

**General Topics :: TNIV - Your Thoughts??**

**TNIV - Your Thoughts?? - posted by Mr\_Nath, on: 2005/3/18 18:59**

An open question, what is your personal feelings towards to newly released version of the Bible, the 'Today's New International Version'??

In Christ,

Mr Nath.

**Re: TNIV - Your Thoughts?? - posted by Mr\_Nath, on: 2005/3/18 19:03**

And a strange question I know - but who is the person in my Avatar Icon?? I picked it as it seems to look strangely like me, my wife hesitantly agrees as well. :/

And here is a link to the (<http://www.tniv.info/index.php>) TNIV Site

**Re: - posted by Matt25 (), on: 2005/3/19 20:26**

Just another *Bible* based on the wrong texts. I am not a "KJV Only" advocate and I do not believe that any translation from the original Greek/Hebrew text is divinely inspired. Many "KJV Only" enthusiasts believe that ONLY the KJV translators have given us God's perfect word in English. Some "KJV Only" Enthusiasts even believe that the KJV has actually improved upon the original Greek/Hebrew texts. I believe the KJV most accurately translates the original manuscripts off all available English Bible versions but I do not believe it is the only valid English Translation.

That being said, most (if not all) of our modern versions (NIV, NASB, GOOD NEWS, LIVING, NKJV, etc.) are clearly flawed. From dynamic equivalence, to pure paraphrase, to the texts they base their translations on, there are serious questions that should be raised about the wide acceptance of every new translation coming out today. One thing that even laymen should notice when comparing the modern versions with the KJV is how all of the modern versions completely omit verses, words, or phrases. The numbering is retained but in the case of removed verses the text will jump from say Matthew 18:10 to 18:12. Matthew 18:11 is completely omitted but the numbering stays the same so no one will notice unless they attempt to read Matthew 18:11. Another thing more mature Christians should notice is how everywhere a modern version does depart from the Textus Receptus (received text) it always removing, never adding. And in many cases the omissions have direct effects on doctrine such as the Trinity, Salvation, or Christ's deity. There are numerous examples of this and I am not trying to start a KJV vs. all other translations war here. My feeling is that no one is reading the Bible anymore, otherwise all of these new translations would be critiqued more heavily than they are.

**Re: - posted by Mr\_Nath, on: 2005/3/20 1:29**

I currently choose to read the KJV but I think I need to learn Greek/Hebrew :)

In Christ,

Mr Nath.

**Re: - posted by Angyl, on: 2005/3/20 18:12**

Quote:

-----and have actually improved upon the original Greek/Hebrew texts.  
-----

Um...no we don't.

Or I should not generalize, as you have. We certainly don't ALL believe that the KJV version is actually improved over the Greek/Hebrew. 'fact I've never met a KJV-onlyist who holds that view.

Otherwise, I agree with most of your points.

**Re: - posted by Am\_Lovin\_HIM (), on: 2005/3/20 22:54**

Greetings brothers and sisters in Christ:

I begin with Quoting Matt25:

That being said, most (if not all) of our modern versions (NIV, NASB, GOOD NEWS, LIVING, NKJV, etc.) are clearly flawed. From dynamic equivalence, to pure paraphrase, to the texts they base their translations on, there are serious questions that should be raised about the wide acceptance of every new translation coming out today. One thing that even a layman should notice when comparing the modern versions with the KJV is how all of the modern versions completely omit verses, words, or phrases.

This blatant attack on the Word of God should be the concern of every believer.

2 Timothy 2:15 the Word tells us to Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, right dividing the work of truth. 16. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness.

2 Peter 3:18 encourages... But grow in grace (not only is this the unmerited favor from God but it is also the divine influence of God upon the hearts of man and its reflection in the life of every man), and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ...

We can only do this when we have the Word of God hidden in our hearts. The Holy Spirit is our teacher, instructing and comforting us.

Hosea 4:6 My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge:

because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children.

We are familiar with the first half of the above verse, but how many read and understand the second half of the same verse?

God is not a man that He should lie, He watches over His word to perform it. The Word of God does not return void.

Satan can not come to us as he is, so he must be crafty as he was in Gen. 3:1 when he twisted the Word of God in speaking to Eve (a picture of the flesh, the weaker vessel). Since the enemy of our souls can not come directly at the church (2 Corinthians 11: 14-15), he slides in the side door, he comes in the back door, he works subtly within the body of Christ. He is a thief, a robber and a destroyer. We all know this but we forget how subtle his craftiness can be and are unaware that he knows the Word of God more than most of the body of Christ.

What a sad statement this is: GOD'S PEOPLE ARE DESTROYED FOR LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE WORD OF GOD.

If he can not get us blatantly then he will come in the side door and ATTACK THE WORD OF GOD with these versions which change the Word of our Lord. We must be careful to STUDY to show ourselves workmen, accurately handling the Word.

With this said, I once carried the NASB, until one day I found numerous verses had been OMITTED completely. Then I purposed in my heart to research the versions, I choose the KJV as my primary reader, but do will sometimes refer to the alternate versions when doing a deep study. Yes they can have their place but once again we must take HEED, for even the elect may be deceived. I have a KJV published in 1898 and the one I carry today... NO CHANGES!!

I challenge you to go to

<http://www.av1611.org>

Look for the Articles: Bible Verses Removed from New Versions and Bible Words Removed from New Versions and a Bible Version Comparison chart.

This will give you a lot of information so you can be truly ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear: ... 1 Peter 3:15

What better way than to attack the standard and cause confusion within the body of Christ? How many have noticed that

not many people are even carrying their sword to worship? If they do, the covers are still nice and new, not even having been wielded properly? We can not fight without the weapons given to us from the Father! THE WORD OF GOD IS A 2-EDGED SWORD!

Proverbs 1:7 The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction.

Proverbs 3:5-8 Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him and he shall direct thy paths. Be not wise in thine own eyes: fear the Lord and depart from evil.

Proverbs 2:1-22 Reward of heeding wisdom.

Quoting Matt25:

My feeling is that no one is reading the Bible anymore, otherwise all of these new translations would be critiqued more heavily than they are.

I close with the word from REV. 3: 20 - 22

BEHOLD, I stand at the door (your heart) and knock: if any man hear my voice (the WORD), and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne even as I also overcame, and am sat down with my Father in his throne.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.

Brothers and Sisters in Christ, I admonish you to grab hold of the WORD OF GOD TODAY FOR IT IS LIFE AND HEALTH TO YOUR SOUL! JESUS IS THE WORD OF GOD MADE FLESH. HE IS THE MANNA WHICH BRINGS LIFE TO OUR SPIRIT. WE ARE TO DESIRE THE WORD MORE THAN OUR OWN FOOD.

SET A STANDARD FOR THOSE AROUND YOU! GET IN THE WORD, DON'T SETTLE FOR A TRANSLATION, AN INTERPRETATION, OR A WATERED DOWN VERSION.

1 Corinthians 14:33 For God is not an author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints.

I remain

Am\_Lovin\_HIM

**Re: - posted by Am\_Lovin\_HIM (), on: 2005/3/20 23:04**

BIBLE VERSION COMPARISON

by Terry Watkins

"...ye have perverted the words of the living God. . ." Jeremiah 23:36

The following table lists 300 verses that have been changed in the seven most popular versions.

#### THE SEVEN MOST POPULAR VERSIONS

NI New International Version

NAS New American Standard Version

NKJ New King James Version

RS Revised Standard Version

NRS New Revised Standard Version

LB The Living Bible

NC New Century Version

VERSE DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE CHANGED IN...

Matt. 1:25 REM "Firstborn" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 5:22 REM "without a cause" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 5:44 REM 12 WORDS "bless them that curse you..." NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 6:13 REM LAST 14 WORDS (For thine is the kingdom...) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 6:27 CHG "cubit to his stature" TO "hour to his life" et. al. NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 6:33 REM "of God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 8:29 REM "Jesus" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 9:13 REM "to repentance" (see also Mark 2:17) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 11:23 REM hell NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC

Matt. 12:6 REM "one greater" TO "something greater" NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Matt. 12:35 REM "of the heart" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Matt. 12:40 CHG "whale" TO "fish", sea monster NI, NAS, NKJ, NRS, LB, NC

Matt. 12:47 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, RS, NRS,  
Matt. 13:51 REM "Lord" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 15:8 REM "draweth nigh unto me with their mouth" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 16:3 REM "o ye hypocrites" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 16:18 REM hell NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
Matt. 16:20 REM "Jesus" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 17:21 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Matt. 18:11 REM ENTIRE VERSE (key verse) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Matt. 18:26 REM and worshipped him (for Jesus) NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
Matt. 19:9 REM LAST 11 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 19:17 CHG "Why callest thou me good" TO "Why do you ask me about what is good" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Matt. 19:17 REM "God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS  
Matt. 20:7 REM "and whatsoever is right that shall ye receive" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 20:16 REM "for many be called but few chosen" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 20:20 CHG "worshipping him" TO "kneeling down" NI, NAS, RS, NRS  
Matt. 20:22 REM 12 WORDS "baptized with Christ's baptism" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 21:44 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, RS, NRS, NC  
Matt. 23:14 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Matt. 23:33 CHG damnation TO condemn, et. al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 24:36 ADD "nor the Son" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 24:36 CHG "my Father" TO "the Father" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 25:13 REM "wherein the Son of man cometh" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB  
Matt. 27:35 REM LAST 25 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 27:54 CHG "the Son of God" TO "a son of God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 28:2 REM "from the door" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Matt. 28:9 REM "And as they went to tell his disciples" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 1:1 REM the Son of God NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Mark 1:2 CHG "prophets" TO "Isaiah" (blatant LIE) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 1:14 REM "of the kingdom" (gospel ... of God) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 1:31 REM "immediately" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 2:17 REM "to repentance" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
Mark 3:29 CHG "eternal damnation" TO "eternal sin", et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 6:11 REM LAST 23 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Mark 7:8 REM LAST 15 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 7:16 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 9:24 REM "Lord" (refers to Jesus) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 9:44 REM ENTIRE VERSE (about hell) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 9:46 REM ENTIRE VERSE (about hell) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 9:49 REM "and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 10:21 REM "take up the cross" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 10:24 REM "for them that trust in riches" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Mark 11:10 REM "that cometh in the name of the Lord NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 11:26 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 12:23 REM "when they shall rise" NI, RS, NRS, LB,  
Mark 12:40 CHG greater damnation TO punished most severely", greater condemnation" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 13:6 CHG I am Christ TO I am He, the One NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 13:14 REM "spoken of by Daniel the prophet" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 13:33 REM "and pray" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 14:68 REM "and the cock crew" NI, NAS, RS  
Mark 15:28 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Mark 16:9-20 REM ENTIRE LAST 12 VERSES of Mark 16! NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Luke 1:28 REM "blessed art thou among women" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Luke 2:14 CHG good will toward men TO to men on whom his favor rests"et al NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Luke 2:22 CHG "her" TO "their" (makes Jesus a sinner) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Luke 2:33 CHG "Joseph" TO "his father" (attacks virgin birth) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Luke 2:43 CHG "Joseph and his mother" TO "parents" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Luke 4:4 REM "but by every word of God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Luke 4:8 REM "get thee behind me, Satan" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 4:18 REM 8 WORDS "he hath sent me to heal..." NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
 Luke 4:41 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 6:48 CHG "founded upon a rock" TO "well built" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 9:54 REM "even as Elijah did" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 9:55 REM 9 WORDS "ye know not what manner of spirit..." NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 9:56 REM FIRST 16 WORDS For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 9:57 REM Lord NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 10:15 REM hell NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
 Luke 11:2 REM 15 WORDS from Lords prayer NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 11:4 REM but deliver us from evil (Lord's prayer) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 11:29 REM "the prophet" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 16:23 REM "hell" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 17:36 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 21:4 REM "cast in unto the offerings of God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 21:8 CHG I am Christ TO I am He, the One NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 22:64 REM "they struck him on the face" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
 Luke 23:17 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 23:38 REM "letters of Greek, Latin, Hebrew" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 23:42 REM "Lord" (thief on the cross - getting saved!) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Luke 24:6 REM "He is not here, but is risen" RS, NRS  
 Luke 24:49 REM "of Jerusalem" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB  
 John 1:14, 18 REM "begotten" (refers to Jesus) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 1:27 REM "is preferred before me" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 3:13 REM "which is in heaven" (refers to Jesus) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 3:15 REM "should not perish" (believeth in him...) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 3:16 REM "begotten" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 3:18 REM "begotten" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 4:24 CHG God is a Spirit TO God is Spirit NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 4:42 REM "the Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 5:3 REM LAST 7 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 5:4 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 5:16 REM "and sought to slay him" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 5:29 CHG damnation TO condemn, judgement NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 6:47 REM "on Me" (He that believeth...) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
 John 6:69 CHG "Christ, the Son of the living God" TO "Holy One of God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 7:53-8:11 REM VERSES 7:53 - 8:11 NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 8:9 REM "being convicted by their own conscience" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 8:47 REM "heareth God's words" TO "hears what God says" NI, NC  
 John 8:59 REM LAST 10 WORDS "going through the midst..." NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 9:4 CHG "I must work the works" TO "We must work the works" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 9:35 CHG "Son of God" TO Son of Man, Messiah NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 11:41 REM "For the place where the dead was laid" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 14:2 CHG "mansions" TO "rooms", "dwelling places" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 14:16 CHG Comforter TO Helper, Counselor, et. al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
 John 16:16 REM "because I go to the Father" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 John 17:12 REM "in the world" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
  
 Acts 1:3 CHG "infallible" TO "convincing" et al. NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Acts 2:30 REM "he would raise up Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Acts 2:31 REM "hell" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
 Acts 2:38 CHG remission of sins TO forgiveness of sins NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Acts 4:27,30 CHG "holy child" TO "holy servant" (attacks deity) NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Acts 7:30 REM "of the Lord" (angel of the Lord) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Acts 7:37 REM "Him shall ye hear" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Acts 8:37 REM ENTIRE VERSE (major salvation verse) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Acts 9:5 REM "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 10:6 REM "he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 15:11 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 15:18 CHG beginning of the world TO ...eternity, ...ages NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 15:34 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 16:31 REM "Christ" (Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 17:16 CHG "stirred" TO "provoked", distressed et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 17:22 CHG "Mars Hill" TO "Areopagus" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC

Acts 17:22 REM "superstitious" TO "religious" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 17:26 REM "blood" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 17:29 CHG Godhead TO Divine Nature , divine being NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 19:35 REM worshipper NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 20:21 REM Christ NI, NRS, NC

Acts 20:24 REM "none of these things move me. . ." NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 20:25 REM "of God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB

Acts 23:9 REM "let us not fight against God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 24:7 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Acts 24:14 CHG heresy TO sect NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB

Acts 24:15 REM "of the dead" (Resurrection) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB

Acts 28:16 REM 11 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Acts 28:29 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

  

Romans 1:3 REM "Jesus Christ our Lord" NI, NAS, RS, NRS

Romans 1:16 REM "of Christ" (gospel of Christ) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Romans 1:18 CHG "hold the truth" TO "suppress the truth" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 1:25 CHG "changed the truth" TO "exchanged the truth" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 1:29 REM "fornication" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 5:8 CHG commendeth to demonstrates , et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 6:8 CHG we be dead TO we died NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 6:11 REM our Lord NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Romans 8:1 REM LAST 10 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 9:28 REM "in righteousness" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 10:15 REM LAST 9 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 10:17 CHG "word of God" TO word of Christ NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 11:6 REM "LAST 18 WORDS ARE OMITTED" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 13:2 CHG damnation TO judgment et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 13:9 REM "Thou shall not bear false witness" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 14:6 REM 15 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 14:10 CHG "the judgement seat of Christ" TO "God's judgment seat" et al. NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 14:21 REM "or is offended, or is made weak" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 14:23 CHG damned TO condemned NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 15:8 REM Jesus NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Romans 15:19 REM "of God" NI, NAS, RS, LB, NC

Romans 15:29 REM "of the gospel" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 16:18 CHG good words and fair speeches TO smooth talk and flattery NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Romans 16:24 REM ENTIRE VERSE NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

  

I Cor. 1:21 CHG "foolishness of preaching" TO "foolishness of the message preached" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 1:22 REM "require" TO "request", ask (Jews require a sign) NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 5:4 REM "Christ" (TWICE) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 5:7 REM "for us" (Christ sacrificed) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

I Cor. 6:9 CHG effeminate TO male prostitutes et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 6:20 REM "and in your spirit, which are God's" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

I Cor. 7:5 REM "fasting" (with prayer) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 7:39 REM "by the law" (The wife is bound) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 9:1 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 9:27 CHG "I keep my body" TO "I beat my body" et al. NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 9:27 CHG "castaway" TO "disqualified" et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

I Cor. 10:28 REM LAST 10 WORDS ("the earth is the Lord's...") NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 I Cor. 11:11 REM "in the Lord" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 I Cor. 11:24 REM "take eat . . . broken..." (Lord's Supper) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 I Cor. 11:29 CHG damnation TO judgment (Lord s Supper) NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 I Cor. 11:29 REM "unworthily" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
 I Cor. 14:33 CHG "author of confusion" TO "a God of disorder" et al. NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 I Cor. 15:47 CHG Lord from heaven TO man from heaven NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 I Cor. 15:55 CHG "grave" TO "Hades", death NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 I Cor. 16:22 REM "Jesus Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 I Cor. 16:23 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
  
 2 Cor. 2:10 CHG "person of Christ" TO "presence of Christ" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 2 Cor. 2:17 CHG "corrupt" TO "peddle", sell (word of God) NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 2 Cor.4:6 REM "Jesus" NI, NAS, RS, LB, NC  
 2 Cor. 4:10 REM "the Lord" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 2 Cor. 5:17 CHG "creature" TO "creation" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 2 Cor. 5:18 REM "Jesus" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
 2 Cor.10:5 CHG "Casting down imaginations" TO "We demolish arguments" et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 2 Cor.11:6 CHG rude in speech TO untrained in speech NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 2 Cor.11:31 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS  
  
 Gal. 2:20 REM "nevertheless I LBe" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Gal. 3:1 REM that ye should not obey the truth NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Gal.3:17 REM "in Christ" (confirmed...of God in Christ) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Gal. 4:7 REM "through Christ" (heir of God through Christ) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Gal. 5:4 CHG "no effect" TO "estranged from", alienated NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Gal. 6:15 REM "For in Christ Jesus" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Gal. 6:17 REM "the Lord" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
  
 Ephesians 1:6 REM "accepted in the beloved" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Ephesians 3:9 REM "by Jesus Christ" (who created all things by) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Ephesians 3:14 REM "of our Lord Jesus Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Ephesians 5:9 CHG fruit of the Spirit TO fruit of the light NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Ephesians 5:30 REM "of his flesh, and of his bones" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
  
 Philippians 2:6 CHG "thought it not robbery to be equal with God TO did not consider equality with God something to be grasped et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Philippians 2:7 CHG "made" TO "emptied" NAS, RS, NRS, LB,  
 Philippians 3:8 CHG dung TO rubbish , trash NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Philippians 3:16 REM LAST 13 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Philippians 4:13 CHG through Christ TO through him NI, NAS, RS, NRS  
  
 Colossians 1:2 REM "and the Lord Jesus Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Colossians 1:14 REM "through His blood" (redemption through...) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
 Colossians 1:28 REM "Jesus" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 Colossians 3:6 REM "on the children of disobedience" NI, NAS, RS, LB, NC  
  
 1 Thess. 1:1 REM LAST 9 WORDS (from God our father...) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 1 Thess. 2:19 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS  
 1 Thess. 3:11 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 1 Thess. 3:13 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
 1 Thess. 5:22 CHG "all appearance of evil" TO "every form of evil" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
  
 2 Thess. 1:8 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS  
 2 Thess. 1:12 REM Christ NI, NAS, RS, NRS  
  
 1 Timothy 1:1 REM Lord NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
 1 Timothy 1:17 REM "wise" (the only wise God) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Timothy 2:7 REM "in Christ" (...the truth in Christ) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Timothy 3:16 CHG "God" TO "he" (God manifest in the flesh) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Timothy 4:12 REM "in spirit" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Timothy 5:21 REM Lord NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

1 Timothy 6:1 CHG blasphemed TO spoken against et al. NI, NAS, RS, LB, NC

1 Timothy 6:5 CHG gain is godliness TO godliness is a means of gain et al. NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Timothy 6:5 REM "from such withdraw thyself" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

1 Timothy 6:10 CHG "root of all evil" TO "root of all kinds of evil" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Timothy 6:19 CHG "eternal life" TO "the life that is truly life" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Timothy 6:20 CHG "science" TO "knowledge" NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

2 Timothy 1:11 REM "of the gentiles" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

2 Timothy 2:15 REM "study" (only command to study the word) NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

2 Timothy 3:3 CHG of those that are good TO good NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC

2 Timothy 4:1 REM "the Lord" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

2 Timothy 4:22 REM "Jesus Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Hebrews 1:3 CHG "by himself purged our sins" TO "provided purification for sins" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Hebrews 2:7 REM LAST 10 WORDS (and didst set him over the works...) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Hebrews 3:1 REM "Christ Jesus" (High Priest of our...) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Hebrews 7:21 REM "after the order of Melchisedec" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Hebrews 10:34 REM "in heaven" (ye have in heaven a better) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Hebrews 11:11 REM "was delivered of a child" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

James 5:16 CHG "faults" TO "sins" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

1 Peter 1:22 REM "through the Spirit" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Peter 2:2 REM "of the word" (sincere milk of the word) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Peter 2:2 CHG "grow thereby" TO "grow up in your salvation" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Peter 3:15 CHG the Lord God TO Christ as Lord et al. NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Peter 4:1 REM "for us" (Christ hath suffered for us) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Peter 4:14 REM LAST 15 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Peter 5:10 REM "Jesus" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Peter 5:11 REM "glory (to Him be glory and dominion)" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 Peter 5:14 REM Jesus NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

2 Peter 2:1 CHG damnable TO destructive NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

2 Peter 2:17 REM "for ever" (darkness is reserved for ever) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

2 Peter 3:9 REM "us" TO "you" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 1:7 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 3:16 REM "of God" (love of God) NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 4:3 REM "Christ is come in the flesh" (antichrist) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 4:9 REM "begotten" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 4:19 REM him (We love him, because he first...) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 5:7 REM LAST 15 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 5:8 REM FIRST 9 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 5:13 REM LAST 13 WORDS NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

1 John 5:13 ADD continue to (denys eternal security) NKJ

2 John 1:3 REM the Lord NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Jude 1:25 REM "wise" (Referring to God) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Rev. 1:8 REM "the beginning and the ending" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

Rev. 1:9 REM Christ (TWICE) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC

Rev. 1:11 REM "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last . NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC



Rev. 1:18 REM hell NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
Rev. 2:13 CHG Satan's seat TO Satan s throne NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 2:15 REM "which thing I hate" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 5:14 REM "Him that liveth for ever and ever" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 6:8 REM Hell NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
Rev. 6:17 CHG his wrath TO their wrath NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 8:13 CHG "angel" TO "eagle" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 11:15 CHG "kingdoms" TO "kingdom" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 11:17 REM "and art to come" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 12:12 REM "inhabiters of" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Rev. 12:17 REM "Christ" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 14:5 REM "before the throne of God" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 15:3 CHG King of saints TO King of the ages et al. NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 16:5 REM and shalt be (refers to deity of Jesus) NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 16:7 CHG And I heard another out of the altar say TO And I heard the altar respond NI, NAS, RS, NRS  
Rev. 16:17 REM "of heaven" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Rev. 20:9 REM "from God out of" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Rev. 20:12 CHG "God" TO "throne" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC  
Rev. 20:13 REM hell NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 20:14 REM hell NI, NAS, NKJ, RS, NRS, NC  
Rev. 21:24 REM "of them which are saved" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 22:14 CHG "do his commandments" TO "wash their robes" NI, NAS, RS, NRS, LB, NC  
Rev. 22:21 REM Christ NI, NAS, RS, NRS, NC

this can be found on <http://www.av1611.org/>  
look for the bible comparison chart

I exhort you to let the Spirit of God lead you in your studies....

Re:, on: 2005/3/21 8:21

Quote:  
-----KJV Only enthusiasts believe that the KJV translators have given us God's perfect word in English and have actually improved upon the original Greek/Hebrew texts.  
-----

Wow... not true at all. In fact, it's a very **small** minority of people who believe that, and it does not represent the vast majority.

As with anything, there are people who take things to an extreme. If you read the writings of KJV supporters you will find that the credible ones do not support at all what you have stated. Thats just another un-truth thrust upon an unsuspecting church that doesnt bother to take the time to actually examine the Bible version issue for themselves.

The TNIV is another attack on the Word of God in a long line of previous attacks... from the RSV (Wescott & Hort) on. These "bibles" are not even based on the same greek text as the KJV, the Reformation Bibles, Tyndale, Wycliff... etc. Any one who has even studied just the basics of the Bible version issue understands this.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/3/21 9:39**

If it were not for the gender neutral emphasis in the TNIV it would have actually been closer to a formal equivalence translation than the NIV which is a dynamic equivalence translation.

I am of the same opinion that the TNIV and the NIV use inferior texts to translate the New Testament.

**Re: I've edited my original text regarding "KJV Only" advocates - posted by Matt25 (), on: 2005/3/21 11:51**

I edited my original statement regarding KJV Only advocates. Poor job of clarifying what I meant. I know not all KJV Only advocates believe that the KJV improved upon the received text. I am mainly lashing out at those who treat the KJV like it is a new revelation and divinely inspired as a translation. I believe only the original text is divinely inspired and as such any translation from that text into another language is subject to man's flaws. The KJV is the best available English translation because it is based on the true text -- the received text.

**Re:, on: 2005/3/21 13:19**

Quote:  
-----I edited my original statement regarding KJV Only advocates. Poor job of clarifying what I meant. I know not all KJV Only advocates believe that the KJV improved upon the received text. I am mainly lashing out at those who treat the KJV like it is a new revelation and divinely inspired as a translation. I believe only the original text is divinely inspired and as such any translation from that text into another language is subject to man's flaws. The KJV is the best available English translation because it is based on the true text -- the received text.  
-----

Very well said... and you agree with probably 85% of the people who are labeled as KJV-Only. Welcome to our cult! :-P

There really is no reason to lash out at the obscure few who do promote what you were coming against. They are a small voice... and an annoying one at that. Unfortunately, those who promote the modern versions have used the few to stereotype the many. It's kinda like saying "everyone in the south is a hillbilly". It's not true... we're really rednecks. LOL... just kidding. Anyway, you get what I mean.

I wasn't offended, but if I need to forgive you for anything... I do. I'm glad you clarified your statement.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/22 8:32**

I know this thread asked for our thoughts on the TNIV, but I thought I would post this. It is from Terry Watkins' website. I don't believe this is copyrighted... at least I couldn't find anything that said it was:

## **TNIV & HOMOSEXUALITY**

In 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, the word of God delivers a very serious warning against certain sins. Among these sins is sodomy, or homosexuality. The TNIV obscures the seriousness of the judgement on "homosexuals" by confusing the sin of "homosexuals" by adding the word "practicing". It's no longer "homosexuals" but "practicing homosexuals".

1 Corinthians 6:8-10, TNIV

8 Instead, you yourselves cheat and do wrong, and you do this to your brothers and sisters.

9 Or do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor practicing homosexuals

10 nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

Practicing homosexuals?

Where did the TNIV translators ever come up with such a biased, unwarranted, pro-homosexual wording? Why didn't they say "practicing" adulterers, "practicing" thieves, or "practicing" drunkards, or "practicing" slanderers? Hmm. . . Why just "practicing homosexuals"?

The TNIV translators pull the same trick in 1 Timothy 1:10

1 Timothy 1:9-10, TNIV

9 We also know that the law is made not for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers,  
10 for the sexually immoral, for those practicing homosexuality, for slave traders and liars and perjurers. And it is for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine  
Why not "practicing" murders, or "practicing" liars, or "practicing" slave traders?

The fact is – every time "practicing" shows up in the TNIV it ONLY applies to "homosexuals". And the fact is – every time "homosexual" shows up in the TNIV it is blurred with "practicing". There is no basis in the Greek text for adding the word "practicing".

Why do the homosexuals get special treatment? Hmm. . .

What's the difference between a "homosexual" and a "practicing homosexual"? Are the TNIV translators implying it's ok to be a homosexual, just not a "practicing homosexual"? Are the TNIV translators saying that it's ok for homosexuals to engage in a "monogamous" homosexual relationship? Just as long as they don't "practice"? Are the TNIV translators implying that God created homosexuals?

What are the TNIV really trying to say?

Boy. . . oh boy. . . You talk about opening a confusing "can of worms". . .

### **HOMOSEXUALITY AND THE ORIGINAL "NIV":**

The NIV-TNIV translators and the sin of sodomy or homosexuality have an on-going sympathetic relationship.

The "original" NIV is also very kind to homosexuals. 1 Corinthians 6:9, in the "original" NIV is translated "homosexual offenders". Not just "homosexuals" but "homosexual OFFENDERS". And again, the obvious implication is "homosexuality" is fine. It's just "homosexual OFFENDERS" that's the problem.

1 Corinthians 6:9-10, in the "original" NIV:

Surely you know that the people who do wrong will not inherit God's kingdom. Do not be fooled. Those who sin sexually, worship idols, take part in adultery, those who are male prostitutes, or homosexual offenders nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

The pro-homosexual, website, Religious Tolerance, heartily agrees with the NIV's "homosexual friendly" translation of 1 Corinthians 6:9

"The NIV contains the phrase: "homosexual offenders." Suppose for the moment that Paul had written "heterosexual offenders" or "heterosexual sexual offenders." We would not interpret this today as a general condemnation of heterosexuality; only of those heterosexuals who commit sexual offences. Perhaps the appropriate interpretation of this verse is that it does not condemn homosexuals. Rather it condemns homosexuals who engage in sexual offences."

([http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom\\_bibc1.htm](http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom_bibc1.htm))

The NIV's "homosexual offenders" has lead many to refer to the NIV as the "homosexual version". The "USA forbidden" New International Version Inclusive Language (NIVI) also translates 1 Corinthians 6:9 as "homosexual offenders".

Of all the mainstream translations, the NIV, NIVI and the TNIV are, FAR AND AWAY, the most friendly with homosexuals.

Here's how 1 Corinthians 6:9 reads in some of the other major versions:

New American Standard Version (NASV) "homosexuals"

Revised Standard Versions (RSV) "sexual perverts"

King James Bibles (KJB) "abusers of themselves with mankind"

New Century Version (NCV) "men who have sexual relations with other men"

New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) "sodomites"

New King James Version (NKJV) "sodomites"

The Living Bible (TLB) "homosexuals"

As you can see, homosexuals are much more acceptable in the NIV, NIVI and TNIV.

### THE NIV'S DIRTY LITTLE SECRET. . .

It's a dirty little secret, that radical feminist and lesbian author Virginia Mollenkott was a stylistic consultant for the "original" NIV translation team. Mollenkott, a very outspoken, lesbian and feminist, is the author of at least 11 highly controversial books such as *Is The Homosexual My Neighbor*, *Omnigender: A Trans-Religious Approach*, and *Divine Feminine*.

After being exposed for having an open, militant, homosexual on the NIV translation staff, the NIV crew has vigorously attempted to deny the influence and sexual perversion of Mollenkott. They've claimed Mollenkott's lesbianism was not known when Palmer asked her to participate on the NIV translation process. But Dr. Donald Waite, who taught with her at Shelton College in Ringwood, New Jersey, says he knew she was a lesbian as early as 1962-63—many years before (1978) the NIV was published. Dr. Waite, also has a letter, from Bob Jones, Jr. (Bob Jones University), addressing Mollenkott's attraction to "young girls", as far back as the 1950's. The BJU letter states, "We had a definite problem with her because she insisted on hobnobbing with a few girls when she was employed as a teacher here for one year in the fifties."

And in *Episcopal Witness* (June 1991, pp. 20-23), Mollenkott readily confessed, "My lesbianism has ALWAYS been a part of me. . ." Mollenkott, says in the pro-homosexual *Evangelicals Concerned's* Spring 1997 Record, "I came of age in the 1940s and 1950s, discovering my own sexuality at a time when only negative information was available to me...I was one of the many gay teenagers. . ."

If the NIV staff did not know Mollenkott was a lesbian, it was simply because they did not want to know. It was a Clinton, "don't ask, don't tell" cover-up.

What about Mollenkott's influence on the NIV?

In an interview with Joseph Chambers, Virginia Mollenkott, explained her role in the NIV translation process:

"I worked mainly in solitude. . . they would send me big swatches of translations. . . and 'my job' was to read them with an eye as to how this would communicate with the modern reader, and to indicate if I thought there were any infelicities in language that could be corrected... So, I would write notes all over manuscripts which I was sent, both praising phraseology that I thought was wonderful and raising questions or asking-for instance something I would typically write would be, 'Would the Greek or would the Hebrew permit this word' which would seem to me to be much more understandable or clear to a modern reader?..."

Now, what do you suppose Virginia Mollenkott wrote if she received 1 Corinthians 6:9, or 1 Timothy 1:10? Possibly "homosexual OFFENDERS" rather than a general condemnation of "homosexuals"? Not surprising, the NIV completely removes the word "sodomy".

**Re: - posted by inotof (), on: 2005/3/22 11:28**

Casting in my lot, I have to agree with Krispy's post below. Very powerful information. I don't want to say anything other than I do not approve, will not use or sell it in our bookstore and ever since its inception was pitched at CBA years ago, have opposed it.

**Re: TNIV - Your Thoughts?? - posted by Sentry (), on: 2005/3/22 12:33**

I use KJV, always felt like I should. What about the NEW King James Version? Our Pastor preaches with the NKJV.

On another note, I was teaching a class the other day, and someone said, I don't have that in my bible! (they had NIV)

I can't remember the scripture, but it proves the point.

Re:, on: 2005/3/22 14:08

Quote:

-----What about the NEW King James Version? Our Pastor preaches with the NKJV.  
-----

Proably Phil. 2:6 is the most damning verse for the NKJV. Compare the KJV and the NKJV:

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

NKJV: *Who being in the form of God, **did not consider equality with God something to be grasped***

That is a direct attack on the diety of Jesus Christ.

Compare the following verses between the KJV and the NKJV... and decide for yourself if the NKJV is an accurate Bible:

Lk. 16:23

John 5:24

Acts 2:38

Acts 17:16-17,22

Rom. 1:28-32

Rom. 2:2

Rom. 4:7

I Cor. 1:22

I Cor. 11:29

II Cor. 2:17

II Cor. 5:17

II Cor. 10:5

Gal. 4:17

Gal. 5:4

Eph. 6:12

Phil. 2:8

Phil. 3:2

Col. 2:12

Col. 2:14-15; 17-18

Col. 3:2

I Thess. 5:22

I Thess. 5:23

II Thess. 2:7

II Thess. 2:12

I Tim. 1:4

I Tim. 3:6

I Tim. 4:1

I Tim. 5:1

I Tim. 6:5

I Tim. 6:10

I Tim. 6:20

II Tim. 2:5

II Tim. 2:12-13

II Tim. 2:14-15

II Tim. 4: 2-5

Heb. 12:8

Ja. 5:16

I Jn. 2:2

I Jn. 3:6

I Jn. 3:8- 9

II Jn. 10

Jude 6,8,12,15,19,24  
Rev. 1:18  
Rev. 6:14

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/22 15:02**

One more thing about the NKJV... pronouns. Thee, thou, ye, you... The original languages had different words for "you" singular, and "you" plural. In today's English we use the same word "you" whether we are speaking to one person, or many. The KJV translators used "thee" and "thou" as singular "you", and "ye" and "you" as plural.

For instance, if I say "I want **thee** to sing this song" ... and we are in a room full of people, you know I am speaking to only one person. BUT, if I say "I want **you** to sing this song", then you can know I want everyone in the room to sing.

But when you remove the thees & thous... and use only "you", that is lost, and in many passages of the Bible it changes the meaning... and in some instances, the complete doctrine.

Thats a very simple explanation of this, and I know philologos or someone else can offer a better explanation... but I think you can understand what I'm trying to say.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2005/3/22 16:25**

Quote:

-----Probably Phil. 2:6 is the most damning verse for the NKJV. Compare the KJV and the NKJV:

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

NKJV: Who being in the form of God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped

That is a direct attack on the deity of Jesus Christ.  
-----

Krispy, are you sure you're quoting the Philippians verse from the New King James Version? The verse does not read that way in the online version of the NKJV found at Crosswalk.com, it reads as follows;

who, being in the form of God, did not consider it robbery to be equal with God, (Philippians 2:6)

Here is a link directly to the verse on  
(<http://www.biblestudytools.net/OnlineStudyBible/bible.cgi?new1&wordphilippians+2%3A6&section0&versionnkj&languageen>) NKJV on Crosswalk.com

In Christ,

Ron

**Re: - posted by inotof (), on: 2005/3/22 16:28**

I think the TNIV should be the next candidate for a Revolve NT Mag-Bible :-P :-P

**Re: TNIV - Your Thoughts??, on: 2005/3/22 17:57**

It's funny how passionate people are on this subject...Especially because we are only talking about the English Translation of text. We have to remember that Scripture has been translated into thousands of languages all over the world, thankfully! We have a couple from our church who work for a translation ministry. They have the tedious task of translating Scripture into hundreds of different dialects just for one small country in Africa. No version is perfect!! Even the KJV is flawed!! Besides that the Old English language used in the KJV is very confusing. How do you translate the word Thou or Thee into Chinese?

As far as the TNIV goes I personally have major concerns because it eliminates gender. I would personally not use it because of that!

Leonard Ravenhill once referenced these lines from the old hymn, Break Thou The Bread of Life!

beyond the sacred page I seek thee, Lord;  
my spirit pants for thee, O Living Word!

Ultimately we should be seeking to know the Lord more! Jesus Himself is the Word!

p.s. I'm a NIV, NASB, NKJ version guy!

**Re: - posted by Matt25 (), on: 2005/3/22 20:39**

Quote:

-----Ultimately we should be seeking to know the Lord more! Jesus Himself is the Word!  
-----

Then you see why if the Word is corrupt then our picture of exactly who Jesus is, is corrupt. I am against most of the new translations because I believe they are using the wrong texts. Not sure if you've done any study on this but it is fascinating to see how the new translators are using "new and improved" texts which only make up 5% of all available manuscripts. The other 95% of what is commonly called the Textus Receptus (received text) is ignored all together. If your friends who translate use the correct texts then I'm quite sure their translations are fine. I believe the message of the Gospel is so strong that it can speak even through inferior translations but I also believe that the new translations are bowing to political correctness and to pluralism and the church is suffering because compromise is everywhere.

For example, how is John 6:47 an improvement upon the majority text?

KJV -- Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth **on me** hath everlasting life.

NIV -- I tell you the truth, he who believes has  
everlasting life

NASB -- "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who  
believes has eternal life"

NKJV -- Most assuredly, I say to you, he who  
believes in Me has everlasting life.  
(BUT WITH A NOTE IN THE MARGIN THAT SAYS  
"NU-TEXT OMITTS "ON ME") referring to the  
minority text

Help me figure out how deleting "in me" is NOT an attack on the exclusive claim that Christ made about himself being the only Way, the only truth, and the only life. "He who believes" in what? Allah? Buddah? my Dog?

Quote:

-----Leonard Ravenhill once referenced these lines from the old hymn, Break Thou The Bread of Life!

-----

In his 2 hour long interview which you can download from this site you will hear Ravenhill say these exact words: "I still think the King James version is nearest to the best." If you listen to his sermons you'll also hear Ravenhill refer to the King James as "the Living Bible" implying that the new translations are inferior and compromised.

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 8:09**

Quote:

-----Krispy, are you sure you're quoting the Philippians verse from the New King James Version?  
-----

My mistake... that's how the **NIV** "translates" that verse... not the NKJV.

Even I am capable of a mistake now and then! :-)

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 8:19**

Quote:

-----No version is perfect!! Even the KJV is flawed!! Besides that the Old English language used in the KJV is very confusing. How do you translate the word Thou or Thee into Chinese?  
-----

Instead of just making statements that the KJV is flawed, why not offer some proof. I've not once stated that a version is flawed without backing it up with some evidence.

As far as how Thou and Thee are translated into Chinese... I am no expert in the Chinese language (except that I know what Kung Pow Chicken is). However, if I am not mistaken, the Chinese language does have words for "you" singular and "you" plural, and that is how it would be translated. I found this information in my studies on Bible versions, and so I am trusting that what I read was correct. If I am not correct, I am open to being corrected, if anyone knows any different.

I'm glad your friends are involved in a translation ministry, but the basic difference between the Reformers Bibles, the Bibles of Wycliff and Tyndale, and the KJV **vs.** the modern English "bibles" is the underlying text is completely different.

Reformers Bibles, the Bibles of Wycliff and Tyndale, and the KJV are based on the Received Text, which consists of over 2,000 manuscript witnesses which are in almost complete agreement with the exception of a few minor grammatical nuances.

The modern versions are based on 2 manuscripts, the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus, and these 2 manuscripts don't even agree with each other. Each of them have gaping holes in the text where scripture has been removed, and many scriptures have been altered, compared to the Received Text. Both are heralded by the Roman Catholic Church as the "real" manuscripts, and they claim the Received Text is corrupt. If one wants to trust the Roman Catholic Church on this issue, be my guest... but I surely do not.

If you just go on the odds alone, you have to side with the Received Text. 2,000+ to 2.

But there is much more to it than that. The history of the 2 different schools of manuscripts is very very interesting, and different. I suggest you study it out a little better.

Krispy



**Re: - posted by inotof (), on: 2005/3/23 9:13**

Does anyone know if they use the textus receptus to translate the NIV or do they use another manuscript? Just curious, don't mean to get off subject, but it is relevant.

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 9:51**

Quote:

-----Does anyone know if they use the textus receptus to translate the NIV or do they use another manuscript? Just curious, don't mean to get off subject, but it is relevant.  
-----

You're right... it is extremely relevant because the NIV is the most popular modern version.

The NIV is absolutely **not** based on the same text as the KJV. (Textus Receptus)

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 14:07**

My point was simply that we can't allow the enemy to get us distracted by arguing about which version is the best. My point was that Jesus Himself is who we are seeking and the Holy Spirit reveals Jesus to us. NOT THAT WE DON'T NEED THE BIBLE! You referenced comparisons of John 6:47 but I can just as easily point to Colossians 2:9

"For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form" (Colossians 2:9 NIV).

"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Colossians 2:9 KJV).

I could just as easily say the KJV leaves room for confusion by saying him instead of Christ.

My point is we need to be careful but not so careful we are paranoid!

Also I have seen the whole interview by Leonard Ravenhill. I believe his opinion was KJV was the best. However his point was that we can't make an idol out of the bible and use it to hit people over the head with it.

**Re: TNIV - Your Thoughts?? - posted by Zumb, on: 2005/3/23 14:14**

Right, but the main reason that the newer translators chose those manuscripts is that they were earlier manuscripts not even discovered at the time of translating the KJV in 1611. So yes there are some verses missing and some things added but the same could be said about the KJV.

Nobody has even mentioned the ESV yet, do some research on it. It retains ambiguities gets the most accurate word for word translation, tries to keep poems as poetic as they were. I can't explain it as well as they did.

<http://www.esv.org/translation/philosophy>

Here is what they say

Translation Philosophy

The ESV is an "essentially literal" translation that seeks as far as possible to capture the precise wording of the original text and the personal style of each Bible writer. As such, its emphasis is on "word-for-word" correspondence, at the same time taking into account differences of grammar, syntax, and idiom between current literary English and the original languages. Thus it seeks to be transparent to the original text, letting the reader see as directly as possible the structure and meaning of the original.

In contrast to the ESV, some Bible versions have followed a “thought-for-thought” rather than a “word-for-word” translation philosophy, emphasizing “dynamic equivalence” rather than the “essentially literal” meaning of the original. A “thought-for-thought” translation is of necessity more inclined to reflect the interpretive opinions of the translator and the influences of contemporary culture.

Every translation is at many points a trade-off between literal precision and readability, between “formal equivalence” in expression and “functional equivalence” in communication, and the ESV is no exception. Within this framework we have sought to be “as literal as possible” while maintaining clarity of expression and literary excellence.

Therefore, to the extent that plain English permits and the meaning in each case allows, we have sought to use the same English word for important recurring words in the original; and, as far as grammar and syntax allow, we have rendered Old Testament passages cited in the New in ways that show their correspondence. Thus in each of these areas, as well as throughout the Bible as a whole, we have sought to capture the echoes and overtones of meaning that are so abundantly present in the original texts.

As an essentially literal translation, then, the ESV seeks to carry over every possible nuance of meaning in the original words of Scripture into our own language. As such, it is ideally suited for in-depth study of the Bible. Indeed, with its emphasis on literary excellence, the ESV is equally suited for public reading and preaching, for private reading and reflection, for both academic and devotional study, and for Scripture memorization.

From all that I know about translation which isn't really a huge amount this is the most accurate english version.

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 14:29**

I just bought an ESV, my only complaint is that it hasn't come out in a study Bible version like the NIV I have from Zondervan, which I love. I have pretty much all the versions, and love them all, they all excite me....it's the Word of God and that's always exciting.

what's NOT exciting is constant controversy and backbiting and arguing among the Body.

oh well.....when we get glorified, other Things will captivate our minds.

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 16:02**

Quote:  
-----My point was simply that we can't allow the enemy to get us distracted by arguing about which version is the best. My point was that Jesus Himself is who we are seeking and the Holy Spirit reveals Jesus to us. NOT THAT WE DON'T NEED THE BIBLE! You referenced comparisons of John 6:47 but I can just as easily point to Colossians 2:9  
-----

I completely disagree. If you check the warnings in Deuteronomy and Revelation concerning the adding to or taking away from the Words of God... one has to conclude that it's a **very** big deal to God. If it's a big deal to God, it's a big deal to me. Paul warned about those who mishandled the scriptures, and if it's a big deal to Paul... it's a big deal to me.

No one is making an idol of the Bible, but God said that He exalts His own Word above His name.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/3/23 16:21

Quote:  
-----Right, but the main reason that the newer translators chose those manuscripts is that they were earlier manuscripts not even discovered at the time of translating the KJV in 1611. So yes there are some verses missing and some things added but the same could be said about the KJV.  
-----

The KJV translators made no secret that they added some words to the text, but they said they did so so that the sentence structure would make sense in English. Everytime you see a word in italics in the KJV it is a word they added for this reason. At least they didnt make a secret about it, they were very honest and open about it. Get a Greek Linear Bible and try to read the literal translation... it's hard.

Yes, it is true that the **Catholic Church** makes the claim that the Sinaticus and Vaticanus are older... but there is no proof. Just their word on it. I dont know about you, but I dont trust an organization that did it's best to murder anyone who tried to translate the Bible into English a few centuries ago... including William Tyndale... whose translation was used for over 80% of the KJV.

Some claim "well, these two manuscripts are older, so if something isnt in them, then it must have been added to the Received Text." **However**, there are references in the writings of the 1st and 2nd century church fathers that mention portions of scriptures that are missing from the Sinaticus and Vaticanus... and these writings of the early church fathers are older than the RCC claims the Sinaticus and Vaticanus to be.

Sinaticus and Vaticanus disagree with about 90-95% of all known manuscripts, and they even disagree among themselves. Both have a long history of corruption and obscurity.

Omissions of Sinaticus and Vaticanus

**Vaticanus omits:**

- a.) Everything from Genesis 1:1 to 46:28.
- b.) Psalms 106-139
- c.) All of First Timothy
- d.) All of second Timothy
- e.) All Titus
- f.) All of Revelation
- g.) All of Hebrews after Chapter 9:14 to the end of the book
- h.) Our Lord's agony and blood like sweat in the Garden of Gethsemane. Luke 22:43- 44
- i.) Our Lord's prayer for his adversaries. Luke 23:34 "Father forgive them; for they know not what they do."
- j.) Mark 16:9-20. There is a significant blank space in the manuscript where this passage would have gone, testifying for its inclusion in the Bible.
- k.) The story of the women taken in adultery John 7:53 - John 8:11
- l.) Heb 9:15 to the end of the book.
- m.) 2 Kings 2:5-7, 10-13

Vaticanus adds the Apocrypha to the OT.

**Sinaticus omits:**

- a.) John 5:4, 8:1-11
- b.) Matthew 16:2-3
- c.) Romans 16:24
- d.) Mark 16:9-20 Again, there is a significant blank space where these verses should have gone.
- e.) Acts 8:37
- f.) 1 John 5:7

Sinaticus adds: The Epistle of Barnabas and The Shepherd of Hermas to the NT and the Apocrypha to the OT.

As you can see... these two "more reliable" manuscripts do not even agree with each other. Yet the Received Text is made

de of more than 2,000 manuscript witnesses that agree with each other with the exception of a few grammatical nuances.

God has preserved His Word... **just as He said He would**. If the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are more reliable, then one must believe that God kept His Word hidden from man for nearly 1,500 years.

I reject that. Thats not the God I serve. The God I serve keeps His promises.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 16:27**

I would also like to point out that I would support a Bible in more modern English **if**:

a) it used the same Greek and Hebrew underlying text that the KJV used.

b) it maintained the pronoun usages of "thee" and "thou" and "you" (differentiating between "you" plural, and "you" singular).

...so far no one has.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 17:18**

You didnt respond to the scriptures I brought up from Colossians.

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 17:54**

Also...This discussion was started simply by asking about the TNIV which I do not endorse.

For more info you can check out <http://www.no-tniv.com/>

**Re: - posted by Angyl, on: 2005/3/23 18:56**

Quote:

-----You didnt respond to the scriptures I brought up from Colossians.

I'll take a stab at that. It's all about **context** of course. Those in history most guilty of abusing scripture always do so because they lift a single verse or two out of CONTEXT to make it suit their argument. The verse before the one you mentioned reads:

*"8Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.*

*9For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."*

As there is only a SINGLE proper noun that comes before the sentence in question, it is quite easy to see they are talking about Christ.

**Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/3/23 19:36**

I do not like the TNIV

**Re: TNIV - Your Thoughts?? - posted by Smokey (), on: 2005/3/23 20:45**

EVERY TIME someone comes our with a "new updated translation", they say that it is to "make it easier to understand". What is wrong with taking the time to ask the Holy Spirit to help us in understanding that original classic the KJV??? All the great preachers of the past managed quite well with the KJV, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit.  
Greg

**Re: - posted by Matt25 (), on: 2005/3/23 20:53**

Quote:  
-----Also I have seen the whole interview by Leonard Ravenhill. I believe his opinion was KJV was the best. However his point was that we can't make an idol out of the bible and use it to hit people over the head with it.  
-----

pij could you quote me the statement made by Ravenhill anywhere in that interview (or in any of his sermons for that matter) where he implies "we can't make an idol out of the bible and use it to hit people over the head with it"???? That was n't the point of his statement regarding the superiority of the KJV among the available english translations...

**Re: - posted by Matt25 (), on: 2005/3/23 21:31**

Quote:  
-----  
"For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form" ( Colossians 2:9 NIV).  
  
"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Colossians 2:9 KJV).  
  
I could just as easily say the KJV leaves room for confusion by saying him instead of Christ  
-----

Read Colossians 2:8. There is no ambiguity as to who "in him" refers to.

Now read John 6:43-51. This is Jesus speaking about himself. When you get to verse 47, why is "on me" removed from the NIV? Removing "on me" leaves it very ambiguous as to who or what exactly we are supposed to believe. Jesus is commanding you to believe on him specifically. Removing "on me" leaves all kinds of room for a different interpretation.

Back to Colossians and the NIV.  
Col 1:2 Removes "and the Lord Jesus Christ"  
Col 1:14 Removes "through his blood"  
Col 1:28 Removes "Jesus"  
Col 3:6 Removes "on the children of disobedience"

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 22:25**

Mind you brother, I love the KJV. I prefer it over the others.

But I want to point out something, there is a difference between a Version and a Translation.

The KJV was really a group of other versions that were floating around in that day and formed into one.

It is mostly made up of William Tyndales work, and rightly so, he paid for it with his life several years before.

In the true original KJV the Apocrypha was included but it was taken out later on, which was a shame I think.

The book of Enoch was totally rejected but should be read by all christians because if Jude used a verse from it why can't we? I've read some of it, and it's really no different then the writings of Ezkeil.

There are other versions out there, but what one needs to look for is a Translation.

Now remember the KJV is not all we think it is, it has many errors in it. And all those italics makes some of the word of no effect and also adds a great deal, even though we are told it helps to build the sentence structure of the english, yet I have found italics questionable and ask myself, "Why did the translator add this for it ruins the whole message".

But then again, who am I.

Karl

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 22:29**

The NIV is worldly friendly. It fits into everyone's way of thinking, whereas the old KJV is dangerous to the New World Order.

**Re:, on: 2005/3/23 23:53**

Hello again! I just wanted to say that I'm dropping out of this particular discussion. It was originally started with the focus being on the TNIV, which I do not endorse, and strayed over into all kinds of different attacks on other versions. I think this is one thing I am going to disagree with some people on and that's ok. God knows my heart! :-) Blessings!

**Re:, on: 2005/3/24 8:17**

Quote:  
-----Hello again! I just wanted to say that I'm dropping out of this particular discussion. It was originally started with the focus being on the TNIV, which I do not endorse, and strayed over into all kinds of different attacks on other versions. I think this is one thing I am going to disagree with some people on and that's ok. God knows my heart! Blessings!  
-----

I don't doubt your heart or motivation at all, pij. But you can't talk about the TNIV without talking about the NIV... and when that happens you have to bring in the history of the modern versions and their corruption... and therefore it will always morph into a discussion like we're having.

As for attacks on other versions... I think you have it backwards. The modern versions are an attack on God's Word.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/24 8:22**

Quote:  
-----Now remember the KJV is not all we think it is, it has many errors in it.  
-----

Several people have made this claim on just this thread alone... and without any evidence to back it up, even though I have repeatedly asked for some.

Quote:  
-----And all those italics makes some of the word of no effect and also adds a great deal  
-----

Again, you make a claim and do not back it up.

Quote:

-----yet I have found italics questionable and ask myself, "Why did the translator add this for it ruins the whole message  
-----

Ugh... Evidence please?

You could never go into a courtroom and make these kinds of claims and expect to get anywhere unless you can provide some evidence. When those of us who support the Received Text (and the KJV) against the modern versions we provide **pages and pages** of evidence to back up what we're saying... but those who want to tear down the KJV make claim after claim with absolutely no evidence at all. It makes me wonder if these folks are merely mimicking what they've been told by publishing companies, but haven't actually investigated it themselves.

C'mon folks... let's reason together, but let's do it reasonably!

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/24 8:23**

As to the verse in Col. ... I refer you to Angyl's post (thank you bro!).

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/24 10:18**

Quote:

-----EVERY TIME someone comes out with a "new updated translation", they say that it is to "make it easier to understand".  
-----

Amen... how many "easier to understand" Bibles can we make for English speaking people? Does anyone know how many "modern" "easier to read" Bibles have come out in the last 124 years using the corrupted Vaticanus & Sinaiticus manuscripts... supposedly in an attempt to make the Bible easier to read and understand?

Here is a list (after you read this list, tell me money isn't involved):

- 1) 1881 The English Revised Version
- 2) 1901. American Standard Version
- 3) 1901 The New Testament. The Modern American Bible
- 4) 1902 The Emphasised Bible
- 5) 1902 Translation of the New Testament from the Original Greek
- 6) 1903 The New Testament in Modern Speech
- 7) 1904 The New Testament, revised and translated by A.S. Worrell
- 8) 1912. The Holy Bible ... An Improved Edition
- 9) 1913 The New Testament: A New Translation in Modern Speech
- 10) 1914 The New Covenant, commonly called the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ

- 11) 1914 The New Testament from the Greek text as established by Bible Numerics
- 12) 1918 The New Testament, translated from the Sinaitic Manuscript discovered by Constantine Tischendorf at Mount Sinai
- 13) 1923 The New Testament: An American Translation
- 14) 1923 The Riverside New Testament, a translation from the original Greek into the English of to-day
- 15) 1924 The Centenary Translation of the New Testament
- 16) 1926 A New Translation of the Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments
- 17) 1926 Concordant version, the Sacred Scriptures
- 18) 1927 The Old Testament: An American Translation
- 19) 1931 The Bible: An American Translation
- 20) 1933 The Four Gospels, A New Translation
- 21) 1935 The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures
- 22) 1937 The New Testament, a translation in the language of the people
- 23) 1941 The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, translated from the Latin Vulgate
- 24) 1946. Revised Standard Version New Testament
- 25) 1947 The New Testament ... Translated from the Greek text of Westcott and Hort
- 26) 1948 New Testament, Letchworth Version in Modern English
- 27) 1949 The Basic Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments in Basic English
- 28) 1950. New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures Rendered from the Original Language by the New World Translation Committee (Jehovah's Witnesses)
- 29) 1950 Sacred Name New Testament
- 30) 1951 The New Testament ... in Modern English
- 31) 1952. Revised Standard Version.
- 32) 1952 The New Testament, A New Translation in Plain English
- 33) 1952 The Four Gospels. A new translation from the Greek
- 34) 1954 The New Testament rendered from the original Greek with Explanatory Notes
- 35) 1955 The Holy Bible; A Translation from the Latin Vulgate in the Light of the Hebrew and Greek Originals
- 36) 1955 The Authentic New Testament, edited and translated from the Greek for the general reader
- 37) 1957 The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts. Containing the Old and New Testaments, translated from the Peshitta, the authorized Bible of the Church of the East
- 38) 1958 The New Testament in Modern English



- 39) 1959 The Holy Bible, The Berkeley Version in Modern English
- 40) 1961 The New English Bible New Testament
- 41) 1961 The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures, rendered from the Original Languages by the New World Bible Translation Committee (Jehovah's Witnesses)
- 42) 1961 The New Testament: An Expanded Translation
- 43) 1963 New American Standard New Testament
- 44) 1965 **The Amplified Bible**
- 45) 1965 The Letters of Paul: An Expanded Paraphrase, Printed in Parallel with the Revised Version with Fuller References
- 46) 1966 **Good News for Modern Man**: The New Testament in Today's English Version
- 47) 1966 The Jerusalem Bible (Roman Catholic)
- 48) 1969 The New Testament, A New Translation
- 49) 1970 The New American Bible, Translated from the Original Languages, with Critical Use of All the Ancient Sources, by Members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America
- 50) 1970 The New English Bible
- 51) 1970 The Restoration of Original Sacred Name Bible
- 52) 1971 **New American Standard Bible**
- 53) 1971 **The Living Bible**, Paraphrased
- 54) 1972 The Bible in Living English
- 55) 1972 Today's English New Testament
- 56) 1976 **Good News Bible**: The Bible in Today's English Version
- 57) 1976 The Holy Bible in the Language of Today, An American Translation
- 58) 1977 The Christian Counselor's New Testament. A New Translation in Everyday English with Notations
- 59) 1978 **New International Version**
- 60) 1982 **New King James Version** (Supposedly based on the Received Text, but it's notations strongly suggest that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are more reliable... causing one to doubt the authenticity of the Word)
- 61) 1982 Messianic Edition of the Living Bible
- 62) 1983 An Inclusive Language Lectionary
- 63) 1985 The New Jerusalem Bible (Roman Catholic)
- 64) 1985 Tanakh: A New Translation of The Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text
- 65) 1987 The Holy Bible - **New Century Version**

- 66) 1988 McCord's New Testament Translation of the Everlasting Gospel
- 67) 1989 **The Revised English Bible** with the Apocrypha
- 68) 1989 God's New Covenant: A New Testament Translation
- 69) 1989 Jewish New Testament: a translation of the New Testament that expresses its Jewishness
- 70) 1990 **New Revised Standard Version**
- 71) 1993 **The Message**: The New Testament in Contemporary English
- 72) 1993 The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus
- 73) 1994 The Inclusive New Testament *A revamping of Scripture according to the latest rules of political correctness*
- 74) 1995 New Testament and Psalms: An Inclusive Version
- 75) 1995 God's Word
- 76) 1995 The New Testament: An Understandable Version
- 77) 1995 Holy Bible: **Contemporary English Version**
- 78) 1996 **NIV Inclusive Language Edition**
- 79) 1996 Holy Bible, **New Living Translation**
- 80) 2001 The Holy Bible: The Net Bible (New English Translation).
- 81) 2001 The Holy Bible, **English Standard Version**
- 82) 2002 **The Message**: The Bible in Contemporary Language
- 83) 2004 Holy Bible: **Holman Christian Standard Bible**
- 84) 2004 Good As New: A Radical Retelling of the Scriptures
- 85) 2005 **TNIV** Today's New International Version

Phew... that took me awhile!

Do you think out of **85** "easier to read and understand" bibles, they may be close to having one?

Think I'll stick with the ol' reliable.

Krispy

**He loves me, the bible says so. - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/24 11:02**

Quote:

-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:

Think I'll stick with the ol' reliable.

-----  
I think that is the crux of the whole thing, Questioning versions can create doubt in the hearts of the saints. Stick to the version you trust. From a studying standpoint, get the most accurate you can, but from a relational aspect, get a bible that helps you such. From my personal experience, I looked at other versions simply because what I was reading did not make any sense.

I started reading the NKJV from being blooded on the NIV and quite honestly the sentence construction and grammar in the NKJV through me for a loop.

**Re: He loves me, the bible says so., on: 2005/3/24 11:21**

Quote:

-----I think that is the crux of the whole thing, Questioning versions can create doubt in the hearts of the saints. Stick to the version you trust.

-----  
But Zeke... why would you want to read a "bible" at all that is based on corrupted text? If your not reading truth... then what are you reading?

If I know a saint who is relying on the NIV, then yes, I do want to create doubt in their hearts about what they're reading. Just like I would want to create doubt in the heart of a Muslim about what they believe. Only difference is, someone can absolutely be saved... and be relying on the NIV for the truth. We're not saved based on what version we read... but I think you know what I mean.

Krispy

**Re: Bible Evidence, on: 2005/3/24 17:32**

Eat your Rice Krispies! and think outside the box. Snap,Crackle, Pop

**Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/3/26 20:06**

The danger of talking about the TNIV too much is that you may help advertise it and I don't think it is worth doing that.

**So right, but so wrong - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/26 22:44**

Quote:

-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:

If your not reading truth... then what are you reading?

-----  
Doctrinally, what difference does it make? Can you tell me or any of the other Jamites what those 'imperfections' do in altering what I believe about the Lord Jesus and his church?

Maybe this highlights the fact that I don't take every letter and pull it to pieces, but I do believe by God's grace that I adhere to spirit filled correct doctrine.

**Re: So right, but so wrong - posted by iHilam (), on: 2005/3/26 23:30**

I have yet to read any version of the Holy Bible that would lead someone to hell. I read KJV because that is my preference. I have many times had two and three version opened at once to better my understanding or form an opinion.

**Common sense, obviously, is not common - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/26 23:36**

Quote:

-----

iHilam wrote:

I have many times had two and three version opened at once to better my understanding or form an opinion.

-----

Thats just good practise, and I would say a hearty amen. Even Peter had a hard time understanding the stuff Paul spoke about, and they spoke the same language. :-?

**Re: So right, but so wrong - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/29 12:25**

Quote:

-----

Quote:

-----

KrispyKrittr wrote:

If your not reading truth... then what are you reading?

-----

ZekeO wrote:

**Doctrinally, what difference does it make? Can you tell me or any of the other Jamites what those 'imperfections' do in altering what I believe about the Lord Jesus and his church?**

-----

Sorry all, this is for baked and fried's benefit, but if anyone else has input, I would like to know what the answer is.

**Re:, on: 2005/3/29 13:25**

Quote:

-----Doctrinally, what difference does it make? Can you tell me or any of the other Jamites what those 'imperfections' do in altering what I believe about the Lord Jesus and his church?

-----

You tell me...

DOCTRINAL CHANGES IN THEIR PROPER NEW TESTAMENT ORDER ARE NOW LISTED:

MATTHEW

1:25 "her firstborn" is omitted. That Jesus was her firstborn indicates that Mary and Joseph had sexual relations after the birth of Jesus and that others were born of her. The omission here seeks to add credence to the false doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the perpetual virginity of Mary. The Bible is clear that Jesus had brothers and sisters.

5:22 "without a cause" is removed. In the Sermon on the Mount the Lord warned of judgment for those who were angry with a brother without a cause. Should this change be accepted everyone who is angry with his brother may be judged. The effect is to bring Jesus into judgment for failing to observe his own words (see Mark 3:5). Such is contrary to the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ.

6:4, 6, 18 "openly" is out. It is a Bible Doctrine that Christian work done unnoticed for the glory of the Lord will one day be rewarded openly (Col. 3:4).

6:13 "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever, Amen" is deleted. This ascription of praise to "Our Father" is found in 491 out of 500 existing manuscripts. This statement was made a century ago by Dean John Burgon.

8:29 "Jesus" is left out. The demons bore witness to the fact that Jesus was the Son of God. It was an identification of Jesus (in humanity) as the Son of God (in Deity). It affects the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

9:8 "marvelled" is changed to "were afraid." There is no reason to believe that the people were afraid because Jesus healed the sick of the palsy. There is every reason for them to marvel at the miracle.

9:13 "to repentance" is left out. The Bible doctrine of repentance is one that men would like to do away with. God requires that in order to be saved one must truly repent (Acts 17:30; 2 Peter 3:9). The word means "a change of mind" and there must be that concerning God, sin and salvation. Men think that sin does not really separate them from God--they must change their mind about that. Men think that salvation is by works--they must change their mind about that. There is nothing more evident today than the absence of repentance among those who are professing to be converted.

15:8 "draweth nigh unto me with their mouth" is left out. According to Isaiah 29:13 it belongs in because Isaiah prophesied of these hypocrites exactly that way.

16:2,3 "When it is evening ... the signs of the times" is all omitted. The Pharisees and Sadducees came looking for a sign and the signs were all around them. Jesus called them hypocrites because they could not tell the signs of the times.

17:21 Whole verse is left out. Power with God is to be had by prayer and fasting. That is a fundamental truth of the Word of God.

18:2 "Jesus" is left out. This is done many times by the corrupt Greek Text of Westcott and Hort. I have not chosen to remark about each instance because it would add many pages to this work. The MAJORITY Text continuously places the word "Jesus" in the narrative with the definite article preceding it. Thus it places him in the center of things and in command. It is doctrinally unsound for such prominence to be discarded for the word "he."

18:11 The whole verse is omitted. This verse tells us that man is lost, that he needs to be saved, and that the Son of man is the one who can do that. The doctrine of salvation through Jesus Christ is affected by this change.

18:15 "against thee" is omitted. This omission sets us up as watchdogs over others and if one sins we are to go and tell him. Such is not the teaching of Scripture. Were we to declare every sin we would be constantly busy (bodies) judging the actions and motives of everyone. This change is a very bad error.

18:35 "their trespasses" is omitted. Same thought as mentioned in 18:15.

19:9 "and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery" is removed. This is a very important doctrinal change which concerns divorce and remarriage. A man who divorces his wife and remarries commits adultery, and also the man who marries the divorced wife commits adultery.

19:16,17 "Good" before Master is omitted. In addition to that, the phrase "Why callest thou me good?" is changed to "Why askest thou me concerning the good?" Good Master is correct and Jesus responded to show the young man that only one was good and that one was God. The conclusion should have been obvious. Since Jesus was good he was necessarily God. The omission and change destroys the intended testimony to the Deity of Christ.

20:16 "for many be called, but few chosen" is left out. The Lord would have us know that many are called to inherit eternal life, but few are chosen by virtue of believing in Christ. It is a Bible doctrine that God wants all men to be saved but few will come to Christ for salvation.

21:12 "of God" is out. Jesus, who was God in the flesh, came to his own temple and said, "My house shall be called the house of prayer." It was the temple of God and the God of the temple was there.

22:30 "of God" is removed. There are good angels and fallen angels. The believers, in the resurrection, will be like the good angels.

ood angels "of God" who alone are in heaven.

23:28 "Master" is changed to "teacher." There are many teachers but only one master. The change here takes away the pre-eminence that God intends for his Son.

25:13 "wherein the Son of man cometh" is omitted. The warning to watch is tied to the imminent return of the Lord. The omission here does away with the doctrine of the Lord's second advent.

26:28 "new" is dropped before testament. The apostle Paul tells us that Jesus said, "this cup is the NEW testament in my blood." The change here is intended to corrupt the Word of God and to confuse Christians.

27:35 "that it might be fulfilled ... did they cast lots" is all omitted. It is very important in Matthew's gospel, where Jesus is portrayed as the King of Israel, to show that he is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies. Here the parting of his garments and casting lots is the fulfillment of Psalm 22:18 which portrays the crucifixion of Christ. To omit this is to show the intended corruption of the Word of God by the textual critics.

28:6 "the Lord" is omitted. The very reverent angels said, "see the place where the Lord lay." They would not say, "see the place where he lay." The constant attempt to humanize Jesus and take away from his Deity does not endear the Wescott and Hort Greek Text to believers.

## MARK

1:1 "the Son of God" is left out. These words present Jesus Christ as Deity. Such an omission is a direct attack on the person of Christ and is without doubt a doctrinal error.

1:31 "immediately" is dropped. The descriptive word tells us when the fever left her and therefore provides us with a miracle. The word left out denies the miracle and thus the one who performed it.

2:17 "to repentance" is left out. See comments on Matt. 9:13.

3:15 "to heal sicknesses" is omitted. Jesus gave them authority to heal diseases as well as to cast out demons. Sickness is the result of sin (Adam's) and the only one who has authority to eliminate it is the one who would die for sin. On the basis of his approaching death for sin on Calvary he could say, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee" and "Rise up and walk."

4:24 "and unto you that hear shall more be given" is left out. It is a Bible teaching that those who seek truth from the Lord shall be given more truth (see John 7:17).

5:36 "as soon" is dropped. The word in the Greek is "immediately." The word immediately is constantly dropped by the Revisers of 1881. It is a key word in Mark which is the Gospel of the Servant of the Lord who came "not to be ministered unto, but to minister." When Jairus was told that his daughter was dead and that he should not trouble Jesus further, the Lord "immediately" encouraged him to believe.

6:11 "Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city" is removed from the text. This passage emphasizes the great degree of responsibility that was upon those cities who heard the Lord's apostles as they preached repentance and worked miracles before them. Sodom and Gomorrah did not have such light, yet they are still suffering the eternal wrath of God (see Jude 7 where "suffering" is in the present tense). How much more the judgment of America today where people sit in an abundance of complete revelation from God and choose to remain in darkness.

7:8 "as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do" is omitted. The Lord not only condemns the Pharisees for traditions of men, but he names them. There are traditions of men today which are sending people to Hell and preachers need to name them. It is doctrinally unsound to let men go on in traditions and not expose them.

9:23 "if thou canst believe" is dropped. The father had said to Jesus, "if thou canst do anything." To this lack of faith Jesus answered, "if thou canst believe." It was at once a rebuke and an encouragement to have faith in him. The father's answer in the next verse is beautiful but the Revisers ruined that also. They omitted "with tears, Lord" from the most precious answer as recorded by the Spirit of God.

9:45 "into the fire that never shall be quenched" is dropped. The character and duration of Hell is described here and the doctrine of eternal retribution is affected by this change.

9:47 "fire" is omitted. The words are inspired and in complete agreement with Rev. 20:15. The consignment of the lost to the lake of fire is a Bible doctrine.

10:21 "take up the cross" is left out. The word to the young man was to divest himself of the riches in which he trusted, consider himself dead to the world, and follow Christ into eternal life. There are many who will let go of riches and seek to emulate some of Christ's teachings, but the way of the cross they refuse. The cross for Christ and for believers is fundamental in Christian doctrine.

10:24 "for them that trust in riches" is left out. This is a very glaring doctrinal error. It is not hard to enter into the kingdom of God (salvation is a free gift through faith in Jesus Christ) but it is hard for those who trust in riches to trust Christ alone for salvation. Their God is their wealth and it is no more compatible with Christ than Dagon was with the Ark of God (see 1 Sam. 5:1-5).

11:26 The whole verse is removed. It is a Bible doctrine that if we regard iniquity in our heart the Lord will not hear us. Answered prayer and clean vessels go together. When I confess my sins and ask God for favor he requires that my confession of sin include forgiveness of those who have sinned against me. If I refuse to forgive others it becomes sin to me (see Eph. 4:32).

13:14 "spoken of by Daniel the prophet" is dropped. Without the reference to Daniel the appeal to understand is without force. Though some might connect it in their thoughts because they are familiar with Scripture, it does not follow that he is referring to Daniel. The reference to Daniel by the Lord also authenticates his writing as inspired Scriptures.

14:22 "eat" is dropped. Our Lord did not give them a relic from the Last Supper to take home and cherish. He gave them broken bread to eat which (when observed) would always remind them of his body which was broken for them.

15:28 The whole verse is left out. Jesus was crucified between two thieves in fulfillment of Isaiah 53:12. It is doctrinal error to eliminate clear statements concerning the fulfilling of prophecy (see Luke 24:27).

16:9-20 Twelve verses are omitted. These verses are found in every known manuscript but two (the oldest of those two leaves a blank space where it belongs). They are found in all the Versions, quoted by the church fathers, and seen in the lectionaries of the church. There are many doctrines affected by the omission of these twelve verses. The resurrection of Christ is deleted. The great commission, baptism, eternal damnation and His ascension into Heaven are all taken out of the Word of God. Certainly the gospel does not end with "they were afraid." Some say the ending has been lost (see Dr. Ryrie's Study Bible) but that destroys the Bible Doctrine that God preserves His Word (see 1 Peter 1:23-25). The evidence is clear that these verses are original and to cut them out is to affect many doctrines of the Christian faith.

## LUKE

1:28 "blessed art thou among women" is omitted. There were many virgins in Israel at the time, but God chose Mary. The Son that she bore would be her Saviour from sin. The Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary (concerning her birth) is nothing but pagan fiction. Mary was blessed AMONG women, but not ABOVE women. The worship of Mary is contrary to Scripture. This omission is designed to lift her above others and eventually deify her.

2:14 "peace, good will toward men" is changed to "peace among men of good will." The first talks of the birth of Christ as bringing God's peace and good will (reconciliation) to men. Faith in the death of Christ for our sins brings justification and peace with God. The change offers God's peace to men who are good. That is doctrinally unsound since there is none good.

2:33 "Joseph and his mother" is changed to "his father and mother." The Spirit of God is very careful to show that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of a virgin and that he did not have a human father who begat him. The change casts doubt upon the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ as the "seed of the woman." Later, when Mary refers to Joseph as "thy father," Jesus answers with, "wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business," meaning that God was his father (see 2:48, 49).

2:40 "in spirit" is left out. That the child grew and waxed strong in spirit (meaning that he was spiritually strong) is evident

from verse 47. It is unlikely that the Spirit of God wanted us to see how strong Jesus was with reference to his physique.

2:43 "and Joseph and his mother knew not of it" is changed to "and his parents were unaware of it." The first retains the teachings of the virgin birth, the second discards it. The virgin birth is a Fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith and the MAJORITY Text upholds it. Let us not hear of supposed overzealous copyists but rather let us beware of overzealous heretics who would deny the fundamentals of the faith.

4:4 "but by every Word of God" is dropped. Many are willing to agree that bread alone cannot satisfy man, but few are willing to live by every word of God. This quotation is from Deut. 8:3 where the omitted words are found. The same one who said, "Yea, hath God said?" is the author of this omission. The Revisers could not leave this passage in because they have changed "every word of God" in over 5,000 places in the New Testament. Satan does not mind if we read the Bible as long as we have a Swiss cheese Bible (full of holes). Holes in the Word cause doubts in the Word, doubts cause faith to be lost, and without faith it is impossible to please him.

4:8 "Get thee behind me, Satan" is omitted. The devil had tempted Jesus to bypass the cross and receive the kingdom over the world. Jesus, whose face was set as a flint to go to the cross, refused to worship him.

6:10 "whole as the other" is left out. These words tell us that not only was his hand restored to use but it was whole as the other. The completeness of the miracle is attested to by these words.

9:54 "even as Elias did" is omitted. Apart from this word they had no precedent for doing such a thing.

9:55, 56 "and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them" is omitted. In reply to the disciples who thought that they could call down fire from heaven, Jesus told them that he came to save men. This passage is consistent with John 3:17, "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved."

11:2-4 "Our ... which art in heaven" is deleted along with "Thy will be done as in heaven, so in earth" and "but deliver us from evil." Only corrupt manuscripts can produce so many departures from the disciples prayer which is found without deletions in Matt. 6:9-13.

14:5 The word "ass" is changed to "son." The use of "son" is too much for the comparison the Lord is making. Only a slavish loyalty to a corrupt Greek text can produce such a foolish change.

22:31 "And the Lord said" is dropped. The Lord Jesus was God and as such he was omnipresent and omniscient. He was present when Satan came before God and asked permission to try Peter's faith. He had prayed to the Father, as Peter's intercessor, that his faith would not fail. It was the Lord who knew all of this and warned Peter specifically.

22:64 "they struck him on the face" is dropped. It is error to minimize the sufferings of Christ. His facial appearance was marred more than any man (see Isaiah 52:14 and 53:5).

23:23 "and of the chief priests" is omitted. The Lord was careful to let us know that the religious priests were involved in the rejection of Christ. Those who call themselves priests today do likewise.

23:42 "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom" is changed to "Then he said, Jesus remember me when you come into your kingdom." The confession that Jesus is Lord is doctrinally correct because it is required for salvation (see Rom. 10:9,13).

23:45 "the sun was darkened" is changed to "the sun was eclipsed." The Greek word in the corrupt Greek Text is EKLIPONTOS from which we derive the word ECLIPSE. An eclipse is caused by the natural occurrence of the moon passing between the sun and the earth and usually lasts for about 3-5 minutes. The sun being darkened for three hours was a miracle of God and will be repeated again prior to the Lord's return to earth (see Matt. 24:29) Many modern versions try to hide the Greek word they are using to translate from the corrupt Greek text by using words like: obscured (NASV), faded (AMPLIFIED), stopped shining (NIV), failed (NEW WORLD), but some honestly translate the word "eclipse" (20th CENTURY, MOFFAT, NEB, PHILLIPS). Humanism would try to find some way to explain away the miracles of God's Word lest they be forced to accept it as the revelation from God concerning salvation.



24:36 "and saith unto them. Peace be unto you" is omitted. Jesus had said to them, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you" (John 14:27). He was now risen from the dead and in their midst to guarantee that peace to them. One of the greatest benefits of our salvation is to have peace with God (Rom. 5:1) and the peace of God ruling in our hearts (Phil. 4:7).

24:40 The whole verse is omitted. The bodily resurrection of Christ is proven here as he showed them his hands and his feet. The omission affects Bible doctrine very much.

24:51 "and carried up into heaven" is left out. The bodily ascension of Christ into heaven is a Bible doctrine that is denied here. It leaves the Lord parted from them but does not tell us where he went. The Revisers removed the doctrine and left the Word in a poor state of disarray. Acts 1:1, 2 tells us that the "former treatise" (Luke) ended with Jesus being "taken up." That ought to be sufficient to show the Revisers are wrong.

24:52 "And ... worshipped him" is omitted by the NASV. The MAJORITY Text says, "And they having worshipped him returned to Jerusalem with great joy." The picture we have is of our Lord receiving their worship because he is God (see 4:8 where worship is to be to God only) and then before their very eyes ascending into heaven. It is a Bible doctrine that we are to worship Jesus and the omission by the NASV is a clear denial of that doctrine.

## JOHN

1:18 "the only begotten Son" is changed to "The only begotten God." Such a phrase is foreign to Scripture. It accommodates the Arian teaching that Christ was a lesser deity created by God. It agrees with the teaching of Origen that Christ was not equal with God in essence and nature. Sound Fundamental doctrine concerning Christ is that he is one person of the Triune God and that he proceeds from the Father by an eternal generation and reveals God to men as the Son of God.

1:27 "He it is ... who is preferred before me" is removed. This change removes the pre-eminence and pre-existence of Christ. John wanted us to see that though Christ came after him, he in reality preceded and ranked above him.

3:13 "which is in heaven" is omitted. This change affects the doctrine of the omnipresence of Christ. As man he was here on earth, as God he was able to be everywhere present. The omission is a corruption introduced by those who do not believe in the perfect and absolute Deity of Christ.

3:15 "should not perish" is removed. This deletion removes the opposite of everlasting life, which is to perish. The doctrine of eternal damnation is weakened by the change.

3:16 "his only begotten Son" is changed to "the only begotten Son." The word HIS marks Jesus Christ out as God's own peculiar son in a relationship that no one else has. It marks him as of the same essence and nature. The Deity of Christ is involved and is thereby weakened (3:17 also changed).

4:42 "the Christ" is left out. The purpose of John's gospel as given in 20:31 was to lead people to believe that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. That belief was to bring life to them. To omit it here is to deny the purpose of the inspired writer.

5:3b, 4 The statement regarding the moving of the water by an angel and subsequent miraculous healing is removed. Should this deletion be permitted there would be no sense to verse 7 since that verse presupposes 5:3b, 4. This is an effort to remove the miraculous from the Bible and thus accommodate humanism.

5:16 "and sought to slay him" is omitted. The Scripture teaches us that on many occasions they tried to kill Jesus but by supernatural power were kept from doing so (see John 18:6). He was omnipotent and there was no way they could take him until his hour was come.

6:47 "on me" is left out. The object of faith has been removed here. Everlasting life does not come to those who believe, but to those who believe on Christ. This is doctrinal error of the gravest sort and has been carried over into the NASV and NIV.

7:8 The little word "yet" is dropped and the result is that the Lord appears to lie to his brothers, since he did go up to the feast. There is a world of difference between "I go not up YET" and "I go not up." The sinlessness of Christ is an indis-

nsable doctrine of the Christian faith and lying is sin.

7:53-8:11 The whole story of the woman taken in adultery is omitted. This is one of the most blessed portions of the Word of God. It is intended by God through the inspired writer to amplify what came before in 3:17. The law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (1:17).

8:38 The words "my Father" and "your father" are intended to show the difference between his father and their father, who was Satan. By removing the word "my" and "your" there is a deliberate attempt to remove the offence and cater to the false dream of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

8:39 "If ye were Abraham's children" is changed to "if ye are Abraham's children." The Lord intended them to see that they were not Abraham's children at all. The change gives us to see that they were Abraham's children and therefore they ought to act like it. This is pure humanism and contrary to sound doctrine.

9:4 "I must work the works of him that sent me" is changed to "We must work the works of him that sent us." The uniqueness of Christ as the Sent One of the Father is destroyed and he is placed equally with the disciples as sent from God to do the work of God. This is an attack on the Person and Work of Christ and it exalts humanism. Jesus was sent by the Father and the disciples were sent by Jesus, "as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

9:35 "the Son of God" is changed to "the Son of man." The thing to be believed in John's gospel is that Jesus is the Son of God (20:31). The change by the minority texts is not warranted.

10:38 "that ye may know, and believe" is changed to "that ye may know, and understand." The union of Christ and the Father within the Godhead is that which we are to believe and rely upon for the certainty of our salvation. To understand the union is beyond human comprehension and if it could be understood, that would still not be the equivalent of salvation.

11:41 "where the dead was laid" is removed. God intends that we should know that this was the very same place where Lazarus was laid. This is an attempt to cloud the evident miracle which followed. (see also 12:2 where "which had been dead" is also removed).

## ACTS

Title "of the Holy Apostles" is deleted. To leave us with "ACTS" means nothing. That the Apostles were sanctified (holy) by the Lord Jesus and sent forth as his sent ones is evident from John 17:17-19. The title in the MAJORITY Text is doctrinally correct.

2:30 "according to the flesh he would raise up Christ" is omitted. It was not just that one of David's descendants would sit upon the throne, but that his greater Son would be raised from the dead in a body of flesh.

2:31 "his soul" is omitted. The body of Christ was in the tomb but his soul went down into Hades (Hell), the place of departed spirits. The teaching of the Bible is that our Lord had a body, soul and spirit.

2:47 "to the church" is left out. Believers are added to the Church which is Christ's body. The Church is an organism, and when persecutors touched the Church they touched Christ (see 9:5).

3:21 "all" is dropped in front of "his holy prophets." God has spoken of the Kingdom age by the mouth of ALL his prophets since the world began. In harmony with this Jesus spoke to the two on the road to Emmaus about himself from "all the prophets" (see Luke 24:27). There are others in the world who claim to be prophets but they do not speak of Jesus and his kingdom, therefore they are not of God.

3:26 "Jesus" is dropped. The specific name leaves no doubt as to whom God raised up from the dead to offer again the kingdom to Israel.

4:24 "thou art God" is changed to "thou art he who." There is no reason to accept MINORITY manuscripts when they want to change "God" to "he who" (see 1 Tim. 3:16).

6:3 The word "Holy" is dropped. When God led the Church to choose deacons he made it clear that they should be contr

olled by the Holy Spirit. Many churches since have appointed men who had a lot of spirit and were full of enthusiasm, but that is not the same as being full of the "Holy Ghost." Godly living is required of deacons and it is contrary to sound doctrine to leave out "Holy." The Greek word for spirit can refer to man's spirit or God's spirit and lest we should err here God inserted the word "Holy" before spirit.

6:8 "faith" is changed to "grace." The Bible does not teach that Christians are full of grace but rather that they receive grace. The only one who was "full of grace" was our Lord Jesus Christ (see John 1:14). The measure of faith is given to every believer to profit thereby.

7:30 "of the Lord" is omitted. It was not just an angel that appeared to Moses at the burning bush, it was an angel of Jehovah (the Lord). This was an Old Testament appearance of the eternal Son of God in angelic form. In plain words it was the Lord who appeared to Moses (see Exodus 3:1-5).

7:37 "The Lord your" and "him shall ye hear" are omitted. This is contrary to the original quotation as found in Deut. 18:15. In Stephen's sermon the "him shall ye hear" is most important since those who refuse Christ's words will be judged by God.

8:18 "Holy" is dropped. Four times here in four verses the Holy Ghost is mentioned. To drop the word Holy in one out of the four times is to create confusion and doubt concerning the Word of God.

8:37 The whole verse is omitted. This leaves the question of the Ethiopian eunuch unanswered. Philip's answer is correct in that belief must be from the heart prior to baptism. The eunuch's confession of faith is in exact agreement with what is required for salvation as given in John 20:31. Souls have been led to Christ with this verse of Scripture and it is doctrinally unsound to remove it.

9:5,6 "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him" is all omitted. This passage gives us a picture of Saul resisting the Spirit of God as he was under conviction. Saul's response is to submit to the Lord's direction, having been humbled before the Lord. Without Saul's "what wilt thou have me to do?" there could be no "arise and go."

9:29 "Jesus" is left out. The reason the Jews went about to slay Saul was not because he spake boldly in the name of the Lord, but because he spoke of the Lord Jesus. As we well know in this day of Modernism there is a great difference.

10:6 "he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do" is left out. The would-be correctors of the MAJORITY Text would have us believe that Cornelius was already saved and that it would be good for him to have fellowship with Peter. The truth is that Cornelius was not saved (see 11:14) and that there was something which he had to do. He must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ or he would be lost and go to Hell.

10:30 "fasting" is left out. Fasting, to find the will of God, is a Biblical doctrine. Though it is little used today, especially since we have the completed Word of God, it was evident in the New Testament apostolic times.

10:32 "who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee" is omitted. See above comments under 10:6.

15:24 "Ye must be circumcised and keep the law" is left out. This is exactly the reason why the Jerusalem council was called or convened. There is no doubt that the reply to the Gentile converts made mention of the all important question.

16:31 "Christ" is omitted. The word speaks of the Deity of Christ. It pointed the Philippian jailer to the God he must believe in for salvation.

18:5 "was pressed in the Spirit" is changed to "was engrossed with the word." When Paul was teaching he was always engrossed with the Word. In Corinth Paul had been laying the groundwork at the synagogue concerning what the Scriptures had to say about their Messiah (Christ). When Silas and Timothy came, Paul was under compulsion to show that Jesus was the Christ.

19:10 "Jesus" is left out. For the heathen to hear about the Lord is not enough. They must hear that Jesus is that Lord.

20:28 "of God" is changed to "of the Lord." The word lord is sometimes used of men and sometimes of God. Therefore, the change does not affirm the Deity of Christ. Our Authorized King James Version shows that God purchased the church

h with his own blood. This establishes the Deity of Christ irrefutably.

21:25 "they observe no such thing, save only that" is omitted. The Gentiles had been told that they did not have to observe the law of Moses nor circumcise their children (see Acts 15:23-29). James was in error when he sought to keep the Jews obedient to the Law after he had written to the Gentiles that they were not under it. The omission here leaves one with the impression that the Law was optional for the Gentiles and possibly preferable. Tampering with God's Word always leaves the door open for doctrinal error.

26:28 "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian" is changed to "do you think that in such a short time you can persuade me to be a Christian?" King Agrippa was "almost persuaded" and he was in possession of the truth concerning salvation. The change would have us believe that he needed more information and perhaps Paul was too quick to expect a decision.

## ROMANS

1:16 "of Christ" is omitted. The gospel message is of Christ and centers around his Person and Work. This is an inexcusable attempt to leave Christ out of the good news of salvation.

3:22 "and upon all" is dropped. The doctrine of imputed righteousness is most blessed to the believer. We are clothed in his righteousness and God sees us in Him, therefore it is "upon us."

8:1 "Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" is dropped. To the truth that there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ, the Word adds the truth that they are characterized by a walk in the Spirit. It is a Bible doctrine that those who are saved are characterized by a changed life.

11:6 "But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work" is dropped. The first part of the verse shows that grace rules out works. The second part of the verse shows that works rules out grace. It is intended for those who want to intrude works into the established state of grace for good measure (or safekeeping in salvation). This is a very important doctrinal passage in its entirety.

13:9 "thou shalt not bear false witness" is dropped. Those who wrote the corrupt manuscripts had no trouble with the other commandments shown here. It is obvious that a smiting conscience would not permit them to include this commandment since it directly involved what they were engaged in, bearing false witness about God's Word.

14:9 "and rose" is left out. Many heretics are willing to say that he died and that he lives again, but that he rose (bodily out from among the dead) they reject outright. The bodily resurrection of Christ is a cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith.

## 1 CORINTHIANS

2:4 "man's wisdom" is changed to "wisdom." Paul did not reject wisdom in his teaching, he rejected MAN'S wisdom.

3:4 "are ye not carnal?" is changed to "are ye not men?" It should be obvious that they were men, but the Bible truth to be taught was that in their divisions they were being controlled by fleshly (carnal) desires and not spiritual desires.

5:7 "for us" is omitted. This affects the vital doctrine of the substitutionary atonement of Christ. If Christ did not die for our sins then we are still under the wrath of God and without hope.

5:12 The little word "also" is dropped. That word indicated that Paul did judge those who were within the church. Those who were outside the church were for God to judge. The responsibility for believers to carry out discipline within the church is a Bible doctrine.

6:4 "set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church" is changed to "do you appoint them as judges who are of no account in the church?" The Word of God teaches that it is better to suffer wrong than to go to court against another Christian before a lost world. It is better to leave the judgment of the matter to the least Christian than to the greatest worldly judge. The change here completely turns around the way of God and seems to rebuke the church for leaving the matter in the hands of the least Christians.

6:20 "and in your spirit which are God's" is omitted. The body gives us world consciousness and the spirit gives us God consciousness. We are to glorify God in our body by holy living and in our spirit by walking in fellowship with God. Verses 16 and 17 talk about both.

10:9 "Christ" is changed to "Lord." In the Old Testament they tempted Christ and that rock that followed them was Christ (see verse 4). The word Lord can be used of the Father and the Son. Changing to that word here eliminates the pre-existence of Christ.

11:24 "take eat" is omitted along with "is broken." The symbolic bread was broken and given to the disciples with instruction to eat it. It typified his flesh which "is being broken for you" (literal Greek). Though not a bone of him was broken it is true that his flesh was broken in many places before he died on our behalf.

11:29 "unworthily" is dropped. The word gives the picture of a believer treating the Lord's Supper as a common meal, not reverencing the symbolic meaning and spiritual impact it is intended to make upon his soul and spirit. To remove this word is a very great doctrinal error. When you consider that sickness and death was the result of such unworthy participation, it is no light matter.

11:29 "not discerning the Lord's body" is changed to "if he does not judge the body rightly" (NASV). When we partake of the Lord's Supper we are to see through the elements to the Lord's body. As you think of the cost of your redemption there ought to be more holy living. The change brings absolute confusion concerning what body is meant, the Lord's or the believers. It is hallowed ground and the corrupters of God's Word have dared to tread upon it.

15:47 "the Lord" is left out. God is contrasting Adam and Christ. To say that the second man is from heaven is not enough. There have been men from heaven who were angels. Here the man from heaven is the Lord. This is an attempt to do away with the Deity of Christ.

15:49 "we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" is changed to "we should bear the image of the heavenly." The first is a fact based upon the certainty of our eternal salvation in Christ. The second is an exhortation based upon the uncertainty of a salvation by works. The first is sound doctrine, the second is unsound doctrine.

16:22 "Jesus Christ" is omitted. In a phrase with such import as to be accursed it is unthinkable that the test should center around the general term "Lord." The curse of God is upon those who do not love the Lord Jesus Christ. When his person and work is refused there is nothing to look for but wrath.

## 2 CORINTHIANS

4:4 "unto them" is omitted. The devil does not have power to keep the light of the gospel of Christ from shining, but he does have power to blind men lest it shine "unto them."

5:17 "all things" is left out. The believer is brought into vital union with Christ so that it is declared that he is in Christ. In the sight of God "old things" of the sinful nature are passed away. It only remains for those old things to be unwound, like Lazarus' graveclothes, in his daily life. In the sight of God "all things" are become new though they make their appearance in the life of the believer as he grows in grace and knowledge. To deny that "all things" are become new is to deny the finished work of Christ whereby we are made accepted in the beloved.

12:11 "in glorying" is dropped. The Corinthians had compelled Paul to talk about his experiences with the Lord. He did not want to brag about his spirituality. He felt that he had become foolish in boasting or glorying. The change would have Paul saying, "I have made a fool of myself." That is not what we are to understand.

## GALATIANS

3:1 "that ye should not obey the truth" is omitted. The Galatians had been bewitched by the Jewish legalizers who had put them under the Law to keep saved. Paul tells them that in so doing they were not obeying the truth. The truth was that they were saved by grace and that all spiritual blessings were theirs in Christ. To turn from that is to be in error.

3:17 "in Christ" is dropped. Paul is talking about the covenant with Abraham through his seed which was Christ. The law was added later and did not affect the covenant of promise to those who would be saved by believing as Abraham did. God promised Abraham that through his seed (singular) all the families of the earth would be blessed. That was a covenant

ant confirmed before of God "in Christ."

4:7 "an heir of God through Christ" is changed to "an heir through God." The inheritance is to the children of God through the mediatorship of Christ. We are not heirs of God through God, but through Christ. The change here is intended to destroy the reliance upon the Lord Jesus Christ who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."

#### EPHESIANS

1:1 "at Ephesus" is left out. It is hard to conceive that the Spirit of God addressed an epistle and then lost the address.

3:9 "by Jesus Christ" is removed. It is a Bible doctrine that all things were created by Jesus Christ and without him was nothing made that was made. This change detracts from the Deity of Christ which is made evident by the fact that ALL THINGS were created by Him.

5:30 "of his flesh, and of his bones" is left out. The Bible teaching is that the believer is vitally conjoined to Christ for a new life and walk in the Spirit. We are "quickened together with Christ," "raised up together," and "seated together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." God likens this to the marriage relationship where two people become one flesh.

6:10 "my brethren" is dropped. These words make it very clear that Paul's instructions concerning Christian living are for Christians who by the new birth have become Paul's "brethren." There is a great danger that unsaved people might get the impression that by imitating the things that Christians do they can become Christians.

#### PHILIPPIANS

4:13 "Christ" is changed to "him." It is precious to the believer to know that Christ will give him strength for spiritual living. Christ himself said, "without me ye can do nothing" (John 15:5). The word "him" is quite indefinite and can be misconstrued by Modernists to include the "him" of any religious group believing in a Supreme Being.

#### COLOSSIANS

1:2 "and the Lord Jesus Christ" is omitted. Along with the Father he is the source of grace and peace.

1:14 "through his blood" is left out. Redemption and forgiveness of sins is through the direct agency of his shed blood. Many Modernists today can work around the words "redemption" and "forgiveness of sins," but they cannot work around the shed blood. Therefore they must deny it and be in direct opposition to it.

2:11 "of the sins" is removed. What is left to work with brings the NIV to translate "In him you were also circumcised, in the putting off of your sinful nature." It is an established Bible doctrine that by the circumcision of our heart which the Lord made, we are able to overcome the sins of our flesh. But the putting off of our sinful nature will not take place until we are changed in the Rapture. Errors like this can only occur as the group of translators persist in following the MINORITY Text.

2:18 "those things which he has not seen" is made to read "those things which he has seen." Men were vainly attempting to worship angels as emanations from God in a step-ladder effort to reach God. Paul exhorted them to hold fast to the Head (our God-man Christ Jesus) who proceeded forth and came from God (himself being of the Trinity) that he might bring us to God. Paul says they DID NOT see them, heretics say THEY HAVE.

#### 1 THESSALONIANS

1:1 "from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" is dropped. Are we to think that grace and peace is bestowed by Paul? No, that is not within his power. They have their source in the Father and the Son.

5:27 "holy" is dropped from before "brethren." Paul had other brethren according to the flesh who were not saved (Rom. 9:1-3; 10:1). These were sanctified and preserved brethren and they were "holy" because they were accepted in the beloved.

#### 1 TIMOTHY

3:3 "not greedy of filthy lucre" is omitted. The phrase has to do with obtaining earthly gain through disgraceful means. This happens everyday within professing Christendom. It is inspired of God and belongs in the text.

3:16 "God was manifest" is changed to "He was manifest." The reference is to Christ manifest in the flesh, etc. The MAJORITY Text tells us that this Christ was God. There are 252 copies of Paul's Epistles which have "God" and only 2 copies which have "he." The MINORITY Text leaves us in doubt as to who "he" is. The doctrine of the Deity of Christ is greatly harmed here by the corrupt text.

4:12 "in spirit" is left out. To be an example of the believer it is necessary to have a spiritual man guided by the indwelling Holy Spirit.

4:16 "if any man" is omitted. It is unthinkable that the head of the house should be removed here from the responsibility to provide for widows.

6:5 "from such withdraw thyself" is dropped. The Bible doctrine of separation is affected by this corruption. We are to withdraw from teachers who are destitute of the truth.

6:19 "eternal life" is changed to "that which is truly life." The first talks about the length of life, the second talks about the quality of life. You cannot have the first without being saved. You can have the second but still be lost, depending on what you think is "truly life."

## 2 TIMOTHY

1:11 "of the Gentiles" is omitted. That Paul was appointed to teach the gospel to the Gentiles is indisputable (see Gal. 2: 7-9).

## HEBREWS

1:3 "When he had by himself purged our sins" is changed to "when he had made purification of sins." The omission of the word "our" leaves us to wonder whose sins were purged, his own or others. It is not plain and therefore the substitutionary atonement of Christ is affected by the change. With the words "by himself" the Holy Spirit wanted us to see that the atonement for our sins was accomplished by Christ alone. The damage to this verse is awesome in its consequences.

3:1 "Christ" is omitted. Our High Priest must be anointed of God to that office and the word Christ means the Messiah or Anointed one of God.

10:34 "in heaven" is left out. Those who had lost all their earthly goods certainly had no enduring substance here, but in heaven was their treasure and reward.

## JAMES

2:20 "faith without works is dead" has been changed to "faith without works is useless." There is a great difference between dead faith and useless (or idle) faith. The first indicates that no faith exists and the person is lost. The second implies that faith exists but it is not being used. Again we see humanism and the false idea of a little divinity in each one which only needs to be fanned into a flame. The change promotes false doctrine.

4:4 "ye adulterers" is dropped from the text. No reason to excuse the men from the scathing denunciation of God's Word.

4:14 "It is even a vapour" is changed to "Ye are just a vapour." In describing the length of our life, God tells us it will pass quickly like a vapour. The change would have US OURSELVES to exist as a little steam. There is a leaning here toward annihilationism.

5:16 "Confess your faults" becomes "confess your sins." In a context where God talks about sin in relationship to sickness, he moves on to talk about faults (a side-slip or deviation). The change "faults" to "sins" leads to the priesthood and the confession box which is contrary to all of Scripture.

## 1 PETER

1:22 "through the Spirit" is removed. The Bible teaches that it is through the agency of the Holy Spirit that men are brought to believe in Christ. In John 16:8,9 he convicts the world (all men) and draws them to faith in Christ.

1:23 "for ever" is dropped and thereby the preservation of the Word of God is called into question. The agency here of the new birth is the Word of God, which is eternal. Our new birth therefore is as eternal as the Word which originated it.

2:2 The phrase "unto salvation" is added by Westcott and Hort to "that ye may grow thereby." This puts a question mark over the certainty of our present salvation. It makes salvation a process rather than an accomplished fact. The doctrine of eternal security is denied by the new exhortation to grow UNTO SALVATION.

3:18 "suffered for sins" is changed to "died for sins." The context has Christians suffering for well doing and they are exhorted to keep on because Christ also has suffered for us. It is a Bible teaching that Christ not only died for our sins, but that he suffered for our sins (see Isaiah 53:5-7).

3:18 "quickened by the Spirit" is changed to "quickened in the spirit." The correct rendering attributes the resurrection of Christ to the Holy Spirit. This completes the truth that all three persons of the Trinity were involved in the resurrection of Christ (see John 2:19; Rom. 8:11).

4:1 "for us" is left out. Christ suffered for us, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.

5:2 "taking the oversight thereof" is omitted. To watch over the flock of God with authority is a clear teaching of the Word.

5:12 "wherein ye stand" is changed to "wherein stand." By the removal of the word "ye" there is a change from our standing in grace to an exhortation to stay there standing. The blessing of a perfected standing in grace is thereby removed.

## 2 PETER

2:17 The words "for ever" are dropped. Peter, in the word concerning false teachers, states that their darkness is to last forever. The change leaves us with no definite word as to their end.

2:18 "those that were clean escaped" is changed to "those that are scarcely escaping." The change from past tense to present tense moves us from a completed salvation to a hope-so salvation. Those who are saved are in possession of eternal life (see John 5:24).

2:20 "the Lord and Saviour" becomes "our Lord and Saviour." The false teachers had escaped some of the world's worst sins by following the teachings of "the Lord" but they had never come to know him as "our Lord" is known to real Christians. They were not saved and then lost, but never saved at all.

3:2 "us the apostles" is changed to "your apostles." The Church is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (Eph. 2:20) and there are no apostles and prophets today nor is there any such thing as an apostolic succession. The phrase "your apostles" indicates that the people he was writing to had special apostles designated for them and lends support to the continuance of a so-called "Apostolic Succession."

## 1 JOHN

1:7 "Christ" is dropped. This word brings the cleansing blood into relationship with our great anointed High Priest who ever liveth to make intercession for us. Many cults believe that Jesus (as man) died for the original sin of Adam and that Christ (as a spirit) rose without the body. John would have us know that the one who died and the one who arose are the same.

3:5 "our" is removed from before "sins." Once again the question of whose sins were taken away is raised. There have been sins committed by angels and men. The "our sins" refers the atonement to those of men. (see my comments under Hebrews 1;3).

3:14 "his brother" is removed. The teaching of the Word is that a true Christian will love his brother in Christ. If a man do



es not love a true Christian, then it is evident that he is still lost and abides in death. The test of spiritual life is not that we love, but that we love the brethren (see John 13:34,35).

4:19 "We love him" is changed to "We love." The object of God's love is us, and the object of our love is him. Christians are not just people who love, but people who love God because of his grace. The very next verse deals with the profess or who says he loves God but is a liar. Lost people may love, but saved people love God.

5:7 The whole verse bearing testimony to the Triune God is discarded. There are at least 20 Greek manuscripts which have this verse in. It is also seen in the writings of the church fathers and lectionaries. It directly affects the Bible doctrine of the Trinity.

## REVELATION

5:10 "kings and priests" is changed to "a kingdom of priests." The 24 elders are representative of all the redeemed who in Christ are constituted kings and priests. A kingdom of priests smells of Nicolaitanism (the rule of the clergy over the laity) and the priesthood for a select few as in the Roman Catholic Church. (The same change is seen in 1:6)

8:13 "an angel" is changed to "an eagle." This is most amusing and shows how captive the Revisers are to their corrupt text. In a setting replete with angels we are told about a talking eagle who pronounces three more "Woes" to the inhabitants of the earth.

14:5 "before the throne of God" is dropped. This phrase speaks of the perfect standing that the saved have in Christ. They are without fault before God because they are, like the church, "accepted in the beloved" (Eph. 1:6).

20:9 "from God" is dropped. At the end of the Kingdom Age the enemies of God are destroyed by fire "from God out of heaven." God is the one who will destroy all enemies and create a new heaven and a new earth.

20:12 "before God" is changed to "before the throne." The dead will be raised, not to stand before an impersonal throne, but to stand before "the God". Many would like to change the personal God into some kind of Divine Mind or Supreme Being.

## CONCLUSION

All that has gone before makes it very clear that Christian Doctrine is greatly affected by the changes. The MINORITY Text is the source of these changes and the New Modern Versions follow that Text. The ministry of the Holy Spirit is to guide us into "all truth."

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/29 13:31**

This may upset some people... and I'm not saying this with the intention of upsetting people... but I truly believe that the reason people say "Sure, some things are different in the modern versions, but none of the doctrine is changed" is because they don't study the Word of God. Or they have never studied with a KJV... even though most proponents of modern versions claim they love the KJV... they've never studied it (i.e. they don't really love the KJV cuz how would they know they love it if they have never read it?). If they did, I believe they would see the differences and be concerned.

People make a lot of claims, but they don't mean anything.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/29 15:15**

No comments on the laundry list of doctrinal changes between the KJV and the modern versions?

Krispy

**Re: - posted by Zumb, on: 2005/3/29 15:59**

Wow KrispyKrittr, Thanks a lot for taking so much time to humbly describe the problems with a lot of the new versions. I have heard a lot of people say the KJV is way better then not back it up or say it in pride.

I have grown up with the NIV, memorized Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter and almost all of Matthew so far in the NIV. So reading through those doctrinal changes in Matthew I knew you were right about all of them. It really opened my eyes. I think for the most part more harm is done than good by attacking other translations and it causes disunity among believers. But you did it in a really good way. I am definitely going to research this a lot more and find where I stand. Maybe after I graduate from high school. But yeah, thanks a lot for putting all of that information out there :-)

**Re:, on: 2005/3/29 16:35**

Quote:

-----Thanks a lot for taking so much time to humbly describe the problems with a lot of the new versions.  
-----

As much as I would love to honestly take credit for that compilation I posted earlier this afternoon... alas, I can not. That was drawn up by someone else.

However, I have investigated the majority of what is on that list, and if you do the same you will draw the same conclusions as the writer and myself have.

As of yet, not one person who has posted on this thread claiming there to be errors in the KJV has provided one piece of evidence.

So far the evidence presented on this thread seems to be tipping the scales in favor of the KJV... not surprisingly. :-)

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/29 16:40**

Quote:

-----I have grown up with the NIV, memorized Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter and almost all of Matthew so far in the NIV. So reading through those doctrinal changes in Matthew I knew you were right about all of them. It really opened my eyes. I think for the most part more harm is done than good by attacking other translations and it causes disunity among believers. But you did it in a really good way. I am definitely going to research this a lot more and find where I stand. Maybe after I graduate from high school. But yeah, thanks a lot for putting all of that information out there  
-----

Hey man, I used the NIV for 7 years. I never even knew there was an issue about versions until 2 or 3 years ago. This has to be debated... it's extremely important, but you are right, it needs to be done civilly. But we should always contend earnestly for the faith, and for truth. We need to keep in mind that we are saved by grace... not by what version we read. But at the same time, as we mature in Christ this is an issue that I believe every Christian needs to take very seriously.

Welcome to the conversation, Zumb. Glad to have ya aboard.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/31 8:43**

Sooo... I'm wondering...

There have been several claims on this thread that the KJV has errors.

When is anyone going to give us some examples?

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2005/3/31 13:19**

Interesting... I can hear crickets chirping on this thread...

Krispy

**Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/3/31 21:02**

After seeing the difference between the NIV and KJV I was shocked

**Re: - posted by Matt25 (), on: 2005/3/31 23:44**

Quote:  
-----"I seldom go to any other version outside of the King James for it is so to be trusted. And so many of the newer versions are not to be trusted..."  
-----

Keith Daniel in *Are You a Soul Winner?* 5 minutes 32 seconds into the sermon.

**Re: - posted by inotof (), on: 2005/4/1 9:30**

KJV! Gud enuff fer Paul, gud enuff fer me! :-P

**Re:, on: 2005/4/1 9:57**

Quote:  
-----KJV! Gud enuff fer Paul, gud enuff fer me!  
-----

That would be funny if it wasn't for the fact that many use that line to mock the KJV, while remaining in ignorance about the entire topic. Heck, I used to say that... and mock KJV defenders. Then I gave it an honest study.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by inotof (), on: 2005/4/1 11:19**

Quote:  
-----  
That would be funny if it wasn't for the fact that many use that line to mock the KJV, while remaining in ignorance about the entire topic. Heck, I used to say that... and mock KJV defenders. Then I gave it an honest study.

Krispy  
-----

I'm all for the KJV! I was just ribbin' ya man. It was really in response to your "cricketts are chirpin'" quote. Hard to convey what you're trying to say in type. Sorry if it brought offense.

Re:, on: 2005/4/1 11:25

Quote:  
-----I'm all for the KJV! I was just ribbin' ya man. It was really in response to you "cricketts are chirpin'" quote. Hard to convey what your trying to say in type. Sorry if it brought offense.  
-----

No, it wasnt offensive to me. It is funny, but I do cringe some when I hear someone say that because I know I said mockingly for a long time.

Dont worry... I have a sense of humor. I have to, I have kids.

Krispy

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/4/1 14:20

Quote:  
-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:  
So far the evidence presented on this thread seems to be tipping the scales in favor of the KJV... not surprisingly.  
-----

Evening all,

Found this website:<http://www.bibletexts.com/kjv-tr.htm#7>. Would anyone care to comment on the validity of this site and of what he is saying about the Tectus Reciptecorus. :-?

The scales may be tipping. :-P

Re:, on: 2005/4/1 14:43

oh sure... bring this into the picture when I dont have time to address this!

This is a quote from another article on this website you've posted:

*"Beyond the issues of scholarship, Mrs. Eddy is best recognized by her living practice of Christianity. Though best known to many as a practitioner and teacher of Christian healing, she also was remarkable for her consistent unconditional Christian love (Greek: agape), especially toward her many enemies. I myself am grateful to God to have experienced many Christian healings of sin and disease through the practice of her teachings on **Christian Science**, the Science of Christ."*

*I believe that the most balanced and honest biographies of her are those by the thorough, scholarly historian, Robert Peel. He did not back down from his honest conclusions, even when the publishing of those conclusions reportedly brought him disfavor from some senior management at **The Church of Christ, Scientist, the church that Mrs. Eddy founded.***

So... this guy you're linking us to promotes false religions, and belongs to one himself.

Be very careful who you use as resources...

I wont reply to anything at that link because #1 I dont have time today... and #2 he's a cultist, or at least very deceived. He's not credible, at least in my mind.

Acutally... this gentleman kinda proves my point, in a way.

Krispy

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/4/1 15:00

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

oh sure... bring this into the picture when I dont have time to address this!

Fortunately for me, my work day ended about five hours ago. So my weekend has started. :-D

Come let us reason - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/4/1 15:33

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

So... this guy you're linking us to promotes false religions, and belongs to one himself.

Be very careful who you use as resources...

First of all, I asked for feedback, so to use it it as a resource is a bit of stretch, but I will anyway, if I remember, he has h aystacks of stuff in there. You were just fortunate enough to find the needle.

Second of all, I could not find that exact quote but I did find the book in the biblio section. At the top of the page he says t his: In the books listed below, I have made no recommendations. **These represent great variations of conclusions a mong scholars.** I am attempting to avoid my prejudicing a reader's choices, without being able to explain adequately wit hin the limited scope of this webpage the reasons for my conclusions. Read, think, ask, listen then decide.

Quote:

... and #2 he's a cultist, or at least very decieved. He's not credible, at least in my mind.

Very quick on that one. Think it needs time to, as it has been referenced here before, perculate. :-(

Re: Come let us reason, on: 2005/4/1 15:45

There are others who would do a better job of countering the points this gentleman makes. Obviously I have not had tim e to sufficiently read everything he says. Usually when someone tells me to look into something an author has to say, th e first thing I do is look to see what he/she believers and who they are affiliated with. That says a lot about where they ar e coming from, obviously.

For instance, if someone tells me they attend an Assembly of God church, I can make the assumption that they are sym pathetic to Pentacostal doctrine.

This gentleman is a Christian Scientist. As such, he believes in a false religion, a false teacher, and a false god.

Paul was very clear that we should mark and avoid false teachers. Therefore, since this man is very much influenced by a false teacher... I really am not too interested in reading about what he sees wrong with the KJV. His religion does not make any sense in light of the KJV, and so it only makes sense that he doesnt like it.

Why would I go to a man who doesnt even believe in the same God I do for information concerning the Word of the Livin g God?

Just something to think about.

Krispy

**Re: Cowboy or sharpshooter - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/4/1 16:02**

Quote:  
-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:  
  
This gentleman is a Christian Scientist. As such, he believes in a false religion, a false teacher, and a false god...since this man **is very much influenced by a false teacher...**  
  
-----

Really, 'very much influence'?

Quote:  
-----  
His religion does not make any sense in light of the KJV, and so it only makes sense that he doesn't like it.  
-----  
When you have some more time you can qualify some of these claims.

Quote:  
-----  
Why would I go to a man who doesn't even believe in the same God I do.  
-----  
That's again, quite a statement.

I'll leave it for now, you are busy.

Enjoy the rest of your day,  
by the way are you Tar Heels fan? Tomorrow's the big one. UNC are apparently the favourites.

**Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/4/6 9:58**

Today Non Inspired Version :lol:

**Re:, on: 2005/4/6 10:13**

Quote:  
-----are you Tar Heels fan? Tomorrow's the big one. UNC are apparently the favourites.  
-----

Go Tarheels! I can't believe they almost blew a 15 point lead the other night. The best team won... of course. :-)

On to more **serious** things...

Do you really need me to explain why I'm not willing to give credence to someone who is a Christian Scientist, and who praises Mary Baker Eddy?

Christian Science is a cult, Zeke.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/4/6 10:17**

I do not like the TNIV, it does damage to language