



General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation? - posted by JohnnyAnt (), on: 2005/8/10 0:09

I have always been raised with the King James Version, and I was talking with a friend a couple days back about different versions of the Bible. I began to wonder which version was most consistently close to the exact translation of what the Bible said. I realize that when translating things can be said in many different ways, but I was just wondering if any one, or multiple versions, stood out above the rest.... Which versions are trying their best to literally translate what is being said rather than putting things in modern day terms?

Re: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation? - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/8/10 0:15

Johnny,

Stick with the King James, but don't be afraid to compare it with other versions. People get angry when the topic is brought up, but many have not done verse by verse comparison. If anyone uses another version and loves the Lord, God bless them.

This is probably the third or fourth posting on this topic lately. If you want verse comparisons there are many in this forum, like myself, that are more than willing to post them in the forum or send them to you via email.

The truth is out there. The Spirit will guide you rightly if you are willing to submit to Him.

Re: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation? - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/10 4:16

Quote:

-----Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

I favour the KJV too, although I most often read it in a version called the Newberry Bible. As so often with this question the real question is 'what do you mean by 'exact translation'? If by 'exact translation' you mean 'word for word' equivalence I would say the Youngs Literal Version (available in most Bible software packages) is the most 'literal' of the 'literal equivalence' translations but although it is a very valuable study aid it is not easy to 'meditate' or just 'read' this version; it almost compels you to 'study'.

The most readable of the 'literal equivalents' and probably the most I would say would be the American Standard Version. You can't get them over here, other than in Bible software. The Old Testament of the ASV should always be consulted if you are doing any 'in depth' Bible study. If you can get a version which has the full marginal variants... even better. It has been said that the best translation of the OT ever is the 'ASV margin'.

BUT, before the feeding frenzy begins... the ASV is not trustworthy in the New Testament due to its almost exclusive use of a different family of Greek manuscripts. However, its tenses and prepositions, which are one of the weaknesses of the KJV, are very good. The best of both worlds would be the ASV/RV Old Testament with a KJV NT with the tenses and prepositions corrected... and such a Bible exists! It is called (<http://www.cambridge.org/uk/bibles/rv/interlinear.htm>) The Interlinear Bible and it makes it possible to read devotionally and read for study from the same page. However, it is only currently available as a wide-margin edition which makes it a bit bulky. Occasionally, older printings (non wide-margin) appear in ebay but they are expensive to buy second hand as some folks have discovered its value!

Most of the advantages (and more) of the Interlinear have been harvested in (https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id175&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) the Newberry Bible.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re:, on: 2005/8/10 5:49

The real question should be... a more literal translation of what? The underlying stream of text is different between the KJV and the modern versions. They are not translations of the same thing... they are different.

Stick w/ the KJV.

This will be my only post on this thread. Dont care to be involved in the "feeding frenzy".

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/10 6:28

Quote:

-----Stick w/ the KJV.

...until something better comes along. ;-)

If any doubt my support for the KJV here are a couple of great quotes:

The peculiar genius which breathes through the English Bible, the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars, all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man, and that man - William Tyndale.

Thomas Newberry. Preface to the Newberry Bible.

The Authorised Version (KJV) has this incalculable advantage, that is is a truly *literal* translation - the only form of translation that can properly and reverently be adopted in the case of the Holy Scriptures.

Ellicott; Preface to Galatians.

Re: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation? - posted by aeryck (), on: 2005/8/10 8:43

Hear Ye All, Hear Ye All,

'All the version of the King James Version from 1611 onward are still extant and have been examined minutely by F.H. Scrivener and other careful scholars. Aside from printers errors, the editions differ from each other only in regard to spelling, punctuation, and, in a few places, italics. Hence any one of them may be used by a Bible-believing Christian. The fact that some of them include the Apocrypha is beside the point, since this does not affect their accuracy in the Old and New Testaments.' Edward F. Hill

In Jesus,
Aeryck.

ps. Personal experience with audio versions has led me to the firm conviction that the Holy Spirit favours this version. It seems from this thread to be how the Lord is still guiding us by 'common faith' Praise God.

Anyone read:- 'In Awe Of Thy Word' by Prof. Gail Riplinger?

Re: - posted by AgapeLove81 (), on: 2005/8/10 10:17

I agree with aeryck all versions say the same thing, just modern english is used in some. The only difference I have noticed is that even though they say the same thing a few seem to be "watered down" for lack of a better term. The KJV seems to be more powerful as far as wording, but I personally find the NIV easier to understand and apply to life today.

For example one of the other threads deals with discipling children, the KJV states **"Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die"**, , the CEV states **"Don't fail to correct your children. You won't kill them by being firm"**, , both are Proverbs 23:13 the only difference is one is firmer then the other. But everyone has their own views and this is mine.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re:, on: 2005/8/10 11:14

Quote:
-----all versions say the same thing, just modern english is used in some. The only difference I have noticed is that even though they say the same thing a few seem to be "watered down" for lack of a better term.

This is not true... "just modern english" is a myth. It goes much much deeper than that. I recommend you research this topic further. It's a real eye opener.

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/10 11:25

Quote:
-----'All the version of the King James Version from 1611 onward are still extant and have been examined minutely by F.H. Scrivener and other careful scholars. Aside from printers errors, the editions differ from each other only in regard to spelling, punctuation, and, in a few places, italics. Hence any one of them may be used by a Bible-believing Christian. The fact that some of them include the Apocrypha is beside the point, since this does not affect their accuracy in the Old and New Testaments.' Edward F. Hill

This quotation is a little misleading. Scrivener died in 1891 so this quotation does not refer to any (http://www.bible-researcher.com/versbib10.html) 20th Century Versions or (http://www.bible-researcher.com/versbib13.html) 21st Century Versions. Scrivener was an strong supporter of the Byzantine text against the Westcott and Hort editions.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2005/8/10 14:32

Hi...!

While I do like to read the KJV (chiefly among others), I would recommend that those who research such matters to read the original KJV. It is found in many libraries and Christian book stores. However, you may notice quite a bit of difference between the original KJV and the later editions -- especially linguistic change and inclusion of many apocryphal books. Perhaps those researching this might also want to read the translator's preface (included in the original, and in some of the later versions of the King James Version). The preface display the original intent and reasoning behind the new version in 1611. It echoes some of the later translations (like the original 1978 NIV). Oddly, this preface stands in stark contrast with the some of the "prose" arguments of many *KJV-only* believers.

Its unfortunate, but many of the *KJV-only* crowd tend to "research" using only *KJV-only* friendly books concerning Scripture translation. And many of the Scriptural "discrepancies" are in reality just Scriptural *comparisons* with the KJV. I have read several works in the *KJV-only* school of thought, but I have noticed that (even from the very beginning) they are quite partial.

Like others said on this particular thread, I suggest that the sincere believer research the matter wholeheartedly and without prejudice.

:~)

Re:, on: 2005/8/10 14:40

ccchhrrriiiss, I actually used to be a devoted NIV reader, and I hated the KJV. Everything I read when I started to research this came from an "anti" KJV stance because they were given to me by someone who was my pastor, who was very pro-modern version. So I have actually researched this completely backwards from what you described. Not disagreeing with you... just ask that you don't paint with such a broad brush.

And when the translators were suggesting that multiple versions be used when studying scripture, they were not meaning the Alexandrian stream of Greek text, since that stream was very much rejected by the Protestant until the 1880's.

Also, yes, the 1611 reads slightly different from the KJV most have now. Not speaking for anyone but myself, I am not a

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

gainst updating. But using a completely different Greek text which varies quite differently from the Received Text is not an update... it's a different translation of a different text. That's what the modern versions (NIV, NASB etc) are.

Just wanted to point that out...

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/10 15:02

Further to my comments on Scrivener I thought this (<http://www.bible-researcher.com/ervrevisers.html>) List of Revisers might be of interest. These are the people who actually created the English RV of 1881 (and consequently the ASV of 1901) and there are some surprising people among them; Scrivener being one of them.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2005/8/10 16:04

Hi Krispy...!

That's a great method of research. I have never really heard of an "anti" KJV school of thought, though. That is very surprising and disheartening.

Please forgive any misunderstanding with my comment (as being painted with a "broad brush"). I have unfortunately found *many* who have used more of a "narrow brush" (pardon the borrowed colloquialism) when using references or "research material" in this matter. Because of overwhelming availability, *many* researchers tend to find books supporting a *KJV-only* mentality. While there is a lot of great material contained in many of these books, it still offers only a biased or slanted view, rather than a truly investigative view. And some of these books offer a "conspiracy theory" approach to all other versions (as if the NIV translators were evil men bent on destroying the faith). Some books go so far to label those who use other translations as being "lost."

Sadly, it seems that many people often accept an argument based upon the credibility of the informant, rather than on the weight behind the research or work. This is true with a multitude of topics of discussion within Christianity, as is evidenced in discussions in congregations and by even some visitors to this website.

The KJV that we accept today is usually the version published in 1769 (sometimes known as the Benjamin Blayney text). This was actually the fifth edition. The original 1611 version, due to linguistic changes, is written in an older, non-standardized form of English (with many spelling differentiations). Here is a link to a page out of the original, from a *KJV-only* website:

Quote:

-----<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kjplate1.jpg>

As you can see, because of such spelling changes, it is quite difficult for many average readers to understand. It is widely available at libraries and bookstores (ISBN 0840700288 and ISBN 0840700288).

I suggest that those who really want to study the KJV to begin by going to the original. Read the original 1611 version (rather than the 1769 KJV), including dedicatory and translators notes. It might be helpful to read the original preface to the 1611 version (often called "*The Translators to the Reader*").

Probably one of the most surprising elements when studying the KJV is the stringent instructions that were given to the translators by King James (and the Catholic clergy). They were surprisingly quite the opposite of what some might believe. For instance, many of the old ecclesiastical words and terminology were not permitted to be "updated" during the translation process. Also, whenever possible, the translators were urged to not deviate from the commonly read *Bishop's Bible*, but when necessary, to use much of the *Tyndale* wording. And again, if any word "hath divers signification" -- then the translators were to refer to what was accepted by the most "eminent" church "fathers." Ultimately, the King James Version was almost an 80% unaltered version of *The Tyndale Version*.

Skeptics of modern translations often have a good reason to be skeptical. In fact, they *should* be. A lot of what is passed as a *translation* is nothing more than a modified version of a previous translation (such as the NKJV; NIV, The Living Bible, etc...). Critics point to the obvious flaws in those versions, as well as the more subtle flaws in the more serious translations.

But is the KJV without controversy? Of course not. People often point to the fact that the Original 1611 KJV is notably d

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

ifferent in linguistic style and spelling from the later editions. There are also several oddly translated passages in the KJV (such as the KJV Acts 12:4 reference of *Easter* -- reference to the pagan diety and Roman holiday, when the greek translation is obviously *Passover*).

Obviously, there are other versions available in other languages that even outdate the 1611 King James Version. Many of these are also based upon the same manuscripts available to the translators of the KJV. But in some of these languages, the pronouns have changed very little in 400 years (like Spanish). Thus, the "kingly" sounding "thees" and "thous" are not as present.

The Word of God is, of course, *inspired* by God -- and it is infallible. The translation, regardless of how honorably some one tries to argue, can sometimes be flawed. There are slight differences in wording (and yes, in meaning) of text. But because a word is mistranslated does not change the fact that God is indeed the author of the Bible. Someone once said, "*Some men like to read the Bible in Hebrew. Some like to read the Bible in Greek. I prefer to read it with the Holy Ghost.*" I suggest that this is the attitude to take. The Holy Spirit will lead us and guide us into all truth. Like I said before, I suggest that the sincere believer research the matter wholeheartedly and without prejudice. And, as with all matters of faith and belief, *test everything* (I Thessalonians 5:21).

:)

Re:, on: 2005/8/10 16:40

While I do reject modern versions now, I am not of the extreme KJV-Only variety. Some go so far as to say that the KJV corrects the Greek. I reject that. I do believe the KJV is God's preserved Word, based on the Received Text, which is how I believe God has preserved His Word since the Apostolic Age. I reject anything that is based on any other stream of text.

Thats my position in a nutshell. :-)

Krispy

Re: What is the best translation in other translations other than english - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/8/10 18:49

I have been looking at versions in different languages and it is hard to tell what is accurate or not in those translations if anybody say knows about the korean or the japanese or the portuges or hebrew translation or turkish I would be interested!!

Re: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation? - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/8/10 18:53

I am not a bible scholar. Thus, anything I say should be taken with scrutiny.

Recently, I visited an exhibit called "Ink and Blood" which goes into the history of the bible and how it has come to be what it is. You can see more about this exhibit at thier website: <http://www.inkandblood.com/>

In addition, if you would like to read a good book on the history of bible translation, check out "The Bible in Translation" by Bruce M. Metzger.

From what I understand, however, the KJV is not the best translation to read, if not for any reason than this: it is written in another language. We speak modern English whose form has so deviated from original English that if you do not know Old English as a language, you will misinterpret the text. The next reason is that over 80% of the King James Translation comes from one translator, Tyndale. Lastly, it was translated from Latin to English, rather than Greek and Hebrew. This means it has passed through two languages. That would be like an Arabian telling a Roman who then tells a German. How accurate could it be? (Then again, does not the Spirit work in us?)

The debate could rage for which bible is the "best." The New American Standard Bible is a word for word translation that comes from the original Greek and Hebrew languages. (Many scholars will argue this is the most accurate.) The NIV gathered the top scholars of our day and age with teams of people translating each book. (This method offers a more democratic approach.) Other bibles, like the Message, offers a single translator putting things in his own words. The list goes on.

I always think of what Jesus said: "My sheep will know my voice." (John 10:27) Whether it's a bible, preacher, or minister

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

, God's people will know when the Holy Spirit is speaking.

The bible was written by the Holy Spirit, and only the Spirit can understand things of the Spirit. (1 Corinthians 2:6-16)

Humans are fallible. The bible cannot be authenticated. Our faith is not based upon a book, it is based upon Christ. And so, what is most important is putting our faith in Christ. When we do this, we trust in Him and by this we trust that when we read the bible, He will use it to speak to us through the Spirit. Obviously then, the "best" translation is the one Christ chooses to speak to you, whether it is the King James or New Century.

Spiros Zodhiates Key Word Study Bible?KJV -n- NASV - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/8/10 20:29

How do thoughts two bibles compare to Spiros Zodhiates Key Word Study Bible?

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/8/10 23:28

brother blake,

Like you I'm only out to find the truth. And I also believe the Spirit will guide us in all truth.

However, in defense of the King James, there are three things you stated that are incorrect. The KJV did not come from the Latin Vulgate, it came from greek texts:

"Erasmus gathered together what Greek manuscripts he could locate in Basle. He was able to collect five, the majority of which were dated in the twelfth century."

From website:

http://www.solagroup.org/articles/faqs/faq_0032.html

There are some phrases that were said to be taken out the the Latin Vulgate, but the Textus Receptus were translated from Greek manuscripts. Erasmus did make a Latin copy as well as a Greek if this is what you meant.

Also, when you tell me that I am reading the KJV in another language, that just is not true. There are some words that I look up on Webster's, but that doesn't make the version inferior, it shows the corruptive nature of man's languages. Corrupted English is still English.

Lastly, the fact that you said the Bible cannot be authenticated is rather shocking. If it's not authentic, how can you trust what you read?

I'm searching for truth regardless of where the evidence points.

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/8/11 0:19

My dear letsgetbusy,

I could be wrong, as I said, I am not an authority on the bible.

The new testament consists mostly of letters written by the apostles. None of the original letters are in existence today. If they were, imagine the impact it would have on religious community. The bible would have to be accepted as truth. However, it is not. Rather, it suffers under immense debate.

The authenticity of the bible can be proved no more than any person can prove the existence of God. Rather, God has made it this way intentionally. If a person could prove the existence of God, humanity could not choose to love God. They would have to as their would be undeniable proof. Rather, God has established a system whereby faith is key. We must choose to believe in Christ. We must live by faith.

Likewise, we must also have faith in the bible. The bible is the word of God written by the Holy Spirit through people. As we know, people are corrupt. Many people stumble over knowing the bible has been written by humans. They discredit the bible as such. I know many Christians who discredit the bible.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

It is our choice to believe in the bible as God's word. We must bow down to our Lord Christ Jesus and accept His Spirit (His word) as truth. We must walk by faith even in this.

Let me not confuse anyone. I was not discrediting the King James version by my last post. I was merely pointing out that the word of God is not the book, it is the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit can choose to speak through many translations across a variety of languages.

One last thing about a search for truth: I too am in search of truth. I have come to realize that there is only one truth: Jesus Christ. Everything apart from Jesus has multiple truths.

This is important. Many people want to believe that there is only one way for everything. If X is right, then Y is wrong. They try to make the world black and white when it is not. Only God is truth. For everything else which God has created, there is variety and multiple truths.

God loves variety. There are no two things that God has created that are exactly the same. Think of snowflakes, fingerprints, and trees. Can you give me two that are exact copies?

Both maples and pines are trees. If I asked if a pine was a tree, you would say yes. If I asked a maple was a tree, you would say yes. So which is a tree? They both are.

Likewise, there are a variety of people. We speak different languages. We have different cultures and looks.

The worst thing we can do is limit God by saying there is only one way to everything. There is only one God. He is Jesus Christ. He is truth. Everything else has multiples. God is the foundation.

Therefore, to say there is only one true bible is ridiculous and blasphemous. There is only one true God. There is only one Holy Spirit. His Spirit is not a book. Rather, the Holy Spirit speaks through more books than the bible, and more preachers than just the apostles.

"For no man can lay a foundation other than the one which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor 3:11)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/11 4:20

beenblake

Quote:
-----From what I understand, however, the KJV is not the best translation to read, if not for any reason than this: it is written in another language. We speak modern English whose form has so deviated from original English that if you do not know Old English as a language, you will misinterpret the text. The next reason is that over 80% of the King James Translation comes from one translator, Tyndale. Lastly, it was translated from Latin to English, rather than Greek and Hebrew. This means it has passed through two languages. That would be like an Arabian telling a Roman who then tells a German. How accurate could it be? (Then again, does not the Spirit work in us?)

I'm taking up your invitation to 'scrutinize'. ;-) I think your information is a little off here but I think I can guess where it came from. It is true that Erasmus 'used' the Latin Vulgate but he did not 'base' his translation on it. He based his translation on his own text based on some ancient Greek manuscripts; this is important to remember. He created a Greek text using methods of what would now be called 'Textual Criticism'. We would not have our KJV without some textual critical foundations. He produced a 'version' which was his 'best fit/guess' at what the original 'autographs' (the handwritten originals) had actually said. But Erasmus was always a Catholic and never really willing to challenge the authorities of his day. (unlike the reformers) On occasion the Latin Vulgate had passages which were not in any of the manuscripts from which Erasmus had created his edited text. The Vulgate was highly regarded at that time and had itself been translated from the Greek. Erasmus took the line of least resistance and translated the missing verses from the Latin Vulgate into his own Greek text, although there was no manuscript evidence for them! He obviously concluded that although the verses were not in Greek manuscripts available to him they must have been in manuscripts which had been available to Jerome in his Vulgate translation. Not wanting to 'lose' anything he decided to 'take Jerome's word' for it.

The consequence of this was that a passage of 1 John which was not in the Byzantine textform was then translated by Tyndale (using Erasmus' text) into English and remains still in our KJV even though there is no textual evidence to support it. As you point out in your letter the KJV preface makes it very clear that the intention of the translators was to make a

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

good translation better, and that they regarded their translation as a work in process. It is important to remember that this was always Tyndale's attitude too. If I shall perceive either by myself or by the information of another, that ought be escaped me, or might be more plainly translated, I will shortly after, cause it to be mended. The precise figure of KJV dependence on Tyndale, btw, is 83%.

The other thing that might lie behind your comments about Tyndale translating from the Latin may be to do with language itself. Tyndale learned his Greek through the medium of Latin. He was a brilliant linguist, but Greek has verb tenses which Latin does not have so all Greek scholars of this period struggled with Greek tenses. Their Greek was Greek understood by Latin. I can illustrate this simply.

“Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.” (Rom. 6:6, KJV)

“knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin;” (Rom. 6:6, ASV)

“knowing this, that our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves of sin.” (Rom. 6:6, NKJV) You will see that the ASV and the NKJV have changed the tense of this 'crucifixion'. The KJV puts it into the present tense, the ASV and the NKJV put it into the past tense. There is a vital aspect of New Testament truth contained in this verse and the KJV loses it, simply because Tyndale translated the Greek Aorist tense as a simple present tense. The Aorist tense is best translated as a simple past tense, although it has the sense of the action having been completed in the past. So the KJV says that our 'old man' is in process of 'being crucified', the Greek and the ASV and the NKJV says 'our old man was crucified'. The issue of whether the 'old man' is undergoing crucifixion or 'was crucified' with Christ is a vital element of New Testament truth.

So Tyndale was limited in the tools that were available to him. Another aspect of Tyndale's work which often surprises people is that he did not try to create a 'word for word' translation. For him communication was always uppermost in his mind. I prefer word for word myself, but it is important to see Tyndale and hence the KJV in their historical context.

Re:, on: 2005/8/11 6:39

Quote:
-----In addition, if you would like to read a good book on the history of bible translation, check out "The Bible in Translation" by Bruce M. Metzger.

I would caution people to be careful about depending on Bruce Metzger as a source in learning about Bible translations. He is a theological liberal who believes most of the Old Testament is mythical, leans heavily in the direction of evolution, and in his auto-biography there is one thing that is never mentioned: he never mentions being saved. Yet he is the main person people run to when they want to learn about Bible versions. Seems to me that a reliable Bible scholar would mention *something*... **anything**... about his salvation experience!

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/8/11 6:48

Quote:
-----From what I understand, however, the KJV is not the best translation to read, if not for any reason than this: it is written in another language. We speak modern English whose form has so deviated from original English that if you do not know Old English as a language, you will misinterpret the text.

Ummm... my kids read the KJV. I haven't seen where they have misinterpreted any more than they would if they were reading the NIV. Harvard University did a study a couple years ago which showed that the KJV was written on a 9th grade reading level. This whole "The KJV is too hard to understand" is a myth which has been propagated by the publishing companies in order to sell more modern versions. Don't believe me? Wait until the next modern version comes out (a new one comes out about 6 months) and read the advertising.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Quote:

-----The next reason is that over 80% of the King James Translation comes from one translator, Tyndale

I have a Tyndale Bible. I've read a lot about Tyndale, and he's a hero of mine. I would take Tyndale's work over any translator alive today. And yes, 80% of the KJV is based on his translation. What's your point?

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/11 8:37

Quote:

-----University did a study a couple years ago which showed that the KJV was written on a 9th grade reading level.

“Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldst: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not.”

(John 21:18, KJVS)

Krispy, you know I love and use the KJV but most folk I know would struggle with the above, especially if they have false teeth. ;-)

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2005/8/11 8:43

Quote:

-----especially if they have false teeth.

Ha ha ha, I like it. :lol:

Re:, on: 2005/8/11 8:47

Quote:

-----especially if they have false teeth.

Then let them read silently... :-P

Krispy

Re: - posted by Joshua99 (), on: 2005/8/11 8:57

I Have been using primarily the New American standard version, for 25 years. The KJV is always within reach to double check all research in study. As I have understood it, the New American standard version, is a literal translation from the greek to english- word for word. I have always felt safe using this bible along with the KJV and sometimes the NIV. :-)

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re: How about translations in other languages other than english!! - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/8/11 10:04

What is the most accurate bible say in chinese or turkish or russian i am just interested

Dom

Re:, on: 2005/8/11 10:14

Quote:
-----I Have been using primarily the New American standard version, for 25 years. The KJV is always within reach to double check all re search in study. As I have understood it, the New American standard version, is a literal translation from the greek to english- word for word. I have alw ays felt safe using this bible along with the KJV and sometimes the NIV.

The NASB is a literal translation, yes... but of a different stream of Greek text. A Greek text that is considered by some (myself included) to be very corrupted. It's not translating the same text as the KJV. So you're half right.

Krispy

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/11 10:45

I feel if God has a message for you he can minister to you through a comic book, unless you limit him and put him in a b ox, as for as which Bible version the one that "you" personally understand the best, because no one I don't think is using the original inspired word that Paul and others wrote if so please send me a copy. Every version today is a translated ver sion even KJ version, I personally use the NASB and I love it, I think the best way to teach anyone is out of a book they can understand, I know you have you hard core KJ folks I know of a few myself nothing wrong with that but me personall y I just can't understand it very well, maybe that's because I am an old Country boy and lack the big city know how. :-P

Re:, on: 2005/8/11 11:13

Quote:
-----no one I don't think is using the original inspired word that Paul and others wrote if so please send me a copy

Bill... my friend, do you think God is capable of keeping His promise to preserve His Word unto every generation? Or is t his one area that He failed in?

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/8/11 11:16

Quote:
-----I just can't understand it very well, maybe that's because I am an old Country boy and lack the big city know how.

C'mon plow boy... you think I'm some kind of slicker? LOL.

Have you seen the Dukes of Hazzard movie yet? (I actually have no desire to see it... just makin' a joke)

This is Roscoooooe P. Coltrain... you got your ears on, little fat buddy?

I just baffled all our friends from outside the US... :-)

Krispy

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/11 11:25

I feel the King James Bible, it preserves God's words because it was translated using "formal equivalence." All other Bibles were translated using "dynamic equivalence," in which the translator is free to change words as long as he conveys the "idea." :-P

Duke of Hazzard yea I would like to see that, should will take me back to my roots. :-P

Re: - posted by AgapeLove81 (), on: 2005/8/11 11:26

I love reading your posts Krispy. I hope one day to be as out spoken and out going as you. I'm glad to see that you are comfortable in your own skin.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/11 11:41

Quote:

AgapeLove81 wrote:

I love reading your posts Krispy. I hope one day to be as out spoken and out going as you. I'm glad to see that you are comfortable in your own skin.

I think Krispy has a great purpose here, I know exactly where he is coming from most of the time on his posts, I think it's time a lot of the timid Christians rise up and let this world know were not going to take the get God out of our schools, remove the Ten Commandments, stuff any longer, we can make a difference, but we can't if we just lay back with a timid I don't want to stir up anything attitude. In fact, the Bible, in Hebrews 11, for instance, celebrates men and women of faith such as Daniel, Moses, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego and others, who all committed civil disobedience—rebellion against unjust rule. Some of the Apostles themselves refused to submit to Caesar and paid with their lives.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/11 12:28

Quote:

-----This is Roscooooo P. Coltrain... you got your ears on, little fat buddy?

I just baffled all our friends from outside the US...

Not some of us really old guys who watched it every Saturday over here!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/11 12:32

Quote:

-----I feel the King James Bible, it preserves God's words because it was translated using "formal equivalence." All other Bibles were translated using "dynamic equivalence," in which the translator is free to change words as long as he conveys the "idea."

No so, MrBillPro :-)

The RV, ASV, and the NASB are all more 'formal equivalence' than the KJV. But as Krispy has pointed out the Greek text behind the RV, ASV and the NASB is inferior, in the view of some of us, to that behind the KJV.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re: A great Bible resource... - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2005/8/11 12:55

Hi...!

A verse-by-verse comparison would take forever in this thread, with one group showing "flaws" in non-KJV translations, and another group pointing out to the "flaws" in the KJV. And a third group sits quietly on the side trying to learn something.

As stated before, I suggest that people really study the history behind of all translations. Contrary to much of modern Christian teaching, it is healthy to question the validity of anything pertaining to the faith. As a teen and a new believer, I wrestled with quite a few "traditions of faith" that were handed down through the ages. Because I sought so intently to learn the truth of such matters, I was able to stand firm on the validity of what I learned.

But many modern authoritarian pastors would say that such studying is spiritually unhealthy. I have been told that I am "under the umbrella" of their authority, and as long as I "unconditionally accepted" what was taught, I was protected by God. A pastor told me that I should "accept and not question the pastor's vision." After explaining that my beliefs differed somewhat from some of the beliefs that were taught, I was scolded for "lacking faith." I explained that I felt that such unconditional acceptance of doctrine or tradition is "blind faith" and can be quite dangerous. The pastor instructed me that, if I could not accept everything that was being taught without question, I should leave the church. Because of how involved I was in the Church, when the pastor saw how serious I was about the matter, he backtracked and asked me to just not "publicly disagree" with him.

The same thing can be said about all such matters -- including Bible translations. It is important that people make all such searches with complete and honest sincerity (and with an open mind -- realizing that you might actually change some of your accepted beliefs). The purpose of all such quests is to increase in the knowledge of God (rather than to find ammunition to support your particular beliefs).

There are *KJV-only* people who view those that accept other translations as *lost, confused, or unlearned*. And there are those that view the *KJV-only* crowd as *pompous, prideful, think-they-know-it-alls*. Like mentioned in an earlier post, there are people that believe all other versions are the result of "an evil conspiracy to destroy the faith." Of course, all such perceptions are usually wrong.

I suggest that all believers research the matter with wholehearted sincerity. Research (and even question) the origin of the translation, the intent of the translation, and even the comments made by Biblical pundits along the way. Read the prefaces written by the translators, the instructions given to the translators, and the history behind the text in which the versions are translated. And if you really want to get technical, contact the Bible societies in which the modern versions are published. While the answers will undoubtedly be slanted, they might offer a personal sense of understanding -- especially if you are able to speak with one or more of the translators. And it might be quite important to realize that most books written on the subject are quite prejudiced one way or the other. They can still be referenced, but always with a "grain of salt."

Finally, a verse by verse comparison can be helpful. There is a great website that you may already be aware of: <http://www.biblegateway.com> This website offers the entire Bible in many versions (including some foreign language versions).

:)

Re: - posted by saved_matt (), on: 2005/8/11 13:11

I'll start with a nice safe statement, I am NOT a Bible scholar, now my credentials have been done with i'd like to address a school of thought that always seems to crop up in these kind of discussions, it goes something like this,

Quote:

-----God can speak through any medium He decides to use!

Whereas this is true i think someone said something about how He could use a comic book if He wanted, this i completely agree with in fact He has spoke to me through a song coming out the radio in work before now, (it was one of those ev

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

everything seems to stop and the world melts away moments)

I want to ask if God can speak through any medium how do we know when He is?

we need some kind of basis of comparison, a standard against which everything else is compared, this is what the Bible is. In fact the Bible itself says over 3,000 times that it is the very Word of God, often in the NT when the author quotes from the OT they preface it with, 'God said' and that the terms 'Word of God' and 'scripture' were interchangeable, of course the most explicit example of this is 2 Tim 3:16 **All scripture is given by inspiration of God**, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

thus if God reveals anything to anyone that is not from the Holy Spirit quickening the Word, it will line up with what God has already revealed about Himself/us/the world etc.. in His Word.

Surely there is only one Word of God and anything that differs from it by one jot or tittle is merely the idea conveyed by the Word of God

Re:, on: 2005/8/11 13:25

Quote:
-----A verse-by-verse comparison would take forever in this thread, with one group showing "flaws" in non-KJV translations, and another group pointing out to the "flaws" in the KJV. And a third group sits quietly on the side trying to learn something.

Quick homework assignment... everyone do a verse comparison of the following verse without using the footnotes in your Bible...

Act 8:37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. (KJV)

Krispy

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/11 14:00

Quote:

philologos wrote:
No so, MrBillPro :-)
The RV, ASV, and the NASB are all more 'formal equivalence' than the KJV. But as Krispy has pointed out the Greek text behind the RV, ASV and the NASB is inferior, in the view of some of us, to that behind the KJV.

Well I still disagree with you but that's alright as long as we agree to disagree and move on. :-?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2005/8/11 14:09

Krispy wrote:
Quote:
-----Quick homework assignment... everyone do a verse comparison of the following verse without using the footnotes in your Bible...

Act 8:37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. (KJV)

The problem with such comparisons is that you are comparing a *translation* with other *translations*. This could be as bad as tuning one piano with another piano. You may end up with two out-of-tune pianos. Unfortunately, I do not speak ancient greek. And even if I did, who is to say that the earliest "received text" that is available is the best?

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Such verse-by-verse comparisons would take forever -- and could be a *chasing after the wind*. There are *obvious* flaws in all translations -- including the King James Version (especially the fifth edition in use today). In an earlier post, I mentioned **Acts 12:4**:

Quote:

-----**KJV**:

"And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people."

NIV:

"After arresting him, he put him in prison, handing him over to be guarded by four squads of four soldiers each. Herod intended to bring him out for public trial after the Passover."

NASV:

"When he had seized him, he put him in prison, delivering him to four squads of soldiers to guard him, intending after the Passover to bring him out before the people."

NKJV:

"So when he had arrested him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four squads of soldiers to keep him, intending to bring him before the people after Passover."

Darby Translation:

"whom having seized he put in prison, having delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep, purposing after the passover to bring him out to the people."

Notice that the King James Version is the only version to use the word Easter. Obviously, the KJV is flawed in using this word. How do we know this? Well, we know that the word *Easter* is from pagan origins -- and originated many centuries after the death of Peter and Paul. The early church did not "celebrate" roman holidays like Easter (or Christmas, etc...) . Such inclusion was probably the result of the instructions by King James to the translators to include such traditionally Catholic ecclesiastical terminology.

But such flaws do not nullify the Word of God. It only makes us realize that the *translating* was flawed -- because it was done by flawed humanity. Many people in the world point to many such obvious flaws in order to discredit Christianity. However, it only serves to strengthen our faith. Why? Because the Scriptures have been translated many times for millennia -- and the overwhelming bulk of it is indisputable! God has preserved it for thousands of years, with very few discrepancies. And with each of these discrepancies, we are able to understand them -- because we know the heart of God.

And remember, the Word of God is *living* and *active*. Like Leonard Ravenhill reminds us in the title of one of his books, *Sodom Had No Bible*. Neither did Noah...or Moses...or Abraham. The Word of God is alive within us. Of course, everything that we believe and teach should line up with the written Word. But as long as the translation is literal and academically sound, it stands the test of authenticity.

The argument that the King James Version is the *only preserved version* is quite hollow -- and unwittingly prejudiced. Imagine where that leaves all other peoples of the earth. Many of these foreign versions pre-date even the original King James Version (1611) -- not to mention the common fifth edition KJV.

Again, I recommend that the seriously concerned believer to sincerely and openly research each version without prejudice. Such research can undoubtedly be helpful to the honest believer.

:-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/11 14:38

Quote:

-----Well I still disagree with you but thats alright as long as we agree to disagree and move on.

It wasn't a personal opinion I was sharing. I can prove to you that the RV, ASV and NASB generally show more 'formal' or 'literal' equivalence than the KJV. This is evidenced among other things in the actual order of the words; frequently Tyndale chose the order for its sound, whereas these later translators actually tried to keep to the strict word order. In the KJV in Romans 6 we have..

Rom. 6:3 Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?

Rom. 6:11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our L

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

ord.
Rom. 6:23 For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Whereas in the ASV we have
Rom. 6:3 Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?
Rom. 6:11 Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus.
Rom. 6:23 For the wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord. Some of the old Brethren saw significance in this reversal of the word Christ and Jesus. This is Thomas Newberry "Jesus Christ: His title as living and dying on earth; here the emphasis is upon 'Jesus' as expressed by it being place first.

Christ Jesus: His title as risen and glorified. Anointed for his heavenly priesthood. Here the emphasis is on 'Christ' as no w glorified. It does not occur in the gospels. Here is a list of the occasions where his title is expressed as Christ Jesus - Acts 24:24; Rom. 3:24; 6:3,11,23; 8:1-2,11,34,39; 15:5,16-17; 16:3; 1Cor. 1:2,4,30; 4:15; 15:31; 16:24; 2Cor. 1:1; 4:5; Gal. 2:4,16; 3:14,26,28; 4:14; 5:6,24; Eph. 1:1; 2:6-7,10,13,20; 3:1,6,11,21; Phil. 1:1,8,26; 2:5; 3:3,8,12,14; 4:7,19,21; Col. 1:1,4; 2:6; 4:12; 1Th. 2:14; 5:18; 1Tim. 1:1-2,12,14-15; 2:5; 3:13; 4:6; 5:21; 6:13; 2Tim. 1:1-2,9-10,13; 2:1,3,10; 3:12,15; 4:1; Titus 1:4; Philem. 1:1,9,23

In some of these the KJV has the right order and in others has reversed them. I don't think the translators of the RV/ASV/NASB were better Bible students, it just that their methodology was more 'formal equivalence' orientated that was the KJV.

Re:, on: 2005/8/11 16:00

Quote:
-----The problem with such comparisons is that you are comparing a translation with other translations.

No, the problem with such comparisons is... it cant be done! That particular verse (along with hundreds of others) is gone, missing, not there in the versions that are based on the Alexandrian stream of Greek texts. This particular verse changes the doctrine of baptism. The doctrine of fasting (why and what for) is completely missing in the NT of the modern versions. Fasting is mentioned, but there is no explanation as to why, or the purpose of it. The KJV is clear about fasting.

I think that is pretty serious.

Krispy

Re: - posted by AgapeLove81 (), on: 2005/8/11 16:46

My personal reason for fasting is mentioned in most every version of the bible I can get my hands on (I own 5 physical versions and I have 2 computer programs that have around 25 versions each). It clearly states in most every bible that *But an evil spirit of this kind is only driven out by prayer and fasting." Matthew 17:21.* And that is in WNT translation.

But I do agree that for the most part KJV is the best translation for getting your point across, but there are sometimes that a different version says it better. This thread could go on for years and the only way to know for 110% is for someone to get a hold of the original documents and read them. We all know that is impossible so I think that it is a matter of opinion now.

P.S. Let the "your wrong and the check your facts begin"

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2005/8/11 17:04

Hi Krispy...

Quote:
-----"No, the problem with such comparisons is... it cant be done! That particular verse (along with hundreds of others) is gone, missing, not there in the versions that are based on the Alexandrian stream of Greek texts. This particular verse changes the doctrine of baptism. The doctrine of fasting (why and what for) is completely missing in the NT of the modern versions. Fasting is mentioned, but there is no explanation as to why, or the purpose of it. The KJV is clear about fasting."

Have you ever thought to consider that perhaps it is missing because some of the most reliable greek transcripts now available might *not* have contained that passage? And I disagree that with the notion that other translations change the importance of doctrinal beliefs like fasting or baptism. From the Scriptures (as a whole) it is quite clear that fasting and baptism is important.

There are many who place utmost faith in the "received text" (or correctly in latin, the "textus receptus"). Since I am not a scholar in ancient greek, I cannot vouch for the authenticity or non-authenticity of such manuscripts. But I also cannot dismiss that there are other manuscripts (some even older than those used for the "received text").

:)

Re: In Awe of Thy Word - posted by aeryck () , on: 2005/8/11 18:33

Hi everybody,

alt-add: I realized that my post was too heavy and irrelevant, so this is it slightly, lol amended.

I have watched this thread growing and I know it is going to swell, for this thread reflects our, 'common faith'. There are doctrines in the Word of God, that will I hope always remain constant.

So to Professor Gail Riplinger our sister who loves us and has spent a lot of time compiling:

In Awe of Thy Word.

In Jesus,

.A.

:-P

Re: Havent we argued this many a time - posted by deltadom () , on: 2005/8/11 18:46

I wish I could bring up the thread so i could generalize what was on them!! it would make like alot easier to actually have a section with what people believe in their profile!! because this issue pops up so many times!!

Re: - posted by beenblake () , on: 2005/8/11 18:49

Re: KrispyKrittr

My, my, brother Krispy. Why are you so defensive? What is it that you fear? You are constantly on the defense as if everyone is judging you, all the while criticizing everyone and everything else.

Let me share a little secret with you: only Jesus is perfect; only God is good. This means everything else is corrupt. Yes, indeed, Metzger is corrupt. The bible says that all men are bad. This includes all the apostles who wrote the bible, all the translators who translated the bible, and even Tyndale. And yet, God has chosen to use these bad/corrupt men to deliver His word. Why? God is greater than men. He can use evil to bring about good.

Do not fret over evil. God is in control and He is in charge. He does not need you to fight His battles. He does not need you to keep the world in check. He does things according to His will.

Do not be so afraid of evil. Rather, be filled with the Holy Spirit and let Jesus direct and guide your life.

We are followers of Christ. Let us do just that and follow Christ. Everytime we look away at sin and evil, we lose our focus. When we are filled with Christ, we are filled with peace, love, and joy.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

In love,
Blake

Re: In Awe of Thy Word - posted by aeryck (), on: 2005/8/11 18:50

Hi my precious brothers and sisters in Jesus, here is the whole book, I think?..nah but enough to make one wanna buy it ...yeah!:-P

In Awe of Thy Word by Professor Gail Riplinger

Amen, and Amen.

In Jesus,
Aeryck.

alt-add: I pressed the quote button instead of the send, my colours are too dark again...whoops.lol :-P

Re: In Awe of Thy Word: Previews - posted by aeryck (), on: 2005/8/11 19:35

Okay, these are some previews of 'In Awe of Thy Word' by Professor Gail Riplinger, enjoy!

Chapter One: Every Word
Chapter Two: Sound = Sense
Chapter Three: From Bishop's Bible To King James Bible
Chapter Four: How the Mind Works
Chapter Five: The Holiest of All
Chapter Six: Pure Words..true
Chapter Seven: The Little Book
Chapter Eight: Magnified Words..
Chapter Nine: The Breath and Heartbeat of God
Chapter Ten: Even Balance
Chapter Eleven: Jesus & Jehovah
Chapter Twelve: End of the world..KJV for kids and missionaries
Chapter Thirteen: THE NEW SLEAZY READING BIBLES
Chapter Fourteen: Enemy Secrets, Lexicons and Private Interpretations
Chapter Fifteen: Hidden Notes & Public views of King James Bibles
Chapter Sixteen: The Kings Letters Figured in Glory...
Chapter Seventeen: The Sounds of the 1st English Bible..
Chapter Eighteen: Acts 2 to you, from the Gothic Bible
Chapter Nineteen: ANGLO SAXON BIBLE
Chapter Twenty: From Anglo Saxon to KJB
Chapter 21: English Bibles before Wycliffe
Chapter 22: Wycliffe's Views
Chapter 23: Translators in the 1500's

etc...
one more that intrigued me:-

Chapter 27: The Received Text and Erasmus

I must point out that these brief segments are only from a small part of this magnificent book, so it would be wrong to make a sweeping assessment without first reading, 'IN AWE OF THEY WORD' by Professor Gail Riplinger. Praise the Lord!

In Jesus,
Aeryck
:-P

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re: - posted by cchhhrrriiss () , on: 2005/8/12 1:43

Hi Aeryck...!

Remember to "test" this book too. The material contained in it needs to be scrutinized by both the Word of God and history. Thus, I recommend research, even for the books that offer "expert advice" on such subjects.

The book is from Chick Publications, which is notoriously "KJV-only." While Chick publishes alot of wonderful tracts, don't forget that they are the same company that published the controversial and flawed *Alberto* series, as well as the doctrinally flawed *He Came to Set the Captives Free*. Mrs. Giplinger is quite militantly prejudiced against all other translations. Yet a simple Google search reveals that there are many who do not "buy" her argument:

http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=664

<http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/riplinger3.htm>

<http://www.nccg.org/nccm/KJV9.html>

Like always, the key remains to "test everything...and hold onto the good."

: -)

Re:, on: 2005/8/12 6:19

Quote:
-----My, my, brother Krispy. Why are you so defensive? What is it that you fear? You are constantly on the defense as if everyone is judging you, all the while criticizing everyone and everything else.

I didnt think I was being defensive. Who have I criticized here? Arent you judging me by your last sentence? I havent criticized anyone!

Quote:
-----Let me share a little secret with you: only Jesus is perfect; only God is good. This means everything else is corrupt. Yes, indeed, Metzger is corrupt. The bible says that all men are bad. This includes all the apostles who wrote the bible, all the translators who translated the bible, and even Tyndale. And yet, God has chosen to use these bad/corrupt men to deliver His word. Why? God is greater than men. He can use evil to bring about good.

Everything I stated about Metzger is a fact. I'll not go to someone who does not believe the Bible is literal to learn about the Bible. Thats a **FACT**, not a criticism.

Quote:
-----Do not fret over evil. God is in control and He is in charge. He does not need you to fight His battles. He does not need you to keep the world in check. He does things according to His will.

Now you're talking down to me.

Quote:
-----Do not be so afraid of evil. Rather, be filled with the Holy Spirit and let Jesus direct and guide your life.

You're judging me again...

Quote:

-----We are followers of Christ. Let us do just that and follow Christ. Everytime we look away at sin and evil, we lose our focus. When we are filled with Christ, we are filled with peace, love, and joy.

So then I suppose you are suggesting we ignore scripture when Paul exhorts us to earnestly contend for the faith? Or to mark and avoid false teachers? Or to correct a brother when he is error?

The marshmellow pop-psych brand of Christianity you apparently promote is a danger. Of all the things worth contending for, the Word of God is on the top of the list.

I'm not afraid of evil... that is not why I contend for truth. I contend for truth because the Word of God tell me to.

Before you consider this a personal attack, it is not intended to be one. I wrestle not against flesh and blood. But you have leveled judgements on me while accusing me of being judgemental. You know nothing about me. This ought not to be. You are not debating the issue here... you are coming after me personally. This happens often when one can not defend their own position in light of the facts.

So please... stay focussed on the issue, and not on me.

Krispy

PS... if you'd like, when I have time I would be happy to send you a ton of documented information on Bruce Metzger. If after reading it you still think he's the bomb, then we really dont anything more to discuss on this topic. It's ok to discuss people who claim to be experts (as long as it's factual, and not gossip!). Thats called being a Berean, my friend.

Partially True or Common Faith - posted by aeryck (), on: 2005/8/12 7:39

Hi Chris,

This book is being promoted by Jack Chick, but it was released by AV Publications, and is written by Professor Gail Riplinger. Obviously, one would have to read the book to draw a firm conclusion as to whether her argument was valid or not. Much the same as Rick Warren's book the 'Purpose Driven Life', is it a lie or truth, can only be determined by reading it, not simply by a few cheap shots from the google search engine, the first link which is anti-kjv onlyism, which Prof. Riplinger's work is not.

I am happy to say that I have heard Prof. Riplinger in direct conference with the opposers, and well let's just say they did not fare very well. She was calm, splendid, and right on target.

You have got to remember that we are talking about severe butchering of the texts by the practitioners of Higher Criticism, who treated the Bible merely as a book of literature.

God the Holy Spirit has revealed by Jesus Christ in John 10:35, that the Scripture, which is the Word of God, cannot be broken!

Truthfully, I have no problem with a brother or sister, reading whatever bible they want, but when it comes to the issue of authenticity, I would not touch a bible that has the route traced back through Nestle and to Westcott and Hort, and to the Duo Rheims and back through Clement, Origen and Jerome, these are practitioners of false doctrine and those who have applied a means of analysis, to the Scriptures that is what a person might do if they came to a book by someone else and changed major sections to fit in with their own ideas. Let's just say that the Textus Receptus did not experience such a degree of butchering, and as such is a far superior text, having its root to the original autographs of the New Testament and as much as the Old Testament is concerned well, that is even clearer.

Higher Criticism has done much to cut and chip away at what already was regarded at the onset as being something quite inappropriate in at least the eyes. Of Dean John Burgon, who stood firmly against a Revision, this revision was done, and it was based on a flawed revision by Westcott and Hort, so if one is to choose, I would advise strongly against bibles that attack the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is what seems to have been the criteria of those who were happy to adopt the Alexandrian texts, namely the Aleph and B and P75 AND P66, I am saddened that such ignorance has permeated through to our time, but this is the problem time, has eroded our sensibility on such serious matters.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

I have tried to explain the position and maybe I have gone on a bit lo.....ng, but it is not because I wish to argue merely to express that their needs to be considerably more research into this matter before one becomes linky monstrous and endeavours to sweep away a legitimate challenge to the blindness that has allowed, the Modern Critical Textual Critics to gain supremacy over the 'common faith' which was how the Holy Spirit guided the early church into all truth.

In Jesus Christ,

Aeryck.
8-)

Re: Partially True or Common Faith, on: 2005/8/12 7:41

I like Gail Riplinger, she really can articulate well. I've heard her being interviewed a number of times. I recommend her highly.

Krispy

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/8/12 7:47

My dear Krispy,

I am not judging you. I am encouraging you. I am asking you to follow Jesus. Jesus commanded that we love God, love our neighbor, and love our enemy. It was Jesus who promoted this "marshmallow pop-psych brand of Christianity." He commanded us to complete submission by saying that we should take up our cross daily. If we truly sacrifice ourselves to Jesus Christ, then we will not fight against the world, we will not fear it or the evil's within, rather, we will love it, for there is nothing but love radiating from God.

Why do you judge Metzger? Whether it is fact or not, why are prosecuting him? Is it loving to hold him under such harsh light?

I am not perfect either. I am sure you could criticize me just the same. You could pick me apart how I don't obey every command or follow every rule. And I have no doubt I could do the same with you. Yes, these errors in us would be fact. We are human. We are not God. However, God's grace is sufficient even for you, me, and Metzger.

I believe with all my heart that your passion is due to a deep passion for Christ. However, passion easily turns into fear. And fear brings about judgement, criticism, and close-mindedness. Don't you think we should be accepting of our brother's and sister's despite thier flaws?

It is true what Paul has said. Jesus also said that we should approach a brother in private if he sins against us. There is a difference between telling the whole world of another's sin and approaching that person in private. It is up to that person to confess thier sins. It is more loving to respect thier decision not to do so and give them time to repent. When we point out faults in others, we are prosecuting them much like a lawyer in a courtroom. Jesus did not do this. He could have easily judged the world. Rather, He loved it.

The bible does not command us to go therefore into the world and point out the wrongs in everyone. Paul says to beware of false teachers. He does not say, "Go and warn your brother's and sister's if you think someone is a wolf in sheep's clothing." Do you not think that I have Christ in me? Do you not think Christ will protect me? Do you not believe God is in control? I do not need you to warn and protect me of wolves. Christ is my shepard. Not you.

Jesus is all that matters. Let us follow Jesus. Let us be a light admist darkness. Jesus said that our strongest testimony will be our love for one another. And so, out of love for one another, let us encourage and build each other up. Let us not be quick to point out faults and errs.

You seek truth. There is but one truth: Jesus Christ. Follow Him and you will contend with truth.

This is all that I am saying: follow Jesus.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation? - posted by Sentry (), on: 2005/8/12 8:02

Geez...

After reading all these posts....

I'm not sure what to believe.

:-{

For what it's worth, I rely on the KJV most of the time, but I use the E-sword bible software also to compare other versions.

Something in me just keeps pulling me to the KJV.

God bless all of you!

In Christ,

Mark

Re:, on: 2005/8/12 8:41

Quote:

-----Why do you judge Metzger? Whether it is fact or not, why are prosecuting him? Is it loving to hold him under such harsh light?

Sorry, friend... I'm not even going to reply to this. Or any of the rest of your post. Not trying to be mean. Just not going to get into it with you.

One more thing... you said:

Quote:

-----Jesus is all that matters.

Truth is what matters. And Jesus is Truth.

Krispy

Re:beenblake your comments to Krispy - posted by ellie, on: 2005/8/12 8:45

This is not a free for all site.

This is Jesus, that you are talking about.

Jesus who is holy, who is seated on the throne.

We have to show respect for members and this Site, that allows us entry into the Forum.

If you did not know, you now will know.

This site is for the edification of our walk with God, being subject to God, for what we do or say on this Site.

Be careful of spoken words.

James 1:26

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridled not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain.

ellie

Re:, on: 2005/8/12 9:02

Thank you Ellie...

I would recommend that anyone who is new here (beenblake) take time to understand where people are coming from here. There are thousands and thousands of posts on this site that people have written. It's dangerous to show up on a forum and start comment on people who have been here for awhile.

All of my thoughts on this subject are available. Just look 'em up.

Enough of the smoke screen... lets stop talking about me, and talk about the topic of this thread. If you want to talk about me, start a new thread instead de-railing this one.

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/12 9:03

Quote:

-----Something in me just keeps pulling me to the KJV.

me too, for all I have commented here. :-)

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/12 9:50

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:
Thank you Ellie...

I would recommend that anyone who is new here (beenblake) take time to understand where people are coming from here. There are thousands and thousands of posts on this site that people have written. It's dangerous to show up on a forum and start comment on people who have been here for a while. Krispy

I have learned that is pretty much with any forum anyone joins the above is excellent advice. :-?

Re:, on: 2005/8/12 10:14

Quote:

-----**beenblake wrote:** Therefore, to say there is only one true bible is ridiculous and blasphemous. There is only one true God. There is only one Holy Spirit. His Spirit is not a book.

Joh 1:1 *In the beginning was the **Word**, and the **Word** was with God, and the **Word** was God.*

Joh 1:14 *And the **Word** was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.*

Isa 66:5 *Hear the **word** of the LORD, ye that **tremble at his word**; Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for m*

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

y name's sake, said, Let the LORD be glorified: but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed.

Psa 12:6-7 *The **words** of the LORD are **pure words**: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. **Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever.***

Psa 119:89 *Forever, O LORD, thy **word** is settled in heaven.*

Psa 138:2 *I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: **for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name.***

Interesting to note that God has magnified His word above all his name. God puts a bigger value on His word than most Christians do. After reading these scripture, I can not help but think that this is a serious topic. Anytime we see a defiation in a modern version... it is a very **serious** thing.

I've been accused on this thread of having fear. Well, I dont fear evil, and I dont fear men who would butcher scriture... wether intentionally or not. But the poster is correct. I do fear one thing: **GOD!**

Pro 1:7 *The **fear** of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction.*

Pro 9:10 *The **fear** of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom: and the knowledge of the holy is understanding.*

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/12 10:34

Quote:

-----Geez...

After reading all these posts....

I'm not sure what to believe.

Sentry.

I am very grateful that you posted this. I am very conscious of this continuing danger when we get into this territory. The problem is if someone believes something which is not quite what they thought what should we do about that? Is it better to leave them believing something which may not be quite as they thought or is it better to say something?

If this were a matter of salvation (and it is not) it would be an easier answer. We would say no matter how long you have believed it, and no matter how comfortable it makes you feel, be sure that your faith is based on the truth not just what many have declared to be the truth.

I will tell you why I personally sometimes risk disturbing people. When people put their faith in an idea which is not proven scripturally it makes them very vulnerable. Let me illustrate from another thorny topic; creation. One of my sons was raised as a 'young earther' at his dad's side. When he began to study biology he manfully tried to remain 'loyal' to his dad although in his conscience he began to struggle. He had believed the package deal and to question any part of it was disloyal. I had no idea that his 'faith' in dad's interpretation of Genesis was under such pressure, until one day he said "I can't believe the Bible anymore" "why?" I asked. "I can't believe the first page" he replied. This is known as throwing out babies with the bath water, but young teenagers deal in absolutes.

It forced me to listen to other Christians who were not 'young earthers'. My science was hardly up to the task but I began to read. We began to talk about other Christians who believed in another way of interpreting Genesis. It took a long time even to get a foundation down. To explain that to differ from 'dad's theology' did not mean he had to abandon the whole bible.

Let me tell you what I think happened, and I think it happens more than we might think with young Christians. An illustration might serve... When an army goes on to the attack the advantage initially lies with the attacking side; surprise and the energy of the attack gives them the initiative. Usually territory will be gained in the initial advance, but as the attacking

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

army advances it may overextend and become vulnerable in its supply line. The further the advancing army gets from its solid foundation and supply the more the advantage switches to the 'defenders'. If the advance cannot be held at this point the counter-attack will very likely not only recapture the lost territory, but will over-run the original attackers so that the final condition is worse than if they had never attacked in the first place.

Conscience is a delicate instrument and if we over-ride it we may weaken it to such an extent that when the counter-attack comes it will be a rout. (a overwhelming and disorderly retreat) If we defend the indefensible we may gain an early victory but when the counter-attack comes we may be driven from the field. We ought not to be in a hurry to get people to believe things; they must take their own time and at times be prepared to move only as quickly as their conscience can cope with. If they have taken steps A, B, C, but then swarm ahead to E, F, G, H in advance of their conscience they will be vulnerable. The counter attack may not only take back H,G,F,E. but in the charge take C, B, and A too.

We do not need to be afraid of the truth wherever we find it. If God has revealed things to us our conscience will keep pace with it and we shall stand strong when the counter-attack comes. But if we have believed what men told us in our 'school' of understanding and are defending their position rather than our own, we stand in danger.

Hope the complicated illustration has not disturbed you too much.:-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/12 10:57

Quote:
-----Psa 12:6-7 The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever.

Krispy

You have quoted this passage on more than one occasion and I think it may be foundational to the way you see the whole transmitted text issue. I am not sure that it says what you think it is saying.

The word 'from' could mean the starting point, so that God is promising to 'preserve from this point and forwards for ever', but it could also mean 'preserve against this generation'. In fact the 'them' may not even be referring to the words but to the 'godly' of verse 1 and this is the sense the Youngs Literal translation takes "Thou, O Jehovah, dost preserve them, Thou keepest us from this generation to the age." (Psa. 12:7, YNG) In fact this fits much more with the final verse, so that the whole section reads as in the KJV. "Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted." (Psa. 12:7-8, KJVS) Now, I do believe God has watched over his written word, but your view seems to indicate that you believe that 'somewhere' there is a perfect 'copy' of what God said. I don't think the scholars who like you and I support the Byzantine textcode would ever claim this. If my understanding of your interpretation were correct it must mean that either there is a perfect copy somewhere or God has broken His promise; I don't believe either of these is the case.

Re:, on: 2005/8/12 11:41

philologos... I've heard both sides of this. I do believe that based on this verse that God has promised to preserve His Word unto all generations. However, you raise some good points, and if I am misinterpreting this verse, well... what can I say?

I think my main point would be: Why *wouldnt* God preserve His Word? Why would he allow it to be corrupted to a point where there is no way of knowing that what we are reading is the truth? If we ask these questions in light of Psa 12:6-7, then I think we can conclude that He will and has preserved His Word.

Not necessarily in a grammatical sense, but the meaning of the text. The modern versions often have a different meaning than the Bibles based on the RT. Sometimes they eliminate verse completely, tearing apart many different doctrinal issues.

But I'm listenin', brutha... keep talkin'.

Krispy

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/12 13:38

Quote:

-----But I'm listenin', brutha... keep talkin'.

Krispy

You realise, don't you, that if you ever change sides I will take up the other viewpoint? ;-)
I often find myself on both sides of a discussion and sometimes on neither, but I do want folks to think about their faith and not pick it up second hand from some some extreme website. Not that I think that is a danger for you. You realise too, I'm sure that I don't want you to change your mind, just to open it a little wider. ;-)
I think we all have so much to learn from each other. God preserve us from the fate of those who are recorded in Wesley's journal who said of certain that he met that ...they had sundry excellent qualities, but unfortunately they knew everything and therefore learned nothing.

Re:, on: 2005/8/12 13:47

Quote:

-----You realise, don't you, that if you ever change sides I will take up the other viewpoint? I often find myself on both sides of a discussion and sometimes on neither, but I do want folks to think about their faith and not pick it up second hand from some some extreme website. Not that I think that is a danger for you. You realise too, I'm sure that I don't want you to change your mind, just to open it a little wider. I think we all have so much to learn from each other. God preserve us from the fate of those who are recorded in Wesley's journal who said of certain that he met that ...they had sundry excellent qualities, but unfortunately they knew everything and therefore learned nothing.

Absolutely... this is exactly why I have so much respect for you. I mean think about it... you're a Brit who used to watch the Dukes of Hazzard! How cool is that?

All kidding aside, I'm not planning to change my mind unless the Holy Spirit leads me to. However, I am always interested in understanding why someone disagrees with me on some point. That's why I started researching this topic in the first place. I used to read the NIV. Then I began to read the NIV and the NASB... etc etc. At one point I had 8 modern versions that I would refer to in my study of the Bible. One day a good friend pointed out some things to me in the NIV... and I set out to prove him wrong. But as I studied the issue my mind and attitude began to change, and eventually I ended up where I am now.

Kinda like Josh McDowell. He set out to prove Christianity was not based on truth... and ended up getting saved, and writing Evidence That Demands A Verdict... which is perhaps one of the best apologetics book there is.

Anyway, I think my mind is open to what you have to say. With me, I have to respect someone's knowledge and wisdom before I become too open to their opinions. I don't just listen to any Joe on the street... I have to know the person knows what their talking about before I really begin to chew on their words. And you, philologos, have definitely earned my respect. Especially on this topic. You have a lot things rolling around in your head (and your heart) that I want to learn from you.

Is this the Mutual Admiration Society, or what? LOL

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/12 14:11

Quote:

-----Is this the Mutual Admiration Society, or what? LOL

I only choose friends with impeccable discernment! 8-)

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re:, on: 2005/8/12 14:22

Quote:

-----I only choose friends with impeccable discernment!

Guess that would exclude me, eh? :-x

Krispy :-?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/12 14:26

No, you were specifically 'included'.

Re:, on: 2005/8/12 14:36

awww... ;-)

Krispy

Re: Car Tape Experiment - posted by aeryck (), on: 2005/8/13 13:50

Sentry:-

'Something in me just keeps pulling me to the KJV.'

Philologos:-

'Me too, for all I have commented here'

I wanna tell a little story....sounds like the opening to Johnny B. Goode. Nah, seriously, I have to express a very loud, A MEN!!! To both you comments.

Some years back I got the NIV audio tape New Testament, and well I travel a lot so I got to listen to the New Testament over and over and over again...It was good, but that was only because I had nothing to compare it with.

Then my sweet neighbour who is getting along in years, somewhere between 70 and 80, she reminds me a little of Corrie Ten Boom mentioned she had the Authorized Version by Alexander Scourby, so I jumped with joy, I cannot tell why, I just did.

Well, I plugged in the Gospel of John, and I think I have listened to this so many times I cannot count, there is just something about the King James that seem to find a much easier entrance to my heart.

Only after that did I come upon the huge school of defence for the King James, so essentially though I do fully support what Prof. Riplinger is doing, my real reason for choosing the King James Version, is because for some reason that Edward F. Hill called the 'common faith' ~ the Holy Spirit seems to like the combination of Himself, the Word of God and my little achy breaky heart...lol

Make of it what you will, it is the one I am gonna take home with me..lalol

Aeryck by Jesus Christ.

General Topics :: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation?

Re: Stick it - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/8/20 22:06

is there any way we could stick this one as bible translations come up a lot!!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/21 4:07

I think some of the earlier threads have dealt/are dealing with this much more comprehensively. I don't know which one would be the right one to make 'sticky'.

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/8/21 4:36

Yes. Make it sticky guys!

Re: Which version of the Bible is closest to exact translation? - posted by janneju, on: 2005/8/21 5:37

Just out of interest, I was in touch with Times Square Church recently, and found out that David Wilkerson recommends -
KJV Life in the Spirit Study Bible .. (Zondervan).

He apparently uses this.

I have since got a copy and found it quite good.