

News and Current Events :: Charisma House Announces 'Most Modern Version' of KJV

Charisma House Announces 'Most Modern Version' of KJV - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/2/4 8:14

Charisma House has announced plans for an update of the King James Version (KJV) Bible, to be called the Modern English Version (MEV). Described as "the most modern of the KJV," the new version will be released next year.

The MEV is the most modern translation produced of the KJV in 30 years, according to officials for the book group of Charisma Media. The word-for-word translation maintains the beauty of the past, yet provides clarity for a new generation of Bible readers. The MEV also accurately communicates God's Word anew as it capitalizes references of God, "maintaining reverence" for the Scriptures.

"To Bible readers who value biblical truth, the MEV literally translates God's Word in a way that preserves the message, but remains readable for today's world," said Tessie DeVore, executive vice president of Charisma House. "And because of this, we anticipate that the MEV will have broad ecumenical and consumer acceptance."

read more: <http://www.charismanews.com/us/38080-charisma-house-announces-most-modern-version-of-kjv>

Re: Charisma House Announces 'Most Modern Version' of KJV - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/2/4 15:02

Sounds like this version won't please anyone. Those looking for a more current language version based on the King James already have the NKJV. The King James only crowd won't like any 'modern' translation (especially with a new name) and those looking for a better translation won't like the fact that it will just follow the KJV and not change anything that could have been better translated from the original manuscripts.

I wonder the reason for this. I hope it isn't a way of making money for the publishers.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/4 16:07

Quote:

-----I wonder the reason for this. I hope it isn't a way of making money for the publishers.

that's exactly what it is. i believe the kJV is a public domain, or something similar to that. by changing it they can create a new copyright for their transcript which is owned by the publishing company, and they make money on every copy sold. bible publishing is BIG \$\$\$\$. so is music publishing and other print media such as sunday school and vbs material. every year there is a new vbs theme that is the hottest thing while the owners of the publishing companies line their pockets. and the sheeple gobble it up.

stand and sing with me:

my faith is based on nothing less
than scofield's notes and scripture press

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/4 16:15

i am not a scholar on bible versions but i do know that when u go to the bookstore there are literally hundreds of versions that are supposed to be in modern english, so-called. how many modern english versions will they have to make before they get it right? this is all about copyrights and MONEY. u do not have to be a rocket surgeon to figure this out. my 8 year daughter figured this out.

Re: Heydave - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/4 22:46

Heydave wrote ///Sounds like this version won't please anyone. Those looking for a more current language version based on the King James already have the NKJV. The King James only crowd won't like any 'modern' translation (especially with a new name) and those looking for a better translation won't like the fact that it will just follow the KJV and not change anything that could have been better translated from the original manuscripts.///

Its success will be based on what Strategies they will use for marketing, The advantage they have is that There is a Large charismatic crowd which does not have a version to claim for their own, They will need to follow in the steps of the successful (ESV), in declaring the (MEV) as a word-for-word translation and for this reason a much more reliable translation than a 'dynamic equivalence' approach such as that of the (NIV). If they propagate this fact strong enough as what the (ESV) has, than they can draw more conservative charismatics away from the (NIV) to the (MEV) as how the (ESV) has been successful with drawing conservative reformed and calvinist away from the (NIV) in favour of the (ESV)

As with the (NKJV) they have another quality that can benefit them, but they have to walk this tight rope very carefully as not to be thrown into being stereotyped with the KJV only crowd, As the NKJV They will need to make the case that there is an increasing opinion that the Majority text is superior to that of the Critical (eclectic text.) This argument can draw some as what the (NKJV) has, of those whom are disturbed by verses like Acts 8:37, Mat. 18:11 etc. being removed from the modern versions but of whom are not completely sold on the KJV only position.

They will probably spend a lot of effort in promoting their version as containing these superior qualities and like the NKJV maintaining the beauty of the past but providing a more updated version with more clarity and easier readability for a new generation.

They will also need to get popular christian leaders that they are in association with to openly promote the (MEV) as we see happens with all new versions.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/5 6:07

proud papa u nailed it. its all about the almighty dollar.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/2/5 8:40

Quote:

-----proud papa u nailed it. its all about the almighty dollar.

Sadly I agree with this, the majority of translations are now made by book publishing houses so they can "own" their own translation themselves and profit from it. That is to say not all translations have had this hidden agenda. I personally have used the NIV and NKJV as well as KJV. Currently I am using the NKJV and see nothing dubious about it.

One of the greatest deceptions of the enemy in the West is to make it so that believers do not trust the words of God with the multiplicity of translations. This is tragic.

yeh i know., on: 2013/2/5 10:38

know what?....i'm just happy that i can own Bibles, from which i feed my soul.

i have KJV's, NIV's and i regularly read the ESV, and God laid it in my heart to buy an initial case of 24 hardback ESV Bibles, because i see a day, when private Bible ownership will be made illegal.

i never fret over translations, because our Tutor helps me in understanding the Glorious Light of Messiah Jesus.

but i understand the consternation of the saints in Christ.

Re: yeh i know. - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/2/5 11:05

Quote:

-----because our Tutor helps me in understanding the Glorious Light of Messiah Jesus.

Amen brother, that is the true conclusion that any translation even a poor one we can receive light and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Re: Charisma House Announces 'Most Modern Version' of KJV - posted by flameoffire (), on: 2013/2/5 12:01

I may be the only one, but I'm actually happy to see this.

The KJV and NKJV are the only English translations currently available which are based on the Majority text.

It would be great to have a dynamic equivalent translation based on the Majority Text.

While we have a lot of translation debates etc., I think the plethora of translations, while unnecessary, can be quite a blessing. Many times I have learned something new by comparing translations or reading through a translation I haven't used before. I've read 5 different translations all the way through and was glad I did each time.

Re: Tozer Quote - posted by flameoffire (), on: 2013/2/5 12:50

Since shortly after my conversion to Christ as a teen-ager I have been addicted to the habit of acquiring and being disappointed with new versions of the Scriptures, both revisions and new translations.

It is a habit I cannot shake off. In spite of a long record of frustrated hopes and cruel disappointments, to this day I have but to hear a new version of the Scriptures has come out and I am off to the book-seller to pick up a copy.

- A.W. Tozer, "Confessions of a New Version Addict"

Original source: <http://www.orange-street-church.org/text/addict.htm>

Re: , on: 2013/2/5 14:46

The issue is not the translation based on this or that text. The issue is people are not reading the translation they have, KJV included.

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/5 15:10

u can lead a horse to water, but u cant make him drink.

conversely, real believers do in fact read their bibles in whatever form they may have it in be it a bible big enuf 2 choke a mule, or a page or two torn out and passed around in a cave. a christian who does not have a desire to read gods word duz not have the holy spirit residing inside them becuz he gives the believer that desire. no desire no holy spirit. no holy spirit no salvation. no salvation no christian.

Re: , on: 2013/2/5 15:31

Amen, SG, Amen..

Bear.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2013/2/5 15:58

Whether the reason for the proliferation of translations is the copyright and the money that comes with it, or whether it is a true desire to see the word of God available to all people?...I am sure it is a mixed bag. I agree with earlier posts. The problem that I have in my own life is allowing the word of God to become revelation to me that changes the very fabric of who and what I am. As a teacher of the word, I often find myself struggling with this. The translation is not, in my opinion, the key. The key is getting into the word and allowing the word to transform my life. The Holy Spirit is the one who quickens the word to us. To borrow from Wigglesworth, I need to read my Bible in the Holy Ghost and allow Him to reveal it to me.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/5 23:12

Quote:
-----One of the greatest deceptions of the enemy in the West is to make it so that believers do not trust the words of God with the multiplicity of translations. This is tragic..

I think When meditating on Bible translations, It is absolute necessary to ask ourself where is the enemy in all of this? Has he just put distorting and destroying the Scriptures on the back burner?

The above quote is a reality, It is one of the fruits that has been created as the serpent of historical criticism has increasingly crept its way into the church.

The issue at hand is not so much one of preference of Bible translation as it is one of inspiration, Few people today believe that the scriptures we have are inspired.

Charles C. Ryrie wrote "For if even one part of our Bible is thought to be false, how can any of it be trusted to be true?
Is the Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11 a Counterfeit or Genuine??

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/6 0:12

"....not trust the words of God with the multiplicity of translations."

So what ARE the words of God?

If the translations would all agree with each other it would be easy. But someone does not want it to be easy for us. He actually makes us want to doubt the inspiration and the preservation of God's words. So we can claim "this translation says it in that way...not God says so". There you go, not responsible to God, it's just a translator's opinion that made me do it.

King James Version
2 Corinthians 2:17 "For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God"

New King James Version
2 Corinthians 2:17....."peddling the word of God" (like the NIV, NASV and RSV)

Both sounds generally true, but which Paul is the original, and what did God inspire and preserve here, at this position 2 Cor 2:17?

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/2/6 5:05

Re: a-servant quote: "Both sounds generally true, but which Paul is the original, and what did God inspire and preserve here, at this position 2 Cor 2:17? "

Hi a-servant. Here is what I do when I see two different wordings of a passage of scripture. I go back to look at the original language and what the lexicons say is the definition of the words.

So using the KJV greek we find that the word 'corrupt'(KJV) comes from the original greek 'kapēleuō'. This word means to be a huckster, to peddle; to corrupt; to make money by selling. So to answer your question, both are technically correct, but I would say that the NKJV gives a better definition of the word.

If we choose the words of the KJV, just because it is the KJV then I think we are being disengenuous. Why should we choose one over the other when we have access to the original language text and in this instance both the NKJV and the KJV draw from exactly the same manuscripts?

By looking into this particular verse and seeing both ways that it is translated and then checking the meaning of the word, I got a blessing, thank you! I now see what it means in a deeper way. I draw something from both the NKJV and the KJV and it tells me that it is talking about those who corrupt the word by making it a means of financial gain. Probably very relevant to the topic here!

In fact it would not make sense to infer that Paul is talking about changing the 'translation' of the written word of God, as part of it was still being written here. In fact in the context of the rest of this verse it is clear he is talking about the 'spoken' word of God. "...in sight of God speak we in Christ" he says, i.e preaching.

I'm just trying to be a good Berean :). I think both the KJV and NKJV are good translations, but it's good to check out meanings if we are unsure. God gave us the intelligence and resources to do this. Did God preserve His word? Absolutely He did. We have hundreds of reliable manuscripts. Unfortunately for you and me God decided not to have them written in English!

Re: - posted by sonofthunder (), on: 2013/2/6 6:14

Seems like there is always some "newer" more "readable" to this Generation Bible. Hmmm

Here's some more food for thought ...Jesus actually didn't want his words to be understood (by all)

Lest they hear with ears - and their hearts should be converted.

Therefore do I speak to the multitude in parables.

More readable (sorry but I now laugh at) more readable translations

In ten years from now language will change yet again:

Back to the publishing for profit drawing board ... we need ...a more legible readable bible translation (quote unquote)

That was supposedly the quest of Niv and new KJV (more readable)

Only problem - is language keeps changing. (Grrrr)

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/6 7:16

Hey HeyDave,

"Why should we choose one over the other when we have access to the original language text and in this instance both the NKJV and the KJV draw from exactly the same manuscripts?"

Ahhhh, that's what the publisher of the NKJV wanted to make us believe. And you answered my question based on the assumption of the correctness of that statement.

Let me quote you a source that also looked into this in detail:

"The NKJV repeats the lie that "There is only one basic New Testament used by Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Orthodox, by conservatives and liberals." In fact, there are two: the perverted Alexandrian line that was continued by the Roman Catholic religion and the preserved, apostolic, Antiochian line that progresses from the Christians at Antioch of Syria (Acts 11:26) to our precious King James Bible."

"The New King James is NOT a King James Bible. It changed thousands of words, ruined valuable verses, and when not agreeing with the King James Bible, it has instead copied from the NIV, NASV or RSV"

So it looks to me like the mix & match of all available text streams based on their liking.

To my understanding after reading the context of 2 Cor 2:17 only the first makes sense here, since nobody would accuse Paul out of thin air in the middle of a sentence to sell the word for worldly profit.

"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"

When you're aware to be in the sight of God in fullest sincerity, you're first of all concerned to be truthful according to the word received. Corruption of the message is impurity that has serious consequences in his position. "Peddling" isn't content related, it's a completely different topic and has nothing to do with the rest of the sentence.

Re: - posted by sonofthunder (), on: 2013/2/6 7:51

Oh. Does anything stir the pot more than bible translation?

A problem the 1st century church didn't have to deal with (not like us)

Well us 21st (centurions) anyhow:

I don't race out to test/ try/ purchase some New hot off the press bible.

The King James version is antiquated and non-contemporary (now)

So does that mean the Niv and nkjv will be ...if the Lord tarries another 20 years?

What is the answer???

We keep bible hopping (like a lot of church goers)** smile ** i suppose:

Re: - posted by sonofthunder (), on: 2013/2/6 7:56

But keep the argument going:

After all that's what bible translation does

Hot up debate.

Don't let me interfere. (God forbid)

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/6 9:00

I use and promote the use of the older edition KJV, so I'm a little biased to that translation. I don't consider myself a member of the KJV only group yet in essence I suppose I am. I do however own a half dozen or so modern translations and at times refer to them in difficult passages or simple comparisons. Still, I accept the KJV as final authority among translations. In all my study I refer to the original languages as best as my ability allows. I place more emphasis on word meaning at the time of the writing than on today's meaning and utilize older dictionaries and traditional word meanings. I prefer the 1769 KJV edition over others more readily available. Though the KJV has undergone very few actual revisions, editors have continually changed words for the sake of ease of reading, page format, today's more modern word usage and also apply electronic (digital) spell editing. As someone stated the NKJV is not a revision, but a new translation. Those who use today's KJV should be very much alert to such changes.

Bearmaster stated "many do not read their bible today". I agree with that statement and think one reason for this is brought about because of the various translations used from the pulpit. It's difficult to follow along with the preacher quoting or reading from the NIV when one has a different translation in his hand so in turn many even leave their bible at home and rely entirely upon what the preacher says, whom now has become their bible. The same holds true in many Sunday school and bible study classes. There are those who use a different translation with every other sermon or message, dependent upon which more easily reinforces his sermon. IMHO all this brings confusion into the church and we all know what the bible says about confusion. Thus Satan uses these translations as a tool to discourage both believer and would be believer. How often have we heard, "Which bible should I use, there are so many which one is the correct one", or some similar statement.

Another brother mentioned in this thread, the Byzantine and Alexandrian texts. The far greater majority of professing Christians have little or no awareness of the two and even fewer have any understanding of the history, background, and difference between them. The publishing houses capitalize on this with catch phrases such as "translated from older writings" or "new information", which is very misleading in that the fact is the majority text contains many partial manuscripts and documents which are much older than these "Dead Sea Scrolls" which are actually the oldest MOST COMPLETE COPIES we have, not categorically the oldest. The history and origin of the minority and majority texts become extremely pertinent as well. We should all learn more of the theology of such men as Origen, Westcott, and Hort, before so readily adopting their teachings and these minority texts. At times we all seem lead of a different "Holy Spirit".

Praise God the jux of the matter is He came, He died according to scripture, He resurrected, ascended in to Heaven and now sits at the right hand of God the Father making intercession for ALL those who call upon His name.

Re:Heydave - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/6 9:09

Hi Heydave

Heydave wrote /// We have hundreds of reliable manuscripts. Unfortunately for you and me God decided not to have them written in English!///

Which manuscripts are reliable??

If my memory serves me right there are more variants within the existing manuscripts than there are words in the new testament.

I believe that God has blessed the martyrdom of William Tyndale and opened the eyes of the King and has supernaturally inspired the exact words that He wanted for the English speaking people, so that even a plow boy like myself can have the Word of God.

2 tim 3:16 is not referring to the originals, Paul wrote 2 timothy some 1500 years after the giving of the originals to Moses, The originals were well gone and passed away, the word scripture is never in reference to some long lost originals as Christendom would have us to believe today.

the issue is not one of translation preference it is an issue of inspiration, Oh that God would save the church from the carnal mind from its sight from its rational reasoning from its pagan rooted worship of Scholasticism.

Re: Translations and the Text of the Greek New Testament - posted by hulsey (), on: 2013/2/6 9:44

<http://www.wels.net/sites/wels/files/Translations%20and%20the%20Text%20of%20the%20Greek%20New%20Testament.pdf>

Excellent article

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/2/6 10:11

a-servant,

You asked a straight forward question, I gave a straight forward answer! I have been around this forum long enough not to want to get into the KJ only debate. Let's just agree to disagree on this one.

You take a faith position on the KJV being inspired. I don't see anywhere that I am to place my faith in a particular translation as being 100% perfect. Even the translators of the KJV did not claim their work to be inspired in this way. I won't change your view and that is your right to believe what you want.

In Acts 12:4 the KJV translates the 'Pesach' (passover) as 'Easter'. Is this correct? Easter was a pagan festival pre-dating Christianity and 'Christianised' by the church around 2nd century. Everywhere else the KJV translates Pesach as 'Passover'. Surely this is the correct translation and Easter is clearly a wrong translation put in to appease the established English church at the time of King James.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/6 12:30

Heydave

Quote:

In Acts 12:4 the KJV translates the 'Pesach' (passover) as 'Easter'. Is this correct? Easter was a pagan festival pre-dating Christianity and 'Christianised' by the church around 2nd century. Everywhere else the KJV translates Pesach as 'Passover'. Surely this is the correct translation and Easter is clearly a wrong translation put in to appease the established English church at the time of King James.

While the premise of your statement is perhaps correct, I'm not so sure we could factually claim this to be a mistranslation or an appeasement, but a purposeful, intentional attempt to distinguish between the "Pesach" given to the Jews, and the now accepted gentile's "Easter". Just a thought, but the very statement would seem to indicate a misperception of one other than the translators. If in fact it is a mistranslation, how/why would the same scholars interpret the same word correctly every place except this one instance? Forgive my ignorance, certainly it pleased the church at the time but I can make no sense of the idea of a mistranslation of the same word by the same translators once out of 29 times. Obviously the verse is not promoting but referencing an easily recognized day. Inspired or non inspired? I could not presently teach either boldly and I readily confess it to be a troubling verse for me. There have been times when I almost wished the word "Easter" was not there.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/6 12:49

People don't speak or read KJ English anymore. You have to face facts.

I read the KJV from time to time but the language is very stilted for today's reader. Today's youth have no reference for a lot of the language in the KJV. What's an emrod?

Pick up any Shakespeare work and you can get an idea of the difficulty. That's why HS students, at least the great majority of them, hate reading Shakespeare. To be quite honest, I am not a big fan myself. Love the stories and plots, but the language is a hindrance.

Similarly, I believe the language of the old KJV is a hindrance to the modern reader. It is no one's fault; it is just that the passage of time has rendered KJ language obsolete.

Newer translations attempt to remove this hindrance so that people will actually be able to read their Bible and understand it without having to have an Old English Dictionary opened by their side.

I would rather have my kids read a Bible they can understand than one they can't understand.

To say that only the old KJV is "inspired" is a little out there. The only writings that are inspired are the original ink marks that went on to the original parchments by the pen of the original authors/scribes. Thank goodness we have good grounds to believe that, for the most part, the scripture we have today is faithful to those original ink marks.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/2/6 13:39

Hi jmur,

Thank you for your honest thoughts on this. I agree that it would be improbable to think the translators of the KJV could have mis-translated pesach here, so that leaves us with the fact that they deliberately translated it that way. So we now must see that this particular verse is no longer a word for word translation, but an interpretive translation of that word. Again we ask why? If as some suggest they wanted to distinguish a different event from the Jewish passover, then why is it not in the original language? Do some (not you) seriously expect us to believe that the KJV translators were more correct/inspired/perfect than that which was written inspiration of the Holy Spirit by Luke?

Once people go down that road of treating the KJV as THE perfect inspired word of God that all others, including the majority text must be judged by, they have gone too far to reason with. It's like talking to JW's who cannot accept anything that contradicts the NWT.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/6 14:12

if the kjv was good enuf for the apostle paul then its good enuf for me!

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2013/2/6 14:24

Quote:

-----if the kjv was good enuf for the apostle paul then its good enuf for me!

My favorite comment of the day. lol.

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/6 21:25

Hahaha, the story to that comment is a great study as well. What's behind it opens itself as yet another revelation.

Re: the word "easter" in the KJ, and the reason why it belongs there. Almost every Bible-versions site has it explained.

What you also really have to look at is what is in most of the 200 english bibles. Look under the hood, then your thinking in schemata has actual facts to stand on. It's not enough to have an opinion.

Besides all this, with even a little faith a child can understand that the one true God does not have many bibles.

Instead faith in the promise of preservation of His words (not the general meanings) is the only right thing to do - what we have instead is confused academia that insists on "there is no way we could possibly know for sure". Oh ye of little faith.

It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing:
the WORDS that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

Thy WORD is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it.

Where to start? Look at the basics of all, the text streams: Either the Majority Text or the Minority Text is the inerrant Word of God. Both cannot be, because they do not say the same thing.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/6 23:56

a-servant wrote ///Where to start? Look at the basics of all, the text streams: Either the Majority Text or the Minority Text is the inerrant Word of God. Both cannot be, because they do not say the same thing.///

This is a good point that a-servant has brought up.

One thing we need to think about is where is our supernatural God in all of this ??

Is He bound to our naturalistic Realm ??

Think about how often God was disturbed with the children of Isreal or how often Jesus was disturbed with the disciples because their rational logic hindered their faith.

The arguments about which text is superior is based not on facts but on theories, they are opinions!

Those whom use modern versions of the Bible with the exception of the NKJV and maybe a couple others that are based on the majority or the TR have either ignorantly or knowingly succumbed to a view that the inspired Scripture's do not Exist,

I have probably close to, and maybe more than a hundred books on this subject, from all angles and perspectives.

Listen we have been duked.

Conservative christians speak boldly of and in defense of the inspiration of scriptures. One is considered a heretic if they do not.

They have come out with a ton of words to describe inspiration, they will say that they believe in the verbal, plenary, infallible, inerrant, unlimited inspiration of the scriptures.

This sounds good until you ask them which scriptures are you referring to ??

They will boldly tell you well certainly no translation.

Then I ask what then??

They will reply inspiration only applies to the original greek and hebrew and a little Aramaic of course.

Then I ask out of all of the thousands of manuscripts which ones??

of which they will reply, Oh inspiration of the scriptures only applies to the original autographs.

Rather it be ignorantly or knowingly That is the belief that those whom use modern versions have succumbed to, That inspiration applies to a bunch of non-existent manuscripts.

A mocking statement which was followed up by an endorsement of the mocking statement read /// if the kjv was good enough for the apostle paul then its good enough for me//

Paul in Acts 17 was mocked and laughed out of Athens for preaching the resurrection, this made no sense to the rational Athens mind, Yet Paul was the one who held the truth.

People have different preferences when it comes to bible translation but people are only convicted to use one Bible, In which several of the Spirit filled Preachers presented on SI have a smaller conviction of that of my own on which English Bible is superior.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2013/2/7 0:31

Quote:
-----A mocking statement which was followed up by an endorsment of the mocking statement read /// if the kjv was good enuf for the apostle paul then its good enuf for me//

proud papa.

If you are speaking about my "endorsment", please note that my endorsement was for the COMMENT that Paul used the KJV. I thought that it was a funny comment to make, that is all. Although I am not a KJV onlyist, I prefer the KNJV.

I appologize if my comment was offensive. I try to find humor in these types of debates...

Does translation matter - posted by proud papa, on: 2013/2/7 1:00

psalms 91 from the Bible
//11 For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.
12 They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.//

psalms 91 from a corrupt translation

//11 He shall give his angels charge concerning thee:
12 and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.//

Do you notice any differences in the translations??

If so, is the difference significant or not??

Re: Does translation matter , on: 2013/2/7 6:13

My goodness. The persecuted cry for the word of God in restricted nations and this thread is debating which translation is the most superior.

Only in America.

Brarmaster.

Re: - posted by proud papa, on: 2013/2/7 10:34

Hi bearmaster

bearmaster wrote ///My goodness. The persecuted cry for the word of God in restricted nations and this thread is debating which translation is the most superior.

Only in America.

Brarmaster.///

Lets not side step the issue, Bible translation is a very serious issue one that is greatly effecting America and effective witnessing and especially our ability to withstand attacks from the enemy.

So I ask again: Does translation matter

psalms 91 from the Bible

//11 For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12 They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.//

psalms 91 from a corrupt translation

//11 He shall give his angels charge concerning thee:

12 and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.//

Do you notice any differences in the translations??

If so, is the difference significant or not??

Re: , on: 2013/2/7 11:27

PP you evidently have read the history of the Anabaptists. What were they persecuted and martyred for. The Word of God and their testimony to that word. Not a Bible translation. As a matter of fact it was for translating the Bible in the vernacular of the people many were put to death.

To own a copy of the Bible in N. Korea is certain imprisonment and death. That with 3 generations of one's family. The rest of the world cries for the word of God and this thread as well as others are debating which is the one pure translation

Why can you KJV folks not allow for the liberty of others to use a translation that God leads them to use. I have used the New American Standard and NIV and have been blessed by both.

But what is your agenda? What is it about you KJV types that despise the rest of us who use a different translation? Why do you despise us? Instead of encouraging people to get onto the word you try to bind them to a particular translation. My question is why?

Again my question to you who advocate the KJV. Are you more godly than the rest of us because your translation is incorruptable? Are the rest of us going to hell because in your eyes we use a corruptible translation?. Do I need the KJV Bible to get me into heaven? Will using the KJV make me love God more? Will using the KJV make me love my neighbor more? Will using the KJV bring me closer to Jesus?

Again you who advocate KJV only? What about Bible translations to other nations? Do you want the inhabitants of other nations to learn KJV English?

Those of you who sit on this nice American bubble debating your translations need a reality check of the world around you.

Bearmaster.

Re: Does translation matter - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/7 11:29

Bear- I'm with you on this one.

PP wrote:

psalms 91 from the Bible

//11 For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12 They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.//

psalms 91 from a corrupt translation

//11 He shall give his angels charge concerning thee:

12 and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.//

Do you notice any differences in the translations??

If so, is the difference significant or not??"

Which "corrupt" translation? I did a quick check and the NIV and NLT include the 2nd phrase of v. 11, albeit worded a little differently.

But, in response to your questions:

yes- i noticed a difference.

No, the difference is not significant.

I kind of like the MSG paraphrase:

"He ordered his angels
to guard you wherever you go.
If you stumble, they'll catch you;
their job is to keep you from falling."

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/7 13:56

sum1 was offended by my comment 'if the kJV was good enough for the apostle Paul then it's good enough for me'.

Why are people so easily offended? If we are focussed on Christ and not ourselves then I think there would be far less offense.

I did not intend to offend anyone. I apologize if I did.

I actually find myself in agreement with Bearmaster here. That's a scary thought! He is right. Millions around the world sacrifice much for one page of the Bible, or can't get any of the Bible, and we are so FAT and SPOILED that we have time to bicker over Bible versions.

It is shameful.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/2/7 13:59

Brethren, please let us remember we are brothers in the Lord and not fall into extreme and heated accusations of each other. Is this the spirit of God when we belittle one another if they don't agree with our view?

Quote: "Where to start? Look at the basics of all, the text streams: Either the Majority Text or the Minority Text is the inerrant Word of God. Both cannot be, because they do not say the same thing."

The problem with the above (as I tried to point out earlier) is that the majority text says 'Pesach' (Passover) in Acts 12:4 and the KJV says something different (Easter), so you cannot claim the majority text is inerrant and also the KJV is inerrant, both cannot be because they do not say the same thing! I choose the majority text, which one do you choose?

I know that the KJO people give their reason why Easter is correct in the KJV, but the outcome of what they say is that the KJV translators corrected or made better the majority text!! Really?!

Please I am not knocking the KJV, as I think it is a very good translation, but I'm just trying to explain why it makes no sense to claim it is the perfect translation, without error. The NKJV, which I prefer, also sometimes translates something that

at I think is better in the KJV.

Now here is my personal experience. I have sat in a church for the last two years that will only preach and read from the KJV and I follow closely in my NKJV. I have not once found any conflict in what I read in the NKJV and what is being preached from the KJV (and this is a very bible centered church). In fact there have been many occasions when the pastor explains the meaning of a word or passage he is reading more accurately, not knowing that the verse in the NKJV has it that way already. I just smile:~)!
I suppose some of you would have me put out of fellowship for using something other than the KJV!!lol.

As Bearmaster said, what are we doing arguing about a translation when millions are going to hell and millions of believers don't even have one bible to read in their language? God have mercy on us!

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/7 14:25

Bearmaster-

"The rest of the world cries for the word of God and this thread as well as others are debating which is the one pure translation "

Hmmm, and what a blessing it is! Have you not considered the very thought of such a liberty has driven countless thousands to emigrate into such a country?

"you KJV folks", "what is your agenda?", "you KJV types", "Why do you despise us?", "you try to bind"

Bear do you really want to discuss spite, anger, animosity, false assumption and accusations?

"Are you more godly than the rest of us because your translation is incorruptable? Are the rest of us going to hell because in your eyes we use a corruptable translation?. Do I need the KJV Bible to get me into heaven? Will using the KJV make love God more? Will using the KJV make me love my neighbor more? Will using the KJV bring me closer to Jesus?"

Wow, I must have missed the posts suggesting this. I'll go back and read the thread again.

"What about Bible translations to other nations? Do you want the inhabitants of other nations to learn KJV English?"

Correct me if I'm wrong Bear, is this not an ENGLISH speaking forum?

"Those of you who sit on this nice American bubble debating your translations need a reality check of the world around you."

Sorry Bear. Sometimes I suppose it IS necessary we consider our own advice. Sometimes we also need to incorporate a little discernment too, huh? Perhaps as in debate vs. discussion vs. despite. Out of curiosity are we to take your post as one of anger, despite, or perhaps the promotion of an agenda?

I'm sorta taken back here Brother.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/7 14:40

TMK-

I understand your position as well as the benefits of some of the more modern translations. But think for a moment of your statements. You stated;

"People don't speak or read KJ english anymore. You have to face facts."

Obviously many read the post 1769 editions with standardized spelling and font format else we would not be having this discussion. Even in our modern society, the KJV continues to out sell the other translations.

You also stated;

"Today's youth have no reference for a lot of the language in the KJV. What's an emrod?"

Again, you obviously found a "reference" to the word. Are you suggesting today's youth are in some way incapable of following suit, or perhaps an emErod is pertinent to salvation?

You further stated;

"Newer translations attempt to remove this hindrance so that people will actually be able to read their Bible and understand it without having to have an Old English Dictionary opened by their side."

Here you seemingly allude to an idea that modern translations have in some way eliminated the need or use of "word study" or other reference material. Thus rendering the benefit of such obsolete.

I especially like this one;

"I would rather have my kids read a Bible they can understand than one they can't understand."

Perhaps something along this line?

Genesis 4:1 (TLB) "Then Adam had sexual intercourse with Eve...."

Or maybe the recent "Queen James" Translation. How old are those kids, when do they begin reading and hearing bible stories, and what questions do we want them to ask?

"Thank goodness we have good grounds to believe that, for the most part, the scripture we have today is faithful to those original ink marks."

We do indeed TMK, in many translations and have had, in mass, since 1611.

Please understand TMK, I am not trying to be facetious, difficult, rude, or combative. Just pointing out that many if not most arguments and attacks on the KJV can be a matter of surface, or off the cuff, thought rather than truly defensible positions. Likewise the same holds true for attacks against some of the more modern translations. As Bearmaster indicated in an earlier post, we should read and study, prayerfully, the translation we have. The best translation for any is the one which IS read and studied. For me, it is the KJV. Maybe because it was the first bible I was introduced to prior to my salvation, maybe because I am more familiar with it, maybe because it has endured four hundred years, or maybe it stems from a leading of the Spirit. Regardless, I remain confident and secure I will not suffer the blood of any to whom I recommend it or teach it and I am most willing and comfortable to carry its words with me into eternity thru Jesus our Lord and Saviour, then humbly present myself pitiful, ignorant, and undeserving at His feet. I pray all have the same assurance and faith of their translation of choice.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/7 15:45

while i agree w/ what bearmaster has said concerning 'what are we doing arguing over this when...', i must make an observation: the questions 'why are we arguing over this when...' is asked only when its a topic that WE dont think is important. duznt mean it isnt important, simply that WE dont think it is important. we will argue all day long till the cows who are blue in the face come home when it is sumthing WE are passionate about. when it isnt, hey, why are we wasting our time on this? we dont consider that sum1 else IS passionate about it, and thinks its important. while i do not necessarily agree with KJV-O people i DO understand they are passionate about this topic, and more importantly: i understand why!

by saying "why are we talking about this when so many are going to hell" is basically saying "i dont really care or know much about this topic, and i dont think its important anyway, so lets talk about sumthing else."

if people here cared about those people "going to hell" they wouldnt be hear deciding which topics are worthy of discussion and which are not, and judging their brethren for not doing what they themselves are not doing. if we really cared about the loss none of us would spend as much time here as we do.

i dont care about the lost like i should. any1 else dare to stand up and admit to this as well?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/7 15:49

Hey Jimur-

I admit that my statements were quite surfacy and simplistic, but for the most part I think a lot of people would agree with me.

Please don't get me wrong; I have nothing personal against the KJV at all. I think it is a beautiful translation. The bible teacher I listen to most strongly favors the KJV. But I grew up with it and am used to it. The hithers and thithers don't bother me. I pray with a old guy on Wed nights who prays in KJ english. Doesnt bother me a bit.

When (not if) my unsaved step-son in law gets saved, I honestly would be a little reticent in giving him a KJV bible to read. I am afraid it might put him off reading it. The NKJV or ESV would, in my opinion, be a much better option.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/7 15:55

Heydave -

Based on statements you've made in threads of different topics, which I've read, I'm presuming you to be aware of the dates and activities of Passover, how it's commemorated, references to the Queen of Heaven, etc., etc. and we for the most part agree the word Easter was not a mistranslation but the intentional replacement of a properly translated word with one which the translators determined a better fit, for what ever their reason.

Setting aside the known integral problems encountered with both the Minority and Majority texts as well as the history and even dates of both, to my knowledge, it remains they do not agree. Without question, to compromise either or both for the sake of agreeing would be a gross mistake. So what's left? Here I have a very difficult time placing confidence in what I understand to be about 5% of the combined total both complete and partial, of all the known mms and docs available. I could easily be wrong about the percentage but it seems I have read that in multiple places fairly recently. In this light I feel more secure in the Majority Text. Yet knowing there exists discrepancies within it I can not, as deeply as I desire, in good faith and without conscience state the KJV or any translation is without error. (wow, it was hard for me to type that, lol)

Seriously, I struggle with this thought and pray God increase my faith and enlightenment. Yet, in the pure "Gospel of Salvation" itself, I am assured. Would God have us abandon a search for truth in any matter? I think not, but perhaps the problem becomes one of proper emphasis. ??

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/7 15:59

SG wrote:

"i dont care about the lost like i should. any1 else dare to stand up and admit to this as well?"

None of us do. I am reminded of something a brother wrote on another forum that I have always kept handy:

"Besides, most Christians nowadays don't believe in the Hell of eternal conscious torment. Not really. This is clearly evidenced by the way they live and the priorities they set in their lives. If one is truly convinced that, for most people, a short span on earth is followed by an eternity of misery, then surely one would spend every waking hour, every penny and every ounce of energy trying to save people from it. I think most Christians who claim to believe in the traditional concept of Hell suffer from a form of cognitive dissonance which forces them to tune out and turn away from any lingering thoughts on the fate of most of their fellow humans; the people they rub shoulders with and work with and live with. Those who are unable to compartmentalize the doctrine of Hell become wild-eyed street preachers or suffer nervous breakdowns."

There's no getting around it--words like this bite and sting.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/7 16:03

TMK -

I have no problem with your stand, nor any one else that has posted to the thread. Everything seems to me, quite reasonable really. Though I admit having been taken back a little at Bear's last post, I try to understand his position on the subject. I think it is a great thread as long as it doesn't get too heated. lol I'm not sure how much it will accomplish apart from a possible understanding of differing views.

I kinda like the Paul/KJV statement too. Betcha I use that one in the future when I find just the right place! lol

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/7 16:26

SkepticGuy -

quote: "i dont care about the lost like i should."

Odd you should ask. Just yesterday evening on the way to Bible Study I made the same comment to my wife. I have a burden for society in general but I truly do not have that deep unconditional love for the individual so many Christians claim to have. Certainly there are times when I feel such for a specific person, but it's the exception to the rule. I have compassion for them and do share the Gospel, yet I tend to think they are living their choice and other than plant a seed, there is little I can do but pray. This would be a good topic for its own thread.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/2/7 16:46

Hi Skepticguy (yeh it's me again..lol),

quote:"by saying "why are we talking about this when so many are going to hell" is basically saying "i dont really care or know much about this topic, and i dont think its important anyway, so lets talk about something else."

You're right. I was being much too flippanant to say that and I'm sorry! After all I am participating in this discussion.

jimur: I appreciated your posts and your honesty. I'm glad you treasure your bible of choice and hope you continue to be blest in reading it.

Re: Jimur, on: 2013/2/7 16:51

Brother my position is the believer is free to use any translation of the Bible as he is led by the Spirit. I allow the KJV folks to use their translation in their freedom in Christ. The KJV only people do not accord us that freedom. If seems in their minds we are corrupted because we use a corrupted translation.

Also those who are arguing over the superiority of one text over another are ignoring the Holy Spirit. That is the work of God in the New Covenant. God says he will write his word or law upon our minds and hearts. That is not speaking of a particular Bible translation.

Again a believer can take the NIV, NASB, NKJB, ESV, NLT, Etc. And can get direction from the Holy Spirit on how to live the Christian life. Just as surely as one can read the KJV and get direction on how to live the Christian life.

Again I ask you KJV proponents. Will using the KJV only make me more like Christ.

Bearmaster.8

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/7 19:28

I just realized most of you here do not even understand what the problem of corruption is, or why we discuss this here.

An example of corruption and its final result:

Jeremiah 51:18 "They are vanity, the work of errors: in the time of their visitation they shall perish."

Re: Bible version - posted by RogerB (), on: 2013/2/7 21:50

and Satan will say....."which Bible?", Bible? Which one?

will take your argument away

It's all about money.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/2/7 22:01

Quote:
-----Again a believer can take the NIV, NASB, NKJB, ESV, NLT, Etc. And can get direction from the Holy Spirit on how to live the Christian life. Just as surely as one can read the KJV and get direction on how to live the Christian life.

Amen brother.

Re: does translation matter - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/7 22:16

PP or proudpapa

asked Does translation matter

psalms 91 from the Bible

11 For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12 They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

psalms 91 from a corrupt translation

11 He shall give his angels charge concerning thee:

12 and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.

Do you notice any differences in the translations??

If so, is the difference significant or not??

TMK wrote ///Which "corrupt" translation?///

Satans translation !!

TMK wrote /// I did a quick check and the NIV and NLT include the 2nd phrase of v. 11, albeit worded a little differently.

But, in response to your questions:

yes- i noticed a difference.

No, the difference is not significant.///

I beg to differ that the difference is not significant, but you make my point that christians today are not concerned about little omissions and changes in the scripture, The modern christian believes that the scripture is only authoritative in the areas on redemption and christian life.

TMK wrote /// kind of like the MSG paraphrase:

"He ordered his angels
to guard you wherever you go.
If you stumble, they'll catch you;
their job is to keep you from falling."///

The different versions was between psalms 91 and Satans version of psalms 91, That he used with the temptation of Jesus in Matthew ch 4 v 6

What you should know about Inerrancy by Charles C. Ryrie moody press 1981
p77

"The second temptation also illustrates the importance of plenary inspiration. Satan tried to entice the Lord to throw Himself off the pinnacle of the Temple by assuring Him that he could claim the promise of psalms 91:11-12 that God's angels would guard Him. But in quoting those verses Satan omitted part of verse 11: "to guard you in all your ways." The omission distorts the meaning of the promise, which is that God will keep the righteous on their journeys, not that He will preserve them when they take needless risks. A needless risk was exactly what Satan had proposed to Christ. The Lord replied that to bank on part of a verse would be to tempt God. Instead He would rely on every word that came from God, including every word of Psalms 91:11-12."

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 0:04

Then to those off you who who advocate the KJV onky. Do you have tbe courage to tell me in this forum that I am of Sat an because I use a translation you deem of the devil.

Bearmaster.

Re: bearmaster - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 1:04

Hi bearmaster

bearmaster wrote ///Then to those off you who who advocate the KJV onky. Do you have tbe courage to tell me in this forum that I am of Satan because I use a translation you deem of the devil.///

Brother why are you so offended ??

I and some others are expressing our reasons for believing the way that we do. If you feel differently that is fine you are intitled to your opinion and free to express why you believe the way that you do in a civil manner.

But are you opposed to allowing those whom differ from you to express the reasons that they feel and have come to the conclusions and convictions that they hold ??

As I have pointed out in other threads Many Spirit filled preachers hosted on SI advocate the KJV, Why would it be out of line to express the reasons that some of us feel like wise, in these forums??

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/8 5:55

My comment: Why would anyone willingly eat spiritual mix food prepared by translators like Westcott and Hort and claim that his health would not be affected after years of consumption? One example from hundreds just like it:

Christ's Deity

Book Title: New Age Bible Versions

Author: G.A. Riplinger

"Christ was and is perfectly man." "He never spoke

directly of himself as God."
"He does not expressly affirm
the identification of the Word
with Jesus Christ."(8)
- B.F. Westcott

"he divine anointing or
Christhood. . .the
prophet, the people. . .
and the dimly seen Head. .
.are all partakers of the
divine anointing and
messiahship."(9)
- F.J.A. Hort

Under the century old spell of the Westcott and Hort Greek Text, NIV editor Edwin Palmer comes to his chilling theological conclusion!:

few clear and decisive texts that declare Jesus is God.(10)

Palmer should qualify his statement noting, "In the new versions, there are few clear and decisive texts that declare Jesus is God."

Blavatsky echoes Palmer:

here is not a word in so-called sacred scriptures to show that Jesus was actually regarded as God by his disciples. Neither before nor after his death did they pay him divine honours. . .there is not a single act of adoration recorded on their part. . .(12)

Palmer and Blavatsky are facing a plastic dashboard Jesus, driven by the vehicle of the new versions. Picking up passengers as they pass by, the new versions have prompted Kenneth Copeland to conclude:

He never made the assertion that He was the most High God. . .He didn't claim to be God when He lived on earth. . . Search the Gospels for yourself. If you do, you will find what I say is true.(13)

The book *Agony of Deceit* chronicles the down swing of many ministries, including Copeland's. In response to Copeland's comment, the authors cite Phillipians 2:5-7 in the KJV. They could not use another version here because all other versions deny Christ's deity in this verse. The NKJV, here as well as in other places, denies Christ's deity also.

=====
NIV, NASB, et al.

=====
did not consider equality with
God something to be grasped.

=====
KJV
=====
thought it not robbery to be
equal with God.
=====

The spiritual nature of this battle became all too apparent when I was showing this verse to a 'Christian' linguistics major. She could not see that the KJV and the new versions expressed diametrically opposite views here.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/8 7:33

a-servant wrote:

=====

NIV, NASB, et al.

=====

did not consider equality with
God something to be grasped.

=====

KJV

=====

thought it not robbery to be
equal with God.

=====

The spiritual nature of this battle became all too apparent when I was showing this verse to a 'Christian' linguistics major. She could not see that the KJV and the new versions expressed diametrically opposite views here.

These ****are not**** diametrically opposed versions.

Apparently in order to make a point, you left out the first phrase of Phil. 2:6, which was very crafty of you.

The KJV says "Who, being in the form of God..." and the NIV says "Who, being in very nature God..."

I actually have a much greater problem with the KJV version of this opening phrase; it says that Jesus had the "form" of God but the NIV said that Jesus is "in very nature God." Which better speaks of Jesus's divinity?

As for the rest of the verse that you quoted, both versions comment on the first part of v 6 that you omitted, namely that even though Jesus was God, he humbled himself and did not insist on hanging on to all that entails and emptied Himself in the incarnation. Quite frankly, the KJV version of this verse has never made sense to me in context and never will. Jesus didn't consider it "robbery" to be equal with God? What does that mean? The other version makes much more sense- that even though Jesus WAS God he did not grasp on to his rights as God-- He gave them up to save you and me. Thank goodness for that.

Re: Charisma House Announces 'Most Modern Version' of KJV, on: 2013/2/8 8:04

Quote:

-----Quite frankly, the KJV version of this verse has never made sense to me in context and never will. Jesus didn't consider it "robbery" to be equal with God? What does that mean? TMK

Jesus did not regard Himself as having been defrauded or was not compelled to suffer loss.

"No man takes My life. I lay it down of My own free will".

"If any man demands your coat give him your shirt also"

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/8 8:25

Quote:

-----I allow the KJV folks to use their translation in their freedom in Christ.

wow... quite a statement, brother.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/8 8:58

TMK -

quote "I actually have a much greater problem with the KJV version of this opening phrase; it says that Jesus had the "form" of God but the NIV said that Jesus is "in very nature God." Which better speaks of Jesus's divinity?"
end quote

Interesting. When I first made the comparison between the two translations, I felt much like you state. Then it occurred to me, while Jesus was 100% God and 100% man, God, has but one. Splitting hairs perhaps, but with that thought the KJV, for me, became the decidedly better translation. Jesus in fact was in the form of God, yet not the VERY nature. Spiritually Jesus was equal, but in his humanity was not. Jesus, we know was not omnipresent.

Re: another disturbing fruit of modern versions: contention in the body - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 9:18

Bearmaster wrote ///The issue is not the translation based on this or that text. The issue is people are not reading the translation they have, KJV included.

Bearmaster.///

The reason people are not reading their bibles is because they do not believe their bibles are inspired,
The reason that people do not believe that their bibles are inspired is because we have bought into the lie that inspiration only applies to the original autographs.

Even Virginia Ramey Mollenkott claimed that she believed that the original autographs were inspired,
To believe that inspiration is limited to non-existing manuscripts is to not believe in inspiration at all!

bearmaster wrote ///My goodness. The persecuted cry for the word of God in restricted nations and this thread is debating which translation is the most superior.

Only in America.

Bearmaster.///

As I have pointed out several times before the issue is not so much about translation preference as it is an issue of inspiration, it is an issue of the nature of scripture.

It is not only in America that we find advocates of the KJV as I pointed out one does not have to listen to many of Keith Daniels sermons to know that he advocates the superiority of the KJV, he is not American, I have heard that many of the Missionaries in Africa advocate the KJV. and everyone knows that Ian Paisley is not an American and he very vocally advocates for the old Sword.

The Trinitarian Bible society that advocates the superiority of the KJV for the English speaking people and translates the Bible in foreign languages based on the Received Text has head quarters in London, Australia, Brazil, Canada, New Zealand, Netherlands and of course Grand Rapids, MI.

Bearmaster wrote ///PP you evidently have read the history of the Anabaptist. What were they persecuted and martyred for. The Word of God and their testimony to that word. Not a Bible translation As a matter of fact it was for translating the Bible in the vernacular of the people many were put to death.///

Yes, bear I have studied some of the history of the Anabaptist and I am not ignorant that Sattler and Manz and others whom died in 1527 obviously did not use a 1611 KJV,
but what I do know is some of the very verses that those Anabaptist used for the defence of their doctrines have been omitted from your NIV, such as in the Martyrs Mirror p.375 of the 'Confession Of faith, According to the Holy Word of

God' Artical iv 'How Father,Son and Holy Ghost are to be distinguished in certain attributes' at the end of artical iv they reference 1 John 5:7

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost:

the only proof text for the Trinity KJV 1 John 5:7

1 John 5:7

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

1 John 5:7

NIV For there are three that testify (omitted!!)

Another verse that the Anabaptist used very, very often, for their scriptural proof of Believers Baptism was Acts 8:37, Many should remeber that Calvin in his institutes wrestle with the Anabaptist over this verse, It is a very significant verse for us whom believe in believers Baptism.

Acts 8:37

King James Version (KJV)

37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God

Acts 8:37 (NIV) (omitted!!)

Bearmaster later in another post wrote/// Also those who are arguing over the superiority of one text over another are ignoring the Holy Spirit.///

I do not believe that us whom are disturbed about the omission of such verses should be accused of ignoring the Holy Spirit.

bear wrote ///translating the Bibke in tbe vernacular of the people many were put to death///

Yes, this is all the more reason I believe in the supernatural hand of protection from God on the KJV, William Tyndale the Martyr whom claimed "I never altered one syllable of God's Word against my conscience", Whoms last words where "Oh Lord, open the King of England's eyes."

75 Years later the Birth of the King James Bible

the RSV translators noted: "It kept felicitous phrases and apt expressions, from whatever source, which had stood the test of public usage. It owed most, especially in the New Testament, to Tyndale". Many scholars today believe that such is the case. Moynahan writes: "A complete analysis of the Authorised Version, known down the generations as "the AV" or "the King James" was made in 1998. It shows that Tyndale's words account for 84% of the New Testament and for 75.8% of the Old Testament books that he translated. Joan Bridgman makes the comment in the Contemporary Review that, "He is the mainly unrecognised translator of the most influential book in the world. Although the Authorised King James Version is ostensibly the production of a learned committee of churchmen, it is mostly cribbed from Tyndale with some reworking of his translation."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Tyndale

I have heard some suggest the New Testament words account for much higher than even 84% up into the 90%

Bear wrote ///Why can you KJV folks not allow for the liberty of others to use a translation that God leads them to use I have used the New American Standard and NIV and have been blessed by both.///

I am not aware of any one, forcing any one else to use or not use a certain translation, I and a couple of others are expressing why we believe the way that we do, you also have that liberty to engage in meaningful discussion and defend your perspective but lets be careful not to lose our composure.

Bear wrote ///Again my question to you who advocate the KJV. Are you more godly than the rest of us because your your translation is incorruptable? Are the rest of us going to hell because in your eyes we use a corruptable translation?. Do

I need the KJV Bible to get me into heaven? Will using the KJV make love God mire? Will using the KJV make me love my neighbor mote? Will using the KJV bring me closer to Jesus?
Again you who advocate KJV only? What about Bible translations to other nations? Do you want the inhabitants of other nations to learn KJV English?

Those of you who sit on this nice American bubble debating your translations need a reality check of the world around you.

Bearmaster.///

Lets keep our composure!

I think I have made my position real clear and why I am confident in my position, Because the issue is not one of translation preference but one of inspiration and one of believing the nature of scripture by the nature it reveals of its self.

Lets not have feelings of victimization just because there are those whom are expressing differing opinions.

There are tons and tons of nations with Bibles based on the same text as the KJV, The Trinitarian Bible society specializes in producing translations in various languages based on the Received Text.

Bearmaster wrote /// Brother my position is the believer is free to use any translation of the Bible as he is led by the Spirit. I allow the KJV folks to use their translation in their freedom in Christ. The KJV only people do not accord us that freedom. If seems in their minds we are corrupted because we use a corrupted translation.///

What is the Leading that you feel when you come to all of the omissions in the NIV??

Or the disturbing ownership of Publishing companies like Zondervan and Thomas Nelson.

Bearmaster wrote ///Also those who are arguing over the superiority of one text over another are ignoring the Holy Spirit. That is the work of God in the New Covenant. God says he will write his word or law upon our minds and hearts. That is not speaking of a particular Bible translation.///

Do you believe that Keith Daniels is ignoring the Holy Spirit when he in his sermons advocate the superiority of the KJV ??

Or when Denny Kenaston defends verses that are only found in the majority text, received text ??

or when Chuck Smith defends the superiority of the KJV ??

https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/scr_index.php?act=topicSermons&topic=KJV%20Version&page=0

Lets be careful in our attacks!!

Bearmaster wrote ///God says he will write his word or law upon our minds and hearts. That is not speaking of a particular Bible translation.///

Yes and this is one of the reason I take the position that I do on this subject.

We need to remember that Jesus the Son of God the anointed relied on the written Word when he was tempted in the wilderness, Satan inticed him with a perversion of the written word that sounded good but had omitted a small seemingly insignificant omission, but that seemingly insignificant omission totally changed the meaning, as I have already clearly pointed out.

bearmaster wrote ///Again a believer can take the NIV, NASB, NKJB, ESV, NLT, Etc. And can get direction from the Holy Spirit on how to live the Christian life. Just as surely as one can read the KJV and get direction on how to live the Christian life.///

The serpent of historical criticism has injected its poison into the church, whenever Christians believe that scriptures are only authoritative in the areas of redemption and the Christian life.

bearmaster wrote ///Again I ask you KJV proponents. Will using the KJV only make me more like Christ.///

I believe that having faith in the nature of scripture's as scriptures reveal of themselves is a wonderful blessing.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/8 9:33

bearmaster wrote:

"Brother my position is the believer is free to use any translation of the Bible as he is led by the Spirit. I allow the KJV folks to use their translation in their freedom in Christ. The KJV only people do not accord us that freedom. It seems in their minds we are corrupted because we use a corrupted translation."

I'm sure your allowance is in turn appreciated Bear. Which translation do you use? Are you being forced to use a KJV?

bm: "Also those who are arguing over the superiority of one text over another are ignoring the Holy Spirit."

Ignoring, or discerning the Spirit?

bm: "Again a believer can take the NIV, NASB, NKJB, ESV, NLT, Etc. And can get direction from the Holy Spirit on how to live the Christian life. Just as surely as one can read the KJV and get direction on how to live the Christian life."

One certainly can't disagree with that.

bm: "Again I ask you KJV proponents. Will using the KJV only make me more like Christ?"

I don't know bear, it might make you less like bearmaster, should that be your desire.

Re: another disturbing fruit of modern versions: contention in the body, on: 2013/2/8 10:12

Let's see if you mean by having a civil discussion one is using a "translation of Satan" than sure let's discuss this in a civil manner. I believe by inference one is inferring that we who use the NIV and other non KJV translations are quite deceived and going to hell. Though it is not clearly stated the inference is there.

I believe the Catholics were stating the same thing of Wycliff, Luther, and Tyndale when they translated the Bible from Latin into the vernacular of the people. The RCC regarded Latin as the sacred language of scripture. Any attempt to translate the scriptures from Latin into the vernacular or common language of the people was regarded as Satanic.

That is what is happening here. To claim one text is divinely inspired and resulting in one translation is divinely inspired is doing what the RCC did with the Latin Vulgate. And to deviate from that mindset with a new translation to make truth clear to a present generation is regarded as satanic. Thus the KJV only or those who defend those texts are doing what the RCC did. In essence they are not allowing the people to hear the word of God in the vernacular of their day. They call any reasonable translation to communicate the truth of God in the vernacular "a translation of Satan".

God in his sovereignty never bound himself to particular text. To say these are inspired is like saying he bound himself to the original tablets the law was given on. To the eternal truth contained in such, YES. But to the medium by which that truth is expressed, NO.

The issue is truth. Most importantly the truth of JESUS CHRIST!!!! Does the KJV contain the truth about Jesus. YES!!! Does the NIV contain the truth about Jesus. YES!!! And any other translation done with prayer and integrity. Translations such as NKJV, NASB, NLT, ESV, etc. They contain the truth about Jesus. The truth where people can be brought to saving faith and life in Jesus.

When the Scriptures say that God's word is settled forever in heaven. He is not talking about a text or particular translation. He is speaking of his truth as conveyed through the venues of different translations.

Truth is inspired as breathed out by God's Holy Spirit. A particular text or translation is not inspired. Only the truth of Jesus Christ is inspired.

Bearmaster.

CAP's are for emphasis only.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/8 10:14

PP wrote:

the only proof text for the Trinity KJV 1 John 5:7

1 John 5:7

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

1 John 5:7

NIV For there are three that testify (omitted!!!)

Come now, PP. It only takes a very quick google search to show that even very conservative scholars are in agreement that the KJV of this verse was a late addition. For example, it was never used by early church fathers in their disputing about the trinity. Surely if it was in the original mss they had, they would have used this verse as a proof text.

Unless you are insinuating that the **later addition** of the phrase "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one" is MORE inspired than the original writings, in which case I give up.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/8 10:24

amrkelly wrote:

Quote:
-----Quite frankly, the KJV version of this verse has never made sense to me in context and never will. Jesus didn't consider it "robbery" to be equal with God? What does that mean? TMK

Jesus did not regard Himself as having been defrauded or was not compelled to suffer loss.

The KJV of this verse reads:
"Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God"

I agree with you regarding what the verse MEANS, but what you stated is not what the verse SAYS.

The verse says that Jesus "thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

What it SHOULD say is that Jesus thought it not robbery to have to give up some of his rights AS God. I stand by my statement that the KJV translation, as written, makes no sense.

But I am certainly open to an explanation as to how it DOES make sense in the context of the passage.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/8 10:31

bearmaster, honest question:

you said:

Quote:
-----Truth is inspired as breathed out by God's Holy Spirit. A particular text or translation is not inspired. Only the truth of Jesus Christ is inspired.

the way i understand it the two different streams of text do have a lot of differences. would it be fair then to conclude that either only one of the streams can be correct OR that neither stream can be correct, BUT both streams can not be correct at the same time?

obviously its either ONE or NONE. can not be both. that doesnt even hold up logically that it could be both.

what do u do w/that?

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/8 10:34

Quote:
-----A particular text or translation is not inspired. Only the truth of Jesus Christ is inspired.

wait, did u just say that the bible is not the inspired word of god?

so much 4 orthodoxy.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/8 10:39

pp wrote: "The reason people are not reading their bibles is because they do not believe their bibles are inspired, The reason that people do not believe that their bibles are inspired is because we have bought into the lie that inspiration only applies to the original autographs."

I can not and would not dispute God's hand was in the inspiration, the translating and the production of the KJV in a mighty way. Does anyone have documented references to statements made by the translators themselves, apart from those included within the published work? In contrast, what have the translators of modern versions had to say of their own newer translations in regard to inspiration?

Re: When the Bible became regarded as authoritative only in areas of redemption and C - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 10:39

When the Bible has become regarded as authoritative only in areas of redemption and Christian life we are sliding down a dangerous slope

Quote:
-----Again a believer can take the NIV, NASB, NKJB, ESV, NLT, Etc. And can get direction from the Holy Spirit on how to live the Christian life. Just as surely as one can read the KJV and get direction on how to live the Christian life.

Quote:
-----Amen brother.

Quote:
-----bm: "Again a believer can take the NIV, NASB, NKJB, ESV, NLT, Etc. And can get direction from the Holy Spirit on how to live the Christian life. Just as surely as one can read the KJV and get direction on how to live the Christian life."

One certainly can't disagree with that..

lets be careful with endorsing pious sounding words wedged in a sandwich of contention

Historical Criticism of the bible methodology or ideology? reflections of a bultmannian turned evangelical, Eta Linnemann, translated by robert W. Yarbrough, baker books 1990 p.24-25 Scholasticism

Scholasticism undertook "to bring the new rational knowledge into agreement with the articles of faith" --an effort which set the tone for all the theological exertions of the High and Late Middle Ages. But it had made a weighty and fateful decision! Instead of bearing in mind that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge lie hidden in christ (Col. 2:3), it was assumed that man requires the worldly wisdom of paganism right alongside God's Word in order to make real intellectual progress. God's Word was reduced to just one of two focal points for determining wisdom and knowledge. The Bible came to be regarded as authoritative only in those areas touching on redemption and the Christian life. Aristotle, in contrast, became the source of all valid knowledge of the world, that is, for the realm of natural sciences, social analysis, and so on. From then on, in other words, God's Word was no longer regarded as reliable for these areas of knowledge. Later, Aristotelian philosophy would be replaced by newly developed sciences that hastily blamed the cosmological errors of Aristotle on God's Word.

This initial recourse to the traditions and writings of pagan antiquity led, already in the Middle Ages, to the institutionalizing of the drive for autonomy as part of the formative essence of the university. The Holy Scripture was still authoritative; the attempt was still made to approach the human wisdom of paganism with the intention of bringing "the new rational knowledge into agreement with the articles of faith." Theology was the queen, and philosophy was declared to be her handmaid. But it did not take long for the pagan mentality, which had been taken as handmaid into the newly founded university, to assume sovereign authority. The former queen was, to be sure, accorded a few eye-catching civil rights for a few hundred more years.

At the beginning of modern thought stands the frightful decision, which was carried out by the forces of intellectual leadership, to circumvent God's Word and to seek direction instead in pagan antiquity. Humanism made the decision to make man the measure of all things. That was a decisive renunciation of God, even if such humanism usually adopted a thoroughly pious deportment and constantly mouthed god's Word. What was said about God no longer sprang from God's revealed Word but rather from the human spirit, which increasingly distanced itself from God's Word.

'Bibliology, authority in religion', 'L. Thomas Holdcroft', 'Ceetec publishing' 2006 p.49

Human Reason as Authority

Many who deny the special status of the Bible, and reject its authority, hold that critical human reason or intellectual understanding (i.e. rationalism) is the ultimate authority in religion. This view may be implicit rather than explicit, for the one holding it may piously endorse the holy Scriptures, though he rejects those portions that his intellect finds unacceptable. Typically, the supernatural elements of Scripture fall victim to this rational approach.

Applying rationalism to Christian beliefs led to theological liberalism which holds that reason and not the Bible is the final authority. This critical liberal view is typical of those who deny God's claims. They reject the Bible on this point, "or "The Bible is in error here." By reasoning they sit in judgement of God's Word.

Tragically, those serving within the religious establishment may deny the Bible's authority. Religious leaders may reject whatever in the Bible cannot be explained in terms of natural everyday experience. These rationalists may not be rebellious sinners, but because they teach others, their rejection of the Bible's authority is especially insidious...

Rationalism, which gave rise to Christian Liberalism, ascribes authority in religion to the court of human judgment. The human mind is to evaluate Scripture and arbitrate its truth and meaning. In this view, knowledge based on human intelligence is more trustworthy than knowledge from any other source, including revelation...

Re: Sjeptic Guy, on: 2013/2/8 12:09

The truth of Jesus Christ as contained in the medium of a translation of Scripture is inspired. The truth as found in Jesus Christ as contained in a medium of scripture is inspired. It is the truth of Jesus Christ that is inspired. Not the translation of scripture in and of itself.

Jesus pointed this out to the Jewish intellectuals of his day when he said that they diligently studied the scriptures. In doing so they thought they had eternal life. But Jesus said the scriptures testified about him. Yet they would not come to him for eternal life.

The same warning can be applied by getting caught up in the medium that testifies to the truth and forgetting who is the truth.

Bearmaster.

Re: bearmaster - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 12:34

bearmaster wrote ///The truth of Jesus Christ as contained in the medium of a translation of Scripture is inspired. The truth as found in Jesus Christ as contained in a medium of scripture is inspired. It is the truth of Jesus Christ that is inspired. Not the translation of scripture in and of itself.

Jesus pointed this out to the Jewish intellectuals of his day when he said that they diligently studied the scriptures. In doing so they thought they had eternal life. But Jesus said the scriptures testified about him. Yet they would not come to him for eternal life.

The same warning can be applied by getting caught up in the medium that testifies to the truth and forgetting who is the truth.

Bearmaster.///

You could not get that scripture more wrong!!

Read deeper, Read it in its entirety,

This is exactly the blindness and lack of depth that the modern versions are creating..

THIS IS MY POINT!!

John 5 v 38-47

38 And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.

39 Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.

(from this verse you would think they believed scripture but lets read on)

40 And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.

41 I receive not honour from men.

(Jesus did not care what Orthodoxy taught in his day, He was not afraid to be labeled a Heretic)

42 But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you.

43 I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.

44 How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?

(this was an important verse, are we worried about reading the scripture in the box of orthodoxy!! afraid to be labeled a heretic!)

45 Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust.(by this you would think that they really believed the scripture the old testament,but lets read on)

46 For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me.

(He now tells them that even though they claimed that they believed in Moses (old testament scripture) that they really did not,they prided themselves in their view of inspiration, But they did not listen to it personally, they always had their tradition their theology their doctrines their commentaries their talmud that explained away all the passages.

47 But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?

(this last verse is very powerful meditate on it)

Re: bearmaster - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 12:41

bearmaster wrote ///Let's see if you mean by having a civil discussion one is using a "translation of Satan" than sure let's discuss this in a civil manner. I believe by inference one is inferring that we who use the NIV and other non KJV translations are quite deceived and going to hell. Though it is not clearly stated the inference is there///

Bear, would you please quote in its entirety any statement that I specifically said was a "translation of Satan" even though yes I do believe that it is the Enemy whom has deceived men in doubting the verses that are questioned and left out of the modern versions.

Those verses are either of God and inspired of Him or else the enemy has added them, it is either or, no in between. the Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11 was not accidentally inserted in the Text!!

Bear just because people are convicted about the inspiration of scripture and expressing their views of the nature of scripture does not at all mean that they are somehow implying that those /// who use the NIV and other non KJV translations are quite deceived and going to hell./// Bear do you get that impression when you listen to Keith Daniels and he endorses the superiority of the KJV ??

Why brother do you continue to try to turn this beneficial discussion into a mud sling? by accusing others of personally slinging mud at you, when they have not, We are just giving and sharing why we hold the perspectives that we do, You are entitled to do the same.

I would for one be interested in hearing why you feel that a Bible that has omitted 17 sound verses and is owned by a publishing company that is a division of the publishing company that publishes the satanic bible and many other disturbing books is an acceptable translation for the christian??

Bear wrote ///I believe the Catholics were stating the same thing of Wycliff, Luther, and Tyndale when they translated the Bible from Latin into the vernacular of the people. The RCC regarded Latin as the sacred language of scripture. Any attempt to translate the scriptures from Latin into the vernacular or common language of the people was regarded as Satanic.

That is what is happening here. To claim one text is divinely inspired and resulting in one translation is divinely inspired is doing what the RCC did with the Latin Vulgate. And to deviate from that mindset with a new translation to make truth clear to a present generation is regarded as satanic. Thus the KJV only or those who defend those texts are doing what the RCC did. In essence they are not allowing the people to hear the word of God in the vernacular of their day. They call any reasonable translation to communicate the truth of God in the vernacular "a translation of Satan".///

Well stereotyping those whom endorse the superiority of the KJV for the English speaking people with the RCC is a little far fetched to say the least.

Let's not bear false witness.

Instead of trying to build up a strawman, let's bring facts to the table and go from there.

Bearmaster wrote ///God in his sovereignty never bound himself to particular text. To say these are inspired is like saying he bound himself to the original tablets the law was given on. To the eternal truth contained in such, YES. But to the medium by which that truth is expressed, NO.

The issue is truth. Most importantly the truth of JESUS CHRIST!!!! Does the KJV contain the truth about Jesus. YES!!! Does the NIV contain the truth about Jesus. YES!!! And any other translation done with prayer and integrity. Translations such as NKJV, NASB, NLT, ESV, etc. They contain the truth about Jesus. The truth where people can be brought to saving faith and life in Jesus.

When the Scriptures say that God's word is settled forever in heaven. He is not talking about a text or particular translation. He is speaking of his truth as conveyed through the venues of different translations.

Truth is inspired as breathed out by God's Holy Spirit. A particular text or translation is not inspired. Only the truth of Jesus Christ is inspired.

Bearmaster.///

God in his Sovereignty included many, many specific details within scripture!! (It is absolutely filled with detail!!)

If He did not plan on preserving those details, It would not make sense that He included those details nor that Jesus used those details that had been preserved in the Copies that was available in Jesus' time to make doctrinal statements.

bearmaster wrote ///Truth is inspired as breathed out by God's Holy Spirit. A particular text or translation is not inspired. Only the truth of Jesus Christ is inspired.///

And yet Jesus Christ in His temptations relied on the written Word of His day which was not original autographs, they were copies of copies.

Again, and as Bearmaster is clearly bringing to light, this is not an issue of translation but one of inspiration.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/8 12:42

pp: "lets be careful with endorsing pious sounding words wedged in a sandwich of contention"

Of course you're right and correct to point that out. Thank you.

Let's also consider, agreement with a cause and effect, does not constitute an endorsement of its source. The adage comes to mind, "when reaching for the rose, beware the thorn".

I have a peach tree in my back yard. Each year it bears the most savory fruit. The tree's location however, is quite undesirable.

Re: Robbery or Grasped, on: 2013/2/8 12:50

Quote:

The verse says that Jesus "thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

What it SHOULD say is that Jesus thought it not robbery to have to give up some of his rights AS God. I stand by my statement that the KJV translation, as written, makes no sense.

But I am certainly open to an explanation as to how it DOES make sense in the context of the passage. TMK

Philippians Chapter Two

6 who, although He existed in the form of God, did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped, NASB

6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: KJV

Although I take your point about context being important it seems to me that the very context is verse 1-5 and 7-11. All of this speaks about humility and especially about not seeking one's own rights above others. Rather to give thought to others first. In this sense verse six is saying to me "although Christ Immanuel (God is with us) could have insisted in being the One over others, He instead emptied Himself taking the form of a man (7b) and a servant (v7a) for the sake of others", even unto death (v8). This is the attitude which Paul is asking of the Philippians and which Christ Himself had. So t

hat the word "robbery" in this context simply means that Jesus did not make an issue of His loss in becoming humble before men, though He could, have He indeed was Immanuel .

I think the deeper and more specific context however is not of the Son of God becoming a man, nor yet fully becoming Christ , rather it is His humility in the sight of men unto death on the cross. In contrast when Jesus returns He will not come to serve but to reign. Also the term "thought not robbery" means to me that it was the Father who sent the Son and therefore the "thought not" would have amounted to Christ's own attitude rather than taking issue with God the Father in heaven and complaining about the way He was treated by men even though He was the Christ of God. Isn't this why Jesus came and what His name means? "and you shall call His name Jesus because He shall save His people from their sins."

In the greek the word which is translated "equality" is the word ἰσότης; which is literally "equality" and is the anglicised form "isos" so the translators of the King James by using the correct form of "isos" of necessity had to restructure the sentence to carry the correct semantic as well to appropriate the meaning and use of correct grammar. As the implicit meaning is form of God & servant & humbled it is easy to see that "thought not robbery" to be equal with God is attitudinal and means Jesus didn't count His own loss not only in becoming a man, but expressly even to the point of death. Other translations do not convey this meaning in quite the same way. The two corresponding words are "robbery" and "grasped" both speak of attitude but the one (robbery) carries a weightier meaning because it denotes a sense of having suffered great loss and the other (grasped) simply denotes a willingness not to insist on His own rights as Immanuel.

contradictory double talk!! - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 13:16

Hi SkepticGuy

SkepticGuy wrote

Quote:

-----bearmaster, honest question:

you said:

/Truth is inspired as breathed out by God's Holy Spirit. A particular text or translation is not inspired. Only the truth of Jesus Christ is inspired./

the way i understand it the two different streams of text do have a lot of differences. would it be fair then to conclude that either only one of the streams can be correct OR that neither stream can be correct, BUT both streams can not be correct at the same time?

obviously its either ONE or NONE. can not be both. that doesnt even hold up logically that it could be both.

what do u do w/that?.

The modern perspective on the inspiration of scripture is neither Logical nor Scriptural, it is creating men like Bart Ehrman, Because it is contradictory double talk!!

SkepticGuy wrote

Quote:

-----bear wrote //A particular text or translation is not inspired.Only the truth of Jesus Christ is inspired.//

wait, did u just say that the bible is not the inspired word of god?.

so much 4 orthodoxy.

No, His view is very orthodox,

The issue is not translation preference it is one of inspiration.

The critical eclectic text used in most modern versions does not believe that any Manuscript, or text or version in any language greek, hebrew, aramaic, english or any other that we have today is inspired.

They believe that inspiration applies only to a bunch of none exsistant originals!

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/8 13:16

i dont know that i agree w u, bearmaster, but i do appreciate ur response 2 my questions.

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 13:18

PP the issue is not that medium that conveys tbe truth of God. The issue is him who is tbe truth. That is Jesus. He is tb e truth. Translations and text only convey that truth. But the medium of scripture as contained in translation testify ofJes us. You get so focussed on the medium you lose sight of Jesus.

By tbe way. Jesus calls us into relationship with him through the Holy Spirit. We are not called into relationship with a p articular translation of scripture. We are called into personal relationship with a person.

Bearmaster.

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 13:24

And why are scriptures not only autborative in the realm of redemption and the Christuan life. I believe that is what 2 Ti m. 3:16-17 is all about. To make the Bible other than what is what not meant to be. That is going down a slippery slope.

The old writers said The Scriptures are tbe only infallable rule of faith and practice.

Bearmaster.

Re: bearmaster - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 13:37

Hi bearmaster

Jesus never undermined the scripture of His day which where copies of copies,

He went out of his way to make sure that he fullfilled to the very details of scripture.

He made clear doctrinal statements based on the very jot and tittle of scripture.

Jesus Relied totally on the written Word of his day when tempted by the tempter whom used a distorted translation of sc ripture that subtly omitted part of the verse inorder to deceive.

Jesus said 'But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?'

If we do not Believe the written Logos, how shall we believe the inward Logos??

Re: - posted by makrothumia (), on: 2013/2/8 13:44

Proud papa, greetings in the name of our Lord Jesus,

In the area of continuing discovery of ancient texts, such as the dead sea scrolls, etc. - the Septuagint has received mor e consideration in recent years than it had in the past.

With the importance of reliable texts being understood, how would you view the role or value of the Septuagint in this dis cussion?

thanks

makrothumia

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 13:46

PP by your own reasoning Jesus should have kept the truth as contained in the original tablets on Mt Sinai. The tablets were not the inspired medium. It was the truth contained on those tablets. You said Jesus quoted scriptures that were copies of copies. I agree. It is not the copies that were inspired but the truth contained in those copies.

That is what I am reasoning here. It is not text or translations. What I call mediums that are inspired. It is the truth which those mediums contained that is inspired.

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/8 13:58

All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness; that the man of God may be adequate, equipped for every good work. (II Tim 3:16)

i dunno. that seem pretty clear to me that all scripture (which is text) is inspired by god. i am not smart enough to understand that any other way.

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 14:33

SG the truth is contained in the scriptures is certainly inspired by God. But the contri is which scripture and text are we talking about. PP and others would argue that it be the KJV and textus receptus that is inspired. Thus arguing for the literal words themselves that are inspired. I reason it is not the letter of the law that is inspired. But the Spirit of life that is behind the words. The truth of JESUS CHRIST himself.

Bearmaster.

Re: bearmaster - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 14:47

bearmaster wrote ///SG the truth is contained in the scriptures is certainly inspired by God. But the contri is which scripture and text are we talking about. PP and others would argue that it be the KJV and textus receptus that is inspired. Thus arguing for the literal words themselves that are inspired. I reason it is not the letter of the law that is inspired. But the Spirit of life that is behind the words. The truth of JESUS CHRIST himself.
Bearmaster.///

What scripture did Jesus use to prove the resurrection of the dead with the Sadducees ??

Just because we believe in the inspiration of scripture as the scripture speaks of themselves in no way negates the reality of the Spirit to enlighten us of what God wants to reveal to us in the text, Keith Daniels often prays that the word might be enlightened by the Spirit before he preaches.

The Bible is a dead book without the Spirit but that does not negate the Jot and tittle of inspiration

Again answer this What scripture did Jesus use to prove the resurrection of the dead with the Sadducees ??

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/8 14:55

i hear what you're saying, and i can agree with you. i do think there is strong evidence that the textus receptus has a much purer lineage than that of the other, which has a very strong and questionable background in the catholic church. i do not know enough about this topic to say the textus receptus is inspired, just that it seems convincing to me that it is much more pure. therefore any version derived from it is much more pure. there is nothing magical about shakespearean english, and i do think bible in modern english is very important.

i just wonder how many modern english translations do we need? what are there? 500 so far and counting? why? can't they get it right? what kind of people are doing these translations that they can't get it right so they have to keep producing more and more? the catholic church laughs at this just like they laugh at our multiplicity of denominations.

Re: SkepticGuy - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 15:07

If we do not believe our English translation is inspired of God.

If we do not believe that the textus receptus is inspired of God

If we do not believe that the majority text is inspired of God

Than the only other option is to believe that inspiration was only applied to a bunch of non exsistant autographs

Than We have nothing but religious traditiones to follow, But such is Contradictory to the Bible, it is the same type of unb elief that Jesus faught with when he was on earth.

Lets rather than worship at the alter of rationalism which is of sight, Lets read the scripture with faith and believe the nat ure that it reveales of its self.

unstead of trying to raise up an ishmael on the subject.

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 15:12

PP you want the letter of the law. Thus you miss the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. You get focussed on the medium. You lose proximity to the truth himsekf. Namely Jesus.

You want to argue words. But can you tell me how Jesus spoke to you today. You are so caught up in the intellectual a rgument. You lose sight of the joy of Jesus.

Spent too long on tthis thread. Need st stand down. Thus bro you have the last word.

Bear.

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 15:17

Skeptic I would exhort you to find a good English translation of the Scriptures and read it in the joy of Jesus.

Blessings to you bro. Catch you on another thread. Spent too much time on this.

Bear standing down.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/8 15:25

thank u bearmaster. i think there is much to learn from both sides of the discussion. i think PP makes sum good points, a s do u. i dont know if there can be middle ground on a topic like this, but if there is i would like to be standing on it.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2013/2/8 15:33

I do not want to get involved in this discussion as I find it personally fruitless. As far as I see there is one poster here wh o believes only KJV is right. Ok fine, go with it if you believe you are right. I personally believe NASB is more accurate, n ot because of the confidence I have on the people who translated but based on my personal reading. I found that most o f the verses spiritually in a correct form in NASB, even in KJV I found the word not bringing the correct spirit in some cas es. Also those who wrote KJV are not really God fearing people, if so then they would have translated Baptism as immer sion. But they feared Churches that practiced sprinkling of water more than God and hence they did not translate this wo rd but added a new word in English. (I do not want someone to debate on this as it is not main part of my discussion, I ju st brought it up).

My confidence is not in the scholars who translated the Bible but in God who will never let me be deceived because of a n incorrect translation as long as I truly seek him.

I have respect for Kieth Daniel and has been part of organizing his meetings in US. But I do not agree with him that only those who use KJV are supposed to quote Bible which he mentioned in one of his meetings. Because if what he says ho

Is true then the Man who has most sermons in this website (Zac Poonen) will not be worthy of quoting scriptures as he uses NASB.

There are people in rural India who have their Bible in local language. No one knows what version it is based on. But they still read it and I have seen some great men of God raised from there with anointed gifts of Prophecy.

There is an Elder in rural India who does even know how to read he just hears scriptures read and recorded by someone and uses that to prepare his sermons in Church. There are many educated men who sit and listen to this man. How is all things possible? God is still in throne and he can bring us revelations through scriptures beyond what is written in it.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/8 15:34

I too need to depart from this discussion, but it has been a good one!

PP you do an admirable job of supporting your position.

Bottom line, I don't think a person who prayerfully and faithfully reads the NIV will be led to perdition. Quite the opposite is likely to happen.

Blessings,

TK

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/8 16:04

Quote:
-----I personally believe NASB is more accurate, not because of the confidence I have in the people who translated but based on my personal reading. I found that most of the verses spiritually in a correct form in NASB, even in KJV I found the word not bringing the correct spirit in some cases.

I agree with everything you wrote except this part quoted above. far too subjective. never a good idea to interject our feelings or what we feel the "spirit" should be into scripture.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2013/2/8 16:18

Quote:

I agree with everything you wrote except this part quoted above. far too subjective. never a good idea to interject our feelings or what we feel the "spirit" should be into scripture.

I think I should have explained it further. I didn't explain this piece well. I meant that the revelation that I get from the scripture and the letter are much more closer in NASB. It is my personal view. I know a preacher who told me that when he reads KJV he feels like God is directly talking to him because of the difference in the language used in KJV. I respect his view. I have a similar experience with NASB.

I have seen a difference in the Bible before and after Baptism of Holy Spirit. I used to get some intelligent ideas before when I read the scripture (Tree of Knowledge) but after it was revelation (Tree of life). The Bible itself became a different book for me. A scripture could mean different things each time I read. I was referring to this revelation in my previous post not about my feeling of what scripture should say.

Re: Sree - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 16:30

Hi Sree

what about the omissions in the NASB, What do you feel that God says to you, When the verse is missing, do not give me you intellectual answer tell me what you feel??

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 16:35

bearmaster wrote ///PP you want the letter of the law. Thus you miss the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. You get focussed on the medium. You lose proximity to the truth himself. Namely Jesus.

You want to argue words. But can you tell me how Jesus spoke to you today. You are so caught up in the intellectual argument. You lose sight of the joy of Jesus.

Spent too long on this thread. Need to stand down. Thus brother you have the last word///

I can honestly say not one word that you have written in this forum has either convicted nor shaken my faith.

I do find it somewhat bizarre that you would classify my position as 'caught up in the intellectual argument'

I do wish that with such spiritual accusation as you are contending against my position, that you would answer my simple question.

What scripture did Jesus use to prove the resurrection of the dead with the Sadducees ??

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2013/2/8 16:44

I read about certain omissions that you mentioned like Romans 8:1. I compared both KJV and NASB in this case and I could see that line missing in NASB. But I always read Romans 8:1 as it was in KJV though I used NASB. What I mean is I always knew that the promise of no condemnation in Christ is for those who live according to Spirit. I was never misled by it. So personally to me this omission did not matter. I just took 1 case as an example.

I hear certain people even in this site believing that certain scripture even in New Covenant is applicable only for Jews and very few are for Gentiles etc. Such thing is seriously wrong in God's eyes because they are removing a huge chunk from God's word and also teaching others to follow it. It is for such people we have verses like Revelation 22:19 and Matthew 5:19.

Also Bible is not written by directly translating one book. There are different copies of each book. The one who translated NASB might have given more importance to certain copies and one using KJV might have used different (I could be wrong here). My point is as long as we rely on the spirit we will never be misled.

Re: makrothumia - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 17:09

makrothumia wrote ///Proud papa, greetings in the name of our Lord Jesus///

What a wonderful introduction, greetings also in the name of our Lord Jesus

///makrothumia wrote In the area of continuing discovery of ancient texts, such as the dead sea scrolls, etc. - the Septuagint has received more consideration in recent years than it had in the past.

With the importance of reliable texts being understood, how would you view the role or value of the Septuagint in this discussion?

thanks

makrothumia///

Of course we know that the modern translations use the Septuagint where as the KJV uses the Masoretic text.

Many Years ago I had my faith crushed because of a seemingly apparent contradiction in the KJV which also was in the Masoretic text,

I walked lost and bewildered for years.

Relieving that christianity for the most part only believes that the scripture is inspired only in a general way as what bear master is promoting.

But believing in this way, left me uncertain of anything, because the reality is as:

Charles C. Ryrie wrote "For if even one part of our Bible is thought to be false, how can any of it be trusted to be true?"

I was in years this way. My Bible reading never penetrated deep enough to hear anything other than laws, stories, principles and the such, I did not have enough faith to be delivered from gross habitual sin, because I did not believe deep enough to lay claim of the promises in Romans.

But I ran across a Man full Of the Spirit, whom bodily taught from the jot and tittle of the KJV, so I showed him this contradiction,

I thought, I would shake his faith when I showed him,
no instead he so calmly said I will find the answer the explanation to the seemingly contradiction.

His faith was grounded, he had already been through a terrible crises as I have to.

When you bounce back from a crises and God reveals himself to you in away that He never has before,
You become grounded and confident in your faith.

He found the answer for me and after he did I was still a little sceptical but very impressed of his faith.

Faith is passed onto faith not from good worded rational argument.

I have Faith that the nature that the Bible speaks of its self, is reality, I hope others can see my unswerving faith in the Sovereignty of God and embrace such faith.

The answer that he gave me I found was also believed by others it can be found in Edwin R. Thiele's 'The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings'

and also Floyd Nolen Jones 'The Chronology of the Old Testament' which is a defence of the Masoretic text

I learned something from finding the answer to this seemingly contradiction,
I learned how to read the Bible.

It is a much deeper book than many Christians realize,

Listen I have learned to love the seeming contradictions, Between kings, chronicals, the prophets, the new testament there are hundreds upon hundreds of them.

We need to ask ourself why Did Sovereign God inspire such minute detail in the original autographs, if He knew that such details would not be preserved??

What a Joy beyond measure to look at a contradiction with no apparent solution and believe it anyhow,
and to totally give up on ever finding a solution and to trust Gods Sovereign hand in it being that way.

Do you know what happens when you have pushed thru with faith and believed anyhow?

I find most often the minute I have truly given up and stop thinking, a solution appears as clear as Crystal.

Once you have that answer the entire Bible becomes more real and more dimensional.

Sometimes it can be weeks or months or longer for an answer. (WE as Christians no how hard it is to let go) But the solution

tion comes when you are totally broken and have given up on finding the solution,
and Willing to trust without sight.

The reason I say this is because, If I use a modern version based on the Septuagint, I find that the septuagint as well as modern translators often seem from my perspective to have tried to correct these seeming contradictions themselves within the text.

We see through a glass darkly.

We do not know when through out history that there may have been palaeographer forgers such as Constantine Simonides, Moses Wilhelm Shapira, Abraham (Avraham) ben Samuel Firkovich and so on.

We do not have to know the science behind the crossing of the red sea or the Jordan to believe it, We do not have to understand the science behind Abraham and Sara having a child. When we try to rationalize things of faith we produce Ishmaels.

Our Faith is the Substance of these realities, it is the evidence of the things that we know but can not rationally defend.

If new discoveries agree with our scriptures that is great but let us be firm in our faith when new discoveries of the oldest tend to change our scriptures.

When we are willing to change our beliefs with new discoveries we can find ourselves on the Path that former Moody graduate now agnostic Bart Ehrman is on.

Re: Charisma House Announces 'Most Modern Version' of KJV, on: 2013/2/8 18:32

brother Greg,

my heart just breaks for you...i cant even imagine what you must be feeling, seeing, after all these years of labor, having to read this kind of thread again and again and again.

its really makes one NOT want to post. No wonder we dont see a lot of the old timers, which is a sad testimony.

at least i see my dear sister ginny rose is online. God love you beloved, neil

Re: HezWelling - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 19:16

Actually, I found the thread to be very pleasant and much respect between differing opinions, TMK, skeptic and others whom differed with me personally where very respectful.

When defending an unpopular ideology as I am one could not ask for more respect from those whom differ in opinion.

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 19:17

As I picked up my NIV to read it. I asked the Lord what he thought about it. His response " it is a pure translation. Read it and hold to it.". Another time the Spirit said " It is a safe translation to read."

Enough for me.

Bearmaster.

Re: bearmaster - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 19:36

Well bearmaster

I would ask you what He said about the 17 sound missing verses and the realization of the disturbing realities of the Zondervan, HarperCollins, NewsCorp, Rupert Murdoch ownership. and several other disturbing features that I personally feel with the NIV,

But one thing I can respect is Freedom of Conscience.

It is not my job to convict, If you truly feel clear on your side of the issue than who am I to judge,

It maybe nothing more than an Acts 15 contention

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/8 20:36

I'm just reading this book by Riplinger, she studies basically the motive behind the changes, and what inspires bible correctors in general. She has a few good questions:

"Is the fall, recorded in Isaiah 14 about Lucifer or Jesus, the morning star, as the NIV and NASB imply?"

For me personally, that was the moment I woke up to the reality that one of the parties has been compromised.

she also reports of a very unusual "coincidence":

" A surprising number of new version editors have permanently lost their ability to speak (five and still counting)."

Re: , on: 2013/2/8 21:02

PP then let us agree to respect one another's freedom of conscience. For sure this is what the Anabaptist believed in and died for. Even though I may not agree with your position you are a man of conviction. Sorely lacking in the kingdom.

My apologies for the heated language. Much blessing and peace be on you. I am standing down from this thread. Sure we will post on another thread where we will be in agreement

Bearmaster..

Re: a-servant - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 21:19

Hi a-servant

This thread testifies clearly of my position.

But I would encourage caution with Riplinger. Before posting anything she writes double check and find other sources to back up her statements or you might find yourself backed into a corner. unfortunately many of the more vocal KJV advocates have done more to hurt the position than help.

Re: bearmaster - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 21:29

Hi bearmaster

bearmaster wrote

///PP then let us agree to respect one another's freedom of conscience. For sure this is what the Anabaptist believed in and died for. Even though I may not agree with your position you are a man of conviction. Sorely lacking in the kingdom.

My apologies for the heated language. Much blessing and peace be on you. I am standing down from this thread. Sure we will post on another thread where we will be in agreement

Bearmaster.///

Hey don't make me tear up.

no offence taken here.

We need to get a new anabaptist thread going soon,I have gathered some more books for reference

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2013/2/8 22:51

I have read scriptures before written in Readers Digest, on Twitter, Houston Chronicle, Popular Science, Southern Living , Popular Mechanics, Car and Driver, etc. and it all has ministered to me, I did not research what Bible version it came from.

Re: MrBillPro - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/8 23:19

Hi MrBillPro

MrBillPro wrote

///I have read scriptures before written in Readers Digest, on Twitter, Houston Chronicle, Popular Science, Southern Living, Popular Mechanics, Car and Driver, etc. and it all has ministered to me, I did not research what Bible version it came from.///

When I was young, I did not have a Bible, but started creating one in my head by listening to different people say the Bible says such and such.

Most of it actually was fairly accurate.

And then when I was about 10 I got a child's bible stories book from school during a Christmas book exchange, I devoured that book

I read everything that I could find, I read a lot of watchtower and Awake articles put out by the JW's and actually envisioned becoming a JW going from house to house, preaching and prayed that if that were the right way, that God would open the doors to that direction, I also as a young boy read child stories and material by the Christian Science and Mary Baker Eddy. I also was fascinated by Edgar Cayce This was my source before about 14 years old

and in all of this confusion,

Much Truth was revealed to me and I believe God used the truth in much of this material and safeguarded me from much of the error, but that does not mean that the material was safe.

One of the best truths that I learned when I was young was from a JW visiting the house was when he taught me to pray asking in Jesus name, had he not taught me that truth, I might be a JW today

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/9 2:49

Hi, agreed. I now understand how she works. Her argument is that the modern scribes gradually change words over time. And these replacements then are compared with the terms used by authors of the New Age and the occult. Her thesis is basically that the preparation of the "universal bible" is underway where all religions can find "their christ" in. And in that regard her research is priceless, I haven't seen anything like it before. Here an example of two words I never liked, "godlike" and "imitator" - now I know why:

Imitation or New Creation?

Book Title: New Age Bible Versions

Author: G.A. Riplinger

Trying to be "like the most High" was Lucifer's downfall. God said, "I am God and there is none like me" (Isaiah 46:9). In

spite of this, followers of Hinduism have a "devotion to acquiring Godlike qualities." (11) Gurus like Dr. Galyean, recipient of numerous federally funded grants, tell students "the whole purpose of human life is to reown the Godlikeness within us."

The author of A World Religion for the New Age observed that the occult theme wherein man "has potential to express many God-like qualities" is being "emphasized in Christianity" of late. (12) New versions have supported this and salute the substitution of a dashboard 'likeness'.

=====

NIV, NASB, et al.

=====

like newborn babes I Pet. 2:2

put on the new self Eph. 4:24
which in the
likeness of God has
been created in
righteousness and
holiness

=====

KJV

=====

as newborn babes I Pet. 2:2

put on the new Eph. 4:24
man which after
God is created in
righteousness
and true holiness

=====

(The words "as" and "like" are not interchangeable. e.g., "As a surgeon, I believe you need an operation."

"John carves the turkey like a surgeon, maybe he could perform it and save us some money.")

Satan himself is "transformed into an angel of light." So God warns us to expect Satan's ministers to be imitators of "ministers of righteousness" (II Cor 11:15). Among them are the Buddhists who "set a high value on imitating the behavior of the highest" and mystics like the U.N.'s Dag Hammerskjold and Robert Muller who both read between the lines of Thomas a Kempis' The Imitation of Christ. (13) Luciferian David Spangler prefers 'Christians' who are an imitation rather than a new creation.

"rthodox Christianity has a mystical side that to the best of its ability has taught the imitation of Christ." (14)

Imitation bibles produce imitation Christians. The dictionary destroys any notion that imitations are anything but an "artificial likeness."

=====

NIV, NASB, et al.

=====

Be imitators I Cor. 11:1

Be imitators of God Eph.5:1

=====

KJV

=====

followers of me I Cor. 11:1

followers of God

Eph.5:1

=====

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/2/9 11:22

Off topic I know but this statement really impressed me:

QUOTE:

"One of the best truths that I learned when I was young was from a JW visiting the house was when he taught me to pray asking in Jesus name, had he not taught me that truth, I might be a JW today"

Papa, you got to be kidding! You mean to tell me a JW told YOU to pray in Jesus' name????? WOW! The ones we have met would never have said that! Maybe this JW did know the LORD...and it is possible - David Bercot and his wife were JWs when they came to the LORD, continued therein until the Holy Spirit led them out of it...

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/2/9 12:57

I could NOT believe that Gail Riplinger is being quoted as a an expert on this subject. This woman has caused more confusion and error with her book than most.

Here's what Jacob Prach of moriel ministries says about her qualifications.....

Quote: "Gail Riplinger seems impressive. She has letters after her name - "B.A.", "M.A." and "M.F.A." from Cornell University and Harvard University. Very impressive. What she doesn't tell you is that her degrees are in "Home Economics"! Gail Riplinger has no relevant theological or language qualifications at all." End quote.

Home economics - that's cooking!

And again: Quote:"If you are going to pontificate on Bible versions you should have been to seminary. At the very least you should have done basic studies in theology. You should have studied Hebrew and Greek, and completed some university-level studies in Textual Criticism. You should have a better than passing acquaintance with Biblical Archaeology - you should understand how we came to have the various manuscripts that we do today.

Gail Riplinger was interviewed by Wayne House, a conservative, evangelical Christian scholar. Wayne House reports that she "repeatedly mispronounced terms used by biblical scholars" (1) . After he had asked her four times, "She hesitantly admitted that she could not read Greek". (2)

It is not a simple matter to reach an informed opinion regarding biblical texts and correct translations." End quote.

There is much, much more.

Check out the Moriel.org website for a detailed intelligent discussion on this and bible translations.

Re: Heydave - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/9 15:53

Hi Heydave

One thing I do not want is to be labeled with Riplinger and Ruckman and the like, my response to a-servent is testimony of that reality.

But because of interest of the issue I have a couple of her books as I buy every book that come my way on this issue regardless of the position.

Heydave, which books of Riplingers have you read ?

Heydave wrote/// Here's what Jacob Prach of moriel ministries says about her qualifications.....

Quote: "Gail Riplinger seems impressive. She has letters after her name - "B.A.", "M.A." and "M.F.A." from Cornell University and Harvard University. Very impressive. What she doesn't tell you is that her degrees are in "Home Economics"! Gail Riplinger has no relevant theological or language qualifications at all." End quote.///

You know from what I have read of her writings, I never was of the impression that she held a theological degree,

Does she say that she does?

because she certainly does not imply that from the books of hers that I have,

Actually the fact is she admits quite the opposite, So maybe you should question how qualified Jacob Prach is in making his assertion.

P.48-49 of hazardous material,

She claims Her motive for researching these topics where because her daughter and fiancé

//... enrolled in Christian colleges for the first time, I (riplinger speaking!) discovered first-hand exactly what concerned parents had been calling about. Both went to church based schools where the pastors and their churches were perfect(italicized). How much safer could it get? Surprisingly, my daughter brought home a textbook that falsely charged that the word "candle" in the KJB was incorrect because, according to the author, 'there were no candles in Bible times.' The Lexicon author who invented that lie is discussed in an upcoming chapter. I showed my daughter two standard secular encyclopedia which confirm the KJB reading....///

Heydave,

would you be of the impression after reading this actual testimony (from her book) that riplinger is trying to give a false impression that her degree's pertain to degrees in theology or degree's pertaining to Greek and Hebrew??

When She already was a professor at a (as she admits) (secular) university and parent of a college student, and that was her (first), (first hand) experience of what is being taught in conservative Christian colleges.

It would seem to me that through out her writings that she is more than clear that she is not a Degree'd scribe

So who is giving the mislead impression ?

Because if I had not read her writings and only had read what you posted that Jacob Prach wrote. (I would be of the false impression that she deceitfully was trying to give the impression that she was a theologian whom was studied in Greek and Hebrew.)

Edit:PS. I think it would be wise for me to not get into defending Ruckman, Riplinger Gipp and such. I find some of their material disturbing.

but I was bothered by the assertions of this article that Heydave posted.

Re: ginnyrose - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/9 17:09

Hi ginnyrose

ginnyrose wrote ///Papa, you got to be kidding! You mean to tell me a JW told YOU to pray in Jesus' name????? WOW!
//

Yes He did,

If I remember correctly the first time or close to the first time I tested it out,

Was when we had a dog that my dad accidentally ran over with the dually tires of a one ton, boom truck.

The dog jumped up yelled ran just for a moment and hit the ground, blood was coming out of every opening of the dog's body, ears mouth, every opening.

It was more than clearly evident that the dog was grasping for its last breath, My parents and I where debating if we should shoot it, so as to relieve it of its misery.

We all stood their speechless looking at the dog on the ground as my dad was hesitant to shoot it, I prayed that God would heal the dog

(If I remember correct it was about the first time I prayed asking in Jesus name putting what the JW shortly before had taught me to a test.)

after a few minutes of standing their in silent prayer, the dog miraculously jumped up shook its self and was completely fine, after the amazement of what had happened, we found out that all 3 of us had been silently praying for the healing of the dog.

ginnyrose wrote ///The ones we have met would never have said that! Maybe this JW did know the LORD...and it is possible - David Bercot and his wife were JW's when they came to the LORD, continued therein until the Holy Spirit led them out of it...///

WoW ,I knew David bercot was an ex JW but I did not realize that He was saved before he left.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/2/9 17:20

QUOTE:

"the dog miraculously jumped up shook its self and was completely fine, after the amazement of what had happened, we found out that all 3 of us had been silently praying for the healing of the dog."

Amazing. Wonderful! God used that dog to minister to you, did he not....Hey! I can well imagine what that dog looked like after being run over. And God healed that dog! Awesome.

Glad you shared this testimony. Made my day!

EDIT: The story of David Bercot was taken from his testimony as recorded on his CD.

Papa, do you personally know David Bercot? Sometimes I get the sense you may or at least you do read his writings. Nothing wrong with that, I enjoy them as well.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/9 18:00

ginnyrose wrote///Papa, do you personally know David Bercot?///

No, I have never met David Bercot I have read some his books, researched alot from scroll.

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/9 20:28

Hey Dave, one can sidetrack any issue by ignoring the facts. The facts are clearly presented in the NIV, NASB, et al.

put on the new self Eph. 4:24
which in the
likeness of God has
been created in
righteousness and
holiness

Be imitators of God Eph.5:1

that is subtle theology for the not born-again ones, written by non born-again ones. Or in other words, this is luciferian anti-christ theology in its purest form, to accept his imitation christ in the likeness of him.

When you think it's a case of the "messenger that warns you" I would start looking at Westcott and Hort and their deep involvement in the occult.

And also answer the simple question if this is true or not:

"And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Revelation 22:19

Welcome to the Amazing Westcott and Hort Magic Marker Binge!

The chart below illustrates what was done when the text used by Christianity for 1800 years was replaced with a text assembled by Brook Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort in the nineteenth century and used as the basis for the English Revised Version, which nearly all modern translations closely follow.

<http://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/themagicmarker2.html>

IF it is true, and God keeps His Word.... where exactly is the position of the readers of their works? What do you think?

Re: a-servant - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/9 21:29

Hi a-servant

I appreciate greatly your zeal for contending for the inerrancy of the jot and tittle of the Bible.

But this is a good thread with many good thoughts from all sides, And There are still some post that asked me some direct questions, that I would like to answer when I feel more in the mood to do so.

When you quote riplinger or ruckman it is like quoting kent hovind on an evolution thread with a bunch of science minded athiest, you are throwing rocks at a hornets nest.

When we right things like:

RE:///that is subtle theology for the not born-again ones, written by non born-again ones. Or in other words, this is luciferian anti-christ theology in its purest form, to accept his imitation christ in the likeness of him.///

We are asking for contention, You are going to struggle to make a convincing case that the modern versions are deliberately translating NEW AGE words into the text.

The Words in the text might have new age meanings but it maybe no more than New Age words becoming more infiltrated into every day language and as multiple translations struggle to update the versions to be more current with the current language.

Many of the translators and affiliates of many of the modern versions are Sincere men with good intentions, even though

we disagree with them, Lets be careful in accusations with out solid facts to back us up.

If you want to quote KJV advocates stick to the more solid ones, use Hills, Burgeon, Laurence Vance, Floyed Jones and the such but even then make sure to find other sources to back you up.

Use Majority text advocates also to make your points there points are more easy to defend in rational arguments.

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/10 3:31

Let me be as clear as possible,

If I imitate the likeness of a Chanel handbag, is my newly created product now a member of the Chanel product line?

or is it an imitation?

will it ever become an original by imitating the original?

Does Satan counterfeit the things of God? Yes.

Can the old creation in Adam imitate the new creation in Jesus Christ? Yes, convincingly.

Will this old creation ever enter the kingdom of God? No, we must be born again.

Can we not just imitate Jesus? No, HE said "follow me" many times.

to follow Him means: He guides us - we follow him.

to imitate Him means: We initiate an artificial copy of his behavior, instead of following Him

John 10:27 Â My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/10 21:14

So what is God's way in all of this? For the believer that should be much less complex than for the text critic, as we should not be required to put in 2000 hours of source text analysis just to find out what God really said, and what He didn't say.

Matthew 24:35 Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

Psalm 12:6-7 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.

Compare The Lords' promise with an Illustration that shows how that turned out:

<http://www.moresureword.com/alcuppit.htm>

Could it really be that easy?

For the ones with faith in the Author of the promise, Yes.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2013/2/10 23:20

I have written two lengthy posts that I was going to insert into this discussion, but I prayfully decided against posting them. I suppose that it seems that these types of discussions rarely "convince" anyone one way or the other. Still, I would encourage all who are interested to research this topic -- avoiding the prejudicial literature whenever possible.

I suggest studying the translation process, the history of the various text-types used, the individuals involved in translation, etc... You can also contact translators, scholars, text critics as well as language and text experts for their input and perspective as well.

I would say that it might be a good idea for these sort of discussions is to read the Preface of the original KJV. The translators weren't nearly convinced of the utter "perfection" of even "deified" status that some have made the KJV out to be.

Rather, the translators of the KJV simply had a goal to make a translation available in the "vulgar" (common) tongue of their day. They never set out to make a "new" or "perfect" translation, but "but to make a good one better."

Here are a few things that they included within the text of their preface:

Quote:

"Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the most holy place; that removeth the cover of the well, that we may come by the water, even as Jacob rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well, by which means the flocks of Laban were watered. Indeed, without translation into the vulgar tongue, the unlearned are but like children at Jacob's well (which was deep) without a bucket or something to draw with: or as that person mentioned by Isaiah, to whom when a sealed book was delivered, with this motion, Read this, I pray thee, he was fain to make this answer, I cannot, for it is sealed."

....

"We affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession... contains the Word of God, nay, is the Word of God. Though it be not interpreted by every Translator with like grace, the King's speech is still the King's speech; no cause therefore why the word translated should be denied to be the word, or forbidden to be current, notwithstanding that some imperfections and blemishes may be noted in the setting forth of it."

....

"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."

....

For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free? use one precisely when we may use another no less fit as commodiously?

....

But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar."

....

But it is high time to leave them, and to show in brief what we proposed to ourselves, and what course we held in this our perusal and survey of the Bible. 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 (for then the imputation of Sixtus had been true in some sort, that our people had been fed with gall of dragons instead of wine, with whey instead of milk); 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.

I have always found it interesting that the translators of the KJV quoted from the Geneva Bible. Some of the translators of the KJV continued to write and preach using the Geneva Bible as their text for years AFTER the KJV was completed. I suppose that they felt secure enough in the work (especially since the translators often referenced it and typically reverted to the Bishop's Bible for usage during their translation process unless a difference was detected). Still, the Preface of the KJV is quite telling into what it was that the translators were -- and were not -- trying to accomplish.

Although I use the KJV (alongside the NASB and NIV), it is merely a translation of something much greater -- the Word of God. It seems that the translators knew this better than anyone.

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/11 0:01

"... contains the Word of God, nay, is the Word of God"

- exactly, that is the requirement, faith. That's when God starts to use people for His purpose.

There are scholars in our times that think that a PhD, ThD or DD can replace faith. Or is even required to understand truth.

These are the same people that said this man cannot be the King, since he is a carpenter.

Jesus likewise did not choose apostles from the religious establishment, he needed people he could actually trust with the job.

That's why we still find the same situation today, the harder you step on the toes of the accepted compromise called status quo, that honors only their own kind, the harsher of a press you will get. Darkness doesn't like exposure.

Matthew 11:25 ~ At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.

Re: ccchhhrrriiisss - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/11 0:14

Hi ccchhhrrriiisss

Is the Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11 a Counterfeit or Genuine??

Re: ccchhrrriiisss - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/11 0:39

Hi ccchhrrriiisss

Their is nothing on this topic that is not prejudicial literature, certainly not from translators, scholars, text critics as well as language and text experts.

That reality should have become clear in the "Does inerrancy matter?? or is dynamic equivalence sufficient" thread, https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=48092&forum=36&24

If Abraham was alive today and lets say he got on this forum and told everyone that He was going to be a father of a gre at nation,

and he revealed his age and his wifes age, I feel that many here would be quick to pull up a bunch of proffesional medic al documents and argue with him and try to convince him that if he wants a child that he is going to need to go about it in a different way than expecting that his beyond childbearing wife would acctually conceive.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2013/2/11 1:05

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

Is the Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11 a Counterfeit or Genuine??

I cannot say with absolute certainty. It seems genuine and the message in it is quite clear and can be agreed as an accurate description of what we know of the attitude of Christ toward sinners.

All that I can say with absolute certainty is that some manuscripts contained this passage and others -- including the old est manuscripts that many text critics and scholars find to be the most reliable -- did not.

The translators of scholarly versions (like the NIV) that consulted every possible source text concluded that "The earliest manuscripts and many other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53—8:11."

I feel that this explanation is an accurate description. I believe that it would be poor judgement to conclude ulterior motives on behalf of the translators or to suggest that they were "lying" in regard to the explanation.

In fact, the translators decided to include this passage in the text of the NIV but with the footnote in order to accurately explain the scholarly consensus of opinion regarding the authenticity of the passage. It was not the responsibility of the translators to determine absolute authenticity. They simply translated the Bible from the sources that they deemed most reliable. If they weren't sure about something or if an absolute consensus was not reached, they noted it as such as a footnote.

I think that it is important to remember that the question of authenticity of this passage is not a modern debate. This passage was debated in the 16th Century prior to the publication of the King James Version too. Some scholars embraced the authenticity of the passage. Others rejected it or doubted it enough to include it with a notation concerning its authenticity. Still other ancient scholars believed that it was not part of John's writing, but an accurate account of a scene from the life of Christ (possibly from another contemporary account).

The point? I can't say with absolute certainty that it was written by John and belongs within this particular portion/timeline of the Book of John.

Does this cause me to doubt the authenticity or inerrancy of the Word of God? Of course not!

The Word of God is not dependent upon the noble efforts of feeble, human translators. The Epistle of Jude includes ref

erence to the "Book of Enoch." The Book of Enoch is missing from the "preserved" Word of God. Are we to declare that the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God if it once contained all of the books of the Apocrypha (most editions kept them until the 19th Century) but lacks the "Book of Enoch?"

As noble of an effort that the translators of the KJV may have undertaken, they were still flawed men. They explicitly explained that they didn't attempt to create a "perfect" translation or an entirely "new" one either. Their efforts were revised over time and they themselves made footnotes regarding passages where there was debate over proper wording (although they weren't allowed to keep those margin notations in the ultimate publication). While some modern advocates will argue about "perfection," the translators still got the word "Easter" wrong in Acts chapter 12 (and, personally, I find most excuses for this mistake to be almost laughable -- since the Greek word for "Passover" is always "Passover").

So, for your question, I must ask whether or not you think that the KJV is perfect. Do you think that the Received Text that Erasmus almost singlehandedly translated from the various manuscripts of the Byzantine text-types that he consulted was perfect? Do you believe that the translators of the KJV -- some of whom held old Roman "high church" pagan traditions (of which you can read in own their writings) -- were "inspired" by God in their translation efforts? Were they "inspired" when they saw a Greek word for which they had to choose the best possible English equivalent -- often choosing different English words for the same Greek source word)?

It is strangely ironic that some will often use great amounts of criticism in regard to modern scholarly versions (like the NASB or NIV) but not apply the same levels of criticism to the KJV (which was the "modern version" in the early 17th Century).

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2013/2/11 1:17

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

Their is nothing on this topic that is not prejudicial literature, certainly not from translators, scholars, text critics as well as language and text experts. That reality should have become clear in the "Does inerrancy matter?? or is dynamic equivalence sufficient" thread, https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=48092&forum=36&24

I'm not sure what you are referencing. I spoke about the TRANSLATORS of the KJV and their view about their work. I suggested for those who might be interested in studying the matter in depth to first go to source material rather than prejudicial literature. I don't think that was a poor encouragement either.

As for what you said: Actually, there was some mention about some sources used (including Gail Riplinger) within this thread itself. I believe that we should be careful to avoid "yielding" ourselves to secondhand sources before we have researched the issue in depth while contacting others to ascertain why they worded or translated something as they did. There are plenty of myths and rumors out there that sound credible but do not meet the muster of "truth." I don't think that it would be wrong to suggest "getting it right" or "testing everything" (I Thessalonians 5:21) whenever possible.

And, of course, this topic has been discussed exhaustively in a similar manner in the SermonIndex forums many, many, many times before.

Quote:

If Abraham was alive today and lets say he got on this forum and told everyone that He was going to be a father of a great nation, and he revealed his age and his wives age, I feel that many here would be quick to pull up a bunch of professional medical documents and argue with him and try to convince him that if he wants a child that he is going to need to go about it in a different way than expecting that his beyond childbearing wife would actually conceive.

Really? Do you believe this or are you just saying this as a rhetorical slight at those with whom you disagree? Despite any intent, this statement could be construed as a "spiritual" form of "ad hominem" in an effort to discredit those with whom

om you might disagree.

I have been on SermonIndex for nearly a decade. I don't know any member here who would question the Biblical account of Abraham's or Sarah's age in regard to pregnancy. Perhaps you are thinking of someone in particular? Or, are you simply being facetious?

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/2/11 8:33

I agree with ccchhhrrriiisss that I just cannot understand why the same measure of judgement is not used with the KJV as with other translations. It just seems a very dogmatic position to me. I understand that this is a 'faith' position for those who are KJO. My 'faith' position is as follows: I believe the bible as originally written is the inspired word of God, without error. The issue seems to me around which text documents are the best as we don't have the exact originals (first hand copies). Now I am not an expert by any means, but personally I favor the majority text for the NT. This includes the Greek texts used in the Textus Receptus, but includes many more from similar sources as the TR.

Here is a statement from THE TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY about the Textus Receptus (which the KJV is translated from). Note the Trinitarian Bible Society promotes the KJV and bibles ONLY translated from the Textus Receptus and therefore this is not propaganda against the TR or KJV.

Quote: "Today the term Textus Receptus is used generically to apply to all editions of the Greek New Testament which follow the early printed editions of Desiderius Erasmus. Erasmus of Rotterdam (1469?-1536), a Roman Catholic humanist, translated the New Testament into Latin and prepared an edition of the Greek to be printed beside his Latin version to demonstrate the text from which his Latin came. Erasmus used six or seven Greek manuscripts (the oldest being from the 10th century), combining and comparing them in a process in which he chose the correct readings where there were variants. On several occasions he followed the Latin and included some of its readings in his text. This edition was published in 1516. There was great interest in this Greek text, and it is the Greek text for which the volume is remembered. This New Testament was the first published edition of a Textus Receptus family New Testament." End Quote.

So as I understand it, Erasmus when he produced The Textus Receptus did not have available (or use) a complete set of Greek manuscripts for all the NT, so he translated from the Latin scriptures in these cases into the Greek.

So why would one think that the TR Greek, which was incomplete and used Latin in places is a better text than the majority text (also the KJ bible that used the TR as its base)?? What about the apocrypha books that were in the KJV until the 1800s? Call me simple, but I just can't see it!

Additionally why is there so much conspiracy theory around 'other' translations when you only have to consider the background of Erasmus and some of the KJV translators, not mentioning King James I? This would give any conspiracy theorist ammunition if they so wanted. In fact the non-conformist of the day did not trust the 'new' KJV and kept to the Geneva bible.

Please don't think I am trying to put down the KJV. I think it is a great translation and we owe a great debt to those who worked so faithfully to give it to us. But I do not trust every translated English word as inerrant. I do however take the bible as inerrant as I have already stated. The fact that I don't have all the answers does not shake me or give me a problem. I am secure in my trust of God's word and the God of the word. Even if the KJV or any other translation was inerrant, we would still 'only know in part'. I don't know anyone who knows everything in God's word perfectly. We are all still learning. Me more than most.

If I have misunderstood the facts above, then please forgive me, but this is my understanding and I am open to be shown I'm wrong. That does not mean open to conform to your opinion, but open to truth.:)

Re: ccchhhrrriiisss - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/11 13:27

Hi ccchhhrrriiisss

pp asked ///Is the Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11 a Counterfeit or Genuine?:///

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote ///I cannot say with absolute certainty. It seems genuine and the message in it is quite clear and can be agreed as an accurate description of what we know of the attitude of Christ toward sinners.

All that I can say with absolute certainty is that some manuscripts contained this passage and others -- including the oldest manuscripts that many text critics and scholars find to be the most reliable -- did not.///

You bring up an excellent point and the reason I specifically asked about the Pericope De Adultera because its message is as you admit "quite clear and can be agreed as an accurate description of what we know of the attitude of Christ toward sinners."

Could we agree that it did not accidentally find its self into the text, for it certainly is not just a scribal error, nor is it, and could we not agree that it is much too detailed to be just a scribe's footnote that accidentally got inserted into the text??

It did not get into the scripture by accident, it is either inspired or else it was mischievously inserted. And if we conclude that it was mischievously inserted then what was the spirit behind it being mischievously inserted?? and if this text was mischievously inserted then what scripture or scriptures can be completely relied upon??

So then the question we must ask ourselves is Did God inspire it to be in the text or is the enemy behind its insertion??

The only way I know of determining this is not by looking at two manuscripts that may be the oldest but that differ more than any other from the majority of all other manuscripts.

For such a theory of determining what should be Omitted or else included throws the entire biblical canon into question, because of these "oldest manuscripts that many text critics and scholars find to be the most reliable" are referring mostly to the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

The Sinaiticus in which as with The Vaticanus I find to be exalted above measure, by modern text critics and scholars. The Sinaiticus also contained the Epistle of Barnabas, and portions of The Shepherd of Hermas.

So if we determine that their validity is superior to that of the majority of all the other existing manuscripts based on their age, and conclude that it is justifiable to remove complete sound verses from our bibles, then the next logical question is should we also include the Epistle of Barnabas, and portions of The Shepherd of Hermas. and if we add the Epistle of Barnabas, and portions of The Shepherd of Hermas to our biblical canon, then the next logical question becomes Did God ever put His thumb of protection over any of the biblical canon that we have today? and if He did not, then could our entire canon that has been accepted as authentic be brought into question? Do you see where this mindset leads? It leads men like Bart D. Ehrman to go from being a Moody graduate to Wheaton and from there to Princeton to study under Bruce M Metzger into complete agnosticism and as an expert text critic and scholar writing 'Misquoting Jesus' 'Jesus Interrupted' and such, anti Biblical anti Christian literature.

The view that we are in the process of reconstructing the originals takes no faith, It takes Zero faith. many non Christians such as Ehrman work at trying to determine what the originals actually said.

When you go down this path who is to say that the first Christians were not actually the gnostics, and that latter forger's changed things, who is to say?? It is a slippery slope, a sea of doubt,

It is a denial of the sovereign hand of God in willing the Bible that we have today.

ccchhrrriiss wrote ///I feel that this explanation is an accurate description. I believe that it would be poor judgement to conclude ulterior motives on behalf of the translators or to suggest that they were "lying" in regard to the explanation.///

It is not their explanation that I consider as ulterior or "lying" it is their entire approach or philosophy of an on going process of trying to reconstruct the originals, that I deem as inferior and dangerous, as what I have pointed out in the above paragraphs.

Who knows when the next archaeological discovery that will throw more doubts on more scriptures be unearthed.

ccchhrrriiss wrote/// In fact, the translators decided to include this passage in the text of the NIV but with the footnote in order to accurately explain the scholarly consensus of opinion regarding the authenticity of the passage. It was not the responsibility of the translators to determine absolute authenticity. They simply translated the Bible from the sources that they deemed most reliable. If they weren't sure about something or if an absolute consensus was not reached, they noted it as such as a footnote///

What do you suppose would be or would have been the effect had the NIV decided to be consistent in their translational methods by not inserting the last 12 verses of Mark nor the beloved 'Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11'??

Could the effect have possibly been similar to that of Zondervan's TNIV translation that flopped because of the gender n

neutral controversy.

I am not at all equating excluding the last 12 verses of Mark nor the beloved 'Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11' with anything to do with the gender neutral controversy.

other than as the saying goes you do not throw a live frog into a boiling pot of water (as he will jump right out) you place him in luke warm water and slowly turn up the heat so as to boil him without resistance.

There is no more justification for omitting many of those 17 sound verses in the NIV than there would be for omitting the beloved 'Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11' other than to omit such a beloved and large portion of scripture which would be likely to cause such an outcry of critics as to cause such a translation to become discontinued.

I point this out because in past threads many have stated that they appreciate the modern translators sticking to their convictions and not inserting some of the scriptures because they are not found in a couple of the supposed oldest manuscripts, but if such is because of conviction of the translators, then how come are they not consistent in their translation methods??

So how about rather than coming to a conclusion on omitting 17 complete verses and omitting many partial verses and changing some of the verses based on them not being found in a couple of the manuscripts. Instead what if we challenged their validity similar to how a bank teller is trained to spot a counterfeit, that is by comparing it to all of the other authentic ones.

By which I personally conclude all of the omissions as inspirational and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, and thus I find it unjustifiable to omit such sound verses.

Re: May I suggest a possible remedy to a complicated matter - posted by makrothumia (), on: 2013/2/11 13:58

I use a Greek English Interlinear that is drawn from the Majority Text but it notates the variants in other texts within the verses and references the basic text group from which the variant reading has its source.

This allows me to objectively and prayerfully consider the reading while comparing the texts with each other. The vast majority of the different readings are minuscule, and I have never been disturbed to this date while comparing and praying over the correct wording. I have been reading this way for many years now.

I realize that not everyone has a basic training in Greek, but even without this, at the least, every place where there is a variant reading can be recognized, considered, and researched by those who feel compelled to do so.

There are places where either wording were both very acceptable, so much so that they both blessed me.

makrothumia

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2013/2/11 15:26

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

You bring up an excellent point and the reason I specifically asked about the Pericope De Adultera because its message is as you admit "quite clear and can be agreed as an accurate description of what we know of the attitude of Christ toward sinners."

Could we agree that it did not accidentally find its self into the text, for it certainly is not just a scribal error, nor is it, and could we not agree that it is much too detailed to be just a scribe's footnote that accidentally got inserted into the text??

It did not get into the scripture by accident, it is either inspired or else it was mischievously inserted. And if we conclude that it was mischievously inserted then what was the spirit behind it being mischievously inserted?? and if this text was mischievously inserted then what scripture or scriptures can be completely relied upon??

I think that you misunderstand the nature of the debate over that particular passage. As I explained, the argument about the text is not an "either/or" argument. The debate over the inclusion of this passage in John is older than the King James Version itself. I mentioned at least three pools of thoughts in my post: 1.) The passage is original to John and falls in perfect sequence with this particular rendering; 2.) It is not original to John and its origin cannot be verified; and, 3.) It is written by John but is out-of-sequence and was inserted into this passage at a later time.

However, there are other possibilities to also consider. Some scholars and even early Church leaders (such as Papias of Hierapolis circa 125 A.D.) attribute this passage to the Gospel of the Hebrews. Other scholars believe that the passage was fragmented from the Apostolic Constitutions (~375 A.D.). Others have argued that it was worded from a fragment and felt "authentic" to the point that it was inserted into the Book of John.

So, while we can say that it is either "inspired" or not, we can't conclude that it was "mischievously inserted" regardless of inspiration. That would be like suggesting that the word "Easter" was "mischievously inserted" by translators of the KJV— even though we really don't know the rationale.

Quote:

So then the question we must ask ourselves is Did God inspire it to be in the text or is the enemy behind its insertion??

The only way I know of determining this is not by looking at two manuscripts that may be the oldest but that differ more than any other from the majority of all other manuscripts.

For such a theory of determining what should be Omitted or else included throws the entire biblical canon into question, because of these "oldest manuscripts that many text critics and scholars find to be the most reliable" are Referring mostly to the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

Again, I think that you misunderstand the debate over this particular passage. It isn't just two sources that doubt the full authenticity of the passage itself. Some of the early texts that actually included the passage did so with hesitation— noting it with an asterisk or lemniscus because of questions regarding authenticity, origin, sequence or placement.

Quote:

The Sinaiticus in which as with The Vaticanus I find to be exalted above measure, by modern text critics and scholars,. This Sinaiticus also contained the Epistle of Barnabas, and portions of The Shepherd of Hermas.

So if We determine that their validity is superior to that of the majority of all the other existing manuscripts based on their age, and conclude that it is justifiable to remove complete sound verses from our bibles, Then the next logical question is should we also include the Epistle of Barnabas, and portions of The Shepherd of Hermas. and if we add the Epistle of Barnabas, and portions of The Shepherd of Hermas to our biblical cannon, then the next logical question becomes Did God ever put His thumb of protection over any of the biblical cannon that we have today ? and if He did not, then could our entire cannon that has been excepted as authentic be brought into question? Do you see where this mindset leads? It leads men like Bart D. Ehrman to go from being a Moody graduate to Wheaton and from there to Princeton to study under Bruce M Metzger into complete agnosticism and as an expert text critic and scholar writing 'Misquoting Jesus' 'Jesus Interrupted' and such, anti Biblical anti Christian literature.

I think that it is a stretch to conclude that those who might scrutinize or question the authenticity of passages of a particular disputed text are in danger of meandering into "complete agnosticism." The goal of a text critic or translator is to do what they can to be accurate with their undertaking. Again: The translators of versions like the NIV did not omit the passage, but simply notated the fact that the earliest manuscripts and other ancient witnesses did not contain the passage. That is an accurate account from those translators.

As for the "Epistle of Barnabas:" If we are going to scrutinize the Sinaiticus for including it, then should we also question how "perfect and preserved" the King James Version actually is for including fifteen additional books of the Apocrypha until the 19th century?

As I mentioned previously, there are serious questions about how "perfect" the KJV can be if it lacks the "Book of Enoch" – which is mentioned in the Epistle of Jude. In fact, there are other books that are mentioned elsewhere in Scripture that didn't make it into our "perfect and preserved" KJV. We don't have the Book of Jasher, the Records of Nathan, the Book of Shemaiah, the Book of Jehu, the Book of Gad, the Acts of Uzziah or other books, writings or prophecies referenced elsewhere in the Word of God.

If one were to argue that the Bible is "perfect and preserved" and that the King James Version is the designated standard for that title, then why did it contain 15 books of the Apocrypha for hundreds of years yet lack the books actually referenced elsewhere in Scripture?

Quote:

The view that we are in the process of reconstructing the originals takes no faith, It takes Zero faith. many none Christians such as Erhman work at trying to determine what the originals actually said.

When you go down this path who is to say that the first Christians were not actually the gnostics, and that latter forgers changed things, who is to say?? It is a slippery slope, a sea of doubt,

It is a denial of the sovereign hand of God in willing the Bible that we have today.

Again, I think that what you are suggesting is well outside of where honest, sincere textual criticism will lead.

I think that it is very important to remember that we are blessed in this day and age with the Word of God (regardless of the language or scholarly version). Brother Ravenhill wrote a book entitled SODOM HAD NO BIBLE. It is about the judgment of God fell upon an area that really didn't have access to Scripture. Yet, the same can be said of nearly ALL the world (at least until Johan Gutenberg came along).

The Bible was a set of writings that were eventually gathered together into one edition. The Israelites didn't carry around the Book of Genesis in the desert. Jews didn't carry around copies of the Gensis, Exodus, Psalms, Proverbs or even the Book of Kings in their pockets. Most early Christians didn't have immediate access to Scripture in their homes. For the first 14-15 centuries after Christ, most people never had the opportunity to hold the Word of God in their hands or read it in their native languages. In the 15th Century, Johan Gutenberg created a press to print the Bible and spread it to the world in the native language of the reader. What an amazing and wonderful thing!

So, how did believers throughout the ages "learn" from God? While they didn't have access to the written Word of God, they always had access to Jesus Christ -- the eternal Word.

During a mission trip deep inside of the rugged, pine-covered mountains of the Sierra Madre Occidental, I met a Tarahumara pastor who "found" the Lord without having ever heard about God, Jesus or the Bible. Most of the isolated Tarahumara do not speak Spanish and follow their own version of Animism (the belief in spiritual gods and beings that are seen or represented by the physical). If someone gets sick, they might think that they insulted a big tree or river. This Tarahumara man grew sick and undertook a seven-day run to a Mexican village that had a doctor who helped the Tarahumara. The doctor informed the Tarahumara that he was dying. He asked him, "Do you want to die here or at your home?" So, this Tarahumara man journeyed back to his cave in the mountain village where they lived.

One night (as his condition grew worse), he sat out on the mountain. He was looking up at the stars. The Tarahumara believe that each star is a spirit or god. In his yearning to know the truth, it dawned on him that there might be one god who was above all others. He wondered, "What if there is a single god that created EVERYTHING?"

Then, the Lord spoke to this dying Tarahumara man. He said, "I am the Lord God that created all things. If I heal you, will you serve me?"

This Tarahumara man said, "Yes." He began to love and serve the "one true living God." Over time, this man learned to speak and, eventually, read in Spanish. He eventually read a Bible (in Spanish) that he was given in a Mexican village. This man was astonished to find that many of the things that the "one true living God" was speaking to him were recorded in the Book. This man eventually began converting others to Christ and is now a pastor in that same village.

I am always astonished when I hear individuals scowl at other scholarly versions of the Bible or who argue that the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" version of the Word of God. If they aren't suggesting some grand collusion of corruption (regarding non-KJV translations), they often fail to remember the history of the Word of God or just how scarce that it has been throughout the ages – and even now.

I was telling my wife about how I would spend \$7 Billion if I had it. I told her that I would like to create an efficient printing press and publish quality physical copies of the Bible in every language possible...and then distribute them throughout the rest of the world for free. I would like to cover the Earth with the Word of God.

While my wife agreed that this would be a noble undertaking, she smiled and reminded me that the Word of God is available all over the Earth – and throughout the universe. In fact, He is as close as a prayer. I smiled and couldn't help but think of that Tarahumara pastor now overseeing a growing congregation.

Quote:

What do you suppose would be or would have been the effect had the NIV decided to be consistent in their translational methods by not inserting the last 12 verses of Mark nor the beloved 'Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11' ??

Could the effect have possibly been similar to that of Zondervans TNIV translation that flopped because of the gender neutral controversy.

First of all, no hypothetical is necessary. The translators of the NIV did not omit these passages at all. They simply noted them and explained the "earliest manuscripts and many other ancient witnesses" do not contain them. We shouldn't meander into questioning "consistency" when they did what they did for the reasons that they gave. If you have further questions, I suggest that you contact them yourself. In fact, I have questioned them about such things and they were more than willing to explain their rationales and reasons.

As for the TNIV, it would be important for you to mention that it is a revision that is not connected to the translation process of the NIV. The TNIV simply used the NIV as its base...and nothing more. It is the equivalent of the NKJV in that the translators of the KJV did not have "say" in the creation of the NKJV.

Quote:

There is no more justification for omitting many of those 17 sound verses in the NIV than there would be for omitting the beloved 'Pericope De Adultera, John ch 7:53-8:11' other than to omit such a beloved and large portion of scripture would be likely to cause such an outcry of critics as to cause such a translation to become discontinued.

Again, each passage is different. There are different reasons for the decisions in wording and omission by the translators of various versions of the Word of God. I suggest that you contact the TRANSLATORS and ascertain their reasons rather than reading about them elsewhere. However, I would like to say that the NIV does contain EVERY verse that is in

question. They are contained in footnotes with an accompanying explanation as to the reason why. This isn't just true of what you call "omitted" verses (although you can't "omit" something that the sources that you deem most credible do not contain), but also of alternate renderings. The KJV also contained alternate renderings and postulates in the margins as well as footnotes, but they weren't allowed to keep those in the final printed editions.

Quote:

I point this out because in past threads many have stated that they appreciate the modern translators sticking to their convictions and not inserting so much of the scriptures because they are not found in a couple of the supposed oldest manuscripts, but if such is because of conviction of the translators, then how come are they not consistent in their translation methods??

I don't think that they were "sticking to their convictions" except to produce a translation as honestly as they could. BTW, their sources were "supposed oldest manuscripts." They were the oldest manuscripts that they had available. The translators of the NIV used EVERY possible manuscript for reference (including those from the Byzantine text-types and the gathered, sifted work at translation by Erasmus, the Textus Receptus). The translators of the NIV were not confined to a list of prohibitions, so they were able to include ALL of those passages and alternate renderings in the margins, text and footnotes. They were simply noted as such. This isn't "sticking to convictions" but simply producing an accurate and honest scholarly translation.

BTW, if you read the writings of Erasmus about his effort, one could reason that he would have used Alexandrian text-type if it had been readily available to him. He simply used what he had, sifted through it and pieced them together in order to produce a single, cohesive "Received Text." As mentioned, even his sources were limited to the point that he had to borrow from other texts to finish sections (like the Book of Revelation).

Quote:

So how about rather than coming to a conclusion on omitting 17 complete verses and omitting many partial verses and changing some of the verses based on them not being found in a couple of the manuscripts.
Instead what if we challenged their validity similar to how a bank teller is trained to spot a counterfeit, that is by comparing it to all of the other authentic ones.

By which I personally conclude all of the omissions as inspirational and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:
That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, and thus I find it unjustifiable to omit such sound verses.

Wow – that is quite some work and skill that you have! I didn't know that you are fluent in ancient languages, manuscripts and text criticism so much so that you have examined and validated that Erasmus's work was accurate (for the Textus Receptus) or that all of those ancient manuscripts that contained such verses or passages (including those that noted certain questions of validity) are beyond dispute. Or, did you simply read about such things?

You see, we can fancy ourselves with an ability to "spot a counterfeit" or "straining a gnat" when it comes to other versions, yet we so often find ourselves unwilling or unable to apply that same level of criticism to the KJV or even the Textus Receptus.

There are text critics, historians, manuscript experts and language experts who have done that. They are learned in Ancient Greek and are experts in manuscripts and text criticism. They have their reasons for why they believe as they do. I suggest that, instead of reading about why they believe as they do or decided as they did, you should CONTACT them and raise the very issues that you have raised here. They were kind enough to answer many of my questions (even though it doesn't mean that I readily agree with them). However, they will likely provide you some insight into their reasons and rationale. They will also answer some of the myths, rumors or even accusations that are so often spread about certain versions (or translators) of the Bible.

Re: Charisma House Announces 'Most Modern Version' of KJV, on: 2013/2/11 15:35

Quote:
-----Then, the Lord spoke to this dying Tarahumara man. He said, "I am the Lord God that created all things. If I heal you, will you serve me?"

This Tarahumara man said, "Yes."

Praise God for this testimony. How utterly wonderful and true!

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/11 16:54

Hi ccchhhrrriiisss

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote ///I think that you misunderstand the nature of the debate over that particular passage. As I explained, the argument about the text is not an "either/or" argument. The debate over the inclusion of this passage in John is older than the King James Version itself. I mentioned at least three pool of thoughts in my post: 1.) The passage is original to John and falls in perfect sequence with this particular rendering; 2.) It is not original to John and its origin cannot be verified; and,///

Probably in your sincerity, and I do not at all doubt your sincerity, you scratch your head at how I could interpret and respond to your post as I do.

Because that is exactly what I feel when I read your responses to my post.

I ask myself How could he not get the jest of what I am saying and totally misinterpret and give an absolute rabbit trail of a response.

Your 3 rational pool of thoughts, totally deny the point that I am trying to make, and that is the Spiritual reality of the text, in which there are only 2 choices.

You totally missed the jest of my entire point. Almost Everything that you presented (and very well done I might add) is opinioned by learned men it is debated by learned men their conclusions no matter how scholarly are nothing more than theories, and they have never and never will come to absolute agreement. So bringing up 'Papias of Heiropolis' or 'Apostolic Constitutions' makes no difference to me.

It much reminds me of Debating the existence of God with an atheist they always want to go to the fossil record and fossil dating and radiometric age dating and talk about all of the information that points to the earth being 4.54 ± 0.05 billion years old, and talk all about the opinioned facts of evolutionary biology, and deem any one whom disagrees with them as just ignorant of the facts.

And then they will Ask why are you so certain that Christianity is the right religion why not Islam or Buddhism or some ancient pagan religion that is much older than Christianity and on and on.

The reason I believe in God, and The Reason I believe The Christian God, and The reason I Believe that God has sovereignly inspired every jot and tittle exactly the way He wants for the English speaking people in the KJV, for our generation is because of the inward certainty that is with me. That inward certainty is the substance and the evidence not some radiometric age dating or some fragment from the Apostolic Constitutions

on another note though the story about Tarahumara man. (Wonderful!!)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2013/2/11 19:41

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

Probably in your sincerity, and I do not at all doubt your sincerity, you scratch your head at how I could interpret and respond to your post as I do. Because that is exactly what I feel when I read your responses to my post. I ask myself How could he not get the jest of what I am saying and totally misinterpret and give an absolute rabbit trail of a response.

Well, I am not responding to your intent but the specific words that you typed. Hence, that was the purpose of first quoting your statement and then providing a response -- so that the context of my response is clear. What specific gist is it that you think that I am "missing" or "misinterpreting" to the point that you assume that I am giving an "absolute rabbit trail" response?

Quote:

Your 3 rational pool of thoughts, totally deny the point that I am trying to make, and that is the Spiritual reality of the text, in which there are only 2 choices.

You totally missed the jest of my entire point. Almost Everything that you presented (and very well done I might add) is opinionated by learned men it is debated by learned men their conclusions no matter how scholarly are nothing more than theories, and they have never and never will come to absolute agreement. So bringing up 'Papias of Heiropolis' or 'Apostolic Constitutions' makes no difference to me.

That is PRECISELY why I mentioned those things. Yes, there is a debate among scholars over the authenticity, and/or authorship and/or sequential placement of the passage that you brought up. I simply pointed out that this debate goes back many, many centuries -- and even predates the translation of the KJV itself. I mention this whereas to dispel any thought that questions over that passage was not a "modern" phenomenon that was delegated to translators of modern versions of the Bible. Translators who used the Byzantine text-type also had questions over that particular passage (which is why I offered the rebuttal to your introduction of that passage into this conversation).

I also wanted to point out that the translators of the NIV did what they could to honestly and openly explain the debate -- that the oldest manuscripts and other ancient witnesses did not include the passage in John 7:53-8:11. I don't fault those translators for mentioning this as a margin note or footnote.

Is the passage authentic? I have already explained that I don't know with absolute certainty. However, that doesn't mean that the context is not worth acknowledging. There is no passage in the Bible that specifically states "Jesus love you," but I understand that those words are a timely and accurate descriptions of His love for us. I cherish the written "Logos." I came to Christ on the day that the words of Matthew 11:28-30 both inspired and tugged at me. However, I am transformed by the eternal "Rhema."

Quote:

It much reminds me of Debating the existence of God with an atheist they always want to go to the fossil record and fossil dating and radiometric age dating and talk about all of the information that points to the earth being 4.54 ± 0.05 billion years old, and talk all about the opinionated facts of evolutionary biology, and deem any one whom disagrees with them as just ignorant of the facts.

And then they will Ask why are you so certain that Christianity is the right religion why not Islam or Buddhism or some ancient pagan religion that is much older than Christianity and on and on.

Brother, you are not speaking with an atheist, Buddhist or Islamist. You are speaking with believers in Jesus Christ. They may (or may not) have a different opinion about certain matters pertaining to which Bible sources or translations are superior to others. However, it helps in these discussions not to dismiss believers -- who are pursuing the same unprejudiced truth of the matter as you are -- with some consideration of them as "closed-minded," "blind" or even "the enemy." Thankfully, that hasn't happened in this thread. However, many of the many Bible version debates on SermonIndex often turn out that way.

Quote:

The reason I believe in God, and The Reason I believe The Christian God, and The reason I Believe that God has sovereignly inspired every jot and tittle exactly the way He wants for the english speaking people in the KJV, for our generation is because of the inward certainty that is with me. That inward certainty is the substance and the evidence not some radiometric age dating or some fragment from the Apostolic Constitutions

I don't believe in God BECAUSE of the KJV. I am a Christian because I believe in, long to know and have given myself to Jesus Christ our Lord.

I do admire and embrace the King James Version, but I believe what the translators of the KJV said about their finished work. It is not -- and never was intended to be considered -- perfect. There are some mistakes and errors in the translation process and there may be some passages in which the wording could have been somewhat more accurate. "Easter" in Acts 12 is an obvious error. There were revisions (mostly minor or grammar-based) in the text over 150 years. There are some areas where the numbers were wrong. There are some areas in which the numbers between one book and another contradict one another.

On a personal level, I use the KJV, NASB and NIV almost exclusively. I often read the Word of God while cross-referencing each of them for a different perspective or simply to see how the various translators worded something. For the most part, I feel that they are in agreement on every essential matter. Even in the areas that they might (or seem to) disagree, the essential doctrines are still there.

In regard to Bible translation, I do not trust my own intuition on specific textual perfection -- no matter how spiritual or inspired I might feel it to be. I strongly embrace the KJV as a faithful translation from the sets of source materials used in its creation. I feel the same way about versions like the NASB and NIV. I have gained much from studying all three of these versions...and many others here on SermonIndex and elsewhere have stated the same.

If there is any "rabbit trails," I often wonder if it is by looking at Bible versions and translations with suspicion or discussing it with an attempt to not recognize the great things that have come from other scholarly versions. I hope that this makes some sense. There are many people in this nation and other lands who don't have a written version of the Word of God. How tragic! In the United States, we are flooded with Scripture...and yet we spend so much time debating over whether one (or more) are "perfect" and if that disqualifies the other versions that we don't prefer.

We have never lived at a more blessed time in human history in which we have been given so much in terms of knowledge of the written Word. I wonder: Have we shown a return for the investment of those who have come before us?

The Lord bless you.

Re: - posted by a-servant, on: 2013/2/12 0:35

some wisdom... exactly 100 years ago:

The Pulpit Commentary (1913)
Isaiah by H.D.M. Spence

"The title daystar is truly Christ's but will be confiscated by the antichrist of whom Babylon is a type and mystical Babylon is a forerunner. And Satan will assume it, who is the spirit that energizes the heathen world power Babylon, that now energizes the apostate church and shall at last energize the secular antichrist. . .and his champion the false prophet."

2 Peter 1:19 Â We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that

shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. 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.

Revelation 22:16 & I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.

So H.D.M. Spence said there will be a switch in "Christ persona" in mystical Babylon, and that before the time of antichrist's rule.

Is there any evidence that would support that claim?

NIV Isaiah 14:12, 15

How you have fallen from heaven O morning star, son of the dawn. . .but you are brought down to the grave.

NASB Isaiah 14:12, 15

How you have fallen from heaven O star of the morning, son of the dawn. . .you will be thrust down to Sheol.

The above two examples want to make the reader believe that the morning star is the same that also said "I will be like the most High" in Isaiah 14:13

Isa 14:13 & For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.

That's quite an identity switch where the real Jesus Christ is portrayed to be the 'fallen one'. Who can even say things like that? The same spirit that will later do the same:

Rev 13:6 & And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.