wish everyone well and you should all get back to your usual discussions. No child of God is a buffoon and neither side of this discussion should be characterized in a negative way.

I am sorry if I offended anyone, I guess I was just naive and did not know what I was walking into.

Julius



**Re: julius21, on: 2011/7/17 23:57**

Brother I deeply apologize. My post was not to characterize or offend. I honestly foresee a time that believers will go to prison and possibly death for their faith in Jesus in America. So this was not to mock you. I was wondering what your thinking would be come the time we are put in prison for our faith.

Julius I do not know you except through your post. You seem reasonable. Unfortunately most of my experiences with the KJO have been pretty unpleasant. But I have had some good dialogue with you and Sarah. I apologize that I misread your passion. Brother keep your thread open. We need to be challenged. I have been continually challenged and even insulted in this forum. Brother I may pose questions and maybe disagree with you. But if I have insulted you then please forgive me. That was never my intention. You have the freedom to keep this thread open. I hope you do. There will be those who will differ with you. But you will always have my respect because you love the word.

Your brother in Christ,

Blaine aka Martyr

**Re: - posted by A-Run (), on: 2011/7/18 4:32**

Quote:

-----Brother, it's a narrow WAY not a narrow-minded way.  
-----

Well said!

**Re: My point - posted by matt1000, on: 2011/7/18 10:17**

Hi Julius and all those who want to read this.

I must say, I am very glad to see the good spirit of love amongst us all on this website. What an example for our Lord Jesus Christ!

I would like to add to this discussion, because I also am very familiar with the KJV-only movement and sadly the damage that it caused me personally. I have no doubt Julius that you love the word of God and want to honour God. No doubt at all. But I would like to give you one or two things to think about.

For starters, we all agree here that the KJV is not an easy translation to read. I had been just as zealous to defend the KJV previously and I had no time for the NIV. I had heard plenty of KJV-only arguments against the NIV and I was scared to touch it, quite frankly.

But reading the NIV Preface one day began to change my mind. This is always helpful, I find. I began reading the NIV and read through all the prophets, which was far easier than in the KJV! All of us admit that the Scriptures must be in language that is easy enough for us to understand. God does NOT want his word veiled in language that is difficult. I accept that most of the NT in the KJV is simple enough to understand: but what about the OT? How many Christians actually read through every word of the OT in the KJV? It's extremely challenging to do this for the average Christian, far more so than reading through the entire NIV.

In addition: reading the NIV everyday, the OT, has blessed me immeasurably! I used to get hung up also on all of those very Scriptures you have brought up. But I wonder what the need is to be concerned about these slight differences in translation IF SOMEONE IS ONLY READING THROUGH THE ENTIRE BIBLE. I think for reading through the Bible, an accurate, but readable translation is by far a better choice than the KJV. The NIV is quite accurate enough to do this, without claiming perfection in accuracy.

I have come to believe strongly that the Bible is not a text book or reference book. It's a book which contains 66 books, all of which have a main point and purpose. But to get that purpose in one reading, you must not miss the wood from the trees. You must see basically what each passage is saying. This means paying attention to the CONTEXT as your greatest concern: not each individual words. In fact, attention to the context often overthrows these textual concerns. For example: the Matthew 1:25 text. Ok, let's say the original read 'firstborn son', rather than just son. There are other areas in t

he whole context of the NIV, like Mark 6:2-3 and Luke 2 which tell you clear as day that Jesus was not Mary's only child. So what's the problem? Also, the Genesis 12 one: Pharaoh does not say to Abram: 'Take MY wife, and go', but 'take YOUR wife and leave'. So it's clear Sarai wasn't really Pharaoh's wife.

If a Christian seeks to just read the Bible and get the basic thrust of each passage, the vast majority of them would never have picked up those differences in translations anyway. This is not because we don't care about accuracy. It is because to pay too much attention to errors (which all translations have) when simply reading the Bible would cause us to miss the point of the passages.

I believe that accuracy is of the greatest importance when someone is studying a passage very intimately. That's when we want to be having as accurate a translation as possible and perhaps the KJV is good for this. But the ASV and ESV are good for this too.

Anyway: since my heart is on desiring Christians to read through the Bible, I cannot favour the KJV for this. I would far favour the NIV, or just about any version other than the JW's one, where the Scriptures have clearly been meddled with.

I will say one last thing. When I saw that the NIV and ESV and other translations are not seeking to corrupt God's word and that it was not poison that would kill my Christianity, this was one of the most liberating experiences in my life. I really don't think holding to the common KJV-only view-point is helpful at all to God's people. It does create division and puts an enormous block in the way of preventing believers from getting the most out of reading the Bible. Trust me: I've done it myself. I blame myself for enforcing the KJV onto Christians because I believe this hindered their understanding of the Bible. So even if we all went back to the KJV, you'd have another enormous problem on your hands: getting Christians to enjoy reading it, especially in the OT prophets. That sacrifice is far too great in my mind's eye. I would far rather they stick with the NIV or another readable translation which is reliable enough for just reading repeatedly through the Scriptures.

**Re: , on: 2011/7/18 10:27**

Hi matt1000,

Everything you say is fine by me, I may not agree but I am not going to argue with you.

Have a great day,  
Julius

**Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2011/7/18 11:07**

You can point out 1,000 alleged discrepancies/errors in mounting the KJV against all other versions, but what will this accomplish if it will not bring the affections of a believer closer to Christ, and plant a deeper hatred for and more graceful abstinence from sin. It's all but chaff if these things are not engendered. The intransigent Bible version wars we see in here are usually nothing more than clever diversions from the real topic at hand: conformity to Christ.

If, by reading the NIV, one is able to be nurtured by the Spirit of God and brought to a sweetness in Christ that has not been effectuated by one's reading of the KJV, it is the epitome of foolishness in my opinion to launch a smear campaign against the former version, for clearly, God has accepted it and uses it to his purpose and glory.

We must come to a place where our acceptance of a thing we do not understand or even approve of bows in submission to the sovereignty and wisdom of God, if the stamp of God is shown to be upon it in any measure. There is some Christian music I do not care for, but I bow in submission to the fact that God can and does use it to His glory. It doesn't mean that I must accept it as a form of nurturing into my own life, but I refuse to write articles against it and label such as 'heresy', when it has been proven to be used by God to bring others to Christ and engender holiness to some degree in their lives.

It is when we come to this place of submission; where we can lay our own spiritual biases down, and readily admit: "O God, Thou alone knowest" when we at last find peace and can really grow in grace. A thread like this really has no profit in terms of helping a believer grow in grace; it will actually cause the opposite effect. Believers should be led by the Holy Spirit to a version suitable to their place in life. For some it may be the NLT or the NKJV or even the Message and Living Bible. God is able to bring fruit from them; and usually in greater abundance than the KJV, if only because of the immediate illumination of a scripture's gist in a straight-forward, colloquial lucidity.

**Re: 2 Samuel 21:19 - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2011/7/18 11:30**

Well said brother Paul.

Just a little comment to Julius and I will get off.

In 1 Chr the name Lahmi does not refer to the giant but to Elhanan. it is a shorter version of Bethlehemite. refering to his place of birth which is Bethlehem. Just as the name Jair is a shorter version of Jaareoregim.

This verse is slightly mistranslated.

In the hebrew sentence structure is different and sometime the verb comes first.

so 1 Chr would read like this: And slew Elhanan the son of Jair Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite. If you would to put a comma in this sentence, it should be placed like this: And slew Elhanan the son of Jair Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite.

NOT like this: And slew Elhanan the son of Jair, Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite.

Hope this helps.

Blessings.

**Re: , on: 2011/7/18 13:02**

Sooo, is it alright to read my NIV????

**Re: , on: 2011/7/18 14:11**

That was an interesting post Matt. First time I've seen someone speak out from the context of being a former KJVO advocate. Thanks again for posting it.