

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Corrupted King James?

Corrupted King James? - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/11/27 2:02

1 John 5:7 (KJV)"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. (8)And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

1 John 5:7 (NIV)"For there are three that testify: the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement."

I've heard a lot of debate about why one version is better than another, and sometimes I agree with it. But often times, it seems that some of the KJV preferers, in particular, speak of how NIV, and other modern translations are perverted.

Now, looking at the footnote of 1 John 5:7 in my NIV, it says, that in regards to how the KJV translates 5:7-8 is "not found in any Greek manuscript before the sixteenth century".

So, has something been added to KJV? There are many differences between KJV and NIV, in particular, and NIV always has a footnote explaining how they used the earliest manuscripts, versus the Textus Receptus, which is a much newer manuscript set.

So, without just pouring out personal preference, or rumor, or opinion, does anybody know the history as to why there are so many differences, and which is really more correct?

Grace and Peace...

Re: Corrupted King James? - posted by saved_matt (), on: 2005/11/27 5:10

1 John 5:7 is probably the most debated verse in the Bible so this discussion should be interesting, anyway:

I'm certainly no authority on ancient Biblical text but what I heard about the textus vaticanus (TV) predating the textus receptus (TR) was something like this:

Imagine you've received a letter from someone really important and so you want other people to read it, but you want to keep your copy so you copy it out perfectly word for word because you know it's come from someone really important and you don't want to lose any of its text in copying, so you send a copy to say 4 friends each of which have the same feelings and copy it out word for word.

Now someone else gets a copy of the letter and doesn't like some of it so changes a word here and there now this copy he copies out and sends it to his friends but his original he locks in box and keeps it safe.

Now back to you, you like your letter that you received so much that you read it all the time, so do your friends eventually it begins to deteriorate but people are still making accurate copies but eventually all the accurate copies will deteriorate due to much use, the guy who made the dodgy copy now long dead kept his in the box.

Some years later historians discover his dodgy copy and realise that it predates all the accurate copies of the original so the historians decide that because the dodgy one is older it must be more accurate.

do you see the point of my rather poor analogy, like I said I'm not a Biblical historian and to be honest one of the reasons I responded was to keep this thread up so someone far more knowledgeable in these things can spot it (think of you Philologists)

matt

Re: Corrupted King James? - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2005/11/27 13:42

Quote:
-----So, has something been added to KJV? There are many differences between KJV and NIV, in particular, and NIV always has a foot note explaining how they used the earliest manuscripts, versus the Textus Receptus, which is a much newer manuscript set.

I have been on both sides of the KJV only debate. What has kept me from embracing the KJV only position is the circular arguments and logic which are usually employed.

The KJV is an excellent translation. But it is only a translation and if you read the preface to the 1611 KJV you will see the translators themselves considered it to be "a better translation" than the previous "good translations" and they argued that "any translation no matter how mean, is still the word of God".

And all the arguments the translators of the 1611 KJV put forth to produce their translation are argued against by those who see any attempt to make a better one as a corruption of the "perfect Word of God".

But the underlying Textus Receptus which was compiled by Erasmus is a composite of all the known existing manuscripts of that day.

In subsequent years many older texts were uncovered including the infamous "Vaticanus B" which are Alexandrian in origin, but many feel they are corrupted and therefore unreliable.

What strikes the strongest nerve in the KJV only adherents is the lists of verses of all the modern translations compared to the King James Version. They use the KJV as the standard, show all the verses in the others where a word or phrase is "omitted" and thereby conclude that they are corruptions of the Word of God which they define as the King James Version.

I have yet to see one of these comparison charts where all of the verses including the King James is compared with the Greek text. Even the Textus Receptus.

If you set aside the superstitious belief that the King James is God's final Word, in His final translation, and accept it as an excellent translation of God's final Word in the original texts, then you would do good to compare all the translations with the best Greek manuscripts.

I would like to see a comparison chart which is side by side and where the King James has a phrase which is not found directly in the Greek text and "Added" would be in the note.

This is a fair comparison.

The implication is that if it is in the King James and not in a modern translation, then the modern one is wrong and corrupts the text and omits God's Words.

I have also seen a chart where phrases omitted in modern translations are found in the quotations of the earliest church Fathers, proving that they were in the original. But in comparing many of these quotes, in the modern translations they are omitted from one place in the scripture, but they are still found in another. So the quote of the church father is not necessarily of the omitted passage.

In other words, there is repetition in the Bible, and Paul used many similar phrases in his epistles. And even if in one version, a phrase is omitted in one passage, the same phrase is found in another book. Like Ephesians and Colossians.

The argument of the newer translations is that a scribe inserted this phrase in one place because he is used to reading it in another. And so it went unnoticed. But its omission does not invalidate the truth contained in it as it is found in other passages.

The bottom line is that all the manuscripts including the Alexandrian texts agree 98% and 9/10s of the 2% discrepancies are of typos and punctuation and spelling. and have little effect on its meaning.

But I would add that there are some terrible translations out there. The new NIV has changed things of a doctrinal nature. They have changed the gender specific references to God as He or Him and replace them with, "He/She" And other such nonsense.

Another notable example I found is changing the Word "forebearance" to "Tolerance".

This is a doctrinal change. To forbear is to withhold judgement for a time to give space for repentance. To tolerate is to ignore and to accept and overlook. God forbears but He never tolerates.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by lamusktrat (), on: 2005/11/27 14:24

Quote:

-----But I would add that there are some terrible translations out there. The new NIV has changed things of a doctrinal nature. They have changed the gender specific references to God as He or Him and replace them with, "He/She" And other such nonsense. Another notable example I found is changing the Word "forebearance" to "Tolerance".

This is a doctrinal change. To forbear is to withhold judgement for a time to give space for repentance. To tolerate is to ignore and to accept and overlook. God forbears but He never tolerates.

Glad you caught that Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by PTywama3 (), on: 2005/11/27 14:25

There are (as far as I know) two different lines of texts of the New Testament, the Alexandrian and Byzantine texts.

There are known instances where scribes of the "early" Christian church would take viewpoints of the day and inscribe them into copies in order to better explain a verse or put in what they considered a very valuable insight into God's character. Kind of like sidenotes getting inscribed in. Other than being not quite proper, the actual variations are relatively minor. Throughout the bible, there are fewer discrepancies even in these texts than the most "historically reliable" materials we have like the Iliad.

As far as use of the NIV, etc., there are a few things to consider. The KJV attempted a literal translation into a modern tongue. The NIV is a more literal translation but was also written to "better explain" (or some might say "dumb down") and so is taken as a partial interpretation as well. This does make it less accurate. The most accurate bible according to modern scholars of language is the NASB '95 edition, which incorporates some of those same Byzantine text bits with subnotes as well as several other identified discrepancies.

As of note, the Alexandrian texts generally hold more true to each other - there are fewer discrepancies in the texts themselves, but are generally less complete. The Byzantine texts are quite complete (all together) and we have more of them at our disposal (by far). There are differences in verses, but the vast majority of differences are based on spelling and grammatical errors (someone puts el instead of ed for example).

Although I've been given bits and pieces in several locations, the most accessible and generally what I found to be a good reference would be A Ready Defence by Josh McDowell.

<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0840744196/103-3628924-0208629?v=glance&n=283155&n=507846&s=books&v=glance>

If all of my references weren't paper copies from different seminars and classes and all stored a goodly distance away, I'd post some of them for you (and have some really spiffy numbers). I've tried to find a good online source that has these uploaded, but I haven't had much luck yet.

I really should find a graph with a lot of the translations in terms of their respect to language. The lines of "accuracy" are more a distinguishing of "literal" vs. "interpreted" and the balance your bible uses. In that respect, the KJV is more linguistically accurate than the NIV. Like the Message is a complete interpretation (and should be handled as such.) The KJV falls below the "common" translations of the NASB ('95 ed., the older is less accurate) and the ASB.

Re: - posted by lamuskrat (), on: 2005/11/27 14:33

I was once die hard KJV, but for readability and understanding I have diversified. Has anyone come across error in the ESV. When reading in parallel with the KJV, ASV, Amplified and others, I find it to be accurate (or at least as accurate as the others), when compared to the KJV. I for one do not do/use NIV, NLT, the Message.

Anyone familiar with (<http://www.scripture4all.org/>) Interlinear Scripture Analyzer

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/11/28 4:52

There is definitely a problem concerning some modern translations. I myself don't like the "interpreted" versus the "translated ones". There's a chart that I've seen that talks about differing versions, and how they were translated. While some, like NAS strive to be a more word-for-word translation, NIV is a little more phrase-for-phrase, while some go so far as to change the names of people, so as not to "offend" readers, like Oxford's Inclusive Language Version, or change the text to interpret what the translator thinks the writer might have meant.

<http://www.ibs.org/bibles/translations/index.php>

But going back to the original texts, the fact that there are such differences between translations should speak volumes. If what the NIV translators wrote in their footnotes is true, then KJV should be considered a corrupted version. Likewise, if texts that are used, like the Vaticanus B are corrupt, then translation that use them should be watched a little more carefully when studying doctrine.

I guess on a personal note, I memorize scripture in KJV for two reasons. (1)Most "christian" cults use KJV, (2)The old-time language seems to perk listeners ears, sounding more authoritative. Outside of that, I like to read NIV, but study using NAS.

Now, I don't know much about the history of translations, but hearing so much speculation and uneducated opinion thrown into the mix, I want to find some truth to stand on.

Grace and Peace...

Grace and Peace...

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/11/28 8:40

I have a question: If you are KJV only... what does that mean for non-english countries?

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2005/11/28 9:26

Quote:

-----I have a question: If you are KJV only... what does that mean for non-english countries?

Ah so thats why the Lord gave me that I could read English! ;-) :-P

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/28 11:52

I'm a bit late to this discussion, although I suspect we have had it several times here on SI.

Quote:

-----I'm certainly no authority on ancient Biblical text but what i heard about the textus vaticanus (TV) predating the textus receptus (TR) was something like this:

Your analogy showing the bad logic of 'older is better' is accurate but the quotation above needs a bit of tweaking. The Vatican Codex is an actual manuscript held in the Vatican. The 'Textus Receptus' is NOT a manuscript. The definitive 'Textus Receptus' does not exist anywhere. (and I am a TR man!)

Modern translations begining with someone compiling a Greek text from many Greek manuscripts (just talking about the NT here) These texts are usually called 'eclectic' which means 'gathered out' of many manuscripts. The first 'eclectic text' was created by Erasmus which became the prime text for early translations into the vernaculars of several European countries. Later this was 'improved' by Stephens

Maurice Robinson has writtenFor over four-fifths of the New Testament, the Greek text is considered 100% certain, regardless of which texttype might be favored by any critic. This undisputed bulk of the text reflects a common pre-existing archetype (the autograph), which has universal critical acceptance. In the remaining one-fifth of the Greek New Testament, the Byzantine/Majority Textform represents the pattern of readings found in the Greek manuscripts predominating during the 1000-year Byzantine era. Early printed editions of the Greek New Testament reflect a general agreement with the Byzantine-era manuscripts upon which they were based. Such manuscripts and early printed editions are commonly termed "Textus Receptus" or "Received Text" documents, based upon the term applied to the Elzevir 1624 printed Greek edition. Other editions commonly termed "Textus Receptus" include the editions of Erasmus 1516, Stephens 1550, and Beza 1598. George Ricker Berry has correctly noted that "in the main they are one and the same; and of them may be referred to as the Textus Receptus."The phrase 'Textus Receptus' has come to be used as a synonym for the Byzantine Textform, but this is NOT a manuscript but an 'eclectic text', in other words, a compiled Greek text created by textual scholars.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/28 11:55

Quote:

-----I have a question: If you are KJV only... what does that mean for non-english countries?

I have 'discussed' some of these topics with individuals here on SI who tell me I must not 'correct' the King James Version by referring to the Greek text!

Although 'foreign translations' cannot be 'KJV' they can be based on the Byzantine textform and so become local 'equivalents' of the KJV in their own language. Most modern translations both English and 'other' are now not based on the Byzantine textform.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/28 11:58

It's not exactly a 'comparison chart' but you can use (<http://www.bible-researcher.com/title.html>) Michael Marlowe's Comparison to compare the different 'editors'.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/11/28 13:06

Hi Graftedbranch...!

Quote:
-----I have been on both sides of the KJV only debate. What has kept me from embracing the KJV only position is the circular arguments and logic which are usually employed.

The KJV is an excellent translation. But it is only a translation and if you read the preface to the 1611 KJV you will see the translators themselves considered it to be "a better translation" than the previous "good translations" and they argued that "any translation no matter how mean, is still the word of God".

And all the arguments the translators of the 1611 KJV put forth to produce their translation are argued against by those who see any attempt to make a better one as a corruption of the "perfect Word of God".

But the underlying Textus Receptus which was compiled by Erasmus is a composite of all the known existing manuscripts of that day.

In subsequent years many older texts were uncovered including the infamous "Vaticanus B" which are Alexandrian in origin, but many feel they are corrupted and therefore unreliable.

What strikes the strongest nerve in the KJV only adherents is the lists of verses of all the modern translations compared to the King James Version. They use the KJV as the standard, show all the verses in the others where a word or phrase is "omitted" and thereby conclude that they are corruption of the Word of God which they define as the King James Version.

Well said. I prefer to use the currently accepted edition of the King James Version (from 1769). It is the most widely used version, and the bulk of all study aids from the past are geared around it. However, I still use other academic translations -- like the NASV, and (gulp) even the NIV (1978). The ease of use, present-day English used, and the "scrutinizable accuracy" is acceptable to me.

The Word of God is indeed perfect. But all translations -- including the King James Version -- are flawed. Why? Because they were created by flawed (although well-meaning) men. That is why I pray about the verses and passages that I read. The Spirit is more than able to lead us and guide us into all truth.

What bothers me the most about this issue are the believers that immediately pass judgment upon or dismiss those believers that are not KJV-only. I am certain that many of such believers feel that they are doing a *service* for the Lord. They feel that they "know" the certainty of this issue, and refuse to accept the notion that their research may not be totally accurate -- or may be slightly "nearsighted." I "listen" to both "sides" in this debate -- but I do not blindly accept the argument of either.

:~)

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2005/11/28 14:32

Quote:
-----I have 'discussed' some of these topics with individuals here on SI who tell me I must not 'correct' the King James Version by referring to the Greek text!

Yes, one wonders how those in other countries which do not speak English get on without the "Pure Words of God" contained in the 1611 King James Bible.

I suppose only a translation of the King James Bible is acceptable with no aids from the Greek manuscripts.

Graftedbranch

Re: Corrupted King James? - posted by Billy7 (), on: 2005/11/28 19:41

Does anyone know of any modern translations that are based on the Textus Receptus? My experience has been that there are none.

Are there any other translations, besides the KJV, that are?

Thanks,
Billy

Here's how I know, on: 2005/11/28 19:48

we're in the midst of High School football season.....a KJV refutation thread and Krispy Kritter is nowhere to be found.....

Krispy!! Where are you at?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/29 2:39

Quote:
-----Does anyone know of any modern translations that are based on the Textus Receptus? My experience has been that there are none.

The (<http://www.mkjvonline.com/>) Modern KJV by Jay P. Green Sr is based on the Byzantine Textform. It is available for most Bible software and in a printed version. It also tries to be a more 'literal equivalence' translation.

There is a full explanation of the MKJV and its philosophy (<http://www.chrlitworld.com/BookSGP/MKJVExplain.htm>) here.

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/11/29 4:23

So, there's really no way to know which texts are more original?

Grace and Peace...

Textual Criticism: the study of probability in textual transmission - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/29 5:29

Quote:
-----So, there's really no way to know which texts are more original?

The whole discipline of 'Textual Criticism' is concerned with this very issue. It simply means a reasoned approach to ascertaining what the original 'autographs' (the copy in Paul's own handwriting etc) actually said. This discipline can be very subjective in its development which is why many are deeply suspicious of the philosophy behind the various scholars who engage in this work.

If you have two manuscripts which have the slightest difference you are immediately launched on a study of which is the better. If you have 3 manuscripts which differ slightly you have the added possibilities and even the possibility that none of them is completely accurate. You then have to say which is likely to be closest to the originals. Some scholars say the longer version is likely to be the more accurate, some say the shorter version and some say the middle one! If a single word is different in all three you then ask the questions about which is the most likely original or which is the most likely mistake that a copyist may have made.

This is a very complicated study process and godly men have sometimes come to different conclusions about this. I have studied the topic over many years but not intensively. I understand it sufficiently to follow some of the more complicated arguments. But it is a highly technical field of study and pretty difficult for most to follow precisely.

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2005/11/29 5:52

Hey philologos,

Can you tell me what the difference of the NKJV and the MKJV is? The page you quoted didn't mention the NKJV. I already know that those are not the same.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/29 18:37

Try these URLs

(<http://www.bible-researcher.com/nkjv.html>) NKJV - New King James Version

(<http://www.chrlitworld.com/BookSGP/MKJVExplain.htm>) MKJV - Modern King James Version

The NKJV is the work of a committee, the MKJV is the work of one man. The MKJV tries for a more 'literal equivalence' than the NKJV.

This is my usual warning. Although Michael Marlowe's Bible pages are a wonderful resource he is a man of strong convictions and one of them is that the Byzantine Textform is inferior. This results in his rejection of the passages such as John 8 and the woman taken in adultery. I have argued these with him at some length in the past but he remains of the same conviction.

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2005/11/29 20:00

Quote:
-----Does anyone know of any modern translations that are based on the Textus Receptus? My experience has been that there are none.

I believe the New King James Version is still based primarily on the Textus Receptus.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2005/11/29 20:07

Quote:
-----So, there's really no way to know which texts are more original?

The fact is all the manuscripts agree 98%. And most of the discrepancies are in the realm of typos and spelling.

All decent translations give us the revelation of the crucified and resurrected Christ. If a phrase is omitted here, it is also included there.

God has preserved His Word and His Truth in all the manuscripts and any decent translation gives us the Word of God.

No essential doctrine is based on one verse of scripture but on the whole testimony of the Word of God. If we are open to the Lord, genuinely seeking Him and in contact with Him in our spirit. We will find the food we need in any good translation.

However that is not to say that some are not better than others. We should seek the best and compare and study.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Billy7 (), on: 2005/11/29 21:45

Thanks Graftedbranc. I had forgotten about the NKJV.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/30 2:22

Maurice Robinson, who is an evangelical 'Textual Criticism' expert says For over four-fifths of the New Testament, the Greek text is considered 100% certain, regardless of which texttype might be favored by any critic. This undisputed bulk of the text reflects a common pre-existing archetype (the autograph), which has universal critical acceptance. In the remaining one-fifth of the Greek New Testament, the Byzantine/Majority Textform represents the pattern of readings found in the Greek manuscripts predominating during the 1000-year Byzantine era. The NKJV is based on the same family of Greek manuscripts known as the 'Byzantine Textform'. The Textus Receptus is an 'edited' version of this family of texts and is the edited Greek text behind the KJV and the NKJV.

Some are uncomfortable with the NKJV because of the Hebrew text behind its Old Testament. Krispy would tell you more. I have not studied Old Testament textual criticism, so I will not say more.

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2005/11/30 4:51

Quote:

-----Try these URLS

NKJV - New King James Version

MKJV - Modern King James Version

The NKJV is the work of a committee, the MKJV is the work of one man. The MKJV tries for a more 'literal equivalence' than the NKJV.

This is my usual warning. Although Michael Marlowe's Bible pages are a wonderful resource he is a man of strong convictions and one of them is that the Byzantine Textform is inferior. This results in his rejection of the passages such as John 8 and the woman taken in adultery. I have argued these with him at some length in the past but he remains of the same conviction.

Thanks! :-)

I will look into those links at home.

What role did Michael Marlowe play then in the MKJV?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/30 5:50

Quote:

-----What role did Michael Marlowe play then in the MKJV?

None. Michael Marlowe is a bible-researcher and his site is a collection of information relating to the Bible and its different versions. The MKJV was the work of Jay Green.

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2005/11/30 10:19

Ok, its clear to me now! :-)

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2005/11/30 18:10

Quote:

-----The NKJV is based on the same family of Greek manuscripts known as the 'Byzantine Textform'. The Textus Receptus is an 'edited' version of this family of texts and is the edited Greek text behind the KJV and the NKJV.

Amen. But if you also include the infamous "Alexandrian text" which is primarily the 'Vaticanus B text, the agreement is still 98%.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by nobothhand, on: 2005/12/2 16:05

The number of times 15 Major words differ from the King James Bible

o = Omits

a = Adds

* = Word is Completely Removed

Christ

NIV - o 25

NASV - o 34

NKJV - o 1

RSV - o 32

NRSV - o 87

Lord

NIV - o 352

NASV - o 438

NKJV - o 66

RSV - o 36

NRSV - o 91

Jesus

NIV - a 292

NASV - o 64

NKJV - o 2

RSV - o 53

NRSV - a 16

God

NIV - o 468

NASV - o 87

NKJV - o 51

RSV - o 111

NRSV - o 138

Godhead

NIV - o 3 *

NASV - o 3 *

NKJV - o 1

RSV - o 3 *

NRSV - o 3 *

Lucifer

NIV - o 1 *

NASV - o 1 *

NKJV - 0

RSV - o 1 *

NRSV - o 1 *

devil(s)

NIV - o 80

NASV - o 82

NKJV - o 81

RSV - o 82

NRSV - o 80

hell

NIV - o 40
NASV - o 41
NKJV - o 22
RSV - o 41
NRSV - o 41

There is much more...

I think that the KJV is the most reliable.

Jesus is God -noboithand-

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2005/12/2 16:15

So we should compare the Greek texts to the KJV too? :-) (Don't get me wrong, the KJV is a very good translation)

Had to replace a Dutch word.. :-(

Re: - posted by noboithand, on: 2005/12/4 14:33

Isn't it wonderful how God can preserve a single translation amongst so many false brethren who love to add unto the Words of God. (Logos)

I cannot remember the site where I found this light research, but the info is great.

From Alexandria to New Bible Versions:

The city of Alexandria is located in Egypt. Unlike Antioch, no original texts were written in Alexandria. Noah prophesied of his son Ham; "And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren" (Genesis 9:25). Egypt is scripturally known as the "land of Ham" (Psalms 105:2). Egypt is mentioned over and over in the Bible as opposed to the things of God. God would not allow His Patriarchs (Genesis 50), His nation (Exodus 12), or His only begotten Son (Matthew 2) to remain in Egypt. Egypt is a type of sin and a type of the world system. It was a land of bondage (Exodus 20:1), Jeremiah was to be ashamed of it (Jeremiah 2:36), and to trust in Egypt was confusion (Isaiah 30:3). Many modern scholars have accepted some of the early manuscripts that were apparently altered in Alexandria. This has led to the confusing array of different modern Bible Versions. Would God want us to accept anything that claims to be His word, from this land of confusion?

From Antioch to King James:

To determine truth from error the place to start is God's word. Let's first look at what the Bible says about the city of Antioch. Antioch is located in Syria on the continent of Asia Minor. In Genesis 9:26; Noah prophesied, "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem". The native people of Antioch were descendant from Noah's son Shem. Abraham was a descendant of Shem who God used to establish His chosen nation and a people who would be used in God's fulfillment of salvation (See Genesis 12:1-3). To the Jewish people were "committed the oracles (word) of God" (Romans 3:1-2). God used the Jewish people to write down His words (2 Peter 1:20-21). Most of the books of the New Testament were either written or received in Asia Minor. These were the books of John, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Philippians, 1 Peter, 1, 2, 3 John, Revelation and possibly other books. Antioch was the place where the disciples were first called "Christians" (Acts 11:26). The Church of Antioch was also a preaching, witnessing, and teaching church (Acts 11:20-26), a serving, giving church (Acts 11:26,29), also a praying, and missionary church (Acts 13:2-4). This church would only make sense that God used it to preserve His word

Praise the Lord,

Jesus is Lord -noboithand-

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2005/12/4 15:09

Hi nobothhand...

The fallacy of this "argument" is that it assumes that the KJV is *flawless*. The Word of God is indeed flawless. But all translations are flawed. To judge other versions by the KJV would be like judging whether or not a piano is tuned by comparing it with another piano.

Now, if we had complete original manuscripts -- then those types of judgments could be made.

As good a translation as the KJV is -- it is not without flaws. The wording concerning "*Easter*" in Acts 12:1-4 is one is probably the most common or accepted "flaws" in the translations of the KJV. "*Easter*" is actually a pagan word, and it was not "tied" to the death of Christ until several hundred years after the death of Luke. As most other versions point out, the correct word is "Passover."

But is such a "flaw" in translation really all that important to our spiritual walks? Remember, most early believers *did not have* a copy of the Scriptures in their possession. At that time, faith came by hearing (...and hearing by the Word of God -- as it was read and recited by fellow believers or rabbis in the synagogues). As Brother Ravenhill reminds us, "*Sodom had no Bible*." Peter, John and Paul did not carry around *scrolls* on their journeys. Rather, they carried a Word that was written upon the "tablets of their hearts."

While I feel so blessed that we live at a time in history that the Word of God is made readily available to virtually anyone who wants one (at least, in many nations) -- I still feel that we need to do a better job of "rightly dividing the Word of Truth." I prefer the KJV for various reasons -- but not because I would blindly accept it as infallible. As stated before, the Word of God is infallible -- but all translations are not.

:-)

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2005/12/5 22:10

Quote:

-----The number of times 15 Major words differ from the King James Bible

Don't you think the real issue is the number of times the words differ from the Greek Text? Should not the KJV also be subject to the original text, and not the yardstick by which we judge other translations?

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2005/12/5 22:15

Quote:

----- Peter, John and Paul did not carry around scrolls on their journeys. Rather, they carried a Word that was written upon the "tablets of their hearts."

Paul when in prison did request Timothy to bring Him his scrolls and Parchments.

2 Timothy 4:13 "The cloak which I left in Troas with Carpus, bring when you come, and the scrolls, especially the parchments."

He also in writing His epistles to the churches instructed them to circulate and exchange epistles with the other churches. He also charged that the epistles be read in the gatherings of the saints.

From AD 50 on and especially AD 64 on, there was not an absence of written New Testament scripture which the believers read and enjoyed.

And as time went on, many epistles were written because of degradation and false teachings which crept in. Galatians, Colossians, 1 Corinthians, and 1 & 2 Timothy are such books, which shows that having only the oral teaching can degenerate quickly. And even the 7 epistles to the churches in Revelation were written to recover the degraded situation in the churches in Asia in AD 90.

Paul labored many months among the Thessalonians, yet He was burdened by the Lord to write to them the two epistles and in them he said, "remember when I was with you, I spoke of these things." They needed reminding.

Peter also in His epistle spoke of Paul's letters which he identified as scripture and stated that many twist them to their own destruction. This implies that He was familiar with them and that they were circulated and read.

With all due respect to brother Ravenhill. Good preachers often make broad sweeping statements in a certain context to press a point which is true, but the statements sometimes are not completely accurate.

I am sure Ravenhill's intent was to press upon his hearers that the Word of Christ needs to dwell in them richly that they speak out of the Reality of Christ within them and not just by rote. That they be sanctified in the truth and transformed by the truth through the Spirit's working it into them.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/12/5 22:48

Hi Graftedbranch...!

Quote:

-----Paul when in prison did request Timothy to bring Him his books and Parchments.

He also in writing His epistles to the churches instructed them to circulate and exchange epistles with the other churches. He also charged that the epistles be read in the gatherings of the saints.

From AD 50 on there was not an absence of written New Testament scripture which the believers read and enjoyed.

Indeed, Paul did request to have the books (scrolls) brought to him. And yes, Paul's letters were constantly circulated among the early Church. However, it is inaccurate to imply that "*from AD 50 on there was not an absence of written New Testament scripture which the believers read and enjoyed.*" First of all, the literacy rate for the time period was quite low. More importantly, the availability of scrolls, parchments and like materials was rare. There were no printing presses. Scribes copied Scripture through a slow and careful process. Outside of wealth or religious office, very few "common" individuals were able to obtain such materials due to cost or lack of availability.

Of course, there have always been "hard copies" of Scripture. But it was not until the Protestant Reformation (and more importantly, the invention of the printing press) that "normal people" (outside the secular and ecclesiastic aristocracy) were able to more easily obtain and own a copy of Scripture.

However, the point is that the people so valued Scripture that it was literally memorized. Unfortunately, I know "mature" believers today that can't remember whether the Book of Ezekiel is in the Old or New Testament.

:-)

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2005/12/5 23:05

Quote:

-----is inaccurate to imply that "*from AD 50 on there was not an absence of written New Testament scripture which the believers read and enjoyed.*"

I corrected my original statement to: "From AD 50, and especially AD 64 on"

But as to the literacy among the believers, Paul did instruct the epistles to be read among them. Also, one of the problems in Corinth was their boasting in philosophies and knowledge. Surely they were not all that illiterate.

It did lie with those who were literate to read to the others and to instruct them concerning these things.

And also, Ezekiel is one of the best psalms David wrote don't you think? (-:

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/6 0:00

The greatest lie and deception of most of the new translations is to take away the faith of Christ and change it into our faith in Jesus Christ. Paul makes it clear that our faith is of and by Christ in us. Heavenly faith not earthly faith.

New International Version (NIV)

20I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me. The life I live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.

New Living Translation (NLT)

20I myself no longer live, but Christ lives in me. So I live my life in this earthly body by trusting in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.

New American Standard Bible (NASB)

20I have been (A)crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but (B)Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in (C)the Son of God, who (D)loved me and (E)gave Himself up for me.

Amplified Bible (AMP)

20I have been crucified with Christ ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ (the Messiah) lives in me; and the life I now live in the body I live by faith in (by adherence to and reliance on and complete trust in) the Son of God, Who loved me and gave Himself up for me.

King James Version (KJV)

20I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

Do you see what I mean, of to in, takes away from the responsibility, deity, and Christ for our birth in Christ. Faith of Christ is His Faith in us. Faith in Christ gives us the responsibility, it is our faith in Christ. That is why there are so many books and seminars on how to build you own faith so you can get from God what you want. The Lie of Satan, always the same, you are as God and it is your faith you must muster, in fact if you only had the faith as big as a mustered seed you could move mountains. That means that we don't have faith that will give us any power at all. It is the Faith of Christ that has the power, and the Holy Spirit using it to bring us to Christ and learn of Christ. I give a thumbs up to the KJV, this is how I judge new translation, what they do with the Faith of Christ in us. If this is right the rest of the translation is usually closer to infallible, which none are, but this is the first place to start. Get this wrong and all of our conversion and regeneration are off center. God will keep His Word Pure and will give His Children the ability to choose which translation is best and what to correct in the one He points to.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2005/12/6 0:13

Quote:
-----The greatest lie and deception of most of the new translations is to take away the faith of Christ and change it into our faith in Jesus Christ. Paul makes it clear that our faith is of and by Christ in us. Heavenly faith not earthly faith.

The Recovery Version says"

I am crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live but it is Christ who lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me.

Footnote says: "The title Christ denotes mainly Christ's mission, which is to carry out God's plan; "The Son of God" denotes Christ's person, which is for the imparting of God's life into us. Hence, the faith in which we live God's life is of the Son of God, the life-imparting One."

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/6 4:05

I like that just as good as the KJV, maybe even a little clearer. The Spirit in me also agrees. The devil will stop at nothing to keep us from the Christ that is in us. Very subtle but still a lie. Two small words "of" to "in."

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/12/7 7:07

Quote:
-----The greatest lie and deception of most of the new translations is to take away the faith of Christ and change it into our faith in Jesus Christ. Paul makes it clear that our faith is of and by Christ in us. Heavenly faith not earthly faith.

New International Version (NIV)

20I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me. The life I live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.

To call this a 'lie and deception' is nonsense. The NIV etc is a perfectly legitimate although, in my view, mistaken interpretation.

The phrase 'faith of Christ' is simply "pisteOs Christou" as used in Rom. 3:22; Gal. 2:16; 3:22; Phil. 3:9; in the KJV is simply the genitive form where the words 'faith' and 'Christ' are both in the genitive form. This could equally be translated:

'the faith of Christ'

"Christ's faith"

"the faith belonging to Christ"

"the faith pertaining to Christ"

Rom. 3:22 Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:

Gal. 2:16 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

Gal. 3:22 But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

Phil. 3:9 And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: Furthermore I would have expected to have found the definitive article in the Greek. This would have given 'the faith' as we have it in many of the older versions. However, the Greek does

s not say 'the faith' but simply 'faith'. This is not pointing to the distinctive and unique faith of Christ himself but to the 'kind' of faith being referenced. I would like to suggest a more neutral route for ascertaining its true meaning. The phrase is used of 'Abraham's faith' in...Rom. 4:12 And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.

Rom. 4:16 Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, These two references to 'the faith of Abraham' have exactly the same grammatical construction as the 'faith of Christ' references. Now all we need to do is ask ourselves the question 'what could this construction mean?' If we take our earlier examples that would give

'the faith of Abraham'
"Abraham's faith"
"the faith belonging to Abraham"
"the faith pertaining to Abraham"

It seems obvious to me that the phrase means 'Abraham's kind of faith' or Abrahamic faith. This is a vital truth because not all faith is 'justifying faith', but Abrahamic faith is, plainly. This is why I concentrated so much on Abraham's faith in the (https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewcategory&cid305) Abraham, my Friend meditations. We know that this phrase does NOT mean 'Abraham's faith' INSTEAD of 'my faith'. Nor does it mean 'my faith in Abraham'. It simply means 'Abraham-type faith'. If we take this understanding to the 'faith of Christ' passages we shall see that the phrase could be interpreted to mean 'Christ-type faith'. As such the NIV etc would not be 'lies and deceptions' but simply an interpretation.

What is this faith? It almost certainly includes 'faith in Christ' but has another dimension too; it is the faith of a Son. John Wesley was often challenged as regards his own personal testimony by people who knew of his prior activities in care and missionary venture and demanded 'how can you say you did not have faith before that time?' Wesley's answer was instructive 'I had' he said, 'even then, the faith of a slave but not that of a Son'. The 'faith of Christ' is preeminently the 'faith of a Son'.

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/12/17 12:38

I wanted to share a sermon by Chuck Smith that KrispyKrittr sent me. It deals pretty well with addressing some of the problems is assuming that "the oldest texts are the best" as NIV and some of the other modern translations do. It also lays a good perspective on why he uses KJV above the others.

http://server.firefighters.org/kjv/projects/firefighters/kjv_web/html/sermons.htm

Under the "Foundation of the Word" column, it's called "The Basis For Our Bible".

Grace and Peace...

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/12/17 13:51

Hi Christinyou...!

Quote:
-----The greatest lie and deception of most of the new translations is to take away the faith of Christ and change it into our faith in Jesus Christ.

It is *dangerous* (and wrong) to label the translations that you do not agree with as containing "lies" and "deceptions."

Even if you do not agree with the translation of the NIV (1978), are you really so bold as to state that the translators intentionally altered their translation to suit their own doctrinal beliefs? That is a very **bold** allegation -- one in which I doubt seriously that you can prove.

One of the biggest problems with the arguments made by many of those that discredit other translations is the denial that any other good translation exists. Many wholeheartedly feel that the KJV is the "*preserved*" Word of God as spoken about in the Bible. Such adherents feel that all other Bible owners/users are *deceived*. To many (especially non-English speakers), the idea that the KJV is the only "perfect version" is silly. But the "defenders of the faith, er, version" continue to consistently compare other versions by the KJV.

It is my opinion that this argument needs to be modified from verse-by-verse or version-by-version comparisons, to examination of the root texts. Why do some prefer to hold in high regard the "Received Text" while at the same time dismissing all others? What other texts and manuscripts are available? Are they accurate? Are the "Dead Sea Scrolls" of any value? Etc... These types of questions may prove helpful, and quite interesting.

:-)

Re: - posted by brentw (), on: 2005/12/17 18:21

Just a question??: What is THE Word of God!? Is the kjv THE word of God?? Or the niv THE word of God!??? Etc... You know where I'm going. Are all translations THEE word of God?? Just a thought.

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/12/17 21:09

Hey brent, this is the question that this column was started for, and many before it.

I'll tell you that I was an NIV lover. I like the language, and it was easy to use. KJV seemed crazy. And seeing so many push their mere opinions on the subject almost made me an "anything but KJVer". Listen to the sermon posted below, and it'll give you a little more perspective on some things to consider. I'll tell you straight up that I respect KJV a whole lot more than NIV now. Is KJV the only one that a person can be saved by? No. But there's some factors to think about when you listen to that sermon by Chuck Smith.

Grace and Peace...

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/12/17 23:54

Hi groh_frog...

Quote:

-----And seeing so many push their mere opinions on the subject almost made me an "anything but KJVer".

I have had the opposite experience -- especially amongst some believers in the forums. There are some "KJV-only" believers that frequently post their opinions in the forums. Some are vehemently opposed to any translation besides the KJV. Many of them write as if they have "seen the light" concerning Bible translations -- and feel that others are still in cognitive "darkness" for using versions other than the KJV.

I prefer to use the KJV. But this has nothing to do with its supposed "infallibility." The fact that this English translation has been the most common since it was "authorized" by King James in 1611 has led to its nearly universal use in the English speaking world. There are vast amounts of research aids for the KJV. But I also use the NIV, NASV and a few others. Of course, I use all Bible translations with careful scrutiny -- including the KJV.

:-)

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/18 5:34

What is Satan's greatest deception in the church?

Galatians 1:6-7 I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.

What is Paul's Gospel of Christ? Galatians 1:8-9 But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

What Gospel is Paul speaking of? Galatians 1:15-16 But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood:

This is the final Gospel that Paul calls a mystery which is 1/5 of the Bible, the rest is prophecy which is not for the Church, the Body of Christ. Galatians 2:16 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

Paul's mystery which he call his ministry and his Gospel and if preached in any other way than we have heard him preach they are accursed.

This is Paul's mystery and his Gospel, Colossians 1:25-28 Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God; Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

If any one takes away from this Gospel they are cursed.

KJV.

Gal 2:16 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

Gal 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

Gal 3:22 But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

Eph 3:12 In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.

Phl 1:27 Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel;

Check other versions of the bible and see how Satan uses new translations to change the faith of the Son of God in us, changed to faith in the Son of God. One is Satan's lie the other is the truth of the Faith of the Son of God, that is Christ in you the Hope of Glory. Not my faith in Jesus Christ, it will do nothing except as my earthly faith, to make me religious by my own works and unable to understand Heavenly Truths by the heavenly Faith of Christ that is in me. It must be the Faith of the Son of God, not faith in the Son of God. The Faith of Jesus Christ in me that has given me Faith in Jesus Christ, but not my faith in Christ to make me who I am. That takes His Faith in me that makes me a son of God, God's Child headed for His House to be with our Heavenly Father for ever.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/12/18 8:49

I should have been a little more clear in what I said earlier. What I meant was that there are so many people who push their opinions as fact regarding KJV that it almost turned me off to KJV entirely. They use KJV as the standard to judge other translations, assuming that it is the infallible version. Nice idea, but it's the wrong way to inspect this subject. Did you know that there is no such thing as the 1611 KJV any more? KJV itself has been revised many times over, and thank fully so, unless you don't see the mistake in "Thou Shalt Commit Adultery", and other mistakes.

Why is it the best, coming from a historical perspective? Look at Mark 16:9-20. It's the story of the woman at the well. Now, if you're looking at NIV, it will tell you that "The most reliable early manuscripts and other ancient witnesses don't have Mark 16:9-20." By most reliable, they assume that the older the text, the more accurate. This particular missing section is based off of the Alexandrian Texts, which were several hundred years older than the oldest known texts. It's also the base for the Wescott and Hort texts.

Is this a good assumption? It could have been, except for the fact that some of the church fathers have quoted from this section- several hundred years before the Alexandrian Texts were made.

Now, I'm not a Bible Scholar, but if you have a question, I really urge you to listen to Chuck Smith's sermon (webpage posted on a below post). I've learned a lot, as he clarifies a lot of the "haze" on this battlefield.

Grace and Peace...

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/18 23:00

I am sure that there are many mistakes in all translations. It is the Holy Spirits responsibility to bring us into all truth. He will give us truth and nothing but truth and He will surely make up for man's mistakes.

Jhn 16:13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.

Sounds to me like the Holy Spirit will reveal by Christ all things that He will speak, and He will show us things to come. Interesting He did not say the same that He said in Revelations.

Revelation 22:16-18 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star. And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:

Sounds like Christ is pretty much in control of the Words of this book, even the Holy Spirit says come and even the bride. I will not trust in man but I will trust completely in the Holy Spirit to lead me into all truth. In testing all things to see that they are truth is our responsibility and the Holy Spirit will not lie to us when we ask for it. He will show us truth and keep us from untruth, That is the Holy Spirit's direct commission from the Father and Christ, The Holy Spirit being God Himself will not give us a rock when we ask for bread.

In Christ: Phillip

Re:, on: 2005/12/19 1:17

Gro_frog said:

"Now, I'm not a Bible Scholar, but if you have a question, I really urge you to listen to Chuck Smith's sermon (webpage posted on a below post). I've learned a lot, as he clarifies a lot of the "haze" on this battlefield."

And what Bible does Chuck Smith, founder of Calvary Chapel, rely on? The King James, and the King James only!

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/12/19 3:04

Church Smith is a great man but as we have discussed here before some of his statements on this topic are just not facts.

Re: Chuck Smith? - posted by CyberCarbon (), on: 2005/12/19 10:08

The bible we use has a lot to do with our age; you see Chuck grew up at a time when the KJ was the preferred translation. I think the best thing a serious student can do is to first STUDY translation theory and practice, so you know why there are differences and problems. Second use at least 4 different translations, I use the KJ, the NKJ, NIV, and the Message, and several others that are on my laptop. I use a free bible study software called "esword" it has a lot of the features of the "blue bible" plus it has 100's of add on features and classic Christian works that migrate easy between MS software etc. I hope this helps you.

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/12/19 10:51

Where do you disagree with Chuck Smith, Philologos?

Grace and Peace...

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/12/19 17:59

groh-frog

We had some discussion on this topic some time ago and return to it fairly regularly. The last time Chuck Smith came up was, I think, in the
(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id3602&forum36&start40&viewmodeflat&order0) Which Bible? thread. I posted on the Chuck Smith position on 2005/2/1 15:50.

My 'bottom line' is the same as Chuck's. The KJV is my Bible of choice although I use many others in study and I have a little Bible Greek too. My main objection to Chuck's statements was that his approach is too simplistic for this extremely complicated topic.

Re:, on: 2005/12/19 21:29

Stever's response to Philologos:

As a member of Calvary Chapel of Costa Mesa (Pastored by Chuck Smith), the Bible version that he always refers to in his sermons and during the service is always the King James. When the Church body reads verses from the Bible (you can hear an example of that on the audio sermon that was referred to on this thread and can be found on sermonindex today) you will notice that you will not hear a cacaphony of sound because everyone is reading the same version (KJV) and not different versions that takes place in so many Churches today.

It is interesting to see the Names of Christ and Titles of Deity Missing in the newer versions (NASV & NIV)

It is the omission of Sacred Names that has often caused the first doubts over the trustworthiness of the modern translations.

Names of Deity are missing and they are missing frequently! The totals of such omissions in two of the most popular versions—The New American Standard and The New International—are tabulated below. Where these Names are in combination, they have been counted separately.

N.A.S.V.

Jesus (36); Christ (43); Lord (35); God (33); Other Names (30)

NIV

Jesus (73); Christ (44); Lord (55); God (31); Other Names (30)

Total Missing Names====NASV 214 NIV 176

God bless,

Stever

Re:, on: 2005/12/19 22:47

Another thing to consider, when picking a Bible version, is the character of the two men behind the NIV translation in the 1800's. This is part of a book that I would like to post here that sheds light on this issue (by Floyd Nolen Jones- Which Version is the Bible).

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

AN ASSESSMENT OF WESTCOTT AND HORT - THEIR CHARACTERS

The naturalistic critics say that Erasmus could not have been providentially guided in the editing of the Textus Receptus because he was a humanist and a Roman Catholic. They purport that Westcott and Hort were epoch making scholars and

irectly guided by God's providence to restore the New Testament, having completed their assignment in 1881. However, if we compare the character of Erasmus to those of Westcott and Hort, we shall see that such a declaration is vacuous and specious. It thus becomes necessary to draw a contrast between the lives of Messers B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort with Erasmus in order to evaluate these charges and claims of the critics as well as to grasp the full impact of this exposure.

Westcott, an Anglican Bishop and professor at Cambridge University, and Hort — also an ordained Anglican priest and professor at Cambridge — came to participate on the 1881 Revision Committee of the King James Bible under the guise of being Protestant scholars. Actually, they were very Roman Catholic in doctrine, belief, and practice. Both conservative and liberal branches of Christendom hold Westcott and Hort in high esteem as if God had greatly used these men to reestablish and restore the text of the Bible. However, it is most difficult to believe that God would use two men to perform such a task who did not believe that the Bible was the verbal Word of God.

Westcott and Hort maintained that they had raised New Testament textual criticism to the level of an exact science. Thus when they concluded that the Traditional Text was late and a composite reading resulting from combining older text-types, they affirmed that this should be regarded as the true explanation with the same degree of reliance as one would esteem a Newtonian theorem. Indeed, they asserted that their work had been so scientifically and carefully executed that there could never be more than one change per thousand words. Nevertheless, today most liberal (or lost) modern scholars say that they no longer agree completely with the Westcott-Hort theory. Kurt Aland, a foremost leader of the modern school, is representative when he admits to this in saying:

"We still live in the world of Westcott and Hort with our conception of different recensions and text-types although this conception has lost its *raison d'être*, or, it needs at least to be newly and convincingly demonstrated. For the increase of the documentary evidence and the entirely new areas of research which were opened to us on the discovery of the papyri, mean the end of Westcott and Hort's conception."

Still, these same liberals always begin their own investigations with the acceptance of most of the basic W-H tenants. Sadly, most conservative scholars have accepted the W-H theory of textual history — largely because most Christian scholars fear scholastic and intellectual ridicule. To stand against the tide carries with it the stigma of appearing uninformed and non-progressive, resulting in the loss of credibility and status among one's peers. The man of God should never allow his faith to be intimidated by so-called "scholarship" — for God promised to preserve His Word.

Herman C. Hoskier, *The John Rylands Bullentin*, 19-1922/23, p. 118. Hoskier stood with Burgon & Scrivener against the Revised text. He produced the two famous comprehensive works *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae* and *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*.

Jack A. Moorman, *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text*, (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press, #1617, 1988), p. 26.

Westcott, B. F. and F. J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, (NY: Harper and Bros., 1882), p. 107.

Ibid., p. 2.

Kurt Aland, "The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research", *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, J.P. Hyatt ed., (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 337.

From published letters written by Westcott and Hort, either to each other or to family members, the following has been gleaned. On one occasion, Mr. Westcott was near a monastery and, upon going into the chapel, found a pieta. In writing from France to his fiancée in 1847 concerning the event he wrote: "Had I been alone, I could have knelt there for hours."

As he was not alone, he had to refrain for to have so done would have revealed just how Roman his beliefs actually were. On November 17, 1865 he wrote to Archbishop Benson remarking, "I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry bears witness." He stated that the fall of man was an allegory covering a long succession of evolutions. He rejected Genesis 1-3 as a literal history and also denied the fall of man. Westcott felt all women should be named "Mary" so that his wife Sarah, at his request, added "Mary" to her name and he ever so addressed her. Does that sound like a Protestant?

With regard to spiritual authority in general and especially the Bible's being the final authority, Mr. Hort said: "Evangelicalism seem to me perverted rather than untrue." On October 17, 1865 Hort wrote "I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus-worship' have very much in common in their causes and their results". Hort praised his "prayer boxes" which he carried about with him. These contained statues (idols) to which he prayed. Confessing in a 26 October, 1867 letter to Dr. Lightfoot that he was a staunch sacerdotalist, Hort wrote to Westcott regarding the Protestant's teaching of the "priesthood of the believer" as being a "crazy horror"! He believed neither in a literal Garden of Eden nor that Adam's fall differed in any degree from that of any of his descendants. In a March 4, 1890 letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Old Testament Criticism, Westcott gave his "amen" to Hort's last sentiment by penning:

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history. I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did."

Although not wishing to be under the dominion of the Pope, in writing to Rev. John Ellerton on July 6, 1848, Hort said:

"the pure Romanish view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the evangelical view. ... We dare not forsake the sacraments or God will forsake us."

In a December 14, 1846 letter to his father, Hort wrote

"... Methodism ... is worse than popery ... being more insidious", and in an 1864 correspondence to Bishop Westcott he stated his conviction that "Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary".

Indeed, Hort wrote Westcott (December 4, 1861) of preferring Greek philosophy and Both W&H came under the influence of J.H. Newman, an Anglican Bishop who returned to the Roman church and was made Cardinal. Newman held a doctrine of angelology in which he taught the gnostic view that there were many intermediates between God and His creation. Westcott and Hort also fell under the spell of Coleridge and Maurice, two Unitarians who were pantheistic and metaphysical, holding low estimates of "inspiration of Scripture".

Coleridge said "Reason was the divine logos."

Frederick Maurice was the son of a Unitarian minister and a brilliant student of Oxford and Cambridge. Having become a clergyman in the Church of England, he was dismissed as principal of King's College, London, on charges of heresy. Maurice had a commanding influence on many of the leaders of his day, especially Dr. Hort who wrote of him November 8, 1871:

"... Mr. Maurice has been a dear friend of mine for twenty-three years, and I have been deeply influenced by his books".

Westcott also admitted he owed much to the writings of Maurice, and Hort's son wrote of his father:

"In undergraduate days, if not before, he came under the spell of Coleridge".

Thus we have two Anglican priests whose stated beliefs were strongly Roman. Both accepted Darwin's theory of evolution.

Writing to Rev. John Ellerton, April 3, 1860, Hort declared:

"But the book that has engaged me most is Darwin. ... it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. ... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable."

Denying that the death of Christ Jesus made the once for all vicarious atonement for the sinner, Westcott & Hort choose instead to emphasize atonement through the incarnation rather than through the crucifixion. This view was an attempt to exalt Mary's position as, of course, she was prominent at the conception and birth of Jesus. Such posture upholds the Roman Catholic Mass. So their view was that of atonement through Jesus' conception and birth rather than his shed blood!

Further, Westcott doubted the Biblical account of miracles. Writing in his diary, August 11, 1847, Bishop Westcott penned:

"I never read an account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it."

Indeed, Westcott and Hort did not even believe the original autographs of the Scriptures were God inspired! Writing in their "Introduction", they impiously stated:

"Little is gained by speculating as to the precise point at which such corruptions came in. They may be due to the original writer, or to his amanuensis if he wrote from dictation, or they may be due to one of the earliest transcribers." (emphasis author's)

WESTCOTT AND HORT'S INVOLVEMENT IN SPIRITISM

Westcott and Hort belonged to what Westcott's son referred to as "The Ghostly Guild." Westcott took a leading role in this society and its proceedings, the purpose of which was the investigation of ghosts and other supernatural appearances. They believed that such things existed. Concerning this society, Hort wrote to Rev. John Ellerton on December 29, 1851:

"Westcott, Gorham, C.B. Scott, Benson, Bradshaw, Lauard, etc., and I have started a society for the investigation of ghosts and all supernatural appearances and effects, being all disposed to believe that such things really exist, and ought to be discriminated from hoaxes and mere subjective disillusiones."

Such is spiritism and is absolutely forbidden by Scripture.

Westcott's son wrote of his father's communing with "saints" especially at a great cathedral at Petersburg where "there was as much company." On that same page he wrote that his father said, in speaking of the chapel at Auckland Castle, it was as "full" and that he was "not alone" in the darkness. He was, of course, communing with demonic spirits supposing that they were ghosts (the souls of men who had lived formerly). However, the Word of God clearly teaches that "familiar spirits" are demons impersonating people. They are not the spirits and/or souls of people who have lived previously. Both of these men denied the deity of Christ Jesus and they denied the verbal plenary inspiration of Scripture. Moreover, Hort spent the last eight years of his life working with Westcott in translating the Books of Wisdom and Maccabees, two uninspired writings.

V. THE GREEK TEXT OF WESTCOTT AND HORT THE MEN WHO CONTROLLED THE 1881 REVISION

Let us return to the 1881 Revision Committee and examine the lives (and the text which they produced) of two of its leading members—Westcott and Hort. These two men had been working in secret prior to the revision for over twenty years putting together a theretofore unpublished Greek text of the New Testament which was based almost exclusively upon one manuscript, Vaticanus B. Their New Testament altered the 140,521 word text of the Textus Receptus at 5,604 places involving 9,970 Greek words. Representing 7 percent of the total word count, these 9,970 included Greek words that were either added, subtracted, or changed.

When the Committee initiated its revision process in 1870, W-H succeeded in getting it to agree to a secrecy pledge concerning the actual product of the revision. On this committee was Vance Smith, a Unitarian scholar who did not believe in the deity of Jesus Christ and had so stated in writing. At the initial meeting, Westcott and Hort insisted that Smith be included in the inaugural communion service. This speaks loudly as to the true commitment to the Lord Jesus Christ that these two "professors" of the faith actually held forth.

In 1851, Mr. Hort wrote:

"I had no idea until the last few weeks of the importance of texts having read so little Greek Testament and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus. Think of that vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late manuscripts."

Thus at only age twenty-three and having admitted he had almost no preparatory background, Hort concluded that the Textus Receptus was "vile" and "villainous". At that time he dedicated his life to its overthrow, intending to supplant it with another text. The text he eventually replaced the TR with was Codex Vaticanus B.

At the time of this decision, young Hort had been schooled in Classical Greek and was unaware that the New Testament had not been written in that form of the Greek language. Since the Greek of the New Testament as recorded in the Textus Receptus did not rigidly follow the syntax of the Greek of the classics, Hort deemed it as an inferior quality of Greek. This misconception was responsible for his having rashly termed the TR as "vile" and "villainous". Indeed, the Egyptian papyri which proved that the N.T. had been written in Koine (common) Greek rather than Classical Greek had not yet been discovered.

Vaticanus B had been "discovered" in 1481 on the library shelf of the Vatican. To understand Vaticanus B, we have to go back to approximately 200 A.D. to an early so-called "Father" of the church named Origen. If the student researches encyclopedias and other reference materials, he will find Origen, Westcott, and Hort spoken of as having been great men of God—men of faith. They will state how much the Church is indebted to them, that Origen was the first scientific textual exegete of the Scriptures, etc. However, such is not what one finds upon close examination of the facts.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

With all of the various posts on Sermonindex that I have read that relate to the KJV version versus the Newer Versions, I wonder why no one has ever brought up the underlying character flaws and intent of Westcott and Hort upon taking up their work. It surely affects the final decision that anyone makes in regards to its value as an accurate translation (the NIV).

Sincerely,

Stever

Re: Corrupted King James? - posted by CyberCarbon (), on: 2005/12/20 8:43

If you are looking for corrupted, the "New World Translation" the Watchtower Corporation uses has some very interesting additions, deletions.

However, honest variations in bibles come from several areas, Word for Word translations vs. Thought for Thought. There are some changes needed to keep copyright licenses active, (they have to change some things to make money). Then there are interpretations of KEY words. Well you get the idea, the strongest argument for the KJV or the NKJV is that all of the problems have been identified and are pretty well known. It is a good starting point. The NIV while being very easy to read has some translations that really OFFEND some believers as being blasphemous. I still use it though because of the ease of reading 98 percent of it. My corner stone is the NKJV and I back it up the KJV because I really think the KJV is the closest to what my Roman friends use, they (The Roman Church) have been studying it longer than anyone else I know. USE several in your study and you have a better chance to get close to what the original text was trying to say.

Re:, on: 2005/12/20 11:41

Quote:

CyberCarbon wrote:

"..... I still use it though because of the ease of reading 98 percent of it. My corner stone is the NKJV and I back it up the KJV because I really think the KJV is the closest to what my Roman friends use, they (The Roman Church) have been studying it longer than anyone else I know. USE several in your study and you have a better chance to get close to what the original text was trying to say.

Stever's response:

What "Roman Church" are you referring to?

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/12/21 1:23

Hi Stever...!

Quote:

-----It is interesting to see the Names of Christ and Titles of Deity Missing in the newer versions (NASV & NIV)

It is the omission of Sacred Names that has often caused the first doubts over the trustworthiness of the modern translations.

Names of Deity are missing and they are missing frequently! The totals of such omissions in two of the most popular versions—The New American Standard and The New International—are tabulated below. Where these Names are in combination, they have been counted separately.

N.A.S.V.

Jesus (36); Christ (43); Lord (35); God (33); Other Names (30)

NIV

Jesus (73); Christ (44); Lord (55); God (31); Other Names (30)

Total Missing Names====NASV 214 NIV 176

The error in this argument is the one most commonly used by *KJV-only* believers (particularly in these forums). They compare all other versions of the Bible by what is found in the KJV. The problem with this lies in the notion that the KJV is

perfect and without flaw. It is not without flaw. There are a few obvious contradictions in the translation. This is to be expected, because the translation itself was performed by flawed men.

But as many have suggested on this message board, it is important for believers to take the time to research the matter. Believers should study the history of all such Bible translations and read the intent of the translators.

One should be careful not to dismiss all other translations as "garbage" or even "inadequate." Remember, most of these translations were not meant to "*corrupt*" the Word of God. Rather, the translators were hoping to make the Word of God available in the language of the common man. If you read the translators' preface to the KJV (1611), you will find that this was their intent as well.

:-)

Re: - posted by CyberCarbon (), on: 2005/12/21 3:59

Is there more than one?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/12/21 4:21

Quote:

-----My corner stone is the NKJV and I back it up the KJV because I really think the KJV is the closes to what my Roman friends use, they (The Roman Church) have been studing it longer than anyone else I know.

As a rule the Roman Catholic church did not like nor use the King James Version. They preferred the Knox version and laterly the RSV and the Jerusalem Bible. At least that is my impression.

Re:, on: 2005/12/21 10:04

C

Quote:

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:

"But as many have suggested on this message board, it is important for believers to take the time to research the matter. Believers should study the history of all such Bible translations and read the intent of the translators.

One should be careful not to dismiss all other translations as "garbage" or even "inadequate." Remember, most of these translations were not meant to "*corrupt*" the Word of God. Rather, the translators were hoping to make the Word of God available in the language of the common man. If you read the translators' preface to the KJV (1611), you will find that this was their intent as well."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Did you read my entire post on Westcott & Hort? Much like the mind of Adolph Hitler was an unknown entity to Neville Chamberlain and other world leaders when they sat down to create a treaty with Nazi Germany. All they knew was what he told them, what he said to them. He was a master deceiver and used them like pawns. If they would have taken the time to read Mein Kampf (My Struggle), written in the late 1920's while he was imprisoned, they would have understood the thoughts and intents of his heart and what he was going to do. The book spells out in detail his theory that the Arian Race was the master race. They would have found his intent to eradicate population groups around the world by ethnic cleansing, etc. etc. etc.

Did they read it? No, they just listened to his words and were manipulated and deceived by them.

I would surely hope that you take the time to read my entire post on the Characters of Westcott & Hort, the leaders of the "Revision Committee" that were responsible for creating the NIV Bible in the late 1800's.

I would just like to repost a short part of it here, for your review and comment:

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

"..... From published letters written by Westcott and Hort, either to each other or to family members, the following has been gleaned. On one occasion, Mr. Westcott was near a monastery and, upon going into the chapel, found a pieta. In writing from France to his fiancée in 1847 concerning the event he wrote: "Had I been alone, I could have knelt there for hours." As he was not alone, he had to refrain for to have so done would have revealed just how Roman his beliefs actually were. On November 17, 1865 he wrote to Archbishop Benson remarking, "I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry bears witness." He stated that the fall of man was an allegory covering a long succession of evolutions. He rejected Genesis 1-3 as a literal history and also denied the fall of man. Westcott felt all women should be named "Mary" so that his wife Sarah, at his request, added "Mary" to her name and he ever so addressed her. Does that sound like a Protestant?

With regard to spiritual authority in general and especially the Bible's being the final authority, Mr. Hort said: "Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue." On October 17, 1865 Hort wrote "I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus-worship' have very much in common in their causes and their results". Hort praised his "prayer boxes" which he carried about with him. These contained statues (idols) to which he pray

ed. Confessing in a 26 October, 1867 letter to Dr. Lightfoot that he was a staunch sacerdotalist, Hort wrote to Westcott regarding the Protestant's teaching of the "priesthood of the believer" as being a "crazy horror"! He believed neither in a literal Garden of Eden nor that Adam's fall differed in any degree from that of any of his descendants. In a March 4, 1890 letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Old Testament Criticism, Westcott gave his "amen" to Hort's last sentiment by penning:

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history. I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did."

Although not wishing to be under the dominion of the Pope, in writing to Rev. John Ellerton on July 6, 1848, Hort said:

"the pure Romanish view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the evangelical view. ... We dare not forsake the sacraments or God will forsake us."

In a December 14, 1846 letter to his father, Hort wrote

"... Methodism ... is worse than popery ... being more insidious", and in an 1864 correspondence to Bishop Westcott he stated his conviction that "Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary".

..... Writing to Rev. John Ellerton, April 3, 1860, Hort declared:

"But the book that has engaged me most is Darwin. ... it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. ... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable."

Denying that the death of Christ Jesus made the once for all vicarious atonement for the sinner, Westcott & Hort choose instead to emphasize atonement through the incarnation rather than through the crucifixion. This view was an attempt to exalt Mary's position as, of course, she was prominent at the conception and birth of Jesus. Such posture upholds the Roman Catholic Mass. So their view was that of atonement through Jesus' conception and birth rather than his shed blood!

Further, Westcott doubted the Biblical account of miracles. Writing in his diary, August 11, 1847, Bishop Westcott penned:

"I never read an account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it."

Indeed, Westcott and Hort did not even believe the original autographs of the Scriptures were God inspired! Writing in their "Introduction", they impiously stated:

"Little is gained by speculating as to the precise point at which such corruptions came in. They may be due to the original writer, or to his amanuensis if he wrote from dictation, or they may be due to one of the earliest transcribers." (emphasis author's)

..... When the Committee initiated its revision process in 1870, W-H succeeded in getting it to agree to a secrecy pledge concerning the actual product of the revision. On this committee was Vance Smith, a Unitarian scholar who did not believe in the deity of Jesus Christ and had so stated in writing. At the initial meeting, Westcott and Hort insisted that Smith be included in the inaugural communion service. This speaks loudly as to the true commitment to the Lord Jesus Christ that these two "professors" of the faith actually held forth.

In 1851, Mr. Hort wrote:

"I had no idea until the last few weeks of the importance of texts having read so little Greek Testament and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus. Think of that vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late manuscripts."

Thus at only age twenty-three and having admitted he had almost no preparatory background, Hort concluded that the Textus Receptus was "vile" and "villainous". At that time he dedicated his life to its overthrow, intending to supplant it with another text. The text he eventually replaced the TR with was Codex Vaticanus B.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Steuer

Re: on: 2005/12/21 11:31

What happens to the people who have never read the KJV Bible? What about fifteen centuries of the NT Scripture in Greek? I would consider it such a waste if the Greeks had the manuscripts in their own language to begin with, but unfortunately they could not "perfect" them until the time the Scriptures would be translated into a "flawless" version some centuries later! This makes no sense. If I write a text in Spanish, for example (that is my original), and then somebody translates it in English to make it flawless -- this is ludicrous. Perfect translation into another language doesn't improve the quality of a text -- at best, it achieves the same "perfection" as the original manuscript. It cannot be more perfect than the original itself and it does not have to be! It is a bad translation, indeed, if it turns out semantically different from the original text.

Peace be with you--

P.S. You mention "the Faith of Christ in us" as opposed to simply "our faith in Christ." Jesus never mentioned or clarified

anyone's faith to be indeed "the Faith of Christ in them." Never did he say, "the Faith of Abraham in you has healed you," or "My Faith in you has healed you." This would have confused the people! And if it is indeed true, then does it matter what one believes in, if it is NOT your faith, but the Faith of Christ in you? Does such an approach invalidate our reason? Does it, more importantly, give Him all the responsibility for our lack of faith (at times)? Why would Christ so often criticize their "little faith," if it was His Faith in them to begin with? Was He criticizing Himself? Read John 3:16 again - it says, "whoever believes in him," and not "whoever has the Faith of Christ in him." As simple as that!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/12/21 12:23

Hi Stever...!

Quote:

-----I would surely hope that you take the time to read my entire post on the Characters of Westcott & Hort, the leaders of the "Revision Committee" that were responsible for creating the NIV Bible in the late 1800's.

The NIV came about as the result of many translators belonging to many denominations, including many of the historic protestant denominations, as well as pentecostal denominations like the Assemblies of God. It was completed in 1978 -- not the "late 1800s." I'm not certain if your remark is just a typo or if you are just mistakenly identifying the NIV with another translation.

It is a good thing to not be biased when reading works on Bible translations. The sad truth is that many of such works are inherently biased one way or the other. Instead, research should begin at the **source**. In this case, most of us do not have access to the original texts, so we are forced to do comparative research in non-source materials. Many will argue in favor of the "Received Text." But where is your source material for such? Is it from a well-meaning sermon delivered by a *KJV-only* teacher? Is it from a book that is inherently biased? Or was research truly performed?

If someone is willing to dismiss all other translations, then they had better show some sort of proof. In my opinion, much of the "proof" presented thus far is inadequate.

Christ did NOT speak with "thees," "thys" and "thous." Neither did the apostles. Neither did Martin Luther (he did not even speak *English*). The phrases, terms and grammar used in the KJV (1611) were particular to that time period. That is why it was CHANGED several times -- in 1629, 1638, 1762, and finally in 1769. The common KJV edition used by most people today is the 1769 edition. Why was it changed? Because the English language was also changing. The intent of the translators was to offer a sound translation of the Bible in the language of the common person.

I suggest those who are seriously wanting to study this topic to perform research using great scrutiny. In particular, read the words of the translators themselves! They explain their motives and methods in great detail -- including why they intentionally did not change some "ecclesiastical" words of the Church, which they knew were inconsistent with real translation. They also explain why they followed the translation of the *Bishop's Bible* (1568) and *Tyndale's Bible* (1525-1536). The translators also encountered problems with varying translations from diverse texts that they used. When this was the case, they were instructed to keep the commonly used terms and phrases used by Church fathers.

Like others have stated, the KJV is a wonderful translation. But it is not without flaw. The Word of God is indeed perfect -- but all translations of the Word are not. We must rely on the Spirit of God to breathe life into what we read. The Spirit will lead us and guide us into all truth.

:-)

Re:, on: 2005/12/21 12:38

Quote:

-----It is the omission of Sacred Names that has often caused the first doubts over the trustworthiness of the modern translations.

Matthew 5:18:

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

Are you saying that the law has been preserved in its perfect form in the KJV only? Can you offer any proof for this claim to be true? It would make things so much simpler if there were actually enough evidence to prove that no other manuscript or translation in the world is purer than the KJV. Yet, we are saved through faith in Christ alone. We are following a real Person, not a doctrine on paper. It surely feels good to have the perfect translation, but it is not by the will of King James that we are now found.

Let us not forget what Jesus prayed for before he was arrested:

"I have given them the glory that you gave me, that they may be one as we are one: I in them and you in me. May they be brought to complete unity to let the world know that you sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me." (John 17:22-23)

Unity is what the Body of Christ lacks the most these days. I pray that this conversation will only bring us closer and not separate us.

Re:, on: 2005/12/21 20:54

Quote:

ccchhrrriiss wrote:

Hi Stever...!

Quote:

-----I would surely hope that you take the time to read my entire post on the Characters of Westcott & Hort, the leaders of the "Revision Committee" that were responsible for creating the NIV Bible in the late 1800's.

The NIV came about as the result of many translators belonging to many denominations, including many of the historic protestant denominations, as well as pentecostal denominations like the Assemblies of God. It was completed in 1978 -- not the "late 1800s." I'm not certain if your remark is just a typo or if you are just mistakenly identifying the NIV with another translation.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response: To be crystal clear, the work of Westcott & Hort and the revision committee of 1881 has affected all of the newer versions of the Bible since their work was finished in 1881. The NIV is one of the worst of the modern translations.

I would like to post this one last time. Hopefully it will provide insight on the problem. The work of Westcott & Hort was responsible for eliminating the Received Text, and exchanging it for the corrupt Alexandrian text, the same text that the Catholic Bible has relied on for centuries.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

The theories of textual criticism which underlie the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament of 1881 have been somewhat discredited by textual critics of the 20th century. It is not surprising, therefore, that modern version proponents today often disassociate themselves from Westcott-Hort and claim that they merely use an "eclectic" Greek text. ("Eclectic" means to "select or employ individual elements from a variety of sources, systems, or styles.")

James White, author of the popular and influential book "The King James Only Controversy," makes this claim. He says, "While modern Greek texts are not identical to that created by Westcott and Hort, one will still find defenders of the AV drawing in black and white, saying that all modern versions are based upon their work" (White, p. 99).

I have heard other modern version defenders imply that Westcott and Hort are irrelevant to the subject of the biblical text because "no textual critic now holds to the Westcott and Hort theories of textual criticism."

This position DODGES THE REAL ISSUE, WHICH IS THE FACT THAT WESTCOTT AND HORT REPRESENTED THE SIGNAL DEPARTURE FROM THE RECEIVED TEXT THAT IS REPRESENTED TODAY IN THE POPULAR THEORIES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM. Westcott and Hort built upon the foundation established by their predecessors, such as Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf. Westcott and Hort adapted the textual theories of these men into their own unique blend, and their Greek New Testament represented the first popular departure from the Greek Received Text.

While today's textual scholars do not always admit that they follow Westcott and Hort, many of the more honest ones do admit that they are powerfully influenced by these men.

Bruce Metzger is probably the most influential textual critic alive. He is one of the editors of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament and the author of many widely-used books on textual criticism. In his 1981 book The Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament--Yesterday and Today, Metzger makes the following plain admission: "The International committee that produced the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, NOT ONLY ADOPTED THE WESTCOTT AND HORT EDITION AS ITS BASIC TEXT, BUT FOLLOWED THEIR METHODOLOGY IN GIVING ATTENTION TO BOTH EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CONSIDERATION" (Metzger, cited by James Brooks, Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century, p. 264).

In light of this admission by such a prominent textual authority, James White needs to explain for his readers why he condemns King James Bible defenders for claiming that Westcott-Hort are still followed.

Brooks further states, "There is nothing unique about Metzger's theory of textual criticism. It is simply a refinement of Westcott and Hort's theory in the New Testament in the Original Greek (1881). . . . this theory is dominant today in part because of Metzger's great influence. It was the theory employed in producing the United Bible Societies Greek text. It is the theory lying behind the Greek text used by most modern versions: The Revised Standard Version."

standard, the New Revised Standard, the New English Bible, the Revised English Bible, the New American Bible, the New American Standard, the Good News Bible, the New International Version, and to a lesser extent, also the Jerusalem Bible and the New Jerusalem Bible" (Ibid.). This should be enough to demonstrate our point, but we offer more.

Consider the following quotation by Ernest Cadman Colwell, a textual scholar who published a number of widely used grammars and textbooks, including A Beginners Reader-Grammar for New Testament Greek (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), A Greek Papyrus Reader, with Vocabulary (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), A Hellenistic Greek Reader (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), and Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969).

"THE DEAD HAND OF FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT LIES HEAVY UPON US. In the early years of this century Kirsopp Lake described Hort's work as a failure, though a glorious one. But HORT DID NOT FAIL TO REACH HIS MAJOR GOAL. HE DETHRONED THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS. ... Hort's success in this task and the cogency of his tightly reasoned theory shaped—AND STILL SHAPES—the thinking of those who approach the textual criticism of the NT through the English language" (emphasis added) (Ernest Cadman Colwell, "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J.P. Hyatt, New York: Abingdon Press, 1965, p. 370).

In the introduction to the 24th edition of Nestle's Greek New Testament, editors Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland make the following admission:

"Thus THE TEXT, BUILT UP ON THE WORK OF THE 19TH CENTURY, HAS REMAINED AS A WHOLE UNCHANGED, particularly since the research of recent years has not yet led to the establishment of a generally acknowledged N.T. text" (Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece, 24th edition, 1960, p. 62).

James White is failing to acknowledge a fact that modern textual authorities such as Metzger, Colwell, and Nestle do acknowledge—that Westcott and Hort are key, pivotal men in the modern history of textual criticism and that the current "eclectic" Greek New Testaments continue to reflect, for the most part, the decisions made by Westcott and Hort. To deny their influence is similar to denying the influence of Darwin on contemporary evolutionary thought. Many planks of Darwin's theories have been discredited, but Darwin and his theories are important because of their key, pivotal role in the field.

Consider another quote, this one from Dr. Zane Hodges:

"MODERN TEXTUAL CRITICISM IS PSYCHOLOGICALLY 'ADDICTED' TO WESTCOTT AND HORT. Westcott and Hort, in turn, were rationalists in their approach to the textual problem in the New Testament and employed techniques within which rationalism and every other kind of bias are free to operate. The result of it all is a methodological quagmire where objective controls on the conclusions of critics are nearly nonexistent. It goes without saying that no Bible-believing Christian who is willing to extend the implications of his faith to textual matters can have the slightest grounds for confidence in contemporary critical texts" (emphasis added) (Zane C. Hodges, "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism," Bibliotheca Sacra, January 1971, p. 35).

Zane Hodges is not a fundamental Baptist, but I believe he is more honest about the influence of Westcott and Hort upon modern textual scholarship than James White.

White and others attempting to discredit the defense of the King James Bible claim that Westcott and Hort are not important because (they say) "the modern versions (NASV and NIV) are not based on the Alexandrian text or on the Westcott and Hort text. They are based on an eclectic text which sometimes favors the TR over Aleph or B."

This is true as far as it goes, but it ignores the heart of the issue. The fact is that the United Bible Societies (UBS) text is almost identical to the W-H text of 1881 IN SIGNIFICANT DEPARTURES FROM THE RECEIVED TEXT.

For example, both the W-H and the UBS delete or question almost the same number of verses (WH--48, UBS--45).

Both delete almost the same number of significant portions of verses (WH--193, UBS 185).

Both delete almost the same number of names and titles of the Lord (WH--221, UBS--212).

An extensive comparison of the TR against the WH text, the Nestle's Text, the UBS text, and key English versions was done by the late Everett Fowlmer and can be found in his book Evaluating Versions of the New Testament, available from Bible for Today.

The W-H text of 1881 and the latest edition of the United Bible Societies' text differ only in relatively minor points. BOTH REPRESENT THE SAME TYPE OF TEXT WITH THE SAME TYPE OF DEPARTURES FROM THE RECEIVED TEXT. They follow the type of text found in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, which the Reformation era Greek editors believed was a doctrinally corrupt text that was modified during the theological battles occurring in the two centuries after the apostles.

The fact is that the Westcott-Hort text represents the first widely-accepted departure from the Received Text in the post-Reformation era, and the modern English versions descend directly from the W-H text. The Westcott-Hort Greek text is very significant and its editors are highly significant to the history of textual criticism. Any man who discounts the continuing significance of Westcott-Hort in the field of Bible texts and versions is probably trying to throw up a smoke screen to hide something.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I really hope this clarifies the issue for you, Chris.

God bless,

Stever

Re:, on: 2005/12/21 21:08

Quote:

NotMe wrote:

.....P.S. You mention "the Faith of Christ in us" as opposed to simply "our faith in Christ."

Stever's response:

I must be loosing it, because I cannot find anywhere that I quoted the above. If I quoted it, I surely didn't mean it. I don't personally think that----"the Faith of Christ in us"

Let me know where I posted it so that I can retract it.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/12/21 21:37

Hi Stever...!

Thank you for the article. But it seems that you have only reprinted *someone else's* position on this issue (and unless I missed it somewhere, I cannot find the actual source of your material). Even this article identifies only other "sources" that agree with their own argument, rather than original source material. Thus, this article comes across as just a biased piece of "research" which used sources supporting an already preexisting position.

Likewise, this article that you reprinted still does not clarify the argument of the *KJV-only* crowd. Why do some suppose that the "Received Text" is superior to all other manuscripts and texts? There are many questions concerning the prejudices that the *KJV-only* crowd holds toward other texts, manuscripts and translations. And I truly believe that the translators of the NIV meant well -- and did their best -- with that translation in 1978. The preface of the NIV (containing the methods and intent of the translators) sounds remarkably like the intent of the translators of the KJV.

However, I feel that the KJV is inadequate for most individuals today. It is not because it is in any bit inferior to other translations. It is because it now goes against the original intent of the translators. It is no longer written in the "language of the common man." Its archaic form of English is misunderstood by many people that have not been raised in Churches that use this version exclusively. Like previously stated, Christ did not speak with such archaic language. Neither did the apostles. They spoke the commonly understood language of the people.

:-)

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/12/21 21:48

I am presently going to a seminary class designed for our organization that ministers to inner-city youth. The author of our textbook is very obviously not a KJV fan. I made comments in my textbook where I disagreed with the author but left the issue alone during class.

One day, one of the other guys started really going into a lot of the details of what is not in the NIV, as he had just learned the info during a Sunday School study on the history of the English Bible.

There were many different responses. Some were very sensitive and defended the modern versions, and some were pro-KJV. I made comments that I chose the King James after hours of comparing. The issue came up probably every class since then, but in small amounts. Someone might just interject a comment or two, but it was still brought up.

Today, we exegeted a passage from one book of the Bible that we had studied in-depth. Three of the students had done 1 John. Interestingly enough, one of the guys focused on 1 John 5:7 as a foundational verse to his faith. The teacher commented that his NIV read differently. Being familiar with the debate, I just kept quiet, I just let it play out, relying on the fact that I had told people to just compare the versions to see which is superior. This study I feel is perfectly reasonable.

I think that something must be realized, that all versions do not say the same thing, and the differences are not over unimportant statements. 1 John 5:7 is a prime example. While I am a pro-KJV guy, I don't reject guys who aren't, but I think it is ignorant whenever I hear this statement that the differences in the Greek manuscripts are not important. I do understand that they agree well above 90 percent, but they don't say the same things.

While I believe you can get saved from a Catholic Bible, a Living Bible, an NIV, or a AV, I think it is fair to look into which is superior since they don't say the same thing. And I think we must respect our brothers and sisters who stand with a different version. However, I see that many of the anti-AV crowd often says they all more or less say the same thing. They don't. Two Sundays ago we covered a verse in SS in which the NIV didn't have the words, "by his blood."

So whether you go this way or that, let's just be honest and agree that there are differences. Most of us on this site never had a problem bringing differences forward. I still get the feeling the many make comments who have not taken the time to compare version against version with effort and patience, as well as these things put in the light of historical events. I respect all Christians, regardless of version preference, but comments from a surface study tend to just attack the opposing side versus debating the evidence.

BTW-These comments are not aimed at anyone as I haven't read the posts except for about the last two and the original. I just thought it interesting that I saw the 1 John 5:7 difference in action during a study of respectable, intelligent Christians who had both versions present, and neither person's comments were prepared or knowledgeable of the textual difference, but all agreed the difference was significant.

Re: - posted by dhcolesj (), on: 2005/12/21 22:00

I think his post DOES clarify the base issue, that of source. This is the reason I adhere to Received Text translations, (or translation considering I only use KJV). The source behind almost all other translations is that of godless men such as Wescott and Hort, and as such cannot be reliable or accurate.

The question the verse asks in Psalms (11:3) is "if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" So, if there are two basic families of Greek text, the Alexandrian, and the Byzantine, and the Alexandrian has been proven unreliable, then the translations based on them, must also be unreliable. If so, then those based on the Byzantine must be reliable, unless you believe we do not have a reliable source for God's Word in our day.

Now, the question has also been posed about those not able to speak English. I think this is foolish, and only distracts from the original question. There is no one in their right mind who holds to the King James who would say that someone in China would have to learn English before they can read God's Word. Neither have I heard of anyone who would point out the same to any other group of non-English speaking people. The question deals with the English language, let's keep it there. Note to those who think Chinese people must learn the KJV: You heard me right, you are NOT in your right mind, and are no better than the Romanist who did their best to kill anyone who tried to translate scripture into English in the first place.

Now, as to source I can't speak to where STEVER came up with his information, and since I am no longer near the University I can't look up the material. However, I have read this from various sources myself.

Re:, on: 2005/12/22 1:38

Stever's response to dhcoles:

It is a pleasure to find: 1) a Brother in agreement on this important issue

I truly agree with everything you say below.

God bless,

Stever
xxxxxxxxxx

Quote:

dhcolesj wrote:

I think his post DOES clarify the base issue, that of source. This is the reason I adhere to Received Text translations, (or translation considering I only use KJV). The source behind almost all other translations is that of godless men such as Wescott and Hort, and as such cannot be reliable or accurate.

The question the verse asks in Psalms (11:3) is "if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" So, if there are two basic families of Greek text, the Alexandrian, and the Byzantine, and the Alexandrian has been proven unreliable, then the translations based on them, must also be unreliable. If so, then those based on the Byzantine must be reliable, unless you believe we do not have a reliable source for God's Word in our day.

Now, the question has also been posed about those not able to speak English. I think this is foolish, and only distracts from the original question. There is no one in their right mind who holds to the King James who would say that someone in China would have to learn English before they can read God's Word. Neither have I heard of anyone who would point out the same to any other group of non-English speaking people. The question deals with the English language, let's keep it there. Note to those who think Chinese people must learn the KJV: You heard me right, you are NOT in your right mind, and are no better than the Romanist who did their best to kill anyone who tried to translate scripture into English in the first place.

Now, as to source I can't speak to where STEVER came up with his information, and since I am no longer near the University I can't look up the material. However, I have read this from various sources myself.

Re:, on: 2005/12/22 1:41

Steve's response to the Letsgetbusy (Below)

Praise the Lord- What a wonderful thing to witness with your own eyes and ears. There really is a difference that can be seen by people that have eyes to see and ears to hear!!!

God bless,

Stever
xxxxxxxxxx

Quote:

letsgetbusy wrote:

I am presently going to a seminary class designed for our organization that ministers to inner-city youth. The author of our textbook is very obviously not a KJV fan. I made comments in my textbook where I disagreed with the author but left the issue alone during class.

One day, one of the other guys started really going into a lot of the details of what is not in the NIV, as he had just learned the info during a Sunday School study on the history of the English Bible.

There were many different responses. Some were very sensitive and defended the modern versions, and some were pro-KJV. I made comments that I chose the King James after hours of comparing. The issue came up probably every class since then, but in small amounts. Someone might just interject a comment or two, but it was still brought up.

Today, we exegeted a passage from one book of the Bible that we had studied in-depth. Three of the students had done 1 John. Interestingly enough, one of the guys focused on 1 John 5:7 as a foundational verse to his faith. The teacher commented that his NIV read differently. Being familiar with the debate, I just kept quiet, I just let it play out, relying on the fact that I had told people to just compare the versions to see which is superior. This study I feel is perfectly reasonable.

I think that something must be realized, that all versions do not say the same thing, and the differences are not over unimportant statements. 1 John 5:7 is a prime example. While I am a pro-KJV guy, I don't reject guys who aren't, but I think it is ignorant whenever I hear this statement that the differences in the Greek manuscripts are not important. I do understand that they agree well above 90 percent, but they don't say the same things.

While I believe you can get saved from a Catholic Bible, a Living Bible, an NIV, or a AV, I think it is fair to look into which is superior since they don't say the same thing. And I think we must respect our brothers and sisters who stand with a different version. However, I see that many of the anti-AV crowd often says they all more or less say the same thing. They don't. Two Sundays ago we covered a verse in SS in which the NIV didn't have the words, "by his blood."

So whether you go this way or that, let's just be honest and agree that there are differences. Most of us on this site never had a problem bringing differences forward. I still get the feeling the many make comments who have not taken the time to compare version against version with effort and patience, as well as these things put in the light of historical events. I respect all Christians, regardless of version preference, but comments from a surface study tend to just attack the opposing side versus debating the evidence.

BTW-These comments are not aimed at anyone as I haven't read the posts except for about the last two and the original. I just thought it interesting that I saw the 1 John 5:7 difference in action during a study of respectable, intelligent Christians who had both versions present, and neither persons comments were prepared or knowledgeable of the textual difference, but all agreed the difference was significant.

Re:, on: 2005/12/25 12:20

To answer an earlier remark by ccchhhrrriiss,

Quote:
-----Likewise, this article that you reprinted still does not clarify the argument of the KJV-only crowd. Why do some suppose that the "Received Text" is superior to all other manuscripts and texts?

Here is an article you may all find extremely helpful to read, which presents I believe - correct me if I am wrong, Stever - the main argument for the modern use of the Received Text and KJV with abundant detail.

<http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/sbs777/vital/kjv/part1-1.html>

Here is an excerpt from the article, but please examine it throughout with prayer and supplication:

Quote:
-----How should Protestants who believe in the divine inspiration and preservation of Scripture evaluate this committee's work (The Revised Standard Version Committee)? I answer without hesitation: With grave suspicion! JEHOVAH the Holy One of Israel, who initially gave us the Scriptures through His prophets and apostles of old, who carefully selected the King James Version translators on the basis of their faith and linguistic ability and has since blessed His Word for some 400 years, would certainly never, never change His methods and use translators who reject basic Bible doctrines such as the creation account in Genesis. Would the Almighty, who claims never to change (Malachi 3:6), now use UNBELIEVERS to re-translate the Bible? The very idea is preposterous, if not blasphemous. I am still aghast that it took me so long to learn these facts. I am even more astounded when Christians, who are given this information, continue to hold to their modern Bibles.

Let God lead you in His mighty ways,
S. Stefanov

Re:, on: 2005/12/25 12:22

As for where our argument went, Stever:

Quote:
----- If I quoted it, I surely didn't mean it. I don't personally think that-----""the Faith of Christ in us"

I believe this was a petty misunderstanding, and I just wanted to make sure you didn't mean it.

God bless--

Re: New Age Versions, on: 2005/12/26 12:57

The following is written by the late David B. Loughran (he passed away in 2000) from Stewarton, Scotland.

Quote:
-----The NIV, like many other modern translations, contains many doubt-laden footnotes such as:

'Many mss.(manuscripts) do not contain this verse.'
'The best manuscripts read.'
'The earliest mss read.'
'Some ancient mss add.'
'Some mss insert.'
'Many ancient authorities read.'
'Not found in most of the old mss.'
'Some late manuscripts.'
'Some manuscripts and certain Jews.'
'Some manuscripts do not haveÂ...'

These footnotes clearly show that the NIV translators, whilst putting on a show of apparent fairness, are really unsure of their product; they doubt whet

her the NIV is God's Word for today. The editors obviously don't know or don't believe it is, else they would not insert so many conflicting footnotes; which not only cast doubt on the King James Bible, but also on their own version. These dubious footnotes all imply that since there are so many disagreeing manuscripts, no one can be absolutely certain as to which is the real Word of God. In effect they say: 'Take your pick, decide for yourself which manuscript or version you want to believe; for the fact is, no one can be certain what God actually inspired His prophets and apostles to write.'

'Yea hath God said?' (Gen.3:1) was, and still is, Satan's main weapon against truth. He deceived Eve in the Garden of Eden by planting doubt concerning God's Word in her mind. Satan is doing the very same thing with the modern translations of the Bible. They all cast doubt on the real Word of God (the KJV); and those insinuating footnotes are the latest Satanic way of saying: 'Hath God said? Is it any wonder there are so few Christians who really believe the Bible is the infallible Word of God!'

What does your conscience say?

In Christ,
Slav Stefanov

Re:, on: 2005/12/26 15:01

"Not me" quoted:

"As for where our argument went, Stever:

Quote:

If I quoted it, I surely didn't mean it. I don't personally think that----"the Faith of Christ in us"

I believe this was a petty misunderstanding, and I just wanted to make sure you didn't mean it.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response to "Not Me":

What I was responding to is that I can't remember posting what you quoted in the first place---that I can ascertain from all of my posts. This was your original post to me in this regards:

xxxxxxxxxx

P.S. You mention "the Faith of Christ in us" as opposed to simply "our faith in Christ." Jesus never mentioned or clarified anyone's faith to be indeed "the Faith of Christ in them." Never did he say, "the Faith of Abraham in you has healed you," or "My Faith in you has healed you." This would have confused the people! And if it is indeed true, then does it matter what one believes in, if it is NOT your faith, but the Faith of Christ in you? Does such an approach invalidate our reason? Does it, more importantly, give Him all the responsibility for our lack of faith (at times)? Why would Christ so often criticize their "little faith," if it was His Faith in them to begin with? Was He criticizing Himself? Read John 3:16 again - it says, "whoever believes in him," and not "whoever has the Faith of Christ in him." As simple as that!"

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Please, point out to me where I said this, and then I can respond properly.

God bless,

Stever

Re:, on: 2005/12/26 20:09

My apologies, Stever. The actual quote was by Christinyou, and not yours. Here it is:

Quote:
-----The greatest lie and deception of most of the new translations is to take away the faith of Christ and change it into our faith in Jesus Christ. Paul makes it clear that our faith is of and by Christ in us. Heavenly faith not earthly faith.

I have wrongly accused you of posting this.

In Christ,
S.S.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/27 3:35

Quote: ""Why would Christ so often criticize their "little faith," if it was His Faith in them to begin with? Was He criticizing Himself? Read John 3:16 again - it says, "whoever believes in him," and not "whoever has the Faith of Christ in him." As simple as that!""

It was not His faith in them if it were they could move mountains. His Faith had not yet come to believers.

Rom 4:16 Therefore of faith, that by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the Father of us all,;

This is not Abraham's faith, this is the Fathers Faith in Abraham and it was made righteousness and justification reckoned to him not because of him but because of God.

It is not Abraham but to that also which is of the faith which is the Father of us all. Connect Faith and Father not Abraham and father.

The faith of our Lord Jesus Christ; i.e. faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; God is the author of this faith but Christ is the object of faith, is meant, as Ga 2:20; 3:22; Php 3:9.

Galatians 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

Galatians 3:22-24 But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

When did faith come? This faith was shut up until after He was made our Justification, then this faith would be revealed in them that believe and are saved.

Philippians 3:9-15 And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press to ward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.

Man in himself does not even have the faith of a mustard seed, if he did he could move mountains.

The Life I know live I live by the faith of the Son of God which is now revealed in the son's of God. Just like it was reckoned to Abraham it is now come and revealed in us.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/12/27 10:59

Christinyou's Â 2005/12/27 8:35

Quote:

-----Rom 4:16 Therefore of faith, that by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the Father of us all.??This is not Abraham's faith, this is the Fathers Faith in Abraham and it was made righteousness and justification reckoned to him not because of him but because of God.??It is not Abraham but to that also which is of the faith which is the Father of us all. Connect Faith and Father not Abraham and father.

I am having difficulty following your reasoning here. This is very plainly 'Abraham's Faith'. This whole chapter begins with the question that the chapter is answering.Â“What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.Â” (Rom. 4:1-3, KJVS) and the chapter goes on to describe 'Abraham's kind of faith' the absolute dependence upon the character of God as expressed in his word to Abraham. Are you saying that "this is the Fathers Faith in Abraham" to imply that this was God's faith in the person of Abraham ie God trusted Abraham, or the 'Fathers' in the sense of the OT patriarchs? This chapter is about the 'Faith of Father Abraham' not the Father's faith in Abraham. The word 'father' is used 6 times in this chapter and each time it refers to the man Abraham. (Rom. 4:1,11-12,16-18)

If you are wanting to distinguish between the Abrahamic Faith and Christian Faith I am with you, but I'm not sure that this is what you are trying to convey.

In his sermon (Sermon 110 "Faith is the substance of things seen" Wesley says But still let it be carefully observed, (for it is a point of no small importance) that this faith is only the faith of a servant, and not the faith of a son. Because this is a point which many do not clearly understand, I will endeavour to make it a little plainer. The faith of a servant implies a divine evidence of the invisible and the eternal world; yea, and an evidence of the spiritual world, so far as it can exist without living experience. Whoever has attained this, the faith of a servant, "feareth God and escheweth evil;" or, as it is expressed by St. Peter, "feareth God and worketh righteousness." In consequence of which he is in a degree, as the Apostle observes, "accepted with Him." Elsewhere he is described in those words: "He that feareth God, and keepeth his commandments." Even one who has gone thus far in religion, who obeys God out of fear, is not in any wise to be despised; seeing "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Nevertheless he should be exhorted not to stop there; not to rest till he attains the adoption of sons; till he obeys out of love, which is the privilege of all the children of God. This differentiation of servile and filial faith was a regular theme in Wesley's teaching.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/12/27 11:09

Quote:

-----"He that feareth God, and keepeth his commandments." Even one who has gone thus far in religion, who obeys God out of fear, is not in any wise to be despised; seeing "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Nevertheless he should be exhorted not to stop there; not to rest till he attains the adoption of sons; till he obeys out of love, which is the privilege of all the children of God.

What an outstanding quote. Have wondered why there is not more of Wesley's expressions ... expressed. Thanks Ron.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/28 4:33

A son has the faith of the Father and His Son is Jesus Christ and we have The Son birthed in us and we have the same Faith of the Son by birth. Not servant faith which is earthly and may or may not reach the Father, if it does its only because of the Father's Grace and still it must be to the believing on the Name of Jesus Christ. The servant's faith because of the Son, reaches to salvation as by fire and will not attain sonship until the rapture, then the servant's faith will become the Faith of the Son. We can stay in the servant's faith and grow in spirit little and believe and be saved, but the Faith of the Son of God is the faith we should reach for and knowing that The Father will not give us a rock when we ask for the Bread of Life. Servant hood faith will reach sonship faith if it is known and the knowledge of The Faith of the Son of God that by that Faith will reach sonship faith. If we don't get it now we will have to get it when we are resurrected, even though it was available to all. The ones that have lived in the Faith of the Son of God will already be where Paul was..

Philippians 3:12-21 Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I

press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing. Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample. (For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.) For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

Hsa 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.

Jam 1:5 If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.

There is line upon line and precept upon precept and we will get off the milk and come to oneness upon oneness with Jesus Christ the more we see that all we are is in Christ and He is the One we should seek and we will be assured that the life we now live we live by the Faith of the Son of God, and learning the Love that is in Christ Jesus, then The Love of the Father can be returned to Himself, not just by Jesus but by His brother's whom He has made son's by the incorruptible Seed of Himself in us by the Father.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/12/28 12:38

Hi NotMe...!

Quote:

-----The NIV, like many other modern translations, contains many doubt-laden footnotes such as:

'Many mss.(manuscripts) do not contain this verse.'

'The best manuscripts read.'

'The earliest mss read.'

'Some ancient mss add.'

'Some mss insert.'

'Many ancient authorities read.'

'Not found in most of the old mss.'

'Some late manuscripts.'

'Some manuscripts and certain Jews.'

'Some manuscripts do not haveÂ...'

These footnotes clearly show that the NIV translators, whilst putting on a show of apparent fairness, are really unsure of their product; they doubt whether the NIV is God's Word for today. The editors obviously don't know or don't believe it is, else they would not insert so many conflicting footnotes; which not only cast doubt on the King James Bible, but also on their own version. These dubious footnotes all imply that since there are so many disagreeing manuscripts, no one can be absolutely certain as to which is the real Word of God. In effect they say: 'Take your pick, decide for yourself which manuscript or version you want to believe; for the fact is, no one can be certain what God actually inspired His prophets and apostles to write.'

'Yea hath God said?' (Gen.3:1) was, and still is, Satan's main weapon against truth. He deceived Eve in the Garden of Eden by planting doubt concerning God's Word in her mind. Satan is doing the very same thing with the modern translations of the Bible. They all cast doubt on **the real Word of God (the KJV)**;

I truly believe that the remarks left in the NIV demonstrate the honesty of the translators, rather than any type of "show of apparent fairness," "doubt," or deception. If you read the preface to the KJV, you will find that the translators encountered the same problems. Rather than include these issues as footnotes, such problems and issues were explained in the preface.

As has been often stated before, most non *KJV-only* individuals have no problem with the King James Version. In fact, many of us actually *prefer* the version to other translations. However, the problem is included in your quote written by the late David B. Loughran. They consider the KJV the "real Word of God."

The Word of God was not spoken in English -- let alone 16th Century English. As beautiful and poetic as the language now seems to be, in its day, such language was only the common and proper language as spoken by England and its colonies. In fact, it did not last long. The King James Version (or "Authorized Version") as purchased and used most often today was modified 158 years after the original 1611 printing (in 1769).

The Word of God has been printed in nearly every language in the world today. The KJV does nothing for the majority of people living in the world today. Why? Because they either do not speak English -- or they do not understand the English as spoken during that time period. Many people in Mexico, Spain, France, Russia, China, Japan, or even *inner-city Dallas, Texas* cannot fully understand that version of the Bible without proper instruction.

Even if you hold the "Received Text" as the only proper source for translation, what is wrong with a newer translation (in modern English) that is based upon such source material? But many *KJV-only* believers often dismiss such an idea. Either they do not believe that people can have problems with the archaic language of the KJV, or they believe that the version is the actual "preserved" and "infallible" translation of the Word of God. Of course, those who honestly and seriously follow the translation realize that it is not without translation error.

Was the "Received Text" the only source for the King James Version? Of course not! Read the preface of the translation (including the intent of the translators), and you will find proof in their own words that the translators encountered problems and issues, and their instructions to follow other translations and ecclesiastic tradition "whenever possible." The actual explanation for the translation was that this new *authorized* version was "translated out of the original tongues, and with the former translations diligently compared and revised by His Majesty's special command" (emphasis mine).

There are "translations" and "versions" of the Bible that are obviously biased. *The New World Translation* (of the Jehovah's Witnesses) and *The Living Bible* are great examples of such. However, it is disheartening to me to see so many believers that often attack other serious and academic translations of the Word of God. While no translation of the Bible is perfect (including the King James Version), people should not be so quick to slander other seriously translated versions. As a result, you may find out that you are attacking the Word of God *himself*.

:)

Re:, on: 2005/12/29 0:54

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:

Quote:
-----Even if you hold the "Received Text" as the only proper source for translation, what is wrong with a newer translation (in modern English) that is based upon such source material?

Brother,

I do *not* have a problem with a modern translation based on the same source, since language has truly evolved during the last three or four centuries. However, it is *not* the perfect English translation that makes KJV reliable. What is most precious about the KJV (either the one from 1611 or from 1759) is that the translation was based entirely on the "Received Text" (or "Majority Text," *behind 90% of all extant manuscripts*), while all newer versions rely heavily on the "Minority Text" (from the Alexandrian manuscripts), which *accounts for only 5% of the extant 5000+ manuscripts*. The earliest versions of Scripture - namely, the Peshitta (150 A.D.), the Old Latin Vulgate (157 A.D.), and the Waldensian Bible (120 A.D.) - *all agree with the "Received (or Majority) Text"* - in other words, they *include* the very verses, words, and other omissions characterizing the "Minority Text" manuscripts. Moreover, the early Church Fathers have *abundantly quoted from those same Scriptures* (e.g., Mark 16:9-20) not found in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus codices. The latter two codices were (and have been) preferred by scholars such as Westcott and Hort, because they are dated *earlier* than all extant Greek (not of Egyptian origin) manuscripts of the New Testament. The argument that has been used is that "the oldest is the best." However, these scholars have not taken into consideration the versions from 2nd century mentioned above and the numerous quotations of Scripture by Church Fathers which *predate* the Codex Vaticanus by some 200 years.

The problem with newer versions then is the unfoundedly great relative weight of the "Minority Text" manuscripts the scholars responsible for post-1881 English versions have attributed to the "Minority Text" despite its *proven unreliability* - and not the English language itself.

Also, I am from Bulgaria and when I compare the Bulgarian version of the Scripture from 1871, for example (translated directly from the "Majority Text" Greek NT manuscripts), the text *coincides* with the KJV and *not* the NIV, or the other "Revised Versions" in the English language. Also, have in mind that Bulgaria was christianized in the 9th century and it has used the "Received Text" unchanged ever since - the same text that earlier went to Egypt from where it was transferred over to Rome, eventuating in Codices such as the Vaticanus.

I am not saying I am not going to refer to other versions than the KJV. I do not doubt the scholars' honesty. However, when somebody is in the wrong, their honesty does not alter the fact. That is why when I use English versions other than the KJV, I will always take them with a pinch of salt.

God bless,
Slav

P.S. I guess the greatest problem the new translations have caused is the uncertainty as to whether the untainted Word of God is still to be found nowadays. With so many conflicting manuscripts (such as those 5% originating from Alexandria), one is free to doubt whether anything should really be in the Scriptures, which is indeed what Satan longs for - "Did God *really* say that?"

We must always be able to trust completely what we read, and how can this be so if we assume that we do *not* have the preserved word of God? How can we ever honestly follow Romans 14:23? Or do we risk becoming like the Jehovah's Witnesses with their "perfect version?" Remember this: "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." (Psalm 12: 6-7) The Lord never breaks His promises! Hallelujah!

Re:, on: 2005/12/29 2:09

ccchhhrrriisss said:

"I truly believe that the remarks left in the NIV demonstrate the honesty of the translators, rather than any type of "show of apparent fairness," "doubt," or deception. If you read the preface to the KJV, you will find that the translators encountered the same problems. Rather than include these issues as footnotes, such problems and issues were explained in the preface.

Stever's response:

I take it that you have not read of the character of Westcott and Hort, or the personal statements and writings made between these two men, as well as other witnesses posted on this thread.

If you read them, and I think you have, then perhaps a new television show should be in the works. You will be the host, and the title of the show is "THE SPIN STARTS HERE".

Why not be honest and level with us. That no matter what information is posted here, your mind has already been made up.

Instead of trying to come across as a seeker of truth and reason, come across as who you are- the marketing manager for the NIV and all of the newer versions.

Then tell us why.

That would be something to respond to, from your side of the aisle, as well as the other side.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriisss (), on: 2005/12/29 12:54

Hi Stever...

Quote:

-----If you read them, and I think you have, then perhaps a new television show should be in the works. You will be the host, and the title of the show is "THE SPIN STARTS HERE".

Why not be honest and level with us. That no matter what information is posted here, your mind has already been made up.

Instead of trying to come across as a seeker of truth and reason, come across as who you are- the marketing manager for the NIV and all of the newer versions.

You are obviously a bad judge of character -- and you are completely wrong. May the Lord forgive you for the bad judgment that you have publicly cast upon me.

Why is it that a few strongly opinionated believers take such great effort to "paint" those that disagree with them as "bad people," or as having some sort of ulterior motive?

Brother, you do not know me, nor my heart, nor my experiences, nor my pilgrimage with the Lord. Before you continue to cast bad judgment on other believers, perhaps you should pray. Then maybe God would give you the understanding or words to say before trying to verbally assassinate those that may disagree with you.

As for your comments, there is no "conspiracy" against the KJV (at least on my part). I simply do not agree with those that hold the *KJV-only* or the *KJV-is-the-only-good-translation* perspective. I do not work for the NIV committee, nor am I the "marketing manager" as such. I am simply a college student that loves the Lord with all of my heart, soul, mind and strength. I continue to wholeheartedly seek the Lord on this matter -- and every matter -- with complete honesty and openness. I study diligently the matter, but I do not confine myself to books that just attack other Bible translations or hold the *King James Version* as the only authoritative Word of God. I am completely and honestly open to being wrong in this. But thus far, nothing concrete has been presented that would sway me from my belief.

I am praying for you, brother. I understand that you may just be *over-zealous* for the KJV or your position in this matter. But that seems to be the issue that bothers me the most -- people will resort to any means possible in order to defend their position or beliefs. This occurs often in the forums, and it has caused many hearts to ache from such false accusations or bad communication. In the future, please refrain from cruel *character assassination* in an attempt to defend your own position or if someone says something that you do not agree with. You may not realize it now, but you could be hurting a member of the family of God very deeply with such posts.

:~)

Re:, on: 2005/12/29 13:15

Brother Ccchhhrrriiisss,

Please, forgive Stever's lack of patience. I know where he is coming from and where you are coming from, and he has no excuse for being rudely accusative. I encourage you look at what groh_frog already posted:

Quote:
-----I wanted to share a sermon by Chuck Smith that KrispyKrittr sent me. It deals pretty well with addressing some of the problems assuming that "the oldest texts are the best" as NIV and some of the other modern translations do. It also lays a good perspective on why he uses KJV above the others.

http://server.firefighters.org/kjv/projects/firefighters/kjv_web/html/sermons.htm

Quote:
-----I'll tell you that I was an NIV lover. I like the language, and it was easy to use. KJV seemed crazy. And seeing so many push their meager opinions on the subject almost made me an "anything but KJVer". Listen to the sermon posted below, and it'll give you a little more perspective on some things to consider. I'll tell you straight up that I respect KJV a whole lot more than NIV now. Is KJV the only one that a person can be saved by? No. But there's some factors to think about when you listen to that sermon by Chuck Smith.

In Christ,
Slav

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2005/12/29 13:54

Hi NotMe...

Thanks for the note. I did download the sermon from Chuck Smith (and several others as well). I began listening to it. However, due to the hustle and bustle of the end of the semester, I haven't had the chance to seriously "digest" it.

I suppose that the problem that I see in this entire issue (other than feelings of disgust that sometimes find their way in posts) is that many of the arguments of both sides are just very hollow. Many on the *KJV-only* side argue that the KJV is the perfect or preserved Word of God -- which is simply untrue. It is a translation made by man, taken mostly from the Received Text with other versions also cross-examined. There are those who argue that the NIV, NASV, NKJV, etc... are *inferior* because they are derived from other source material (the Alexandrian texts, the Dead Sea Scrolls, etc...).

The problem, of course, is in the defense of the Received Text as superior to all other versions. First of all, we do not have the Received Text(s) to review. Secondly, most of us do not fluently read in the ancient languages of the Bible. So we are forced to take sides due to the opinionated (and often biased) beliefs of certain books or messages.

I have no problem with the King James Version. There are only a few passages that are obviously poorly translated (such as the infamous "Easter" reference in Acts 12). But the language is archaic, and is poorly understood by the majority of English-speakers, as well as the rest of the world. This conflicts completely with the intent of the translators of the KJV -- and led to four major revisions (including the 1769 version that we commonly use today).

It is my belief that there are no completely perfect translations. Why? Because they are translated by flawed men. Someone wrote that doubting the complete validity of the KJV is like Satan in the Garden ("Did God really say...?"), and cast "seeds of doubt" into the heart of nonbelievers. However, I once received an email from a person that visited the forums who felt the same "seeds of doubt" because of the many posts against virtually every other translation.

Of course, I will continue to seek God on this matter. I will try to finish listening to the Chuck Smith message in the next couple of days. However, if what is presented is what has already been presented, I don't know that it would change my mind on the matter. I will keep you posted!

Quote:
-----"For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.." Hebrews 4:12-13

:-)

Re: Seeds of Doubt, on: 2005/12/29 14:47

Quote:
-----However, I once received an email from a person that visited the forums who felt the same "seeds of doubt" because of the many posts against virtually every other translation.

Ccchhhrrriiisss-

I know intellectual debates can easily get frustrating and futile. I can only encourage you to "keep seeking God on this matter." The KJV vs. other versions debate can tempt us all to make prideful comments and take stands that make us feel good, which is the enemy's delight. I believe in the honesty on both sides. Honesty is a prerequisite for any such conversation to be meaningful. On thing I know, though: both sides on the debate *cannot be right* (which means both can be wrong) and only God can judge between the two. Yet, through His Spirit He has given us discernment so we can distinguish between right and wrong and not rely on our intellect. It would be so much easier if we knew it all. However, we must trust God to lead us all the way, despite how much we do not know at present.

Paul writes in 1 Cor.13:10-12,

10But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

11When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put a

way childish things.

12For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

This is a great hope for all of us! Yet, in our desire to please God, we may try to know too much and get out of the way He is leading us. We can only "pray without ceasing" and put our trust in the Lord - without Him our righteousness is nothing.

I can also feel your indignation against such a firm stance against all-but-KJV versions of the (English) Bible. It is indeed a shame that even in our good intentions we can hurt our brethren. Yet, I believe God is working through each and every one of us and He will bring His work to completion (Phil.1:6). We are just "jars of clay" (2 Cor.4:7) and "unprofitable servants" (Lk.17:10). And, please, do not think it pleases me or others who hold the KJV in a higher standing than the newer English versions of Scripture to be so firm and even rebuke others. It is no easier than exposing the sin of a person you love (if this parallel would work here, given you assume we may as well be in the wrong), because you may offend the person or cause them to hurt. Trust me, if I could honestly admit that NIV, NASV, NRSV, and the rest were all as good and imperfect translations from the preserved Greek (as the KJV), I would fain do so. However, my conscience does not let me keep quiet and not warn others about what I have discovered for the truth's sake.

Yet, I am still learning and I believe sometimes (only the Lord knows and I must be humble before Him) it is improper to take such a strong stand and thus create division and cast seeds of doubt among other believers - even the most well-meant remark can become a stumbling block to another.

Let the Lord blot out my transgressions!

In Christ,
Slav

P.S. I'll keep seeking God for this as well, as you take the time to listen to Chuck Smith's sermon. After all, we cannot have a conversation about a "text" you, I assume, are unfamiliar with.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/29 15:49

I have no problem reading other translation of the Bible, but I am careful to see the sneaky lies of the devil. When the Faith of the Son of God is changed to the faint in the Son of God, I have a problem. This takes away from our salvation and all else we have in Christ by Christ. When I realized it was God's Faith that came by Jesus Christ and by His Faith reborn in me, I became very faithful to His truth that is in me. If we see that it is a different Faith than that is by The Christ in us, "Warning", I realized that my New life in Christ by Him being all in all for my life now, that I should trust His Faith and not my own. The Holy Spirit uses the Faith of Christ to allow us to understand the things of God. Jhn 14:17 the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.

Jhn 7:39 But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.

Jhn 16:14 He shall glorify me: for He shall receive of Mine, and shall shew unto you.

Jhn 8:43 Why do ye not understand my speech? because ye cannot hear my word.

How can we hear His Words? We can only understand His Words by Whom He gave the Witness of Himself, The Holy Spirit. By His Spirit and by The Holy Spirit Whom He gives it to, are we able to understand His Sayings, which is the Whole Word of God. By His Faith, By His Spirit that is Born Again in our spirit and is now His Spirit in complete Union with ours, and by All that Christ is are we to receive of Him, by the Holy Spirit.

That's why when a translation moves away from this Union and The Faith of the Son of God and the Word of the Son of God by the Holy Spirit Teacher, that is when the red light comes on and I see the very subtle deviation from the Truth of the Word that is protected by the Holy Spirit, that is when I either change it in the translation to the truth being revealed in me by the Holy Spirit and the firmness of Christ's Spirit in me, or go to the best translation the bares the Fruit of the Spirit.

If any one takes away from this Gospel they are cursed.

KJV.

Gal 2:16 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

Gal 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

NIV 2:16 know that a man is not justified by observing the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ. So we, too, have put our faith in Christ Jesus that we may be justified by faith in Christ and not by observing the law, because by observing the law no one will be justified.

NIV 2:20

I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me. The life I live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.

Most new translations change this Faith of the Son of God, to our Faith in the Son of God, which is the subtle lie of Satan.

Gal 3:22 But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

Eph 3:12 In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him.

Phl 1:27 Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel; Which is Christ.

Colossians 1:27-28 To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

Check other versions of the bible and see how Satan uses new translations to change the faith of the Son of God in us, changed to faith in the Son of God. One is Satan's lie the other is the truth of the Faith of the Son of God, that is Christ in you the Hope of Glory. Not my faith in Jesus Christ, it will do nothing except as my earthly faith, to make me religious by my own works and unable to understand Heavenly Truths by the heavenly Faith of Christ that is in me. It must be the Faith of the Son of God, not faith in the Son of God. The Faith of Jesus Christ in me that has given me Faith in Jesus Christ, but not my faith in Christ to make me who I am. That takes His Faith in me that makes me a son of God, God's Child headed for His House to be with our Heavenly Father for ever.

Jhn 14:26 But the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.

And yet even Christ also: John 14:18 I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: Conduct - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/12/29 16:55

Quote:

-----In the future, please refrain from cruel character assassination in an attempt to defend your own position or if someone says something that you do not agree with. You may not realize it now, but you could be hurting a member of the family of God very deeply with such posts.

Stever,

That is precisely correct. There is no place for this here and is grounds for having you removed from the forum, it will not

be tolerated. Consider this a warning.

Re:, on: 2005/12/29 17:37

1 Peter 3:15-16,

But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear: Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evildoers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.

Speaking the truth is no excuse for disobedience. Praise God for His mercy!

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/29 20:00

Galatians 5:22-26 But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. >>>>>Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another. To myself most of all, Father I beg on bended knees That You Keep me from from the affections and lusts of the flesh, but fill me with the Glory of Your Christ, Your Son, that is in me.

Colossians 1:28-29 Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: Whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily. In us all. Amen

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/12/29 21:35

Yes, let us reason together. I am openly a KJV guy, but if you are for Jesus Christ and the Bible I'm with you. I will tell you if you are interested why I choose the KJV. Let's continue to discuss with fear and trembling, knowing that we will all stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ.

I think Steve, you are a man of character, and are calling the shots as you see them. Let's show people the truth out of love. And those of us who disagree with Steve should realize that he is passionate about truth-seeking.

Even Gail Riplinger, who wrote the book "New Age Bible Versions" that stirred up the controversy so much, said she believed the modern version translators were not conspiracy driven necessarily (my comment: though some involved may have been), but rather were like Adam and Eve in the garden; trying to add something to God's plan. Trying to steady an ark that is not to be touched except by those appointed by God.

Riplinger also commented that she thought the version debate was laughable when she first heard about it. This same woman, years later, did a 6 year exhaustive study to defend the superiority of the King James. Kent Hovind came to the KJV stance reluctantly over many years, but now defends the AV during his evangelism efforts.

The subject was very offensive to me, thinking that my church is full of inferior Bibles in the pews, but I let the evidence prove itself. My mind was sore for weeks thinking of all that was to be dealt with in this subject. The result was hours of study of: English Bible history, Greek manuscript evidence, version comparison, Christian doctrine explored, etc.

I don't get upset at you guys that take a stand for modern versions, though I do get very frustrated at remarks made from surface study to just attack the 'KJV-only' crowd. I'm no more a 'KJV-only' guy than I am a 'protestant.' Simply because neither is my condition in the sight of God, and neither helps me walk rightly in the Spirit. I am merely His child because of the covering of the precious blood of Christ.

While I think the AV is stronger in doctrine, the words on the page do me no good if I don't obey them. So I take my stand on AV, knowing I will be judged for how I take my stand on the AV.

So for us pro-AV guys, we must speak out of love to defend our position, regardless of what the comments of others are. I do get a little wound up when searching for truth, why shouldn't we? Let's just make sure we are honoring Christ along the way.

John 15:12 "This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you."

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/12/29 23:19

Back to the issue:

Statement: "The KJV does nothing for the majority of people living in the world today."

Reply: I disagree. English is the world trade language of today just as Greek was the trade language of the New Testament.

Statement: "I have no problem with the King James Version. There are only a few passages that are obviously poorly translated (such as the infamous "Easter" reference in Acts 12)."

Reply: Check out these comments on Acts 12 concerning "Easter." All comments below are from Kent Hovind available at:

<http://www.drdino.com/articles.php?spec=88>

The word 'Easter' is the correct word and the KJV is the only version I have seen that gets it right. Read Ex. 12 and Num. 28:16-17 and it will be clear that the Passover came before the days of unleavened bread.

In fact, by translating "pascha" as "passover" in Acts 12:4 modern bibles have inserted an ERROR that displays not only their lack of knowledge of Greek in context, but even more their lack of knowledge of ENGLISH!

You see, the man who INVENTS a particular word is the world's foremost authority on that word. In this case, the word "passover" was INVENTED by William Tyndale. Thus, William Tyndale knew the CORRECT definition of "passover" since he INVENTED the word "passover" in the first place.

Singular to relate, William Tyndale did NOT use the word HE INVENTED - "passover" - in Acts 12:4. Why? Why did William Tyndale not use the word HE INVENTED in Acts 12:4? Because, as Dr. Thomas Holland demonstrated, the days of unleavened bread come AFTER Passover. That's ONE reason Tyndale did not employ the word HE INVENTED in Acts 12:4.

The second reason, of course, is because Herod was looking forward to the pagan feast of Ishtar, from which the word "Easter" is derived, and so Tyndale, who INVENTED the word "passover" did NOT use the word "passover" in Acts 12:4 in HIS OWN TRANSLATION.

In summary, had modern translators bothered to learn ENGLISH etymology, they would have discovered that the INVENTOR of the word "passover" declined to use the word HE INVENTED in this verse, because the INVENTOR of the word "passover" did not want to MISTRANSLATE the passage, as modern bibles have done.

Some points to ponder about Easter:

- 1-The Passover was at night on the 14th day of April.
- 2-The seven days of unleavened bread always followed the Passover.
- 3-The pagan festival of Astart or Ishtar (Easter) was always held late in April to celebrate the earth regenerating itself after winter. That is why rabbits (Playboy) and eggs, symbols of fertility are used.
- 4-The feast days are never called the Passover anywhere in scripture.
- 5-Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread after Passover.
- 6-Herod wanted to kill him during his own pagan festival of Easter coming up in a few days.

KJV is the only version to get it right.

Re: Version not a translation, on: 2005/12/29 23:33

Grafted Branc wrote:

Quote:

-----The KJV is an excellent translation. But it is only a translation

The KJV is not a translation, it's a Version.

The KJV was compiled together using the various translaton of the day. William Tyndale's work was used greatly in putting the New Testament together.

The King James Version was not the only bible floating around at that time, there were several in their respective languages.

The original King James Version had alot more books in it than what we have today, but in the revision they were removed.

Another revision came which is called the Revised Standard Version which mutilated the King James Version it took many verses out sometimes whole paragraphs.

But many clung to the King James and rightly so.

Karl

Re:, on: 2005/12/30 0:44

Stever posted to ccchhhrrriiisss:

If you read them, and I think you have, then perhaps a new television show should be in the works. You will be the host, and the title of the show is "THE SPIN STARTS HERE".

Why not be honest and level with us. That no matter what information is posted here, your mind has already been made up.

Instead of trying to come across as a seeker of truth and reason, come across as who you are- the marketing manager for the NIV and all of the newer versions.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Chris, I made this post to you in tongue and cheek.

I really believe that if each of us would identify his position, and then defend his/her position with Scripture and other sources of documentation on this issue of Bible Translations, then we could really make some headway.

We have discussed this subject before on Sermonindex, and it always seems to go in circles. We have the conservatives, and then we have the liberals. Neither one of us should be ashamed of our position. Each of us should lay that position out with Scripture and history, and other documentation available. Instead of a he said- she said approach, just let it stand on the merits.

As I look at all of the posts on this subject I can find two specific sides-- One side that supports the King James because they feel it is more reliable than all of the other versions. Also, in this same group that support it, there are those that believe the KJV (Received Text) is "Spirit breathed" and the very word of God.

The second group also has two positions- one that believes the newer translations are just as good as the KJV or better than the KJV. There is also in this second group those that use the KJV, as well as other Bible Versions, and find really no substantial difference between them.

This is a detailed study. I believe when we discussed this subject before I sent you several books in zip files that address all of the issues that have been presented here from my side of the aisle.

So, we continue to disagree on an issue that to me as a mature Christian of 63 years old is very, very critical to a growing apostate Church.

You, on the other hand are a young Christian man, still in College, probably at least 40 years younger than me, with his future before him.

So, again, please realize I was NOT really serious in my post above. I was just jokingly making the point that we are on two opposite sides of an issue, and things of critical importance to one are not of equal or any importance to another. And so it continues, on the current subject.

I truly hope that if my words have offended you that you will forgive me. I know that we will someday be in heaven together, where all things will be known to us. All of us look through the glass darkly, and none of us have Christ's 20/20 vision.

In Christ Jesus,

Stever

Re: Appreciative - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/12/30 9:57

Thank you Stever for addressing this here.

My apologies here as well, upon some reflection felt I reacted a bit too hastily with the warning there, that was going a bit too far.

Having said that, the difficulty is and will always likely be in determining things from this standpoint;

Quote:

-----Chris, I made this post to you in tongue and cheek.

It can practically be almost impossible to tell sometimes and really if you were to re-read what was written I.E.;

Quote:

-----come across as who you are-

doesn't sound very tongue in cheek but more presumptuous, perhaps this and the other comments are what come across more as accusatory than in jest. Motivations aside, that can be how they sound. Basically, whatever the intent they seem rather unnecessary.

Indeed it is true there is a lot of history and discussion on all this here. It can be rather heated and I could only add the observation of how telling the whole issue can be in a paradoxical kind of way. It is really just this, that the core principles and sentiments expressed even in the worst of translations, the very penetrating questions of motive and manner of heart are often exposed from both 'sides' of the debate. We can miss the trees for the forest if we are not more careful.

Re:, on: 2005/12/31 11:54

Ccchhhrrriiss said:

"I have no problem with the King James Version. THERE ARE ONLY A FEW PASSAGES THAT ARE OBVIOUSLY POORLY TRANSLATED (SUCH AS THE INFAMOUS "EASTER" REFERENCE IN ACTS 12).

Letsgetbusy responded as follows:"

Reply: Check out these comments on Acts 12 concerning "Easter." All comments below are from Kent Hovind available at:

<http://www.drdino.com/articles.php?spec=88>

The word 'Easter' is the correct word and the KJV is the only version I have seen that gets it right. Read Ex. 12 and Num . 28:16-17 and it will be clear that the Passover came before the days of unleavened bread.

In fact, by translating "pascha" as "passover" in Acts 12:4 modern bibles have inserted an ERROR that displays not only their lack of knowledge of Greek in context, but even more their lack of knowledge of ENGLISH!

You see, the man who INVENTS a particular word is the world's foremost authority on that word. In this case, the word "passover" was INVENTED by William Tyndale. Thus, William Tyndale knew the CORRECT definition of "passover" since he INVENTED the word "passover" in the first place.

Singular to relate, William Tyndale did NOT use the word HE INVENTED - "passover" - in Acts 12:4. Why? Why did William Tyndale not use the word HE INVENTED in Acts 12:4? Because, as Dr. Thomas Holland demonstrated, the days of unleavened bread come AFTER Passover. That's ONE reason Tyndale did not employ the word HE INVENTED in Acts 12:4.

The second reason, of course, is because Herod was looking forward to the pagan feast of Ishtar, from which the word "Easter" is derived, and so Tyndale, who INVENTED the word "passover" did NOT use the word "passover" in Acts 12:4 in HIS OWN TRANSLATION.

In summary, had modern translators bothered to learn ENGLISH etymology, they would have discovered that the INVENTOR of the word "passover" declined to use the word HE INVENTED in this verse, because the INVENTOR of the word "passover" did not want to MISTRANSLATE the passage, as modern bibles have done.

Some points to ponder about Easter:

- 1-The Passover was at night on the 14th day of April.
- 2-The seven days of unleavened bread always followed the Passover.
- 3-The pagan festival of Astarte or Ishtar (Easter) was always held late in April to celebrate the earth regenerating itself after winter. That is why rabbits (Playboy) and eggs, symbols of fertility are used.
- 4-The feast days are never called the Passover anywhere in scripture.
- 5-Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread after Passover.
- 6-Herod wanted to kill him during his own pagan festival of Easter coming up in a few days.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

My question to you , ccchhrrriiss, is

---what is your response to the above? It would be nice to have a dialogue here.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/12/31 12:05

Stever writes

Quote:
-----You see, the man who INVENTS a particular word is the world's foremost authority on that word. In this case, the word "passover" was INVENTED by William Tyndale. Thus, William Tyndale knew the CORRECT definition of "passover" since he INVENTED the word "passover" in the first place.

Singular to relate, William Tyndale did NOT use the word HE INVENTED - "passover" - in Acts 12:4. Why? Why did William Tyndale not use the word HE INVENTED in Acts 12:4? Because, as Dr. Thomas Holland demonstrated, the days of unleavened bread come AFTER Passover. That's ONE reason Tyndale did not employ the word HE INVENTED in Acts 12:4.

This is very peculiar reasoning.

First, no man can control a word he invents. Words have lives of their own and ultimately meaning is determined by usage.

Secondly, although your comments regarding Tyndale sound very authoritative they are sheer speculation.

I love the KJV and use it constantly but this kind of reasoning is liable to make it another Nehushtan.

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/12/31 12:56

Phil,

I would assume that you would say that God did not assure His Words were preserved from the originals to anything we have access to today. I am assuming that your stance is that the Bible we have today 'contains' the Word of God, rather than 'being' the Word of God. Would this be correct? I am just trying to figure out where you are coming from.

Your statement: "Words have lives of their own and ultimately meaning is determined by usage."

I would reply that I agree with the first half of your statement that words change meaning over time, yet disagree with your latter statement. Because I can open up a Bible and read the account of Acts 12 and understand what it is saying. In other words, the fact that a word changes meaning does not discount the usage of the word in history. For example, because we say 'cool' as meaning hip, etc, this does not mean that the word no longer means 'not hot.' It has multiple meanings, both of which are easily understood.

So that fact that English has corrupted does not dissolve the definition of the word 'Passover' and 'Easter,' as used in the book of Acts.

I am still with Stever on this, in that I would like to hear a disputing response to the accuracy of the AV using 'Easter' instead of 'Passover,' in light of the fact that Passover never occurred after the 'days of unleavened bread.'

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/12/31 13:01

Here is an outstanding site to help with this study, regardless of your stand, Online Parallel Bible:

<http://bible.cc/>

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/12/31 13:34

Phil: Secondly, although your comments regarding Tyndale sound very authoritative they are sheer speculation.

Me: If this is just speculation, it is not speculation on my part.

From: <http://www.drdino.com/articles.php?spec=88>

An article which appeared in The Trinitarian Bible Society Quarterly Record states:

"When Tyndale applied his talents to the translation of the New Testament from Greek into English, he was not satisfied with the use of a completely foreign word, and decided to take into account the fact that the season of the passover was known generally to English people as 'easter' ... Tyndale has ester or easter fourteen times, ester-lambe eleven times, esterfest once, and paschall lambe three times. When he began his translation of the Pentateuch, he was again faced with

h the problem in Exodus 12:11 and twenty-one other places, and no doubt recognizing the easter in this context would be an anachronism he coined a new word, passover and used it consistently in all twenty-two places. It is, therefore, to Tyndale that our language is indebted for this meaningful and appropriate word."

anachronism

- 1 : an error in chronology; especially : a chronological misplacing of persons, events, objects, or customs in regard to each other
- 2 : a person or a thing that is chronologically out of place; especially : one from a former age that is incongruous in the present

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/12/31 17:42

Quote:
-----I would assume that you would say that God did not assure His Words were preserved from the originals to anything we have access to today. I am assuming that your stance is that the Bible we have today 'contains' the Word of God, rather than 'being' the Word of God. Would this be correct? I am just trying figure out where you are coming from.

You could not be more wrong. But the 'Word of God' was 'as originally given' and that perfect text does not exist at the present time.

It might surprise you to know that Tyndale was not in favour of literal equivalence and this a recorded fact. His translation was attacked for being too 'dynamic equivalence'.

Re: the Bible we have today, on: 2005/12/31 18:27

Philologos wrote:

Quote:
-----But the 'Word of God' was 'as originally given' and that *perfect text does not exist at the present time*.

(emphasis mine)

Phil, may I ask: Does it matter that God gave us the perfect text, when it, as you claim, does not exist any more?

I agree that when the Bible was written it was the inerrant Word of God. If we do not assume the latter, we make God imperfect. Have in mind, however, that God Himself said that He would preserve His Word from generation to generation (Psalm 12:6-8). Today we say He has NOT preserved it, as He CLAIMED He would do. Because of scribal errors, omissions, additions, and what not, the Biblical text that we have today is impure and suspicious to say the least, and we are not absolutely sure whether we have it as originally given/inspired.

Let me ask: Is "not having the original manuscripts" equivalent to "not having the perfect text"? And does having contradictory manuscripts mean we do not have the perfect text and/or that *we do not know the text as it was originally given*?

Here I'm not talking about simple misspellings and word transpositions, which we can eliminate by looking at the majority of the extant manuscripts. A problem arises whenever we admit we do not know whether a passage or verse, for example, such as Mark 16:9-20, is indeed the Word of God or not. Even if all the manuscripts until a certain time are identical, we need to believe that *prior to* this known time of consistency the Word of God was indeed preserved untainted. That is, we need to believe God that He has preserved and will preserve His Word from generation to generation (as He said He would). If the Almighty God of Israel cannot keep His Word, and if He is incapable of saving the Scriptures for all generations, is He Almighty indeed? And, more importantly, does this make God a liar?

Phil, I am afraid that if we assume we cannot fully trust the Scriptures because we do not know if they are really "the Scriptures," we may be conceding defeat - replying "I don't know" to the enemy's question, "Did God really say that?" It is a question of authority of the Biblical text. If we forfeit the Scriptures' authority by eliminating the possibility of their inerrancy (even if we do it unwillingly, against all the evidence we have gathered), are we not elevating the judgment of sinful men, however honest, above the Word of God?

You are going to say that the King James Version Committee collated many manuscripts and faced the same choices of

the Revision Committee of 1881; yet, does choosing one group of manuscripts over another presuppose both are NOT to be WHOLLY trusted?

Happy New Year and let God's grace abound in you.

In Christ,
Slav

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2005/12/31 19:30

Job 32:8 But a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.

2Ti 3:16 All scripture given by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

It is not which translation of the Word we use unless we are depending on man to give the written word as our only truth. The Living Word is Born Again in us and if we are walking in the Spirit of Christ and depending on the Holy Spirit to give us truth, it won't make any difference what translation we use, the Living Word Himself will by the Holy Spirit reveal what is of God and what is of man. 2Ti 3:16 All scripture given by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

John 14:26-29 But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I. And now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe.

If we walk by the Spirit how can the Spirit not reveal what is of man and what is of the Spirit. I use the KJV, the NAS and the Amplified, But it is the Spirit that brings Truth and always brings all three into agreement by His Spirit that is in me. Then when we can become partakers of His Body the Church the Body of Christ we will be in agreement and we will be proving the Word, and perfection in Christ. Let us reason together in Christ and in all we do let us do to the "knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: " This is our Glory and this is our translation, Christ Himself and the Translator is the Holy Spirit of Truth. "that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:"

Col 1:28 Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

Here are the 4 remaining inexact matches:

2Cr 12:9 And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

Eph 4:13 Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

Col 4:12 Epaphras, who is of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.

Hbr 13:21 Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom glory for ever and ever. Amen.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2005/12/31 19:35

This document is a response to all the people who question the "integrity" of the King James Version of the Holy Bible. There has been a wholesale assault on the King James Bible by the producers of new translations citing many "concerns" with the KJV such as; Use of older questionable texts, additions not found in existing texts, the use of old archaic English, and even the accuracy, and relevance of some of the accounts recorded therein.

There has been an explosion of "new translations, and paraphrases" that have been dumped on "believers" in the last couple of decades, claiming to be "better" because they have "fixed" some perceived problem with the King James Version. Each new version produced has brought the claim that it is "easier to understand" and that it has been produced to help understand scripture better. Instead, due to the vast numbers of versions available, and the widespread acceptance of them, it has brought chaos into the church building, and bible studies worldwide. It is virtually impossible to read scripture in church today, due to the multiple changes from version to version, unless the leadership has designated a certain version to be used. In the bible studies I lead, and attend, far too much time is spent comparing the wording of the various versions, and not enough spent on actual bible study.

A word of warning to all those that declare themselves smarter, wiser, and better informed than God Himself, by finding fault with the King James Version of the Holy Bible.

Many early reformers such as John Wycliffe, Martin Luthor, John Colet, Erasmus, Myles Coverdale, William Tyndale, John Huss, who were involved with the early translation of scripture from Greek, into German, Swiss, and English, did so under threat of death by the Church of Rome.. William Tyndale, and John Huss are only two of the many men that willingly gave their lives to bring the people a version of scripture in their common language.

God Himself brought Godly men together in 1604 to produce an English version of scripture. God Himself brought them together with the early bible translations, and His choice of manuscripts to translate from. Large portions of the Tyndale version were adopted, after meticulous comparisons with the Greek (Received Text), and incorporated into the 1611 or King James Version. This version has remained intact, and aside from a few revisions to update archaic English language, is the same today as it was when it was first printed. God has preserved his Word through the King James Version of the bible.

Some proofs that the King James Version is the Word Of God..

1. The longevity of the version. Nearly 400 years.
2. The blood of the martyrs who died to translate scripture into common language.
3. The blood of the martyrs who died for owning a copy.
4. The witness of the MILLIONS of souls that were converted using this bible.
5. God Himself chose the Received Text. Do you really think that God did not know about the Alexandrian or Egyptian Text, that modern translations use?
6. If the issue truly is the "reliability" of the text, why then are there not only 2 versions of the bible? One being the KJV from the Received Text, and one version from the Alexandrian Text?
7. What we have instead is the KJV, and a plethora of versions based on the Alexandrian Text, each one a bigger abomination than the one that preceded it.

I believe that what is happening is that our enemy Satan continues to question the Word of God as in Genesis 3, and has found many souls who are willing to challenge God's word, and even produce abominations that they pass off as God's Word.

Greg Dec. 30/05

Re: King James - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/12/31 21:32

Interesting, but I don't know who it is you are referring to when you say those

Quote:

-----who question the "integrity" of the King James Version of the Holy Bible

That doesn't seem to be at issue here.

Quote:

-----God Himself brought Godly men together in 1604 to produce an English version of scripture. God Himself brought them together with the early bible translations, and His choice of manuscripts to translate from.

That's speculative, but how do you prove it? From scripture? Brother, this is really unnecessary and if anything where so

me may have a bigger problem with this whole issue is in the ways that the King James Bible is defended. It's the arguments that go off to extremes. What you have presented are not 'proofs'.

Quote:
-----I believe that what is happening is that our enemy Satan continues to question the Word of God as in Genesis 3, and has found many souls who are willing to challenge God's word, and even produce abominations that they pass off as God's Word.

I believe what is happening is the simplest of principles and basic understandings of scripture are being sidelined and not accepted anymore, nor taught, even from the worst of versions. Wasn't it Mark Twain who said "It's not the things I don't understand in scripture that bother me, it's the ones that I do."

Yes, I am more fond of the KJV, but not for these reasons.

Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2005/12/31 22:19

Mike

The "who" as stated in my post is anyone who declares themselves to be smarter than God, and claims error in the King James Version.
As for the reputation of the men responsible for the translation, a simple Google search will clear that up for you. It is not speculative, it is a fact that every man involved lived a life of service that we can only dream about.
And only our enemy Satan has anything to gain in continuing to cast doubt on God's Word.

Re: Erasmus- Who was he and what was his intent?, on: 2006/1/1 0:52

ERASMUS RESTORES THE RECEIVED TEXT (GREEK)

The Greek upon which the King James translation was based was first printed in A.D. 1516 at Basle, Switzerland, under the editorship of the famous Dutchman, Desiderius Erasmus. As a Scholar, Erasmus was without peer – the intellectual giant of Europe in his day.

Erasmus was ever at work, visiting libraries, collecting, comparing, writing and publishing. Europe was rocked by his works which exposed the ignorance of the monks, the superstitions of the priesthood, and the general bigotry and wickedness within the Roman church.

He classified the Greek manuscripts and read the "Fathers" (letters etc. written by the early Church pastors which taken as a whole contain almost the entire New Testament). Today, many who deprecate the pure teachings of the Received Text sneer at Erasmus and pervert the facts in order to belittle his work. All this by men who could never have intellectually tied Erasmus' boot straps. While he lived, Europe was at his feet.

Several times the King of England offered him any position in the kingdom, at his own price! The Emperor of Germany likewise. Indeed, the Pope offered him the position of Cardinal. Erasmus resolutely declined not being willing to compromise his beliefs or conscience. France and Spain beckoned him to their realm while Holland proudly claimed him as her most distinguished son.

Book after book came from his labors. The demand for them was overwhelming. His crowning work was the New Testament in Greek. At last, after one thousand years, the New Testament was printed in its original tongue (A.D.1516). Astonished and confounded, Europe – the intellectual, civilized cradle of the world – deluged by superstitions, coarse traditions, and moneries, read the pure story of the Gospel.

In a letter dated 13 August, 1521 to Peter Barbirius, Erasmus wrote:

"I did my best with the New Testament, but it provoked endless quarrels. Edward Lee pretended to have discovered 300 errors. They appointed a commission, which professed to have found bushels of them. Every dinner-table rang with the blunders of Erasmus. I required particulars, and could not have them."
(Edward Lee afterwards became Archbishop of York)

Consider and reflect upon this – the foremost scholar in the entire civilized world said the work was his "best". Such men have both egos and detractors. Erasmus would never have put his name on an undertaking which would have left him

man exposed and defenseless before his enemies and critics.

When Erasmus came to Basle in A.D. 1515 for the purpose of assembling a complete Greek New Testament, he had only five Greek cursive minuscules of the New Testament at his disposal.

For the most part, he utilized a 15th century manuscript for the Gospels but used an 11th or 12th century manuscript on occasion. He used a 12th or 13th century manuscript for the Acts and the Epistles. Erasmus had a 15th century manuscript of the Acts and the Epistles which he also used occasionally, and he had a 12th century manuscript of Revelation. The last six verses of the Revelation manuscript were missing so he used the Latin Vulgate version to complete the chapter.

Erasmus' Greek New Testament has been often criticized on the grounds that he had so little data at his command from which to draw and that they were "late" copies. However, Erasmus did not go to the task unprepared. Although he had only five late minuscules, he had already translated a Latin New Testament and in preparation for this labor had collected and gathered variant readings from many Greek manuscripts. He journeyed all over Europe to libraries and to anyone from whom he could gather readings from manuscripts. Erasmus organized his findings and made notes for himself concerning the different readings. These travels brought him into contact with several hundred manuscripts and Erasmus divided them into two camps, i.e., those he considered spurious and those he deemed genuine and trustworthy. The spurious group was a small percentage of the whole and mainly agreed with the Latin Vulgate readings. Of the several hundred, between 90 to 95% had the same text. This group Erasmus judged to contain the true God given text.

Naturalistic critics think that the presence and availability for Erasmus' use of these five Basle minuscules was merely an unhappy accident. But these men do not reckon sufficiently with the providence of God— that God has promised to overlook His Word. The text which Erasmus published was really not his own. It was taken virtually without change from these few manuscripts which God providentially placed at his disposal. The text contained in these manuscripts eventually came to be known as the "Textus Receptus" (the Received Text).

To emphasize and demonstrate the above, we quote the late Herman C. Hoskier. Hoskier gave thirty years to the task of collating a majority of the available manuscripts containing the text of Revelation. His conclusion, based upon the 200 plus extant manuscripts he examined, was:

"I may state that if Erasmus had striven to found a text on the largest number of existing MSS in the world of one type, he could not have succeeded better ... "

As Moorman relates, this is truly a powerful example of God's guiding providence in preserving the true text though but one late mss containing the Revelation was available to Erasmus at Basle.

ERASMUS AND THE WORK HE PRODUCED

Erasmus knew almost all of the important variant readings known to scholars today— more than 470 years ago. This may be proven from a perusal of his notes. Dr. Frederick Nolan (1784-1864 A.D.) was a Greek and Latin scholar who, as an eminent historian, researched Egyptian chronology and spent twenty eight years tracing the Received Text to its apostolic origin. After surveying Erasmus' notes, Nolan recorded:

"With respect to manuscripts, it is indisputable that he was acquainted with every variety which is known to us; having distributed them into two principle classes, one of which corresponds with ... the Vatican manuscript ... the church, he was aware, was infested with Origenists and Arians; and affinity between any manuscript and that version, consequently conveyed some suspicion that its text was corrupted."

In producing his first edition, Erasmus was under an incredible work load. Due to publication problems and deadline pressure, his first edition had many typographical errors, misprints, and misspellings. This led to much undue criticism. His work was greatly disfigured only in the sense mentioned, but the Text was providentially protected. God has not preserved the Text miraculously for then there would have been no such glosses, and all the various uncials and cursives would read the same, word for word. In the case of providential guidance, we can see that there is a human as well as a divine side to the preservation of the Text. For the most part, these errors were eliminated by Erasmus in his later editions. Such things as these are, however, not factors which need to be taken into account insofar as evaluating the "Textus Receptus"— a designation by which his work later came to be known.

The year after Erasmus published, Luther used the Textus Receptus (TR) for the basis of a German translation of the New Testament. Shortly thereafter, God— using Luther and his translation, brought about the Reformation.

Luther and Erasmus knew each other. They did not always agree. One of the chief areas of disagreement between them was Luther's conviction that the Roman church was incapable of being reformed and he thought that Erasmus should join him in leaving. However Erasmus believed that he could better bring about reform by working from within the system.

m. He was quite wrong.

All of the above is from the Book by Floyd Nolen Jones- Which Version is the Bible.

I have that book in zip format if anyone wants it. Just send a request to my personal email address at sgoltra@socal.rr.com

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/1 6:49

Quote:

-----Phil, may I ask: Does it matter that God gave us the perfect text, when it, as you claim, does not exist any more?

Are you claiming it DOES exist? Where is it?

Quote:

-----I agree that when the Bible was written it was the inerrant Word of God. If we do not assume the latter, we make God imperfect. Have in mind, however, that God Himself said that He would preserve His Word from generation to generation (Psalm 12:6-8). Today we say He has NOT preserved it, as He CLAIMED He would do.

As so many of your persuasion quote this verse perhaps it is time to look at it. First of all you will note that it makes no mention of 'the Word of God' which you equate with the King James Version but of 'God's words' "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted." (Psa. 12:6-8, KJVS) and secondly what is being promised here is preservation of God's people as distinct from the wicked. This Psalm, if read in its entirety, will be found to be a psalm which contrasts the 'godly' with the 'wicked'. God's promises to the godly are sure and have 'been through the fire' of testing. The 'godly' will be preserved from 'this generation' and its wicked men. This is not a promise that God will keep the 'Word of God'

Spurgeon's commentary on the Psalms makes this point very clearly: Verse 7. To fall into the hands of an evil generation, so as to be baited by their cruelty, or polluted by their influence, is an evil to be dreaded beyond measure; but it is an evil foreseen and provided for in the text. In life many a saint has lived a hundred years before his age, as though he had darted his soul into the brighter future, and escaped the mists of the beclouded present: he has gone to his grave unrevenged and misunderstood, and lo! as generations come and go, upon a sudden the hero is unearthed, and lives in the admiration and love of the excellent of the earth; preserved for ever from the generation which stigmatised him as a sower of sedition, or burned him as a heretic. It should be our daily prayer that we may rise above our age as the mountain tops above the clouds, and may stand out as heaven pointing pinnacle high above the mists of ignorance and sin which roll around us. O Eternal Spirit, fulfil in us the faithful saying of this verse! Our faith believes those two assuring words, and cries, Thou shalt, thou shalt. It is the tested and tried 'words of God' which will sustain the godly throughout this generation and forever.

Quote:

-----A problem arises whenever we admit we do not know whether a passage or verse, for example, such as Mark 16:9-20, is indeed the Word of God or not. Even if all the manuscripts until a certain time are identical, we need to believe that prior to this known time of consistency the Word of God was indeed preserved untainted.

Problems don't go away just because you choose to ignore them.

Quote:

-----If the Almighty God of Israel cannot keep His Word, and if He is incapable of saving the Scriptures for all generations, is He Almighty indeed? And, more importantly, does this make God a liar?

The same might be asked of his 'keeping of Israel in the flesh' or of the 'church'. Does the fact that the church has so often failed indicate that God is not almighty? Of course not.

Quote:
-----You are going to say that the King James Version Committee collated many manuscripts and faced the same choices of the Revision Committee of 1881; yet, does choosing one group of manuscripts over another presuppose both are NOT to be WHOLLY trusted?

So are you suggesting that the KJV committee was 'wholly trustworthy'? Don't you know that it was the persecution by some of these men which sent the Pilgrim Fathers on their way to the Americas. Don't you know that James gave them specifications as to how they were to translate certain key words?

I love the KJV, it is my bible of choice and has been for many years but I am not blind to its errors or to its weaknesses. To ignore its errors and weaknesses is folly.

Re: The Characters of Westcott & Hort, on: 2006/1/1 12:26

Stever posts:

Westcott & Hort and other textual "critics" after them have found fault with the preserved text, the Textus Receptus (the Authorized Version). The character of these two men (Westcott & Hort) is never brought up- BOTH MEN DID NOT BELIEVE IN:

1. THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST
2. THE VIRGIN BIRTH
3. THE MIRACLES PERFORMED BY JESUS CHRIST
4. THE MIRACLES PERFORMED BY THE APOSTLES
5. THE GENESIS STORY OF CREATION- THE FIRST THREE CHAPTERS OF GENESIS
6. THE MIRACLES OF GOD, AS REPORTED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.
7. BOTH MEN ACCEPTED DARWINS THEORY OF EVOLUTION.
8. BOTH MEN DENIED THAT THE DEATH OF JESUS CHRIST MADE THE ONCE FOR ALL VICARIOUS ATONEMENT FOR THE SINNER AND CHOOSE INSTEAD TO TO EMPHASIZE ATONEMENT THROUGH THE INCARNATION, RATHER THAN THE CRUCIFIXION.THIS VIEW WAS AN ATTEMPT TO EXALT MARY'S POSITION AS, OF COURSE, SHE WAS PROMINENT AT THE CONCEPTION AND BIRTH OF JESUS. SUCH POSTURE UPHOLDS THE ROMAN CATHOLIC MASS. SO THEIR VIEW WAS THAT OF ATONEMENT THROUGH JESUS' CONCEPTION AND BIRTH, RATHER THAN HIS SHED BLOOD!
- 9, HORT BELIEVED MARY-WORSHIP AND JESUS-WORSHIP HAD VERY MUCH IN COMMON IN THEIR CAUSES AND THEIR RESULTS".
10. WESTCOTT AND HORT DID NOT EVEN BELIEVE THE ORIGINAL AUTOGRAPHS OF THE SCRIPTURES WERE GOD INSPIRED!

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

What could be expected but for these two men to try and find a text that agreed with their pre-conceived beliefs? Neither one of these men believed what Christ actually said: 35. "HEAVEN AND EARTH SHALL PASS AWAY, BUT MY WORDS SHALL NOT PASS AWAY. (Matthew 24:35)"

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

AN ASSESSMENT OF WESTCOTT AND HORT - THEIR CHARACTERS

The naturalistic critics say that Erasmus could not have been providentially guided in the editing of the Textus Receptus because he was a humanist and a Roman Catholic. They purport that Westcott and Hort were epoch making scholars directly guided by God's providence to restore the New Testament, having completed their assignment in 1881. However, if we compare the character of Erasmus to those of Westcott and Hort, we shall see that such a declaration is vacuous and specious. It thus becomes necessary to draw a contrast between the lives of Messers B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort with Erasmus in order to evaluate these charges and claims of the critics as well as to grasp the full impact of

this exposé.

Westcott, an Anglican Bishop and professor at Cambridge University, and Hort – also an ordained Anglican priest and professor at Cambridge – came to participate on the 1881 Revision Committee of the King James Bible under the guise of being Protestant scholars. Actually, they were very Roman Catholic in doctrine, belief, and practice.

Both conservative and liberal branches of Christendom hold Westcott and Hort in high esteem as if God had greatly used these men to reestablish and restore the text of the Bible. However, it is most difficult to believe that God would use two men to perform such a task who did not believe that the Bible was the verbal Word of God.

Westcott and Hort maintained that they had raised New Testament textual criticism to the level of an exact science. Thus when they concluded that the Traditional Text was late and a composite reading resulting from combining older text-types, they affirmed that this should be regarded as the true explanation with the same degree of reliance as one would esteem a Newtonian theorem.

Indeed, they asserted that their work had been so scientifically and carefully executed that there could never be more than one change per thousand words. Nevertheless, today most liberal (or lost) modern scholars say that they no longer agree completely with the Westcott-Hort theory. Kurt Aland, a foremost leader of the modern school, is representative when he admits to this in saying:

"We still live in the world of Westcott and Hort with our conception of different recensions and text-types although this conception has lost its *raison d'être*, or, it needs at least to be newly and convincingly demonstrated. For the increase of the documentary evidence and the entirely new areas of research which were opened to us on the discovery of the papyri, mean the end of Westcott and Hort's conception."

Still, these same liberals always begin their own investigations with the acceptance of most of the basic W-H tenants. Sadly, most conservative scholars have accepted the W-H theory of textual history – largely because most Christian scholars fear scholastic and intellectual ridicule. To stand against the tide carries with it the stigma of appearing uninformed and non-progressive, resulting in the loss of credibility and status among one's peers. The man of God should never allow his faith to be intimidated by so called "scholarship" – for God promised to preserve His Word.

From published letters written by Westcott and Hort, either to each other or to family members, the following has been gleaned. On one occasion, Mr. Westcott was near a monastery and, upon going into the chapel, found a pieta. In writing from France to his fiancée in 1847 concerning the event he wrote: "Had I been alone, I could have knelt there for hours." As he was not alone, he had to refrain for to have so done would have revealed just how Roman his beliefs actually were. On November 17, 1865 he wrote to Archbishop Benson remarking, "I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry bears witness."

He stated that the fall of man was an ALLEGORY covering a long succession of EVOLUTIONS. He REJECTED GENESIS 1-3 as a literal history and also DENIED THE FALL OF MAN. WESTCOTT FELT THAT ALL WOMEN SHOULD BE CALLED "MARY" SO THAT HIS WIFE SARA, AT HIS REQUEST, ADDED "MARY TO HER NAME AND HE SO ADDRESSE HER. DOES THAT SOUND LIKE A PROTESTANT?

With regard to spiritual authority in general and especially the Bible's being the final authority, Mr. Hort said: "EVANGELICALS SEEM TO ME PERVERTED RATHER THAN UNTRUE."

On October 17, 1865 Hort wrote "I HAVE BEEN PERSUADED FOR MANY YEARS THAT MARY-WORSHIP AND JESUS-WORSHIP HAVE VERY MUCH IN COMMON IN THEIR CAUSES AND THEIR RESULTS".

Hort praised his "PRAYER BOXES" which he carried about with him. These contained statues (IDOLS) to which he prayed. Confessing in a 26 October, 1867 letter to Dr. Lightfoot that he was a staunch SACERDOTALIST, Hort wrote to Westcott regarding the Protestant's teaching of the "PRIESTHOOD OF THE BELIEVER" AS BEING A CRAZY HORROR"! He believed neither in a literal Garden of Eden nor that Adam's fall differed in any degree from that of any of his descendants.

In a March 4, 1890 letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Old Testament Criticism, Westcott gave his "amen" to Hort's last sentiment by penning: "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history – I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did."

Although not wishing to be under the dominion of the Pope, in writing to Rev. John Ellerton on July 6, 1848, Hort said: "the pure Romanish view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the evangelical view. ... We dare not forsake the sacraments or God will forsake us."

In a December 14, 1846 letter to his father, Hort wrote " ... METHODISM ... IS WORSE THAN POPERY ... BEING MORE INSIDIOUS", and in an 1864 correspondence to Bishop Westcott he stated his conviction that "PROTESTANTISM IS ONLY PARENTHETICAL AND TEMPORARY".

Indeed, Hort wrote Westcott (December 4, 1861) of PREFERRING GREEK PHILOSOPHY AND IT'S "PRECIOUS TRUTH" TO THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION IN WHICH HE SAID HE "... NOTHING, AND SHOULD BE VERY MUCH ASTONISHED AND PERPLEXED TO FIND ANYTHING".

Both Westcott & Hort (W&H) came under the influence of J.H. Newman, an Anglican Bishop who returned to the Roman church and was made Cardinal. Newman held a doctrine of angelology in which he taught the Gnostic view that there WERE MANY INTERMEDIATES BETWEEN GOD AND HIS CREATION.

Westcott and Hort also fell under the spell of COLERIDGE AND MAURICE, TWO UNITARIANS who were PANTHEISTIC AND METAPHYSICAL, HOLDING LOW ESTIMATES OF "INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE". COLERIDGE said "REASON WAS THE DIVINE LOGOS."

Frederick Maurice was the son of a Unitarian minister and a brilliant student of Oxford and Cambridge. Having become a clergyman in the Church of England, he was dismissed as principal of King's College, London, on charges of heresy. Maurice had a commanding influence on many of the leaders of his day, especially Dr. Hort who wrote of him November 8, 1871: "... Mr. Maurice has been a dear friend of mine for twenty-three years, and I have been deeply influenced by his books". Westcott also admitted he owed much to the writings of Maurice, and Hort's son wrote of his father: "In undergraduate days, if not before, he came under the spell of Coleridge".

Thus we have two Anglican priests whose stated beliefs were strongly Roman. Both accepted DARWIN'S THEORY OF EVOLUTION. Writing to Rev. John Ellerton, April 3, 1860, Hort declared: "But the book that has engaged me most is Darwin. ... it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. ... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable."

Denying that the death of Christ Jesus made the once for all vicarious atonement for the sinner, W&H choose instead to emphasize atonement through the incarnation rather than through the crucifixion. This view was an attempt to exalt Mary's position as, of course, she was prominent at the conception and birth of Jesus. Such posture upholds the Roman Catholic Mass. So their view was that of atonement through Jesus' conception and birth rather than his shed blood!

Further, Westcott doubted the Biblical account of miracles. Writing in his diary, August 11, 1847, Bishop Westcott penned:

"I never read an account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it."

Indeed, Westcott and Hort DID NOT EVEN BELIEVE THE ORIGINAL AUTOGRAPHS OF THE SCRIPTURES WERE GOD INSPIRED! Writing in their "Introduction", they impiously stated:

"Little is gained by speculating as to the precise point at which such corruptions came in. They may be due to the original writer, or to his amanuensis if he wrote from dictation, or they may be due to one of the earliest transcribers."

WESTCOTT AND HORT'S INVOLVEMENT IN SPIRITISM

Westcott and Hort belonged to what Westcott's son referred to as "The Ghostly Guild." Westcott took a leading role in this society and its proceedings, the purpose of which was the investigation of ghosts and other supernatural appearances. They believed that such things existed. Concerning this society, Hort wrote to Rev. John Ellerton on December 29, 1851:

"Westcott, Gorham, C.B. Scott, Benson, Bradshaw, Lauard, etc., and I have started a society for the investigation of ghosts and all supernatural appearances and effects, being all disposed to believe that such things really exist, and ought to be discriminated from hoaxes and mere subjective disillusions."

Such is spiritism and is absolutely forbidden by Scripture.

Westcott's son wrote of his father's communing with "saints" especially at a great cathedral at Petersburg where "there was much company." On that same page he wrote that his father said, in speaking of the chapel at Auckland Castle, it was "full" and that he was "not alone" in the darkness. He was, of course, communing with demonic spirits supposing that they were ghosts (the souls of men who had lived formerly). However, the Word of God clearly teaches that "familiar spirits" are demons impersonating people. They are not the spirits and/or souls of people who have lived previously.

Both of these men denied the deity of Christ Jesus and they denied the verbal plenary inspiration of Scripture. Moreover, Hort spent the last eight years of his life working with Westcott in translating the Books of Wisdom and Maccabees, two uninspired writings.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

I truly hope that this opens the eyes of everyone that has come this far.

God bless,

Stever

"HEAVEN AND EARTH SHALL PASS AWAY, BUT MY WORDS SHALL NOT PASS AWAY. (Matthew 24:35)"

Re:, on: 2006/1/1 14:26

Philologos said about Psalms 12:6-8

As so many of your persuasion quote this verse perhaps it is time to look at it. First of all you will note that it makes no mention of 'the Word of God' which you equate with the King James Version but of 'God's words'

and secondly what is being promised here is preservation of God's people as distinct from the wicked. This Psalm, if read in its entirety, will be found to be a psalm which contrasts the 'godly' with the 'wicked'. God's promises to the godly are sure and have 'been through the fire' of testing. The 'godly' will be preserved from 'this generation' and its wicked men. This is not a promise that God will keep the 'Word of God'

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever's response:

Try this verse, that specifically refers to Christ's Word:

"HEAVEN AND EARTH SHALL PASS AWAY, BUT MY WORDS SHALL NOT PASS AWAY. (Matthew 24:35)"

God Bless,

Stever

P.S.--- Happy New Year to All!!!!!!

"HEAVEN AND EARTH SHALL PASS AWAY, BUT MY WORDS SHALL NOT PASS AWAY. (Matthew 24:35)"

Re: KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/1 15:02

Stever and others,

Trying to get at some kind of substance from all this went back through most of this post and by the way this most recent posting here is the same as you already posted on page 6 and it begs the question, what is the point of this? This is not the first thread of it's kind here and think the sentiments expressed by others are warranted, it is a complicated issue trying to piece together history and motives and so forth. What was brought up again is interesting, in fact found much of this quite interesting but am still at a loss as what this is saying to the members of this site at large.

I don't think I have as yet come across anyone disputing or having a dislike for the KJV that would warrant all the extra verbiage even if it is telling and interesting. That the issue is one of extracting out the "only" from the KJV may be the one item that is of concern and that if this is challenged a whole barrage is often unleashed.

Maybe I am only attempting to look at this from the rather unlearned angle in these matters. Everything should be examined, the errors ought to be pointed out and spiritual honesty ought to rule the day no matter what it is. Along with that is the very Spirit of that requirement, *what manner of Spirit ye are*. When things begin to go towards the *persons* who are discussing these things (amongst ourselves), assumptions and accusations of motivations and so forth it seems we need to readdress our thinking.

Collectively it seems the majority would suggest the KJV as a preferable bible to read, study and learn from, that from a variety of reasons, one that hasn't really been touched on much but strangely elsewhere is just in the "nobility" of the language that has fallen out of favor in our day.. See this simplistic approach;
(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id8905&forum35&post_id&refreshGo) Something different

What I guess I am attempting here is to question whether it is noticed that the *reasonings* can backfire in it's attempts to win more converts to it's claim.

Quote:
-----Verse 7. To fall into the hands of an evil generation, so as to be baited by their cruelty, or polluted by their influence, is an evil to be dreaded beyond measure; but it is an evil foreseen and provided for in the text. In life many a saint has lived a hundred years before his age, as though he had darted his soul into the brighter future, and escaped the mists of the beclouded present: he has gone to his grave unreverenced and misunderstood, and lo! as generations come and go, upon a sudden the hero is unearthed, and lives in the admiration and love of the excellent of the earth; preserved for ever from the generation which stigmatised him as a sower of sedition, or burned him as a heretic. It should be our daily prayer that we may rise above our age as the mountain tops above the clouds, and may stand out as heaven pointing pinnacle high above the mists of ignorance and sin which roll around us. O Eternal Spirit, fulfil in us the faithful saying of this verse! Our faith believes those two assuring words, and cries, Thou shalt, thou shalt.

What an outstanding quote Ron! Still have yet to understand what it is that draws such friendly fire towards you ...

Re: Preservation or Restoration of the Scriptures, on: 2006/1/1 15:43

crsschk said:

"Trying to get at some kind of substance from all this went back through most of this post and by the way this most recent posting here is the same as you already posted on page 6 and it begs the question, what is the point of this? "

Stever's response:

I think that the entire issue boils down to one issue, and one issue only----Preservation or Restoration, what is it?

We have the conservatives that have a well founded belief that the King James provides the very Words of God and that God has providently preserved the Scriptures.

On the other side we have the liberals who deny the power of God to do any such thing, and therefore they have sided with Westcott & Hort and all of the other liberals and textual critics that want to "Restore" the Scriptures.

That is the bottom line. When those of us on the conservative side post various points on this issue, it is never responded to in detail by the liberals. They pick and choose their responses, and many times do not respond at all.

If we were all in the same room, face to face, perhaps it would be different. Each point should be countered by the other side, and documented.

For some reason that does not happen here.

I will finish up with an explanation of why this issue is some important:

I. PRESERVATION OR RESTORATION?

THE KEY ISSUE - PRESERVATION

Gentle reader, may the LORD grant you patience and grace to perceive the issue which will be unfolded before you to the end that you may be grounded and established.

Even in fundamental circles the issue relating to the various modern translations of the Bible is controversial. It is not merely the question of "inspiration". The crux is that of preservation. Has God preserved His Word perfect for us today, or was it only perfect in the "original" autographs? If God has not preserved His Word perfectly, we must assume that we are preaching and teaching from a book that is not completely reliable as the "original" autographs are no longer accessible.

If we believe that the Bible is still the inerrant Word of God, we must then deal with the problem of determining which version is the true Word of the Living God. Logic dictates that two opposing statements cannot both be true (we reject the Hegelian Dialectic). Therefore, two contradicting "Bibles" cannot both be the inerrant Word of God. This author proclaims from the outset that the "King James" or "Authorized Version" is the Word of God translated into the English language to the extent that it is the final authority in all matters of conduct and faith. Furthermore, as the modern translations since 1881 often differ from the King James Bible in wording as well as doctrine, and since two conflicting texts cannot be infallible, perfect and inerrant, the reader must of necessity make a choice. That which follows is intended to assist the seeker to clearly discern the truth of the matter for himself.

Moreover, that which follows is not intended to be an intellectual treatise. The uncompromising stand is taken herein that God gave us His pure Word in the original autographs, and that He has preserved it in its pure form unto this day - and will continue so doing forever. Indeed, preservation is the only issue separating the Biblicist from other professing Christians; yet, the traditional viewpoint has always been that God not only gave mankind His pure Word but that He also assumed the oversight of its preservation as well. Over the years, this position has deteriorated and the contemporary view is that God has not protected the Scriptures, that they are not available in a pure form, and that this necessitates their recovery by reconstructing them from the manuscripts which have survived to this day.

Floyd Nolen Jones, A Chronology of the Old Testament: A Return to the Hebrew Text, (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press, #2427, 1993), p. 6.

The following definition is adapted from the preceding which is the author's Ph.D. dissertation. By "Biblicist", this author does not merely refer to a fundamentalist or a Biblical scholar as many dictionaries so define. By it, much more is intended. The word connotes one who, while taking both the immediate and the remote context into account, interprets and believes the Word of God literally. This necessitates that the person so designated has chosen to believe God's many promises that, despite all textual criticism objections to the contrary, he would forever preserve His infallible Word. Moreover, the meaning intended to be conveyed by this word carries with it the concept that such a person trusts that the Hebrew and Greek Textus Receptus (the Authorized Bible) which is today at his disposal is a fulfillment of those promises. Sadly, even among the pastors and seminary professors, most of today's conservative evangelical Christians do not qualify to bear this appellation which many in the not too distant past bore, counting the cost while enduring the shame.

Part 2

Continued:

But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.

Many Christians have been taken captive by the devil concerning the Bible manuscripts. As will be revealed, the questions regarding the reliability and authenticity of the Word of God are neither foolish nor unlearned. The ultimate purpose in all of this is to restore - to meekly instruct those who are either in error or simply do not understand the issue with regard to the various translations, in order to bring them to the truth:

That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: (Eph.4:14-15)

So that everybody may grow up - we are attempting to assist in that process but in so doing some things have to be said which may seem hurtful for the moment. It is not our intent to do so.

THE ISSUE - JUST WHAT IS AT STAKE?

God teaches us that the purpose of Scripture is to lead us to Christ and then to guide our lives (John 5:39-40). God did not give the Scriptures for the purpose of scholarly intellectual exercise. Yet that is what they are being used for by many. This is one of the major problems plaguing the Church today. As we enter this study, we need to consider carefully the following questions:

1. Would God inspire a text and then allow it to become lost?

Within our diverse denominational backgrounds are found various confessions of faith. These statements of faith concerning the Holy Scriptures, particularly within conservative evangelical backgrounds, always say

something to the effect that we believe that God gave the original Scriptures inerrant. We profess to believe in the originals, that they were divinely inspired by God - God breathed. Now we say that, intending it as a statement of faith, but we shall soon come to see that it is in reality a statement of unbelief! This study is designed to bring us to grips with this issue. But first, the second question:

2. If God did inspire a text, would He not preserve it?

The New Testament was written in Greek whereas the Old Testament was mostly authored in Hebrew. It may surprise many to learn that there are no original manuscripts of the Bible available today. The Old Testament scribes destroyed the scrolls upon which Scripture was written as they became worn, and "dog eared" from so much handling. When they copied out a new one, they destroyed the old so that the earliest Old Testament manuscript now in existence is dated about 900 A.D. This is called the Hebrew Masoretic Text. It was the earliest witness to the text of the O.T. that we possessed until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls which contain some parts of the Old Testament, especially Isaiah. Likewise, We possess no "original" New Testament manuscripts - none of the "autographs" which the apostles wrote have been preserved. This brings us to the third question.

3. Could we expect counterfeits of the originals to be in circulation?

Is there someone who has always hated God's Word, wanted to destroy it, and has attempted to cloud man's mind and heart about its validity? In other words, as we read the Bible, is there any evidence that somebody has founded a "Yea, has God said" society? According to Genesis 3:1, Bible corruption began with Satan. Satan is the original Bible revisor. When he confronted Eve in the garden, he added to God's Word, he subtracted, he diluted and finally substituted his own doctrine for that which God had said. We find this occurring today. People are trying to add books to the Old and subtract words from the New Testament. Nothing has changed. We need to understand that the devil is promoting this continuing attack on the Word of God.

Continued Part 3
Continued:

THE ORIGINAL "AUTOGRAPHS" AND "PRESERVATION"

We are expected to believe in the "INSPIRATION" without believing in the "PRESERVATION" of the Scriptures. We are being asked to believe in the inspiration of the "originals" without believing in the preservation of the text of the Scriptures. It is a statement of unbelief when we say that we only believe that the original autographs were inspired. What we really are saying is that we do not believe that we have the infallible Word of God on this planet, or at least in our hands, at this moment. Let us consider that statement scripturally:

14But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; 15And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 16All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works (II Tim.3:14-17).

Here God tells us His purposes in giving us the Scriptures: "... for

doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

Do we actually believe that God allowed them to become lost after giving them? If so, how could He use them to accomplish these purposes?

Now we know that we do not have an original. The question is has God preserved His Word - the original text - although not the original piece of paper or vellum on which it may have been written?

The observant reader will note that in the above cited verses given through Paul to Timothy no reference is being made with regard to the "ORIGINAL" Scriptures. Look at verse 15. Paul says to Timothy, "from a child you have known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make you wise unto salvation." Paul is obviously not speaking of the "ORIGINAL" New Testament Scripture. Second Timothy was penned about A.D. 65. Further, Timothy was old enough to join Paul and Silas c.53 A.D. (Acts 16:1-4). Thus, when Timothy was a child, there was no New Testament collection of Scripture anywhere. Nor was Paul speaking of the "ORIGINALS" of the Old Testament for there was not an original Old Testament piece of paper or vellum extant at that time. Wrestle with this! Come to grips with it! These are the verses upon which many of us base our faith and say we believe in the "ORIGINALS". Yet these very verses are not speaking of the original manuscripts!

But are the copies inspired? The Bible itself clearly teaches that faithful copies of the originals are also inspired. The word "Scripture" in II Timothy 3:16-17 is translated from the Greek word "graphÃ©" (graphV). GraphÃ© occurs 51 times in the Greek New Testament and at every occurrence it means "Scripture" - in fact, it usually refers to the Old Testament text.

A perusal of the N.T. reveals that the Lord Jesus read from the "graphÃ©" in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luk.4:21) as did Paul in the synagogue at Thessalonica (Acts 17:2). The Ethiopian eunuch, returning home from worshipping at Jerusalem, was riding in his chariot and reading a passage of graphÃ© (Acts 8:32-33). These were not the autographs that they were reading; they were copies - moreover, copies of copies! Yet the Word of God calls them graphÃ© - and every graphÃ© is "given by inspiration of God" (II Tim.3:16). Thus, the Holy Writ has testified and that testimony is that faithful copies of the originals are themselves inspired. Selah!

Therefore, it all comes down to a promise given by God - that He would preserve the text which He gave us. Timothy never saw an original when he was a child of either the Old or New Testament, yet in verse 16 God says that what Timothy learned as a child was given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Now if God were talking about something which had been lost and/or is no longer true and accurate, why did He give verse 17?

Peter S. Ruckman, The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence, (Pensacola, FL: Pensacola Bible Press, 1970), p. 29.

Edward W. Goodrick, Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God, (Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1988), pp. 61-62.

Continued Part 4

Continued:

WHAT DOES GOD HIMSELF PROMISE CONCERNING THE SCRIPTURES?:
Let us examine some verses where God has promised both to give and protect His Word.

"Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten my word to perform it." (Jeremiah 1:12)

Here God says He is watching over His Word to perform it - to make all that He has said come to pass.

Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." (Mark 13:31)

God did not promise to keep the original piece of material upon which His words were given. He says His Words **SHALL NOT PASS AWAY**. Therefore, this promise demands that we still have them on planet earth.

Jesus also says, "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mark 8:38)

Why this verse if God has not preserved His Word?

"But the word of the Lord endureth forever." (1 Pet.1:25)

This is a direct quote of Isaiah 40:8. God has said that His Word will endure forever! He did not promise that the original piece of paper, rock or vellum would exist forever but that He would preserve the Word - forever.

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever." (Isaiah 40:8)

".. for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." (Psalm 138:2)

Look at that! God says He has magnified His Word above His name! That is incredible for supposedly THE name was so sacred to the Jews that they did not even pronounce it.

Jesus said "... and the Scripture cannot be broken." (John 10:35)

Thus, on the basis of God's many promises we declare and proclaim to you that we have in our hands the absolutely infallible inerrant Living Word of Almighty God - that God has promised to keep His Word as revealed through these Scriptures. But there is more!

"The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shall keep them, O Lord, thou shall preserve them from this generation forever." (Psa.12:6, 7)

This is a promise from God! Christian, do you believe it? He says He will preserve it. He did not just promise to give the originals pure and free from error - He promised to preserve the text forever!

"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."

(John 12:48)

Since God's Word will judge us, are we to believe that God will judge us by something which He meticulously gave us and then lost along the way? Would it be just and fair of God to judge us with these words if they are no longer trustworthy - to hold us accountable when our guide is not 100 percent reliable?

In Matthew 5:18, Jesus said not "one jot or one tittle" shall change in the Word of God. Specifically, He was speaking of the Old Testament. We are being taught today that perhaps the Old Testament is not true, that it is full of contradictions, scribal errors, etc., but Jesus said that it was true and unerring - even to the smallest detail - and He was not referring to the originals, but to copies of copies of copies.

"Do you not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:45-47)

Was Jesus speaking of the "originals"? No, for they did not have the originals. They had copies of copies of copies of the originals yet Jesus said "not one jot or one tittle" had been changed. If God has only promised the "ORIGINALS" to be pure then Jesus erred in His assessment of the Scriptures. Should these statements of Jesus concerning the Scriptures be inaccurate then He is not Lord, no longer all knowing, no longer all God.

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (John 5:39-40)

The ultimate purpose of the Scriptures is to lead us to Christ - and then to guide our lives. If the Scriptures are not accurate, if they have been changed or altered, if they have been lost so that we no longer have the Word of God, how can we come to Christ for they are the Holy Spirit's implement to testify of the Lord Jesus.

As set forth in the preceding paragraphs, we have Scripturally demonstrated that faith in the preservation of the text is a basic Bible doctrine. Furthermore, the context of these many promises is not that God's Word is to be preserved in a jar somewhere in a cave or desert, lost for hundreds of years waiting to be found and restored to the believing remnant of the Church. The context is very clear in Second Timothy 3:16-17 that the inspired Word was given by God as a deposit to the Body of Christ "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works". Therefore, for God to accomplish this stated purpose for His having given us His Word - it must remain accessible to the disciples of the Lord, Christ Jesus!

Continued part 5

GOD'S METHOD OF PRESERVING THE SCRIPTURES

In selecting Hebrew and Koine (koinh = common or everyday) Greek for the languages in which He would originally give the Bible, God revealed His wisdom, foreknowledge and power. Both of these tongues became "dead languages" within several hundred years after each respective canon was established. By this, the words became "frozen in time". None of the words or their meanings could change. They were, as Latin, dead languages from

which one cannot subtract or add. In contrast, English is a living language and as such new words are constantly being added and old words remain in a state of flux. Their meanings may change or take on new or different connotations.

In Old Testament days, the Levitical priests copied and preserved the Living Words of God. Throughout Scripture, the scribes were of the tribe of Levi (Mal.2:7; Deu.31:25; Deu.17:18). Ezra the priest was also "the ready scribe" of Israel (Ezr.7:1-11). This method of preserving the text was extremely successful as the Lord Jesus bore witness that not "one jot or tittle" had been altered in the 1500 years from Moses to His day.

As to the accuracy of the Hebrew Old Testament in our day, Bishop Kennicott did a study of 581 manuscripts of the Old Testament which involved 280,000,000 letters. Out of that 280,000,000, there were 900,000 variants. Although seemingly large to the reader, it is only one variant in 316 letters which is only 1/3 of 1%. But there is more. Of those 900,000 variants, 750,000 pertain to spelling - whether the letter should be an "i" or "u". This has to do with vowel points for the purpose of pronunciation which were added c.600 A.D. by a group of Jewish scribes known as the Masoretes. Thus we are left with only 150,000 variants in 280,000,000 letters or only one variant in 1580 letters, a degree of accuracy of .0006 (six ten thousandths). Indeed, most of those variants are found in only a few manuscripts; in fact, mostly in just one corrupted copy.

The Dead Sea Scrolls of Isaiah agree with the Hebrew Masoretic Text (the Hebrew Old Testament with the vowel points added to aid in pronunciation). The earliest extant Masoretic Text is dated c.900 A.D. Almost no changes have occurred in the Book of Isaiah. Isaiah 53, for example, contains only one word of three letters which is in doubt after nearly eleven hundred years of copying. In a chapter of 166 words, only 17 were different - 10 were spelling, 4 were conjunctions.

Actually, the Masoretic Text is the true text, not the Dead Sea Scrolls, even though the Scrolls are more than a thousand years older. The Dead Sea material was not written by Jews who were given the charge by God to protect them. They were not of the tribe of Levi. They were Essenes, a Jewish cult of ascetics whose teachings were rife with heresies.

Similarly, the Septuagint manuscripts exhibit considerable significant differences among themselves and disagree with the Hebrew Masoretic Text in many places. Both cannot be correct. As the Hebrew Masoretic text is the inerrant, infallible Word of God - the Septuagint should be seen as spurious and rejected. We cannot even be certain that the LXX which we have extant today (c.350 A.D.) is a faithful reproduction of the c.260 B.C. original (if such an early translation actually ever existed in the first place).

But in the New Covenant, all become priests through the new birth in Christ Jesus. As in the Old Covenant, God gave the New Testament text into the hands of the priesthood of believers, both laymen and elders. The early Christians copied, wrote and preserved it. Most of the early Christians were not wealthy. They often wrote on paper which would be comparable to that of a daily newspaper. Most were not trained scholars or scribes, but they copied with fear in their hearts. They knew that God had warned four times that there would be a curse on anyone who added, subtracted or altered in any way the Word of God (Deu.4:2; Prov.30:5-6; Psalms 12:6-7; Rev.22:18-19). As believers, they would never deliberately alter the Holy Scriptures for

they would have believed in the curse that these verses proclaimed. The only persons who would deliberately change the true text would be blasphemers who did not believe the warnings. In context, these verses forewarn not so much of accidental miscopying but of willful alterations.

Although the New Testament scribes may have left out a "thee" or an "and" as they copied, they copied as carefully and meticulously as possible for they believed with all their hearts and souls that these were God breathed words. They had made a commitment to follow the Lord Jesus under great persecution from the emperors. Many of the scribes gave up their very lives as well as the lives of their whole families, keeping that commitment while being crucified, fed to the lions, etc. For modern scholars who sit comfortably in air conditioned surroundings to accuse these dedicated souls of deliberately altering the Scriptures is almost unforgivable. Poor writers, some may have been, but the high degree of accuracy found in their work is not present in those writings which are being put off on the church today as being the "oldest and most reliable" manuscripts.

A dialect of the Greek language that flourished from the time of Alexander the Great to the barbarian invasions which overtook the Roman Empire after the 4th century A.D. It was replaced by "Byzantine" Greek until 1453 at which time the "Modern" Greek stage superseded it. Koine is singularly the language of the N.T.

Rene Pache, Inspiration and Authority of Scripture, (Chicago, IL: Moody Bible Institute, 1969), pp. 189-190.

Floyd Nolen Jones, The Septuagint: A Critical Analysis, 3rd ed., rev. & enlarged, (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press, #2161, 1994). A spurious Greek Old Testament supposedly written for the library of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, 285-246 B.C. The story of its origin abounds in legend. It is often designated by LXX after the 70 translators reputed to have produced the translation.

Continued, part 6

Continued:

WOLVES PARADING AS SHEEP

In Acts 20, Paul warned that wolves would come in amongst us and not spare the flock; that from among our own selves men would arise with perverse things to say drawing away disciples unto themselves. With tears in his eyes, Paul cautioned us to beware, and he did not cease issuing this warning day and night. Indeed, Jesus taught that there would be wolves coming into the flock of God in sheep's clothing (Mat.7). Such a wolf cannot be recognized easily. It looks like a sheep. Revelation 13 speaks of a false prophet with horns of a lamb but when he opens his mouth, he speaks with the voice of the dragon. So these wolves appear as sheep in order to deceive and to devour.

The church at large is inattentive and dulled to these warnings. We tend to think because someone has been to the seminary, has on a white collar with robe, holds his hands in a pious manner with a devout look upon his face, says he is a minister, perhaps speaks in tongues, and says nice things about

Jesus, that he is a man of God.

Even demons say nice things about Jesus. The first demonic person encountered by Jesus in the Book of Mark was at the synagogue (church). The demon possessed person said, "I know who you are. You are the Holy One of God." He spoke well of Jesus but did not speak the whole truth.

Jesus is Jehovah God - the Creator - come in the flesh! The demon did not give forth the full import as to Jesus' personage, but he did say something nice about Him. Today we get lulled to sleep with people who say some nice things about Jesus. But both Jesus and Paul said beware for there are wolves in sheep's clothing. Today these wolves are in the flock as preachers, scholars, seminary professors, teachers etc. and they are attacking the Word of God while the unsuspecting sheep graze on unaware.

WHEN DID THE WOLVES BEGIN TO DEVOUR THE WORD?

Corruption of the New Testament text had begun by the time of Paul. The following was preserved for us by the Holy Spirit through Paul in II Corinthians 2:17: "For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God" Bible corruption, beginning in the garden of Eden, was out of control as early as the time of Paul. In other words, when the original apostles were here, they had trouble over the purity of the Bible text. This is confirmed and enlarged upon in II Corinthians 4:2:

"But we have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully"

Thus even in Paul's day, when it was still possible to appeal to the New Testament "autographs", there were those who were handling the Word of God deceitfully and many were corrupting it.

Peter adds that all of Paul's writings were Scripture and that men were wrestling against them at the cost of the destruction of their own souls (II Peter 3:16).

If many were corrupting the Word of God during the days of the Apostles, it is possible that we could find a first century document which did not contain the original reading. It could have been altered and thus be corrupt even though very old for Paul and Peter said many were corrupting the Word of God in the first century A.D.

People today are reading from so many different translations that they begin to believe that they can translate or interpret the Bible in any way they desire. The King James Bible says that there is but "one" interpretation of Scripture (although there are many applications).

Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit (II Peter 1:20, author's emphasis).

God says there is only one interpretation - and that is His. Man does have a free will and he may chose to believe anything he wishes, but he will answer and give an account to God for it.

Continued, part 7
Continued:

BEWARE - "A LITTLE LEAVEN ..."

In Matthew 16:6 and 12, Jesus said unto his disciples "... Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." The Pharisees and Sadducees were very religious people yet enemies of God. The disciples finally understood in verse 12 that Jesus was not speaking of the bread which the Pharisees and Sadducees had made. He was warning of their doctrine - to beware of that which the religious leaders were teaching. Today, the warning is still valid. Religious, pious devout men who attack the Scriptures are wolves (or have been deceived by wolves) in sheep's clothing; beware of their leaven for a little leaven leavens the whole lump.

Mark 12:37 contains these words - "... And the common people heard him gladly." Nothing has changed. This is still true. The common people still hear Jesus and the Word of God gladly but more and more in churches and seminaries it is no longer believed that we have the Word of God. We are being told in conservative seminaries and Bible colleges that we do not have the infallible Word of God and that we have lost its text. Are we to believe that God has preserved the canon of the Bible but not the text?

If you are born again of God by the blood of Jesus Christ, through simple faith in Jesus Christ - believing in His virgin birth, His death to pay for our sin, and His resurrection which confirmed that He is God Almighty come in the flesh - then it follows that you believe that God gave the canon (the books which belong in the Bible). Are we now to believe that He did not give or preserve for us the text - that is, what those God chosen books actually said?

NOT AN "AD HOMINEM"

In order to fully expose the wickedness of these wolves within the flock of God, we shall have to review the story of the 1881 revision and contrast it to that of the 1611 King James translation. It is quite a story and in order to disclose it, we shall have to examine the lives and beliefs of some of the men involved. As a result, some might say that our thesis is an "ad hominem" and therefore not valid, for it draws on emotions and feelings - that it is a personal attack upon the men involved. Such is not the case. We have not erected any "straw men" to attack. Rather our account is that of an expos , an expos  which will reveal that the Church has, for centuries, been intimidated into following the scholarship of brilliant - yet habitually unregenerate - men.

However, no unsaved person can teach us ANYTHING about the Bible that we really need to know. They may be brilliant scholars of Greek and/or Hebrew. They may be able to explain how to conjugate Greek and Hebrew verbs, but they cannot explain or clarify Scriptural context because they do not know. They may know all about Assyriology, Egyptology, Astronomy, the History of Babylon, the archaeology of Israel, etc., but such information is not really necessary to the understanding of the Holy Writ. The Scripture is a fully self contained revelation. Were other data necessary to its comprehension God would have included it in The Word.

With reference to these bold assessments, the Scripture proclaims that the natural (unregenerate) man cannot receive the things of God ... "nor can he know them" (I Cor.2:9-14). Ephesians 4:18 says that their "understanding has been darkened". Romans 1:28 teaches that they have reprobate and depraved minds. Matthew 13:14-15 says that they hear with their ears, but they do not hear with their understanding and their hearts. Despite their scholarship and their brilliance, they do not see and hear - they cannot perceive. However, the Christian by virtue of the new birth may have his

perception opened by revelation from the Living God.

This is thus not an ad hominem. We need to understand that the men who have led us into today's position have been, for the most part, lost and godless (albeit "religious and devout") and that we are blindly following their erroneous logic of textual criticism.

Continued part 8

Continued:

THE GREEK STRONGHOLD

For the past several decades most conservative fundamental Bible colleges and seminaries have been perpetuating a significant weakening of the faith of their students with regard to the inerrancy of the Scriptures. The result is that today most Church pulpits are now filled by these students who have since become pastors. The scenario is similar and familiar almost no matter where one goes. As the young impressionable man of God enrolls for study and preparation to become a pastor, he is soon informed that the New Testament was written in Greek. Consequently the student eventually finds himself enrolled in a first year Greek course.

The moment the student enters the class, a peculiar phenomenon occurs. Not yet knowing Greek, he immediately finds himself placed at a great disadvantage. What is the effect upon him from the spiritual standpoint? Very soon, the professor will subjugate the young man under his authority - not merely as an older man or as a teacher, but with regard to all spiritual matters by virtue of his knowledge of the Greek language. The clear impression that is conveyed toward the student is "You don't have the Word of God. It is written in Greek. You just don't know the 'Holy' language. I do." So at the onset, the student is placed in submission under a teacher who may or may not love the Lord or believe in the verbal inspiration and preservation of the Scriptures.

Having been thus subjugated to a Greek scholar, further adverse ramifications will follow shortly. The mind tends to accept as fact that the student never knows as much as his teachers. If he did, most teachers would soon convince him to the contrary. We tend to elevate teachers to a high intellectual pedestal, and many teachers assist us in so doing. In the mind of the learner, his Greek or Hebrew professor usually remains a spiritual authority and the professor feels likewise.

Being subjugated to a Greek faculty, the young impressionable student is unaware of what is transpiring. The final authority for his life is no longer the Holy Scriptures which brought him to the Lord and set his soul on fire. Final authority has become the Greek lexicons and his Greek professor, the scholar, rather than the Word of God and the Holy Spirit. This is accomplished by subtly convincing the inexperienced student that he doesn't have the Word of God at his disposal. He soon begins to wonder if it even exists.

The real issue here is that of authority. Authority is the controversy of the universe. If the Bible is not really the infallible Word of God, then what is final authority? Is it the Greek/Hebrew instructor? "Mother Church"? the Pope? the head of one's denomination? one's local preacher or Bible teacher? Thus someone has placed himself between the laity and God by virtue of his knowledge of Greek. The church at large is being told: "You laymen simply do not know the language and therefore cannot understand God or doctrine as we who know Greek and/or Hebrew."

This is the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, found in Revelation chapter 2; a doctrine which Jesus Christ says He hates. The term "Nicolaitan" was originally applied to a group of people who plagued the first century church by its pretensions to having divine authority. Although some have speculated that it could have referred to a group named after the early deacon, Nicolas of Antioch (Acts 6:5), there exists no reliable record of such a cult. The name itself comes from the Greek words "Nikao" ("to conquer" or "overcome") and "laos" ("people", especially in context here of the laity, the laymen). Thus, we have a clergy priest class taking authority over and dominating the people, the laymen.

The Roman Catholic Church in particular has exercised such a practice for years. One of the means by which Rome has accomplished this unbiblical dominion has been that of continuing to use the Latin language - a language which laymen no longer understand - during the conducting of the various ceremonies, especially mass.

Today most Protestant Churches and their seminaries are guilty of the same sin and, again, the means is that of language. When the laity attend church and/or Bible studies, they hear preachers and teachers say "The ORIGINAL Greek says" or "Your Bible may say thus and so, but the ORIGINAL Greek says something different." As mentioned previously, this is occurring at the seminary where the professor affirms "You just don't know the language."

Continued part 9

Continued (The Greek Stronghold)

Gradually something happens in the heart and mind of the student. He wonders "how do I know that I am reading that which the LORD actually inspired and gave through the prophets, apostles and other men of God? After all, most of the preachers, teachers and the commentaries are saying 'but the original Greek says'."

Some seeking to circumvent the problem may reply - "Well, the final authority is Jesus, only Jesus." The problem with such a statement is that Jesus has not physically shown up at anyone's home for nearly two thousand years and audibly said what He meant (Mat.24:23-27). It sounds very spiritual to say that Jesus is the final authority. After all, He is - and thus the statement is "true truth". But what many people mean by such an affirmation is that since no one alive today has spoken to the Lord Jesus physically and heard Him reply audibly, if the Bible is not the Word of God - then there is no final authority on the earth. Again, the real issue at stake is that of final authority.

And so, again, we say, would God inspire a text and then allow it to become lost? Would He not preserve it as He promised so many times? And if He preserved it would He not keep it in the hands of His followers for their use and instruction? Would He only preserve it within jars in caves and the like or in the obscure inner recesses of the vast library of a harlot church, having been lost there for centuries? Are we to understand His promises to preserve the Word as being fulfilled in such a context - really?

Today most seminary instructors ridicule or play down the King James translation to the student at the onset by statements such as "The original Greek says this or that. The King James is really not so bad but of course we have learned a lot since it was written", etc. Amazingly, we have been blinded in believing that we know more about Greek today than people did

four hundred years ago. But is that a reasonable position? Does not all logic, common sense and experience tell us the farther one goes from the original source, that less will be certain?

So after the student's confidence in the King James Bible has been totally diminished, he is informed that the original Bible was given in Hebrew and Greek and that the original was inspired. The learner is then reminded that all he has is a translation and as such, it is not inspired. After a little more time in the class during which the teacher continues harping on the originals, suddenly the student is informed "There are no originals! We don't have an original.

Continued part 10

Continued (The Greek Stronghold):

We don't have a single first century document of the Bible." This is devastating to the faith of the young inexperienced would-be man of God. He has been told that the King James isn't the faithful Word of God; that the originals were the only true, accurate, authentic Word; and then informed that there are no original manuscripts of either the Old or the New Testament.

This is soon accentuated by introducing the student to the "variant readings" between the existing Greek MSS (we shall discuss this subject later). How can the young pastor now face his congregation and say, "Almighty God says", or "thus saith the Lord". His faith in God's Word has been demasculated by such wicked faculties. The man of God who cannot quote Scripture with an assured "thus saith the Lord" is but a shorn Samson, not yet aware that the Philistines have already had their way with him. Young men with hearts on fire for God walk into the classroom and a Greek scholar belittles the Word of God and destroys their faith in the Bible. These same professors then incredulously tell us "Despite all the changes we have made in translation recently, not one single basic doctrine has been altered in any way."

But they have! By their tactics, they have altered two of the most important doctrines of all. They have altered the crucial doctrine of "preservation" to that of "restoration" - and most text critics do not believe that such restoration is even any longer possible. Moreover the fall out from this places another of the most basic doctrines under attack, the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the text. Consequently, in so doing, they have destroyed the faith of many such that they no longer are certain that they have God's Word in their hands. The teacher has perpetuated that which happened to him years before when he was the student. The evil cycle is now complete. We have turned full circle to a different pope.

Again, we are being asked to believe in the inspiration of Scripture without believing in the preservation of the sacred Writ. We are being taught at nearly all the conservative fundamental seminaries that God gave an inspired text but could not (or did not) quite protect or preserve it. As a result, part was lost somewhere along the way and text critics are supposedly engaged in the arduous process of restoring to the world the original readings. Whereas that which follows may at times seem somewhat complicated, the only question the inquiring reader need ask himself is: "Is it reasonable that God gave man His pure infallible Word and then allowed it to become so corrupted over time that He (we) was left to call and rely upon unregenerate men to restore it?" One can but wonder how a believing

Christian scholar, pastor, or layman could allow himself to become so deceived as to fall into the snare of considering only the "originals" to be trustworthy. Most assuredly, their faith did not begin there. God "lost" portions of His Word? Was not that rather awkward of Him?

Continued Part 11

Christ tells us, in His own words, 3 times in the Gospels, as reported by Matthew, Mark & Luke:

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

Matthew 24:35; Mark 13:31; & Luke 21:33

The original text, God's word, has indeed been preserved. It is the text that was used by the early Church, all the way through the 17th Century until Westcott & Hort decided to change it all.

Hort's statement that none of the church Fathers before 350 quoted the T.T. is simply not true. As mentioned, even Origen occasionally cited and adopted purely Syrian readings. For example, Dr. E.F. Hills states that in John 1-14 which is covered by Papyri 66 and 75, fifty-two times the Syrian reading stands alone as to the text and Origen agreed with twenty of them. This may be quickly verified by merely scanning Tischendorf's critical apparatus. Thus, the oft stated assertion of the critics that Origen knew nothing of the Byzantine text is simply untenable. On the contrary, these statistics demonstrate that Origen was not only familiar with the Byzantine text, he frequently adopted its readings in preference to those of the "Western" and "Alexandrian" texts. Hills goes on to report that seven of these same twenty occur in Papyri 66 and/or 75 (circa 200 A.D.).

Although Hort accused the Traditional Text as having late readings, hence it must be a "late text", his own research revealed otherwise. In his "Notes on Select Readings" which appears as an appendix in his Introduction, Hort discussed about 240 instances of variation among the manuscripts of the Gospels. In only about twenty of these was he willing to characterize the Byzantine reading as "late". Thus, by Hort's own admission, only around ten per cent of the Byzantine readings were supposedly late. Scholars today offer even less.

PAPYRI (c.200 A.D.) SUPPORTS THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS

The papyri (around 200 A.D.), which dates 150 years before Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, support the Textus Receptus readings. This may come as somewhat of a shock to those familiar with the problem of textual criticism, as most have been informed that the early papyri are listed as Alexandrian or Western. True, nevertheless the Chester Beatty and Bodmer Papyri, even though placed in those families, have many renderings which are strictly Syrian - strictly Textus Receptus. After a thorough study of P46, Gunther Zuntz concluded: "A number of Byzantine readings, most of them genuine, which previously were discarded as 'late', are anticipated by P46". Having several years earlier already acknowledged that with regard to the Byzantine New Testament "Most of its readings existed in the second century", Colwell noted Zuntz's remark and concurred. Many of these readings had been considered to be "late readings", but the papyri testify that they date back at least to the second century!

In his recent book, the late (d.1989) Harry A. Sturz surveyed "all the available papyri" to determine how many papyrus-supported "Byzantine" readings were extant. In deciding which readings were "distinctively Byzantine", Dr. Sturz states that he made a conscious effort to "err on the conservative side" and thus his list is shorter than it could have been. Sturz lists 150 Byzantine readings which, though not supported by the early Alexandrian and Western uncials, are present in the bulk of later manuscripts and by the early papyri. Sturz lists a further 170 additional Byzantine readings which also read differently from the A-B text but are supported by Western manuscripts. These are also supported in the ancient papyri. This support may seem minimal, but nothing can diminish the fact that the total number of papyri citations favor the so-called "late" Byzantine readings against their rivals in the two lists by two to one. Sturz demonstrates papyri support for a total of 839 readings which in varying degrees would be classified as Byzantine. This forever dismantles Hort's theory that the Byzantine text was created as an official compromise text during the 4th-century by combining readings from earlier text-types.

Hills declared that the Chester Beatty readings vindicate "distinctive Syrian readings" twenty-six times in the Gospels, eight times in the Book of Acts, and thirty-one times in Paul's Epistles. Hills goes on to state that Papyrus Bodmer II (Papyri 66) confirms 13% of the so-called "late" Syrian readings (18 out of 138). To properly appreciate this one must consider the fact that only about thirty percent of the New Testament has any papyri support, and much of that thirty percent has only one papyrus. Thus this is seen as a major confirmation to the antiquity of the text of the Traditional Text in direct contradiction to the theory previously outlined in which the Syrian readings were said by Westcott and Hort to be fourth and fifth century. May we not reasonably project that subsequent discoveries of papyri will give similar support to readings now only extant in Byzantine text?

A most telling fact concerning the papyri is that several of them have texts of Revelation (P-47 for example). How does the destructive critic explain the fact that Vaticanus (written c.350) does not include the Book of Revelation whereas the 1611 Authorized Version (written nearly 1260 years later) contains this book? Can one reasonably explain how Erasmus' "late" manuscripts contained an entire book missing in the "pure, neutral Vatican" text? How did Erasmus know that the book of Revelation should be in the canon when the "oldest and best" manuscript did not contain it?

Hills, The King James Version Defended, op. cit., p. 172.

Edward F. Hills, The King James Version Defended, 1st ed., op. cit., p. 73. The page of this reference has changed in Dr. Hills' later editions and to date I have not been able to locate it in his 1984 publication. All other references to this work of Hills within this publication except that on page 20 is to his 1984 4th edition.

Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 55.

Colwell, What is the Best New Testament?, op. cit., p. 70.

Colwell, "The Origin of Texttypes of New Testament Manuscripts", op. cit., p. 132.

Harry A. Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type And New Testament Textual Criticism* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1984), pp. 61-62, 145-159. For many years Chairman of the Greek Department (contra the dust cover of his book) at Biola University, Dr. Sturz studied New Testament textual criticism with E.C. Colwell. This work is a slightly revised version of his doctoral dissertation at Grace Theological Seminary. Dr. Sturz passed away 26 April, 1989. Dr. Theodore P. Letis, who was literally tutored privately at the feet of Hills, states in a 7-20-88 critique of Sturz's book that Hills was the first text critic to use the papyri to vindicate Burgon's argument that the Byzantine text reached back well before the 4th-century. Letis relates that while a doctoral student under E.C. Colwell at the University of Chicago in 1942, Hills proposed a dissertation topic which - had it been accepted - would have accomplished that which Sturz set out to do 25 years earlier. The proposal was refused, hence Hills wrote his dissertation on another topic.

Moorman, When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text, op. cit., p. 2.

John William Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark*, (Ann Arbor, MI: The Sovereign Grace Book Club, 1959), p. 50. This is a reprint of Burgon's 1871 work containing an Introduction by Dr. Edward F. Hills from pages 17-72.

Ibid., p. 54.

Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, op. cit., p. 77.

XX

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2006/1/1 16:15

Philologos says:

Quote:

" I love the KJV, it is my bible of choice and has been for many years but I am not blind to it's *errors* or to it's *weaknesses*. To ignore its *errors* and *weaknesses* is folly.

If indeed we are to believe that there are ERRORS and WEAKNESSES in the King James Version, my only QUESTIONS are:

HOW CAN ANY SCRIPTURE IT PRESENTS BE TRUSTED ?
IS GOD NOT ABLE TO PRESERVE HIS WORD?

If indeed there are ERRORS and WEAKNESSES, in the KJV, what can we trust? Have all those that have proceeded us in the last 400 years perished in their sin for trusting such a flawed thing? Sir I admire your determination, but I question the wisdom in your claims to be better informed than God Himself.

I do not believe for a moment that any committee of men, left to their own devices, is "wholly trustworthy" to accurately translate scripture. This is abundantly clear in the case of those that have presented us with the likes of the TNIV and the Good As New bibles.

I believe that the translators of the KJV were Spirit led, Spirit filled men, working under God's guidance, to produce an English translation of Holy Scripture.

2Ti 3:16 All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

Greg

Re: KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/1 16:33

Quote:

-----I think that the entire issue boils down to one issue, and one issue only----Preservation or Restoration, what is it?

We have the conservatives that have a well founded belief that the King James provides the very Words of God and that God has providently preserved the Scriptures.

On the other side we have the liberals who deny the power of God to do any such thing, and therefore they have sided with Westcott & Hort and all of the other liberals and textual critics that want to "Restore" the Scriptures.

That is the bottom line. When those of us on the conservative side post various points on this issue, it is never responded to in detail by the liberals. They pick and choose their responses, and many times do not respond at all.

If we were all in the same room, face to face, perhaps it would be different. Each point should be countered by the other side, and documented.

For some reason that does not happen here.

Before going too far into this and having not read all that follows.... Isn't this a major part of the problem, this dividing into neat and clean camps? Conservatives/Liberals and if one does not fit neatly into one of the constructs someone is ready to put them there regardless? This happens an awful lot even in other areas of discussion and find it a bit peculiar. Without being accusatory, is it bothersome when some will refuse to be crowded into others categories? Is that it? Republican/Democrat, Calvinism/Arminianism, KJV "Only"/____.

There was a time when being accused of being "wishy-washy" was actually quite true, more afraid often times before their opinions of men and therefore sitting on the fence. But to have to now proscribe to a preset logic of conditions or get a label slapped on you ... Not that it really matters personally, could frankly care less, just seems there is far too much reading into things often times. I get the arguments but this is not always the case with a lot of brethren as is surmised.

Quote:

-----That is the bottom line. When those of us on the conservative side post various points on this issue, it is never responded to in detail by the liberals. They pick and choose their responses, and many times do not respond at all.

And "you" (whoever you are) do not do the same? Come now, is this a war we are fighting or a search for the truth?

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/1/1 16:41

Great article: Faith used in unbelief is death.
The Faith of Christ in the Believer is life.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/1/1 17:13

Mark 9:35-40 And He sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all. And He took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when He had taken him in His arms, He said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in My Name, receiveth Me: and whosoever shall receive Me, receiveth not Me, but Him that sent Me. And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part.

It is the same thing, saying, Master, we saw one reading the NIV in thy name, and he followeth not us and use the KJV.

The Miracle is that None of us can lightly speak evil Of Christ, just because he use this version or this translation, for he that is for us is our part and not against us.

This is how bad dividing the camp of Christ Ones is to Him. Mark 9:41-43 For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched:

We were and are these little ones, and if we offend them we offend Jesus our Lord and His Father and grieve the Holy Spirit.

We should love the Word and give each other the Gift of the Holy Spirit in us by building up one another and clearly understand that it is Christ that will Keep Us in Truth and the Precious Holy Spirit that will keep us in the Truth of the Christ that is in us, and let us come together in the Oneness of Christ. Isa 1:18 Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. By the Christ that is in us. Amen.

In Christ: Phillip

Re:, on: 2006/1/1 21:13

Crsschk (Moderator) said:

Before going too far into this and having not read all that follows.... Isn't this a major part of the problem, this dividing into neat and clean camps? Conservatives/Liberals and if one does not fit neatly into one of the constructs someone is ready to put them there regardless? This happens an awful lot even in other areas of discussion and find it a bit peculiar. Without being accusatory, is it bothersome when some will refuse to be crowded into others categories? Is that it? Republican/Democrat, Calvinism/Arminianism, KJV "Only"/_____.

Stever's response:

We all know that Christ uses all things for His glory. He is still in control, and always will be. Whether we study the NIV and the newer versions, or just the King James only, he still draws all to Himself.

What I have focused on has nothing to do with "division". The division took place when two men hijacked the revision committee and exchanged the Received Text (The Textus Receptus) for the corrupt Alexandrian text. The Alexandrian text is the text behind the Catholic Bible.

Are there saved Catholics, even though they have a corrupt Bible? Yes there are. But look at all of the problems that the Catholic Church has fallen into because of the corrupt text they study- Mary Worship, as the "Co-Redemptrix" of mankind with Christ; Praying to Mary, instead of Jesus; Praying to the dead Catholic saints, who know nothing, rather than Jesus; Graven images in the Churches; etc. etc. etc. They also give the Pope greater authority than the Word of God itself (maybe that is because the Word they have is the corrupted Word??)

The entire Church TODAY, at this time in history, is going into apostasy. Believers today think that what the Holy Spirit tells them is of more value than the Word of God. Rather than qualifying what the Spirit is teaching them, by the very

Word of God (the Bible), they then fall into error. Why? Because many, many times it is their own/our own flesh that is talking to us. We have to test the Spirit that talks to us, and that isn't being done today. We test the Spirit by God's Word.

2 Timothy tells us: " 15. Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.
16. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness.
17. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus;
18. Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some."

I personally use the King James, as well as other Bible translations. The Amplified, as well as the Living Bible, and sometimes even the NIV. The point is, I know that the King James is the very Spirit Breathed Word of God, and that is my standard that I compare all of the others to.

My point here is not to divide, but to INFORM. The very issue itself is what divides those who have already chosen what they want to believe.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Crsschk said:

There was a time when being accused of being "wishy-washy" was actually quite true, more afraid often times before the opinions of men and therefore sitting on the fence. But to have to now proscribe to a preset logic of conditions or get a label slapped on you ... Not that it really matters personally, could frankly care less, just seems there is far too much reading into things often times. I get the arguments but this is not always the case with a lot of brethren as is surmised.

Stever's response:

We all have labels, it is just not politically correct (PV) to reveal who you are anymore. Again, the labels do not divide, they describe our position on DOCTRINE, and how we interpret the Scripture that we all read.

A great example of that is what takes place in the study and understanding of The Book Revelation. We must realize that Christians hold varying views on this end time Book of Prophecy (Revelaton).

There is the 1) Preterist interpretation, that believes Revelation has been fulfilled in the past.

Then there is the 2) "historical interpretation that believes that the fulfillment of Revelation is going on continuously in the Church.

There is also the 3) historical-spiritualist (amillennialism) believes that Revelation is already fulfilled and that the book is largely contains only spiritual lessons for the church today.

The 4) futurist (premillennialists) interpretation is the view which is held by all premillennialists and is the one which I accept and present to you. It sees the Book of Revelation as primarily prophetic. Most premillennialists follow a certain form of interpretation that conforms to the Book of Revelation.

Through Bible study I have taken the Premillennialist point of view in regards to Revelation. When I post something on Sermonindex on this matter of the Book of Revelation, there are always others that scoff at and don't take my point of view. ---When Philologos posts on this matter, I already know that he has a amilleennialist position and expect debate from him on this issue (Revelation), as well as most other issues.
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Various Millennial Positions

So that we can better understand the debate, we will start with a brief definition of the four major millennial positions in the Church today. Because in understanding these different theologies, we will get a better awareness of how each

views the Church's mandate, plan, and final victory in accomplishing its mission.

Amillennialism

The word millennium is a Latin term meaning one thousand years. It's from the root words , meaning thousand, and , meaning years. In Greek (yes Greek, not Latin), placing the letter "a" before a word negates the word. So a-millennial literally means no millennium.

However, we should note that Amillennialists do in fact believe there is a millennial reign of Christ, but not on an earthly throne upon this sin cursed earth. They believe that the Messiah has come to reign upon the throne of David in the Kingdom of heaven. So the word Amillennial itself is literally accurate as it is understood to mean, "no millennial reign on an earthly or worldly throne." Use of this word in any sense other than a "no future earthly kingdom reign," would be a misnomer.

This view of eschatology maintains that the present reign of Christ (Revelation 20:4), began with His ascension to the throne of God, and that this is what the apostle Peter was speaking about in Acts 2:30-32. Christ instituted His kingdom reign by His death, resurrection, and ascension to the throne of David, and it will be fully realized and manifested at His second coming.

Amillennialism does not support the idea that the Kingdom of Christ is an intangible, but that it is incontrovertibly real, effectual, substantive, factual, essential, and of a spiritual rather than worldly (earthly) or carnal nature. They believe that the Kingdom of Christ is now being both extended and advanced through the preaching of the gospel by the servants of their King, Christ. THEY ALSO BELIEVE THAT THE CHURCH HAS REPLACED ISRAEL (REPLACEMENT THEOLOGY)

Premillennialism

By contrast, the term Premillennialist identifies Christians who believe that the thousand year reign spoken of in Revelation chapter 20 is earthly in nature. It is where Christ literally returns to earth as potentate to rule. Pre-millennial literally means before millennium, or before the thousand years. This doctrine teaches that sometime in the future Christ will return to this earth and begin a literal one thousand-year reign upon a literal throne in the Middle East. He will reign and govern from Jerusalem, and peace will rule on earth from the nation of Israel. Generally, Premillennialists believe in two separate and unequal salvation programs. A national or racial (rather than individual) salvation plan for the Jewish people, and another plan for everyone else (any non-Jew or Gentile). They hold that future redeemed Israel will be the center of government and the spreading of the gospel to the nations of the world. In this, they generally reject the contention that Christ has already come to redeem and deliver Israel, and that He is now the center of rule and Government. This is a future event, that will happen at the end of the Tribulation. Premillennialists do NOT believe that the Church has replaced Israel!!!!

There are different forms of premillennialism (Dispensationalism, Historical, etc.), but in general, they do not believe that many Old Testament scriptures which were fulfilled, are "completely" fulfilled. They take the position that fulfillment in Israel (if any) is incomplete, and the pertinent scriptures dealing with this have yet a further future literal fulfillment. e.g., some premillennialists look for Elijah to literally come back to prepare the way for Christ's rule, because they don't believe that John the Baptist "completely" fulfilled that prophesy.

Postmillennialism

A view that is increasing in popularity within some Reformed circles recently, is Postmillennialism. This is the view that the millennium will produce a future golden age of the Church that will precede the second advent of Christ. They (as do the Amillennialists) offer up the scriptures that declare that Christ is ruling in His kingdom now, and that the kingdom of God is now being extended through servants of that kingdom preaching the gospel. But they differ from the Amillennial view in that they believe that at the end of this kingdom age, there will be an age of righteousness and worldwide turning to Christ.

The word "post," means after, and thus postmillennial identifies those who believe in the return of Christ after this future golden age or period. The belief is usually that this golden age of the Church will feature the exercise of Christ's power and authority in this world whereby its rulers are hindered in their wickedness. The influence of Christianity will excel and spread until a future time when most of the world will be in obedience to God's laws. They expect that after they have created this just, God-fearing society, Christ will then return, and the judgment and resurrection occur.

Praeterist

The Praeterist (or Preterist) view means its past fulfillment. Praeterit is Latin and means Pre (before) in fulfillment. i.e., . . .

t is expressing time fulfilled. Praeterists believe that most or all of Bible Prophecy has already been fulfilled in Christ, and the on-going expansion of His Kingdom. They hang this belief of Past-fulfillment on many different verses, including the witness that Jesus and his apostles said that his coming (or presence) and the end of all things, would occur soon (in that generation).

Full Praeterists spiritualize Matthew 24 as having already taken place in the past, and believe that Christ actually returned in 70 AD fulfilling the prophesy of the second advent.

We should understand that in all these different views of eschatology, it is not simply a matter of opinion about chronology, it's a matter of different hermeneutics and of different types of exegesis. These positions differ not only in their methodology, but also in the way they understand biblical history. So in coming to an understanding of what each eschatological doctrine teaches, we come to better understand the very structure, purpose, and nature of the Kingdom of Christ, and His reigning within.

Of all these diverse and adverse millennial positions, only the Amillennial view can be "totally" supported in all of its pertinent declarations concerning the kingdom with unambiguous scripture. Not with scripture that we say is interpreted to mean these things, but scripture that actually says them! Of course, I fully realize that this is a bold statement from which I should expect skepticism and cynicism. But in this study we will go through the verses one by one to prove that this is the truth. For we all know that simply making these declarations is the easy part, but an "undeniable" defense of them requires the unquestioned "unadulterated" witness of scripture.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever concludes:

Thus names, or "labels" as you call them are important in the discussions that we have on sermonindex and in the Church body, especially in regards to DOCTRINE. The problem is, most don't know the name of their own label.

I am not ashamed of my label, and I would hope that others are not ashamed of theirs.

My label, my position on Doctrine, is that of a Postmillennial Dispensationalist.

Dispensationalism is a conceptual overview and interpretive framework for understanding the overall flow of the Bible. As a branch of Christian theology, it teaches biblical history as a number of successive economies or administrations under God known as "dispensations," and emphasizes the continuity of the Old Testament covenants God made with the Jewish people through Abraham, Moses and King David. Dispensationalist Christian eschatology emphasizes a premillennial futurist view of prophecy of the "end times" and a pretribulation view of the rapture.

God bless,

Stever

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/1 22:11

Quote:
-----We have the conservatives that have a well founded belief that the King James provides the very Words of God and that God has providently preserved the Scriptures.

Quote:
-----On the other side we have the liberals who deny the power of God to do any such thing, and therefore they have sided with Westcott & Hort and all of the other liberals and textual critics that want to "Restore" the Scriptures.

I am not sure when being a conservative was defined as equalling "King James Only" and everything outside of KJO = liberal. This is a new one.

Bishop Westcott was by no means a "liberal" himself but held an unqualified belief in the Divine Authorship of scripture as a reading of His Greek commentaries will show.

AS to the "well grounded belief in God's ability to "preserve His Word" with no need of "restoration", Was not this also true 100 years, 200 years, 50 years prior to the publishing of the King James 1611 Bible? Where was the "preserved Word of God then?

Church History did not begin with the reformation. It began in the 1st century AD.

Was not the very act of translation by the King James translators a "restoration"? They said, "we made a good translation better (Preface to the 1611 King James Bible).

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2006/1/2 0:39

Hi Stever...

As a result of this thread, and out of a *continued desire* to know the truth in this matter, I am beginning serious research into this issue. I have recently listened to some messages and read some literature recommended by *KJV-only* believers from the forums. However, I still have not found any concrete evidence that would make me believe that other versions (such as the NIV or NASV) are *dishonest* translations. On the contrary, as has been my past experience, I have found quite a bit of biased "evidence" that makes *accusations* about such translations without providing any real academic proof.

Yesterday, I wrote several letters and emails to various Bible societies, manuscript experts and Bible professors with specializations in this field. I have not written to anyone that I know is biased. In fact, I have referenced some of the "sources" and "proof" provided by various posters from the forums, in order to determine the responses of these individuals concerning such information. I have also asked these individuals for any references that might help me in this endeavor.

It has always been disheartening for me to witness believers that defend their particular positions on serious matters by referencing known biased source material, or by attacking the character of other believers. I believe that in such controversial matters, it is always better to be "slow to speak." Source material should not just quote references from secondary material. Source material should be just that -- source material. I will look up the information that you provided in this last post in order to determine the degree of bias versus truth.

It is my opinion (just an opinion) that much of the rhetoric presented by the *KJV-only* believers has been a little slanted. For instance:

Quote:

-----I think that the entire issue boils down to one issue, and one issue only----Preservation or Restoration, what is it?

We have the conservatives **that have a well founded belief** that the King James provides the very Words of God and that God has providently preserved the Scriptures.

On the other side we have the liberals **who deny the power of God** to do any such thing, and **therefore they have sided with Westcott & Hort** and all of the other liberals and textual critics that want to "Restore" the Scriptures.

That is the bottom line. When those of us on the conservative side post various points on this issue, **it is never responded to in detail by the liberals . They pick and choose their responses, and many times do not respond at all.**

Brother Stever, I highlighted some of the comments in your statement. I know that you are quite honest in your "defense" of your belief against other translations. But your comments sound just a little bit *slanted* against those with whom you disagree. This does not represent any of the non *KJV-only* individuals that I know on this forum. I do not know any of them that would consider themselves textual "liberals." Nor do I know any that believe that they (or desire to) **deny the power of God** in this issue. And I don't know anyone that would say that they have **sided with Westcott & Hort and all of the other liberals**. Rather, it seems presumptuous to make such a statement about (or label) those that simply do not agree with your position.

My biggest fear for those who loudly proclaim to be *KJV-only* is that they might make their remarks wholeheartedly, but without proper knowledge in this matter. They may certainly be filled with information from "academic sounding" biased sources that do not agree with modern translations, prefer the traditional translation of the KJV, or question the validity or motives of the translators of other versions. However, such individuals might find themselves accusing such translations as the NIV or NASB as being useless (or worse) -- when in fact most of it might very well be the authentic Word of God.

:~)

Re: May God bless your search for truth, on: 2006/1/2 2:58

ccchhrrriiisss said:

"Yesterday, I wrote several letters and emails to various Bible societies, manuscript experts and Bible professors with specializations in this field. I have not written to anyone that I know is biased. In fact, I have referenced some of the "sources" and "proof" provided by various posters from the forums, in order to determine the responses of these individuals concerning such information. I have also asked these individuals for any references that might help me in this endeavor. "

Stever's response:

I will never forget a speech class that I took in College many years ago. Our teacher was excellent. I really learned a lot from him because he was an honest teacher, concerned with learning.

The advice he gave us then, that I still use today is to study all sides of an issue (which is what you are doing!!).

The example he gave us was simple- you want to know the truth about something, then research all 3 sides of every issue- the right, the center and the left. Your source material? The actual publications put out by each side. You will never find someone in the middle that sees the whole issue, no more than you will find on the right or the left.

His suggestion at the time (this was 1967-after I got out of the Navy) was to find the truth about the World situation, subscribe to 3 publications on that subject. At the time the right was represented by William Buckleys monthly magazine "National Review" (I think). The Center was represented by Newsweek and the left represented by Time Magazine.

By looking at all three, the truth comes into perspective early. Instead of listening and reading about others from our own choir, we can read each side and come to our conclusions early, rather than late.

The information that I provided goes right back in time to the people who were associated with Westcott & Hort. Also the son of Westcott wrote a book that is also quoted, as well over 400 source material (books) as well.

I don't know if you recall, but I emailed this material to you in zip format the last time this subject came up.

The Books were both by Floyd Nolen Jones, who in the early 1970's welcomed the new versions. However, after finding

problems with the newer versions in regards to Scripture and Doctrine, Wrote two books to expose the errors and to explain to the world what had happened at the revision committee in the 1800's.

God bless,

Stever

May God bless you and guide you in your search

Re:, on: 2006/1/2 12:49

by Graftedbranc on 2006/1/1 17:11:04

I am not sure when being a conservative was defined as equalling "King James Only" and everything outside of KJO = liberal. This is a new one.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Conservative: a) Preservative; having power to preserve in a safe or entire state, or from loss, waste or injury.

Conserve:, v. t. conserv'.

To keep in a safe or sound state; to save; to preserve from loss, decay, waste, or injury; to defend from violation; as to conserve bodies from perishing; to conserve the peace of society

Conservations: (noun- Latin conservatio. See Conserve.)

The act of preserving, guarding or protecting; preservation from loss, decay, injury, or violation; the keeping of a thing in a safe or entire state; as the coconservation of bodies from perishing; the conservation of peace of society; the conservation of privileges.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's continued response: Up until the revision committee did their dastardly deed, the Christian body had their Bible- the received text-God's Word that was Spirit Breathed. At that same time the Catholic Church had it's corrupted Bible- the corrupt Alexandrian text. When Westcott and Hort were finished in 1888, they had replaced the Received text of the Christian Church with the corrupt Alexandrian text of the Catholic Bible.

Hence, anyone who supports the newer versions, in this sense of things is a LIBERAL. Those of us that support the King James (the Received Text) is a CONSERVATIVE,

God bless,

Stever

Conservative or Liberal ?

Re:KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/2 13:23

Well how much more appreciative is the sentiments expressed here. Well done brothers, that we could keep this spirit in all our discussions. Had shelved a response to Stever last night and in light of recent developments....

Quote:
-----The example he gave us was simple- you want to know the truth about something, then research all 3 sides of every issue- the right, the center and the left. Your source material? The actual publications put out by each side. You will never find someone in the middle that sees the whole issue, no more than you will find on the right or the left.

Well.... here goes, but I think I disagree, from the shelf and hope the spirit of it is still intact;

Quote:
-----We all have labels, it is just not politically correct (PV) to reveal who you are anymore. Again, the labels do not divide, they describe our position on DOCTRINE, and how we interpret the Scripture that we all read.

No, that's not the point at all, or second thought, maybe it is. We all have labels only as far as we choose to fall under them. The point was in making assumptions into clear black and white categories by projecting brethren into them. I believe it is judgment with wrong judgment.

There is actually another position that is not a position, it's 'neither'. It does not necessarily agree with everything nor disagree with everything. It refuses to be labeled while holding to the truth even while that may straddle the lines and frustrate those who must insist on their particular bent as being the only correct assumption. It is by no means 'relativism'. That is not an accusation, by the way.

An example, I was once a fully staunch Republican after seeing many things that were so biased in the media and after hearing and looking into various issues and by way of that and the normal course of things, followed along *the party line*. After the Lord drew me to Himself and began to break off many things I began to see the errors not only in much of what I previously bought into but into the whole of the mindset as well, broadly speaking. My *leanings* may be in concert with some of the same values that can be held by some in this particular 'party', but by and large this, nor most of politics in general has God's concerns in mind to begin with and find the mudslinging and constant hypocrisy, lying, half-truths from both 'sides' just a complete waste of any energy whatsoever. But others do and that's just my particular opinion. Only find trouble in the same ways that spurious things are used to advance an argument.

There is just something dishonest about this whole projecting business.

Quote:
-----Again, the labels do not divide, they describe our position on DOCTRINE, and how we interpret the Scripture that we all read

That is not what you were proposing from this;

Quote:
-----I think that the entire issue boils down to one issue, and one issue only----Preservation or Restoration, what is it?

We have the conservatives that have a well founded belief that the King James provides the very Words of God and that God has providently preserved the Scriptures.

On the other side we have the liberals who deny the power of God to do any such thing, and therefore they have sided with Westcott & Hort and all of the other liberals and textual critics that want to "Restore" the Scriptures.

That is the bottom line. When those of us on the conservative side post various points on this issue, it is never responded to in detail by the liberals. They pick and choose their responses, and many times do not respond at all.

If we were all in the same room, face to face, perhaps it would be different. Each point should be countered by the other side, and documented.

For some reason that does not happen here.

This was the issue being addressed, not doctrine. And by making the issue one of conservatives vs. liberals by labeling them as such you are causing a division or at least are presenting one and find it really unnecessary. The irony here is ju

st this;

Quote:
-----I personally use the King James, as well as other Bible translations. The Amplified, as well as the Living Bible, and sometimes even the NIV. The point is, I know that the King James is the very Spirit Breathed Word of God, and that is my standard that I compare all of the others to.

How does this fit into the clean lines of conservative/liberal? If you truly believe this then why use others translations at all?

Maybe this all seems just didactic and argument for arguments sake, I hope it is not either. It can seem on the one hand that you may be speaking in generalities, yet you did state those who are 'posting' here so...

~~~~~  
So maybe as this is beginning to turn out somewhat, is a proving of a certain 'tension', that as we process things without holding to hard and fast lines we are both able and willing to let go and allow our assumptions to be challenged. What I do suppose often times is in admitting our possible weakness that our positions that we set up might take a hit and out of fear of that will hold to contrary opinions, even dodging the issues raised and sometimes even unaware will use that which is really not honest to continue to support those same positions. Boy is that a mouthful... It begs just one question; "Could I be wrong"? Or is it by giving a needed inch does that necessarily mean the whole of the structure must come tumbling down? I don't think so, it seems an unwarranted fear.

As it is being addressed to the matter at hand, that of the particular preservation of scripture, of Gods *Word*, it does seem that there is some things that are confusing that really ought not to be. Without getting down into the minutiae of the details and even with the given proclivities of certain men and their bents as has been well pointed out and even with the fact that many a new 'translation' has come along that is sheer folly (thinking of even at the moment the "Good News" Bible that was mentioned elsewhere that is just rubbish) All that and more, to go back to what was mentioned about whether or not God has protected His word;

Quote:  
-----We have the conservatives that have a well founded belief that the King James provides the very Words of God and that God has providently preserved the Scriptures  
-----

"*The very words*" Would have trouble with that and maybe Chris has already adequately addressed this, but not with the idea that God has in fact preserved His Word contained in the scriptures. It is here where the "only" gets curiously explained and again if this be so and is held to wholeheartedly, it just makes no sense why anyone would bother reading any other 'version'. Still the questions keep coming up though. What of that question of *prior* to the KJV? What of other cultures and languages are we to assume that either we convert the whole world into Old English language or is it that we re-translate the KJV into their language? What to do with the linguistic problems where an English word has no proper equivalent in a native language?

I am sure many of these questions have been thrown out there before. Then there is the errors pointed out with the KJV itself, in spelling and I do believe those "Oops" that were mentioned and cannot recall at the moment where the wrong word was used and changed the whole context of the sentence as one example.

The point is the reasonings of this being some sort of 'perfect' infallible or completely divine, providential and only reference of translation cannot be true and that there is some sort of fear in being completely honest about that and somehow that negates whether God has protected His word is beyond reason.

The amazing fact is that with all the manuscripts there is so much agreement when the Lord in His folly allows mere men to copy down His words ... I am more surprised that we aren't astonished at that miraculous intervention! Isn't it at the same time true that we could create the New Testament from the earliest writers just from their use of scripture even before it was 'canonized'?

Find this all very fascinating and have no fear that what we have is in fact Gods word. It is not to dismiss the particular problems and errors both of good man and bad, nor to dismiss improper motives, nor to examine the errors of mistranslation but it is also to do so honestly and quit propping up that which needs no propping.

I have struggled to express this in more than the issue at hand because it cuts across so much thinking in this modern day

ay. From denominational constructs to doctrinal 'positions', pre, post, Calvinism\Armenianism, sprinkling or dunking ... How long is the list now? These are things that man creates and the labeling that goes on with it.

2Co 10:12 For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves: but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise.

Where in scripture do we find these 'headings'? Actually, isn't more of the opposite that was attempting to be curbed, this separating of the Body into factions and controversies? Not that there wouldn't be as was also mentioned but it seems there was an effort to hold to the basics of unity and maybe I am just too pie in the sky to attempt to promote the same, I actually don't really believe it is possible on a large scale. There is still too much pride in us that won't allow for it.

Look at Jesus. Where did He fit into neat categories? He frustrated and offended many and despite an out of balance prescription in this day, the minute one reflects on His demeanor as 'gentle' in comes the reminder that He is also the one who said *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?* Mat 26:53

**Re: - posted by groh\_frog, on: 2006/1/2 15:34**

Found an interesting article that exemplifies why we should get to the root of this.

Grace and Peace...

You Want Me to Take You Seriously?

Issue Date: September/October 2005

By David Daniels

A friend of mine was in church listening to his pastor preach on a Bible passage. Looking earnestly at his congregation, he said, "I've read this verse in several translations, but the one I like the best says ...." My friend didn't hear the rest of the sermon. He just looked down at his King James Bible and thought, "Pastor, you want me to change my life—because of the Bible you like the best?! How can I take you seriously?"

Today pastors are pressured to change their churches in order to grow. If they want to attract the multitudes, they must change the music, the seats, the sermon ... and of course, the Bible they use. One Bible is no longer enough—especially not the King James. So the newest materials for sermons, Sunday school materials, devotionals and even journals use multiple versions of the Bible!

Now it's not necessary to change your life by what God's words say in the Bible. Instead, you can pick and choose from a variety of versions to make the scriptures say whatever you want. But people cannot bring 30 Bible versions to church. No problem: they can be conveniently shown on a screen for all to see. No longer do we have to believe the words of God in our King James Bible. We can put our trust in whatever version (or paraphrase) is quickly flashed on a screen! After all, God didn't want you to believe his exact words, did He?

Yes, He did, actually. Jesus was very clear: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." (Matthew 24:35, Mark 13:31 and Luke 21:33.)

We must not be ashamed of God's words. Look at Luke 9:26: "For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels." (See also Mark 8:38 and John 12:48).

But is there any difference between versions? Of course! Why do you think they pick and choose which Bible they quote in the first place? Look at just some of these Bible versions. Do they say the same thing?

King James Bible vs. Other Versions

Matthew 16:25

For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. (KJV)

Self-help is no help at all. Self-sacrifice is the way, my way, to finding yourself, your true self.  
The Message Bible (MSG)

Acts 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)

(Missing!)

New International Version (NIV)

Acts 3:26

4 Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities. (KJV)

To you first, God, having raised up His Servant Jesus, sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities.

New King James Version (NKJV)

Romans 12:3

...but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. (KJV)

...The only accurate way to understand ourselves is by what God is and by what he does for us...  
(MSG)

Ephesians 4:6

One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. (KJV)

God rules everything and is everywhere and is in everything.

New Century Version (NCV)

Instead of trusting in man and his whim-of-the-day Bible version, trust only what God's people gave their lives to preserve: God's words in English, the King James Bible.

**Re: God's Method of Preserving the Scriptures, on: 2006/1/2 15:40**

Graftedbranch said:

AS to the "well grounded belief in God's ability to "preserve His Word" with no need of "restoration", Was not this also true 100 years, 200 years, 50 years prior to the publishing of the King James 1611 Bible? Where was the "preserved Word of God then?

Church History did not begin with the reformation. It began in the 1st century AD.

WAs not the very act of transation by the King James translators a "restoration"? They said, "we made a good translation better (Preface to the 1611 King James Bible).

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

This is a long read, but addresses the long history of the Received Text (The Textus Receptus).

#### **GOD'S METHOD OF PRESERVING THE SCRIPTURES**

In selecting Hebrew and Koine (koinh = common or everyday) Greek for the languages in which He would originally give the Bible, God revealed His wisdom, foreknowledge and power. Both of these tongues became "dead languages" within several hundred years after each respective canon was established. By this, the words became "frozen in time". None of the words or their meanings could change. They were, as Latin, dead languages from which one cannot subtract or add. In contrast, English is a living language and as such new words are constantly being added and old words remain in a state of flux. Their meanings may change or take on new or different connotations.

In Old Testament days, the Levitical priests copied and preserved the Living Words of God. Throughout Scripture, the scribes were of the tribe of Levi (Mal.2:7; Deu.31:25; Deu.17:18). Ezra the priest was also "the ready scribe" of Israel (Ezr.7:1-11). This method of preserving the text was extremely successful as the Lord Jesus bore witness that not "one jot or tittle" had been altered in the 1500 years from Moses to His day.

As to the accuracy of the Hebrew Old Testament in our day, Bishop Kennicott did a study of 581 manuscripts of the Old Testament which involved 280,000,000 letters. Out of that 80,000,000, there were 900,000 variants. Although seemingly large to the reader, it is only one variant in 316 letters which is only 1/3 of 1%. But there is more. Of those 900,000 variants, 750,000 pertain to spelling - whether the letter should be an "i" or "u". This has to do with vowel points for the purpose of pronunciation which were added c.600 A.D. by a group of Jewish scribes known as the Masoretes. Thus we are left with only 150,000 variants in 280,000,000 letters or only one variant in 1580 letters, a degree of accuracy of .0006 (six ten thousandths). Indeed, most of those variants are found in only a few manuscripts; in fact, mostly in just one corrupted copy.

The Dead Sea Scrolls of Isaiah agree with the Hebrew Masoretic Text (the Hebrew Old Testament with the vowel points added to aid in pronunciation). The earliest extant Masoretic Text is dated c.900 A.D. Almost no changes have occurred in the Book of Isaiah. Isaiah 53, for example, contains only one word of three letters which is in doubt after nearly eleven hundred years of copying. In a chapter of 166 words, only 17 were different - 10 were spelling, 4 were conjunctions.

Actually, the Masoretic Text is the true text, not the Dead Sea Scrolls, even though the Scrolls are more than a thousand years older. The Dead Sea material was not written by Jews who were given the charge by God to protect them. They were not of the tribe of Levi. They were Essenes, a Jewish cult of ascetics whose teachings were rife with heresies.

Similarly, the Septuagint manuscripts exhibit considerable significant differences among themselves and disagree with the Hebrew Masoretic Text in many places. Both cannot be correct. As the Hebrew Masoretic text is the inerrant, infallible Word of God - the Septuagint should be seen as spurious and rejected. We cannot even be certain that the LXX which we have extant today (c.350 A.D.) is a faithful reproduction of the c.260 B.C. original (if such an early translation actually ever existed in the first place).

But in the New Covenant, all become priests through the new birth in Christ Jesus. As in the Old Covenant, God gave the New Testament text into the hands of the priesthood of believers, both laymen and elders. The early Christians copied, wrote and preserved it. Most of the early Christians were not wealthy. They often wrote on paper which would be comparable to that of a daily newspaper. Most were not trained scholars or scribes, but they copied with fear in their hearts. They knew that God had warned four times that there would be a curse on anyone who added, subtracted or altered in any way the Word of God (Deu.4:2; Prov.30:5-6; Psalms 12:6-7; Rev.22:18-19). As believers, they would NEVER deliberately alter the Holy Scriptures for they would have believed in the curse that these verses proclaimed. The only persons who would deliberately change the true text would be blasphemers who did not believe the warnings. In context, these verses forewarn not so much of accidental miscopying but of willful alterations.

Although the New Testament scribes may have left out a "thee" or an "and" as they copied, they copied as carefully and meticulously as possible for they believed with all their hearts and souls that these were God breathed words. They had made a commitment to follow the Lord Jesus under great persecution from the emperors. Many of the scribes gave up their very lives as well as the lives of their whole families, keeping that commitment while being crucified, fed to the lions, etc. For modern scholars who sit comfortably in air conditioned surroundings to accuse these dedicated souls of deliberately altering the Scriptures is almost unforgivable. Poor writers, some may have been, but the high degree of accuracy found in their work is not present in those writings which are being put off on the church today as being the "oldest and most reliable" manuscripts.

-----  
A dialect of the Greek language that flourished from the time of Alexander the Great to the barbarian invasions which overtook the Roman Empire after the 4th century A.D. It was replaced by "Byzantine" Greek until 1453 at which time the "Modern" Greek stage superseded it. Koine is singularly the language of the N.T.

Rene Pache, Inspiration and Authority of Scripture, (Chicago, IL: Moody Bible Institute, 1969), pp. 189-190.

Floyd Nolen Jones, The Septuagint: A Critical Analysis, 3rd ed., rev. & enlarged, (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press, #2161, 1994). A spurious Greek Old Testament supposedly written for the library of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, 285-246 B.C. The story of its origin abounds in legend. It is often designated by LXX after the 70 translators reputed to have produced the translation.

#### WOLVES PARADING AS SHEEP

In Acts 20, Paul warned that wolves would come in amongst us and not spare the flock; that from among our own selves men would arise with perverse things to say drawing away disciples unto themselves. With tears in his eyes, Paul cautioned us to beware, and he did not cease issuing this warning day and night. Indeed, Jesus taught that there would be wolves coming into the flock of God in sheep's clothing (Mat.7). Such a wolf cannot be recognized easily. It looks like a sheep. Revelation 13 speaks of a false prophet with horns of a lamb but when he opens his mouth, he speaks with the voice of the dragon. So these wolves appear as sheep in order to deceive and to devour.

The church at large is inattentive and dulled to these warnings. We tend to think because someone has been to the seminary, has on a white collar with robe, holds his hands in a pious manner with a devout look upon his face, says he is a minister, perhaps speaks in tongues, and says nice things about Jesus, that he is a man of God.

Even demons say nice things about Jesus. The first demonic person encountered by Jesus in the Book of Mark was at the synagogue (church). The demon possessed person said, "I know who you are. You are the Holy One of God." He spoke well of Jesus but did not speak the whole truth.

Jesus is Jehovah God - the Creator - come in the flesh! The demon did not give forth the full import as to Jesus' personage, but he did say something nice about Him. Today we get lulled to sleep with people who say some nice things about Jesus. But both Jesus and Paul said beware for there are

wolves in sheep's clothing. Today these wolves are in the flock as preachers, scholars, seminary professors, teachers etc. and they are attacking the Word of God while the unsuspecting sheep graze on unaware.

#### NOT AN "AD HOMINEM"

In order to fully expose the wickedness of these wolves within the flock of God, we shall have to review the story of the 1881 revision and contrast it to that of the 1611 King James translation. It is quite a story and in order to disclose it, we shall have to examine the lives and beliefs of some of the men involved. As a result, some might say that our thesis is an "ad hominem" and therefore not valid, for it draws on emotions and feelings - that it is a personal attack upon the men involved. Such is not the case. We have not erected any "straw men" to attack. Rather our account is that of an expos , an expos  which will reveal that the Church has, for centuries, been intimidated into following the scholarship of brilliant - yet habitually unregenerate - men.

However, no unsaved person can teach us ANYTHING about the Bible that we really need to know. They may be brilliant scholars of Greek and/or Hebrew. They may be able to explain how to conjugate Greek and Hebrew verbs, but they cannot explain or clarify Scriptural context because they do not know. They may know all about Assyriology, Egyptology, Astronomy, the History of Babylon, the archaeology of Israel, etc., but such information is not really necessary to the understanding of the Holy Writ. The Scripture is a fully self contained revelation. Were other data necessary to its comprehension God would have included it in The Word.

With reference to these bold assessments, the Scripture proclaims that the natural (unregenerate) man cannot receive the things of God ... "nor can he know them" (I Cor.2:9-14). Ephesians 4:18 says that their "understanding has been darkened". Romans 1:28 teaches that they have reprobate and depraved minds. Matthew 13:14-15 says that they hear with their ears, but they do not hear with their understanding and their hearts. Despite their scholarship and their brilliance, they do not see and hear - they cannot perceive. However, the Christian by virtue of the new birth may have his perception opened by revelation from the Living God.

This is thus not an ad hominem. We need to understand that the men who have led us into today's position have been, for the most part, lost and godless (albeit "religious and devout") and that we are blindly following their erroneous logic of textual criticism.

Continued part 8

Continued:

#### THE GREEK STRONGHOLD

FOR THE PAST SEVERAL DECADES MOST CONSERVATIVE FUNDAMENTAL BIBLE COLLEGES AND SEMINARIES HAVE BEEN PERPETUATING A SIGNIFICANT WEAKENING OF THE FAITH OF THEIR STUDENTS WITH REGARD TO THE INERRANCY OF THE SCRIPTURES. THE RESULT IS THAT TODAY MOST CHURCH PULPITS ARE NOW FILLED BY THESE STUDENTS WHO HAVE SINCE BECOME PASTORS. THE SCENARIO IS SIMILAR AND FAMILIAR ALMOST NO MATTER WHERE ONE GOES. AS THE YOUNG IMPRESSIONABLE MAN OF GOD ENROLLS FOR STUDY AND PREPARATION TO BECOME A PASTOR, HE IS SOON INFORMED THAT THE NEW TESTAMENT WAS WRITTEN IN GREEK. CONSEQUENTLY THE STUDENT EVENTUALLY FINDS HIMSELF ENROLLED IN A FIRST YEAR GREEK COURSE.

The moment the student enters the class, a peculiar phenomenon occurs. Not yet knowing Greek, he immediately finds himself placed at a great disadvantage. What is the effect upon him from the spiritual standpoint?

Very soon, the professor will subjugate the young man under his authority - not merely as an older man or as a teacher, but with regard to all spiritual matters by virtue of his knowledge of the Greek language. The clear impression that is conveyed toward the student is "You don't have the Word of God. It is written in Greek. You just don't know the 'Holy' language. I do." So at the onset, the student is placed in submission under a teacher who may or may not love the Lord or believe in the verbal inspiration and preservation of the Scriptures.

Having been thus subjugated to a Greek scholar, further adverse ramifications will follow shortly. The mind tends to accept as fact that the student never knows as much as his teachers. If he did, most teachers would soon convince him to the contrary. We tend to elevate teachers to a high intellectual pedestal, and many teachers assist us in so doing. In the mind of the learner, his Greek or Hebrew professor usually remains a spiritual authority and the professor feels likewise.

Being subjugated to a Greek faculty, the young impressionable student is unaware of what is transpiring. The final authority for his life is no longer the Holy Scriptures which brought him to the Lord and set his soul on fire. Final authority has become the Greek lexicons and his Greek professor, the scholar, rather than the Word of God and the Holy Spirit. This is accomplished by subtly convincing the inexperienced student that he doesn't have the Word of God at his disposal. He soon begins to wonder if it even exists.

The real issue here is that of authority. Authority is the controversy of the universe. If the Bible is not really the infallible Word of God, then what is final authority? Is it the Greek/Hebrew instructor? "Mother Church"? the Pope? the head of one's denomination? one's local preacher or Bible teacher? Thus someone has placed himself between the laity and God by virtue of his knowledge of Greek. The church at large is being told: "You laymen simply do not know the language and therefore cannot understand God or doctrine as we who know Greek and/or Hebrew."

This is the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, found in Revelation chapter 2; a doctrine which Jesus Christ says He hates. The term "Nicolaitan" was originally applied to a group of people who plagued the first century church by its pretensions to having divine authority. Although some have speculated that it could have referred to a group named after the early deacon, Nicolas of Antioch (Acts 6:5), there exists no reliable record of such a cult. The name itself comes from the Greek words "Nikao" ("to conquer" or "overcome") and "laos" ("people", especially in context here of the laity, the laymen). Thus, we have a clergy priest class taking authority over and dominating the people, the laymen.

The Roman Catholic Church in particular has exercised such a practice for years. One of the means by which Rome has accomplished this unbiblical dominion has been that of continuing to use the Latin language - a language which laymen no longer understand - during the conducting of the various ceremonies, especially mass.

Today most Protestant Churches and their seminaries are guilty of the same sin and, again, the means is that of language. When the laity attend church and/or Bible studies, they hear preachers and teachers say "The ORIGINAL Greek says" or "Your Bible may say thus and so, but the ORIGINAL Greek says something different." As mentioned previously, this is occurring at the seminary where the professor affirms "You just don't know the language."



Continued part 9

Continued (The Greek Stronghold)

Gradually something happens in the heart and mind of the student. He wonders "how do I know that I am reading that which the LORD actually inspired and gave through the prophets, apostles and other men of God? After all, most of the preachers, teachers and the commentaries are saying 'but the original Greek says'."

Some seeking to circumvent the problem may reply - "Well, the final authority is Jesus, only Jesus." The problem with such a statement is that Jesus has not physically shown up at anyone's home for nearly two thousand years and audibly said what He meant (Mat.24:23-27). It sounds very spiritual to say that Jesus is the final authority. After all, He is - and thus the statement is "true truth". But what many people mean by such an affirmation is that since no one alive today has spoken to the Lord Jesus physically and heard Him reply audibly, if the Bible is not the Word of God - then there is no final authority on the earth. Again, the real issue at stake is that of final authority.

And so, again, we say, would God inspire a text and then allow it to become lost? Would He not preserve it as He promised so many times? And if He preserved it would He not keep it in the hands of His followers for their use and instruction? Would He only preserve it within jars in caves and the like or in the obscure inner recesses of the vast library of a harlot church, having been lost there for centuries? Are we to understand His promises to preserve the Word as being fulfilled in such a context - really?

Today most seminary instructors ridicule or play down the King James translation to the student at the onset by statements such as "The original Greek says this or that. The King James is really not so bad but of course we have learned a lot since it was written", etc. Amazingly, we have been blinded in believing that we know more about Greek today than people did four hundred years ago. But is that a reasonable position? Does not all logic, common sense and experience tell us the farther one goes from the original source, that less will be certain?

So after the student's confidence in the King James Bible has been totally diminished, he is informed that the original Bible was given in Hebrew and Greek and that the original was inspired. The learner is then reminded that all he has is a translation and as such, it is not inspired. After a little more time in the class during which the teacher continues harping on the originals, suddenly the student is informed "There are no originals! We don't have an original.

Continued part 10

Continued (The Greek Stronghold):

We don't have a single first century document of the Bible." This is devastating to the faith of the young inexperienced would-be man of God. He has been told that the King James isn't the faithful Word of God; that the originals were the only true, accurate, authentic Word; and then informed that there are no original manuscripts of either the Old or the New Testament.

This is soon accentuated by introducing the student to the "variant

readings" between the existing Greek MSS (we shall discuss this subject later). How can the young pastor now face his congregation and say, "Almighty God says", or "thus saith the Lord". His faith in God's Word has been demasculated by such wicked faculties. The man of God who cannot quote Scripture with an assured "thus saith the Lord" is but a shorn Samson, not yet aware that the Philistines have already had their way with him. Young men with hearts on fire for God walk into the classroom and a Greek scholar belittles the Word of God and destroys their faith in the Bible. These same professors then incredulously tell us "Despite all the changes we have made in translation recently, not one single basic doctrine has been altered in any way."

But they have! By their tactics, they have altered two of the most important doctrines of all. They have altered the crucial doctrine of "preservation" to that of "restoration" - and most text critics do not believe that such restoration is even any longer possible. Moreover the fall out from this places another of the most basic doctrines under attack, the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the text. Consequently, in so doing, they have destroyed the faith of many such that they no longer are certain that they have God's Word in their hands. The teacher has perpetuated that which happened to him years before when he was the student. The evil cycle is now complete. We have turned full circle to a different pope.

Again, we are being asked to believe in the inspiration of Scripture without believing in the preservation of the sacred Writ. We are being taught at nearly all the conservative fundamental seminaries that God gave an inspired text but could not (or did not) quite protect or preserve it. As a result, part was lost somewhere along the way and text critics are supposedly engaged in the arduous process of restoring to the world the original readings. Whereas that which follows may at times seem somewhat complicated, the only question the inquiring reader need ask himself is: "Is it reasonable that God gave man His pure infallible Word and then allowed it to become so corrupted over time that He (we) was left to call and rely upon unregenerate men to restore it?" One can but wonder how a believing Christian scholar, pastor, or layman could allow himself to become so deceived as to fall into the snare of considering only the "originals" to be trustworthy. Most assuredly, their faith did not begin there. God "lost" portions of His Word? Was not that rather awkward of Him?

Continued Part 11

Christ tells us, in His own words, 3 times in the Gospels, as reported by Matthew, Mark & Luke:

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

Matthew 24:35; Mark 13:31; & Luke 21:33

The original text, God's word, has indeed been preserved. It is the text that was used by the early Church, all the way though the 17 th Century until Westcott & Hort decided to change it all.

Hort's statement that none of the church Fathers before 350 quoted the T.T. is simply not true. As mentioned, even Origen occasionally cited and adopted purely Syrian readings. For example, Dr. E.F. Hills states that in John 1-14 which is covered by Papyri 66 and 75, fifty-two times the Syrian

reading stands alone as to the text and Origen agreed with twenty of them. This may be quickly verified by merely scanning Tischendorf's critical apparatus. Thus, the oft stated assertion of the critics that Origen knew nothing of the Byzantine text is simply untenable. On the contrary, these statistics demonstrate that Origen was not only familiar with the Byzantine text, he frequently adopted its readings in preference to those of the "Western" and "Alexandrian" texts. Hills goes on to report that seven of these same twenty occur in Papyri 66 and/or 75 (circa 200 A.D.).

Although Hort accused the Traditional Text as having late readings, hence it must be a "late text", his own research revealed otherwise. In his "Notes on Select Readings" which appears as an appendix in his Introduction, Hort discussed about 240 instances of variation among the manuscripts of the Gospels. In only about twenty of these was he willing to characterize the Byzantine reading as "late". Thus, by Hort's own admission, only around ten per cent of the Byzantine readings were supposedly late. Scholars today offer even less.

#### **PAPYRI (c.200 A.D.) SUPPORTS THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS**

The papyri (around 200 A.D.), which dates 150 years before Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, support the Textus Receptus readings. This may come as somewhat of a shock to those familiar with the problem of textual criticism, as most have been informed that the early papyri are listed as Alexandrian or Western. True, nevertheless the Chester Beatty and Bodmer Papyri, even though placed in those families, have many renderings which are strictly Syrian - strictly Textus Receptus. After a thorough study of P46, Gunther Zuntz concluded: "A number of Byzantine readings, most of them genuine, which previously were discarded as 'late', are anticipated by P46". Having several years earlier already acknowledged that with regard to the Byzantine New Testament "Most of its readings existed in the second century", Colwell noted Zuntz's remark and concurred. Many of these readings had been considered to be "late readings", but the papyri testify that they date back at least to the second century!

In his recent book, the late (d.1989) Harry A. Sturz surveyed "all the available papyri" to determine how many papyrus-supported "Byzantine" readings were extant. In deciding which readings were "distinctively Byzantine", Dr. Sturz states that he made a conscious effort to "err on the conservative side" and thus his list is shorter than it could have been. Sturz lists 150 Byzantine readings which, though not supported by the early Alexandrian and Western uncials, are present in the bulk of later manuscripts and by the early papyri. Sturz lists a further 170 additional Byzantine readings which also read differently from the A-B text but are supported by Western manuscripts. These are also supported in the ancient papyri. This support may seem minimal, but nothing can diminish the fact that the total number of papyri citations favor the so-called "late" Byzantine readings against their rivals in the two lists by two to one. Sturz demonstrates papyri support for a total of 839 readings which in varying degrees would be classified as Byzantine. This forever dismantles Hort's theory that the Byzantine text was created as an official compromise text during the 4th-century by combining readings from earlier text-types.

Hills declared that the Chester Beatty readings vindicate "distinctive Syrian readings" twenty-six times in the Gospels, eight times in the Book of Acts, and thirty-one times in Paul's Epistles. Hills goes on to state that Papyrus Bodmer II (Papyri 66) confirms 13% of the so-called "late"

Syrian readings (18 out of 138). To properly appreciate this one must consider the fact that only about thirty percent of the New Testament has any papyri support, and much of that thirty percent has only one papyrus. Thus this is seen as a major confirmation to the antiquity of the text of the Traditional Text in direct contradiction to the theory previously outlined in which the Syrian readings were said by Westcott and Hort to be fourth and fifth century. May we not reasonably project that subsequent discoveries of papyri will give similar support to readings now only extant in Byzantine text?

A most telling fact concerning the papyri is that several of them have texts of Revelation (P-47 for example). How does the destructive critic explain the fact that Vaticanus (written c.350) does not include the Book of Revelation whereas the 1611 Authorized Version (written nearly 1260 years later) contains this book? Can one reasonably explain how Erasmus' "late" manuscripts contained an entire book missing in the "pure, neutral Vatican" text? How did Erasmus know that the book of Revelation should be in the canon when the "oldest and best" manuscript did not contain it?

---

Hills, The King James Version Defended, op. cit., p. 172.

Edward F. Hills, The King James Version Defended, 1st ed., op. cit., p. 73. The page of this reference has changed in Dr. Hills' later editions and to date I have not been able to locate it in his 1984 publication. All other references to this work of Hills within this publication except that on page 20 is to his 1984 4th edition.

Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 55.

Colwell, What is the Best New Testament?, op. cit., p. 70.

Colwell, "The Origin of Texttypes of New Testament Manuscripts", op. cit., p. 132.

Harry A. Sturz, The Byzantine Text-Type And New Testament Textual Criticism (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1984), pp. 61-62, 145-159. For many years Chairman of the Greek Department (contra the dust cover of his book) at Biola University, Dr. Sturz studied New Testament textual criticism with E.C. Colwell. This work is a slightly revised version of his doctoral dissertation at Grace Theological Seminary. Dr. Sturz passed away 26 April, 1989. Dr. Theodore P. Letis, who was literally tutored privately at the feet of Hills, states in a 7-20-88 critique of Sturz's book that Hills was the first text critic to use the papyri to vindicate Burgon's argument that the Byzantine text reached back well before the 4th-century. Letis relates that while a doctoral student under E.C. Colwell at the University of Chicago in 1942, Hills proposed a dissertation topic which - had it been accepted - would have accomplished that which Sturz set out to do 25 years earlier. The proposal was refused, hence Hills wrote his dissertation on another topic.

Moorman, When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text, op. cit., p. 2.

John William Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to

S. Mark, (Ann Arbor, MI: The Sovereign Grace Book Club, 1959), p. 50. This is a reprint of Burgon's 1871 work containing an Introduction by Dr. Edward F. Hills from pages 17-72.

Ibid., p. 54.

Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, op. cit., p. 77.

[illegible]

1. Is it meaningful, then (Biblical Inerrancy)? If inerrancy applies to the original manuscripts, and we don't have those manuscripts, what use is the idea of inerrancy to us?

## 2. Is defending the gospel the same as defending scriptural inerrancy?

Stever's response to the above questions:

Westcott & Hort and other textual "critics" after they have found fault with the preserved text, the Textus Receptus (the Authorized Version). The character of these two men (Westcott & Hort) is never brought up- both men did not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, in Biblical Miracles, etc. What could be expected but for these two men to try and find a text that agreed with their pre-conceived beliefs? Neither one of these men believed what Christ actually said: 35. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. (Matthew 24:35)"

The following is from the the book "Which Version is the Bible":

Which Version is the Bible? Ã“  
Copyright 1995 Â• Floyd Jones Ministries, Inc.

All Rights Reserved. This book may be freely reproduced in any form as long as it is not distributed for any material gain or profit; however, this book may not be published without written permission.

Published by: Bible For Today Press  
900 Park Avenue

## I. PRESERVATION OR RESTORATION?

## THE KEY ISSUE - PRESERVATION

Gentle reader, may the LORD grant you patience and grace to perceive the issue which will be unfolded before you to the end that you may be grounded and established.

Even in fundamental circles the issue relating to the various modern translations of the Bible is controversial. It is not merely the question of "inspiration". The crux is that of preservation. Has God preserved His Word perfect for us today, or was it only perfect in the "original" autographs? If God has not preserved His Word perfectly, we must assume that we are preaching and teaching from a book that is not completely reliable as the "original" autographs are no longer accessible.

If we believe that the Bible is still the inerrant Word of God, we must then deal with the problem of determining which version is the true Word of the Living God. Logic dictates that two opposing statements cannot both be true (we reject the Hegelian Dialectic). Therefore, two contradicting "Bibles" cannot both be the inerrant Word of God. This author proclaims from the

outset that the "King James" or "Authorized Version" is the Word of God translated into the English language to the extent that it is the final authority in all matters of conduct and faith. Furthermore, as the modern translations since 1881 often differ from the King James Bible in wording as well as doctrine, and since two conflicting texts cannot be infallible, perfect and inerrant, the reader must of necessity make a choice. That which follows is intended to assist the seeker to clearly discern the truth of the matter for himself.

Moreover, that which follows is not intended to be an intellectual treatise. The uncompromising stand is taken herein that God gave us His pure Word in the original autographs, and that He has preserved it in its pure form unto this day - and will continue so doing forever. Indeed, preservation is the only issue separating the Biblicist from other professing Christians; yet, the traditional viewpoint has always been that God not only gave mankind His pure Word but that He also assumed the oversight of its preservation as well. Over the years, this position has deteriorated and the contemporary view is that God has not protected the Scriptures, that they are not available in a pure form, and that this necessitates their recovery by reconstructing them from the manuscripts which have survived to this day.

-----

Floyd Nolen Jones, A Chronology of the Old Testament: A Return to the Hebrew Text, (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press, #2427, 1993), p. 6. The following definition is adapted from the preceding which is the author's Ph.D. dissertation. By "Biblicist", this author does not merely refer to a fundamentalist or a Biblical scholar as many dictionaries so define. By it, much more is intended. The word connotes one who, while taking both the immediate and the remote context into account, interprets and believes the Word of God literally. This necessitates that the person so designated has chosen to believe God's many promises that, despite all textual criticism objections to the contrary, he would forever preserve His infallible Word. Moreover, the meaning intended to be conveyed by this word carries with it the concept that such a person trusts that the Hebrew and Greek Textus Receptus (the Authorized Bible) which is today at his disposal is a fulfillment of those promises. Sadly, even among the pastors and seminary professors, most of today's conservative evangelical Christians do not qualify to bear this appellation which many in the not too distant past bore, counting the cost while enduring the shame.

Part 2  
Continued:

But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.

Many Christians have been taken captive by the devil concerning the Bible manuscripts. As will be revealed, the questions regarding the reliability

and authenticity of the Word of God are neither foolish nor unlearned. The ultimate purpose in all of this is to restore - to meekly instruct those who are either in error or simply do not understand the issue with regard to the various translations, in order to bring them to the truth:

That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ:  
(Eph.4:14-15)

So that everybody may grow up - we are attempting to assist in that process but in so doing some things have to be said which may seem hurtful for the moment. It is not our intent to do so.

#### THE ISSUE - JUST WHAT IS AT STAKE?

God teaches us that the purpose of Scripture is to lead us to Christ and then to guide our lives (John 5:39-40). God did not give the Scriptures for the purpose of scholarly intellectual exercise. Yet that is what they are being used for by many. This is one of the major problems plaguing the Church today. As we enter this study, we need to consider carefully the following questions:

1. Would God inspire a text and then allow it to become lost?

Within our diverse denominational backgrounds are found various confessions of faith. These statements of faith concerning the Holy Scriptures, particularly within conservative evangelical backgrounds, always say something to the effect that we believe that God gave the original Scriptures inerrant. We profess to believe in the originals, that they were divinely inspired by God - God breathed. Now we say that, intending it as a statement of faith, but we shall soon come to see that it is in reality a statement of unbelief! This study is designed to bring us to grips with this issue. But first, the second question:

2. If God did inspire a text, would He not preserve it?

The New Testament was written in Greek whereas the Old Testament was mostly authored in Hebrew. It may surprise many to learn that there are no original manuscripts of the Bible available today. The Old Testament scribes destroyed the scrolls upon which Scripture was written as they became worn, and "dog eared" from so much handling. When they copied out a new one, they destroyed the old so that the earliest Old Testament manuscript now in existence is dated about 900 A.D. This is called the Hebrew Masoretic Text. It was the earliest witness to the text of the O.T. that we possessed until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls which contain some parts of the Old Testament, especially Isaiah. Likewise, We possess no "original" New Testament manuscripts - none of the "autographs" which the apostles wrote have been preserved. This brings us to the third question.

3. Could we expect counterfeits of the originals to be in circulation?

Is there someone who has always hated God's Word, wanted to destroy it, and has attempted to cloud man's mind and heart about its validity? In other words, as we read the Bible, is there any evidence that somebody has founded a "Yea, has God said" society? According to Genesis 3:1, Bible corruption began with Satan. Satan is the original Bible revisor. When he confronted Eve in the garden, he added to God's Word, he subtracted, he diluted and

finally substituted his own doctrine for that which God had said. We find this occurring today. People are trying to add books to the Old and subtract words from the New Testament. Nothing has changed. We need to understand that the devil is promoting this continuing attack on the Word of God.

Continued Part 3  
Continued:

#### THE ORIGINAL "AUTOGRAPHS" AND "PRESERVATION"

We are expected to believe in the "INSPIRATION" without believing in the "PRESERVATION" of the Scriptures. We are being asked to believe in the inspiration of the "originals" without believing in the preservation of the text of the Scriptures. It is a statement of unbelief when we say that we only believe that the original autographs were inspired. What we really are saying is that we do not believe that we have the infallible Word of God on this planet, or at least in our hands, at this moment. Let us consider that statement scripturally:

14But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; 15And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 16All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works (II Tim.3:14-17).

Here God tells us His purposes in giving us the Scriptures: "... for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Do we actually believe that God allowed them to become lost after giving them? If so, how could He use them to accomplish these purposes?

Now we know that we do not have an original. The question is has God preserved His Word - the original text - although not the original piece of paper or vellum on which it may have been written?

The observant reader will note that in the above cited verses given through Paul to Timothy no reference is being made with regard to the "ORIGINAL" Scriptures. Look at verse 15. Paul says to Timothy, "from a child you have known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make you wise unto salvation." Paul is obviously not speaking of the "ORIGINAL" New Testament Scripture. Second Timothy was penned about A.D. 65. Further, Timothy was old enough to join Paul and Silas c.53 A.D. (Acts 16:1-4). Thus, when Timothy was a child, there was no New Testament collection of Scripture anywhere. Nor was Paul speaking of the "ORIGINALS" of the Old Testament for there was not an original Old Testament piece of paper or vellum extant at that time. Wrestle with this! Come to grips with it! These are the verses upon which many of us base our faith and say we believe in the "ORIGINALS". Yet these very verses are not speaking of the original manuscripts!

But are the copies inspired? The Bible itself clearly teaches that faithful copies of the originals are also inspired. The word "Scripture" in II Timothy 3:16-17 is translated from the Greek word "graphÃ©" (graphV). GraphÃ© occurs 51 times in the Greek New Testament and at every occurrence it means "Scripture" - in fact, it usually refers to the Old Testament text.

A perusal of the N.T. reveals that the Lord Jesus read from the "graphÃ©" in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luk.4:21) as did Paul in the synagogue at



Thessalonica (Acts 17:2). The Ethiopian eunuch, returning home from worshipping at Jerusalem, was riding in his chariot and reading a passage of graphÃ© (Acts 8:32-33). These were not the autographs that they were reading; they were copies - moreover, copies of copies! Yet the Word of God calls them graphÃ© - and every graphÃ© is "given by inspiration of God" (II Tim.3:16). Thus, the Holy Writ has testified and that testimony is that faithful copies of the originals are themselves inspired. Selah!

Therefore, it all comes down to a promise given by God - that He would preserve the text which He gave us. Timothy never saw an original when he was a child of either the Old or New Testament, yet in verse 16 God says that what Timothy learned as a child was given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Now if God were talking about something which had been lost and/or is no longer true and accurate, why did He give verse 17?

-----  
Peter S. Ruckman, The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence, (Pensacola, FL: Pensacola Bible Press, 1970), p. 29.

Edward W. Goodrick, Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God, (Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1988), pp. 61-62.

Continued Part 4  
Continued:

WHAT DOES GOD HIMSELF PROMISE CONCERNING THE SCRIPTURES?:  
Let us examine some verses where God has promised both to give and protect His Word.

"Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten my word to perform it." (Jeremiah 1:12)

Here God says He is watching over His Word to perform it - to make all that He has said come to pass.

Jesus said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." (Mark 13:31)

God did not promise to keep the original piece of material upon which His words were given. He says His Words SHALL NOT PASS AWAY. Therefore, this promise demands that we still have them on planet earth.

Jesus also says, "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mark 8:38)

Why this verse if God has not preserved His Word?

"But the word of the Lord endureth forever." (I Pet.1:25)

This is a direct quote of Isaiah 40:8. God has said that His Word will endure forever! He did not promise that the original piece of paper, rock

or vellum would exist forever but that He would preserve the Word - forever.

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever." (Isaiah 40:8)

".. for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." (Psalm 138:2)

Look at that! God says He has magnified His Word above His name! That is incredible for supposedly THE name was so sacred to the Jews that they did not even pronounce it.

Jesus said "... and the Scripture cannot be broken." (John 10:35)

Thus, on the basis of God's many promises we declare and proclaim to you that we have in our hands the absolutely infallible inerrant Living Word of Almighty God - that God has promised to keep His Word as revealed through these Scriptures. But there is more!

"The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shall keep them, O Lord, thou shall preserve them from this generation forever." (Psa.12:6, 7)

This is a promise from God! Christian, do you believe it? He says He will preserve it. He did not just promise to give the originals pure and free from error - He promised to preserve the text forever!

"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John 12:48)

Since God's Word will judge us, are we to believe that God will judge us by something which He meticulously gave us and then lost along the way? Would it be just and fair of God to judge us with these words if they are no longer trustworthy - to hold us accountable when our guide is not 100 percent reliable?

In Matthew 5:18, Jesus said not "one jot or one tittle" shall change in the Word of God. Specifically, He was speaking of the Old Testament. We are being taught today that perhaps the Old Testament is not true, that it is full of contradictions, scribal errors, etc., but Jesus said that it was true and unerring - even to the smallest detail - and He was not referring to the originals, but to copies of copies of copies.

"Do you not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:45-47)

Was Jesus speaking of the "originals"? No, for they did not have the originals. They had copies of copies of copies of the originals yet Jesus said "not one jot or one tittle" had been changed. If God has only promised the "ORIGINALS" to be pure then Jesus erred in His assessment of the Scriptures. Should these statements of Jesus concerning the Scriptures be inaccurate then He is not Lord, no longer all knowing, no longer all God.

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (John 5:39-40)

The ultimate purpose of the Scriptures is to lead us to Christ - and then to guide our lives. If the Scriptures are not accurate, if they have been changed or altered, if they have been lost so that we no longer have the Word of God, how can we come to Christ for they are the Holy Spirit's implement to testify of the Lord Jesus.

As set forth in the preceding paragraphs, we have Scripturally demonstrated that faith in the preservation of the text is a basic Bible doctrine. Furthermore, the context of these many promises is not that God's Word is to be preserved in a jar somewhere in a cave or desert, lost for hundreds of years waiting to be found and restored to the believing remnant of the Church. The context is very clear in Second Timothy 3:16-17 that the inspired Word was given by God as a deposit to the Body of Christ "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works".

Therefore, for God to accomplish this stated purpose for His having given us His Word - it must remain accessible to the disciples of the Lord, Christ Jesus!

God bless,

Stever

**Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/2 16:31**

Quote:

-----As the Hebrew Masoretic text is  
the inerrant, infallible Word of God - the Septuagint should be seen as spurious and rejected  
-----

Did not both the Apostles and the Lord Himself quote the Septuagint as scripture and authoritative?

And did not the very translators of the 1611 King James version in their preface to the readers argue for their translation by appealing to the Septuagint as follows?

"But, when the fulness of time drew near, that the Sun of righteousness, the Son of God should come into the world, whom God ordained to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood, not of the Jew only, but also of the Greek, yea, of all them that were scattered abroad; then lo, it pleased the Lord to stir up the spirit of a Greek Prince (Greek for descent and language) even of Ptolemy Philadelphus King of Egypt, to procure the translating of the Book of God out of Hebrew into Greek. This is the translation of the Seventy Interpreters, commonly so called, which prepared the way for our Saviour among the Gentiles by written preaching, as Saint John Baptist did among the Jews by vocal. For the Grecians being desirous of learning, were not wont to suffer books of worth to lie moulding in Kings' libraries, but had many of their servants, ready scribes, to copy them out, and so they were dispersed and made common. Again, the Greek tongue was well known and made familiar to most inhabitants in Asia, by reason of the conquest that there the Grecians had made, as also by the Colonies, which thither they had sent. For the same causes also it was well understood in many places of Europe, yea, and of Africa too. Therefore the word of God being set forth in Greek, becometh hereby like a candle set upon a candlestick, which giveth light to all that are in the house, or like a proclamation sounded forth in the market place, which most men presently take knowledge of; and therefore that language was fittest to contain the Scriptures, both for the first Preachers of the Gospel to appeal unto for witness, and for the learners also of those times to make search and trial by. It is certain, that that Translation was not so sound and so perfect, but it needed in many places correction; and who had been so sufficient for this work as the Apostles or Apostolic men? Yet it seemed good to the holy Ghost and to them, to take that which they found, (the same being for the greatest part true and sufficient) rather than making a new, in that new world and green age of the Church, to expose themselves to many exceptions and cavillations, as though they made a Translation to serve their own turn, and therefore bearing a witness to themselves, their witness not to be regarded. "

Graftedbranch

Graftedbranch

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 17:02**

Steve's continued response to Gro\_Frog:

The King James versus the NIV- which one has the Word of God, and which has the word of man?

Psalms 12:6-7 (KJV) The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

Psalms 12:6-7 (NIV) And the words of the LORD are flawless, like silver refined in a furnace of clay, purified seven times. 7 O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever.

Can you see how the meaning is completely corrupted by this supposed improved "Bible".  
God has a warning to anyone who would dare change His Word.

Revelation 22:18-19 (KJV) For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

Revelation 22:18-19 (NIV) I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds anything to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book. 19 And if anyone takes words away from this book of prophecy, God will take away from him his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this book.

Please note, they (NIV) change "book of life" to "tree of life" (what part would we even have in the tree of life?), then they confuse the last part of the verse, by dropping "and" and running the verse together, it is weakened. The warning is weakened. This is what the NIV is all about. It corrupts, omits, weakens and changes God's inspired word.

A. The Deity of Christ is Clearly Attacked by the NIV.

1. By changing "God" to "He" they remove the fact that Jesus is God. This is done in the NASV also:

1 Timothy 3:16 (KJV) And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

1 Timothy 3:16 (NIV) Beyond all question, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body, was vindicated by the Spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the nations, was believed on in the world, was taken up in glory.

2. By changing "Christ" to "God" they deny that Jesus is God.

Romans 14:10 (KJV) But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand and before the judgment seat of Christ.

Romans 14:12 (KJV) So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

Romans 14:10 (NIV) You, then, why do you judge your brother? Or why do you look down on your brother? For we will all stand before God's judgment seat.

Romans 14:12 (NIV) So then, each of us will give an account of himself to God.

3. They change "Son of God" to "Son of Man", who gave them the right to call Jesus a liar?

John 9:35 (KJV) Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God?

John 9:35 (NIV) Jesus heard that they had thrown him out, and when he found him, he said, "Do you believe in the Son of Man?"

4. In Matthew 9:18, Matthew 20:20, and Mark 5:6 "Worshipped" and "Worshipping" is changed to "knelt down". This removes the due respect of our Saviour.

5. Jesus is eternal, He did not have an origin.

Micah 5:2 (KJV) But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

Micah 5:2 (NIV) "But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times."

6. Again, Jesus is eternal, He is the beginning and ending.

Revelation 1:8 (KJV) I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

Revelation 1:8 (NIV) "I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, "who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty."

7. The NIV omits the first part of the verse, and leaves out the name Jesus, who is called the Son of God by these devils.

Matthew 8:29 (KJV) And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?

Matthew 8:29 (NIV) "What do you want with us, Son of God?" they shouted. "Have you come here to torture us before the appointed time?"

8. NIV leaves out Jesus.

Matthew 16:20 (KJV) Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.

Matthew 16:20 (NIV) Then he warned his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ.

9. They omit Christ and add man - this is wrong!

John 4:42 (KJV) And said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

John 4:42 (NIV) They said to the woman, "We no longer believe just because of what you said; now we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this man really is the Savior of the world."

10. Where did this name for God come from "One" - this is the New Age universal god - "the One".

John 6:69 (KJV) And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

John 6:69 (NIV) We believe and know that you are the Holy One of God."

11. NIV Omits Jesus Christ.

1 Corinthians 16:22 (KJV) If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.

1 Corinthians 16:22 (NIV) If anyone does not love the Lord--a curse be on him. Come, O Lord !

12. NIV omits by Jesus Christ.

Ephesians 3:9 (KJV) And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:

Ephesians 3:9 (NIV) and to make plain to everyone the administration of this mystery, which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things.

13. When did God cease to be wise?

1 Timothy 1:17 (KJV) Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

1 Timothy 1:17 (NIV) Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

14. Omits by himself.

Hebrews 1:3 (KJV) Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;

Hebrews 1:3 (NIV) The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven.

15. The NIV attacks the priestly order of Jesus!

Hebrews 7:21 (KJV) (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord swore and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:)

Hebrews 7:21 (NIV) but he became a priest with an oath when God said to him: "The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind: 'You are a priest forever.'"

16. The NIV changes Lucifer's name to "morning star."

This shows how insidious the NIV corruption is. Remember that this is one of the blessed titles given to our Lord Jesus in (Revelation 22:16). Here they provide confusion between who Satan is and who Jesus is. One thing is for sure, Satan is not the bright and morning star, but the wicked evil deceptive one, who was called before his fall, "Lucifer".

Isaiah 14:12 (KJV) How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! Isaiah 14:15 (KJV) Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.

Isaiah 14:12 (NIV) How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations! Isaiah 14:15 (NIV) But you are brought down to the grave, to the depths of the pit.

Note: At least 70 times, the NIV omits GOD! \* Jesus - 15; Christ - 25; Lord - 16; God - 13.

\*Somebody must not like Jesus, Christ, Lord, and God.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Is this an eye opened to anyone, other than me? Is this "translation" of the Bible (the NIV) disgusting only to me? REvelation 2:7 tells us "7. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the TREE OF LIFE, which is in the midst of the paradise of God."

The above "work" was started with the revision committee in 1888 when they finished their work, and continues a lightening speed today with all of the newer editions ad nauseum. The NIV above is only one example of the corruption that exists in the newer versions.

God bless,

Stever

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 17:16**

Stever's continued, continued response to Gro\_Frog:

THE VIRGIN BIRTH

1. The NIV removes "firstborn" - thus putting into question the virgin birth!

Matthew 1:25 (KJV) And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.

Matthew 1:25 (NIV) But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son. And he gave him the name Jesus.

2. The NIV changes "Joseph" to "the child's father" - questioning the virgin birth!

Luke 2:33 (KJV) And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

Luke 2:33 (NIV) The child's father and mother marveled at what was said about him.

3. The NIV changes "Joseph and his mother" to "his parents" which attacks the virgin birth.

Luke 2:43 (KJV) And when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and Joseph and his mother knew not of it.

Luke 2:43 (NIV) After the Feast was over, while his parents were returning home, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusa

lem, but they were unaware of it.

4. The NIV changes "only begotten of the Father" to "One and Only" which is a New Age title for some cosmic god.  
John 1:14 (KJV) 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.

John 1:14 (NIV) The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.

5. Notice the NIV omits "Christ" and "is come in the flesh". This is important to us who are saved.

1 John 4:3 (KJV) And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

1 John 4:3 (NIV) but every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist, which you have heard is coming and even now is already in the world.

#### THE ATONING DEATH OF CHRIST

1. The NIV Omits over half of the verse.

Matthew 27:35 (KJV) And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

Matthew 27:35 (NIV) When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots.

2. The NIV removes the verse (even the Catholic Bible has this verse).

Mark 15:28 (KJV) And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.

Mark 15:28 (NIV)

3. They omit "they struck him on the face", this weakens the fulfillment of Isaiah 50:6 "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting".

Luke 22:64 (KJV) And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee?

Luke 22:64 (NIV) They blindfolded him and demanded, "Prophecy! Who hit you?"

4. The NIV omits the BLOOD and question the Deity of Christ in these verses.

Colossians 1:14-15 (KJV) In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: 15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

Colossians 1:14-15 (NIV) in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. 15 He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.

#### THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

1. This Omission attacks both the Virgin Birth and Resurrection of our Lord. Without the resurrection, we have not hope of eternal life.

Acts 2:30 (KJV) Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;

Acts 2:30 (NIV) But he was a prophet and knew that God had promised him on oath that he would place one of his descendants on his throne.

2. The NIV omits "of the dead".

This brings in question the power of God in resurrection. Many cultists teach that Jesus was not raised in a physical body. The "New Bibles" give these false doctrines aid and comfort.

Acts 24:15 (KJV) And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.

Acts 24:15 (NIV) and I have the same hope in God as these men, that there will be a resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked.

3. The NIV omits "him that liveth for ever and ever". Jesus said "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." Revelation 1:18

Revelation 5:14 (KJV) And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.

Revelation 5:14 (NIV) The four living creatures said, "Amen," and the elders fell down and worshiped.  
Satan hates the resurrection of Christ, and will do anything he can to fight it.

4. They delete the truth that our Lord has a body; this is taught by the modernist, and cults of our day. When Jesus is seen as not having a BODY, He is seen without a resurrection.

Ephesians 5:30 (KJV) For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

Ephesians 5:30 (NIV) for we are members of his body.

#### THE ASCENSION OF CHRIST

1. They leave out "I go to the Father" this attacks the all important doctrine of the ascension of Christ. If Jesus did not resurrect and if He did not ascend back to the Father, then we have no hope of salvation and we have no hope of the second coming.

John 16:16 (KJV) A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.

John 16:16 (NIV) "In a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me."

2. They leave out "is the Lord", Jesus is Lord to the Glory of God the Father.

1 Corinthians 15:47 (KJV) The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.

1 Corinthians 15:47 (NIV) The first man was of the dust of the earth, the second man from heaven.

#### THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

The Devil hates all three of the Godhead. Many references to names of God are attacked.

1. Who gave the translators the authority to change God's name? Jeremiah spoke about so called "Prophets", "which think to cause my people to forget my name" (Jeremiah 23:27).

Exodus 6:3 (KJV) And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.

Exodus 6:3 (NIV) I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob as God Almighty, but by my name the LORD I did not make myself known to them.

Genesis 22:14 (KJV) And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovahjireh: as it is said to this day, In the mount of the LORD it shall be seen.

Genesis 22:14 (NIV) So Abraham called that place The LORD Will Provide. And to this day it is said, "On the mountain of the LORD it will be provided."

2. It is apparent that the NIV does not like to use the blessed name Jehovah, why? Is this to accommodate the New Age crowd?

For anyone to alter the name of our God is ungodly and out of Hell. (Of course they don't like HELL either, study on).

Exodus 17:15 (KJV) And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovahnissi:

Exodus 17:15 (NIV) Moses built an altar and called it The LORD is my Banner.

3. In the NIV study bible I am using, I cannot find one time they use the name Jehovah, why? What is wrong with the blessed name of God? It is the Hebrew.

Isaiah 12:2 (KJV) Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid: for the LORD JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation.

Isaiah 12:2 (NIV) Surely God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid. The LORD, the LORD, is my strength and my song; he has become my salvation."

#### THESE VERSES TEACHING THE TRINITY

Exodus 3:14 (KJV) And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.

Exodus 3:14 (NIV) God said to Moses, "I AM WHO I AM. This is what you are to say to the Israelites: 'I AM has sent me to you.'"

5. The NIV removes the word Godhead which is a direct reference to the Trinity.

Most every cult I know of hates the Trinity, can a person be saved and deny this great doctrine? in 1 John 2:22 "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." We have already seen how that the deity of Christ is attacked, the Fatherhood of God, and we will see how the person of the Holy Spirit is attacked.



Romans 1:20 (KJV) For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

Romans 1:20 (NIV) For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--his eternal power and divine nature--have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

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

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

Acts 17:29 (KJV) Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.

Acts 17:29 (NIV) "Therefore since we are God's offspring, we should not think that the divine being is like gold or silver or stone--an image made by man's design and skill.

6. They put part of verse 8 and call it verse 7. This is corrupt and evil.

1 John 5:7-8 (KJV) For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

1 John 5:7-8 (NIV) For there are three that testify: 8 the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement. There is no greater verse in all the Bible to teach the doctrine of the Trinity than (1 John 5:7), yet the modern versions omit it, and textual criticism has a heyday with this verse. Yet this verse is found in "The old Syriac A.D. 170, old Latin A.D. 200, Vulgate: 4th and 5th century, Italian 4th and 5th century". Also many church fathers quoted this and it is found in "Liber Apologetic A.D. 350, Council of Carthage A.D. 415." THE IDEA THAT THE TRUE WORD OF GOD WAS LOST FOR 1800 YEARS, AND THEN FOUND BY OUR CATHOLIC FRIENDS, IS AN INSULT TO GOD ALMIGHTY AND HIS ABILITY TO PRESERVE HIS WORD.

THE HOLY GHOST CHANGED ...

Acts 8:18 (KJV) And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money,

Acts 8:18 (NIV) When Simon saw that the Spirit was given at the laying on of the apostles' hands, he offered them money

Romans 15:19 (KJV) Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.

Romans 15:19 (NIV) by the power of signs and miracles, through the power of the Spirit. So from Jerusalem all the way around to Illyricum, I have fully proclaimed the gospel of Christ.

John 7:39 (KJV) (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)

John 7:39 (NIV) By this he meant the Spirit, whom those who believed in him were later to receive. Up to that time the Spirit had not been given, since Jesus had not yet been glorified.

We can see that they don't like "Spirit of God" or "Holy Ghost", why? Because Satan wants to weaken the Trinity.

8. Looks like they could at least translate this Holy Spirit, but this unholy day hates the Holy things of God.

Acts 6:3 (KJV) Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.

Acts 6:3 (NIV) Brothers, choose seven men from among you who are known to be full of the Spirit and wisdom. We will turn this responsibility over to them.

1 Corinthians 2:13 (KJV) Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

1 Corinthians 2:13 (NIV) This is what we speak, not in words taught us by human wisdom but in words taught by the Spirit, expressing spiritual truths in spiritual words.

9. Again it's meaning is changed.

Romans 8:15 (KJV) For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.

Romans 8:15 (NIV) For you did not receive a spirit that makes you a slave again to fear, but you received the Spirit of sonship. And by him we cry, "Abba, Father."

10. The truth is questioned !?!

Acts 11:17 (KJV) Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?

Acts 11:17 (NIV) So if God gave them the same gift as he gave us, who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I to t

think that I could oppose God?"

11. There is a great deal of difference between weakness and infirmity. Infirmity happens because of outside influences, but weakness speaks of one's character. Our Lord was entirely without sin.

Hebrews 5:2 (KJV) Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity.

Hebrews 5:2 (NIV) He is able to deal gently with those who are ignorant and are going astray, since he himself is subject to weakness.

12. Questions Deity !!

Revelation 1:13 (KJV) And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, ...

Revelation 1:13 (NIV) and among the lampstands was someone "like a son of man," ...

Revelation 14:14 (KJV) And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, ...

Revelation 14:14 (NIV) I looked, and there before me was a white cloud, and seated on the cloud was one "like a son of man" ...

Daniel 3:25 (KJV) He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.

Daniel 3:25 (NIV) He said, "Look! I see four men walking around in the fire, unbound and unharmed, and the fourth looks like a son of the gods."

#### THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION BY FAITH.

The NIV attacks this most important doctrine. Satan surely doesn't want anybody saved by grace.

1. The Word of God is our authority for salvation and to defeat Satan.

Luke 4:4 (KJV) And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.

Luke 4:4 (NIV) Jesus answered, "It is written: 'Man does not live on bread alone.'"

2. They omit repentance, Satan hates real heart felt, Holy Ghost inspired repentance.

Matthew 9:13 (KJV) But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

Matthew 9:13 (NIV) But go and learn what this means: 'I desire mercy, not sacrifice.' For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners."

3. They remove the need for the heart to be converted by simply removing the heart.

Matthew 12:35 (KJV) A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things.

Matthew 12:35 (NIV) The good man brings good things out of the good stored up in him, and the evil man brings evil things out of the evil stored up in him.

4. In John 3, the great chapter on the New Birth, the NIV does much damage to the doctrine of salvation by faith in the Son of God.

a. They leave out "which is in heaven" which takes from the Lord's deity.

John 3:13 (KJV) And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.

John 3:13 (NIV) No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven--the Son of Man.

b. They leave out "should not perish" the reference to hell.

John 3:15 (KJV) That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.

John 3:15 (NIV) that everyone who believes in him may have eternal life.

c. They remove the sonship of the believer - John 1:12.

John 3:16 (KJV) For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, ...

John 3:16 (NIV) "For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, ...

d. They just keep on changing, and changing, and changing.

John 3:36 (KJV) He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

John 3:36 (NIV) Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, but whoever rejects the Son will not see life, for God's wrath remains on him."

5. The new birth is changed to a process where you are nurtured into the kingdom. The question, What Kingdom?  
John 1:12 (KJV) But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his  
John 1:12 (NIV) Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God--

6. The doctrine of Salvation by grace through faith could never be clearer than in Romans. Look what the NIV does:  
Romans 11:6 (KJV) And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.  
Romans 11:6 (NIV) And if by grace, then it is no longer by works; if it were, grace would no longer be grace.

7. The NIV does not stand on the great doctrine of salvation by grace through faith.  
The translators were out of "works" backgrounds. The NIV staff was quoted as saying, "A Christian never 'IS' but always 'IS BECOMING'". Notice how they take God's grace out of your heart.  
Colossians 3:16 (KJV) ... with grace in your hearts to the Lord.  
Colossians 3:16 (NIV) ... with gratitude in your hearts to God.

8. Salvation is not a sure thing in the NIV, but rather a process. Notice the change in this verse.  
2 Corinthians 7:10 (KJV) For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death.  
2 Corinthians 7:10 (NIV) Godly sorrow brings repentance that leads to salvation and leaves no regret, but worldly sorrow brings death.

9. This omission reveals the blatant design of Satan through the new bibles. No where can you find a more blessed verse than Acts 8:37, that teaches salvation is without baptism or works, and the NIV omits it altogether.  
Acts 8:36-37 (KJV) And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? 37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.  
Acts 8:36-37 (NIV) As they traveled along the road, they came to some water and the eunuch said, "Look, here is water. Why shouldn't I be baptized?" 37

10. Another shocking omission is found in Mark 6:11, this verse teaches the serious result of rejecting Christ.  
Mark 6:11 (KJV) And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city.  
Mark 6:11 (NIV) And if any place will not welcome you or listen to you, shake the dust off your feet when you leave, as a testimony against them."

11. You will find in the NIV that salvation is a matter of obeying and not believing.  
Romans 11:32 (KJV) For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.  
Romans 11:32 (NIV) For God has bound all men over to disobedience so that he may have mercy on them all.  
Hebrews 3:18 (KJV) And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not?  
Hebrews 3:18 (NIV) And to whom did God swear that they would never enter his rest if not to those who disobeyed?  
Hebrews 4:6 (KJV) Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief:  
Hebrews 4:6 (NIV) It still remains that some will enter that rest, and those who formerly had the gospel preached to them did not go in, because of their disobedience.  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

IF YOU HAVE MADE IT THIS FAR, CAN YOU HONESTLY SAY THAT THERE IS REALLY NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE NEWER VERSIONS AND THE KING JAMES BIBLE?

God bless,

Stever

Re:, on: 2006/1/2 17:30

Stever's continued, continued, continued response to Gro\_Frog:

#### Two Lines of Battle

We have today many new revised Bibles on the market which differ from the King James 1611 authorized Bible. Beginning with the Westcott-Hort resurrection of the old Roman Catholic / Alexander, a manuscript back in the 1880's, we continue to see new revised versions on the market, but these are not revisions of the received text, but rather resurrections of a faulty Greek text that began with Origen and has been protected and promoted by the church of Rome. It is no wonder why many ministries who are so soft on Roman Catholicism are soft on this Bible issue. Lets go back and trace the "Two Lines of Battle" AND YOU MUST, AS A BELIEVER, GET ON ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER. You must decide on what Joshua said, "as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." I make no claims of being a Greek scholar, yet before you disregard this important issue, at least study it out, determine for yourself if we can believe the Bible is God's Word. Now it can not be both ways, if the Catholic, New Age centered, modernist Bible is true; then we should disregard our King James Bible, which came from the received text. But if the King James Bible is the Word of God then the other versions that deny the virgin birth, sinless life, blood atonement, resurrection, ascension, and second coming of our Lord; are wrong and a work of the enemy.

#### I. The Forming of These Two Battle Lines.

##### A. The true scriptures, where did they come from?

How did we arrive at the canon of scriptures? Five general tests were used for this:

1. Authorship, who wrote them.
2. Local church acceptance, did the early church read and practice them?
3. Subject matter, what did the book teach? Was it a contradiction of accepted scripture?
4. Personal edification, did the book move the reader to a personal faith in Christ?
5. The most important determination was if the book was verbally inspired by the Holy Spirit. we must believe that if God moved to inspire the writers, He also moved to collect and preserve His true Word. All of the New Testament was written in Greek and as soon as the real thing was given, Satan began his work of corrupting God's Word. The men God used to write the New Testament were:
  - a. Matthew - author of Matthew.
  - b. Mark - author of Mark.
  - c. Luke - author of Luke and Acts.
  - d. John - author of John, 1st, 2nd, 3rd John and Revelation.
  - e. James - author of James.
  - f. Jude - author of Jude.
  - g. Peter - author of 1st and 2nd Peter.
  - h. Paul - author of the fourteen remaining books.

##### B. Where did the corruption begin?

1. In the Garden of Eden - (Genesis 3) Satan questions God's Word, denies God's Word, God's Word is added to and Satan changes the Word of God.
2. In the temptation of Jesus, (Matthew 4) we see Satan using the first revised version ever, the S.O.V. (Satan's Own Version). You will remember that Jesus turns back the temptation of Satan by quoting the Word of God. Satan figures he will get involved in the act, so he quotes also; but he likes the NIV, he leaves out part of the verse. (Matthew 4:6) "and saith unto him, if thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, he shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou shalt dash thy foot against a stone." Satan quotes Psalm 91:11-12, but he leaves out part of the verse, the part that says, "to keep thee in all thy ways." Satan loves to corrupt God's Word for his own purpose.
3. The school at Alexander Egypt, this was the place where east and west meet together. The Greek Septuagint was translated here around 280 BC This was a translation from the Hebrew to the Greek, yet it has the strong influence of the Alexandrian School. The modernist, Catholic and New Agers still use this for the basis of the new Bibles. We must now look at the primary characters in this Alexandrian movement, because all new translations have their roots here.
  - a. In 4 BC Askoka, the emperor of India, sent Buddhist missionaries to Egypt. These men were to infiltrate and influence thought of the day.
  - b. Philo (20 BC- AD 42) He taught that the scriptures held and occult or hidden meaning. He also expressed contempt for the literal truth of God's Word. We must note that both Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort were great followers of Philo. He

advocated that all religions be under state control and for this to begin at birth. Philo embraced Gnosticism which was greatly fought by the apostles.

c. Clement of Alexandria. Clement started a school at Alexandria in 200 A.D. which propagandized false doctrines. Clement was a disciple of Titan, who came from Rome to Palestine and embraced Gnostic heresy.

Clement mixed Christianity with pagan philosophy. He collected and promoted all the outstanding heretical teachers works.

d. Origen, was the most famous student of Clement. he would do more to set the line for false doctrine than anyone else. Jerome was greatly influenced by him as well as Westcott and Hort. He followed the Gnostic's heresy and Plato's errors and went into new areas of false teaching. Origen taught that the soul existed from eternity and that after death, it migrated to another life form. Sounds like New Age to me. He believed the devils would be saved. Of course, a book could be written on the heresy of Origen.

e. Jerome, was the man that Constantine called upon to translate the Bible into Latin, this would be the Latin Vulgate. In 312 A.D., the Roman emperor embraced the Christian religion, after he saw a cross in the sky. This began the Roman Catholic system and their many errors. Constantine wanted to merge pagan religions and Christianity, so he wanted a Bible that would have the New Age favor. Already, in 251 A.D. the sound, Bible believing churches had withdrawn from the coming Catholic church. These true believers kept and preserved the Word of God. when Jerome sought a Greek text, he chose the Origen, Alexandrian influenced text. The church of Rome has preserved these so called "better manuscripts" and they then produced them so the Bible revision could be possible.

## II. THE FIGHT OF THESE TWO BATTLE LINES

From 312 A.D. until now, this battle has raged. Let's follow these two lines. On one side, the Majority text, also called the Received text. On the other side, the Vaticanus, which came from the Gnostics at Alexandria Egypt.

A. The church of Rome will carry out a war on the textus receptus from day one.

1. A.D. 416 - established infant baptism.

2. A.D. 451 - adopted mariolatry.

3. A.D. 680 - sixth council meet to condemn heresy, or to condemn Bible Believing churches.

4. A.D. 787 - image worship.

5. A.D. 869 - split Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic, with Rome now teaching; no salvation aside from the church, the sale of indulgences, and purgatory.

6. A.D. 1123 - celibacy of priest.

7. A.D. 1215 - transubstantiation, which teaches that the priest has the power to change the host (communion wafer) to the Holy Eucharist (which is the very body, blood and divinity of Christ).

8. A.D. 1229 - forbidden to have or read the Bible.

9. All through these years, we have what is called the dark ages, produced by a monster who is out of control, the Harlot of (Revelation 17). When the Bible reaches the hands of the people, then the dark age gives way to the reformation.

## WE SEE GOD PRESERVING HIS WORD DURING THE DARK AGES

1. The early Syrian Church at Antioch, where the Bible was translated into Syrian about 150 A.D. They used the received text.

2. The Waldenses in Northern Italy, these great believers were hated and butchered by the Roman Catholic system, yet they managed to preserve their Bible, which follows the received text. The Italian (Itala) was preferred by Augustine, which came from the Waldenses.

3. The Gallic Christian in early France, were massacred by the heathen in A.D. 177, yet they sent the records, not to Rome, but to Asia Minor. These gallant believers carried the Gospel to England and Europe. They had the true Word of God from the received text, which the King James was translated from. In the fourth century, Helvius, who was a Waldensian scholar, accused Jerome of using a corrupt Greek manuscript. If there had not been true text at that time, how could these charges have been made? Three famous church fathers, Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose were accused of uniting together to promote a corrupt Bible that has been promoted by the Roman church ever since. The Waldensian made the way for Luther and the Reformation. The translators of our beloved King James translation, referred to an Italian translation produced by the Waldensian scholar, Giovanni Diodati.

## III. THE FURTHERANCE OF THESE TWO LINES.

A. The Alexandrian text is the foundation for the great whore of Revelation 17 & 18.

1. The Papacy promoted this corrupt bible to hold their people in darkness, this was called the Dark Ages (476 A.D. to 1

453 A.D.) and then the reformation began.

2. The Latin Vulgate of Jerome became the book of the Catholic clergy for over one thousand years. Just until recently, they did the mass in Latin, a dead language.

#### B. THE RECEIVED TEXT IS THE FOUNDATION FOR THE REFORMATION

Let's trace the reformation:

1. Wycliff - translated the Bible in English 200 years before the birth of Luther. He used the Vulgate and it contains many errors. The reformation lingered for over 200 years. Wycliff is called the morning star of the reformation.

2. Erasmus, was the great scholar produced by the revival in knowledge that followed the Dark Ages. This man traveled Europe and studied the Greek manuscripts. This beloved scholar produced the Greek New Testament, printed in 1516. Erasmus held a conviction that God only wrote one Bible. Erasmus is hated by those who hate the received text.

3. Tyndale, William Tyndale translated the Greek Bible of Erasmus into English. The great quote of Tyndale is, "if God spare my life, ere many years, I will cause a boy that driveth a plough shall know more of the Scriptures than thou doest." He was burned at the stake but not before he had set England on the path of being the world leader of spiritual blessing.

4. Martin Luther - born November 10, 1483 in Eisleben Germany. He was ordained in 1507 in the Augustinian order. He was greatly disturbed by the abuses, corruption and luxury of the Roman Church. It was when Luther was crawling up the "judgment steps" that God's Spirit spoke to him, "the just shall live by faith"! The cry of the reformation was "sola fide" or justification by faith, and "sola scripture", only the scriptures for authority of faith and practice. On October 31, 1517, Luther posted his ninety-five theses on the door of the Castle church in Wittenberg. In 1520, he was excommunicated by Leo X, this led to a public debate called "the diet at worms". Here Luther refused to recant unless convinced by the scriptures. Luther said he would stand alone on God's Word. Luther translated the Bible into German and he used the received text for his translation.

#### C. ROME'S REACTION - LETS CONSIDER HOW ROME MOVED TO COUNTERACT THE REFORMATION.

1. Ignatius Loyola, who founded the Jesuit Order in 1521 A.D. This man was a Spaniard who was a soldier fighting to drive the Mohammedans out of Spain. He was wounded and so he turned his energy to the church. The Jesuits were founded to be the order that would strive to capture the centers of learning and to oppose Bible believing Christianity. These priests were required to take an oath of blind obedience to the church. They are taught to use any method available to complete their task. The Jesuits guided both the inquisition and the index. The inquisition had originated in the thirteenth century to combat the Albigenses. Only God knows how many hundreds of thousands died slow tortured deaths by the means of the inquisition. The "index" was the banned list of books that faithful were prohibited from reading. We must note that the Greek text given by Erasmus, which our King James 1611, was translated from, was on this index. I, for one, would have made sure I read anything on the index of Rome.

2. The Catholic Council of Trent (1545-1563) a. This council was dominated by the Jesuits. b. This council made four condemnations.

1. Condemned the idea that the scriptures contain everything necessary for salvation.

2. Condemned the rejection of the apocryphal books as being part of the Canon of scriptures.

3. Condemned the study of the scriptures in the original languages. Condemned the teaching that there were errors in the Vulgate (this was the Latin Bible produced by Jerome).

4. Condemned the idea that the scriptures were plain and that they could be understood without commentary, with only the help of the Holy Spirit. Beloved, and organization that hates the Bible this much, how could we find ourselves using a Bible produced and preserved by this harlot religious system that has taken untold millions to Hell down through the years.

3. The Jesuit Bible of 1582 - remember that Tyndale's version had won great acceptance in England. The Tyndale version was from the Received text, the same that the King James would be translated from. The church of Rome brought the Jesuit bible of 1582 to try to dissolve the moving of God in England. The Jesuit Bible intended to do on the inside what the great Navy of Philip II, was to do on the outside. The one moral attack, the other a physical attack. God raised up the great Puritan scholar, Thomas Cartwright to dismantle this corrupt Jesuit Bible, it was soundly rejected by all. Meanwhile, 136 Spanish galleons were sailing up the English Channel to retake England for the Pope. England with only 30 man-of-war ships and harbor tugs, sailed against this greatest navy ever assembled up unto this time. God granted a great victory and the Armada was crushed. This enabled England to become a sea power and also to become the first great mission sending nation in the world. This is why I love history, you cannot miss seeing the Hand of God. This great victory paved the way for King James, who had succeeded Elizabeth, to authorize the production of the king James 1611 version, called, "The Miracle of English Prose".

#### IV. The Fabulous King James Translation

#### A. TRANSLATIONS LEADING UP TO THE KING JAMES

1. Bede (674-735) translated part of the scriptures in the old English.
2. John Wycliffe (1320-1384) first man to completely translate the Bible into English, the sad note is that he used the Latin Vulgate of Jerome for this work.
3. William Tyndale, Tyndale's version (1525) his work was based on Erasmus' Greek text. He also used Luther's translation. This Bible was used mightily of God in England. Tyndale was martyred in 1536.
4. Miles Coverdale, Coverdale version (1535), was the first Bible printed in England.
5. John Rogers, Matthew's version (1537). Rogers used the name Thomas Matthew, to conceal his friendship to Tyndale. He was burned at the stake by the Catholic church, bloody Mary, in 1555.
6. The Great Bible, (1539), this work was authorized by Henry VIII, because of the controversial footnotes in the Tyndale and Coverdale translations. Due to its size it was called the Great Bible and because of its worth it was chained to a reading post within the church.
7. The Geneva Version (1557), translated by William Whittingham in Geneva. It was the first version to divide the text into verses. It omitted the Apocrypha. It was the Bible of Shakespeare and John Bunyan, and it was carried by the Pilgrims to America in 1620.
8. The Rheims - Douay Bible (1582) was the Bible of the Jesuits, to try to win England back to Rome. This was the NIV, RSV, NASV, etc. of that day.

#### **B. THE KING JAMES TRANSLATION.**

1. The Mandate began July 22, 1604. King James appointed 54 men to translate an authorized version.
2. The Men - the translators were the greatest scholars alive and their credentials are very impressive. In the book Which Bible, Terence H. Brown lists 47 of the 54 appointed by the King. Let us never forget that the translation of Westcott and Hort in 1870 was a closed door affair, where the corrupt Greek text was placed above the received text. Also, never forget that every "new" translation has followed Westcott and Hort in their modernist, new age teachings.
3. The Method - the translators were organized into six groups, two meeting at Westminster, two at Cambridge, and two at Oxford. Each scholar made his own translation, then passed it on to each member of his group, and after they had completed their assigned section, it was passed to all other groups. Thus it went through the hands of each of the translators.
4. The Manuscript - what did this cast of great, brilliant scholars choose for their Greek text? The Received text, along with the majority group. We must understand that nearly all of the old manuscripts agree; it is only a very few Greek manuscripts that line up with the RSV, NASV, NIV etc.
5. The Miracle, the King James 1611 authorized version became the greatest Bible ever translated. It has been behind a very great revival in History. The Wesley's, Whitfield's, and Spurgeon's all used this Bible with great success. In America, it produced the Great Awakening, under Jonathan Edwards, and the camp meeting movement. God's hand was on this work as no other Bible ever translated. Is there any question as to why Satan hates the King James 1611 Version? The Devil doesn't want people to have a Bible they can believe is without error.

#### **V. FAULTY REVISION OF 1870.**

- A. The Mandate - some wanted the old words updated and some minor changes. What they got was a subversive, false, Bible that would be the foundation of "textual criticism" which would lead to the self destruction of all the great denominations who used to be committed to the evangelism of the unsaved and the purity of God's people.
- B. The Manuscripts - they used the faulty Alexandrian Greek text preserved by the church of Rome. The two main texts used were the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus.
  1. The Codex Sinaiticus was discovered in 1844 at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai by the German (higher critic) Tischendorf. This text was in a waste basket waiting to be burned. Dean Burgon, great scholar of Oxford, in the 1840's. points out the fact that if these manuscripts had been considered useful to the early church, then they would have been both worn out and recopied for further study.
  2. The Codex Vaticanus - believed to have written around 330 A.D. It is funny that this text was not worn out by those early Christians, if this was the real thing. The Vaticanus was kept in the Vatican Library in Rome since 1481. It is not a complete Greek Text, missing are Philemon, Revelation and part of Hebrews. This is not counting the hundreds of changes from the Received Text. The Vatican conveniently allowed it to be used by Westcott and Hort in 1870 to complete this corruption of God's true Word.
- C. The Men of This Faulty Bible - the Bible says in (Romans 11:16) "For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy, so are the branches,". We could ask this question, what if the root is evil, doesn't that make the product of the branches evil and bad? This is the clear case of the two men most responsible for all the new Bible versions. When comparing the translators of the King James with the stooges who translated the Revised Version English (1881-1885), it is like comparing brain surgeons to podiatrists (foot doctors). I have never read anything good about Westcott and Hort, a whole book could easily be written to expose these men as rank liberals, extreme modernist, active new agers, and even satanic spiritualist. Both of these men were involved in Mary worship and they were disciples of Clement, Origen, and the like. In G.

A. Riplinger's book, *New Age Bible Versions*, the author provides mountains of documentation confirming that the root truly is evil. How strange it is to me that good Bible believing people would defend and follow these ungodly Apostate teachers. Never forget that the omissions and changes in all the new versions, did not happen by chance, but they have been planned and accomplished by the enemy of all men, Satan himself. Let's look briefly at the new revised translation and paraphrase.

1. Dr. Westcott, hated evangelicals and called them perverted. He was fascinated with Darwinism and practiced kneeling before an image of Mary, and believed in Mariolatry, and the mass. This man was an Anglican priest who was involved in the modern channeling movement. He founded the ghostly club or ghostly guild in the 1850's. This is Satanic and ungodly, yet this man is followed instead of the King James Bible.
2. Dr. Hort, also an Anglican priest who was a Roman Catholic stooge. He also was a rank liberal, a true modernist, and a new ager.
3. J. B. Phillips - who translated "The New Testament in Modern English", and "Phillips Translation". This man was involved in Necromancy (the communing with spirits). On several occasions after the death of C. S. Lewis, the supposed spirit of Lewis appeared to Phillips with a new age message, "I'm O.K., you're O.K., don't worry, be happy". Phillips was stricken with the inability to speak, write, or communicate in the summer of 1861. This has happened to several Bible revisers.
4. Kenneth Taylor, the Living Bible Paraphrase. This work follows Westcott and Hort with many ungodly liberties taken. Taylor even translated profanity into this funny book called by some a Bible. (1 Samuel 20:30) "You son of a \_\_\_\_\_!" he yelled at him". Time magazine, July 24, 1972 "mysteriously half way through the paraphrase, Taylor lost his voice and still speaks in a hoarse whisper." It is a dangerous thing to toy with God's blessed Word.
5. Philip Schaff - American Standard Version. Schaff was another rank liberal, modernist, and heavily involved in New Age teachings. The New American Standard Version and Living Bible, followed the work of Schaff. This infidel made over 30,000 changes from the King James in his revised Bible. He gathered a cast of fellow Bible haters and modernists to translate these new Bible versions. He even had a Unitarian layman active in this work. Schaff was the ringleader of the New Age gathering called, "The Parliament of World Religions". They brought the eastern religions and so called Protestants together with the message, "All in one. Man is Divine". This began the modernist movement in America back in the late 1800's.
6. Edwin H. Palmer - he served as the executive secretary of the NIV committee on Bible translation and as coordinator of all translation work on the NIV. He died on September 16, 1980, but not before he had laid the ground work for the NIV. Mr. Palmer was a liberal who questioned nearly every major doctrine. Palmer was the one who selected the cast of translators who produced the NIV.
7. Ronald Youngblood, quoted as saying, "The Bible is the words of men." How can a modernist be trusted to tell us what God's Word is?
8. Burton Goddard, quoted as saying, "There are mistakes in transmission" (the Bible is not trustworthy).
9. Dr. Frank Logsdon - who led the translation of the New American Standard Version. He now renounces the work he did in the NASV and said "I'm afraid I'm in trouble with the Lord." He now concludes that a faulty Greek manuscript was used in the new versions. He now believes that the KJV is absolutely correct.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

In closing:

KING JAMES

Matthew 6:9-13

9. After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.
10. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.
11. Give us this day our daily bread.
12. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.
13. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

NIV

9. "Therefore, this is how you should pray: 'Our Father in heaven, may your name be kept holy.
10. May your kingdom come. May your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.
11. Give us today our daily bread,
12. and forgive us our sins, as we have forgiven those who have sinned against us.
13. And never bring us into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.'

KING JAMES



Luke 11:2-4

2. And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.
3. Give us day by day our daily bread.
4. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

NIV

Luke 11:2-4

2. So he told them, "Whenever you pray you are to say, 'Father, may your name be kept holy. May your kingdom come.
3. Keep giving us every day our daily bread,
4. and forgive us our sins, as we forgive everyone who sins against us. And never bring us into temptation.'"

You must determine this day who you will serve- God or Mammon---Matthew 6:24 " 24. No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

Everyone must choose.  
God bless,

Stever

Re:, on: 2006/1/2 19:06

Quote:

Graftedbranc wrote:

Quote:

-----As the Hebrew Masoretic text is  
the inerrant, infallible Word of God - the Septuagint should be seen as spurious and rejected

Did not both the Apostles and the Lord Himself quote the Septuagint as scripture and authoritative?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

No, they did not. They quoted the Old Testament, written by the Jews. They were Jews, that spoke Ancient Hebrew. The Septuagint was not used by the Levites, or created by the Levites. The Levites were the only ones authorized by God to copy the Scrolls (the Old Testament).

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Grafted branch continues:

And did not the very translators of the 1611 King James version in their preface to the readers argue for their translation by appealing to the Septuagint as follows?:

"But, when the fulness of time drew near, that the Sun of righteousness, the Son of God should come into the world, whom God ordained to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood, not of the Jew only, but also of the Greek, yea, of all them that were scattered abroad; then lo, it pleased the Lord to stir up the spirit of a Greek Prince (Greek for descent and language) even of Ptolemy Philadelph King of Egypt, to procure the translating of the Book of God out of Hebrew into Greek. This is the translation of the Seventy Interpreters, commonly so called, which prepared the way for our Saviour among the Gentiles by written preaching, as Saint John Baptist did among the Jews by vocal. For the Grecians being desirous of learning, were not wont to suffer books of worth to lie moulding in Kings' libraries, but had many of their servants, ready scribes, to copy them out, and so they were dispersed and made common. Again, the Greek tongue was well known and made familiar to most inhabitants in Asia, by reason of the conquest that there the Grecians had made, as also by the Colonies, which thither they had sent. For the same causes also it was well understood in many places of Europe, yea, and of Africa too. Therefore the word of God being set forth in Greek, becometh hereby like a candle set upon a candlestick, which giveth light to all that are in the house, or like a proclamation sounded forth in the market place, which most men presently take knowledge of; and therefore that language was fittest to contain the Scriptures, both for the first Preachers of the Gospel to appeal unto for witness, and for the learners also of those times to make search and trial by. It is certain, that that Translation was not so sound and so perfect, but it needed in many places correction; and who had been so sufficient for this work as the Apostles or Apostolic men? Yet it seemed good to the holy Ghost and to them, to take that which they found, (the same being for the greatest part true and sufficient) rather than making a new, in that new world and green age of the Church, to expose themselves to many exceptions and cavillations, as though they made a Translations to serve their own turn, and therefore bearing a witness to themselves, their witness not to be regarded."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

They quoted History, but they did not use the Septuigent in their translation of the King James. They used the actual Hebrew, not the corrupted Greek as referred to here, when they translated the Jewish Old Testament into English.

Seventy Hebrew Scholars? What is that all about? Only the Levite had authority to touch the Scripture, ever.

Nice try, graftedbranch.

God bless,

Stever

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 19:48**

crsschk said:

That is not what you were proposing from this;

Quote:

-----  
I think that the entire issue boils down to one issue, and one issue only----Preservation or Restoration, what is it?

We have the conservatives that have a well founded belief that the King James provides the very Words of God and that God has providently preserved the Scriptures.

On the other side we have the liberals who deny the power of God to do any such thing, and therefore they have sided with Westcott & Hort and all of the other liberals and textural critics that want to "Restore" the Scriptures.

That is the bottom line. When those of us on the conservative side post various points on this issue, it is never responded to in detail by the liberals. They pick and choose their responses, and many times do not respond at all.

If we were all in the same room, face to face, perhaps it would be different. Each point should be countered by the other side, and documented.

For some reason that does not happen here.

-----  
This was the issue being addressed, not doctrine. And by making the issue one of conservatives vs. liberals by labeling them as such you are causing a division or at least are presenting one and find it really unnecessary. The irony here is just this;

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

This is the "Doctrine" that I was referring to. The King James is clear, the NIV distorts DOCTRINE AND THE SCRIPTURES:

(I posted this in response to a post by Grow\_frog)

Scripture Comparison

Let's consider some important doctrinal truths that are attacked by the NIV, as well as other newer versions that rely on the corrupt Alexandrian text. You should note that most of these omissions are found in the other new versions also, if you want to compare. The NIV even refutes the idea that the Bible is the preserved, inspired, Word of God. Note:

Psalms 12:6-7 (KJV) The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

Psalms 12:6-7 (NIV) And the words of the LORD are flawless, like silver refined in a furnace of clay, purified seven times. 7 O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever.

Can you see how the meaning is completely corrupted by this supposed improved "Bible". Dear friend, God has a warning to anyone who would dare change His Word.

Revelation 22:18-19 (KJV) For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

Revelation 22:18-19 (NIV) I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds anything to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book. 19 And if anyone takes words away from this book of prophecy, God will take away from him his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this book. You will note, they change book of life to tree of life (what part would we even have in the tree of life?), then they confuse the last part of the verse, by dropping "and" and running the verse together, it is weakened. The warning is weakened. This is what the NIV is all about. It corrupts, omits, weakens and changes God's inspired word. I pray that this study will be used of God to give you a conviction concerning the Word of God. I don't know where anything is improved or fortified in the NIV. Here is a good question. Why would you want to use a single shot 22, when the enemy is using a M-16? Not me! Give me a real rifle and the right ammo for the battle.

#### A. The Deity of Christ is Clearly Attacked.

1. By changing "God" to "He" they remove the fact that Jesus is God. This is done in the NASV also.

1 Timothy 3:16 (KJV) And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

1 Timothy 3:16 (NIV) Beyond all question, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body, was vindicated by the Spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the nations, was believed on in the world, was taken up in glory.

2. By changing "Christ" to "God" they deny that Jesus is God.

Romans 14:10 (KJV) But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. Romans 14:12 (KJV) So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

Romans 14:10 (NIV) You, then, why do you judge your brother? Or why do you look down on your brother? For we will all stand before God's judgment seat. Romans 14:12 (NIV) So then, each of us will give an account of himself to God.

3. They change "Son of God" to "Son of Man", who gave them the right to call Jesus a liar?

John 9:35 (KJV) Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God?

John 9:35 (NIV) Jesus heard that they had thrown him out, and when he found him, he said, "Do you believe in the Son of Man?"

4. In Matthew 9:18, Matthew 20:20, and Mark 5:6 "Worshipped" and "Worshipping" is changed to "knelt down". This removes the due respect of our Saviour.

5. Jesus is eternal, He did not have an origin.

Micah 5:2 (KJV) But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

Micah 5:2 (NIV) "But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times."

6. Again, Jesus is eternal, He is the beginning and ending.

Revelation 1:8 (KJV) I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

Revelation 1:8 (NIV) "I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, "who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty."

7. The NIV omits the first part of the verse, and leaves out the name Jesus, who is called the Son of God by these devils.

Matthew 8:29 (KJV) And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?

Matthew 8:29 (NIV) "What do you want with us, Son of God?" they shouted. "Have you come here to torture us before the appointed time?"

8. NIV leaves out Jesus.

Matthew 16:20 (KJV) Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.

Matthew 16:20 (NIV) Then he warned his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ.

9. They omit Christ and add man - this is wrong!

John 4:42 (KJV) And said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

John 4:42 (NIV) They said to the woman, "We no longer believe just because of what you said; now we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this man really is the Savior of the world."

10. Where did this name for God come from "One" - this is the New Age universal god - "the One".

John 6:69 (KJV) And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

John 6:69 (NIV) We believe and know that you are the Holy One of God."

11. NIV Omits Jesus Christ.

1 Corinthians 16:22 (KJV) If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.

1 Corinthians 16:22 (NIV) If anyone does not love the Lord--a curse be on him. Come, O Lord !

12. NIV omits by Jesus Christ.

Ephesians 3:9 (KJV) And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:

Ephesians 3:9 (NIV) and to make plain to everyone the administration of this mystery, which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things.

13. When did God cease to be wise?

1 Timothy 1:17 (KJV) Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

1 Timothy 1:17 (NIV) Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

14. Omits by himself.

Hebrews 1:3 (KJV) Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;

Hebrews 1:3 (NIV) The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven.

15. The NIV attacks the priestly order of Jesus!

Hebrews 7:21 (KJV) (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:) Hebrews 7:21 (NIV) but he became a priest with an oath when God said to him: "The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind: 'You are a priest forever.'"

16. The NIV changes Lucifer's name to "morning star."

This shows how insidious the NIV corruption is. Remember that this is one of the blessed titles given to our Lord Jesus in (Revelation 22:16). Here they provide confusion between who Satan is and who Jesus is. One thing is for sure, Satan is not the bright and morning star, but the wicked evil deceptive one, who was called before his fall, "Lucifer".

Isaiah 14:12 (KJV) How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! Isaiah 14:15 (KJV) Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.

Isaiah 14:12 (NIV) How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations! Isaiah 14:15 (NIV) But you are brought down to the grave, to the depths of the pit.

Note: At least 70 times, the NIV omits GOD! \* Jesus - 15; Christ - 25; Lord - 16; God - 13.

\*Somebody must not like Jesus, Christ, Lord, and God.

B. The Virgin Birth.

1. The NIV removes "firstborn" - questions the virgin birth!

Matthew 1:25 (KJV) And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.

Matthew 1:25 (NIV) But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son. And he gave him the name Jesus.

2. The NIV changes "Joseph" to "the child's father" - questioning the virgin birth!

Luke 2:33 (KJV) And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

Luke 2:33 (NIV) The child's father and mother marveled at what was said about him.

3. The NIV changes "Joseph and his mother" to "his parents" which attacks the virgin birth.

Luke 2:43 (KJV) And when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and Joseph and his mother knew not of it.

Luke 2:43 (NIV) After the Feast was over, while his parents were returning home, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem, but they were unaware of it.

4. The NIV changes "only begotten of the Father" to "One and Only" which is a New Age title for some cosmic god.

John 1:14 (KJV) 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.

John 1:14 (NIV) The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.

5. Notice the NIV omits "Christ" and "is come in the flesh". This is important to us who are saved.

1 John 4:3 (KJV) And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

1 John 4:3 (NIV) but every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist, which you have heard is coming and even now is already in the world.

#### C. The Atoning Death of Christ.

1. The NIV Omits over half of the verse.

Matthew 27:35 (KJV) And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

Matthew 27:35 (NIV) When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots.

2. The NIV removes the verse (even the Catholic Bible has this verse).

Mark 15:28 (KJV) And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.

Mark 15:28 (NIV)

3. They omit "they struck him on the face", this weakens the fulfillment of Isaiah 50:6 "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting".

Luke 22:64 (KJV) And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee?

Luke 22:64 (NIV) They blindfolded him and demanded, "Prophecy! Who hit you?"

4. The NIV omits the BLOOD and question the Deity of Christ in these verses.

Colossians 1:14-15 (KJV) In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: 15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

Colossians 1:14-15 (NIV) in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. 15 He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.

#### D. The Resurrection of Christ.

1. This Omission attacks both the Virgin Birth and Resurrection of our Lord. Without the resurrection, we have not hope of eternal life.

Acts 2:30 (KJV) Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;

Acts 2:30 (NIV) But he was a prophet and knew that God had promised him on oath that he would place one of his descendants on his throne.

2. The NIV omits "of the dead".

This brings in question the power of God in resurrection. Many cultists teach that Jesus was not raised in a physical body. The "New Bibles" give these false doctrines aid and comfort.

Acts 24:15 (KJV) And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.

Acts 24:15 (NIV) and I have the same hope in God as these men, that there will be a resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked.

3. The NIV omits "him that liveth for ever and ever". Jesus said "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." Revelation 1:18  
Revelation 5:14 (KJV) And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.

Revelation 5:14 (NIV) The four living creatures said, "Amen," and the elders fell down and worshiped.  
Satan hates the resurrection of Christ, and will do anything he can to fight it.

4. They delete the truth that our Lord has a body; this is taught by the modernist, and cults of our day. When Jesus is seen as not having a BODY, He is seen without a resurrection.

Ephesians 5:30 (KJV) For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.  
Ephesians 5:30 (NIV) for we are members of his body.

E. The Ascension of Christ.

1. They leave out "I go to the Father" this attacks the all important doctrine of the ascension of Christ. If Jesus did not resurrect and if He did not ascend back to the Father, then we have no hope of salvation and we have no hope of the second coming.

John 16:16 (KJV) A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.

John 16:16 (NIV) "In a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me."

2. They leave out "is the Lord", Jesus is Lord to the Glory of God the Father.

1 Corinthians 15:47 (KJV) The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.

1 Corinthians 15:47 (NIV) The first man was of the dust of the earth, the second man from heaven.

F. The Doctrine of the Trinity.

The Devil hates all three of the Godhead. Many references to names of God are attacked.

1. Who gave the translators the authority to change God's name? Jeremiah spoke about so called "Prophets", "which think to cause my people to forget my name" (Jeremiah 23:27).

Exodus 6:3 (KJV) And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.

Exodus 6:3 (NIV) I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob as God Almighty, but by my name the LORD I did not make myself known to them.

Genesis 22:14 (KJV) And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovahjireh: as it is said to this day, In the mount of the LORD it shall be seen.

Genesis 22:14 (NIV) So Abraham called that place The LORD Will Provide. And to this day it is said, "On the mountain of the LORD it will be provided."

2. It is apparent that the NIV does not like to use the blessed Jehovah, why? Is this to accommodate the New Age crowd?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's conclusion:

As a conservative, I want to conserve the word of God, just like the Salt was used on all of the Sacrifices. Isn't that strange? Salt preserves, yet the sacrifices were burned to ashes on the altar? The reason was to show that the final sacrifice, Jesus Christ would be preserved. Those of us after the cross can see that He resurrected from the dead and lives forever. See Lev 2:13 & Ezekiel 43:24

Sir Isaac Newton was a conservative Christian :

The mathematical and scientific discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton (1642 - 1727) are astronomical. Some of the most notable of his achievements include the invention of calculus, the discovery of the laws of motion and the law of gravitation, and the construction of the first reflecting telescope. He also was a man known for his Christian faith. He spent a great portion of his time studying the Bible with a special interest in prophecy. Following are some of his quotations.

On the Bible:

"I HAVE A FUNDAMENTAL BELIEF IN THE BIBLE AS THE WORD OF GOD, WRITTEN BY MEN WHO WERE INSPIRED. I STUDY THE BIBLE DAILY."

On atheism:

"Atheism is so senseless. When I look at the solar system. I see the earth at the right distance from the sun to receive the proper amounts of heat and light. This did not happen by chance."

At the time of his death, he left more than a million words of notes on the Bible. Six years after his death, Observations Upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John was published. Not only was Isaac a great scientist but also a dedicated student of the Bible.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

SteverI HAVE A FUNDAMENTAL BELIEF IN THE BIBLE AS THE WORD OF GOD, WRITTEN BY MEN WHO WERE INSPIRED. I STUDY THE BIBLE DAILY

**Re: KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/2 20:05**

Stever,

This is getting to be a bit ridiculous. You are posting mountains of stuff here and missing just the most basic issue. If I had to do it all over again the simplest way of putting it is, don't force people into your labels just because they might disagree with you on a point. There is no one here disputing the KJV as to warrant such a thing. Beyond that, it is not necessary to answer a question not asked with 20 pages of documentation.

In your own words;

Quote:  
-----That is the bottom line. When those of us on the conservative side post various points on this issue, it is never responded to in detail by the liberals. **They pick and choose their responses**, and many times do not respond at all.  
-----

The whole issue only that I was driving at is being honest and to answer the questions, many of those that you have chosen not to answer. And that is fine just don't expect the same from others and leave the labeling for somewhere else where it *might* be warranted.

**Re: - posted by groh\_frog, on: 2006/1/2 20:26**

Hey, I just wanted to drop clarification about that last article I posted. I'm just a layman by far with this issue, and have no place to attempt to go nose-to-nose with wiser men than I. Rather, I think this whole issue is so important for the fact that there's so much controversy (both warranted and unwarranted) that must be given an answer, and the fact that I really want to know the truth!

Grace and Peace...

**Re: - posted by Strick, on: 2006/1/2 20:55**

God, I hate these discussions. Yes, Jesus said that the Word wouldn't pass away. But He didn't write the KJV. It is so simple for you Bible scholars. You don't have to learn ancient Hebrew and Greek. It's been done for you. The least you could do is use a Strong's Concordance, which is a WHOLE LOT more accurate than the KJV or any other translation I've read.

I don't agree with everything Kenneth Copeland says, but he is right when he said that the writers of it were so afraid to add to the Word that they tried to do a word for word translation, and that is NOT POSSIBLE!! Just for instance-"Love your enemies". In Greek, there are several words for love. I can speak the one He used to you and you will know immediately that He did not mean the emotional type of feeling a man has for his wife, but that it means, if you have a choice between blessing and cursing, bless your enemy. It means care for him. Pray for him.

KJV uses the Latin Vulgate in certain parts. The Old Testament for this version was originally Hebrew, translated to Greek.

ek, translated AGAIN to Latin, then translated AGAIN to Old English. Then that version (which you ought to see, if you think you are reading the original KJV-it would be completely illegible to you) was changed AGAIN in the 18th Century, and AGAIN in the 20th Century.

My question is-do you worship God, or the King James Version of the Bible?

Personally, I use the Strong's and an Amplified Bible (Gasp! What a heathen!)

**Re: - posted by groh\_frog, on: 2006/1/2 20:59**

Hey, c'mon. No reason to pick a fight with pseudo-insults. Some of us here just want to try our best to get the facts.

Grace and Peace...

**Re: Liberal, Conservative or What?, on: 2006/1/2 21:03**

Dear crsschk:

The reason that I responded the way I did is that you seem to me to be stuck on the label of Conservative versus Liberal, in regards to this issue.

Maybe I should just try another way of explaining my position:

The Newer versions (from the corrupt Alexandrian Text) have replaced the Textus Receptus. I have provided proof that the Newer versions, specifically the NIV, corrupt the Bible. Groh\_Frog has provided proof that other newer versions corrupt it as well. They corrupt the Scripture, and hence corrupt Sound Doctrine.

It is my belief that any who support this change of God's word is a Liberal Christian, because he is not supporting the status quo. He is supporting something new, from the thoughts and minds of the textual critics and others who have changed it.

The conservative Christian, in my view, is the one that supports the Textus Receptus, with the scripture and doctrine that was placed there by the Disciples and Prophets of God, through the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

The very definition of the word conservative (that I posted earlier from the 1828 Dictionary of the English Language by Noah Webster) surely clarifies this issue, does it not? Liberal is defined in this same dictionary as follows:

"Free; not literal or strict; as a liberal construction of law. Also Liberalize is helpful in understanding the distinction between liberal and conservative: To render liberal or catholic; to enlarge; to free from narrow views or prejudices; as, to liberalize the mind.

Please compare that definition to Conservative & Conserve: Conservative: a) Preservative; having power to preserve in a safe or entire state, or from loss, waste or injury.

Conserve:, v. t. conserv'.

To keep in a safe or sound state; to save; to preserve from loss, decay, waste, or injury; to defend from violation; as to conserve bodies from perishing; to conserve the peace of society

Conservations: (noun- Latin conservatio. See Conserve.) The act of preserving, guarding or protecting; preservation from loss, decay, injury, or violation; the keeping of a thing in a safe or entire state; as the coconservation of bodies from perishing; the conservation of peace of society; the conservation of privileges.

The Textus Receptus has a long history, that has been part of my posting on this site over this very long day. Yet no responses?

You have not responded to any of the comparisons that I have provided between the NIV and the King James.

Do you see a difference, or not?



God bless,

Stever

p.s. This is a very complex subject, that for some reason, even with all of the examples, history, etc. posted there is seemingly no understanding on others part of the importance of the issue.

We are in the Apostate Church at this very moment, yet this seemingly has no relevance to that?

**Re: - posted by Strick, on: 2006/1/2 21:41**

You guys are so religious that you don't seem to understand that Christianity isn't a religion-it's a relationship with Christ. See this:

<http://www.kjvonly.org/>

<http://www.godandscience.org/doctrine/kingjames.html>

<http://www.evangelicaloutreach.org/kjvo.htm>

Furthermore, the modern KJV edition that you read from is probably not the 1611. It's probably the Blayney edition of 1769. The 1611 edition of the KJV underwent various changes in 1613, 1629, 1638, 1762 and 1769. With this in mind, which edition of the KJV do you like the best? Why do you favor that particular edition over the other editions?

Also, if one claims the original 1611 KJV is the only inspired, infallible Word of God, he is claiming that Purgatory is true, since the Apocrypha was included in the 1611 version and it teaches Purgatory (2 Maccabees 12:45). (Perhaps the KJV 1611 edition should have also included Grimm's Fairytales with the Apocrypha.)

In 1611, when the king's new version was being spread abroad, people said the same things you're saying now-"What is this new version? What's wrong with what we have? We like the 80-year old version we're using" (what did you think KJV was the first English version?)

**Re: - posted by groh\_frog, on: 2006/1/2 21:54**

Well, I think we **listen** what you're **speaking**, but it's hard to **hear** to what you're **saying** when you sound so angry. You don't have to mix insult with your words, no matter who you're talking to. There's people on many sides of this issue, including yours. Don't look at the last few posts and assume throwing judgment is warranted. It only makes it harder to hear you.

Grace and Peace...

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 21:55**

Thank you so much for the post, crsschk! I can sigh with relief, 'coz this here felt very much like spiritual warfare. I felt so rightfully convicted when looking at the fruit we've produced. I can barely call them fruit of the Spirit.

I agree that there is some fear (maybe I am having myself in mind) when such "controversial" issues are to be discussed among fellow-believers. If one's position is very firm and strictly defined (such as the KJV-only, or KJV being the pure Word of God), allowing little leeway (oh, yes! it sure feels good!), then s/he is more prone to maternally defend the latter against any opposition and refuse to re-examine his/her argument as if summoning Divine protection and blessing upon him/herself. Ultimately, this is an issue of pride and lack of humility - even telling the truth is no excuse for disobedience to the LORD - but also a teachable moment.

When I ask myself about my motives in this thread, I'd say something like this: "I am going to stick to what my reason has once accepted and not cede an inch, because I know that I am right. I cannot let Him down. After all, it was God who gave me the revelation and I must defend Him. It makes perfect sense." Often we are so afraid of letting God down, of misrepresenting Him by holding to an unproved position. Yet, there are abundant examples in the Scriptures and especially in our personal walk with Christ, where we didn't know this and that (and we still know only in part!), yet God never gave up on us! He walked us through the whole process and He will never abandon us whatever happens! See, if God cannot defend Himself, then where does our imperfect, human witness come handy? Isn't the battle His? Are we greater than our Master?

E. Stanley Jones, an early-twentieth-century evangelist and missionary to India, wrote in his book *The Christ of the Indian Road* that believers should not attack other beliefs and/or religions in order to show their flaws, break them down, and then victoriously show the perfect Christ amidst the ruins. (I would say that thus we could open the floodgates for pride to sneak in.) On the contrary, he plainly presented the (the truth of) Christ, just like Paul. Thus, he did not lift himself and his position above all reproach. By lifting up Christ alone, he allowed the Son of God to be the only Judge, so He could (as it befits Him) judge both us, His followers, as well as the unbelievers, both our position and theirs. Thus, we would not fall into the trap of invincibility.

I think the same principle can be applied to a situation within the body of believers. We must let God be the Judge and humbly accede to His righteous judgment. Yet, the latter can result in our (public) humiliation, broken spirit, etc., but most importantly, it leads to a complete trust in our Lord, His guidance and His purposes.

I know, even regarding the KJV debate, I find it really hard to examine myself (once I've come on the KJV side). There is so much comfort when I can plainly say - this is the truth and nothing else; I need not worry despite all outside pressure. Yet, the latter stance is so hypocritical, because there always will be things in our lives that we can only trust God about, things that do not make sense, purposes that are exclusively His and hidden from us, and which it is NOT our job to question. He asks Job, "Who has a claim against Me that I must pay? Everything under heaven belongs to me" (Job 41:11). (Yep, this is NIV!) Remember that being questioned about your position and forced to rethink it does not mean the questioning side disbelieves what one claims to know "for real." It is a process of scrutiny, a process of wrestling with God and of self-examination, so that we might have more of Him in our lives. We need to say to God: "Okay, Lord, I tried to do it on my own and failed. Now I beg you to take over." As a preacher at a revival once said (and it bothered me then, because of the awkward repetition), "You need a Shepherd!"

What kind of creatures are sheep? (silence) We can speculate or not, yet one thing I know: leave the sheep alone and it falls astray. Let us not let the sheep guide the other sheep.

In Christ,  
Slav

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2006/1/2 21:58**

Quote:  
-----God, I hate these discussions.  
-----

Are you talking directly to God? If not brother this is blasphemy.

blasphemy [ˈblɑːfəˈmiː] noun ( pl. -mies) the act or offense of speaking sacrilegiously about God or sacred things; profane talk : he was detained on charges of blasphemy | screaming incomprehensible blasphemies.

**Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/2 22:06**

Look, it is just a matter of conduct primarily. You brought the labels not I and along with those crowded other posters perceived thoughts into them. I cry uncle and give up.

Quote:  
-----You have not responded to any of the comparisons that I have provided between the NIV and the King James.  
-----

I have read through most of the other mountains of transcripts posted elsewhere here in other postings and like Groh\_frog am not all that versed in the 'debate' between texts and so forth, but I do understand the issue enough to consider the arguments. Think there is good reason to do this, to examine things but maybe it's just a penchant to force the honesty issue from all sides. There are a whole host of questions you have not addressed here, going back quite a few pages.

I think the KJV is the bible we ought to be using and again for some but not all of the reasons that are often stated. I own a NKJV that is well worn and has its own commentary (John MacArthur if it must be known) but have learned somehow to just basically ignore it (the commentary), used to depend on it quite a bit. But with e-sword now am able to search through other versions as well and always end up coming back to the KJV just as you had made mention, though you still haven't answered that question related a little ways back (about why you would use other versions while holding to the KJV as ... however you stated it) and that's fine brother I am not trying to be antagonistic here at all.

There is a lot to chew on, granted. One of the issue's that I hadn't given as much thought to was that of the possible confusion of having various versions within a church setting. The preacher using one the congregation who knows how many. Not that one couldn't follow along but still...

So not to completely dodge your question, yes there are some obvious differences and to be honest with the amount of stuff posted here I have not read through it all.

Quote:

-----We are in the Apostate Church at this very moment, yet this seemingly has no relevance to that?  
-----

On some level certainly, but isn't it not more in which version, but in how the whole of it is not held to it, the context is stripped and a whole host of other issues that are often addressed here in this forum?

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:11**

...patience...

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:16**

I think we do too much talking without having done our homework, i.e., getting familiar with the argument of both parties. Also, maybe it is good to ask here what the purpose of the dialogue is? What about your purpose, Stever? What about God's? (Yes, I am stealthily distancing myself from the "battlefield" here... hoping to get my bearings.)

**Re: - posted by Strick, on: 2006/1/2 22:19**

1

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:21**

Strick, take a break for a while. The Bible tells us to "pray without ceasing" - whether we think we are in the right, or in the wrong. Let no flesh get glory here at the devil's delight.

EDIT: This is not to scold or belittle you, but I feel your spirit's agitation, and not the peace of Christ. Please, take it as brotherly advice.

**Re: - posted by Strick, on: 2006/1/2 22:25**

Thank you, NotMe. You're right.

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:25**

crsschk said:

"about why you would use other versions while holding to the KJV as ... however you stated it) and that's fine brother I am not trying to be antagonistic here at all."

Stever's response:

I mainly use the Amplified as a help to add clarification to the KJV. An simple example would be:

Acts 16:1-2

KJV

1. Then came he to Derbe and Lystra: and, behold, a certain disciple was there, named Timotheus, the son of a certain woman, which was a Jewess, and believed; but his father was a Greek:
2. Which was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium.

Amplified:

1. AND (Paul) went down to Derbe and also to Lystra. A disciple named Timothy was there, the son of a Jewish woman who was a believer ; but father was a Greek.
2. He had a good reputation among the brethren at Lystra and Iconium.

The only time that I refer to the NIV is when I look to see how they (the Textual Critics AKA Liberals) have massacred the King James.

Hope that clarifies the issue.

God bless,

Stever

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:26**

I am glad you took that back ;-)

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:29**

What did I "take back"?

Wondering in rainy California.

Stever

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2006/1/2 22:35**

This thread is really showing how conversation on Christian forums can be un-edifying and as one brother just said that it would be wise to look back and see what fruit this is bearing.

As one brother did just say it is wise to pray before posting and take thought into what we are saying. These one-liner posts are more suitable to be instant messenger exchanges and not public discussion that is being viewed by many brethren across the world. As I have said before these forums on the site are an asset for people to dive back into so when we talk it should be though that there is a great cloud of witnesses around us.

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:36**

Quote:

-----The only time that I refer to the NIV is when I look to see how they (the Textual Critics) have massacred the King James.  
-----

To be honest, Stever, this seems like masochism. For me, since English is my second language, I really loved NIV (the first ever English version I read), and I hated my Bulgarian Bible, because of the archaic language of which I could make little sense without the help of my grandfather or another dictionary. Yet, he is thousands of miles away, so this is impossible. (You may say it is dangerous, but I'd rather read the NIV than a text I do NOT fully understand.) The point is: no matter how flawed a version can be, God can still use it for good (even as a failure we can learn from). What matters more is whether we are following Him or the biblical text. Are we following a Book or a Person?

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:45**

Strick said:

"Furthermore, the modern KJV edition that you read from is probably not the 1611. It's probably the Blayney edition of 1769. The 1611 edition of the KJV underwent various changes in 1613, 1629, 1638, 1762 and 1769. With this in mind, which edition of the KJV do you like the best? Why do you favor that particular edition over the other editions?

Also, if one claims the original 1611 KJV is the only inspired, infallible Word of God, he is claiming that Purgatory is true, since the Apocrypha was included in the 1611 version and it teaches Purgatory (2 Maccabees 12:45). (Perhaps the KJV 1611 edition should have also included Grimm's Fairytales with the Apocrypha.)"

Stever's response:

Please, take the time to examine the "changes" that you speak about between the 1611 versus the present day King James. None of the changes apply to Doctrine" and still stay true to the Textus Receptus. The corrupt Alexandrian text is n

owhere to be found!

In regards to the Apocrypha that appeared in the 1611 only- please remember the times. This is the first time in English History that England provided a Bible based upon the Textus Receptus, and walked away from the Corrupt Catholic Latin Bible that contained the Apocrypha. It was not part of the Cannon, only a supplement to the king James this one time. It was only included in the 1611 edition, and not in later editions.

I personally have a 1882 United States King James Version of the Bible that includes the Aspcrypha, Crudens Complete Concordance, and a Comprehensive Bible Dictionary.

Anyone who ever takes the time to read the Apocrypha will see that is not inspired and only the work of mans mind and mans fancy.

God bless,

Stever

**Re:, on: 2006/1/2 22:54**

Dear Not Me:

We are following Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever. His Word never changes, yet that is what you see today, in all of the New Versions, especially the NIV.

With that being said, I used to love the NIV until I found out how wrong it was. Have you read any of my posts today in regards to the comparison to the King James and the NIV.

The NIV is dangerous, but God still works on and in the mind and heart of the believer.

God bless,

Stever

**Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/3 0:36**

Quote:  
-----We are following Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever. His Word never changes, yet that is what you see today, in all of the New Versions, especially the NIV.  
-----

The Lord's Word never changes. But our understanding of it changes as we receive more Light and revelation by the Spirit through the Word.

The translators of the 1611 King James bible argued for their translation on the basis that 'any translation is the Word of God no matter however mean (or vulgar) it may be.'

If those who adhere to the extra biblical doctrine of the infallibility of the one King James translation would read and apply the same principles outlined by the translators themselves, all of this argument would be null and void.

I respect much more those who argue for the Received text as the underlying greek text for the Bible than those who would argue that the King James is an infallible translation.

In fact, in just one matter, the Greek and Hebrew have 4 words for hell. Sheol, tartarous, hades, and gehena. Each has a distinct meaning. but the King James translates each different word with the same word, "hell" thus destroying the distinctions of the original.

Also, on the positive side, the Greek has three words for love, eros, feleto, and agape. But the King James translated them all with one word, "love".

## Scriptures and Doctrine :: Corrupted King James?

The King James is an excellent translation but not a perfect one. The original edition had many marginal alternate readings which they defended in their preface.

I will not subscribe to a King James Only Religion. But rather I am a believer in Christ and a regenerated son of God.

## Graftedbranch

Re: "Corrupt King James? NOT", on: 2006/1/3 1:06

Quote:

Graftedbranc wrote:

Quote: -----We are following Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever. His Word never changes, yet that is what you see today, in a ll of the New Versions, especially the NIV.

The Lord's Word never changes. But our understanding of it changes as we receive more Light and revelation by the Spirit through the Word.

The translators of the 1611 King James bible argued for their translation on the basis that 'any translation is the Word of God no matter however mean (or vulgar) it may be.'

If those who adhere to the extra biblical doctrine of the infallibility of the one King James translation would read and apply the same principles outlined by the translators themselves, all of this argument would be null and void.

I respect much more those who argue for the Recieved text as the underlying greek text for the Bible than those who would argue that the King James is an infallible translation.

Stever's response:

What other version than the King James has the received text today that you rely on?

What specifically is your response to the fact that all of the newer versions, starting with the revision committee that finished its work in 1888, up until today rely on the corrupt Alexandrian text found in the Catholic Bible?

That is the issue here. For some reason, the posts will not focus on this one point. The point being that, contrary to the title of this thread "The Corrupt King James"---the King James is not corrupt and is the most reliable out there for those seeking truth and for those who read and speak English.

Would appreciate your response.

God bless,

Stever

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/1/3 2:32**

Steve,

I hope you won't mind, bro, but it seems that much of the arguments we are circling about are not verses being compared, but yet are more of the philosophy of 'would God pick one version or not.'

So how about we deal with particular verses? Fair enough?

Please don't blast through this, just read what the verses say and compare:

Isaiah 14:12

NIV: "How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn!"

So who is the 'morning star'? According to this verse he is one that has fallen from heaven.

Now read Revelation 2:26,28

NIV: "To him who overcomes and does my will to the end, I will give authority over the nations"

"I will also give him the morning star."

So which is it? Does the morning star fall from heaven, or is he given to him who overcomes?

Some might say that the words in Isaiah and Revelation should have both been translated into 'morning star.' How come the words 'morning stars' are found in Job 38:7 but are not even close to what is in Isaiah?

Hebrew for morning: boqer

Hebrew for star(s): kowkab

Hebrew for son: ben

Hebrew for of the morning: shachar

So how did 'ben shachar' get translated as 'morning star' in the WEB, NCV, HCSB, GNT, NAB, CEV, TNIV and NIV (NASB - star of the morning)? I have studied some on the history behind Jerome's Vulgate, the use of Lucifer, etc. But just read the words. Who is the morning star?

-----

How come every major English version prior to 1901 (please correct me if I'm wrong) translated the Isaiah passage with the word Lucifer? Watch the change over time:

1395 Wycliffe: A! Lucifer, that risidist eerli

1535 Coverdale: (o Lucifer) thou faire mornige childe

1568 Bishop's: O Lucifer, thou faire mornyng chylde?

1587 Geneva: O Lucifer, sonne of the morning?

1611 AV: O Lucifer, fonne of the morning

1769 AV: O Lucifer, son of the morning!

1901 ASV: O day-star, son of the morning!

1917 JPS: O day-star, son of the morning!

1952 RSV: O Day Star, son of Dawn!

1978 NIV: O morning star, son of the dawn!

2002 TNIV: morning star, son of the dawn!

Unless someone can prove otherwise, no version of the Bible in the English language ever called the individual from Isaiah 14:12 the 'morning star' until the NIV in 1978. He was called the 'child' or 'son.' That would mean the first time Lucifer was called 'morning star' in a Bible text was less than thirty years ago. I understand the commentary from the Geneva Bible did, but the Scripture text did not read 'morning star.'

Now take a step back, think outside the box, and think about how Satan is perverting the English language, and constantly changing versions to blur the truth. The newer versions, many of them, do not have the word Lucifer in them. I unders

tand the word means, 'light-bearer,' but the truth is that the average Joe doesn't know that Satan transforms himself into an angel of light. They think he lives in a Hell that he created, and that he is extremely frightening looking. The average Joe knows who Lucifer is, though. Why would Satan leave this issue alone?

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/1/3 12:10**

Hello Stever...!

I have already received several responses as a result of my email inquiries. One that I find particularly interesting is a "question and answer" manual from the International Bible Society concerning the NIV. It addresses several issues, such as why the translators used certain objectable phrases, footnotes, etc... But it also contains a defense from the accusations made by Mrs. G. A. Riplinger (the most vocal advocate of *KJV-only*). However, the most important issue that they cover is the defense of the source material used for the NIV. This is a translator's own reasoning in the field of textual criticism. This little book is only 78 pages long, but I found it helpful to understand the position of the translators.

[http://www.ibs.org/niv/accuracy/NIV\\_AccuracyDefined.pdf](http://www.ibs.org/niv/accuracy/NIV_AccuracyDefined.pdf)

From what I am hearing from several of the responders, it appears that there is a consensus amongst scholars that the works of Riplinger and Floyd Nolen Jones are skewed. One responder (a Bible-language professor) sent a link that he said accurately portrayed his feelings about the criticisms of Floyd Nolen Jones:

<http://www.ecclesia.org/truth/defense.html>

This is just the beginning of some scholarly responses, and I hope that there will be many more. Two of the responders confirmed that I should consider the preface of the original KJV, and how it mirrors the hopes of some of the new translations (such as the NIV). They also stated that the KJV committee did consult other available versions of the Bible when they worked on the 1611 version. I also found it interesting that one of the individuals also stated that he did not have faith in some of the less-scholarly newer versions -- but had confidence in the NIV. This same individual reminded me that the KJV has undergone several changes until it arrived to its eventual 1769 edition that is commonly used today. Another individual also stated emphatically that the entire *KJV-only* argument is "flawed" for several reasons, stating that many of their arguments are built upon "pseudo-research done with a preconceived outcome" rather than real scholarly research.

One of the Bible professors that responded said something very interesting. He told me that this entire issue is a matter of perspective. The KJV may state one thing, and the NIV (or other versions) may state another. It comes to a matter of cross-analyzing, because they are translations based upon several different sources. He said that a good idea is to question whether what is written is something that we believe that God would have said? If you don't like the exclusion of the passages from I John from the source material used for the NIV, it wouldn't change your belief in the Trinity -- because there are still many other verses in the NIV that more than confirm this matter.

While I have only had a few responses thus far, I look forward to more. However, none of these have been *KJV-only*, and I am interested if I will find any scholars/translators/experts that hold such a position. This may not be much, but it is a beginning. Once I finish looking through the information, I will do my best to provide the material here (complete with a list of sources). Please continue to hold this in prayer!

:-)

By the way, I still believe that the KJV inclusion of the term "Easter" is indeed a mistake. All other versions -- including foreign and older versions -- translate it correctly as "Passover." Even *Strong's Concordance* confirms this.

**Re:, on: 2006/1/3 22:15**

Dear Letsgetbusy:

As I look at all of your posts on this thread, I notice that you have never come to the defense of the KJV, not once. In your recent post to me, you start off with:



I hope you won't mind, bro, but it seems that much of the arguments we are circling about are not verses being compared, but yet are more of the philosophy of 'would God pick one version or not.'

So how about we deal with particular verses? Fair enough?

Please don't blast through this, just read what the verses say and compare:

NIV  
Isaiah 14:12

NIV: "How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn!"

So who is the 'morning star'? According to this verse he is one that has fallen from heaven.

Then you continue with:  
Now read Revelation 2:26,28

NIV: "To him who overcomes and does my will to the end, I will give authority over the nations"

"I will also give him the morning star."

So which is it? Does the morning star fall from heaven, or is he given to him who overcomes?

Some might say that the words in Isaiah and Revelation should have both been translated into 'morning star.' How come the words 'morning stars' are found in Job 38:7 but are not even close to what is in Isaiah?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever continues to Letsgetbusy:

Letsgetbusy, YOU HAVE PROVEN MY POINT. The NIV IS CORRUPT- you quoted it above.

Now, I will compare what the King James has to say about this, and tie it all together.

The NIV changes Lucifer's name to "morning star." This is Jesus Christ's name, and it will someday be my name, since I am a believer. I will be called "morning star" and so will all believers, because we all will be like HIM!  
Morning Star is one of the blessed TITLES given to our Lord Jesus in (Revelation 22:16). Here the NIV provides  
CONFUSION BETWEEN WHO SATAN IS AND WHO JESUS IS.

Satan is not the bright and morning star, but the wicked evil deceptive one, who was called before his fall, "Lucifer".

Isaiah 14:12 (KJV) How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! Isaiah 14:15 (KJV) Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.  
Isaiah 14:12 (NIV) How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations! Isaiah 14:15 (NIV) But you are brought down to the grave, to the depths of the pit.

Note: At least 70 times, the NIV omits GOD! \* Jesus - 15; Christ - 25; Lord - 16; God- 13  
King James

Rev. 22:16

16. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.

Rev 2:26-27 tells us that the believer that overcomes will be given His (Jesus Christ's) name-----"Morning Star"

26. And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations:  
27. And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father.  
28. And I will give him the MORNING STAR.  
29. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever concludes:

If you would take the time to read the many, many posts that I posted yesterday, you will find further documentation of why the NIV is dangerous, because it destroys SOUND DOCTRINE.

God bless,

Stever

**Letsgetbusy, YOU HAVE PROVEN MY POINT. The NIV IS CORRUPT**

**Re:Questions for the boys, on: 2006/1/3 22:50**

Dear Chris (CCCHHRRRIIISSS):

Have the boys at the NIV Translation Resource Center answer why they have watered down the scripture and cut it to ribbons as follows:

The Virgin Birth.

1. The NIV removes "firstborn" - questions the virgin birth!

Matthew 1:25 (KJV) And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.

Matthew 1:25 (NIV) But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son. And he gave him the name Jesus.

2. The NIV changes "Joseph" to "the child's father" - questioning the virgin birth!

Luke 2:33 (KJV) And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

Luke 2:33 (NIV) The child's father and mother marveled at what was said about him.

3. The NIV changes "Joseph and his mother" to "his parents" which attacks the virgin birth.

Luke 2:43 (KJV) And when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and Joseph and his mother knew not of it.

Luke 2:43 (NIV) After the Feast was over, while his parents were returning home, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem, but they were unaware of it.

4. The NIV changes "only begotten of the Father" to "One and Only"????

John 1:14 (KJV) 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.

John 1:14 (NIV) The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.

5. Notice the NIV omits "Christ" and "is come in the flesh". This is important to us who are saved.

1 John 4:3 (KJV) And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

1 John 4:3 (NIV) but every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist, which you have heard is coming and even now is already in the world.

The Atoning Death of Christ

1. The NIV Omits over half of the verse.

Matthew 27:35 (KJV) And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

Matthew 27:35 (NIV) When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots.

2. The NIV removes the verse (even the Catholic Bible has this verse).

Mark 15:28 (KJV) And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.

Mark 15:28 (NIV)

3. They omit "they struck him on the face", this weakens the fulfillment of Isaiah 50:6 "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting".

Luke 22:64 (KJV) And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee?

Luke 22:64 (NIV) They blindfolded him and demanded, "Prophecy! Who hit you?"

4. The NIV omits the BLOOD and questions the Deity of Christ in these verses.

Colossians 1:14-15 (KJV) In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: 15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

Colossians 1:14-15 (NIV) in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. 15 He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.

I could go on for many pages more, but why waste the time? The following are only some of the things that the NIV has done to confuse the believer about who and what Jesus is, and also confuse the believers position, authority and power that they have because they do BELIEVE IN HIM, AND CALL HIM LORD:

Some of these are:

Resurrection (This Omission attacks both the Virgin Birth and Resurrection of our Lord. Without the resurrection, we have not hope of eternal life); The Ascension of Christ (They leave out "I go to the Father" this attacks the all important doctrine of the ascension of Christ. If Jesus did not resurrect and if He did not ascend back to the Father, then we have no hope of salvation and we have no hope of the second coming);

The Doctrine of the Trinity (Totally removed this Doctrinal teaching so that it makes NO sense); Etc Etc. Etc.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I truly hope that this opens the eyes of at least one skeptic.

God bless,

Stever

**Re:NIV Translation Resource Center?, on: 2006/1/3 23:08**

Hi Ccchhhrrriiss:

I can see that you are online. Since I have this put together, please add this to your list to send to the experts at the NIV Translation resource center:

The Resurrection of Christ.

1. This Omission attacks both the Virgin Birth and Resurrection of our Lord. Without the resurrection, we have not hope of eternal life.

Acts 2:30 (KJV) Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;

Acts 2:30 (NIV) But he was a prophet and knew that God had promised him on oath that he would place one of his descendants on his throne.

2. The NIV omits "of the dead".

This brings in question the power of God in resurrection. Many cultists teach that Jesus was not raised in a physical body. The "New Bibles" give these false doctrines aid and comfort.

Acts 24:15 (KJV) And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.

Acts 24:15 (NIV) and I have the same hope in God as these men, that there will be a resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked.

3. The NIV omits "him that liveth for ever and ever". Jesus said "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." Revelation 1:18  
Revelation 5:14 (KJV) And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.  
Revelation 5:14 (NIV) The four living creatures said, "Amen," and the elders fell down and worshiped.

4. They delete the truth that our Lord has a body; this is taught by the modernist, and cults of our day. When Jesus is seen as not having a BODY, He is seen without a resurrection.  
Ephesians 5:30 (KJV) For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.  
Ephesians 5:30 (NIV) for we are members of his body.

The Ascension of Christ.

1. They leave out "I go to the Father" this attacks the all important doctrine of the ascension of Christ. If Jesus did not resurrect and if He did not ascend back to the Father, then we have no hope of salvation and we have no hope of the second coming.

John 16:16 (KJV) A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.

John 16:16 (NIV) "In a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me."

2. They leave out "is the Lord", Jesus is Lord to the Glory of God the Father.

1 Corinthians 15:47 (KJV) The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.

1 Corinthians 15:47 (NIV) The first man was of the dust of the earth, the second man from heaven.

The Doctrine of the Trinity.

The Devil (Satan, Lucifer) hates all three of the Godhead. Many references to names of God are attacked.

1. Who gave the translators the authority to change God's name? Jeremiah spoke about so called "Prophets", "which think to cause my people to forget my name" (Jeremiah 23:27).

Exodus 6:3 (KJV) And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.

Exodus 6:3 (NIV) I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob as God Almighty, but by my name the LORD I did not make myself known to them.

Genesis 22:14 (KJV) And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovahjireh: as it is said to this day, In the mount of the LORD it shall be seen.

Genesis 22:14 (NIV) So Abraham called that place The LORD Will Provide. And to this day it is said, "On the mountain of the LORD it will be provided."

2. It is apparent that the NIV does not like to use the blessed name Jehovah, why? Is this to accommodate the New Age crowd? To help bring non-believers into the Church body???

For anyone to alter the name of our God is ungodly and out of Hell. (Of course they don't like HELL either, study on).

Exodus 17:15 (KJV) And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovahnissi:

Exodus 17:15 (NIV) Moses built an altar and called it The LORD is my Banner.

3. In the NIV study bible I am using, I cannot find one time they use the name Jehovah, why? What is wrong with the blessed name of God? It is the Hebrew.

Isaiah 12:2 (KJV) Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid: for the LORD JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation.

Isaiah 12:2 (NIV) Surely God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid. The LORD, the LORD, is my strength and my song; he has become my salvation."

4. These verses teaching the Trinity.

Exodus 3:14 (KJV) And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.

Exodus 3:14 (NIV) God said to Moses, "I AM WHO I AM. This is what you are to say to the Israelites: 'I AM has sent me to you.'"

5. The NIV removes the word Godhead which is a direct reference to the Trinity.

Most every cult I know of hates the Trinity, can a person be saved and deny this great doctrine? in 1 John 2:22 "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." We have already seen how that the deity of Christ is attacked, the Fatherhood of God, and we will see how the person of the Holy Spirit is attacked.

Romans 1:20 (KJV) For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

Romans 1:20 (NIV) For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--his eternal power and divine nature--have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

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

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

Acts 17:29 (KJV) Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.

Acts 17:29 (NIV) "Therefore since we are God's offspring, we should not think that the divine being is like gold or silver or stone--an image made by man's design and skill.

6. They put part of verse 8 and call it verse 7. This is corrupt and evil.

1 John 5:7-8 (KJV) For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

1 John 5:7-8 (NIV) For there are three that testify: 8 the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement. There is no greater verse in all the Bible to teach the doctrine of the Trinity than (1 John 5:7), yet the modern versions omit them, and textual criticism has a heyday with this verse. Yet this verse is found in "The old Syriac A.D. 170, old Latin A.D. 200, Vulgate: 4th and 5th century, Italian 4th and 5th century". Also many church fathers quoted this and it is found in "Liber Apologetic A.D. 350, Council of Carthage A.D. 415." The idea that the True Word of God was lost for 1800 years, and then found by our Catholic friends, is an insult to God Almighty and His ability to preserve His Word.

7. The Holy Ghost changed ...

Acts 8:18 (KJV) And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money,

Acts 8:18 (NIV) When Simon saw that the Spirit was given at the laying on of the apostles' hands, he offered them money

Romans 15:19 (KJV) Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.

Romans 15:19 (NIV) by the power of signs and miracles, through the power of the Spirit. So from Jerusalem all the way around to Illyricum, I have fully proclaimed the gospel of Christ.

John 7:39 (KJV) (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)

John 7:39 (NIV) By this he meant the Spirit, whom those who believed in him were later to receive. Up to that time the Spirit had not been given, since Jesus had not yet been glorified.

We can see that they don't like "Spirit of God" or "Holy Ghost", why? Because Satan wants to weaken the Trinity.

8. Looks like they could at least translate this Holy Spirit, but this unholy day hates the Holy things of God.

Acts 6:3 (KJV) Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.

Acts 6:3 (NIV) Brothers, choose seven men from among you who are known to be full of the Spirit and wisdom. We will turn this responsibility over to them

1 Corinthians 2:13 (KJV) Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

1 Corinthians 2:13 (NIV) This is what we speak, not in words taught us by human wisdom but in words taught by the Spirit, expressing spiritual truths in spiritual words.

9. Again it's meaning is changed.

Romans 8:15 (KJV) For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.

Romans 8:15 (NIV) For you did not receive a spirit that makes you a slave again to fear, but you received the Spirit of sonship. And by him we cry, "Abba, Father."

10. The truth is questioned !?!

Acts 11:17 (KJV) Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?

Acts 11:17 (NIV) So if God gave them the same gift as he gave us, who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I to t

think that I could oppose God?"

11. There is a great deal of difference between weakness and infirmity. Infirmity happens because of outside influences, but weakness speaks of one's character. Our Lord was entirely without sin.

Hebrews 5:2 (KJV) Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity.

Hebrews 5:2 (NIV) He is able to deal gently with those who are ignorant and are going astray, since he himself is subject to weakness.

12. Questions Deity !!

Revelation 1:13 (KJV) And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, ...

Revelation 1:13 (NIV) and among the lampstands was someone "like a son of man," ...

Revelation 14:14 (KJV) And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, ...

Revelation 14:14 (NIV) I looked, and there before me was a white cloud, and seated on the cloud was one "like a son of man" ...

Daniel 3:25 (KJV) He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.

Daniel 3:25 (NIV) He said, "Look! I see four men walking around in the fire, unbound and unharmed, and the fourth looks like a son of the gods."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

This, plus what I sent you before should elicit an answer from the experts at the NIV Translation Resource Center.

I hope it also opens your eyes, ccchhrrriiiss.

God bless,

Steveeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeer

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2006/1/3 23:29**

Hi Stever...!

Quote:  
-----Have the boys at the NIV Translation Resource Center answer why they have watered down the scripture and cut it to ribbons as follows:  
-----

I believe that the translators have already responded to this sort of cross-version criticism (as listed in the little book). They state that they translated the Scriptures to the best of their abilities using the best manuscripts that they are available today. Older texts, they point out, do not have some of the references that are often pointed out by the *KJV-only* believers. They state that they did not attempt to preserve most of the ecclesiastic terms or traditions as the translators of the King James were instructed (as stated in the preface of the King James Version). The reason some verses are different, according to their little book, is that the majority of manuscripts do not contain such references.

Quote:  
-----I could go on for many pages more, but why waste the time? The following are only some of the things that the NIV has done to confuse the believer about who and what Jesus is, and also confuse the believers position, authority and power that they have because they do BELIEVE IN HIM, AND CALL HIM LORD:  
-----

I do believe that you should be careful about *passing judgment* as you have on the translators. They seem to have attempted a translation as honestly as they possibly could. I do not believe at all that they purposely or knowingly attempted to "corrupt" the Scriptures. In essence, you are stating that the translators were "vessel" of Satan -- purposely deceiving the world through this translation. That is quite a bold statement to make so loudly. If, by chance, *you are wrong* -- then you are **guilty of bearing false witness** about the character of many men and women, and will be held accountable for your words. I would rather not pass such judgment until I know all of the facts in this matter.

As I have stated previously, I am studying this matter with great eagerness. I will also read the words of such controversial figures such as Mrs. Riplinger and Floyd Nolen Jones (and even the *Jack Chick* people) -- and I will scrutinize all that I learn with unbiased academic honesty. Growing up, I have heard both sides of the argument many times. Someone handed me some of the Jack Chick books on this matter (and other controversial subjects) less than a year after meeting the Lord. It took some time (and until I read some books that I knew were wrong) before I realized that some of his information and sources were skewed. However, I will still read them if for nothing else to understand both sides of this debate.

And as far as the greater issue concerning the "infallibility" of the King James Version -- I do not believe it. It was a version

on translated by fallible men. The words of the translators themselves in their preface to the original KJV confirms their purpose, limitations and concerns. While the Word of God is infallible, translations are not. This does not make me distrust the KJV, or not treasure it. I treasure the KJV, and enjoy reading this translation with great eagerness. However, I also enjoy reading other versions (including foreign language versions) as well.

:-)

**Re:, on: 2006/1/3 23:45**

Someone posted this previously, and I would like to post it again. It may be of help to some:

The following is written by the late David B. Loughran (he passed away in 2000) from Stewarton, Scotland.  
Quote:

The NIV, like many other modern translations, contains many doubt-laden footnotes such as:

'Many mss.(manuscripts) do not contain this verse.'  
'The best manuscripts read.'  
'The earliest mss read.'  
'Some ancient mss add.'  
'Some mss insert.'  
'Many ancient authorities read.'  
'Not found in most of the old mss.'  
'Some late manuscripts.'  
'Some manuscripts and certain Jews.'  
'Some manuscripts do not haveÂ...'

These footnotes clearly show that the NIV translators, whilst putting on a show of apparent fairness, are really unsure of their product; they doubt whether the NIV is God's Word for today. The editors obviously don't know or don't believe it is, else they would not insert so many conflicting footnotes; which not only cast doubt on the King James Bible, but also on their own version. These dubious footnotes all imply that since there are so many disagreeing manuscripts, no one can be absolutely certain as to which is the real Word of God. In effect they say: 'Take your pick, decide for yourself which manuscript or version you want to believe; for the fact is, no one can be certain what God actually inspired His prophets and apostles to write.'

'Yea hath God said?' (Gen.3:1) was, and still is, Satan's main weapon against truth. He deceived Eve in the Garden of Eden by planting doubt concerning God's Word in her mind. Satan is doing the very same thing with the modern translations of the Bible. They all cast doubt on the real Word of God (the KJV); and those insinuating footnotes are the latest Satanic way of saying: 'Hath God said? Is it any wonder there are so few Christians who really believe the Bible is the infallible Word of God!'

What does your conscience say?

God bless,

Stever

**Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/3 23:53**

Quote:  
-----What other version than the King James has the received text today that you rely on?  
-----

I don't rely on any particular version, I think the assumption made is there must be one version which is 100% accurate and therefore "The Word of God". I compare translations with my Greek commentaries and lexicons.

Most of all I call on the Lord for His light and His leading and study in contact with the Lord in my spirit.

But the fact is translation itself is not an exact art or science since no two languages are the same in structure, expressions, or modes of expression.

Not only so, but the translators must make decisions which could go this or that way based on their understanding of Biblical truth.

A good translation, is one which accurately communicates the meaning of the original in the common language or "vulgar tongue" as the King James did in its time.

I do not consider most modern translations to do this well from any of the Greek texts.

But the King James is far from perfect and reflects in its interpretation, the light of the reformation.

For instance, at the time of the KJV translation, it was not seen that Man is tripartite. So the King James is very obscure in many points. In 1 Corinthians, it translates what should be translated, "soulish" or "man of soul" as "natural".

"The natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God...

instead of. "The Soulful man does not receive...

Why this is of significance is that Paul in writing this is not speaking of a "natural man" exclusively which would imply "unregenerate" but a "soulful man" that is "a man who is soulful". And He included the regenerated Corinthians in this category saying, "I could not write to you as spiritual men but you are still fleshly..."

The sad fact is that we may be genuine regenerated believers but if we are not exercising our spirit and living in and by our spirit in reliance on the Spirit of God, we are merely exercising our mental faculties and our natural wisdom to accrue "knowledge" and therefore we may be saved but we are acting and living as a "natural man" who can only live by his own soul life.

We may have the Life of God in our spirit but we are living in and by our soul life. We have not applied the cross and we are living and acting the same way the unregenerated people do.

This is only one example

Graftedbranch

**Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2006/1/3 23:54**

I am beginning to think that some people here are more concerned with holding onto the "familiar" than they are in accepting truth. Why does EVERYONE insist on finding fault with the King James?????? Is it really that difficult to read it, and pray for understanding in the areas you don't understand?  
Sleep and pray on it brother..LOL Greg

**Re:, on: 2006/1/4 0:05**

Quote:  
-----  
ccchhrrriiss wrote:  
Hi Stever...!  
Quote:  
-----Have the boys at the NIV Translation Resource Center answer why they have watered down the scripture and cut it to ribbons as follows:  
-----



I believe that the translators have already responded to this sort of cross-version criticism (as listed in the little book). They state that they translated the Scriptures to the best of their abilities using the best manuscripts that they are available today. Older texts, they point out, do not have some of the references that are often pointed out by the *KJV-only* believers. They state that they did not attempt to preserve most of the ecclesiastic terms or traditions as the translators of the King James were instructed (as stated in the preface of the King James Version). The reason some verses are different, according to their little book, is that the majority of manuscripts do not contain such references.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

I am glad that you went right to the source, you have studied their response, and now, based upon what you posted above, you believe their response.

If you sent away for copy of "The Daily Worker" (it used to be the Newspaper for the Communist Party of America), and you read it, and you understood it, would you necessarily believe what it had to say and the conclusions that it made?

xxxxxxxxxx

Based upon all that I have personally posted here, in regards to the problems with the NIV can you see a pattern of any kind in the NIV that takes away from the glory and majesty of Jesus Christ that is found in the King James and the Textus Receptus?

Just wondering,

Sincerely,

Stever

**Re:, on: 2006/1/4 0:11**

Stever said:

"What other version than the King James has the received text today that you rely on?"

-----

Graftedbranch replied:

I don't rely on any particular version, I think the assumption made is there must be one version which is 100% accurate and therefore "The Word of God". I compare translations with my Greek commentaries and lexicons.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

I will ask again---what BIBLE VERSION (OTHER THAN THE KING JAMES) do you use that relies SOLELY on the RECEIVED TEXT?

The second thing I will ask you: What Greek Lexicon(s) do you use?

God bless,

Stever

**Re: KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/4 0:12**

A couple of notes. I have begged off the discussion but will continue to monitor it.

Thank you Chris for you spirit brother, you are a delight to have here on this forum and have always been.

Stever, please keep it cordial. And please refer to past threads by links so as not to be repeating the same things over and over on that topic, please refrain from posting excessively long articles, you are not the only participant here.

Also, edited your post where you had the excess XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, it caused the page to be displayed out of proportion at least on one monitor and made it difficult to read.

Please, everyone, pray. It is due to my own lack thereof that I felt it necessary to withdraw from this as a discussion.

Thank you.

**Re: - posted by groh\_frog, on: 2006/1/4 11:45**

Quote:

-----  
Smokey wrote:

I am beginning to think that some people here are more concerned with holding onto the "familiar" than they are in accepting truth.

-----  
I agree with you- but sometimes it goes both ways.

Quote:

-----  
Why does EVERYONE insist on finding fault with the King James??????? Is it really that difficult to read it, and pray for understanding in the areas you don't understand?

-----  
When it comes to the King James text, there's no reason to avoid change to it. The King James translation isn't the scripture, but rather the Received Text from which it was derived is what the focus is.

The King James itself has been revised several times. There is no such thing as the "1611 edition" today. And while there is much to be gained from the old language, often times much is lost, also.

So many points have been discussed, that it's easy for them to become nothing but a blur of opinion and fact. Some facts of our modern world, however, might be enough to warrant a new translation, based on the Received Text.

First of all, not everyone in the world speaks English. Of those that do, not many speak 1700's english. And while many have learned to interpret what the King James says, it's not a common way of speaking today. In fact, it is quite foreign to the basic language in much of the US, Canada, and other English-speaking areas.

Second, and this might be more of a re-emphasis of an earlier point, but few people have the "beef" with the Received Text, so much as they do with the King James translation of it.

Earlier (many many pages ago) Philologos mentioned a couple of Bibles that are modern translations, that use the Received Text.

Quote:

-----The Modern KJV by Jay P. Green Sr is based on the Byzantine Textform. It is available for most Bible software and in a printed version. It also tries to be a more 'literal equivalence' translation.

These should be seen as a good thing I would think, as they provide a more durable text from which to study, while still having used those same texts from which the King James has come.

I think there's quite a few people like me. I want to get to the bottom of the scripture issue, knowing which is fundamentally more correct, not just hear the preference of others, and which version they 'prefer'.

Grace and Peace...

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss () , on: 2006/1/4 12:31**

Hi Stever...!

Quote:  
-----I will ask again---what BIBLE VERSION (OTHER THAN THE KING JAMES) do you use that relies SOLELY on the RECEIVED TEXT?  
-----

I have just a quick question: What is your source material or rationale (including sources) for a preference or belief in the superiority of the *Received Text*? If possible, please do not include the non-academic works of Mrs. Riplinger, Floyd Nolen Jones, or other obviously skewed sources (like those from *Chick Publications*) -- unless you feel they are necessary. I am interested in presenting this aspect of the issue to those that I am contacting.

My biggest issue is that I understand the argument of the *Received Text only* believers -- but I still cannot understand why they have arrived to their conclusions. I have read a lot of allegations made in non-academic (yet academic "sounding") works, but I have not yet arrived to the same judgment about some sort of "corruption" or "conspiracy" of all other texts than the *Received Text*. In fact, there seems to be little evidence other than books that quote one another in this matter.

The purpose of my personal quest in this matter is that I can completely understand the issue as presented by both sides. The only reason that I remain favorable to the notion that both the *Received Text* and the other sources are acceptable is because no credible (and authentic) information has been presented to me to believe otherwise. If I happened to encounter any such information or material that would lead me to believe that versions like the NASB or NIV are corrupt, of course, I would discontinue using such versions. Once I am finished in this research, I will post my own personal conclusions.

To some, this may seem like my "mind" is already "decided." It is not. One might also argue that the *KJV-only* crowd has "made up their minds" prematurely. But I am not ready to pass judgment (especially publicly) on either side of this discussion if I am not certain on this issue. To do so without knowing the facts is "*corruption of the mouth*", and could result in "*bearing false witness*" against a work of the Lord.

But, if possible, could you leave an extensive bibliography of original or secondhand sources that have led to your beliefs -- rather than continual and excessive verse-by-verse analysis? Thanks!

:-)

#### EDIT

On a side note, do you know the process by which the translators of the KJV used in deriving their translation? I know that they consulted at least two previous versions (*Wycliffe* and the *Bishop's Bible*). They also received certain instructions about not straying too far from traditional ecclesiastical terminology of the Church (as is discussed in the translators' preface to the *KJV 1611*). Could you also provide me with information concerning the translation process and biographical sketches, along with a bibliography of your sources? Thanks again!

**Re:, on: 2006/1/4 18:42**

Quote:  
-----  
ccchhrrriiss wrote:  
Hi Stever...!  
Quote:  
-----I will ask again---what BIBLE VERSION (OTHER THAN THE KING JAMES) do you use that relies SOLELY on the RECEIVED TEXT?  
-----  
I have just a quick question: What is your source material or rationale (including sources) for a preference or belief in the superiority of the *Received Text*?

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever's response:

This post was in response to a previous quote from graftedbranch, from several posts that amounted to conversations that he and I were involved in and that response was directed specifically to him.

Since it was directed specifically to him, I will await his answer.

God bless,

Stever

## Re: Fenton John Anthony Hort, on: 2006/1/5 2:11

Stever posts:

There sure are lots of "experts" that want to build up Mr. Hort. I think that we should take the time to look at his own words, his own thoughts, his own beliefs and non beliefs, and then make our own opinion. The experts (?) be damned:

Some of his own words: "ANYTHING IS BETTER THAN THE NOTION OF A RANSOM PAID TO THE FATHER." 67. "he may have failed to make clear that Sacrifice is not the only way of conceiving Atonement..." 78  
I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and results"\*\*\*\*\*

The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort

Author: Hort, Fenton John Anthony

Publisher: London, Macmillan, 1896

Cambridge: Graduate Life -- 1851

"In June (F.J.A. Hort) joined the mysterious Company of the Apostles . . . He was mainly responsible for the wording of an oath which binds members to a conspiracy of silence . . . Two other societies. . . were started . . . in both of which Hort seems to have been the moving spirit . . . the other called by its members 'The Ghostly Guild.' The object was to collect and classify authenticated instances of what are now called 'psychical phenomena' . . . the 'Bogie Club' as scoffers called it, aroused a certain amount of derision, and even some alarm; it was apparently born too soon." 58.

July 6, 1848 -- to Mr. John Ellerton -- On Roman Catholicism

" . . . almost all Anglican statements are a mixture in various proportions of the true and the Romish view . . . the pure Romish view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the Evangelical." 59.

November 16, 1849 -- to the Rev. F. D. Maurice -- On Substitutionary Atonement

"Thus there is the question of Substituted Punishment, which, as it seems to me, is quite distinct from the Atonement and reconciliation of the person of sinning man and God. I can at most times thankfully contemplate the fact of God's forgiveness (in the strict sense of the word; that is, removal of estrangement from the offender, irrespective of the non-enforcement of penalties) and His delight in humanity as restored through its Head; but surely this has little to do with the principle that every offence must receive its just recompense. The Father may forgive the child, and yet cannot justly exempt him from the punishment of disobedience;

"'Amen!' says the evangelical, 'the penalty must be paid somehow by somebody. The penalty is tortures to all eternity for each man. Christ, in virtue of the infinity which He derived from His Godhead, was able on earth to suffer tortures to be suffered by all mankind; God must have the tortures to satisfy His justice, but was not particular as to who was to suffer them, -- was quite unwilling to accept Christ's sufferings in lieu of mankind's suffering.'"

"O that Coleridge, while showing how the notion of a fictitious substituted righteousness, of a transferable stock of good actions, obscured the truth of man's restoration in the Man who perfectly acted out the idea of man, had expounded the truth (for such, I am sure, there must be) that underlies the corresponding heresy (as it appears to me) of a fictitious substituted penalty!...Nor, as far as I can recollect, have you anywhere written explicitly upon this point; even on the corresponding subject of vicarious righteousness, I know only of two pages...and they have not been able to make me feel assured that the language of imputation is strictly true, however sanctioned by St. Paul's example. The fact is, I do not see how God's justice can be satisfied without every man's suffering in his own person the full penalty for his sins."

October 15, 1850 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Evolution

" . . . I do not see why the inconceivableness of a beginning is any argument against any theory of development. The contrary theory is simply a harsh and contradictory attempt to conceive a beginning. That we are in doubt about the early history of organic life arises not from an impotence of conception, but from the mere fact that we were not there to see what, if it were taking place now, we certainly could see. The beginning of an individual is precisely as inconceivable as the beginning of a species...It certainly startles me to find you saying that you have seen no facts which support such as view as DARWIN'S...BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THE MOST PROBABLE MANNER OF DEVELOPMENT, and the reflexions suggested by his book drove me to the conclusion that some kind of development must be supposed." 61.

April 19, 1853 -- to Rev. John Ellerton -- On Bible Revision

"One result of our talk I may as well tell you. He (Westcott) and I are going to edit a Greek text of the New Testament some two or three years hence, if possible. Lachmann and Tischendorf will supply rich materials, but not nearly enough; and we hope to do a good deal with Oriental versions. OUR OBJECT IS TO SUPPLY CLERGYMEN GENERALLY, SCHOOLS, ETC., WITH A PORTABLE GREEK TEXT WHICH SHALL NOT BE DISFIGURED WITH BYZANTINE CORRUPTIONS." 62.

October 21, 1858 -- to Rev. Dr. Rowland Williams -- On the Authority of Scripture

"Further I agree with them in condemning many leading specific doctrines of the popular theology. . . THE POSITIVE DOCTRINES EVEN OF THE EVANGELICALS SEEM TO ME PERVERTED RATHER THAN UNTRUE. THERE ARE, I FEAR STILL MORE SERIOUS DIFFERENCES BETWEEN US ON THE SUBJECT OF AUTHORITY AND ESPECIALLY THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE . . . If this primary objection were removed, and I could feel our differences to be only of degree, I should still hesitate to take part in the proposed scheme. It is surely likely to bring on a crisis; and that I cannot think desirable on any account. The errors and prejudices, which we agree in wishing to remove, can surely be more wholesomely and also more effectually reached by individual efforts of an indirect kind than by combined open assault. At present very many orthodox but rational men are being unawares acted upon by influences which will assuredly bear good fruit in due time if it is allowed to go on quietly; but I fear that a premature crisis would frighten back many into the merest TRADITIONALISM." 63.

April 3, 1860 -- to Rev. John Ellerton -- On Evolution

"BUT THE BOOK WHICH HAS MOST ENGAGED ME IS DARWIN. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. I must work out and examine the argument more in detail, but at present my feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable. If so, it opens up a new period in -- I know not what not." 64.

May 2, 1860 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On the Inerrancy of Scripture

"BUT I AM NOT ABLE TO GO AS FAR AS YOU IN ASSERTING THE INFALLIBILITY OF A CANONICAL WRITING. I may see a certain fitness and probability in such a view, but I cannot set up an a priori assumption against the (supposed) results of criticism." 65.

August 14, 1860 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On the Divinity of Man

"It is of course true that we can only know God through human forms, but then I think the whole Bible echoes the language of Genesis 1:27 and so assures us that HUMAN FORMS ARE DIVINE FORMS." 66.

August 16, 1860 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Substitutionary Atonement

"Perhaps we may be too hasty in assuming an absolute necessity of absolutely proportional suffering. I confess I have no repugnance to the primitive doctrine of a ransom paid to Satan though neither am I prepared to give full assent to it. But I can see no other possible form in which the doctrine of a ransom is at all tenable; ANYTHING IS BETTER THAN THE NOTION OF A RANSOM PAID TO THE FATHER." 67.

October 15, 1860 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Substitutionary Atonement

"I entirely agree--correcting one word--with what you there say on the Atonement, having for many years believed that 'the absolute union of the Christian (or rather, of man) with Christ Himself' is the spiritual truth of which the popular doctrine of substitution is an immoral and material counterfeit. But I doubt whether that answers the question as to the nature of the satisfaction. CERTAINLY NOTHING CAN BE MORE UNSCRIPTURAL THAN THE MODERN LIMITING OF CHRIST'S BEARING OUR SINS AND SUFFERINGS TO HIS DEATH; BUT INDEED THAT IS ONLY ONE ASPECT OF AN ALMOST MOST UNIVERSAL HERESY." 68.

April 12, 1861 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Heresy

"ALSO -- BUT THIS MAY BE COWARDICE -- I HAVE SORT OF A CRAVING OUR TEXT SHOULD BE CAST UPON THE WORLD BEFORE WE DEAL WITH MATTERS LIKELY TO BRAND US WITH SUSPICION. I MEAN A TEXT ISSUE

D BY MEN ALREADY KNOWN FOR WHAT WILL UNDOUBTEDLY BE TREATED AS DANGEROUS HERESY, WILL HAVE GREAT DIFFICULTIES IN FINDING ITS WAY TO REGIONS WHICH IT MIGHT OTHERWISE REACH, AND WHENCE IT WOULD NOT BE EASILY BANISHED BY SUBSEQUENT ALARMS." 69.

December 4, 1861-- to B.F. Westcott -- On Greek Philosophy

"My chief impression is a strong feeling of incapacity to criticize, partly from want of knowledge, and still more from not having fully thought out cardinal questions, such as the relation of 'philosophy' and 'faith'; e.g., you seem to me to make (Greek) philosophy worthless for those who have received the Christian revelation. TO ME, THOUGH IN A HAZY WAY, IT SEEMS FULL OF PRECIOUS TRUTH OF WHICH I FIND NOTHING, AND SHOULD BE VERY MUCH ASTONISHED AND PERPLEXED TO FIND ANYTHING, IN REVELATION...Without condemning anything you have said on the Stoics, I yet feel you have not done them justice. The spiritual need which supported, if it did not originate, their doctrine is, I think, profoundly interesting, above all in the present day." 70.

September 23, 1864 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Protestantism

"... and I remember shocking you and Lightfoot not so very long ago by expressing a belief that Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary. In short, the Irvingite creed (minus the belief in the superior claims of the Irvingite communion) seems to me unassailable in things ecclesiastical." 71.

NOTE: David J. Engelsma writes in "Try the Spirits -- A Reformed Look at Pentecostalism" (1988)

"It is noteworthy that the Irvingite movement, a precursor of Pentecostalism in England in the 1800s, named after its leader, Edward Irving, did appoint twelve apostles. In doing so, the movement was consistent. It is also worthy of note that, although it hesitates to call them apostles, Pentecostalism today is ascribing to its leaders powers that only apostles possess: a personal, absolute authority over the church, or fellowship; new revelations of His will for the church from God; extra-Biblical teachings which are binding upon the saints."

This was written in 1988; today the Latter Rain Movement claims it will soon have 35 Apostles. Westcott and Hort also belonged to the mysterious "Company of Apostles." Vera Alder's New Age handbook, When Humanity Comes of Age, foretells a Council of Twelve which would reign with Antichrist in the New World Order: "the World Government and its Spiritual Cabinet of 12, headed by 'the Christ' will study all archaeological archives... From it, the Research Panel would develop the 'New' Bible of a World Religion which would be the basis of future education." 72.

April 28, 1865 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Democracy

"I dare not prophesy about America, but cannot see that I see much as yet to soften my deep hatred of democracy in all its forms." 73.

October 11 and 12, 1865 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On The Cross

"I am very far from pretending to understand completely the ever renewed vitality of Mariolatry. But is not much accounted for, on the evil side, by the natural reverence of the religious instinct to idolatry and creature worship and aversion to the Most High; and on the good side, by a right reaction from the inhuman and semi-diabolical character with which God is invested in all modern orthodoxies -- Zeus and Prometheus over again? In Protestant countries the fearful notion 'Christ the believer's God' is the result." 74.

October 17, 1865 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Roman Catholicism

"I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and results...we condemn all secondary human mediators as injurious to the One, and shut our eyes to the indeluctable fact of existing human mediation which is to be found everywhere. But this last error can hardly be expelled till Protestants unlearn the crazy horror of the idea of priesthood." 75.

May 14, 1870 -- to Rev. J.L.I. Davies -- On The Trinity

"No rational being doubts the need of a revised Bible; and the popular practical objections are worthless. Yet I have an increasing feeling in favor of delay. Of course, no revision can be final, and it would be absurd to wait for perfection. But the criticism of both Testaments in text and interpretation alike, appears to me to be just now in that chaotic state (in Germany hardly if at all less than in England), that the results of immediate revision would be peculiarly unsatisfactory... I John 5:7 might be got rid of in a month; and if that were done, I should prefer to wait a few years." 76.

July 7, 1870 -- to a Friend -- On Bible Revision

"It is quite impossible to judge the value of what appear to be trifling alterations merely by reading them one after another. Taken together, they have often important bearings which few would think of at first... The difference between a picture say of Raffaele and a feeble copy of it is made up of a number of trivial differences... We have successfully resisted

being warned off dangerous ground, where the needs of revision required that it should not be shirked . . . It is, one can hardly doubt, the beginning of a new period in Church history. So far the angry objectors have reason for their astonishment." 77.

November 12, 1871 -- to the Bishop of Ely -- On Substitutionary Atonement

"But it does not seem to me any disparagement to the sufferings and death of the Cross to believe that they were the acting out and the manifestation of an eternal sacrifice, even as we believe that the sonship proceeding from the miraculous birth of the Virgin Mary was the acting out and manifestation of the eternal sonship. -- So also the uniqueness of the great Sacrifice seems to me not to consist in its being a substitute which makes all other sacrifices useless and unmeaning, but in its giving them the power and meaning which of themselves they could not have... He (Mr. Maurice) may have dwelt too exclusively on that idea of sacrifice which is suggested by Hebrews x. 5 - 10, and he may have failed to make clear that Sacrifice is not the only way of conceiving Atonement..." 78.

58. Hort, Vol. I, pp. 170-172.

59. Hort, Vol. I, p. 76.

60. Hort, Vol. I, pp. 119, 120.

61. Hort, Vol. I, pp. 430, 431.

62. Hort, Vol. I, p. 250.

63. Hort, Vol. I, p. 400.

64. Hort, Vol. I, p. 416.

65. Hort, Vol. I, p. 422.

66. Hort, Vol. I, p. 427.

67. Hort, Vol. I, p. 428.

68. Hort, Vol. I, p. 430.

69. Hort, Vol. I, p. 445.

70. Hort, Vol. I, p. 449.

71. Hort, Vol. II, p. 31.

72. Vera Alder, When Humanity Comes of Age, New York: Samuel Weiser, 1974, p. 39.

73. Hort, Vol. II, p. 34.

74. Hort, Vol. II, pp. 49, 50.

75. Hort, Vol. II, pp. 50, 51.

76. Hort, Vol. II, p. 128.

77. Hort, Vol. II, pp. 138, 139.

78. Hort, Vol. II, p. 158.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever

In Hort's own words:

**"ANYTHING IS BETTER THAN THE NOTION OF A RANSOM PAID TO THE FATHER." 67. "**

***"he may have failed to make clear that Sacrifice is not the only way of conceiving Atonement..." 78***

**I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and results**

**Re: Brooke Foss Westcott, on: 2006/1/5 2:18**

Stever posts:

In our search for truth, and the elimination of "experts (???), let's look at the words of Mr. Brooke Foss Westcott, of the infamous REVISION COMMITTEE of 1888 that started all of the newer versions, and see what his own words reveal to those that have eyes to see and ears to hear:

Some quotes before we begin:

"I reject the word infallibility -- of Holy Scripture overwhelmingly." 82.

heaven is a state and not a place." 83."

The Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott

Author: Westcott, Arthur (Son of Brooke)

Publisher: London, Macmillan & Co. 1903

January, 1852 -- On Spiritualism

"His devotion with ardour is indicated in a 'Ghostly Circular' authorized by him. 'The interest and importance of a serious and earnest inquiry into the nature of the phenomena which are vaguely called 'supernatural' will scarcely be questioned.' . . . My father ceased to interest himself in these matters not altogether, I believe, from want of faith in what, for lack of a better name one must call Spiritualism, but because he was seriously convinced that such investigations led to no good. But there are many others who believe it possible that the beings of the unseen world may manifest themselves to us in extraordinary ways, and also are unable otherwise to explain in many facts the evidence for which cannot be impeached." 79.

Second Sunday after Epiphany, 1847 -- To His Fiance -- On Mariology

"After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill... Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling place; and behind a screen was a 'Pieta' the size of life... Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours." 80.

November 17, 1865 -- To Rev. Benson -- On Mariology

"B.F. Westcott promoted visions of 'the Virgin' in LaSalette, France... 'As far as I could judge, the idea of LaSalette was that of God revealing himself now, and not in one form but in many.'" 81.

May 5, 1860 -- To F.J.A. Hort --

On Infallibility of Scripture

"For I too 'must disclaim settling for infallibility.' In the front of my convictions all I hold is the more I learn, the more I am convinced that fresh doubts come from my own ignorance, and that at present I find the presumption in favor of the absolute truth -- I reject the word infallibility -- of Holy Scripture overwhelmingly." 82.

June 14, 1886 -- To the Archbishop of Canterbury -- On Heaven

"No doubt the language of the rubric is unguarded, but it saves us from the error of connecting the presence of Christ's glorified humanity with place: heaven is a state and not a place." 83.

March 4, 1890 -- To the Archbishop of Canterbury -- On Creation

"No one now, I suppose holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history -- I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did -- yet they disclose to us a gospel." 84.

November, 1895 -- Address at Manchester to the Christian Social Union -- On Socialism

"The Christian Law, then is the embodiment of the truth for action, in forms answering to the conditions of society from age to age. The embodiment takes place slowly and can never be complete. It is impossible for us to rest indolently in conclusions of the past. In each generation the obligation is laid on Christians to bring new problems of conduct into the divine light and to find their solution under the teaching of the Spirit." 85.

---

79. Arthur Westcott, Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, New York Macmillan and Co., 1896, Vol. I, p. 118, 119.

80. Westcott, Vol I, p. 81.

81. Westcott, Vol I, p. 251; New Age Bible Versions, p. 123.

82. Westcott, Vol. I, p. 207.

83. Westcott, Vol. II, p. 49.

84. Westcott, Vol II, p. 69.

85. Westcott, Vol II, p. 197.

God bless,

Stever



I reject the word infallibility -- of Holy Scripture overwhelmingly." 82.  
heaven is a state and not a place." 83.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2006/1/5 3:04

Hello Stever...

Since both Wescott and Hort were dead by the time most attempts at 20th century translations were made (particularly the NIV) -- what does this have to do with the question at hand? Indeed, they may indeed have been bad men, but how do we know that the translators of other versions (like the KJV 1611) were not just as corrupt as King James himself?

I do not know much about Wescott and Hort. I know that they are greatly despised by most *KJV-only* adherents. I did perform a Google search for the book that you mentioned (*The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*), but the only websites that I found information about this book were obviously biased or non-academic *KJV-only* websites. It is interesting to note that outside of the *KJV-only* websites, the academic information available online seems quite favorable concerning these two men.

Do you have a Library of Congress number or ISBN number that I can use to search for this book? That might help a lot -- and I could read it and try to determine what (if any) relevance they may have played in the NIV or NASB. Are you typing this information from the actual book, or are you "cut and pasting" all of this information from an online version of the book -- or are you just "cut and pasting" this information from websites that are supposedly quoting the book (a second hand source)?

I have noticed in the past that it is possible for many well-meaning and supposedly credible works to quote books, interviews or other "source material" that never even existed in the first place. Why does this happen? While it is definitely dishonest, I suppose that some individuals are so devoutly convinced about an issue that they "make up the facts." I'm not saying that this is what has happened here with such references from these sources (such as *New Age Bible Versions* or *Chick Publications*) -- but it is not out of the realm of possibility. I have even heard a missionary who confessed to having made up stories of miracles from his missionary trips -- because he wanted people to know that God was moving on his behalf. He repented after the Lord revealed that he was "bearing false witness."

The University that I attend has a huge library, as well as an Inter-Library loan program (in conjunction with most Universities in Texas). If you provide an ISBN or Library of Congress number, I will look it up tomorrow. Hopefully, I will be able to find the books that you mention. I really like to read such information from first-hand material. Please provide a first-hand bibliography, rather than a bibliography of *KJV-only* materials.

Anyway, thanks again for the help! I hope to work on this over the course of this semester and perhaps have a "working conclusion" drawn as the Lord reveals the truth through this research!

:-)

P.S. - If someone else has a list of credible source material, please let me know! I would greatly appreciate any help. I am looking for scholarly or academic information, rather than skewed books (such as *New Age Bible Versions* or *Why the KJV is the Preserved Word of God*). Thanks!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/5 4:34

Quote:

-----Stever's response:

Try this verse, that specifically refers to Christ's Word:

"HEAVEN AND EARTH SHALL PASS AWAY, BUT MY WORDS SHALL NOT PASS AWAY. (Matthew 24:35)"

Are these the ipsissima verba or are they the words by which Matthew, acting under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, interpreted the 'Christ's words' into Biblical Greek? Or are they the words of the 1611 translators seeking to interpret the words of Matthew's interpretation of 'Christ's words'.

Are you aware of Tyndale's translation of this verse? Heven and erth shall perisshe: but my wordes shall abyde This is an interesting example of the way in which Tyndale's translation was often more 'dynamic equivalence' than the KJV. The KJV, of course, was created as a 'work in progress' and the preface makes clear. I love and revere it, but I do not believe it represents the perfect 'words of Christ', although it is certainly a lot closer than many modern versions.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/5 4:43**

Stever's

Quote:  
-----Let me ask: Is "not having the original manuscripts" equivalent to "not having the perfect text"? And does having contradictory manuscripts mean we do not have the perfect text and/or that we do not know the text as it was originally given?  
-----

Are you suggesting that the translation will be better than the text from which it was translated? Are you raising a case for the 'verbal inspiration of the KJV'?

Is it possible to 'create' from several manuscripts a 'text' which is inherently more reliable than any one of those manuscripts? Well, Erasmus thought so, as did Tyndale and later the 1611 translation committee for the KJV. How to 'create' a more reliable starting point is the whole business of the 'Textual Critic'. This is a very complex subject. I reject the 'textual criticism' theory of Westcott and Hort on the basis that it does not stand up to examination, not because I believe in a verbally inspired KJV. I do not seek character assassination, I prefer to examine their ideas.

The Byzantine textform is, in my opinion, the most reliable starting point. This is not the same as trying to claim that the KJV is without error. Some 2 years or so ago I was rebuked by one of our posters for 'correcting the KJV from the Greek'; his position was that the KJV was more reliable than the Greek from which it was translated. It seems you are saying much the same thing.

**Re:, on: 2006/1/5 11:26**

ccchhhrrriiisss said:

"I do not know much about Wescott and Hort. I know that they are greatly despised by most KJV-only adherents. I did perform a Google search for the book that you mentioned (The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort), but the only websites that I found information about this book were obviously biased or non-academic KJV-only websites. It is interesting to note that outside of the KJV-only websites, the academic information available online seems quite favorable concerning these two men."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Both books can be found at:

University of California (USC) Library

Fuller Theological Seminary

Do you consider USC biased against Westcott & Hort? I hardly think so.

What about Fuller Theological Seminary- do you marginalize that institution as well by being "biased"?

I really have to conclude that the "research" that you stated that you were going to undertake was only a sham.

You make statements that can only be interpreted as biased. Your statements about Riplinger and Jones are great examples. In your second "report" to us on this thread, you completely tar and feather, marginalize, and dismiss everything they have to say, but at the same time show such respect to all of the LIBERAL sources that you are seeking information from. You also offer no proof of your own that what supports the tar & feather, marginalizing and dismissal of anything they (Riplinger & Jones) have written about.

This whole thing that has transpired here actually reminds me of the story of the Dean of a Major University who was getting lots of heat from several of his alumni (who provided lots of financial support for his College) to present creation as a theory. He promised them that he would investigate the issue. He then went to the head of the Mathematics Dept., the Biology Dept., etc. and asked them to study the issue and respond to him in writing. Once that happened he sent the reports to the alumni and reported to them that since there was no support for creation that he could not support it in good faith either. After reading the reports, one of the alumni called him up and asked him why he did not have a report from the head of the Astronomy Department. His (the Deans) response was: "Oh, everyone knows that he is nothing but a Christian ideologue and nothing he says or believes can be trusted."

So the alumni responds: I see then what this is all about. Your "research" consisted of nothing more than to means to substantiating your position, your own beliefs. You actually approached all of the Professors who BELIEVE in EVOLUTION, and have EXCLUDED input from a Christian professor, who is head of the Astronomy Department, who BELIEVES IN CREATION.

The Alumni immediately withdrew his support from the University, and now uses that money to support his Church and other Christian causes that the Holy Spirit puts on his heart.

When this whole charade of yours started about your "search" I immediately was skeptical (based upon my past experience with you on other issues on sermonindex), but then after a nights sleep I became hopeful, and responded positively to your post, as well as sending you a personal email, with two books in zip format- "Ripped from the Bible" & "Which Version is the Bible" by Floyd Nolen Jones.

In conclusion, we are right back to where we started. When will you start the show "THE SPIN STARTS HERE"?

God bless,

Stever

**Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/5 12:49**

Quote:

-----Some quotes before we begin:"I reject the word infallibility -- of Holy Scripture overwhelmingly." 82.  
-----

Brother Stever, Could you quote the entire quotation above filling in the ...

I would like to read this statement in its context in its entirety.

Thanks  
Graftedbranch

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/1/5 13:09**

Hello Stever...

Quote:

-----I really have to conclude that the "research" that you stated that you were going to undertake was only a sham.  
-----

and

Quote:

-----When this whole charade of yours started about your "search" I immediately was skeptical (based upon my past experience with you on other issues on sermonindex), but then after a nights sleep I became hopeful, and responded positively to your post, as well as sending you a personal email, with two books in zip format- "Ripped from the Bible" & "Which Version is the Bible" by Floyd Nolen Jones.

In conclusion, we are right back to where we started. When will you start the show "THE SPIN STARTS HERE"?

-----  
Brother, I asked you before to refrain from using *character assassination* in an attempt to *prove your point* or if you read something that you do not agree with. However, I forgive you for *bearing false witness* against me. I understand that you have particularly strong feelings about this subject. But you do not know me, nor my heart, nor my intentions in anything. I understand that you are older and much more experienced than I. However, you should definitely pray before you post -- or perhaps mingle your posts with humility and patience before you publicly attempt to *humble* someone else.

I have noticed that this seems common with some believers. When they cannot defend their beliefs adequately, or if they do not like the beliefs of others, they turn to personal attacks. I have noticed this greatly in the *KJV-only* issue. Many non-scholars that do not like modern versions turn their attacks to Wescott and Hort or even the translators themselves, in an attempt to paint them as Godless men. I wonder if anyone ever used the same argument to attack the writings or beliefs of Moses (the murderer), David (the adulter/liar/murderer) or Solomon (the fornicating idol-worshipper)? An attack on Wescott and Hort (or the translators of non-KJV versions) -- even if what you read is true -- is not a defense of the KJV.

Yes, I do have some preconceived feelings in this matter since I have studied it (albeit not as diligently) in the past. But I am open to the suggestion that I may be wrong in this. I think that I made that clear from the beginning. However, you do not seem to be open at all to the possibility of being wrong in this.

Over the course of my walk with God, I have changed certain aspects of my beliefs as the Lord has dealt with me through various means. Whether it was through a passage that "came alive" to my understanding, or by opening my eyes to real Biblical research -- it is the Lord that helps me draw conclusions. At one point, I actually believed some things that I now consider well-meaning religious propaganda (such as some of the information from *Chick Publications*). However, I have always kept a willingness to learn. This has usually prevented me from attacking someone that doesn't agree with me or my particular beliefs.

Quote:  
-----When this whole charade of yours started about your "search" I immediately was skeptical (based upon my past experience with you on other issues on sermonindex), but then after a nights sleep I became hopeful, and responded positively to your post, as well as sending you a personal email, with two books in zip format- "Ripped from the Bible" & "Which Version is the Bible" by Floyd Nolen Jones.  
-----

Stever, I did not "pick and choose" to write letters and emails to only one side of the issue. I attempted to find the men, women and organizations that are the most knowledgeable in this matter and mailed/emailed them -- not even knowing what most of them believe. I did not write organizations that are obviously and incredibly biased -- such as many of the almost religiously militant *KJV-only* organizations. Those organizations usually do not have men or women that are completely knowledgeable in such areas as textual criticism. Such organizations seem to rely on the same information (often word-for-word criticism from the books of Mrs. Riplinger and Floyd Nolen Jones) that is shared with one another. Instead, I contacted Bible professors, translators, and Bible societies. Such an approach is not "SPIN." I actually believe that this is real research. Did you happen to do the same? Did you contact such individuals or organizations after reading such criticism from Mrs. Riplinger or Jones? Did you search to determine whether or not the books or websites that you were reading were using authentic and academically honest information?

I appreciate the fact that you sent me an email containing those two books. However, after reading just a few pages, I determined that they are obviously skewed. But that is not necessarily a bad thing. I also found a library containing the other books that you mentioned -- and I will go through the process of ordering them soon. But I still believe that it is important to search for the validity of the things written in those books. Paul encouraged us to "*prove everything*" (or as the NIV states -- "*test everything*") in I Thessalonians 5:21. I do not want to get sidetracked by misinformation, or by attacks or gossip about men like Wescott and Hort -- especially if it matters little in a defense of the *KJV-only* position.

Often, I have noticed that the *KJV-only* argument often evolves as such:

Quote:  
-----Why do you believe in *KJV-only*?

- Because it relies on the *Received Text* as its source, and it is superior to all other versions that rely on the *Alexandrian Texts*.

Why do you discard other versions?

- Because they use the *Alexandrian Texts* as its sources, and they are inferior to the KJV and the superior *Received Text*.  
-----

Such circular reasoning seems common in this argument, with very little real evidence or first-hand sources utilized in the discussion. I have attempted to turn to first-hand source material to determine the reliability of the second-hand sources oft quoted.

But I will ask you again, brother -- please refrain from using *personal attacks* or *character assassination* when trying to prove your point. Such statements are not helpful in this discussion, and they can be hurtful and harmful to others. Thank you!

:)

**Re: Corrupted King James? - posted by brentw (), on: 2006/1/5 13:45**

Let me just put a twist in this post.

Now think about this question: What is the Word of God??  
Is it KJV or NIV or NASB or NKJV or etc...????

What IS the Word of God?

**Re: Sheep leading sheep, on: 2006/1/5 15:27**

I do not see how, through his argument you, Stever, and many others, including me, seek to edify believers. All I notice is some, maybe unwitting, pursuit of fleshly glorification mistaken for giving God glory by defending His Word. Moreover, I do not see how God can be pleased with His children when they are not seeking Him and Him only, but arguing about what He has said. We are shifting the focus from God to man, from the Living God to the works and faults of the fallible man, who, when proved infallible, shall, by getting our approval, bring honor to Christ.

Even if we assume that the KJV is the only perfect Word of God in the English language, the whole argument casts more doubt concerning the Scriptures than light. All other versions become less or un-reliable, and ultimately God becomes unreliable as well. In other words, we start from doubt and progress to certainty, while the Holy Spirit works in us the other way round: "And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23)

I think God is saddened when man does not seek Him and His righteousness, but puts much trust in his reason by summoning Divine blessing on his intellect. I believe one does not have to be a literary critic or Hebrew/Greek scholar to be able to understand the Scriptures and have a relationship with Christ. Actually, the Scriptures tell us something quite different as to what we must do to please God, "The LORD taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy." (Ps.147:11)

Brethren, I believe we lack in prayer and humility (maybe this concerns you the most, Stever, from what I can see in your posts - I do not question your honesty and good intentions, nor the plausibility of your claims). I earlier wrote that holding to the truth or presenting the truth is no excuse for disobedience. We have much to learn about the gentleness and kindness to be employed when correcting a brother. Yes, it sure feels good when you are right and you win an argument, but we must also be aware of Paul's words in 2 Cor.4:1, "Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not." It is by the grace of God we are having this time together, and it is by His grace that we are led into all truth. So please, brethren, do not try to show God how reliable we are, and how much we know so that we do not even need Him to win an argument (which we believe He would endorse/has endorsed).

Lastly, remember Paul's words in 1 Cor.2:4, "My message and my preaching were not with wise and persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit's power," and let us ask ourselves: Are we using God's power and mercy to win an argument (or is He our means?), or are we like Christ's body and bones broken before the Father so we can hope for His mercy?

I know the conversation can last a lifetime without bearing any fruit; however, I am afraid, at least as I am reading through the posts, that the conversation disconnects us from God, even by putting our faith in human logic and reason. Not that we do not need to be reasonable - just the opposite: if we have to be reasonable here, we should leave all partiality, shed our pride, and despite all profound insight regarding the "best/perfect version of the Bible" (or that there is no such a version) we might have, we should seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness, and all these things will be added unto us. (Mt.6:33)

May God have mercy on us the undeserving!

In Christ,  
Slav

Re: KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/5 15:53

Quote:  
-----I have noticed that this seems common with some believers. When they cannot defend their beliefs adequately, or if they do not like the beliefs of others, they turn to personal attacks  
-----

This is the issue at hand. There has been much patience to let these things be worked through here and these personal attacks by presumption or otherwise will not be tolerated here. Agree to disagree but the slandering and snipping and backbiting, no more. This is a warning to you Stever. Cease with this.

Re: KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/5 16:00

Quote:  
-----We have much to learn about the gentleness and kindness to be employed when correcting a brother. Yes, it sure feels good when you are right and you win an argument,  
-----

It shouldn't feel good. That's the trouble...

*Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven.*

Luke 10:20

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/5 16:26

Quote:  
-----I have noticed that this seems common with some believers. When they cannot defend their beliefs adequately, or if they do not like the beliefs of others, they turn to personal attacks  
-----

This is one of the leading characteristics of those whom I have encountered in the KJO movement.

I recently had a month long brouhaha with such and He was at one time a friend of mine and is actually the one who led me to the Lord. I have known him all my life. And we have gone round and round on many points and issues and doctrines.

When I finally put forth evidence from scripture and the most undeniable exposition of it, He responded with telling me I had no right to even expound such things because I was acting on the false assumption that I belonged to Jesus Christ and was manifestly "unregenerate".

And why am I such? It is circular. Because every genuine born again Christian according to this one agrees with him on every point and "KNOWS INFALLIBLY" that he is right. And "absolutely no genuine born again Christian would have a Bible that is not the King James."

It is amazing to me how someone can become so obsessed and blinded by his own circular reasoning. And also blind to the, how shall I say, completely foreign to the Spirit of Christ way of condemning all who are not in agreement on every point as unregenerated heretics.

The Lord Jesus said, "If you were blind, you would have no sin, but because you say, "We see" your sin remains."

Graftedbranch

**Re: - posted by groh\_frog, on: 2006/1/5 16:55**

Quote:

-----  
Graftedbranch wrote:

This is one of the leading characteristics of those whom I have encountered in the KJO movement.

-----  
There's generally a few different personality types, and often times it can be associated with the beliefs a person has (not always, but often.)

In regards to the KJO movement, it's largely pushed by "fundamental" Christians. Nor for the record, I consider myself a "fundamental" Christian. These are often the "Pauls" of today. They carry a hard lesson, and they hold to strict discipline of such. They see the laws set forth in the OT and NT as mandatory, not only optional. They inspect every detail of every doctrine and idea, of which KJV versus other versions is one.

In another case, you have many of the "Barnabas" types. They profess more of the love of God, and tend to be a little more liberal with rules and regulations. More often than not, they recognize that while KJV and others have some differences, they are largely the same. They both contain the Gospel, and both can lead a person to Christ, which is the most important issue. But along with that, being that they are sometimes better at showing the love of God, they don't usually have as many rough edges as the "fundies" do.

I honestly believe that there's a place for both. I try not to say much on this thread, for the simple fact that I don't know enough about this topic to even begin to give my thoughts. That's where you run into trouble- a person gets an uneducated opinion, and before long their pride is attached to it. At that point, to them it is fact, and for their pride's sake, they will do what it takes to prove that it's fact.

Now sometimes the calm conversations get a little heated. Like this one. You have a "room" full of very opinionated people at times, with quite a variety of personality types. Even so, a bar has to be set on how we act, and nobody can control that but you.

I've liked reading this column. I've learned a lot. Even from people who push opinion, there's often fact mixed in. It can be a challenge to sort through, but there's still learning.

And that's all I'd ask. If you have fact to share, please share it! If you have an opinion or idea, share it also, but state it as such. And if someone disagrees with you, just press on. If you're wielding facts, then the facts will speak for themselves. Plus, as a little bonus, The Lord will make his truths known.

;-)

**Re:, on: 2006/1/5 20:06**

Quote:

-----It shouldn't feel good. That's the trouble...  
-----

Amen, Brother! I don't think I clearly expressed the idea. There is nothing in our walk that should make us feel good, or - even worse - feel better than somebody else. C.S. Lewis wrote that when such a thing happens we may be sure that we are acted on by the devil. Unfortunately, thinking we are doing the seemingly godly thing, we may start pursuing the personal victory, as if going on a crusade for Christ, who, to our delight, we can be deceived into thinking, will unconditionally



and without doubt buttress OUR every agenda until the fulfillment of OUR purposes. Here is the dangerously thin line between serving God and having God serve us (may I be exposing my own trespass in the writing of this very sentence?) the crossing of which we should beware, but which also we can easily miss without the help of the Holy Spirit.

In Christ-

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/1/5 22:27**

\*I am editing this as I posted this in a way that would be misunderstood.\*

Steve,

I hope you won't mind, bro, but it seems that much of the arguments we are circling about are not verses being compared, but yet are more of the philosophy of 'would God pick one version or not.'

EDIT: THE REST OF THIS IS ADDRESSED TO THOSE WHO DOUBT IN THE SUPERIORITY OF THE AV:

So how about we deal with particular verses? Fair enough?

Please don't blast through this, just read what the verses say and compare:

Isaiah 14:12

NIV: "How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn!"

So who is the 'morning star'? According to this verse he is one that has fallen from heaven.

Now read Revelation 2:26,28

NIV: "To him who overcomes and does my will to the end, I will give authority over the nations"

"I will also give him the morning star."

So which is it? Does the morning star fall from heaven, or is he given to him who overcomes?

Some might say that the words in Isaiah and Revelation should have both been translated into 'morning star.' How come the words 'morning stars' are found in Job 38:7 but are not even close to what is in Isaiah?

Hebrew for morning: boqer

Hebrew for star(s): kowkab

Hebrew for son: ben

Hebrew for of the morning: shachar

So how did 'ben shachar' get translated as 'morning star' in the WEB, NCV, HCSB, GNT, NAB, CEV, TNIV and NIV (NASB - star of the morning)? I have studied some on the history behind Jerome's Vulgate, the use of Lucifer, etc. But just read the words. Who is the morning star?

-----

How come every major English version prior to 1901 (please correct me if I'm wrong) translated the Isaiah passage with the word Lucifer? Watch the change over time:

1395 Wycliffe: A! Lucifer, that risidist eerli

1535 Coverdale: (o Lucifer) thou faire mornige childe



1568 Bishop's: O Lucifer, thou faire mornynge chylde?

1587 Geneva: O Lucifer, sonne of the morning?

1611 AV: O Lucifer, sonne of the morning

1769 AV: O Lucifer, son of the morning!

1901 ASV: O day-star, son of the morning!

1917 JPS: O day-star, son of the morning!

1952 RSV: O Day Star, son of Dawn!

1978 NIV: O morning star, son of the dawn!

2002 TNIV: morning star, son of the dawn!

Unless someone can prove otherwise, no version of the Bible in the English language ever called the individual from Isaiah 14:12 the 'morning star' until the NIV in 1978. He was called the 'child' or 'son.' That would mean the first time Lucifer was called 'morning star' in a Bible text was less than thirty years ago. I understand the commentary from the Geneva Bible did, but the Scripture text did not read 'morning star.'

Now take a step back, think outside the box, and think about how Satan is perverting the English language, and constantly changing versions to blur the truth. The newer versions, many of them, do not have the word Lucifer in them. I understand the word means, 'light-bearer,' but the truth is that the average Joe doesn't know that Satan transforms himself into an angel of light. They think he lives in a Hell that he created, and that he is extremely frightening looking. The average Joe knows who Lucifer is, though. Why would Satan leave this issue alone?

**Re: - posted by AARON619, on: 2006/1/5 23:06**

Hello, I must admit I don't know much about the subject, and I don't stand one way or the other. However I heard Kent Hovind say that the Alexandrian texts came from a cult. Is this true?

**Re: - posted by groh\_frog, on: 2006/1/6 1:09**

Depends on how you define a cult. Now, if you define a cult as a "church" that degrades the atonement of Christ, idolizes his mother, salvation requires works... Then yes, it's a pretty important text to the Catholic church.

**Re: infallibility? Not for Westcott, on: 2006/1/6 1:09**

Quote:

-----  
Graftedbranch wrote:

Quote:

-----Some quotes before we begin:"I reject the word infallibility -- of Holy Scripture overwhelmingly." 82.

Brother Stever, Could you quote the entire quotation above filling in the ...

I would like to read this statement in its context in its entirety.

Thanks  
Graftedbranch

-----  
xxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Glad to comply with your request:

"My dear Hort - I am glad to have seen both your note and Lightfoot's - glad too that we have had such an opportunity of openly speaking. For I too must disclaim setting forth infallibility in the front of my convictions. All I hold is, that the more I learn, the more I am convinced that fresh doubts come from my own ignorance, and that at present I find the presumption in favor of the absolute truth - I reject the word infallibility - of Holy Scripture overwhelming."

God bless,

Stever

Westcott said: ***I reject the word infallibility - of Holy Scripture overwhelming.***  
**For I too must disclaim setting forth infallibility in the front of my convictions.**

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/1/6 1:21**

Hi letsgetbusy...!

Quote:  
-----So how did 'ben shachar' get translated as 'morning star' in the WEB, NCV, HCSB, GNT, NAB, CEV, TNIV and NIV (NASB - star of the morning)? I have studied some on the history behind Jerome's Vulgate, the use of Lucifer, etc. But just read the words. Who is the morning star?  
-----

While I am not certain about this, it seems to me that the discrepancy may simply be based upon the source material used for the translation. The versions used by the *Received Text* may have all been translated "Lucifer" since the Hebrew in the source material was written as such. But the versions that relied on the *Alexandrian Texts* may have been translated "morning star" because the Hebrew in those sources may have been written that way.

The versions that were cross referenced while translated may have forced the translators to reach a common consensus about the verbiage and grammar that was considered the most reliable.

I know that the translators of the NIV (1978) also relied upon the *Dead Sea Scrolls* when translating the Book of Isaiah. Remember that the one of the most complete portions of the *Dead Sea Scrolls* contained nearly the entire Book of Isaiah -- making it the oldest major portion of Scripture available. Is it possible that the *Dead Sea Scrolls* agreed with the majority *Alexandrian texts* that were supposedly used for the NIV and a few of the other modern versions?

There are other terms and metaphors used in the Bible such as "morning star" that can be used descriptively of various subjects. The Bible speaks of the "son of man" as being an angel, Ezekiel, men in general, and our Lord. A lion is representative of Christ and also Satan. The term "son of David" has been used to reference Solomon, later sons of David, the Hebrew people in general, and of course, our Lord. The term "Word of God" and "Word of the Lord" has been used to reference the written word, the spoken word, prophecy, and of course, our Lord. Is it possible that the term "morning star" is similar? Can it be used to identify the devil, the planet Venus (as it was identified for thousands of years), the sun (or "day star"), as well as our Lord? I definitely do not know which term is correct ("Lucifer," "Shining One" or "Morning Star"). However, this may be something to consider.

As far as the perversion of the English language -- I don't understand exactly what you mean. All languages go through change. The Spanish spoken in Spain today is very different than the Spanish spoken 300 years ago. In fact, the Spanish spoken in Spain today differs quite a bit from that of Mexico, Central America, South America, and of course, the United States. The same is true of English. The grammar used by the translators of the King James in 1611 is quite different than the 1769 King James Version that is commonly used today. The same is true of Hebrew. The Hebrew spoken today hardly resembles that spoken by King David. I don't know whether this is necessarily a "perversion" of language or more of a variation due to time and regionalism.

There are some gross forms of language usage that are sometimes blamed on improper cultural influence (such as accents), and I do feel that this is also an educational problem. However, I feel that there is a big difference from dialect changes over a period of decades (or centuries) and plain *bad grammar*. Of course, I may have simply have misunderstood the intention of your statement though. Perhaps you could clarify it just a little. Thanks!

:~)

Re: What changes in the KJV?, on: 2006/1/6 1:23

Quote:

Strick wrote:

".....Furthermore, the modern KJV edition that you read from is probably not the 1611. It's probably the Blayney edition of 1769. The 1611 edition of the KJV underwent various changes in 1613, 1629, 1638, 1762 and 1769. With this in mind, which edition of the KJV do you like the best? Why do you favor that particular edition over the other editions?  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever's response:

This is a very broad statement that should be backed up by documentation. Exactly what type of changes were made between 1613-1769? Please post them here for us, or at the very least, summarize what they were.

God bless,

Stever

***Changes in the KJV? What, where, when & how?***

Re:, on: 2006/1/6 2:08

Quote:

Strick wrote:

".....Furthermore, the modern KJV edition that you read from is probably not the 1611. It's probably the Blayney edition of 1769. The 1611 edition of the KJV underwent various changes in 1613, 1629, 1638, 1762 and 1769. With this in mind, which edition of the KJV do you like the best? Why do you favor that particular edition over the other editions?

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever's response to Strick:

The changes that you speak of consist of things like the following:

1611 Reading:

THIS THING;Present reading today is "THIS THING ALSO";CORRECTED 1638

SHALT HAVE REMAINED; Present reading:YE SHALL HAVE REMAINED; Corrected 1762

Achzib, nor Helbath, not Aphik;of Achzib, nor Helbath, not of Aphik ; Corrected 1762

Requite good ; requite me good; corrected 1629

his book of the Covenant; the book of the Covenant; Corrected 1629

A fiery furnace ;a burning fiery furnace; 1638

These are the kind of changes that were made, that had nothing to do with DOCTRINE. All of those changes (DOCTRINAL CHANGES) were made by the revision committee by Westcott and Hort when they replaced the King James (Received Text) with the corrupt Alexandrian Text. Based upon their own writings, they made this change with malice and subtely, and in secret.

God bless,

Stever

PS In regards to the change above from "seek good" to "seek God"--This is the only one that has serious doctrinal implications. Here, the 1611 reading of Psalm 69:32 has "seek good" where the correct reading should be "seek God". But the spelling similarity of the words "good" and "God" reveal the problem to be merely that of a weary type setter's having misread the proof. This error was so obvious that it was caught and corrected in 1617, only six years after the first printing and well before the first so-called 1629 revision. Dr. David Reagan reports (p. 11) that his examination of Scrivener's entire appendix resulted in this as being the only doctrinal variation.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss () , on: 2006/1/6 2:11**

Hi Stever...

Quote:

-----This is a very broad statement that should be backed up by documentation. Exactly what type of changes were made between 1613-1769? Please post them here for us, or at the very least, summarize what they were.  
-----

While the spelling and punctuation changes between the original 1611 version of the KJV and the current 1769 version is completely obvious, there are also quite a few grammatical and verbage changes as well. For instance, the current edition of the KJV states Matthew 12:23 as "And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David?" The original 1611 version of the KJV reads: "And all the people were amazed, and said, Is this the son of David?" Do you notice the lack of the word "not." Here is a photo of that particular passage in the original 1611 version of the KJV from a *KJV-only* website:

<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kjplate4.jpg>

There are many such changes. Here is a short list of some of the differences between the original 1611 and the common 1769 versions. The passage is listed first, followed by the words of the 1611 edition, and then the 1769 edition:

Quote:

-----Genesis 19:21  
concerning this thing  
concerning this thing also

Genesis 39:16  
her lord  
his lord

Genesis 47:6  
any man  
any men

Exodus 15:25  
he made a statute  
he made for them a statute

Exodus 21:32  
thirty shekels  
thirty shekels of silver

Leviticus 2:4  
it shall be an unleavened cake  
it shall be unleavened cakes

Leviticus 19:34  
shall be as one born  
shall be unto you as one born

Leviticus 20:11  
shall be put to death  
shall surely be put to death

Leviticus 25:23  
were strangers  
are strangers

Leviticus 26:23  
be reformed by these things  
be reformed by me by these things

Leviticus 26:40  
the iniquity of their fathers  
their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers

Numbers 7:55  
charger of an hundred and thirty shekels  
charger of the weight of an hundred and thirty shekels

Deutnomy 5:29  
keep my commandments  
keep all my commandments

Joshua 3:11  
covenant, even the Lord  
covenant of the Lord

Ruth 3:15  
and he went into the citie.  
and she went into the city.

1 Samuel 18:27  
David arose, he and his men  
David arose and went, he and his men

2 Samuel 16:8  
to thy mischief  
in thy mischief

2 Kings 11:10  
in the temple.  
in the temple of the LORD.

2 Kings 23:21  
this book of the Covenant  
the book of this covenant

1 Chron 7:5  
were men of might  
were valiant men of might

1 Chron 11:15  
of David  
to David

2 Chron 28:22  
this  
his

Job 33:22  
His soul draweth near  
Yea, his soul draweth near

Proverbs 7:21  
With much fair speech  
With her much fair speech

Eccles 2:16  
shall be forgotten  
shall all be forgotten

Isaiah 34:11  
The cormorant and the bittern  
But the cormorant and the bittern

Isaiah 49:13  
God  
the LORD

Isaiah 57:8  
and made a covenant  
and made thee a covenant

Jeremiah 31:14  
be satisfied with goodness  
be satisfied with my goodness

Jeremiah 31:18  
thou art the Lord my God  
for thou art the Lord my God

Jeremiah 51:12  
watchman  
watchmen

Jeremiah 51:30  
their  
her

Ezekiel 6:8  
that he may  
that ye may

Ezekiel 12:19  
violence of them  
violence of all them

Ezekiel 24:5  
him  
them

Ezekiel 24:7  
poured it upon the ground  
poured it not upon the ground

Ezekiel 48:8  
they  
ye

Daniel 3:15  
the midst of a fiery furnace  
the midst of a burning fiery furnace

Daniel 12:13  
the lot  
thy lot

Joel 3:13  
the wickedness  
their wickedness

Zechariah 7:7  
of the plain  
and the plain

-----  
I apologize for the length of this particular post. However, these are just a few of the Old Testament changes. If you would like, I could also include some from the New Testament. As you can see, most changes are small -- but grammatically significant.

For those who truly believe that the KJV is the infallible preserved Word of God, these changes are interesting. I encourage you to find an original edition of the 1611 KJV and compare these and other verses -- as well as the entire text. These changes are indeed undeniable.

Why were there changes? I do not know for certain, but I would suppose that they are just corrections to translation inaccuracies in the original 1611 version. If you would like some more, I can provide them. Please let me know!

:~)

#### Re:, on: 2006/1/6 2:29

Stever's response to Chris:

All of the changes that you quote below have done nothing to change the meaning of the Scripture. They are minor changes (spelling of words, etc.) that still provide the same meaning that God intended them to have when he inspired Men to write them.

Now, if you look at the posts that I have made in regards to the NIV and newer versions, and how they compare to the King James, it can be seen that the NIV and ALL OF THE NEWER VERSIONS have created DOCTRINAL changes that completely change everything, and turn God's Word upside down on its head.

That is the critical issue here on this thread, that so many can seemingly not see.

God bless,

Stever

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Quote:

-----

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi Stever...

Quote:

-----This is a very broad statement that should be backed up by documentation. Exactly what type of changes were made between 1613-1769? Please post them here for us, or at the very least, summarize what they were.

-----  
While the spelling and punctuation changes between the original 1611 version of the KJV and the current 1769 version is completely obvious, there are also quite a few grammatical and verbage changes as well. For instance, the current edition of the KJV states Matthew 12:23 as "And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David?" The original 1611 version of the KJV reads: "And all the people were amazed, and said, Is this the son of David?" Do you notice the lack of the word "not." Here is a photo of that particular passage in the original 1611 version of the KJV from a *KJV-only* website:

<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kjplate4.jpg>

There are many such changes. Here is a short list of some of the differences between the original 1611 and the common 1769 versions. The passage is listed first, followed by the words of the 1611 edition, and then the 1769 edition:

Quote:

-----Genesis 19:21

concerning this thing

concerning this thing also

Genesis 39:16

her lord

his lord

Genesis 47:6

any man

any men

Exodus 15:25

he made a statute

he made for them a statute

Exodus 21:32

thirty shekels

thirty shekels of silver

Leviticus 2:4

it shall be an unleavened cake

it shall be unleavened cakes

Leviticus 19:34

shall be as one born

shall be unto you as one born

Leviticus 20:11

shall be put to death

shall surely be put to death

Leviticus 25:23

were strangers

are strangers

Leviticus 26:23

be reformed by these things

be reformed by me by these things

Leviticus 26:40

the iniquity of their fathers

their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers

Numbers 7:55

charger of an hundred and thirty shekels

charger of the weight of an hundred and thirty shekels

Deutonomy 5:29

keep my commandments  
keep all my commandments

Joshua 3:11  
covenant, even the Lord  
covenant of the Lord

Ruth 3:15  
and he went into the citie.  
and she went into the city.

1 Samuel 18:27  
David arose, he and his men  
David arose and went, he and his men

2 Samuel 16:8  
to thy mischief  
in thy mischief

2 Kings 11:10  
in the temple.  
in the temple of the LORD.

2 Kings 23:21  
this book of the Covenant  
the book of this covenant

1 Chron 7:5  
were men of might  
were valiant men of might

1 Chron 11:15  
of David  
to David

2 Chron 28:22  
this  
his

Job 33:22  
His soul draweth near  
Yea, his soul draweth near

Proverbs 7:21  
With much fair speech  
With her much fair speech

Eccles 2:16  
shall be forgotten  
shall all be forgotten

Isaiah 34:11  
The cormorant and the bittern  
But the cormorant and the bittern

Isaiah 49:13  
God  
the LORD

Isaiah 57:8  
and made a covenant  
and made thee a covenant

Jeremiah 31:14  
be satisfied with goodness  
be satisfied with my goodness

Jeremiah 31:18  
thou art the Lord my God  
for thou art the Lord my God

Jeremiah 51:12  
watchman



watchmen

Jeremiah 51:30  
their  
her

Ezekiel 6:8  
that he may  
that ye may

Ezekiel 12:19  
violence of them  
violence of all them

Ezekiel 24:5  
him  
them

Ezekiel 24:7  
poured it upon the ground  
poured it not upon the ground

Ezekiel 48:8  
they  
ye

Daniel 3:15  
the midst of a fiery furnace  
the midst of a burning fiery furnace

Daniel 12:13  
the lot  
thy lot

Joel 3:13  
the wickedness  
their wickedness

Zechariah 7:7  
of the plain  
and the plain

-----  
I apologize for the length of this particular post. However, these are just a few of the Old Testament changes. If you would like, I could also include some from the New Testament. As you can see, most changes are small -- but grammatically significant.

For those who truly believe that the KJV is the infallible preserved Word of God, these changes are interesting. I encourage you to find an original edition of the 1611 KJV and compare these and other verses -- as well as the entire text. These changes are indeed undeniable.

Why were there changes? I do not know for certain, but I would suppose that they are just corrections to translation inaccuracies in the original 1611 version. If you would like some more, I can provide them. Please let me know!

:-)  
-----

**Re:, on: 2006/1/6 2:58**

ccchhhrrriiisss said:

I do not know much about Wescott and Hort. I know that they are greatly despised by most KJV-only adherents. I did perform a Google search for the book that you mentioned (The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort), but the only websites that I found information about this book WERE OBVIOUSLY BIASED OR NON-ACADEMIC KJV-ONLY WEBSITES. It is interesting to note that outside of the KJV-only websites, the academic information available online seems quite favorable concerning these two men.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Both of the Books that I quoted earlier about Westcott and Hort can be found at the following locations, within 36 miles of

f where I live:

Biola University Library  
Claremont School of Theology  
Fuller Theological Seminary  
UCLA Library

If you are near a College or University Campus you should be able to find both books close to where you are.

Also, why should such books be suspect? YOUR STATEMENT: "but the only websites that I found information about this book WERE OBVIOUSLY BIASED OR NON-ACADEMIC KJV-ONLY WEBSITES. It is interesting to note that outside of the KJV-only websites, the academic information available online seems quite favorable concerning these two men." -

-----  
IS VERY TROUBLING. Why? #1- it is incorrect; #2 it demeans the opposition (your opposition); #3) Have you ever thought that it cannot be found on the sites that you are in agreement with because they want to suppress the truth? #4) the "Academics" are the ones that have created this whole mess of textual criticism in the first place. Westcott & Hort were "academics", and today we have "academics" that have taken over the Bible Colleges that teach there is no difference between the Newer Versions and KJV. They actually teach that the newer versions are better. Their students have become Pastors, who now hold this mistaken view, thus propelling the church deeper into apostasy.

The truth consists of the two men behind the death of the Received Text (KJV) and the birth of something entirely different. The truth about the actual thoughts and intent of both Westcott and Hort, the two men responsible for all of the Newer Bible Versions. If the truth ever got out, they might not sell as many Bibles. That's why you will either find nothing there, or only things that flatter them (Westcott & Hort).

That is something all of us should consider whenever we are searching for the truth about any issue.

God bless,

Stever

,

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/1/6 2:59**

Hi Stever...

I was only trying to provide a small list of the changes that you requested. In some instances, these changes do change the meaning of the passage. Of course, the many changes between the first and later editions were meant to correct the fallacies of translation in the original 1611 version. Some words were added or subtracted from the original King James Version to improve the translation. They do not represent changes in doctrine -- unless someone has built a doctrine upon grammar, verbage, or the perception that the 1611 version was the "*perfect, preserved text*."

A comparison of today's King James Version with that of the New International Version is pointless if the criticism is about translation. The King James Version, as has been pointed out in many threads (I've been reading over past threads today), was translated by scholars using the "Textus Receptus" as their primary source, while also consulting other versions of that time period (such as *Tyndales* and *The Bishop's Bible*).

The NIV was translated from the "Alexandrian Texts," along with the Dead Sea Scrolls and other available texts that are mentioned in the preface of that version (as well as footnoted at the bottom of many pages). So trying to compare these versions is like trying to compare through dissection a Granny Smith apple from two separate trees. While similar in nature and makeup -- there will still be some differences.

I am beginning to reach the conclusion that the differences between the two translations do not change the *fundamentals of the faith*. I do not see any major differences between the KJV and other serious academic translations (like the NIV and NASB) that would change the doctrine of the Church. For instance, even though the NIV excludes a few statements

from I John 5 (because the translators footnote that the best available manuscripts did not include it) -- that exclusion does not imply that the NIV rejects the Trinity. The NIV still shows the Trinity. It shows the deity of Christ, as well as the other things that we all agree are fundamental. While a passage can be pointed out, and cross analyzed, it still does not change the overall message of the entire version.

For now, I still feel comfortable using both the KJV and the NIV. Until I find something drastic -- I will continue to do so. But I will also pray about everything that I read (from all versions), that the Lord will "lead me and guide me into all truth." He is able!

:-)

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/6 6:01**

Quote:

-----Unless someone can prove otherwise, no version of the Bible in the English language ever called the individual from Isaiah 14:12 the 'morning star' until the NIV in 1978. He was called the 'child' or 'son.' That would mean the first time Lucifer was called 'morning star' in a Bible text was less than thirty years ago. I understand the commentary from the Geneva Bible did, but the Scripture text did not read 'morning star.'??Now take a step back, think outside the box, and think about how Satan is perverting the English language, and constantly changing versions to blur the truth. The newer versions, many of them, do not have the word Lucifer in them. I understand the word means, 'light-bearer,' but the truth is that the average Joe doesn't know that Satan transforms himself into an angel of light. They think he lives in a Hell that he created, and that he is extremely frightening looking. The average Joe knows who Lucifer is, though. Why would Satan leave this issue alone?  
-----

I am struggling to understand the point you are making here. The name Lucifer has apparently been given to 'Satan' as a result of the interpretation of this verse. The word does not appear elsewhere in the Bible. The word translated 'Lucifer' (as a proper name) is a word which means 'clear shining'. It is consistent with the description which follows it which the KJV translates as 'son of the morning'. This latter is a poetic means of referring to Venus, known to the ancients as the 'day star' or 'morning star'. It is the 'herald' of the new day and is the brightest visible body seen from earth other than the Sun and the Moon.

The point is that the description 'son of the morning' is a poetic reference to 'the morning star'. The word 'Lucifer' is 'light bearer' is a Latin word. It is strange to me that this description ever became a common name for Satan and I can find no biblical basis for it. It is not a 'name' but a description, as is 'son of the morning'.

This is John Wesley's comment on the verse Lucifer - Which properly is a bright star, that ushers in the morning; but is here metaphorically taken for the mighty king of Babylon. Son - The title of son is given in scripture not only to a person or thing begotten or produced by another, but also to any thing which is related, to it, in which sense we read of the son of a night, Jonah 4:10, a son of perdition, John 17:12, and, which is more agreeable, to the present case, the sons of Arcturus, Job 38:32.

What are you suggesting in this posting? Do you see some kind of conspiracy at work?

**Re:, on: 2006/1/6 11:52**

Ccchhhrrriiisss said:

"Of course, the many changes between the first and later editions were meant to correct the FALLACIES OF THE TRANSLATION in the original 1611 version. Some words were added or subtracted from the original King James Version to improve the translation. "

Stevens response:

I challenge you to prove your statement above. There were no FALLACIES in the original 1611 version.

How sad, that you have to make untrue and slanderous statements to try and make a point.

The ball is in your court, Chris.

PROVE IT.

God bless,

Stever

p.s. the definition of "fallacy" is:

1 a obsolete : GUILLE, TRICKERY b : deceptive appearance : DECEPTION

2 a : a false or mistaken idea b : erroneous character : ERRONEOUSNESS

3 : an often plausible argument using false or invalid inference

**Re:, on: 2006/1/6 11:55**

ccchhhrrriiisss said:

"For now, I still feel comfortable using both the KJV and the NIV. Until I find something DRASTIC -- I will continue to do so."

Stevens response:

This was your belief when this thread started, as well.

....What is your definition of "drastic"?

God bless,

Stever

**Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/6 13:43**

Quote:

-----I challenge you to prove your statement above. There were no FALLACIES in the original 1611 version.  
-----

A reading of the preface to the 1611 King James Bible written by the translators themselves shows they did not consider their work a "perfect translation" but rather "a better translation of already existing 'good translations'"

They also came under fire for having alternate renderings in the margins. The accusation was made that such would minister doubt to the reader. Their response to this was that the essentials of the Word of God are clear but there remains room for different meanings assigned to things of lesser weight and that the reader should be free to use their own discernment and judgement on these things.

The translation itself, regardless of the arguments for this or that underlying text is also lacking in many ways as has been previously pointed out. For instance it translates the Hebrew and Greek word's sheol, Tartarus, Hades, and Gehenna all as one word hell, thus losing the distinctions in the original.

The King James Translators also coined the word, "baptism" which did not exist in the English language. They did this because the accurate translation would have been "immersion" and to us such a word went against the practice of the Church of England. So they just came up with a new word, "Baptism" derived from the pronunciation of the Greek word which is in essence ambiguous since it had no prior English meaning".

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/1/6 13:45

Hello Stever...

Quote:

-----This was your belief when this thread started, as well.  
-----

As I have asked you several times (both in this thread and in a PM), please refrain from publicly passing judgment about me. I did not begin this thread, but I was (and still am) not convinced by the attacks on versions other than the KJV. It may also be said that you have not changed your position either. But is this wrong? Of course not!

However, if the proper evidence was presented to me that made me doubt the authenticity of the NIV or the source material used for that version, I would reexamine my position. However, I have seen no credible information in this (or other) threads.

**As far as I see it, here are some of the major arguments AGAINST newer academic versions like the NIV and the NASB:**

1. Claim: *The source for the KJV, the "Received Text," is superior and more reliable than all other available sources for translation.*

Response: I do not find any concrete evidence that would support such a notion other than a tradition passed down by those who also support this position. Yes, there are books that try to prove this point -- but I do not see any credible information to substantiate this claim. On the contrary, many of today's best available scholars say otherwise. Many of the other manuscripts are older and more common. Are we to believe that these manuscripts are false, corrupted or the result of a conspiracy to pervert the Word of God -- without any real evidence to substantiate such a claim?

2. Claim: *"There are words and passages that are 'left out' of certain versions like the NIV and NASB, but these passages are included in the KJV. The "Hebrew" and "Greek" support the KJV's translation -- as is recorded in Strong's Concordance and other research aids.*

Response: The reason these passages are "left out" is due to the fact that they are translated from different sources. The KJV is translated from the *Received Text* while consulting other versions at that time, like the *Bishop's Bible* and *Tyndales*. Research aids for the KJV will reference the "Hebrew" and "Greek" as was found in the *Received Text*. The NIV used different sources for translation, including the *Alexandrian Texts* and the *Dead Sea Scrolls*. The reference aids, including the "Hebrew" and "Greek" source concordance will do likewise. If a passage is left out of the NIV, the translators state that it was because the manuscripts that they felt were older and most reliable did not have such passages. But they footnoted any such passages accordingly. But because a set of passages or phrases from *1 John chapter 5* are not included in the NIV (because they were not in its source material), it doesn't substantiate any claim that *"the NIV denies the existence of the Trinity."* The NIV indeed supports the existence of the Trinity through many other passages.

3. Claim: *Wescott and Hort were ungodly men, and they are the "fathers" of all modern translations (such as the NIV and NASB).*

Response: The information that is often included in the *KJV-only* books about these men seems quite irrelevant to me. Neither of these men were authors of the translations in question nor are they accused of having "altered" any of the source material. While they were (and still are) considered two of the most knowledgeable individuals in ancient manuscripts, they did not have anything to do with these translations. An attack on Wescott and Hort is not a good defense of the KJV (or a good support for attacking the NIV or NASB). Such accusations could amount to *gossip*, *slander* or *character assassination*. Perhaps some of this information is false. None of us knew these men. And as the current media mockery and hatred for conservatives (or President Bush) demonstrates, some "credible sounding" information is often false and slander. Besides, the work of such men is mostly confined to a belief in the validity of other textual sources -- that was later confirmed by the beliefs of other scholars as well.

4. Claim: *"The history, availability, language and tradition of the KJV make it far superior to other translations that corrupt the English language."*

Response: The vast majority of people living in the world do not speak English. And of those that do, many have a difficult time reading the 17th Century language, grammar and verbiage used in the King James Version. Thus, a version of the Bible that is understood by the common man was needed (similar to the justification for the KJV as found in the preface).

ce of the KJV by its translators). The KJV is definitely a wonderful translation. But just because it is historically accepted does not mean that it should remain the only acceptable version. If an evangelist travels to Tokyo, should they preach using the KJV? Of course not! It would not be understood. While the KJV is good -- it is showing its age, and is misunderstood by a majority of individuals in the world. As a result, it is no longer the most widespread and published edition in the world today. That position is now held by the NIV (1978). Even if you believe in a superiority of the *Received Text*, perhaps a further modification of the KJV is needed for it to be commonly understood in today's world.

5. Claim: "*The KJV is the perfect, infallible, and preserved Word of God.*"

Response: As was posted in an earlier thread, the original KJV held many errors in translation, some of which were included earlier in this thread. Subsequent versions of the KJV were altered to correct the errors in the original. Words and phrases were added, removed and changed in order to correct the problems in the original translation. The KJV as accepted today is not the one translated in 1611. It was modified over many years, eventually settling on today's common editions that were either published in 1769 or 1850 (158-239 years later). To view some of these changes, please see the earlier post, or email me. I will send you a list of such changes. Such changes do not greatly change the doctrine of the version -- unless your "doctrine" is that the KJV version is perfect or flawless, or if your doctrine is based upon a word or two in the text.

Like I stated before, if the proper evidence was presented to me that made me doubt the authenticity of the NIV or the source material used for that version, I would reexamine my position. However, this is where I stand today on this issue. I am far from perfect, but I do certainly believe in the encouragement from I Thessalonians 5:21 to "*prove everything*" (or, as that passage is written in the NIV, "*test everything*").

:)

p.s. - As I already noted in my PM, Webster's Fourth Edition College Dictionary (ISBN: 0028631188) also defines "fallacy" as: *a false or mistaken idea, fact, opinion, etc.; error*. That was the meaning of the word as I used it. Perhaps I should have used the word "error" instead. I apologize for the misunderstanding.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/6 15:57**

Graftedbranch:

Quote:  
-----The King James Translators also coined the word, "baptism" which did not exist in the english language. They did this because the accurate translation would have been "immersion" and to us such a word went against the practice of the Church of England. So they just came up with a new word, "Baptism" derived from the pronunciation of the Greek word which is in essence ambiguous since it had no prior English meaning".  
-----

This statement is both foolish and inaccurate.

Both Wycliffe and Tyndale used the word which was then spelled as 'baptim/baptym'. Coverdale used the same word. The Geneva Bible used the word 'baptisme'. The Bishop's Bible also used the word 'baptisme'. All these English versions which predated the KJV of 1611 used the word 'baptism'. In fact, I can't find a main-stream English translation which does not use the word 'baptism'.

Not only is your data inaccurate but your reasoning is faulty too. In fact, the Church of England has always permitted 'baptism by immersion'. The issue was not the amount of water but the person who exercised faith/repentance. The Anglicans said one could exercise faith for another; credo-baptists believe that only the baptised can exercise faith. They did not 'come up with a new word' but continued to use a familiar word without defining it.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/1/6 17:29**

Quote;

""Response: I do not find any concrete evidence that would support such a notion other than a tradition passed down by those who also support this position. Yes, there are books that try to prove this point -- but I do not see any credible information to substantiate this claim. On the contrary, many of today's best available scholars say otherwise. Many of the other manuscripts are older and more common. Are we to believe that these manuscripts are false, corrupted or the result of a conspiracy to pervert the Word of God -- without any real evidence to substantiate such a claim?""

Just study the KJV word "of", which was changed to "in", in the NIV and NASB. Changing the Faith that save us from th

e Faith of the Son of God to Our Faith in the Son of God. Is this not enough to see Satan's lie, the same lie as to Adam and Eve, "surely you will be like God," and it all depends on us, it is my faith that saves me, what a lie.

In Christ, by the faith of Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/1/6 20:11**

chris,

I would like to answer your questions. I'll try and go point by point.

chris: "Is it possible that the Dead Sea Scrolls agreed with the majority Alexandrian texts that were supposedly used for the NIV and a few of the other modern versions?"

I can't say for sure. I stayed up last night looking at the photograph of the Isaiah 14 scroll online, and never came up with anything. So going off of people's comments and translations, I have heard opinions leaning both ways. I've heard one say that the DSS matches the AV, and another comment that it agrees and disagrees with various OT versions of today.

"A lion is representative of Christ and also Satan. The term 'son of David' has been used to reference Solomon, later sons of David, the Hebrew people in general, and of course, our Lord. The term 'Word of God' and 'Word of the Lord' has been used to reference the written word, the spoken word, prophecy, and of course, our Lord. Is it possible that the term 'morning star' is similar?"

I would have to say no. Even the translation of the DSS I read was not rendered 'morning star' but 'shining one, son of the dawn.' I will admit that they are similar. I think that is Satan's strategy, though, to be as close to the real thing as possible. He is always subtle, the most subtle creature around, actually. It just seems silly that they would take the words that have been translated to give us 'Lucifer' for around 600 years or so, and then translate them 'morning star,' knowing that those words are used in Rev to describe Christ. Same issue with 'day star' (2 Peter 1:19 KJV).

"As far as the perversion of the English language -- I don't understand exactly what you mean."

The average user of the English language in centuries past was much more knowledgeable. I have heard Keith Green, Kent Hovind, and others comment on this. Finney used to use more complicated words in his preaching because the lay person could understand them. Today we are more familiar with TV than reading, and more familiar with slang than grammar. Even non-Christian scholars agree that the KJV was done in the prime of the English language.

There are also words that appear in the dictionary today that I would be embarrassed to have my daughter to read (I will pm someone examples, they are too crude to post).

Another interesting fact that I heard, was that the KJV standardized the English language. Kent Hovind states in his seminar that linguists have stated that if the AV had not been mass produced, that English speaking people might not have been able to communicate with others that used to speak the same language years past because of the way language changes.

So I suppose one could go back and forth, but I put it forward that the peak of English was around the time the AV was created. This is my take: Satan knows that English is the universal language, and that English speaking people are in a position today to get the gospel to all nations, so why would he not attack the language, and pervert Biblical words from the AV. I find it no coincidence that kids crack up when you read Biblical words that now have sexually perverse slang meanings. I trust most would know the words I'm thinking of without me making a list.

So I suppose my opinion that English has corrupted isn't very weighty, not being a linguist, but I have read many comments on the eloquence of the AV. To me writings of prior centuries seem to be more scholarly.



**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/1/6 23:19**

brethren

21 pages of posts for what purpose? what have we learned and concluded from all this discussion? If one uses the KJV or NIV, and doesn't seek the Lord's HOLY Spirit for the word of God to be ministered then no fruit will be born from even the greatest amount of study. I have a good news version which the Lord has me make notes in, I have an NIV and I'm learning to read the KJV. I'm not a big fan of the KJV because the language for me is quite cumbersome but by God's grace I've been able to learn from it from His Holy Spirit.

The power of scripture requires that we are ministered to by the Holy SPIRIT of God and should seek His counsel lest the scriptures become just another book.

**Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/7 0:10**

Quote:  
-----Not only is your data inaccurate but your reasoning is faulty too. In fact, the Church of England has always permitted 'baptism by immersion'. The issue was not the amount of water but the person who exercised faith/repentance. The Anglicans said one could exercise faith for another; credo-baptists believe that only the baptised can exercise faith. They did not 'come up with a new word' but continued to use a familiar word without defining it.  
-----

You may be correct here. I don't recall the source which I heard this from.

However you did not respond to the other part of my post regarding the position of the translators nor of the lack in the KJV concerning Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna.

Graftedbranch

**Re: The problem with this thread - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/7 0:27**

The difficulty with this thread is that it is wholly a matter of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil and not one of Life.

It is my sense over 30 years of being a regenerated believer that the spirit driving the KJ Only crowd is one of divisiveness and sectarianism based in a particular translation.

It is a religion defined by a particular Bible. They condemn the "corrupted translations" as diminishing the deity of Christ. Yet I find very little love of Christ among them. I am sure there are exceptions. But on the whole, the spirit of the websites I have encountered representing them harbors a critical, condemning spirit, character attacks and is generally completely lacking in the Love of Christ or His body.

The Lord Jesus said to the pharisees, "Ye search the scriptures because in them you believe you have eternal Life, but it is they which testify of Me and you will not come to Me that you may have Life.

I don't care how pure and accurate your Bible is, without the Spirit of the Living crucified and resurrected Christ it is just dead letters.

The issue is Life, not letters or knowledge.

I had rather have a "Living Bible" or some paraphrase Bible and have the Life of God in my regenerated spirit, than have the most accurate bible, be able to defend it and be a debator and a Greek and Hebrew Scholar and be dead.

Those who have the Living Christ within them will see the Glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ in whatever translation they read. Those who have their knowledge and religious opinion will see only error and "heresy" in everything they read.

Why? Because their whole religious existence is taken up with proving their point and showing everyone else to be wrong. I don't find many addressing other issues. This is the thing for which they live. Their religion is the King James Bible. It is a matter of being right. You may be right but you may be dead.



I don't care for religion. I care for Christ.

The body of Christ is not made up of those who hold and accept a particular Bible version. But rather it is made up of all of those who have been redeemed and regenerated and have the Life of God within them.

To separate from the rest of the body of Christ on the basis of some Bible version is to deny the One Lord, One faith, One baptism, One God and Father who is over all, through all and in all. It is to deny the organic nature of the Body of Christ and to make this or that particular belief the centrality of the church.

Graftedbranch

### Re: The Magnitude of the Problem, on: 2006/1/7 0:38

NIV,NAS, RSV OR THE KJV? THERE IS A TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE.

WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF DOCTRINE? "1. In a General sense, whatever is taught, Hence a principle or position in any science; whatever is laid down as true by an instructor or master. The doctrines of the Gospel are the principles or truths taught by Christ and his apostles. The doctrines of Plato are the principles which he taught. Hence a doctrine may be true or false; it may be a mere tenet or opinion. 2. The act of teaching-"He taught them many things by parables, and said to them in His doctrine Mark iv; 3. Learning, knowledge- "Whom shall He make to learn Doctrine? Isaiah xxviii; 3. The Truths of the Gospel in General-"That they may adorn the Doctrine of God our Savior in all things. Titus ii 5. Instruction and confirmation in the truths of the Gospel 2 Timothy iii

BIBLICAL COMPARISONS DEPICTING THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM THAT THE NIV,NAS, RSV AND ALL OF THE NEWER VERSIONS HAVE CREATED:

The Church is constantly being reassured from all quarters that all is well. Check out the following examples for yourself and see what has really happened. Most of the comparisons will be between the King James and the NAS and/or the NIV because these two are being touted as the best versions available in many circles today.

Colossians 1:14

Regarding the son, Jesus, from verse 13, we read:

In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: (KJV)

In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. (NAS,NIV,RSV)

Comment: "Through his blood" is deleted— a major difference! If your "Bible" does not contain these three words, someone has tampered with it such that it is no longer the Word of God.

First Timothy 3:16

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. (KJV)

This verse, as recorded in the King James, clearly teaches that Jesus is God!

And by common confession great is the mystery of godliness: He who was revealed in the flesh, Was vindicated in the Spirit, Beheld by angels, Proclaimed among the nations, Believed on in the world, Taken up in glory. (NAS,NIV,RSV,NEB)

Comment: There is a great difference between someone named "he" being manifest in the flesh and "God". By changing "God" to "He who", the fact that Jesus is God is removed. This is one of the most powerful and clear verses in all of Scripture concerning the deity of Christ Jesus— the alteration therefore is seen as a direct attack upon His deity.

Over 300 mss read "God was manifest", only 8 mss say something else; of those 8, five say "who" instead of "God" and three have private interpretations. This means that of the extant Greek manuscripts of the New Testament that bear witness to the true reading of this verse, 97% agree with the King James as opposed to 2% that read "who".

The verse should read as the 1611 KJV has rendered it, but the question that should be burning in the mind of the reader is "why did the other translations choose the minority text"?

Isaiah 7:14

Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)

"A young woman is going to have a baby." (Jerusalem Version)

"A young woman who is pregnant will have a son." (Good News)

"Behold a young woman shall conceive ..." (RSV)

There is nothing new about a young woman's having a baby, yet this is supposed to be a sign whereby God is promising deliverance in an almost impossible situation!

The Hebrew word "almah" (hmlu) occurs only seven times in the O.T. It should be rendered "virgin" here for although "almah" could mean "young woman", every time it is used in the Old Testament the context demands that it means "virgin".

The other six times it is translated "virgin" in most of the various versions. One wonders why the sudden departure in the verse before us. The miracle was going to be that a virgin was going to conceive!

Furthermore, the New Testament confirms the fact in Mat. 1:23 that Mary was a virgin: "Behold, a virgin (Greek = "parthenos" = parqeno") shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."

All languages contain both "weak" and "strong" words. By "weak" is meant a word that has many shades of meaning or even widely different meanings, i.e., the word "cool" in today's English. Such words can defy etymological studies. "Strong" words, on the other hand, are words which have a very limited narrow meaning—often only one possible sense.

We begin to see the manifold wisdom of God in choosing to reveal His Word to man in two tongues. Weak words in one which could lead to confusion could be covered by strong words in the other by cross references and quotations. Such is the case before us. The "weak" Hebrew word "almah" (though we have already shown that by its Biblical usage it is not so weak) is covered in the N.T. by the "strong" Greek word "parthenos" which can only be translated one way—"virgin".

Moreover, context is the decisive factor for determining the final connotation of any word or phrase, not the dictionary definition or etymology. Etymology, though often helpful, is not an exact science. It should be used for confirmation, not as the deciding factor.

The translators of the modern versions are well aware of the incontrovertible decisive nature of "parthenos" hence the translation of Isaiah 7:14 into any other word represents deliberate willful alteration of the Word of God. In denying the virgin birth of Christ, they are saying:

- 1) Jesus was a bastard as Mary was unmarried when she conceived;
- 2) Mary was a fornicator;
- 3) God has lied to us in Mat. 1:22-23;
- 4) Christ was not God, not deity (having a physical father, He was only human); and
- 5) Christ was a sinner as he would then be a descendant of Adam and inherit Adam's nature as in Rom. 5:12.

The three verses placed before us thus far should serve as an excellent barometer for the reader to use in determining whether a given version is trustworthy or not.

Zechariah 9:9

Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. (KJV)

"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout aloud O daughter of Jerusalem; behold, your King comes unto you; triumph and victorious is He; humble and riding on an ass, on a colt the foal of an ass. (RSV)

"And having salvation" is left out. This verse clearly declares the purpose for the Messiah's coming. The Bible believer must not allow himself to be lulled into complacency. If he concedes these changes, eventually he will have little left!

Matthew 1:25

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

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

"A" son and her "firstborn" do not necessarily mean the same. Furthermore, "firstborn" reveals that Mary had other children, correcting the Roman Catholic error that Mary was a perpetual virgin. (which demands that Joseph be a perpetual virgin also, unless he was an adulterer!? — cp. Mk.6:2-4; Joh.7:2-6, cp. 2:12; Psa.69:8; Luk.21:16)

Matthew 4:10 (9:18; 20:20; Mk.5:6; Lk.24:52)

Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. (KJV)

Comment: In the above verse, Jesus clearly endorsed Deuteronomy 6:13 and 10:20, declaring that all worship and service should be directed toward God and Him alone — yet Jesus Himself received and accepted worship on many occasions. In marked contrast, Peter (Act.10:25,26) and an angel (Rev.22:8) refused to accept worship, insisting that only God should be worshipped. Thus by Jesus' act of accepting worship, He was proclaiming that He was and is God! Moreover, that He was indeed Jehovah come in the flesh. Yet many of the newer versions render the Greek verb "proskuneo" (proskuneo) as "bowed down", "paid homage", "knelt" or "made obeisance" etc. (See the following.)

MAT 9:18 (KJV) While he spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler, and worshipped him, saying, My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.

MAT 9:18 (NAS) While he was saying these things to them, behold, there came a synagogue official, and bowed down before him saying, "My daughter has just died; but come and lay Your hand on her, and she will live." (knelt, NIV)

MAT 20:20 (KJV) Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of him.

MAT 20:20 (NAS) "Then the mother of the sons of Zebedee came to Him with her sons, bowing down, and making a request of Him." (kneeling down, NIV)

MARK 5:6 (KJ) But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him, ...

MAR 5:6 (NAS) And seeing Jesus from a distance, he ran up and bowed down before Him. (fell on his knees, NIV)

LUK 24:52 (KJV) And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy:

LUK 24:52 (NAS) "And they returned to Jerusalem with great joy." (worship omitted)

The preceding changes should alarm the Bible believer who is constantly being told that the NAS and the NIV are the best translations available, often by well meaning conservative men of God. Yet in these verses, the NAS and NIV read almost exactly as the New World Translation published by the Jehovah's Witness cult (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society).

Again, this represents a direct attack on the deity of Christ Jesus and it is not warranted in the Greek language. "Proskuneo" (proskuneo) appears 59 times in the N.T. In all of the other places, it has historically been rendered as "worship", "worshipped", or "worshipping" without challenge. It is by far the most prominent Greek word for worship in the Scriptures (the second largest occurring only 3 times). It is used to describe that which the people offer to: Satan (Rev.13:4), the Beast (Rev.13:15; 14:11; 16:2), demons (Rev.9:20), idols (Act.7:43), and God throughout the N.T.

In these verses, the translators of the NAS, NIV etc., had no difficulty in Translating "proskuneo" as "worship". Why do they suddenly find themselves compelled to offer a different wording when the same word is used in reference to the Lord Jesus Christ?

Moreover, the Hebrew equivalent of "proskuneo" is "shachah" (Hebrew = Shiyn-Cheyth-He = hvy). It occurs 174 times in the Old Testament and it too is normally translated by some form of the word "worship", being so rendered 99 times. It is the same word that is used with reference to the worship of God, idols, demons, etc. throughout the entire O.T.

Can you see the danger here? Does not your heart already tell you — does not the Holy Spirit bear witness to the true meaning of the verses already cited?

I truly pray that the Holy Spirit will open all eyes that read this.

God bless,

Stever

**Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)**

Re: The Magnitude of the Problem (Continued), on: 2006/1/7 1:08

Quote:

Steve wrote:

NIV,NAS, RSV OR THE KJV? THERE IS A TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE.

WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF DOCTRINE? "1. In a General sense, whatever is taught, Hence a principle or position in any science; whatever is laid down as true by an instructor or master. The doctrines of the Gospel are the principles or truths taught by Christ and his apostles. The doctrines of Plato are the principles which he taught. Hence a doctrine may be true or false; it may be a mere tenet or opinion. 2. The act of teaching-"He taught them many things by parables, and said to them in His doctrine Mark iv; 3. Learning, knowledge- "Whom shall He make to learn Doctrine? Isaiah xxviii; 3. The Truths of the Gospel in General-"That they may adorn the Doctrine of God our Savior in all things. Titus ii 5. Instruction and confirmation in the truths of the Gospel 2 Timothy iii

BIBLICAL COMPARISONS DEPICTING THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM THAT THE NIV,NAS, RSV AND ALL OF THE NEWER VERSIONS HAVE CREATED:

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Steve Continues (part 2)

Matthew 6:13

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. (KJ)

Comment: This is the end of the "model" prayer given by Jesus. Nearly all the modern translations either omit or footnote the underlined portion above. The Roman church as well as the post-millennialist want this ending deleted because they teach that there will not be a thousand year kingdom with Jesus enthroned on the earth. The church, according to the post-millennial precepts, will evangelize the world and thus it will bring in the kingdom.

The Roman Catholic position is that as the Pope is ruling on the throne in the Vatican State in Christ's stead, this is the Kingdom here and now. Rome teaches that through the Church's efforts all will be converted, that Satan was bound when Jesus rose from the dead and all Scripture that clearly teaches otherwise is spiritualized away by labeling it as allegory. It also maintains that the Church has replaced Israel in all the prophetic verses - that God has forever abandoned the nation Israel, never to use it again.

Of course, Romans 9-11 and a multitude of other Scripture proclaim that God will again use national Israel to His Glory. Moreover, the Scripture declares that King Jesus is going to physically (Rev.19) return, bring in the kingdom and give it to the saints (Luk.12:32)! God's ultimate plan is that all saved Jews and Gentiles for all time will be together as one flock, one Shepherd, one fold (Jn.10:16).

This conclusion of the Lord's or "model" Prayer is found in almost all the Greek New Testament manuscripts yet it is universally rejected by modern critics. Perhaps it is time that the Church rejected the modern critics!

Matthew 19:17

And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. (KJV)

"Jesus said unto him, Why are you asking me about what is good? There is only one who is good but if you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments." (NAS; NIV is similar)

Comment: The rich young ruler had asked the Master what good thing might he do to have eternal life. Jesus' reply was one of the greatest statements in the New Testament on the depravity of man and the deity of Christ. The question was about eternal life! The issue was Jesus! The young man was not asking "what is good", but "what good thing shall I do"?

Jesus' answer paraphrased would be "Young man, you just called me good! Do you realize what you are saying, for the Scripture teaches that there is only one good and that is God. Now do you still want to call me good?" If he now acknowledges that Jesus is "good" it would be tantamount to a confession that Jesus was God come in the flesh. Jesus was confronting the rich young ruler concerning His person. In so saying, Jesus is making a positive claim to Deity!

Jesus' answer must have deeply stung the pride of Origen (A.D. 185-254 - See Ch. V, p. 60) who is the source of this adulteration in the Holy Writ. As a gnostic Alexandrian Greek scholar and philosopher who had already castrated himself and gone around barefoot for years in order to earn "heavenly merits", Origen could not accept such as an authentic reading. He changed it to appear that the rich young ruler had asked Jesus to answer the great question of Greek philosophy - what is the "Summum Bonum" (highest good)? The reading as it appears in the NAS, NIV etc. is thus exposed as a gnostic depravity!

Mark 1:2-3

As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. (KJV)

As it is written in Isaiah the prophet, Behold, I send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way; The voice of one crying in the wilderness, make ready the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. (NAS; NIV is similar.)

Comment: Verse 3 is from Isaiah 40:3, but Verse 2 is not found in Isaiah. It is from Mal.3:1 - "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me ...". Thus the King James is correct in saying "prophets". Why is this distinction so important? Because Malachi gives the Hebrew rendition which is the precise original quote. If we know to look for the Mark text in more than one O.T. prophet, the reader may learn the great truth that lies couched in these verses.

When we read the last part of Malachi 3:1 and compare this to verse 6, we find that the "my" and "me" of verse one is Jehovah (LORD in all caps). W

When the New Testament quotes the Old, the word for Jehovah is not in all capital letters but in the Old Testament the word "LORD" is the English rendering of the Hebrew YHWH (Yod-He-Vav-He, hwhy) which we call "Jehovah".

Jehovah is speaking, hence Malachi is saying that the God of the Old Testament, Jehovah Himself, is coming  $\hat{A}$ – in the flesh! There is only one God and His principal name is "Jehovah". He manifested Himself in three persons, one in the flesh in order to die for man's sins. As Mark 1:1-3 applies to Jesus, we see that this becomes a declaration as to the person of Jesus  $\hat{A}$ – that He is Jehovah come to earth. This identification cannot be pieced together from Isaiah alone. Origen did not believe that Jesus was Jehovah come in the flesh so he altered the verse to fit his gnostic beliefs, obliterating the connection to Malachi. Modern translators are using Origen's private interpretation from which to translate.

The King James makes it clear that Jehovah was coming in the flesh whereas the NAS and NIV do not. This is a major doctrinal point for the person and deity of Christ Jesus are at issue.

Mark 9:43-44

And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: 44: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. (KJV)

RSV and NIV both omit verse 44. By so doing, man is not warned; he does not have to be concerned about eternal fire.

Comment: To learn what Jesus says about hell, read Chapter 9 beginning with verse 42. Jesus taught more about hell and its realities in the Gospels than is found in the rest of the Bible put together. Jesus repeats verse 44 again in verse 46. A church or person not believing in hell fire prefers the deletion of verse 44, but the original perverter of the Mark Scripture overlooked that it was a quote from Isaiah 66:24 and omitted to alter the teaching there. Man may try to eliminate hell in the New Testament, but the truth of the terrible consequence of man's sin if left unatoned by not receiving Jesus as one's personal Savior is preserved for us in the Old Testament. It does not alter the truth or fact of hell if one says he does not believe in hell. One may declare that he does not believe in gravity, but if he walks off a twenty story building he will find that mind over matter does not work. Cults teach "mind over matter", as do some Christian circles regarding the subject of faith, but it is not a Scriptural concept  $\hat{A}$ – not when context is considered. The fact of hell as a literal place is Scriptural (Luk.16:19-31 etc.).

Mark 10:21

Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me. (KJV)

Jesus looked at him and loved him. "One thing you lack," he said. "Go, sell everything you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me." (NIV; NAS is similar.)

Comment: The words "take up the cross" have been left out. That doctrine admittedly makes Christianity sound more appealing, but Jesus says there is a cross that comes with the new birth. The cross is a place of death. It is where man's will "crosses" God's will in opposition, rather than agreeing and lining up with the will of the Lord. It is the place where "self" dies to its own will, desires, goals, ambitions etc., and bows its head in humble submission to its Lord and says "not my will Lord but thine".

Mark 16:9-20

9Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. 10And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. 11 And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not. 12After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. 13 And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. 14 Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. 15 And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. 16 He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. 17 And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; 18 They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. 19 So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. 20And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen. (KJV)

Comment: Most versions have a footnote to the effect that "these verses are not in the oldest, best, most reliable Greek manuscripts." In laymen's terms this means that Mark 16:9-20 are not in the two 4th century Greek manuscripts, Vaticanus B and Sinaiticus Aleph which were derived from Origen's (185-254) edited New Testament (a 12th century minuscule also omits the verses). Satan has always wanted to strip the church of its power, authority, and commission. These verses are the Great Commission spoken by Jesus as recorded by Mark. It is an apostolic commission delegating great power to the body of Christ that it may continue the ministry of the Lord Jesus.

Of the approximately 3,119 Greek manuscripts of the N.T. extant today, none is complete. The segment of text bearing Mark 16 has been lost from many, but over 1,800 contain the section and verses 9-20 are present in all but the 3 cited above. The footnote is thus unveiled and laid bare as dishonest and deliberately misleading in intimating that these verses are not the Word of God.

The external evidence is massive. Not only is the Greek manuscript attestation ratio over 600 to 1 in support of the verses (99.99%)  $\hat{A}$ – around 8,000 Latin mss, about 1,000 Syriac versions as well as all of the over 2,000 known Greek Lectionaries contain the verses.

They were cited by Church "Fathers" who lived 150 years or more before B or Aleph were written i.e.: Papias (c.100), Justin Martyr (c.150), Tatian (c.175), Irenaeus (c.180), and Hippolytus (c.200). Further, the Vatican MSS has a blank space exactly the size required to include the 12 verses at the end of the 16th chapter. The scribe who prepared B obviously knew of the existence of the verses and their precise content. Indeed, as Tischendorf observed, Sinaiticus exhibits a different handwriting and ink on this page, and there is a change in spacing and size of the individual letters in an attempt to fill up the void left by the removal of the verses. These circumstances testify that the sheet is a forgery.

Do we really believe that God would have the greatest story ever told end at verse 8: "And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulcher; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid." Would God allow the good news of the Gospel to end with his disciples cringing in fear? Would Mark conclude his Gospel without any reference to the appearance of the risen Christ to His disciples? I think not! The reader should feel a deep sense of righteous anger upon learning of the unscrupulous manner in which these verses have been presented by various publishers.

TO BE CONTINUED

God bless,

Stever

**Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)**

## Re: The Magnitude of the Problem (Continued), on: 2006/1/7 1:14

Quote:

Stever wrote:

Quote:

Stever wrote:

NIV,NAS, RSV OR THE KJV? THERE IS A TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE.

BIBLICAL COMPARISONS DEPICTING THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM THAT THE NIV,NAS, RSV AND ALL OF THE NEWER VERSIONS HAVE CREATED:

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever Continues (part 3)

Luke 1:34

Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? (KJV)

Then Mary said to the angel, How shall this be since I have no husband? (RSV)

Comment: These verses are not declaring the same thing. Do not women have children without having husbands? God was declaring that Mary was a virgin. This verse also corroborates that Isaiah 7:14 should read "virgin". Again, Jesus did not inherit Adam's sin nature - He (with regard to His humanity, not His eternal deity) inherited the sinless nature of His Father God as a result of the miraculous conception of Mary! The Scriptures teach that one receives his "nature" (we are not referring to character traits) from one's father, not the mother.

Luke 2:14

Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men. (KJV)

Glory to God in the highest (heaven), and on earth peace among men with whom he is well pleased. (AMP; NAS & NIV read similarly except say "peace among men of good will."

Comment: The Scriptures teach that there are no men of good will, that the heart is desperately wicked and that none are righteous - no, not one - that all are sinners. The humanist trite offered as Scripture in the NAS, NIV, and AMP above is not the message which God brought the night the Messiah was born. The message delivered by the angels to the shepherds near Bethlehem was that God was presenting a gift of His good will toward all men, not merely to men of good will.

The reading contained in the newer translations reflects the view of the ancient Greek philosophers Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. Having a "good will" to them was the major factor in approaching life; some even considered it to be the "summum bonum" (supreme good). This "stale crumb" of Greek Philosophy was introduced into the N.T. when Origen altered "eudokia" ("good will" - nominative case) to "eudokias" ("of good will" - genitive case) thus producing the result he desired (though he admitted in his critical apparatus that he was divided in his mind over the correct reading).

The truth of the matter is assured by the context (context often ignored or missed by many so-called Greek and Hebrew scholars in their determined penchant for altering the King James and its Greek foundation - the Textus Receptus), for verse 10 precedes with "and the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." The angels were bringing the good news to all people, not just to men of good will - for as there are no such creatures, such would not be "good tidings". Moreover, the "new" reading spoils the three-fold meter of the verse by doing away with the last of the three subjects (glory, peace, good will), and "men of good will" is grammatically left without any qualifying genitive.

Luke 2:33

And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him. (KJV)

And His father and His mother were amazed at things which were being said about Him. (NAS; NIV)

Comment: God is meticulously affirming that Joseph was not the father of Jesus by the King James wording "Joseph and Jesus' mother". The NAS and NIV reduce Jesus to a mere human, born with a sin nature inherited from Adam. The alteration is another assault upon Jesus' deity.

Luke 4:4

And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God. (KJV)

Jesus answered and said, Man shall not live by bread alone. (NAS)

Comment: Omitting "but by every word of God" is a major doctrinal point of contention. The King James reading protects the believer from overdispe

nsationalism which tends to negate the importance of the Old Testament. Jesus corrects that error as the O.T. was also given by the Word of God. The whole point of the verse has been left out! Yet the Church is constantly being taught and persuaded that the NAS and NIV are the best translations available.

Luke 9:54-56

The setting of the story here is that Jesus and his disciples are enroute to Jerusalem through Samaria and the Samaritans will not welcome them to their cities.

54 And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? 55 But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. 56 For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village. (KJ)

54 And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, Do you want us to command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them? 55 But He turned and rebuked them. 56 And they went to another village. (NAS; NIV is similar)

Comment: None of the underlined KJV verses appears in the NAS or the NIV. Some of the other versions relegate them to a footnote. Had the Roman Catholic Church read and believed verse 56 there would never have been the inquisition where between 50 to 60 million people were murdered! By omitting these portions of Scripture, one could justify killing those disagreeing with his doctrine!

Luke 22:64

And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee? (KJ)

They blindfolded him and demanded, Prophecy! Who hit you? (NIV, NAS)

Comment: "They struck Him on the face" was omitted. Not only is it important to know the fact that the Lord Jesus suffered such indignity and cruelty, this is prophecy being fulfilled which points to the fact that Jesus is the Messiah. Micah 5:1 records: "... they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek."

TO BE CONTINUED AGAIN

God bless,

Stever

**Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)**

## Re: The Magnitude of the Problem (Continued), on: 2006/1/7 1:23

Quote:

Stever wrote:

NIV,NAS, RSV OR THE KJV? THERE IS A TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE.

WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF DOCTRINE?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever continues:

Luke 23:38

And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS. (KJ)

There was a written notice above him, which read: this is the king of the Jews. (NIV; NAS is similar)

Comment: The words "of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew" were omitted!

Luke 23:42

And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. (KJ)

The word "Lord" is omitted. (NIV, NAS)

Comment: Not one Greek manuscript omits this word! Calling Jesus "Lord" indicates that the thief was converted before his death which establishes several important points. First, that God will receive a wicked man even at the last moments of his life; that it is never too late to become reconciled to God while there is life. This serves to reveal the nature and heart of God— that it is toward man and that He desires that none should perish doomed. Secondly, it demonstrates that God will receive a man apart from any religious rituals such as water baptism or extreme unction. There is absolutely no Greek authority for this omission; it is a private interpretation of those responsible for the newer Greek New Testaments which alter the Greek text upon which the King James is based.

Luke 24:6

He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, (KJ)

Remember how He told you while He was still in Galilee. (RSV)

Comment: The most important part of the verse (see the underlined portion) — the entire resurrection — is omitted!

Luke 24:42

And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. (KJ)

They gave him a piece of broiled fish. (NIV, NAS)

Comment: The words "and of an honeycomb" were omitted. The point that is being made is that when the reader uses the other versions, how is he to know what has been edited or deleted—whether it be concerning a major detail or not as in the above cited case? From now forward, the reader will always wonder, "has anything been omitted"?

John 1:18

No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. (KJ)

Nestle's Greek Text gives the following literal reading (NAS, AMP, NIV are similar): God, no man has seen never— the only begotten God, the One, being in the bosom of the Father, that One declared Him.

Comment: Instead of "only begotten Son" we find "only begotten god". That means that Jesus is a created god— a lesser god— a god with a little "g" and thus not eternal. This Scripture is dealing with the dual nature of Jesus, the humanity of Jesus versus His deity. Some Scripture reveals one and some the other. Not always realizing that He is 100% both, many people become confused. Sonship, in connection with Christ Jesus, always refers to His humanity— never to deity. As a man, He was begotten, had a beginning— became a son (cp. Luk.1:35; Act.13:33; Psa.2:7; Heb.1:5-6; Mat. 1:18-25 etc.), but as God— He had no beginning!

Micah 5:2, in speaking of the Messiah, declares "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

That Jesus is merely a created being, a lesser god, is the original Arian heresy! Arius (died 336) was an early "Church Father" who put forth this heresy. Emperor Constantine I and Eusebius promoted the teaching.

The Holy Scripture teaches that there is ONE God who has revealed Himself in three different Persons— the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. God, who is a spirit, became a Son for the purpose of dying to redeem fallen man. When this occurred, God also remained in heaven becoming a Father as He had "begotten" (imparted life) a son.

The most important single issue regarding Jesus is— Who is He— not what He did! Even though what He accomplished in His finished work of redeeming fallen man through His blood atonement for man's sin and sins was of major and majestic significance, it is secondary when compared to His person. What we are saying is, that the Church has proclaimed that men should give their hearts and lives to Christ— that we should faithfully follow a dore and worship Him— because He gave His life for our sins. Wrong! We should do all of these— first and foremost because of WHO HE IS, God Almighty— the Creator! Because He is God we should worship Him and Him only should we serve, not because He did something for us. He is worthy of worship for Himself! For His own personal worth He deserves man's total being and allegiance. Then, secondarily, out of gratitude for His voluntarily humbling Himself in taking on the nature of flesh and for sacrificing Himself on our behalf— we should give Him all our loyalty, all our love and obedience.

Whenever the Scripture speaks of Jesus as the Son, it is always referring to the 33 years which He spent on the earth as a genuine human, although He never ceased being God. Thus God begat a Son! In other words, before the incarnation, before the virgin Mary's egg was supernaturally fertilized without intercourse (Luk.1:35) when He became "the Son of God", "the only begotten Son of the Father"— before all of this and from eternity past— who was Jesus? He was God in His own right. He was always God. "In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God and the Word was God" (Joh 1:1).

God is a Spirit (Joh.4:24 KJV). The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one and the same eternal Spirit from eternity past. Jesus, the Messiah, is thus the Creator of heaven and earth— the God of the Old Testament whose principal name is Jehovah— come in the flesh.

ISA 9:6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

Christianity is monotheistic— we do not believe in three Gods. There is ONE God (Isa.43:10-11; 44:6, 8b; 45:5, 21-22; Mk.12:29-33; Rom.3:30; I Cor.8:6; Eph.4:5-6; I Tim.2:5; and Jas.2:19) who, for the sake of redeeming fallen man (and that plan via foreknowledge was from before the foundation of the world), has revealed Himself in three distinct persons.

We do not argue or debate the above concerning the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. We proclaim it— though much of Christendom be ignorant of these basic Bible tenets.

The Greek text that most of the Bible Colleges and Seminaries use today which has replaced the Greek text underlying the King James translation denies all of this by its reading— as does the NAS, NIV, AMP etc. which follow it. This is of preeminent importance. This is not error or mistranslation— it is heresy! It attacks the person of the Lord Jesus the Christ at the very foundation. O' Church, awake! The Philistines are upon us!

John 3:36

He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him. (KJV)

Whosoever believes in the Son has eternal life; but who does not obey the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abides on him. (NAS)

Comment: The verse has been changed from God's clear declaration that eternal life is the result of faith in Jesus, of believing in Him— to salvation is obtained by obedience. Obedience (other than that of repenting and receiving Jesus) is a "work of righteousness". Being a child who pleases his father is desirable but when a person is first saved he does not have complete understanding. It is the work of the Holy Spirit within him to bear witness as to right and wrong and it usually takes time to discern His voice and leading. Titus 3:5 says "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;". The NAS offers "another gospel" in the above verse.

TO BE CONTINUED- NOTICE THE DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE BETWEEN THE KING JAMES AND THE CORRUPT NIV AND THE NEWER VERSIONS?

God bless,

Stever

**Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)**



Re: The Magnitude of the Problem (Continued), on: 2006/1/7 1:32

Quote:

Stever wrote:

NIV,NAS, RSV OR THE KJV? THERE IS A TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE.

CONTINUED

John 6:35

And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. (KJV)

And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that comes to me shall not hunger; and he who believes on me shall never thirst. (NAS)

Comment: Why was "never" changed to "not"? It alters the whole force of Jesus' words. Upon eating a large meal, one could say he was not hungry but it would not mean that he would never be hungry again. He would probably be hungry again within five hours. The doctrine of Jesus is centered upon Himself -- "He who comes to Me ..."

John 6:47

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

Truly, truly, I say to you he who believes has eternal life. (NAS, NIV)

Comment: He who believes what? They leave out in whom to believe and trust -- upon whom to rely. Jesus said "He that believeth on ME ...". Is not this a grave matter?

John 8:1-11

The story of the woman taken in adultery -- see APPENDIX A, p. 142. As the explanation is lengthy and technical, it has been placed so as not to cause the reader to lose sight of the issues.

Acts 8:36-37

36 And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? 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)

RSV; New English Bible: Both omit all of verse 37 (underlined). Verse 37 is omitted and relegated to a footnote in the NIV and NAS.

Comment: What church or churches have always taught salvation by water baptism? If verse 37 is part of the Word of God, it would establish that baptizing a baby would not save him. Children are covered by covenant until they are old enough to make a decision. Only Jesus can save the soul -- not water baptism. For those believing in infant baptism for salvation, it would be necessary to remove verse 37. Galatians 3:26 declares: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Thus if you do not have faith in Christ Jesus you are not a child of God. So it is pointless to baptize a baby who does not have faith in Christ Jesus. This verse teaches that faith in Jesus' deity is a prerequisite to water baptism. It is cited by Irenaeus (c. 180) and Cyprian (c.250) and is found in the Old Latin and the Vulgate translations.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Is there really a difference? You betchum Red Rider!

God bless,

Stever

**Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)**

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2006/1/7 1:32

Hi Stever...

Quote:

-----The preceding changes should alarm the Bible believer who is constantly being told that the NAS and the NIV are the best translations available, often by well meaning conservative men of God.

I believe that this is the major error in attempting to discuss this issue. The translators of the NIV did not change the KJV. In fact, it was not a *revision* at all. Rather, they offered an entirely **new translation** using what they, and many other scholars, believed to be the best sources. This type of argument seems to imply that there was some sort of "conspiracy" by the translators of the NIV, NASB and RSV (etc...) to purposely mistranslate the Word of God to suit their own religious beliefs. That is a very strong allegation to state as fact -- particularly if you have not spoken with a translator firsthand. After having looked into this, this type of belief does not seem credible at all.

The truth of the matter is that the source materials for the KJV (the *Received Text*) differs from what was used for the NI

V (the *Alexandrian Texts*, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, etc...). I believe that all of the discrepancies that you often list are due to the fact that the various sources are different. The "Hebrew" and "Greek" that are often referenced by *KJV-only* believers in this discussion is the "Hebrew" and "Greek" as recorded in the *Received Text*. It is not the same "Hebrew" or "Greek" words as recorded in the other manuscripts that the NIV committee believed to be more reliable. The result is, of course, the differences in translation. Thus, it is pointless to perform an endless verse-by-verse comparison of translations taken from different source material.

What then? Do the differences in the text and subsequent translations actually change the "doctrine of the Church" as you seem to suggest? Of course not! The NIV is decidedly clear about subjects like *the Trinity*, *the deity of Christ*, *the Virgin in Birth*, *the fact that Mary did not remain a virgin*, *the need to worship*, etc... For every difference between the Scriptural wording of the KJV version and translations taken from other source material (like the NIV and NASB), there are many other verses that strongly confirm such doctrinal truths. In some instances, it could even be argued that the NIV translation actually offers a much stronger wording of certain fundamental doctrines. But to imply that "doctrine is changed" because a few single differences because of variances in original source material seems rather dubious and unsubstantiated. I use both the NIV and the KJV -- and I strongly hold such fundamental doctrines. All of the believers that I know that use both of these translations also hold firmly to such fundamental doctrines.

As far as any type of Catholic influence on the NIV -- it was translated entirely from a group of various Protestant scholars. They came from a wide variety of Protestant denominations and fellowships. There was not a single Catholic on the translation committee.

:)

#### Re: The Magnitude of the Problem (Continued), on: 2006/1/7 1:41

Quote:

-----  
Stever wrote:

NIV,NAS, RSV OR THE KJV? THERE IS A TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE.

CONTINUED:

Acts 20:28

Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. (KJV)

Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to care for the church of God which he obtained with the blood of his own Son. (RSV 1971 NCC)

Comment: Perceive the difference! The King James declares that God's church was purchased by God's blood -- therefore Christ is God. It was Jesus Christ whose blood was shed. The RSV separates Christ from God when it changes "his own blood" to "the blood of his own Son".

Romans 8:1

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. (KJV)

Comment: All modern versions omit the underlined portion of the verse. This is because they have as their foundation the Greek uncials Aleph and Vaticanus whereas the King James was based upon a different Greek text which reflects the reading of over 95% of all the known Greek manuscripts. These two uncials are supported by a few others (C,D,F & G) as well as a few cursives and versions. However, the vast mass of Greek cursives testify to the inclusion of these words. Even the much vaunted uncial "A" (see p. 70) contains "who walk not after the flesh".

The critics pretend that this portion was inserted from the end of verse 4 in the course of transcription and that this mis-copied mss had its novel reading copied more than all the others. Strangely, such men claim for themselves insight and wisdom far greater than the whole of England. Such critics tell us what God OUGHT to say rather than what God HAS said.

Most Calvinists favor its omission fearing the doctrinal implications toward Arminianism if the portion is included. However such concern is of no force when one realizes that the ending is not a qualifying remark, but rather serves to define what is meant by being "in Christ Jesus". Verses 8, 9, 13, 7:25 and 9:8 clearly define the terms "after the flesh" and "after the Spirit". Verse 4b is a refrain for emphasis. Scripture is rife with similar redundancies for the same reason -- accentuation of important themes.

Romans 14:10b, 12

... for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ ... So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God. (KJV)

... for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God ... So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God. (NAS)

Comment: The logic as preserved by the King James Bible is irrefutable! When we stand before the judgment seat of Christ -- we are giving account to GOD. Therefore -- Christ Jesus is God! Observe the subtle difference in the NAS! Just one small word is changed, yet there is no proof left that Jesus is God in these verses!

Second Timothy 3:16

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: (KJV)

Every inspired scripture has its use for teaching the truth and refuting error, or for reformation of manners and discipline in right living, so that the man who belongs to God may be efficient and equipped for good work of every kind. (NEB)

The NAS footnote reads: "or, every Scripture inspired by God is also profitable ..."

Comment: These renderings imply that there are Scriptures not given by inspiration of God. There is a problem if some are whereas others are not! A Pope or pastor would accordingly be necessary to determine which verses were inspired (job security for the clergy)!

Hebrews 1:3

Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high: (KJV)

... After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand ... (NIV; NAS similar).

Comment: "By himself" has been removed. By removing these words, perhaps Mary or some saint helped Jesus remove our sins! It is clear from the KJ that no one helped Jesus redeem. He is God come in the flesh and does not need any help. This is a major doctrinal point!

Hebrews 2:11

For both he that sanctifieth and they who are Sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,

For he who sanctifies and those who are sanctified have all one origin. That is why he is not ashamed to call them brethren.

Comment: The RSV adds "origin". By saying that Christ had the same origin as man, they are teaching that Christ is not God! Christ did not have an origin, as the Scriptures clearly proclaim, i.e.:

PSA 90:2 ... even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God. (KJ)

MIC 5:2 But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. (KJ)

"All of one" is clearly defined in the context of the last part of the verse, namely the context of "family" via the new birth. Hence "all of one Father" is the sense of the matter, not "origin"!

Micah 5:2

But you, O Bethlehem Ephratah, who are little to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from ancient days (RSV; NIV similar).

Comment: They continue this blasphemy in demeaning the deity of Christ whereas the King James honors it.

Hebrews 2:16

For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. (KJV)

For indeed He does not give aid to angels but He does give aid to the seed of Abraham. (NKJ; NAS, NIV, AMP & RSV similar)

Comment: First, we remind the reader that here both of the above translations are being made from the exact Greek words as contained in the Textus Receptus (the original Greek reading of the New Testament). This is one of the many cases where the translation is facilitated by the context. The immediate context of verse 16 is unmistakably revealed in the verse that follows:

HEB 2:17 Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

Although the Greek is admittedly difficult if verse 16 alone is considered, the translators had their job clarified by the Holy Spirit. That which follows in verse 17 has nothing to do whatever with "giving aid" to angels. Furthermore, verse 14 both confirms and precedes the "problem" verse with the correct context:

HEB 2:14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;

Clearly the subject being presented is that of the human nature of the Messiah, and as the letter is addressed to the "Hebrews" it is of special relevance to those who proceeded from the loins of Abraham. Moreover, verse 16 amplifies verse 5:

HEB 2:5 For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak.

The writer of the Book of Hebrews is being led by the Holy Spirit to demonstrate, beginning with the "remote" context concerning familiar Old Testament fundamentals, why the Messiah had to be a man and could not be an angel.

The 1611 King James translators recognized the importance of bringing this "remote context" (or distant context) to bear upon this verse, the literal Greek itself being cryptic and obscure. As all linguists well know, some interpretation is necessary when engaged in translating from one language to another, sentence structure, word order, etc. often being different. The object is to be faithful to the original wording and meaning such as to do as little interpretation as possible. Thus, guided by the Spirit of God, the King James translators correctly rendered verse 16 with regard to the remote context as well as with regard to the immediate context of the verses surrounding it. They signified that they had done this by placing "him the nature of" and "him" in italics. This clearly distinguishes between the words of man and of God. All other translations contain similar word insertions, but unlike the King James translation (many more than found in the KJ), they do not let the reader know this by so indicating.

Moreover, the verse as rendered in the KJV shows Jesus as the true fulfillment of mankind's only hope as revealed in the Old Testament prophecies – that He is the promised "seed of the woman" (Gen.3:15). This prophetic application of the verse is completely missed in the other translations.

Further, He is pictured by the KJV translators as especially being the fulfillment of the continuation of the Genesis 3:15 promise as given to Abraham.

And in thy (Abraham) seed (singular! Greek = spermati {spermati}, LXX - cp. Gal. 3:16) shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. (Gen. 22:18, KJB)

But we are not left at the mercy of some mere man or modern Greek or Hebrew authority to divulge that the word "seed" in the above verse is not speaking of the Jewish nation but is in the singular and as such is a unmistakable reference to Messiah. The Holy Spirit reveals this truth to him in English elsewhere in Scripture.

Now to Abraham and his seed (spermati = spermati - singular in Greek) were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds (spermasin = spermasin

- plural as does the root sperma, = sperma; see the LXX), as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed (spermati - singular), which is Christ. (Galatians 3:16, KJB)

All of the rich setting and overview that has preceeded is completely lost in the modern reading of Hebrews 2:16.

Equally alarming, the reading as found in the NKJV et. al. introduces a conspicuous error into the Word of God — namely, that God does not give aid to angels.

This contradicts Daniel 10 wherein the prophet for whom the Book is named was told by an angel that he had been dispatched from the throne of Heaven to come to strengthen him. Nevertheless, the heavenly messenger had been withstood for a period of 21 days by the demon prince who oversaw the kingdom of Persia. It was not until God dispatched the archangel Michael to come to the aid of the angelic messenger that he was able to successfully battle through and reach Daniel.

Thus, the internal evidence of other Scripture lays bare this inaccurate rendering of the Word of God and shows all translations which so follow as being erroneous and inferior. The Monarch of Books, the true English rendering of the Holy Writ as preserved in the 1611 King James Bible, is thereby demonstrated to be conspicuously superior and preeminent.

I hope that you have come this far!!!!

I truly pray that the Holy Spirit will continue to open all eyes that read this.

God bless,

Stever

**Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)**  
-----

## Re:The Magnitude of the Problem (Continued), on: 2006/1/7 1:50

Quote:

-----

Stever wrote:

NIV,NAS, RSV OR THE KJV? THERE IS A TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE.

CONTINUED:

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE IN DOCTRINE? JUST READ, STUDY AND SEE FOR YOURSELF.

First Peter 2:2

As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: (KJV)

Like newborn babes, long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow up to salvation. (RSV; NIV is similar)

Comment: This perversion teaches (1) that salvation occurs over a period of time and (2) that it is by works. Salvation is a free gift and the Word teaches that we neither "grow up" to it, "work for it", nor "obtain it gradually". Deliverance from sin comes by faith in Christ Jesus, i.e.:

ACT 16:31 ... Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved ... (KJV)

(3) The phrase "of the word" has been omitted, leaving us to wonder what "spiritual milk" is. The King James tells us the answer.

First Peter 4:1

Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind ... (KJV)

Therefore since Christ has suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves also with the same purpose (NAS; NIV is similar).

Comment: Why did Christ Jesus suffer? For us! Note its complete removal from the text. Is not this "doctrinal"?

Acts 9:6

The following comparison is a clear capsule specimen depicting the character and degree of the alterations that have been made upon the Holy Scripture.

(speaking of the conversion of Saul on the Damascus Road)

"And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." (KJV)

"Now get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you must do." (NIV; NAS etc., is similar)

Comment: Surely by now the reader has seen enough that any more examples are not necessary. We therefore with some reluctance mention that without the above underlined words, one cannot be certain if Saul were converted.

If these words are allowed to stand as faithfully recorded in the King James Bible, Saul — fully aware of the identity of the person with whom he is speaking — acknowledges Jesus as his Lord. That the verse likewise teaches the fear of the risen glorified Christ, as well as His boundless grace, is also

manifestly evident.

Psalms 8:4-5

Lastly, a dramatic example depicting the serious inconsistencies found in the other translations may be seen in the following:

What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. (KJV)

HEB 2:6-7

But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour ... (KJV)

PSA 8:4-5

What is man, that Thou dost take thought of him? And the son of man, that Thou dost care for him? Yet Thou hast made him a little lower than God, And dost crown him with glory and majesty! (NAS, et. al.).

HEB 2:6-7

But one has testified somewhere, saying, "What is man, that thou rememberest him? or the son of man that thou art concerned about him? Thou hast made him for a little while lower than the angels; thou hast crowned him with glory and honor ..." (NAS)

Comment: The highly touted NAS has rendered the Hebrew word "Elohim" as "God" in the eighth Psalm, creating within itself a conspicuous contradiction in the Hebrews 2 quotation of that O.T. passage. The "weak" Hebrew word (which can mean God, angels, judges, magistrates etc.) is protected by the "strong" Greek word "aggelos" which can only be translated "angels". The KJB is faithful to the LORD and to its readers by correctly rendering both passages as "angels".

The NAS reading in the 8th Psalm is not merely wrong, it fails to comprehend the immeasurable chasm existing between the Creator and the creature. It is humanistic, insulting to GOD and as such represents a blasphemous heretical translation having ignored God's New Testament Greek shelter and defense mechanism.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Well, that about wraps it up for tonight.

I pray that this has been a blessing for all to see, with their own eyes.

God bless,

Stever

**Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)**

## Re: The Magnitude of the Problem, on: 2006/1/7 2:09

ccchhhrrriiisss said:

"What then? Do the differences in the text and subsequent translations actually change the "doctrine of the Church" as you seem to suggest? Of course not! The NIV is decidedly clear about subjects like the Trinity, the diety of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the fact that Mary did not remain a virgin, the need to worship, etc... For every difference between the Scriptural wording of the KJV version and translations taken from other source material (like the NIV and NASB), there are many other verses that strongly confirm such doctrinal truths."

Stever's response:

In regards to your post you have stated the above. What I would appreciate is documentation on the following statement made by you:

"For every difference between the Scriptural wording of the KJV version and translations taken from other source material (like the NIV and NASB), there are many other verses that strongly confirm such doctrinal truths."

Please respond to each issue of doctrine that I have presented here that the NIV and Newer Versions have removed. Show us where the Newer versions, IN OTHER PLACES, correct the error that was revealed in my many posts this evening on this same issue.

Your participation is appreciated.

God bless,

Stever

**Your documentation would be appreciated, Chris.**

**Re: The Magnitude of the Problem (Continued), on: 2006/1/7 3:07**

Stever's response:

The relationship to the Catholic Bible, is that all of the newer versions today rely on the same corrupt text as the Catholic Bible does. The Sinaiticus Aleph and the Vaticanus B are the Greek Papyri relied upon solely for the Catholic Bible. That same corrupt text (Sinaiticus Aleph and the Vaticanus B) is the same text relied upon by the Revision Committee chaired by Westcott and Hort, that is THE SAME TEXT AS ALL THE NEWER VERSIONS RELY ON- the NIV,NAS,RSV ETC. ETC. ETC. and all of the other corrupt versions.

#### VATICANUS B AND SINAITICUS ALEPH

What is Vaticanus B? It is a Greek manuscript written on vellum containing 759 pages, each being 10 1/2 x 10 1/2 inches. It adds to the Bible as it includes the Old Testament Apocrypha. Yet God said "don't add." It contains the Epistle of Barnabas (part of the Apocalyptic books of New Testament times) which teaches that water baptism saves the soul, again adding to the Word of God. However, the Word of God has also been deleted as Vaticanus B does not include Genesis 1:1-46:28; Psalms 106-138; Matthew 16:2,3; Romans 16:24 and it lacks Paul's pastoral epistles (1st and 2nd Timothy, Titus and Philemon). Missing are Revelation as well as Hebrews 9:15 - 13:25 which teaches that the once for all sacrifice of Jesus ended the sacraments forever. There is also a blank space left at Mark 16:9-20 (see any standard reference such as ISBE).

Erasmus knew about Vaticanus B and its variant readings in 1515 A.D. while preparing the New Testament Greek text. Because they read so differently from the vast majority of mss which he had seen, Erasmus considered such readings spurious. For example, Vaticanus B leaves out "Mystery Babylon the Great", "the seven heads that are the seven mountains upon which the harlot (the apostate religious system that began at Babel of which the Roman church is a part) sits", and leaves out "the woman which is that great city which reigns over the kings of the earth" which has seven mountains. All of this is found in Revelation 17.

Sinaiticus Aleph, discovered in 1844, has 147 1/2 pages, each page being 13 1/2 x 15 inches. It is always stated that Aleph is a "complete" Greek New Testament, but it is not. It adds, for example, the Shepherd of Hermas and Barnabas to the N.T. It omits John 5:4; 8:1-11; Mat. 16:2,3; Rom. 16:24; Mark 16:9-20; I John 5:7; Acts 8:37 and about a dozen other verses.

The most significant fact regarding these MSS is that in both Vaticanus B and Sinaiticus Aleph, John 1:18 reads that Jesus was the only begotten "God" instead of the only begotten "Son". Now, that is the original Arian heresy! THE MOST WIDELY USED GREEK TEXT IN BIBLE COLLEGES AND SEMINARIES TODAY IS EBERHARD NESTLE'S GREEK TEXT. NESTLE LIKEWISE READS ... ONLY BEGOTTEN "GOD", WHICH MEANS THAT GOD HAD A LITTLE GOD NAMED JESUS WHO IS THUS A LESSER GOD THAN THE FATHER. This means that at first there was big God and He created a little "god".

Thus, Jesus comes out to be a created being, a God with a little "g", but at the incarnation a god was not begotten. God begat a son who, insofar as His deity is concerned, is eternal (Micah 5:2). This reading renders these MSS as UNTRUSTWORTHY and DEPRAVED! The Arian heresy resulted from Origen's editing the Greek manuscripts encountered in his travels and appears in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus Aleph which were derived from copying his work.

Modern scholarship purports that these two codices were copied around 350-380 A.D. The reader can see how well that fits in with the fact that Constantine told Eusebius to prepare the copies for him in 331. The material that Jerome used (Origen's Hexapla and, in places, his edited New Testament) was almost word for word like Sinaiticus Aleph and Vaticanus B, especially the former.

Helvidius, a great orthodox scholar of the fourth century and a contemporary of Jerome's, accused Jerome of using corrupted Greek manuscripts. Remember, Jerome was using Origen's work and from that he produced the LATIN VULGATE. Likewise, Aleph and "B" have their roots in Origen. Thus Helvidius condemns them all, for even in his day that "fountain" was known to be corrupt.

Moreover, whoever copied out Vaticanus obviously did not believe he had the Word of God in his hands for there are misspellings, faulty grammar, numerous omissions, whole lines recopied, and lines and clauses omitted. According to

nearly all scholars, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are "close brothers". They differ many times but they are of the same "textual type", using as they did Origen's fifth column and his New Testament.

#### ALEXANDRINUS "A"

A third manuscript often referred to in textual criticism literature is "Alexandrinus A". Dated as a 5th century witness, though it may be still earlier, "A" often follows the Traditional Text in the gospels. It reads like "B" and Aleph in Acts and the epistles. This MSS also contains the two "Epistles of Clement" in which Clement of Alexandria teaches that:

1. Men are saved by works (II Clem.2:12, 15);
2. Christians are in danger of going to hell (II Clem.3:8);
3. Christians don't get new bodies at the resurrection (IV Clem.4:2);
4. He was a prophet who wrote Scripture (II Clem.4:11); and
5. The male and female in I Corinthians 11:9 (speaking of Christ's being the head, then the husband, followed by the wife in the order or chain of authority) were anger and concupiscence (II Clem.5:4). Not believing the Bible literally, Clement both fantasized and spiritualized the Scriptures

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever concludes:

Both the Catholic Bible and the Revision Committee have relied solely on the corrupt Sinaiticus Aleph and the Vaticanus B text. All newer translations of the Bible also rely on this same corrupt text (Sinaiticus Aleph and the Vaticanus B).

God bless,

Stever

#### **The Corrupt Sinaiticus Aleph and the Vaticanus B**

Quote:

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi Stever...

Quote:

-----The preceding changes should alarm the Bible believer who is constantly being told that the NAS and the NIV are the best translations available, often by well meaning conservative men of God.

-----  
I believe that this is the major error in attempting to discuss this issue. The translators of the NIV did not change the KJV. In fact, it was not a *revision* at all. Rather, they offered an entirely **new translation** using what they, and many other scholars, believed to be the best sources. This type of argument seems to imply that there was some sort of "conspiracy" by the translators of the NIV, NASB and RSV (etc...) to purposely mistranslate the Word of God to suit their own religious beliefs. That is a very strong allegation to state as fact -- particularly if you have not spoken with a translator firsthand. After having looked into this, this type of belief does not seem credible at all.

The truth of the matter is that the source materials for the KJV (the *Received Text*) differs from what was used for the NIV (the *Alexandrian Texts*, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, etc...). I believe that all of the discrepancies that you often list are due to the fact that the various sources are different. The "Hebrew" and "Greek" that are often referenced by *KJV-only* believers in this discussion is the "Hebrew" and "Greek" as recorded in the *Received Text*. It is not the same "Hebrew" or "Greek" words as recorded in the other manuscripts that the NIV committee believed to be more reliable. The result is, of course, the differences in translation. Thus, it is pointless to perform an endless verse-by-verse comparison of translations taken from different source materials.

"....."



As far as any type of Catholic influence on the NIV -- it was translated entirely from a group of various Protestant scholars. They came from a wide variety of Protestant denominations and fellowships. There was not a single Catholic on the translation committee.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

#### False Doctrine

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/1/7 13:19**

Hello Stever...

Quote:  
-----The relationship to the Catholic Bible, is that all of the newer versions today rely on the same corrupt text as the Catholic Bible does  
.

I think that this argument has been covered several times in the forums. As we have already discussed, you are labeling all of the source texts that you do not personally agree with as *corrupt* while many other scholars and believers disagree. You have not given any evidence for this belief.

You have done verse-by-verse analysis between the NIV and the KJV -- but this is unnecessary since they are translated from different sources, and will undoubtedly have such differences.

You also lay accusations against two dead scholars that believed in the validity of other sources. These men died many years before the publication of the versions in question. Thus, these men had nothing to do with any of the actual translations.

The fact that the Catholic Church may have used the same source material in their newer versions does not change the credibility of other translations that use similar source material. Older versions of the Catholic Bibles used also relied on the *Received Text* just as the KJV. The Mormons use the KJV. The Jehovah's Witnesses also used the KJV until they translated their *New World Translation*. The Seventh Day Adventists endorse the KJV. Many of today's cults use the KJV exclusively. Even the KJV incorporated the *Apocrypha* until it was finally removed in 1769. To dismiss the NIV or NASB because the Catholic Church used some of the same source material in their newer versions is like dismissing the KJV because cults used the same source material for their versions. It is a hollow argument.

As far as your request about the doctrine as seen in the NIV, I will try to do this later. However, I am beginning to think that this entire topic is becoming meaningless (or "vanity"). Through research, I am becoming convinced that the *KJV-only* argument is fundamentally flawed. However, you also seem very convinced about your position and beliefs. There is no point in continuing the discussion if we are both so convinced of our beliefs. The only thing that concerns me is your willingness to openly slander or criticize other translations, scholars and source texts (and sometimes, even believers) of which you do not agree. But I have noticed that this is quite common with many of the *KJV-only* websites and books.

Stever, I will attempt to supply you some verses from the NIV that you requested that would support the doctrine that you believe the NIV corrupts. However, I will probably either email them or PM them, since such posts are very long. After that, I believe that I will probably stop visiting this particular thread very often, as it is beginning to sound quite redundant. I will write my conclusion and then just leave it at that. As always, though, I will continue to pray about the topic -- that the Lord will lead us and guide us into all truth. He is able!

:-)

**Re: Catholic Bible & the Christian Bible the same? NOT NOT NOT!, on: 2006/1/7 14:25**

ccchhrrriiisss said:

"The fact that the Catholic Church may have used the same source material in their newer versions does not change the credibility of other translations that use similar source material. Older versions of the Catholic Bibles used also relied on the *Received Text* just as the KJV."

xxxxxxxxxxxx

Stevens response:

Your statement is FALSE. The Catholic Bible has ALWAYS used the Alexandrian Vaticanus B and Sinaiticus Aleph as their source. These manuscripts (Vaticanus B and Sinaiticus Aleph) recently made available are essentially the same as Jerome's Latin Vulgate which finds its foundation in the works of ORIGEN- A HERETIC.



The Reformers knew all about the variant readings of the LATIN VULGATE and they REJECTED THEM which is the same thing as rejecting ORIGEN. In rejecting Origen, they rejected Codex Vaticanus as it was copied from his work. Thus, the Reformers had all the material necessary for the task at their disposal.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever's continued response to Chris:

Chris, how can you make statements like you do that have no source in history? The Catholic Bible has always been different than the Christian Bible, up until the time of Westcott & Hort, who replaced the Christian Bible by re-writing it using the Vaticanus B and the Sinaitus Aleph.

That is WHAT THIS ENTIRE CONTROVERSY IS ALL ABOUT. By just denying it does not cover it up. By just denying it does not stop the truth from coming out of what the revision committee of 1888 was all about. Now, today, when you read the NIV or the other newer versions, you are in effect really reading the Catholic Bible, with the majority of its corruption of Sound Doctrine.

God bless,

Stever

WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF DOCTRINE? "1. In a General sense, whatever is taught, Hence a principle or position in any science; whatever is laid down as true by an instructor or master. The doctrines of the Gospel are the principles or truths taught by Christ and his apostles. The doctrines of Plato are the principles which he taught. Hence a doctrine may be true or false; it may be a mere tenet or opinion. 2. The act of teaching-"He taught them many things by parables, and said to them in His doctrine Mark iv; 3. Learning, knowledge- "Whom shall He make to learn Doctrine? Isaiah xxviii; 3. The Truths of the Gospel in General-"That they may adorn the Doctrine of God our Savior in all things. Titus ii 5. Instruction and confirmation in the truths of the Gospel 2 Timothy iii

### **WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF DOCTRINE?**

**Re: Textural Proof, or only words not supported by Scripture?, on: 2006/1/7 14:49**

Dear Chris:

Yesterday you made statements about the soundness of the NIV in regards to Doctrine. I then asked you to back up those statements by Scripture.

However today you are essentially backing away from doing so? Could it be that there is no Textural proof to your statements?

xxxxxxxxxxxx

This is your statement today:

"As far as your request about the doctrine as seen in the NIV, I will try to do this later. However, I am beginning to think that this entire topic is becoming meaningless (or "vanity")"

xxxxxxxxxxxx

This is your statement yesterday:

"For every difference between the Scriptural wording of the KJV version and translations taken from other source material (like the NIV and NASB), there are many other verses that strongly confirm such doctrinal truths"

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

This is my response to your post challenging you to Proof Text your position:

xxxxxxxxxx

ccchhhrrriiisss said:

"What then? Do the differences in the text and subsequent translations actually change the "doctrine of the Church" as you seem to suggest? Of course not! The NIV is decidedly clear about subjects like the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the fact that Mary did not remain a virgin, the need to worship, etc... For every difference between the Scriptural wording of the KJV version and translations taken from other source material (like the NIV and NASB), there are many other verses that strongly confirm such doctrinal truths."

Stever's response:

In regards to your post you have stated the above. What I would appreciate is documentation on the following statement made by you:

"For every difference between the Scriptural wording of the KJV version and translations taken from other source material (like the NIV and NASB), there are many other verses that strongly confirm such doctrinal truths."

Please respond to each issue of doctrine that I have presented here that the NIV and Newer Versions have removed. Show us where the Newer versions, IN OTHER PLACES, correct the error that was revealed in my many posts this evening on this same issue.

Your participation is appreciated.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever's conclusion:

I would really like to see the proof of your statement above. I took the time to provide Textural proof of my beliefs, now where is the Textural proof of your own beliefs?

God bless,

Stever

### ***Textural proof or only words?***

**Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2006/1/7 15:37**

Dear Stever,

Stever, if Chris and you are using different text to prove the your points about textural proof, wouldn't Chris use the same scriptures as you do? Isn't this circular reasoning?

The problem with KJO is that you are a part of dividing the brethren by being contentious. It ends up causing debate, which KJO starts, that is nothing more than self righteousness on your part. At the truck chapel where I attend, often KJO people won't come to services and fellowship with the rest of the body because of this. The King James version is the bible that is used, yet out of this contention they still separate themselves and won't fellowship. The KJO crowd appears to me to be more interested in bringing people to their idea of KJO than to bringing people to Jesus. In fact, if you read your past posts on this thread you can see that your posts haven't been about bringing people to Jesus, but are about being KJO.

At the truck stop there is a constant flow of many people who are not Christians. The idea is to see people come to Christ and be brought into fellowship with believers. By being contentious with this opinion or other opinions, evangelism of the lost is hindered. People that need to know the Lord see this contention and figure they don't need any part of being a Christian, if this debate and contention is what being a Christian is. They already have this in the world.

These words may seem harsh towards you but they aren't written to condemn you but rather to have you consider what

your objective is. Go into the world and bring people to Jesus. Please put Jesus over KJO instead of the other way around.

In Christ,  
GaryE

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/1/8 1:55**

Hello Stever...

Quote:

-----Dear Chris:

Yesterday you made statements about the soundness of the NIV in regards to Doctrine. I then asked you to back up those statements by Scripture.

However today you are essentially backing away from doing so? Could it be that there is no Textual proof to your statements?

-----  
This is a wonderful example of jumping to conclusions and unwittingly making assumptions without proper cause. The reason that I did not respond to your post yet is simply because I did not arrive home until this evening. My brother, please consider the consequences of making such statements without knowing all of the facts or the consequences of your words.

I have asked you before to refrain from passing judgment in a mean-spirited sort of way. There is no reason for this. As lovers of Christ, we must remain pure in all aspects -- including our conversations (written posts). Therefore I suggest that we become "slow to post" in order to make certain that there is no animosity behind our words. We may not agree on this topic, but there is no reason to use bitter remarks or responses written in spite. Hopefully, this is not the case, and perhaps, your words are misunderstood or unintentionally written as such. I hope that your words do not reflect the attitude of your heart.

But sadly, this has been my experience with many *KJV-only* believers. Some have treated those that use other versions as *heretics* -- going so far as to question their salvation because of their use of versions like the NIV. Others have "looked down" upon believers that use versions other than the KJV, believing that they are not "mature enough" to understand the issue, "unlearned," or simply believing that such believers "just don't get it." It is difficult for some of them to understand that some believers have heard all of the *KJV-only* arguments, but still choose to use versions like the NIV or NASB after conducting research or inquiry into the matter and arriving to such a conclusion.

As for the "doctrinal issue" -- if you would reread my earlier post, you would understand that I will write something for you concerning the doctrine as found in the NIV (and how it is my belief that as a whole the version does not stray from sound doctrine). I am sometimes a very busy person, and I will do so as time and responsibility dictates. Thank you for your understanding in this.

:~)

**My conclusions... - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/1/9 2:04**

Brother Stever...

As I have repeatedly written, the KJV and the other versions that you are attacking (like the NIV and the NASB) were translated from entirely different sources. The position of the *KJV-only* believers as often stated in books and websites is that the *Received Text* is vastly superior than all other manuscripts -- and that the other manuscripts are indeed corrupt. However, there are many scholars and manuscript experts that believe otherwise. While they do not reject the KJV or the *Received Text*, they feel that the other translations are acceptable or even superior. The many differences between the KJV and the NIV do not amount to translators making changes to the KJV. Rather, the NIV is a new translation from different ancient source material. Thus it is wrong to imply that the translators purposely *altered* or *changed* the text to fit their own doctrinal purposes. To continuously quote the "Hebrew" or "Greek" when comparing the KJV and the NIV is also flawed, as the "Hebrew" and "Greek" that you quote is what was found in the source for the KJV (the *Received Text*). That is not sometimes the same "Hebrew" and "Greek" words from the manuscripts cross examined for the NIV (particularly, the differences in translation). It would have been dishonest for the translators of the NIV to preserve the wording of the KJV if the manuscripts that they were using and felt were more reliable through cross-examination.

mination stated otherwise.

Therefore, this issue comes to a matter of trust – just as some individuals from both sides of this issue in these forums have repeatedly stated: *Are the other texts and manuscripts trustworthy?* After researching this matter, I believe that they are. Why? Because nothing has been presented that would lead me to believe otherwise.

My personal conclusion of the matter is as follows:

- 1. The KJV is not perfect.** The KJV was changed over a period of at least 158 years (arriving to the current 1769 and 1850 editions used today). Words were added, subtracted and changed in order to correct errors in the original 1611 edition, some of which were listed in an earlier post. Thus, the argument that the KJV is the *infallible and perfectly preserved Word of God* cannot be true. Like all translations completed by man, the KJV and the NIV are fallible. But the Word of God itself is infallible.
- 2. The differences in certain passages are not the result of a conspiracy against the KJV, but rather a difference in source material.** The translators of the NIV were advanced scholars who used much of the same motivation for their translation as the translators of the KJV (as mentioned in the preface of both versions). None of the men or women that were part of the translation team of the NIV have demonstrated an *ulterior motive* for the translation.
- 3. The language of the KJV is no longer commonly used in today's world, thus making the version difficult to understand by both today's believers and non-believers.** Why should individuals be forced to learn 17th century grammar and language usage in order to read and understand the Word of God? This forces many individuals to use "study aids" due to problems with the language. The fact that the language is not used today also contradicts the purpose of the KJV in the first place. Besides, there are about 6 billion people in the world. The English language itself is only spoken by about 510 million individuals in the world -- with it the primary language of only 340 million (according to liberal estimates from a 2003 study by the CIA, Indiana University and the University of Washington). That leaves about 5.5 billion that do not speak English at all. Of those that do speak English, how many are literate (can read or write). And how many can truly understand the language of the KJV without a need for study aids or education? It seems that an English translation of the Bible is necessary in the language of the common man.
- 4. The NIV was not influenced by reportedly ungodly men.** Westcott and Hort are both highly regarded by many scholars outside of the *KJV-only* schools of thought. However, they were both dead for many years by the time the NIV was translated. The NIV was published in 1978. But Hort died nearly 114 years ago. Westcott died nearly 105 years ago. They are not rumored to have altered manuscripts. They are not listed as translators. Even the gossip that is spread through *KJV-only* books is speculative at best. I am certain that these men were flawed human beings – just like the translators of the KJV were. In fact, they may have been just as flawed as Moses, David, Solomon, Peter, Paul or some of the other "terrible" scribes of the Bible. But should we judge these men because of a quote or two that is attributed to them? None of us could have possibly known them. To judge and then slander these dead men – acting as if you know their own beliefs – is presumptuous.
- 5. The Catholic Church did not have any influence on the NIV.** Of the translators of the NIV, none of them belonged to the Catholic Church. They belonged to many different major Protestant denominations and fellowships (as is mentioned in the preface to the NIV).
- 6. It is nearly impossible to absolutely determine which source texts and manuscripts are the most reliable.** None of us are experts in ancient languages and manuscripts. And among the major scholars today, a great many of them seem to consider the sources used for the NIV (through a method of cross examination) as a more reliable means for translation. I imagine that there are experts today that feel the same way about the *Received Text*, although I must admit that none of the scholars and translators that I wrote even remotely sounded like they adhered to the *KJV-only* school of thought (but if you can find me one, I would certainly like to contact him/her). Thus, we make judgments based upon the best research that we gather through much prayer. However, are we to claim that our particular opinion or belief is reached because "God told me so?" I hope not. Even the cults do that. Has anyone ever heard of the "burning in your bosom" from a particular KJV using cult (the LDS)? We must take the encouragement from Paul in I Thessalonians 5: 21 to "test everything."

#### As for the doctrinal questions:

Brother Stever, I have noticed that you are very quick to slander the NIV, RSV and NASB by labeling them as "perversions." I also noticed that you mingled your posts with certain adjectives that are questionable in nature -- stating as "fact" what is actually "opinion." Not only do I believe that you are incorrect, I also believe that you should be very careful about making such allegations. The KJV was changed several times because of errors (even though you contend that these were not *errors of doctrine*). Nonetheless, the original KJV held many undeniable errors that had to be corrected.

ted through subsequent edits over many years. Words were later added, subtracted and changed as those errors became obvious. But no one here (or anyone that I have ever known) would go so far as to call the KJV a "perversion." The translators of the KJV themselves admitted that their work was not perfect. The translators of the NIV have said the same. They wholeheartedly believed in their cause—and worked tirelessly for many years to bring about what they felt would be the best possible translation from the manuscripts that they felt were more reliable. To slander such a work—particularly since the bulk of the translation is similar to what is found in the KJV—is dangerous. Even if you believe everything that you have read against the NIV and its source material—you still should not slur the entire translation. Just because there are some bad examples in a particular Church (say, the local Baptist, Calvary Chapel or Assembly of God congregation), you should not slander the entire Church as such. In this case, you may find yourself slandering the very words of God.

Looking through your many long posts, I decided that it would be futile and excessive to respond to every verse that you listed. That would take up more space than the moderators (or even other readers) might want to read. If anyone likes, they can refer to your previous posts. But the question is a matter of doctrine—whereby you state that the NIV *perverts* the established doctrine of the Church because of the results of its translation. So I decided to take each of the doctrinal issues that you raised, and I will leave you the verses that you may want to look up in your own NIV (or through the free online Bible sources, such as <http://www.biblegateway.com> ).

Your allegations are that the NIV denies many of the core doctrinal issues because of the way that certain passages were translated in the NIV from its source material. I believe this is an error in judgment. Because one passage or verse varies from one version or another does not change doctrine. Doctrine is never based upon a single verse or passage. If it is, you can end up with a doctrine about "baptism for the dead," "casting lots," or even worse. But here is a small list of the doctrinal issues that you raised, and corresponding verses that are contained in the NIV that support the fundamental beliefs of the Church. Enjoy!

**The Trinity:** Isaiah 43:10; 44:6,8; 45:5,14,18,21,22; 46:9; 47:8; John 1:1-14; I John 2:2; Colossians 1:15-17; Genesis 1:26; Matthew 28:19; Isaiah 6:8; John 14:26; I Peter 1:2;

**The Deity of Christ:** John 1:1-14; John 8:58 (from Exodus 3:14); John 10:30-33; I John 2:2; John 20:28; Colossians 2:9; Philippians 2:5-8; Hebrews 1:8; Genesis 1:26; Isaiah 6:8; I Timothy 2:5;

**Worship of Christ:** Matthew 2:11; Isaiah 6; Matt. 2:2,11; 14:33; John 9:35-38; Heb. 1:6, Acts 7:55-60; Psalm 116:4; Zech. 13:9 with 1 Corinthians. 1:1-2

**No "perpetual" virginity of Mary:** Matthew 13:55; Matthew 1:25; Mark 6:3; Galatians 1:19; John 7:1-10; Acts 1:14; Mark 3:31; Matthew 12:46; John 2:12; John 7:3-5

**Salvation found in Christ alone:** John 14:6; Matthew 11:27; Luke 10:22; John 8:24; I John 2:2; Romans 5:10; Hebrews 7:25; Eph. 2:8-9; John 1:12-13; Acts 13:48; Gal. 3:21;

**The Blood of Christ:** John 6:25-69; I John 2:2; I Peter 2:24; Lev. 17:11; Heb. 9:22; Rom. 5:9; 1 John 1:7-9

**The Resurrection of Christ:** I Corinthians 15:1-4, 14-17; John 2:19-21; Luke 24:36-43;

**Salvation through grace:** Ephesians 2:8-9; Galatians 5:4; Galatians 2:21; Galatians 3:21; Romans 3:20; Romans 4:5; Romans chapters 3, 4, 5; Galatians chapters 3, 4, 5; Romans 6:23;

**Baptism:** Matthew 28:19; Acts 2:38; I Peter 3:21; Acts 22:16; Romans 6:4; Titus 3:5; Galatians 3:27

**Taking up your cross:** Mark 8:34-35

**Hell:** Matt. 25:41-46; Rev. 19:20; Rev. 20 (entire chapter); Luke 16:19-31; Matt. 11:23; 16:18; Luke 10:15; 16:23; Acts 2:27,31; Rev. 1:18; 6:8; 20:13,14.

**Existence of Satan:** I Peter 5:8; Genesis 3:4-14; Matthew 12:24, 43; Mark 3:22; Luke 10:19; John 8:44; John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 2 Corinthians 4:4; 6:15; Revelation 12:3-10; 20:1-2;

**The divine name of God:** Read the preface about the "divine name of God" and how it was translated as LORD (all capital letters) in the NIV. The read passages like Isaiah 6—where both LORD and Lord were used.

**Importance of the Word of God:** II Timothy 3:16; Hebrews 4:12-13; 2 Peter 3:15-16; John 1:1-10

**The Baptism of the Holy Spirit:** Acts 1:8; Acts 2:1-4; Acts 19:1-7

**Homosexuality is a sin:** Genesis 19:1-13; Lev. 18:22; 18:29; 20:13; Romans 1:26-27; I Corinthians 6:9-11; I Timothy 1:8-10; Jude 7

Brother Stever, I apologize for the length of this. But I do hope that this will conclude my posts on this issue for the time being. I don't see a need to continue contentiously discussing this issue or performing unnecessary verse-by-verse comparison (since these versions come from separate sources). I hope that you leave room for the fact that there are those of us that have looked into this issue, researched it, yet have arrived at a different conclusion that the *KJV-only* philosophy. We are not deserving of character assassination or any type of subtle slanderous remarks. We are not part of some "conspiracy" to destroy the Word of God. We are brothers in the faith.

:~)

Seeking His Face,  
-Chris  
Matthew 5:8

**Re: My conclusions... STEVER'S RESPONSE TO SAME, on: 2006/1/9 23:22**

ccchhhrrriiisss said:

1. The KJV is not perfect. The KJV was changed over a period of at least 158 years (arriving to the current 1769 and 1850 editions used today). Words were added, subtracted and changed in order to correct errors in the original 1611 edition, some of which were listed in an earlier post. Thus, the argument that the KJV is the infallible and perfectly preserved Word of God cannot be true. Like all translations completed by man, the KJV and the NIV are fallible. But the Word of God itself is infallible.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response to the above statement:

Chris, I have already responded to your post above on this thread. Your statement above is misleading and is not accurate. The changes had nothing to do with the Doctrine of the New Testament, and only amounted to a thee or a thou and other grammatical issues.

I have even sent you personal email on this subject, yet you continue to say things that are meant to mislead others that are not informed on this issue.

Since you persist in posting disinformation on this issue, I will post the truth of this matter as follows. It is a little long, but worth the read:

#### A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE

Many detracting inferences have been made in recent years such as, "Well, you know how the King James came into being ... It was all done by royal decree of King James ... a politically motivated private enterprise etc." Or they tell us "You can't trust the King James Bible— it is so full of mistakes and scribal errors." But such statements are simply not the truth and do not reflect the historical facts. To begin with, King James did not initiate the idea of a new translation. After a forty five year reign, Elizabeth I— only hours before her death, named her cousin James VI, Monarch of Scotland, to succeed her as James I on the throne of England. The year was 1603 A.D. There was at this time in the Church of England a number of reformers called "Puritans" because of their avowed purpose to purify the English church by removing from it all the remnants of Catholicism. The Puritan leadership was under Dr. John Renyolds (Rainolds) who was president of Corpus Christi College at Oxford. In 1604, he suggested to King James that there be produced a translation which all the people could understand, read and love. Himself a theologian and student of the Scriptures from Presbyterian Scotland, James I subsequently approved the suggestion.

The undertaking began when approximately a thousand ministers sent a petition, which later came to be known as the "Millenary Petition", to King James. Dr. Renyolds was made spokesman for the thousand ministers who represented about one-tenth of the clergy of the Church of England. They requested several "reforms" and eventually, at a meeting at Hampton Court, Renyolds proposed the undertaking of a new translation of the Bible on the grounds that the "Great Bible" of 1539 was a very corrupt translation. Although raised up using the Geneva Bible, King James was troubled over the many "notes" or comments contained in that translation. It was finally agreed that a new translation, absolutely true to the original Greek text, be made which would not have any footnotes or comments. Thus, James I acceded to their request, but he did not initiate the procedure. It was not launched by the "throne" but at the request of a thousand ministers. Further, clergy and laymen from both the Anglicans and Puritans were included in its translation. Thus, with King James' blessings, Bishop Bancroft (soon to become Archbishop of Canterbury) met with the Dean of Westminster and the Professors of Hebrew at Oxford and Cambridge for the purpose of suggesting the names of the men who should work on the translation. Fifty-four of the best scholars in England were selected, but some died before the work began whereas others could not participate in the undertaking because of previous work commitments. Thus, only forty-seven actually engaged in the task (plus nine others whose participation seems to have been somewhat limited). None of the translators was paid for his work.

When the work began the forty-seven were divided into six groups: two at Westminster, one for the Old Testament and one for the New; two at Oxford, one for each Testament; and two at Cambridge, one for the Old Testament and one for

the Apocrypha. For three years, from 1604 to 1606, each man in the group first worked out his own translation on the chapters assigned to him, guided by fifteen specific rules. Some of the most important of these rules were:

1. The Bishops' Bible (1568) was to be followed as a guide with as little alteration as the truth of the original texts would permit.
2. No marginal notes were to be attached except for the explanation of Greek or Hebrew words or for providing cross-references.
3. Tyndale's translation (c.1526), Matthew's (1537), Coverdale's (1535), The Great Bible (1539), and the Geneva (1560) were to be used when they agreed better with the text than the Bishops' Bible.

The same portion of Scripture was translated by each of the other men of that company. Afterward, all the members of the group came together and thrashed out the differences. When a book was completed in this manner, it was sent to the other five groups for review and suggestions. Two men from each group formed a special screening committee to examine the final product. The meetings of the three companies took another three years (1607-1609). Each of these men believed that the text at his disposal was the infallible Word of God. There has never been a committee working on a translation of the Bible with such scholarship and dedication. Regarding this, McClure states:

"As to the capability of those men, ... by the good providence of God, their work was undertaken in a fortunate time. Not only had the English language, that singular compound, then ripened to its full perfection, but the study of Greek, and of the oriental tongues, and of rabbinical lore, had then been carried to a greater extent in England than ever before or since. This particular field of learning has never been so highly cultivated among English divines.

Most were professors and/or preachers. The 12th rule required every Bishop to have small portions of the project circulated and displayed in public places throughout his diocese as it came from the translators' pens and to encourage recommendations. This placed the entire work OPEN TO THE POPULACE so that the whole nation of England could take part in its production. Hundreds of laymen, priests, and preachers who knew Greek and/or Hebrew offered suggestions.

Whereas the King's translators were instructed that the Bishops' Bible was to be their main guide and it to be altered only "as the truth of the original will permit", only about four percent of the King James Bible is, in fact, drawn from that version. The new translation agreed much more with the Geneva than with any other. Over ninety percent of the language of the New Testament is from Tyndale's translation. The rhythmical diction and style imparting literary grace, majesty, and character found throughout the KJB came from this martyr's pen.

For the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, they used the four Hebrew Bibles then available. For the New Testament Greek text, they used the work of Theodore Beza, the associate of John Calvin, who had revised the Greek texts of Erasmus and Stephens (Stephanus). Besides these, many other ancient translations were referred to and considered. Words which were not in the original language but which the translators found necessary to add in order to complete the sense, were especially flagged and appear in our modern King James Bibles in italics.

When all the books had been translated, two men from each company at Westminster, Cambridge, and Oxford came together and carefully considered the completed work of each of the three companies. Finally, two men reviewed that product; thus each Scripture was examined at least 14 times. Consequently, we have seen that the revision of 1611 was neither a private endeavor nor was it an enterprise of King James VI (I) as Sir Frederick Kenyon aptly reminds us:

"The revision was the work of no single man and of no single school. It was the deliberate work of a large body of trained scholars and divines of all classes and opinions, who had before them, for their guidance, the labours of nearly a century of revision. The translation of the Bible had passed out of the sphere of controversy. It was a national undertaking in which no one had any interest at heart save that of producing the best possible version of the Scriptures."

Thus, when the final product was brought before the church in published form, there were no surprises. All was done in the OPEN AND ABOVE BOARD. There were NO SMOKE FILLED BACK ROOM DECISIONS made with regard to the ultimate translation. Indeed, PROFIT WAS OF NO CONSIDERATION. Over the years, several editions have been issued to correct typesetting errors, spelling, the addition of marginal references, italics in place of the original Roman typeface, and so forth. As these editions have been largely misreported, we must now address this matter.

WHAT ABOUT ALL THE CHANGES IN THE KING JAMES BIBLE?



It has often been asserted that the King James Bible has been revised four times in the past. This is offered as proof that no valid objection should be forthcoming to continued revision and endless new translations. The reality is that there have been several editions of the text but no revisions have been made. We shall elaborate and clarify on this important issue.

The printing press was invented in 1450 by the German Johann Gutenberg. Although this was 161 years before the 1611 KJB edition, the printing apparatus had changed very little. The type was set by hand, one character at a time. The process was quite slow, difficult and tedious, hence frequent errors resulted in all publications. The first edition of the King James also contained such printing errors, but these were not the kind of textual alterations which freely occur in modern versions. These were obvious and simple printing oversights. The second printing published later in 1611 corrected about 100 such textual differences. Of course, such errors do not render a Bible or any other book worthless – they merely need to be removed in subsequent editions.

The first two alleged "major revisions" of the King James Bible took place within 27 years of its first edition. The 1629 edition was but a careful correction of earlier printing errors. Only nine years later, a second so-called major revision was distributed. Dr. Samuel Ward and John Bois, two of the original translators, participated in both of these undertakings. However F.H.A. Scrivener (see footnote below) describes this as merely being a reinstatement of words, phrases and clauses overlooked by the 1611 printers – thereby amending these errors. Thus, 72% of the approximately 400 textual corrections in the KJB were completed by 1638. Hence, we find that instead of two major revisions, there were two stages of a single process – namely, the purging of early printing errors. Similarly, the last two "major revisions" were but two stages in standardizing the spelling. Very few textual corrections were necessary for these two publications (1762 and 1769). Thus, the term "four major revisions" is a misnomer, and as such, is grossly misleading.

Much is made by the detractors of the KJB claiming as many as 75,000 changes in the King James Bible since 1611. At first glance, this does seem to be a problem. However, before citing examples, the reader is enjoined to keep in mind that the real issue at hand is that of final authority. Further, the reader needs to be apprised that the original King James Bible is very different in appearance than those published today. Were one to go to a museum to view an original, he would find that he could hardly read it. Indeed, many of the words that were legible would be strangely spelled. The changes fall into three categories (1) printing changes, (2) spelling changes and (3) textual changes.

The printing type used for the original edition was Gothic. The type style or font that the reader has before him and that with which he is familiar is Roman. Although the Roman type style originated fairly early, Gothic had been the predominant form for many years in most European countries. The printers of the original King James chose the Gothic because of its beauty and eloquence. Several of the letters are noticeably different in appearance.

The Gothic "s" looks like the Roman "s" when used as a capital letter or at the end of a word, but when it occurs as a lower case "s" at the beginning or in the middle of a word, the letter looks similar to our "f". Over 30,000 changes were of this kind, as in Mofes to Moses. The Gothic "v" looks like a Roman "u" and vice versa. Now we can see why our "w" is called a "double-u" rather than "double-v". The "v" was changed to "u" 45,281 times (i.e., Daid to David, wiues to wives, vnto to unto). The Gothic "j" looks like our "i", hence Iudah becomes Judah, iudged to judged etc. Remember, these are not spelling changes – they are simply type style changes. These changes reflect a large percentage of the "thousands" of alterations in the KJB, but obviously such modifications do not corrupt or in any way harm the actual text.

As to the changes in orthography (spelling), we remind our reader that most histories date the beginning of Modern English around 1500. Hence, by 1611 the grammatical structure and basic vocabulary of present day English had already been firmly established. However, the spelling did not stabilize at the same time. In the 1600's spelling was largely phonetic as standards had not yet been established. Even among the well educated, an author would spell the same word several different ways, often in the same book and even on the same page. It was not until the eighteenth century that spelling began to be uniform. Therefore, in the last half of that century, the spelling of the 1611 KJB was standardized.

Over 30,000 additional changes involved dropping the final "e" off of the old English spellings such as – sunne to sun, fowle to fowl, goe to go, shee to she, nowe to now etc. Double vowels and double consonants were more common such as mee to me and ranne to ran. Other changes included ftarres to stars, ynough to enough, moneth to month, yeeres to years grinne to grin; flying to fleeing; neezed to sneezed etc.

These typographical and spelling changes account for almost all of the so-called "thousands" of alterations since 1611. Obviously none of them can be truly said to in any way alter the text. Thus they cannot honestly be compared with the thousands of actual textual changes which blatantly appear in the modern versions. The significance of this simply cannot be overstated.

As to the actual textual differences between the 1611 edition and our present editions, there are some variations – but they are not of the magnitude of a revision. Rather, they are merely the correction of early obvious printing errors. They are not textual changes made to alter the reading. This may be readily ascertained by (a) the character of the changes; (b) the frequency of the changes throughout the Bible; and (c) the time the changes were made.



In the first printing, words were occasionally inverted. A plural may have been in singular form or vice versa, and at times a word was mis-written for one that was similar. A few times a word or even a phrase was inadvertently omitted. The omissions were obvious and did not portray the doctrinal implications of those found in modern translations.

Dr. F.H.A. Scrivener compiled a list of the variations between the 1611 edition and later printings. A random sampling giving the first textual correction on consecutive left hand pages is depicted in the following chart.

|                  |                   |                                                        |
|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 1611 Reading     | Present Reading   | Corrected                                              |
| 1 this thing     | this thing        | also 1638                                              |
| 2 shalt have     | remained ye       | shall have remained 1762                               |
| 3 Achzib,        | nor Helbath,      | nor Aphik of Achzib, nor of Helbath, nor of Aphik 1762 |
| 4 requite        | good requite      | me good 1629                                           |
| 5 this book      | of the Covenant   | the book of this Covenant 1629                         |
| 6 chief rulers   | chief ruler       | 1629                                                   |
| 7 And Parbar     | At Parbar         | 1638                                                   |
| 8 For this       | cause And for     | this cause 1638                                        |
| 9 For the king   | had appointed     | for so the king had appointed 1629                     |
| 10 Seek good     | seek God          | 1617                                                   |
| 11 The cormorant | But the cormorant | 1629                                                   |
| 12 returned      | turned            | 1769                                                   |
| 13 a fiery       | furnace a burning | fiery furnace 1638                                     |
| 14 The crowned   | Thy crowned       | 1629                                                   |
| 15 thy right     | doeth thy right   | hand doeth 1613                                        |
| 16 the wayes     | side the way      | side 1743                                              |
| 17 which was     | a Jew which was   | a Jewess 1629                                          |
| 18 the city      | the city of the   | Damascenes 1629                                        |
| 19 now and       | ever both now     | and ever 1638                                          |
| 20 which was     | of our fathers    | which was our fathers 1616                             |

In the preceding chart you have seen 5% of all the textual changes made in the King James Bible in 375 years. Only one (#10) has serious doctrinal implications. Here, the 1611 reading of Psalm 69:32 has "seek good" where the correct reading should be "seek God". But the spelling similarity of the words "good" and "God" reveal the problem to be merely that of a weary type setter's having misread the proof. This error was so obvious that it was caught and corrected in 1617, only six years after the first printing and well before the first so-called 1629 revision. Dr. David Reagan reports (p. 11) that his examination of Scrivener's entire appendix resulted in this as being the only doctrinal variation.

Both the character and the frequency of the changes disclose them to be but printing oversights. Yet scholars, even fundamental conservatives, refer to the thousands of modifications made to the 1611 over the years as if they were on a par with the changes in recent versions. They are not. Again, the overwhelming majority is either type style or spelling changes. The few that remain are clearly corrections of printing errors made due to the tedious nature involved in the early printing process. These few printing errors serve to demonstrate that God chose to preserve the text of His Word, not by continuous miracle, but providentially.

The sample list given heretofore demonstrates how meticulously Scrivener was in compiling all the variations. Yet, even with such great care only approximately 400 variations between the 1611 edition and the modern copies could be identified and listed by him. Remember, there were c.100 variations found and corrected between the first two Oxford editions which were both printed in 1611. The average variation (after c.375 years) is but one correction every three chapters. And as we have seen, these are "chief rulers" to "chief ruler", "And Parbar" to "At Parbar" etc. The early date at which they were corrected also bears witness that they were merely corrected printing errors.

Moreover, the great majority of the 400 corrections were made within a few years of the original printing. For example, from our sampling of the twenty corrections (see p. 1), one was made in 1613, one in 1616, one in 1617, eight in 1629, five in 1638, one in 1743, two in 1762, and one in 1769. Hence, 16 out of 20 corrections, or 80%, were made within twenty-seven years of the 1611 printing. Such is hardly the long drawn out series of revisions that the scholars would have us believe. Another study detailing every other page of Scrivener's appendix revealed that 72% of the textual corrections had been made by 1638. Thus, there is no "revision" issue. As previously stated, the main purpose of the 1629 and 1638 editions was the correction of earlier printing errors. The main purpose of the 1762 and 1769 editions was the standardization of spelling.

To illustrate the import of all this, the 1638 edition of the entire book of Ecclesiastes reads exactly like our present edition. All that has changed in Ecclesiastes during the past 350 years is that the spelling has been standardized! By the time of the 1638 edition, all the printing errors in that book had been corrected and the Roman type applied.

To summarize, the character of the textual changes is that of obvious printing errors, not changes made to alter the reading. The frequency of the textual changes is meager, averaging only one every three chapters. The time frame of the textual changes is early, about three-fourths occurring within twenty seven years of the first printing. These particulars establish that there were no true revisions in the sense of updating the language or correcting translation errors. There were only editions which corrected early typographical errors.

Other such textual changes have been: saveth to "and he saveth"; to be joyful to "and to be joyful"; flix to "flux"; upon the house to "housetop"; unperfect to "imperfect"; have care to "have a care"; sometimes to "sometime"; forsomuch to "forasmuch"; such wrong to "such wrongs"; will fat to "fatten"; northwards to "northward"; cheweth cud to "the cud"; noondays to "noon day"; nor scales to "and scales"; disallow to "disallowed"; in power to "of power"; I start to "I started" etc.

Also, some later printing errors occasionally did creep in, e.g., "Printers" instead of Princes – Psalms 119:161, 1701 edition; "place makers" instead of peace makers – Matthew 5:9, 1807 edition; from "good" works instead of from dead works – Hebrews 9:14, 1807 edition, etc.

Over 5,000 of the remaining changes were in substituting periods for commas, colons for commas, semi-colons for colons and capital letters for lower case.

In stark contrast, the 36,191 changes we are supposed to accept in the new Greek texts of Nestle, Aland, and Metzger include attacks on the Deity of Christ (1 Timothy 3:16), the Virgin Birth (Luke 2:33), the Ascension (Luke 24:51-52), the Bible (Luke 4:4), and the Resurrection (Acts 1:3; see Ch. II). Significantly, the spelling (orthography) of Vaticanus B and Sinaiticus does not agree with that of first century Greek, yet even the tenth century Textus Receptus manuscripts do so concur. Furthermore, the King James is by far the translation easiest from which to memorize because it is written in prose. It is most difficult to memorize Scripture from any of the other translations.

As to the KJB proper, there are problems. As to the problems and how significant they are depend upon whom one asks. The solutions run a gamut of incredible differences of opinion with no consensus in sight. The learned New Testament text critic Herman C. Hoskier claimed to know of only one serious problem. Hoskier said that the Greek word "poimnē" (poimnē) should be translated "flock", not "fold", in John 10:16:

"This I consider to be the only matter of any great consequence which must be amended in any revision, but as everybody knows about this, it is not likely to mislead" (p. 697).

All other problems, this great scholar regarded as merely "academic".

The point we have labored to clarify is that the King James Bible has not been revised, only purified. We have no valid reason to doubt that the one we hold in our hands is the very Word of God preserved for us in the English language. The authority for its veracity lies neither in the original 1611 printing nor in the character of King James VI (I), the scholarship of the 1611 translators, the literary accomplishments of Elizabethan England, nor even in the Greek Received Text. Our authority for the infallibility of the English Bible lies in the promise of God to preserve His Word.

God bless,

Stever

### **What Changes in the KJV?**

**Re: Why not to use the NIV when witnessing to the LOST, on: 2006/1/10 0:16**

**IN SOUL WINNING I NEVER USE THE NIV**

I do not use the NIV, and never intend to use the NIV, in place of the time-honoured and sure King James Version, when I witness to the lost. Why?:

Here is Luke 4:4 in the King James Version. In the NIV the underlined words are cut out:

Luke 4:4 "And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God."

Luke 4:4 is not the only place where parts of the Word of God have been cut out. There are literally hundreds of omissions in the NIV.

This omission in Luke 4:4 makes the statement of Jesus of little sense. "But by every word of God." Now we have it. The Scriptures are to stay. The Word of God is to feed us. We are to live by the Scriptures. Here Jesus is in conflict with the devil and in this statement our Lord is revealing the efficient weapon against sin and Satan.

Is it not significant that this very mutilated version of Scripture cuts out the very passage that condemns it. This omitted passage condemns the NIV!

Note again that our Divine Guide is showing that man is to live by "every word of God." If "every word" is vital and we need "every word" what can be said in favour of a professed version that omits a whole verse? Not only that but omits scores of passages. I will never use in my work a mutilated version, no matter how popular it may be. The "Scripture of Truth" closes with these important words:-

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

Jesus clearly states:-

Rev 22:20 "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

It is Jesus who says "Surely I come quickly." He is the One who testifies these warning words.

Rev 22:16 "I Jesus have sent Mine angel, to testify unto you these things in the churches."

Our Lord leaves us in no doubt. Without Jesus the Bible would never have existed or been written. Jesus gave it to us. It is vital. So Jesus warns against taking away any of His words. "Every word" counts. He declared we are to live "by every word of God." On this important theme may I draw your attention to these words of inspired comment.

"The inspired words of the early church of the first century must be our foundation. In the sermon on the mount, Jesus shows who are going to Heaven and who will not go there. Our Lord closes His sermon with an appeal to build on the Rock. He shows us how:-

Matt 7:24 "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock."

Now from the words of our only Guide to Glory we see the perfect harmony of Scripture and expose the perversions of the "fourth century." Read again the two contrasting statements.

Rev 22:14 These two Bibles are teaching two different doctrines:

"Wash their robes" is claimed by most NIV users to mean forgiveness for PAST SINS.

"They that do His commandments" are people who are abiding in Christ.

Jesus clearly states:-

John 15:10 "If ye keep My commandments, ye shall abide in My love."

John 15:14 "Ye are My friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."

John 14:15 "If ye love Me, keep My commandments."

John 14:21 "He that hath My commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me: and he that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him."

When a person abides in Christ, he can—by that abiding—do the commandments of God. Jesus promises:-

John 15:5 "He that abideth in Me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without Me ye can do nothing."

It is such exceeding great and precious promises of Christ abiding in His servants that grants them power to obey and a place in the City Eternal. Note these clear statements.

2 Peter 1:4 "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature."

By partaking of the divine nature of our Lord you are enabled:-

2 Peter 1:10-11 "To make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

That is why we read this:-

Rev 22:14 "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

Those who only "wash their robes," and then keep on sinning, will never have right to the tree of life. The verses just before call for a "holy," "righteous" people. Jesus says this:-

Rev 22:12 "And, behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be."

The Authorized (KJV) is correct:-

By the context.

By the early fathers before the fourth century.

By the earliest of manuscripts. The Syriac.

By the Coptic.

By the Received Text.

The NIV has the support of Origen, the perverter of Scripture, Constantine and Jerome of the fourth century—the century of corruption of truth. The century of the first church father to quote the perversion "wash their robes."

The Advocates of the NIV proudly claim that it is based on "the two most reliable early manuscripts." These go back to the "fourth century." They are the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. They are both from the Papacy. "Come out of her, My people."

May our Lord lead you to love and follow:-

The Bible of the early church writers.

The Bible of the Waldenses.

The Bible of Tyndale, Luther, and all the Reformers.

The Bible of Wesley, Whitefield, and Spurgeon.

The Bible of the Adventists of 1844.

The Bible of God's Truth of 1888.

#### THE NIV AND THE LORD'S PRAYER

This is a shocking expose!

"9 After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed by Thy name. 10 Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. 11 Give us this day our daily bread. 12 And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. 13 And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen."—Matt 6:9-13.

Now read it in the Douay Bible:-

Matt 6:13, Douay "And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. Amen."

Here is the NIV:-

Matt 6:13, NIV "And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one."

Note both NIV and Douay finish the Lord's Prayer with evil!

They both omit "Thine be the glory" etc.

More evil done in the fourth century. A grand cover-up. Taking away God's glory.

Constantine, Jerome, Origen, Augustine.

It is claimed that St. Jerome omitted the half of Matt. 6:13. He with Origen and Eusebius. They taught that the world was getting better.

They taught they were entering into the millennium. The kingdom was being set up on earth. The Douay (Roman Catholic) has this note. Dan. 2:44:-

Dan 2:44 "A kingdom. The kingdom of Christ in the Catholic Church, which cannot be destroyed."

Both St. Jerome and Eusebius were greatly influenced by Origen. History claims that Origen "did most to create and give direction to the forces of apostasy." Origen wrote "The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written." (McClintock and Strong. Article, Origen.)

The Scriptures warn "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy" (Col 2:8). Origen ignored God's warning and, while professing to be a Christian, worshipped Greek philosophy. Philosophy was his supreme authority, where Scripture got in his road, he changed it to suit his pagan philosophies.

St. Jerome was greatly influenced by Origen and so was Bishop Eusebius. Both of these men were the servants and devoted followers of Constantine. Changing Scripture meant little to these men. This is repeatedly stated by Catholic Authorities.

This "Fourth Century" was famous for the climax of apostasy. This was the century when the VULGATE was compiled by St. Jerome. This contained "many errors". This was due to the corruptions, omissions, and changes by such men as Origen and Jerome.

This was when "many errors" came into the Catholic versions. These omissions and errors have been passed on to the NIV and the other modern versions which are based largely on the Vaticanus and Sinaitus, both Catholic Manuscripts.

The parallel, for instance between the NIV and the Jesuit-prepared Douay version, is too close for comfort. The parallel is no mistake. They come from a common source.

Remember! They both end the Lord's prayer with evil.  
They both omit the words of our Lord.  
They both omit the same important words of holy Scripture in hundreds of other places.  
Thank God, the Spirit of Prophecy still upholds and exalts these words of Jesus:  
"THINE IS THE KINGDOM, AND THE POWER, AND THE GLORY, FOREVER."

God bless,

Stever

**Re: My conclusions..., on: 2006/1/10 0:46**

ccchhrrriiisss said:

"5. The Catholic Church did not have any influence on the NIV. Of the translators of the NIV, none of them belonged to the Catholic Church. They belonged to many different major Protestant denominations and fellowships (as is mentioned in the preface to the NIV)."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

If you would have read the quotes by Westcott and Hort, you would know that both men held Catholic (Romanist) sympathies and beliefs. You would also find that Westcott held the Textus Receptus (the REceived Text) in contempt and the final result of his work eliminated it completely from the Christian Bible, and replaced it with the text used to create the Catholic Bible.

Take the time to read what was posted, and then respond to that.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

ccchhrrriiisss said:

4. The NIV was not influenced by reportedly ungodly men. Westcott and Hort are both highly regarded by many scholars outside of the KJV-only schools of thought. However, they were both dead for many years by the time the NIV was translated. The NIV was published in 1978. But Hort died nearly 114 years ago. Westcott died nearly 105 years ago. They are not rumored to have altered manuscripts. They are not listed as translators. Even the gossip that is spread through KJV-only books is speculative at best. I am certain that these men were flawed human beings—just like the translators of the KJV were. In fact, they may have been just as flawed as Moses, David, Solomon, Peter, Paul or some of the other "terrible" scribes of the Bible. But should we judge these men because of a quote or two that is attributed to them? None of us could have possibly known them. To judge and then slander these dead men—acting as if you know their own beliefs—is presumptuous.

xxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response: Take the time to read the words of Westcott and Hort themselves, that refute your statements above. Does this ever end with you?

This is an endless posting of issues that have already been proven by the words of the very men themselves, Mr. Westcott & Mr. Hort.

xxxxxxxxxx

Stever continues:

Ccchhrrriiisss---- you have tried to tar and feather the websites that had access to their books as "Conservative" or "Fundamental". When I proved to you that the books written by Westcott, and the son of Hort can be found at major Universities and Seminaries throughout my own area in Southern California you said nothing. What difference would it make where the books were located---they are the very writings with the ideas and mindset of the men that steered the revision committee in 1888. If it is truth that you want, it does matter who touts the books of these men. It is the books themselves that are important in finding out what these stealth CATHOLICS (ROMANISTS) were all about.

God bless,

Stever

**Re: Where have all of the DOCTRINES gone?, on: 2006/1/10 0:59**

Where have all of the Doctrines gone?????

Many years ago Church doctrine was essential in learning and understanding the Christian Faith. Doctrine was still an essential of most seminary curriculums 50 years ago. Why is doctrine important? If our Christian faith is built upon sound and unchanging doctrinal pillars as set forth by God in His Word, then we will not be "carried about with every wind of doctrine" (Eph. 4:14). As instructed in 2 Timothy 3:10, if a Christian is well grounded in sound doctrine, then he or she will not be deceived by false teachers and every new cult that comes along.

revelation in Three Persons.

1. Theism: The reality of God and His revelation in Three Persons
2. Bibliology: The divine revelation of God to mankind in the sixty-six books of the Bible, written by men led and inspired by the Holy Spirit, authoritative and infallible.
3. Theology: God as Creator by Jesus Christ; the laws of God that govern this world and the universe.
4. Angelology: The creation and mission of angels; classification, missions, and future of those who fell, and those who remained faithful to God.
5. Anthropology: The creation of man, his fall, and inherent carnality; the reality of Heaven for redeemed man; the reality of Hell for the lost.
6. Soteriology: Jesus Christ; His preincarnate appearances; His incarnation as both God and man in the form of man; His death in sinful man's place; salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, a gift of God's grace; the new birth and ministry of the Holy Spirit; sanctification-immediate and progressive; rewards and the JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST.
7. Ecclesiology: Church definition; founding of the church; government of the church; church ordinances; mission of the church, now and in the future.
8. Eschatology: The second coming of Jesus Christ; purpose of His return; the Rapture or Translation of the church; resurrections; judgments; the coming Kingdom age; the New Heaven and the New Earth.

As a Christian, that understands Doctrine, when I read any of the newer versions of the Bible (NIV, NASV, HCSB, etc.) and I turn to Romans 14:10, I find: "10. But thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why dost thou set at naught thy brother? FOR WE SHALL STAND BEFORE THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF GOD." When I read John 5:22 I FIND THAT THE FATHER HAS COMMITTED ALL JUDGMENT TO THE SON. Paul stated in Romans 14:10, and repeats it in 2 Corinthians 5:10 that we, meaning all Christians, must appear before the JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST to be JUDGED, NOT FOR SALVATION, BUT FOR WORKS. The Textus Receptus states plainly, the Judgment Seat of Christos, interpreted correctly in the KJV as Christ. The word is Christos, not Theos. All of the newer versions, starting with the illustrious Mr. Westcott and Mr. Hort totally distort the meaning of the text.

Rick Warren, who uses every newer translation known to man in his book *The Purpose Driven Life*, page 34, states the following: "One day you will stand before God, and he (small 'h') will do an audit of your life, a final exam, before you enter eternity. The Bible says, 'Remember each of us will stand personally before the judgment seat of God... Yes, each of us will have to give a personal account to God.' God doesn't ask about our religious background or doctrinal views. The only thing that will matter is, did you accept what Jesus Christ did for you and did you learn to love and trust him."

We are not going to be asked about our relationship with Jesus Christ, because if we were not saved, we would not be before the judgment seat of GOD in the first place. Perhaps Warren thinks that he has to appear for judgment before the Great White Throne Judgment, that is only for the lost? If he thinks that, then he is in trouble for sure. He also continues to indicate that salvation also depends upon learning to love and trust Jesus experientially. This is a progressive salvation teaching and is contrary to sound doctrine, but Warren indicates that doctrine is not important. And tens of thousands of pastors are insisting that their Church bodies read Warren's books and espouse this kind of

fuzzy, confusing heresy.

In the Old Testament we find the word "doctrine" six times in the KJV as translated from the Masoretic Text. Two different Hebrew words were understood to be doctrine in the context; In the NIV, NASV, and the HCSB, these words are translated to be: "teaching," seven times; "beliefs," once; "instruction," four times; "message," twice; "taught," once; "discipline," once; "instructed," once; and "instruct," once. Now we would think that in just one of the eighteen places the new versions would take into consideration that for over four hundred years millions of Christian scholars and laymen had understood these words to mean doctrine. But no, the word "doctrine" must go.

But you say, what difference does it make if the Scripture says doctrine, teaching, instruction, or message? Let's continue and go to the New Testament:

In the New Testament, the word "doctrine" occurs forty-four times in the singular in the KJV. The Greek word for "doctor" in the Received Text is didaskalos. The Greek word for "doctrine" is didaskalia. There is no excuse for translating didaskalia as teaching, beliefs, message, or instruction. Your doctor may instruct you to take prescribed medicine, or he may try to teach you how to take care of your health. But teaching or instructing are not the doctor, any more than teaching or instruction is doctrine. Discipleship, or teaching and instruction, come from doctrine.

We read in the four Gospels that the masses were amazed at the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and "doctrine" is found in the singular twelve times in the Gospels. Now we might think that in at least one place the NIV, NASV, or the HCSB would translate from the Westcott and Hort text the word "doctrine." Think again-it isn't there. In all twelve places, all three versions substitute "teaching" for doctrine. Coincidence? No!

In the book of Acts "doctrine" is mentioned four times. Again, the NIV, NASV, and the HCSB say "teaching" -not "doctrine."

In the general epistles, "doctrine" is mentioned nine times in the KJV. In the other versions referenced, the Greek is translated "teaching," "instruction," or "message." Finally, the NASV in Ephesians 4: 14 translated the Greek to mean "doctrine." In the Pastoral Epistles, the KJV references "doctrine" sixteen times, and finally the new Westcott and Hort versions do relent somewhat, possibly to avoid conservative criticism of the heavily doctrinal epistles. In the Pastoral Epistles, of the sixteen times "doctrine" is mentioned, the NIV translates the word "doctrine" seven times, and "teaching" nine times; the NASV, "doctrine" eight times, "teaching" eight times; the HCSB, "doctrine" only three times, "teaching" thirteen times. The NIV claims dynamic equivalency. The HCSB claims optimal equivalency-some option! In the three scriptures in Revelation where the word "doctrine" appears, "teaching" has taken its place in all three versions, as in all Westcott and Hort newer versions.

Is it any wonder that the entire body of Christ is getting fuzzy on Doctrine? What else should we expect when all newer versions rely on the corrupted text? It has created the "name it and claim it crowd, the "Blab it and Grag it Bunch", as well as all of the others out there that are not reading the sound doctrine of the KING JAMES BIBLE.

God bless,

Stever

**The Never Versions have deleted them!**

**Re: Bible Comparisons--A Broad Analysis, on: 2006/1/10 1:17**

Bible Comparisons--a Broad Analysis

Lets actually compare the teaching in the Authorized King James Bible to a broad array of 'modern versions'. The purpose is to note the versions' effect on Christian doctrine. 20 verses, many of them familiar to the reader, are used in this comparison.

When I say 'modern versions', I am referring to all other 'versions' except the Authorized King James Bible. 'Modern versions' include: the NIV, the RSV, the NRSV, the NASV, the NKJV, the TEB, the

LB, the AMP, etc. etc.

The NIV, RSV, NASV etc. etc. fit the 'broad comparison' in this profile.

However, there are at least 3 modern versions which require a specific 'individual' analysis. The 3 I am referring to are: The New King James Version (NKJV), the Living Bible (LB), and the Amplified Bible (AMP).

The 'New King James Version', 'The Living Bible', and the 'Amplified Bible' are compared to the KJV .

To get the most out of this, please get your own Bibles and compare the verses with me, as you read along. You will need a 'modern version' and the King James Bible.

Now that you're ready, let's begin.

XXXXXXXXXXXX  
Bible Quiz-----20 Questions

Bible Question #1: How many Gods are there?

~~~~~

We know there is only 1 God. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord" (De. 6:4).

Now, turn to Daniel 3:25. In this verse, Shadrach, Messach and Abednego have been thrown into the fiery furnace. However, they are not alone. Another one (a fourth) is there to help them.

Look at this verse in a 'modern version'. (Notice: the wording in each 'modern version' will differ from others. But, those small differences, will not materially affect this report).

Suffice it to say that, at the end of Daniel 3:25, the 'modern' version has a reading similar to the following:

"... and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods..."
A son of the gods?! There is only 1 God!

Look at this same verse in your King James Bible. The Authorized (KJ) Bible says:

"... and the form of the fourth is like THE SON OF GOD". i.e. Jesus Christ.

It was Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, who was with Shadrach, Messach and Abednego. Jesus protected them from the fiery furnace; and it's Jesus who will protect you and me from the fiery furnace (i.e. hell).

Now, who would think there is more than 1 God? Well, Satan does. Remember what he said to Eve in Genesis 3:5 ?

"... ye shall be as gods ..."!

Satan believes there is more than 1 God as he believes that HE is

EQUAL to God.

Bible Question #2: Who was Jesus' father?

~~~~~

The answer, of course, is that God was Jesus' father.

Let's look in a 'modern' version of the Bible, at Luke 2:33.

Starting in Luke 2:27 Simeon has gone into the temple to see the baby Jesus (who is with Joseph and Mary). Again, depending on the particular 'modern' version, in verse 33, it will say something similar to:

"... and his FATHER and mother were amazed at the things which were spoken of him".

What do you mean "... and his father ..." was amazed at the things which were spoken of him?! Jesus' father was NOT Joseph! Jesus' father was God!

Now, let's look in the Authorized King James Bible. The KJV has the correct reading; in Luke 2:33 it says:

"And JOSEPH and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him".

For a 'modern' version ( NIV, NASV, RSV etc.) to say Joseph was Jesus' father is blasphemy!

Think about the doctrinal implications: If Jesus had only an earthly father and mother, then he is just any man. If he is just any man, then we are still in our sins. If we are still in our sins, then we are not saved! If we are not saved, then we have a big problem!

Bible Question #3: What was Jesus' purpose in coming to earth?

~~~~~

Turn to Matthew 18:11.

You may have a hard time finding this verse. In many new, 'modern', versions this verse is missing! The verses are numbered 10 then 12, 13, 14! Or you may find verse 11 is in brackets, casting doubt as to whether it is scriptural.

Let's see what the Authorized King James says:

"For the Son of man is come TO SAVE THAT WHICH WAS LOST."

This one verse, which summarizes Jesus' entire mission to earth, is either ignored in 'new' versions; or it is put in brackets casting doubt on it! This verse contains a KEY piece of Christian doctrine.

People have to know they are lost, i.e. that they have a problem, to know they need a saviour.

Bible Question #4: Noah was a great man used by God to build the
~~~~~ Ark. To be called for such a task required  
Noah to be approved by the Lord, God. So, how  
was Noah 'justified' before God? Was Noah's  
justification by his own works?

For the answer, turn in your Bible to Genesis 6:8.

In a 'modern version' it says something like:

"Noah found favor in the eyes of the Lord."

Now think what the word favor implies. Favor implies that Noah was  
'better' than others. Favor implies Noah was approved by God because of  
his own 'good works'.

Now compare that to the KJV. It says:

"Noah found GRACE in the eyes of the Lord".

Even though Noah was used of God, he was also in need of grace  
(just like all of us). Noah was NOT justified by his good works, but by  
God's grace.

Look at verse 9: It says Noah walked with God. Notice that Noah's  
walk with God occurs, in verse 9, AFTER Noah received grace from God, in  
verse 8. Grace precedes our walk with God. We are NOT justified (NOR  
saved) by our own works.

Remember, Noah got drunk on occasion (Gen 9:21). He was in need of  
God's amazing grace. We are, too.

The consistent theme of the Bible is that we are saved by God's  
grace and NOT by our own works. Grace and favor have two totally,  
different, meanings.

The Authorized King James Bible is consistent with the Bible's  
teachings. These 'modern versions' are not.

Bible Question #5: Why did Jesus Christ go to the cross?  
~~~~~

Let's look at 2 verses. Turn to 1st Peter 4:1.

In a 'modern' version it says: "... Christ suffered ..."

In your Authorized King James Bible the full reading is quoted as:

"... Christ suffered FOR US."

Notice the last two words give the FULL meaning. Leaving out "for
us" misses the point entirely!

This is confirmed again in 1 Corinthians 5:7b.

In many 'new' versions it says:

"For Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed."

Again, the full reading is found in the King James Bible. It says:

"For even Christ our passover is sacrificed FOR US."

Bible Question #6: How did Jesus' going to the cross bring
~~~~~ our redemption?

A 'modern' version will NOT tell you how! (in Colossians 1:14). It says (of Jesus):

"in whom we have redemption ..."

The full Christian doctrine is only included in the King James reading of the same verse. Properly stated, it says (of Jesus):

"In whom we have redemption THROUGH HIS BLOOD ..."

Without the shedding of blood there is NO remission of sins. Leaving out "the blood" misses a key point of doctrine (and leaves us in our sins).

Bible Question #7: Who does Jesus "call" and what does he  
~~~~~ "call" them to do?

The questions are getting harder!

Open a 'modern' version to Matthew 9:13b. It says something like:

"For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners".

Notice how the end of this verse begs the question: "... call the righteous, but sinners TO WHAT?"

Turn to the same verse in the King James Bible:

"... for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners TO REPENTANCE".

The last 2 words of this verse are crucial! In the end, Satan gets all the sinners who don't repent. Jesus gets all the sinners who do repent. There is a big difference in those two eternal outcomes. And, there is a big difference in these two translations.

We are all sinners, and we must all repent, to be saved.

Bible Question #8: What happens to those who do not receive
~~~~~ the testimony of Jesus Christ, i.e. what happens the those who do not receive the gift of everlasting life?

In many 'modern' versions you won't find out! This is because part of the verse is missing (in Mark 6:11). Let's turn there now.

A 'modern' version reads something like:

"... shake the dust off your feet when you leave, as a testimony against them."

However, the King James gives the full teaching:

"... shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. VERILY I SAY UNTO YOU, IT SHALL BE MORE TOLERABLE FOR SODOM AND GOMORRHA IN THE DAY OF JUDGMENT, THAN FOR THAT CITY".

I think the reader will agree that this verse contains important information we need to know!

Bible Question #9: After we repent, and are born again (come  
~~~~~ to saving grace), what else does Jesus  
command us to do?

There are many changes that come in our new birth/in our new nature, but the answer I'm looking for is this: We are to make a public profession of faith. Then we are to be baptized, by immersion, in water.

Let's look in Acts chapter 8, verses 35-37.

In Acts 8:35 Philip, the Apostle, preached Jesus Christ to the eunuch. In verse 36 the eunuch realized his need to be baptized. The eunuch then asks if he can be baptized.

Now, take a look at Acts 8:37 in a 'modern' version of the Bible. Many (but not all) 'modern' versions go from Acts chapter 8 verse 35, to verse 36, then to 38. 38?! Where is verse 37 you ask? And, what did verse 37 say?

This key verse, properly included in the King James Bible, tells us whom should be baptized. It says:

"... IF THOU BELIEVEST WITH ALL THINE HEART, THOU MAYEST." And he answered and said: "... I BELIEVE THAT JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD."

Numbering verses 35, 36, and then 38 is NOT the new math!

These 'modern' versions, which leave out verse 37, are omitting the deity of Jesus Christ. Also, they are missing the key point: We must make a PUBLIC profession of faith. We must believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. If we do not know, believe, and confess that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, our baptism only 'gets us wet'. Leaving out verse 37 omits a major portion of Christian doctrine.

Omissions of doctrine and corruptions of doctrine are bad news. In both cases, the reader is NOT getting the correct information he/she needs to know.

Bible Question #10: Can you recite the Lord's prayer?

~~~~~

The Lord's prayer, taught to us by Jesus, and recorded in Luke

11:2-4 of the KJV, is as follows:

"... Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil."

Now turn to Luke 11:2-4 in a 'modern' version and re-read the Lord's prayer. The wording will be similar to:

"... Father, hallowed be Thy name. Thy Kingdom come. Give us each day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive everyone who is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation".

Note this modern version states "Father" but then leaves out "... WHICH ART IN HEAVEN ...". You don't know who you are praying to, your Father in heaven, or to Satan!

It also leaves out "our" as in OUR father. We were created by God who is "OUR" father. Satan is a father, but he is not "OUR" father. Satan is the "father" of lies.

And this 'modern' version leaves out "THY WILL BE DONE, AS IN HEAVEN, SO IN EARTH". By leaving out the fact that we are praying to our Father WHOSE WILL IS DONE IN HEAVEN, this 'modern' version is re-directing your prayer away from God and toward someone or something else (in another place).

Lastly, there is a major omission in the last half of verse 4. Verse 4 states: "And lead us not into temptation". But this verse then leaves out: "... BUT DELIVER US FROM EVIL ..."

Personally, I want to be delivered from evil! How about you?

I think the reader will agree: This 'modern version' is NOT the "Lord's Prayer" you want to be praying!

Think about it.

Bible Question #11: After our new birth, how are we supposed  
~~~~~ to relate to God?

Once we are born again we have a new standard for our lives; it is Jesus Christ. The Bible tells us how we are to relate to him. Please turn to Ephesians 5:1 . In a 'new' version it says:

"... be imitators of God ..."

Compare this to the Authorized King James:

"Be ye therefore FOLLOWERS of God ..."

Even though we are born again; can we possibly imitate God? Can we be the judge of the Universe? Can we be at all places at the same time? No way. We have a new nature, sure; but we are still only men.

Think about it: only Satan tries to imitate God!

Ever since the garden of Eden, Satan has tried to direct worship toward HIMSELF. We, as men, could NEVER imitate God. We are only men. We can only FOLLOW God!

Publishers of 'new', 'more up to date' versions are encouraging us to be like Satan! (i.e. to think of ourselves as God).

Bible Question #12: While we're talking about Satan, now is
~~~~~ a good time to ask Bible question #12.  
What does the Bible say is the test for  
the antichrist?

Let's turn to 1st John 4:3 . A 'modern' version says:

"and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God. This is the spirit of antichrist, of which you heard that it was coming, and now it is in the world already."

Again, in 'modern' versions, key pieces of scripture are left out. Compare this same verse with the FULL reading in the King James. In the KJV it says:

"And every spirit that confesseth not that JESUS CHRIST IS COME IN THE FLESH is not of God: and this is that of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

Remember, evil spirits did confess Jesus. In Luke 4:34 (and in Mark 1:24) a man having a "spirit of an unclean devil" said to Jesus:

"... Let alone; what have we to do with thee, JESUS of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God."

Contrary to what 'modern' versions would tell you, the antichrist DOES KNOW who Jesus is. But, what the antichrist CAN NOT say, is that:

"JESUS CHRIST IS COME IN THE FLESH".

Modern versions not only need to get their gospel straight; they also need to correctly quote the true test for the antichrist.

Also, take a look at this: Compare 1st John 4:3 again between a 'modern' version and the King James Bible. Look one more time at what the 'new' version says:

"... which does not confess Jesus is ..."

But, in the King James it says:

"... that confesseth not that Jesus CHRIST is ..."

Besides the doctrinal error, these 'modern' versions continually assault the Lordship and Deity of Jesus Christ. If the King James says: "Jesus Christ", many times the modern versions will only say: "Jesus".

If the King James says: "Lord Jesus Christ", many times the 'modern' versions will only say: "Lord" or will only say: "Jesus".

Bible Question #13: In the wilderness, when Satan tempted Jesus  
~~~~~  
~~~~~ to turn a stone into bread for food; what  
was Jesus' response?

Turn to Luke 4:4 . In a 'modern' version it reads: "... man shall not live by bread alone".

Well, that's true and that's part of it. But, what about the rest of the verse? Notice: words have been LEFT OUT in these 'modern versions'.

The Authorized (King James) Bible has the correct and full reading. In Luke 4:4 it says:

"... man shall not live by bread alone, BUT BY EVERY WORD OF GOD".

The fact that we are nourished by bread is true, but that is only part of the story. Our lives are sustained by the Word of God. We need bread to sustain our bodies; but, these 'modern' versions leave out our need for the life sustaining Word of God.

Bible Question #14: Whom does Jesus say has "everlasting life"?  
~~~~~

For the answer; open your Bible to John 6:47.

In a 'modern version' it says something like: "... he who believes has eternal life ..."

Notice how this does not make much sense. This verse does not have enough information.

Compare this to the King James. In it, Jesus is quoted as saying:

"... He that believeth ON ME hath everlasting life."

Everyone who believes DOES NOT have everlasting life; only those who believe ON JESUS. In John 6:47, the two words "ON ME" are vital.

Jesus Christ is the rock of our salvation. We must believe ON HIM to have everlasting life. Again, key Christian doctrine is missing.

How can missing information be a 'better', 'improved', translation?

Bible Question #15: Who slew Goliath?
~~~~~

This is an easy one!

Now turn to 2nd Samuel 21:19. Depending on the 'modern version' it will say something like:

"... Elhanan ... killed Goliath ..."

What do you mean Elhanan killed Goliath!? This is wrong you say. Most Sunday school children know that David slew Goliath! Well, you're right. This is clearly in error.

Look at the same passage in your King James Bible. The Authorized King James Bible has the correct reading which is:

"... Elhanan ... slew THE BROTHER OF Goliath ..."

Spiritually, as Christians, we are the equivalent of David. Spiritually, Satan is the equivalent of Goliath. Just as David slew Goliath (with a rock), we Christians are "more than conquerors" as we have overcome (slew) Satan by the blood of the lamb (Jesus Christ, the rock!) and by the word of our testimony. Not only are 'modern versions' in error; but major doctrinal issues are involved here. Think about it.

Bible Question #16: Jesus said that our heavenly Father will  
~~~~~ forgive us of our sins. However, we are  
told that; likewise, there is something
we must do. Do you remember what it is?

Let's turn, in a 'modern version' to Mark 11:26.

Are you not able to find it? Are the verses in Mark chapter 11 numbered 23, 24, 25 and then 27!? Is verse 26 missing? Well, there is nothing wrong with your eyesight! Verse 26 is not there (or it is in brackets, casting doubt on it). It's ANOTHER omission.

Now turn to the same verse in your Authorized (King James) Version. The KJV says:

"BUT IF YE DO NOT FORGIVE, NEITHER WILL YOUR FATHER WHICH IS IN HEAVEN FORGIVE YOUR TRESPASSES."

Oh, man! This is important to know!

Leaving out verse 26, leaves out an important piece of Christian doctrine. Verse 26 needs to be there! And, that's why it is properly included in your King James Bible.

Bible Question #17: What did Jesus say about religious
~~~~~ hypocrisy?

First, let's take a look in a 'modern' version of the Bible. What does it say in Matthew 23:14?

Actually, it says nothing! ( The verse is missing in many modern versions ).

For the word of God, turn to the same verse in your King James Bible. What does it say?

"WOE UNTO YOU SCRIBES AND PHARISEES, HYPOCRITES! FOR YE DEVOUR WIDOWS' HOUSES, AND FOR A PRETENCE MAKE LONG PRAYER: THEREFORE YE SHALL RECEIVE THE GREATER DAMNATION."



Jesus does not like hypocrisy. Notice how God knows our heart!

Bible Question #18: What did Jesus say we are to do relative  
~~~~~ to each other?

For the answer see: James 5:16

Many 'modern' versions say something similar to:

"... confess your sins to one another ..."

(Notice this could lead to gossip and further sinning).

But the King James says:

"... confess your FAULTS one to another ..."

Notice the 2 different words.

The Bible says that ONLY God can forgive sins. We are supposed to confess our SINS to Him. We should confess our FAULTS to one another, but SINS are confessed to God.

Faults and sins are entirely different.

Can you see how 'modern' versions have led Catholics astray? And, if it has led Catholics astray; couldn't the same thing happen to us if we, our spouse, our children, or our pastor, uses a 'modern' version?

Bible Question #19: Do modern 'versions' of the Bible have any
~~~~~ other problems?

Unfortunately, the answer is yes.

In the Bible, the New Testament sometimes re-quotes the Old Testament. An example of this is in Mark 1:2

Compare the two Bibles again. In a 'new version' it says:

"As it is written in Isaiah the prophet, ..."

Compare this to the King James, it says:

"As it is written IN THE PROPHETS, ... "

Comment: The scripture quoted in Mark 1:2 DID NOT come from Isaiah as stated in these 'modern' versions of the Bible. The scripture quoted is from Malachi 3:1 ! Check it out.

Not only do 'modern' versions misquote God; they even misquote themselves!

The KJV reading of: "As it is written IN THE PROPHETS, ... " is correct, because the verse is from Malachi 3:1, and Malachi was a prophet!

So far we have seen all kinds of problems in these 'new', 'modern', 'more easily readable', 'more up to date', etc. etc. versions of the Bible. This leads to the last Bible question:

Bible Question #20: Why is it important to have the true Word  
~~~~~ of God (vs. a corruption).

The answer, to our question, is found in 1 Peter 2:2. Please turn there now.

In a 'modern version' it says:

"... long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow up to salvation; "

The King James Bible tells us to:

"... desire the SINCERE milk OF THE WORD, that ye may GROW thereby:"

My comment is that this verse, in 'new', 'modern,' versions, contains 2 problems:

First: We are to desire the sincere milk OF THE WORD. The purpose is "to grow thereby". Modern versions leave out "OF THE WORD". It's God's word that feeds us. If, like the modern verse, we leave out "the word" how can we grow? Or, if we get a corrupted translation, how can we grow on 'junk food'?

Second: Contrary to 'modern' versions, we DO NOT grow up to salvation. That says salvation is by works! We are saved by grace, and not of works, lest any man should boast. (Ephesians 2:8-9)

Think about it.

In this chapter, we reviewed the doctrine contained in a "broad" array of 'new', 'modern', 'more easily readable', versions of the Bible. We compared 'modern' doctrine to the KJV. And, we have found significant error.

But, all 'modern' versions do not follow this 'broad' profile. So, in the next chapter, we will analyze 3 versions of the Bible which need an individual, case by case, analysis.

XXX
K J V V S. N K J V

Gen 1:21 KJV: "And God created great WHALES ..."

NKJV: "So God created great sea creatures ..."

COMMENT: There is a difference between sea creatures
and whales.

Matt 12:40 KJV: "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in

the WHALES's belly ..."

NKJV: "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish ..."

Gen. 2:7 KJV: "... and man became a living SOUL."

NKJV: "... and man became a living being."

Comment: A MAJOR difference between man and beast is that man is the ONLY creature with a soul. New versions miss this point.

Gen. 2:13 KJV: "... land of ETHIOPIA."

NKJV: "... land of Cush."

Comment: I know where Ethiopia is, but where is Cush?

Gen. 3:4-5 KJV: "And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil."

NKJV: "Then the serpent said to the woman, "You will not surely die. For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God knowing good and evil."

COMMENT: This is major blasphemy! God (with a big G) is not evil! Think about the difference.

Gen. 22:8 KJV: "And Abraham said, My son, God will provide HIMSELF a lamb for a burnt offering ..."

NKJV: "And Abraham said, My son, God will provide for Himself the lamb for a burnt offering."

Comment: It is true, as the NKJV says, that God did provide FOR himself a sacrifice. However, that is only part of the story. The NKJV totally misses the deeper, and more amazing truth: GOD WAS the sacrifice! The KJV wording is perfect: "God will provide HIMSELF" (in the form of his son Jesus Christ) as the sacrifice.

1 Ki.10:28 KJV: "and LINEN yarn: the king's merchants received the LINEN yarn at a price."

NKJV: "and Keveh; the king's merchants bought them in Keveh at the current price."

Comment: I know what linen is, but what is Keveh?

Dan. 3:25 KJV: "... and the form of the fourth is like
THE SON OF GOD."

NKJV: (footnote) "or a son of the gods"

COMMENT: See comments in chapter 1 of this report.
There is a big difference between "THE SON OF GOD" and a
son of 'plural' gods!

Zech 11:17 KJV: "Woe to the IDOL shepherd that leaveth the flock!"

NKJV: "Woe to the worthless shepherd, who leaves the flock"

Matt. 2:4 KJV: "... he (King Herod) DEMANDED of them
where Christ should be born."

NKJV: "... he inquired of them where Christ was
to be born."

COMMENT: King Herod, furious over the arrival of
Jesus, (and wanting to do away with Him) did not inquire
where Christ should be born, he DEMANDED to know!

Matt 18:11 KJV: "For the Son of Man IS come to save that which
was lost."

NKJV: "For the Son of Man has come to save that
which was lost."

Comment: The NKJV says Jesus Christ "has come"
to save that which was lost; a PAST TENSE statement. The
NKJV implies that ALL who were to be saved, HAVE
BEEN saved. Not true. Anyone TODAY can be saved
by Jesus. The correct reading is PRESENT TENSE.
There are NUMEROUS places where the NKJV changes
the verb tense. These types of NKJV corruptions
are very subtle.

Matt 20:20 KJV: "Then came to him the mother of
Zebedee's children with her sons, WORSHIPPING him ..."

NKJV: "Then the mother of Zebedee's sons came
to Him with her sons, kneeling down ..."

COMMENT: Kneeling down is not even close to 'worship'.

John 1:3 KJV: "All things were made BY Him ..."

NKJV: "All things were made through Him ..."

COMMENT: 'BY' and through are totally different.
Think about it.

John 4:24 KJV: "God is A Spirit ..."

NKJV: "God is Spirit ..."

COMMENT: For the NKJV to say: "God is spirit" is to infer that ALL spirits are God. Not true. We know there are evil spirits. And we know in God there is NO evil. Thus the KJV is correct: God is 'A' spirit.

Acts 12:4 KJV: "... after Easter ..."

NKJV: "... after Passover"

Acts 4:13 KJV: "Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and IGNORANT men.."

NKJV: "Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were uneducated and untrained men ..."

COMMENT: Peter and John had been with Jesus for some time. They WERE NOT untrained. Jesus HAD trained them. They were, however, ignorant.

Acts 17:22 KJV: "Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are TOO SUPERSTITIOUS."

NKJV: "Then Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus and said, Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious;"

Comment: Come on! Being very religious and TOO SUPERSTITIOUS are entirely different!

2 Cor. 2:17 KJV: "For we are not as many, which CORRUPT the Word of God ..."

NKJV: "For we are not, as so many, peddling the Word of God ..."

COMMENT: Peddling and corrupting are very different. 'Modern' versions try and hide from the truth they are 'corrupting' the Word of God.

Gal. 2:20 KJV: "I AM crucified with Christ ..."

NKJV: "I have been crucified with Christ ..."

COMMENT: The NKJV is saying their crucifixion is over!
Not true. The believers crucifixion is an ongoing, PRESENT TENSE, transaction.

Eph. 5:1 KJV: "Therefore be FOLLOWERS of God ..."

NKJV: "Therefore be imitators of God ..."

Comment: See chapter 1 of this report for a full analysis. Only Satan tries to imitate God as Satan wants to be worshipped AS God. Born again believers cannot imitate God. We can't rule the universe. We can only follow God. Remember Jesus DID NOT tell his "fishers of men" to imitate Him. Jesus said: "follow me ...".

Philip 3:8 KJV: "DUNG"

NKJV: "rubbish"

COMMENT: I have rubbish on the top of my office desk, but I don't want 'dung' there!!!

1 Tim 6:10 KJV: "For the love of money is THE root of all evil ..."

NKJV: "For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil ..."

COMMENT: There is a big difference between the NKJV's "a" root and the correct KJV reading of "THE" root.

1 Tim 6:20 KJV: "... oppositions of science falsely so called"

NKJV: "... contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge"

2 Tim 2:15 KJV: "STUDY to shew thyself approved unto God ..."

NKJV: "Be diligent to present yourself approved to God..."

COMMENT: We are supposed to STUDY the Word of God.

Jude 15 KJV: "... and of all their hard SPEECHES which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him."

NKJV: "... and of all the harsh things which ..."

COMMENT: There is a difference between speeches and things.

K J V V S. L B

In this section we compare the King James to the "Living Bible" (LB). The Living Bible is a 'paraphrase'. In a 'paraphrased' Bible the renderings are arbitrary.

In this comparison we will show the result of a 'paraphrased' approach.

Lev. 3:13b KJV: "AND THE SONS OF AARON SHALL SPRINKLE THE BLOOD THEREOF UPON THE ALTAR ROUND ABOUT."

LB: "The priest shall throw its blood against the sides of the altar."

Numbers 25:11 KJV: "PHINEHAS ... HATH TURNED MY WRATH AWAY FROM THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL."

LB: "Phinehas has turned away my anger for he was as angry as I."

COMMENT: How can someone be as angry as God?

Judges 7:20b KJV: "AND THEY CRIED, THE SWORD OF THE LORD AND OF GIDEON."

LB: "All yelling for the Lord and for Gideon."

Comment: The two verses are not even close!

Judges 19:2 KJV: "AND HIS CONCUBINE PLAYED THE WHORE AGAINST HIM."

LB: "But she became angry with him and ran away."

Comment: Are PLAYING THE WHORE and running away the same?

I Sam. 20:30 KJV: "THOU SON OF A PERVERSE REBELLIOUS WOMAN."

LB: "You son of a b----."

Comment: Some 'modern' versions, like the LB, actually contain vulgarity. Notice this verse. Also, take a look in an NIV 'bible' at Ezekiel 23:20.

II Sam. 16:4b KJV: "AND ZIBA SAID, I HUMBLY BESEECH THEE THAT I MAY FIND GRACE IN THY SIGHT, MY LORD, O KING."

LB: "Thank you, thank you, sir, Ziba replied."

Comment: There is NO similarity between these two verses.

I Kings 18:27 KJV: "CRY ALOUD: FOR HE IS A GOD: EITHER HE IS TALKING, OR HE IS PURSUING."

LB: "Perhaps he is talking to someone or else is out sitting on the toilet."

Comment: Sitting on a toilet ???

II Kings 21:6b KJV: "HE WROUGHT MUCH WICKEDNESS IN THE SIGHT OF THE LORD, TO PROVOKE HIM TO ANGER."

LB: "So the Lord was very angry, for Manasseh was an evil man in God's opinion."

COMMENT: In God's opinion?

II Chr. 26:4 KJV: "AND HE DID THAT WHICH WAS RIGHT IN THE SIGHT OF THE LORD ACCORDING TO ALL THAT HIS FATHER AMAZIAH DID."

LB: "He followed in the footsteps of his father Amaziah and was in general a good king as far as the Lord's opinion of him was concerned."

COMMENT: Again, God does NOT have opinions. Men have opinions.

Job 3:26 KJV: "I WAS NOT IN SAFETY. NEITHER HAD I REST, NEITHER WAS I QUIET: YET TROUBLE CAME."

LB: "I was not fat and lazy yet trouble struck me down."

Psalms 34:20 KJV: "HE KEEPETH ALL HIS BONES: NOT ONE OF THEM IS BROKEN."

LB: "God even protects him from accidents."

COMMENT: There are NO ACCIDENTS with God!

Ezekiel 2:1 KJV: "AND HE SAID UNTO ME, SON OF MAN, STAND UPON THY FEET, AND I WILL SPEAK UNTO THEE."

LB: "And he said unto me, Stand up, son of dust and I will talk to you."

COMMENT: In the book of Ezekiel 'son of dust' is used in place of 'son of man'. Does the term 'son

of dust' sound as derogatory to you like as it does to me?

Zech. 2:8 KJV: "HE THAT TOUCHETH YOU TOUCHETH THE APPLE OF HIS EYE."

LB: "For he who harms you sticks his finger in Jehovah's eye."

Zech. 13:6 KJV: "AND ONE SHALL SAY UNTO HIM, WHAT ARE THESE WOUNDS IN THINE HANDS? THEN HE SHALL ANSWER, THOSE WITH WHICH I WAS WOUNDED IN THE HOUSE OF MY FRIENDS."

LB: "And if someone asks then, what are these scars on your chest and your back, you will say, I got into a brawl at the home of a friend."

COMMENT: The footnote about this verse says: "That this is not a passage referring to Christ is clear from the context. This is a false prophet who is lying about the reasons for his scars." We wonder how the editor of the LB (Taylor) came to know this.

Mark 9:29 KJV: "AND HE SAID UNTO THEM, THIS KIND CAN COME FORTH BY NOTHING, BUT BY PRAYER AND FASTING."

LB: "Jesus replied, Cases like this require prayer."

COMMENT: Notice: fasting is left out! Wonder why Satan does not want us to fast?

Luke 23:42 KJV: "AND HE SAID UNTO JESUS, LORD, REMEMBER ME WHEN THOU COMEST INTO THY KINGDOM."

LB: "Then he said, Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom."

COMMENT: What justification is there to strip Jesus of his title "Lord"?

John 1:17 KJV: "FOR THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES, BUT GRACE AND TRUTH CAME BY JESUS CHRIST."

LB: "For Moses gave us only the law with its rigid demands and merciless justice while Jesus Christ brought us loving forgiveness as well."

COMMENT: The Old Testament contained God's mercy and grace, too.

John 2:4 KJV: "WOMAN, WHAT HAVE I TO DO WITH THEE? MINE HOUR IS NOT YET COME."

LB: "I can't help you now, He said, It isn't yet my time for miracles."

COMMENT: His hour would come at Calvary. His HOUR and His MIRACLES are not the same.

John 3:13 KJV: "AND NO MAN HATH ASCENDED UP TO HEAVEN, BUT HE THAT CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN, EVEN THE SON OF MAN WHICH IS IN HEAVEN."

LB: "For only I, the Messiah, have come to earth and will return to heaven again."

Comment: Not true, LB! Remember the angels on Jacob's ladder?

John 6:69 KJV: "AND WE BELIEVE AND ARE SURE THAT THOU ART THAT CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD."

LB: "And we believe them and know you are the holy Son of God."

COMMENT: The word Christ means "anointed". Why does the LB strip him of his anointing?

John 13:26 KJV: "JESUS ANSWERED, HE IT IS, TO WHOM I SHALL GIVE A SOP, WHEN I HAVE DIPPED IT."

LB: "He told me it is the one I honor by giving the bread dipped in the sauce."

COMMENT: Was Jesus Christ really HONORING Judas?

Acts 9:5 KJV: "AND HE SAID, WHO ART THOU, LORD? AND THE LORD SAID, I AM JESUS WHOM THOU PERSECUTEST: IT IS HARD FOR THEE TO KICK AGAINST THE PRICKS."

LB: "Who is speaking sir, Paul asked. And the voice replied, I am Jesus, the one you are persecuting. Now get up and go into the city and await my further instructions."

COMMENT: Jesus title "LORD" is changed to 'SIR'. And Saul's name is changed to Paul.

I Cor. 16:22 KJV: "IF ANY MAN LOVE NOT THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA MARANATHA."

LB: "If anyone does not love the Lord, that person is cursed, Lord Jesus, come."

COMMENT: Once again; Jesus Christ is separated from title 'Lord'

II Cor. 8:9 KJV: "FOR YE KNOW THE GRACE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST."

LB: "You know how full of love and kindness our Lord Jesus was."

COMMENT: Lord Jesus Christ is stripped down to: Lord Jesus.

I Tim. 2:5-6 KJV: "FOR THERE IS ONE GOD, AND ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MEN THE MAN CHRIST JESUS, WHO GAVE HIMSELF A RANSOM FOR ALL, TO BE TESTIFIED IN DUE TIME."

LB: "That God is on one side and all the people on the other side, and Christ Jesus Himself, man, is between them to bring them together by giving His life for all mankind."

I Tim. 3:16 KJV: "AND WITHOUT CONTROVERSY GREAT IS THE MYSTERY OF GODLINESS: GOD WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH."

LB: "It is quite true that the matter to live a godly life is not an easy matter, but the answer lies in Christ who came to earth as a man."

COMMENT: Remember the test for the anti-christ. The anti-christ cannot say: "JESUS CHRIST IS COME IN THE FLESH". Notice how the LB dances around this verse! Apparently the LB cannot say "GOD WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH!"

I John 1:7 KJV: "AND THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST HIS SON CLEANSETH US FROM ALL SIN."

LB: "The blood of Jesus, His Son, cleanses us from every sin."

COMMENT: Jesus Christ is stripped down to Jesus.

Rev. 6:17 KJV: "FOR THE GREAT DAY OF HIS WRATH IS COME ..."

LB: "Because the great day of THEIR anger is come and who can survive it?"

Comment: What does "HIS" wrath and "THEIR" anger have in common?

K J V V S. A M P.

In this section we compare the King James to the "Amplified Bible" (AMP).

In this comparison, we will see the results of an 'amplified' approach.

Gen 1:21 KJV: "And God created great WHALES ..."

AMP: "God created the great sea monsters ..."

Matt. 12:40 KJV: "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the WHALES's belly ..."

AMP: "For even as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster ..."

COMMENT: God creates monsters?

Gen. 2:7 KJV: "... and man became a living SOUL."

AMP: "... and man became a living being."

Comment: A MAJOR difference between man and beast is that man is the ONLY creature with a SOUL.

Gen. 2:13 KJV: "... land of ETHIOPIA."

AMP: "... land of Cush."

Comment: I know where Ethiopia is, but where is Cush?

Gen. 3:4-5 KJV: "And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil."

AMP: "But the serpent said to the woman, You shall not surely die. For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be as God, knowing the difference

between good and evil."

COMMENT: This is major blasphemy! God (with a big G) is not evil! Think about the difference between

"as gods" and "as God".

Lev. 3:13b KJV: "... and the sons of Aaron shall SPRINKLE the blood thereof upon the altar round about."

AMP: "... and the sons of Aaron shall throw its blood against the altar round about."

Judges 7:20b KJV: "... and they cried, the sword OF the LORD, and OF Gideon."

AMP: "... and they cried, The sword for the LORD and Gideon."

Comment: Notice: "OF" was changed to "FOR".

2 Sam. 21:19 KJV: "... Elhanan ... slew THE BROTHER OF Goliath ..."

AMP: "... Elhanan ... slew Goliath ..."

Comment: The scholars missed this one! Most Sunday school children know that DAVID slew Goliath.

Daniel 3:25 KJV: "... and the form of the fourth is like THE SON OF GOD."

AMP: "... And the form of the fourth is like a son of the gods!"

COMMENT: It was Jesus Christ, THE SON OF GOD, who was with Shadrach, Messach and Abednego. It was Jesus Christ who saved them from the fiery furnace. And, it is Jesus Christ who saves you and me from the fiery furnace (i.e. Hell). There is a big difference between "THE SON OF GOD" and 'a son' of 'plural' gods! Think about it.

Zech. 11:17 KJV: "Woe to the IDOL shepherd that leaveth the flock!"

AMP: "Woe to the worthless and foolish shepherd who deserts the flock!"

Comment: Idol and worthless/foolish are very different.

Zech. 13:6 KJV: "And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds IN THINE HANDS? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends."

AMP: "And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds on your breast - between your hands? Then he will answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my (loving) friends."

COMMENT: Folks: This is a verse prophesying Jesus Christ. Jesus was wounded IN HIS HANDS (and also on His back), BUT NOT ON HIS BREAST! Also, Jesus WAS NOT BEING DISCIPLINED when He went to the cross! Jesus did nothing wrong! And, lastly, Jesus WAS in the house of "His" friends, but they WERE NOT BEING "loving" back to him!

god bless,

Stever

BIBLE COMPARISON: A BROAD ANALYSIS

Re: The Faith OF Jesus Christ versus the Faith IN Jesus Christ, on: 2006/1/10 2:03

THE FAITH OF CHRIST IS LACKING IN THE NIV AND THE NEW KING JAMES...Â...Â...Â...Â...

It is common knowledge that most modern Bible versions delete passages such as 1 John 5:7; Mark 9:44; Mark 9:46; Matthew 17:21; Matthew 23:14; Matthew 27:35; John 7:55-8:11; Acts 8:37; etc. This occurs because these versions are based upon certain Greek manuscripts, which also omit these passages. Although every modern version does not necessarily delete every one of these passages, most of these versions still delete most of these passages.

In addition, most of these versions also change (or eliminate) several important words in certain other passages, such as Ro.8:1; Acts 20:28; 1Tim.3:16; Revelation 1:11; Revelation 5:10; etc. Again, this is because these versions are based upon a Greek Text that is different from the one that was used for the King James Bible. The N.I.V., N.A.S., New World Translation (the version translated by the Jehovah's Witnesses); R.S.V., A.S.V., etc.; all delete or change various combinations of the above passages.

However, since the New King James is based upon the same Greek Text (the "Textus Receptus") as the "original" King James Bible, the New King James Version actually contains every one of the above-mentioned passages.

The question therefore arises as to why anyone would continue to use the OLD King James Bible, if the New King James still contains these passages.

One of our main reasons for rejecting the New King James is because it still contains certain questionable traits, which are prevalent in the other modern versions, as well. For example, just like the other modern versions, the New King James also changes the faith "OF" Christ to our faith "IN" Christ. This is an important principle, too; because in the "Old" King James, the faith "of" Christ indicates that Christ Himself is the Originator of this faith. The faith "of" Christ is a reference to His faithfulness, while faith "in" Christ refers to our faith.

Moreover, since the New King James does not consistently make this change in every case, we can easily compare the passages that have been changed with those that weren't. For example, the New King James actually retains the meaning of the "Old" King James in Romans 3:3, which refers to the faith "of" God. In the New King James, Ro.3:3 refers to the "faithfulness of" God. Please notice how the entire meaning of the passage would change, if the faith "of" God was changed to faith "in" God:

"Old" King James, Romans 3:3 -

For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?

New King James, Romans 3:3 -

For what if some did not believe? Will their unbelief make the faithfulness of God without effect?

As a result, even though the New King James changes the word "faith" to "faithfulness" in the above passage, the same thought is still being conveyed. It does not change the faithfulness "of" God to faith "in" God.

The same cannot be said, though, of other passages in the New King James that concern the "faith of" Christ. For example, please notice the following passages (for comparison, we have also included these passages as they appear in the N.I.V., as well as the New King James):

PASSAGE:OLD King James
NEW King James
N.I.V.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Romans 3:22

King James: Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:

New King James: even the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ to all and on all who believe. For there is no difference;

NIV: "This righteousness from God comes through faith in Jesus Christ to all who believe."

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Galatians 2:16

King James: Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified

New King James: "knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but by faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law no flesh will be justified.

NIV: "we know that a man is not justified by observing the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ. So we, too, have put our faith in Christ Jesus that we may be justified by faith in Christ and not by observing the law, because by observing the law no one will be justified

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Galatians 2:20

King James: I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

New King James: I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me.

NIV: I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me. The life I live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Galatians 3:22

King James: But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

New King James: But the Scripture has confined all under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe.

NIV: But the Scripture declares that the whole world is a prisoner of sin, so that what was promised, being given through faith in Jesus Christ, might be given to those who believe

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Ephesians 3:12

King James: In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.

New King James: in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by faith in Him.

NIV: In him and through faith in him we may approach God with freedom and confidence.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Phillipians 3:9

King James: And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:

New King James: and be found in Him, not having my own righteousness, which is from the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith;

NIV: and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own that comes from the law, but that which is through faith in Christ - the righteousness that comes from God and is by faith.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Colossians 2:13

King James:

Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.

New King James:

buried with Him in baptism, in which you also were raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who has raised Him from the dead

NIV:

having been buried with him in baptism and raised with him through your faith in the power of God, who raised him from the dead.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

So, in view of the above comparison, we must reject the New King James Bible AS WELL AS THE NIV AND ALL OF THE NEWER VERSIONS. Even though it accurately states in Romans 3:3 that a non-believer's lack of faith will never make the faithfulness of God without effect, it still claims that a believer must maintain his own faith, in order to remain righteous and justified. But this would make the righteousness of God dependent upon the believer's own faith (Ro.3:22; see below). If, for any reason, a believer loses his faith "in" Jesus Christ (and this happens to almost every believer, at some point in his life), the New King James states that he will no longer have the righteousness of God (compare the N.I.V., A.S.V., New World Translation; etc.). At the same time, though, an unbeliever's lack of faith can never cancel out the faith of God (Ro. 3:3).

But if, as the "Old" King James Bible states, the righteousness of God is by faith of Jesus Christ; and believers are justified by the faith of Christ; this means that His righteousness remains with us, even if we happen to temporarily lose our own faith. And this only makes sense. After all, the righteousness of God is still "unto all" (i.e., even available unto non-believers, if they would only believe); as well as upon "all them that believe", as the Old King James states in Ro.3:22-23 -

22: Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:

23: For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;

Consequently, since the righteousness of God is unto all, it is also available to unbelievers, as well as believers. And this could not be, if the righteousness of God was only through faith in Christ, as the New King James states.
xxxxxxxxxx

Stever continues:

In conclusion --is it any wonder that the DOCTRINE of The Faith OF Jesus Christ being changed to the FALSE DOCTRINE of the believers Faith IN Jesus Christ has created the "Name it and claim it crowd (Blab it and Grab It)", and other false teaching that is not found in the King James Version (KJV), but that is found and taught in the newer versions (ESPECIALLY THE NIV)?

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/12 11:55

Quote:
-----It is common knowledge that most modern Bible versions delete passages such as 1 John 5:7; Mark 9:44; Mark 9:46; Matthew 17:21; Matthew 23:14; Matthew 27:35; John 7:55-8:11; Acts 8:37; etc. This occurs because these versions are based upon certain Greek manuscripts, which also omit these passages. Although every modern version does not necessarily delete every one of these passages, most of these versions still delete most of these passages.

Why do we say, "delete these passages". Why not say, "the King James Version "Adds these passages?"

As pointed out, the "deletions" are based on the particular Greek Manuscripts considered. But the way it is put and presented most often give the false appearance that "The King James represents the Greek and these others take the King James and just delete these words and phrases".

And to feed this false concept, charts are presented with all the comparisons of the versions and where they differ from the King James it says, "deleted". The false appearance is that they were just "deleted".

But rather the manuscripts did not contain these words or phrases and so the translation does not "delete anything" it just uses a different judgement on the most accurate manuscript evidence.

So if you want to argue over which Greek manuscripts are the most authentic, then that is a valid discussion. But to compare apples and oranges is on the wrong premise.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2006/1/12 17:02

Graftedbranc, I agree with you. I said something similar to this in the "Bible-quiz" post by Stevers if you all want to see a more in depth look at the arguments of KJV-only proponents. You cannot look at the AV as a start point and compare other translations to it. That is circular reasoning. A note about 1 John 5:7. Erasmus was largely responsible for the final compiled Textus Receptus, and originally did not include this verse because he could not find ANY manuscripts that contained it. Powerful priests, bishops, etc. pushed for it, but he wouldn't budge unless he had proof from Greek manuscripts. Well, right before its release a manuscript was brought to him dating only 20 years old, from the 16th century. As pressure mounted, he decided to add it.

A careful reading of 1 John 5, however, will show that this fragment doesn't even fit with what John was writing. The disputed section brings disconnect to his line of thought.

I listened to most of the now infamous Chuck Smith examination of Textus Receptus and Alexandrian texts, and was quite disappointed. He provided very little substance. While he provides good insight into the problem of accepting some m

manuscripts, he utterly failed to present how modern versions significantly change doctrine. He uses many of the same arguments as Stever does in his "bible-quiz" post, which are weak. The so called "deleted" passages are found verbatim in parallel passages, and the doctrines contained therein are abundant elsewhere in scripture, as I have shown in the other thread. Pastor Smith also assumes the Textus Receptus to be flawless, but as I mentioned above, there are sections of it that have NO manuscript evidence, let alone disputable evidence. And remember, the 1611 KJV also included the apocrypha.

Now, I am not bashing the KJV. Nor am I praising modern versions. I have many issues with the NIV and others. The only two I use are KJV and NASB b/c they seem to be the most consistent and reliable. If you love the KJV and won't use any other, great. I love the KJV as well. But to say God inspired the AV and all others are corrupt is not only a stretch, it is a tradition of man. God inspired Paul, Luke, David, Moses, etc. not a group of 17th century Calvinists.

Re: - posted by ServantofGod, on: 2006/1/12 19:15

I find it troubling that some dear brothers and sisters continue insisting on a JK only view. John 3:16 alone proves that view is wrong. It does not say:

For God so loved the English speaking people only of the world that He waited until 1611 to give them the only Authorized Version. That whosoever believes any other version in the world does not have a complete Bible.

Dear brothers and Sisters. You can love, study, and read the KJ version. Please don't put it ahead of the Hebrew and Greek from where it was translated from. The devil wants people to be stuck on a version while the world goes to hell. I can testify that God speaks to me and no doubt millions of other people in versions other than the KJ. We can agree to disagree in Christ, but please pray about this very important issue.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/13 5:06

Bible Question #1: How many Gods are there?

You are misunderstanding the nature of this particular passage of scripture. It is the exclamation of a heathen king who believed in 'many gods'. It is not a doctrinal statement about the trinity. The Aramaic (this is part of the Aramaic section of Daniel) is 'elahin' the plural form of 'god'. For Nebuchadnezzar to have said anything else would have necessitated him receiving a unique revelation of the God of Israel.

Your complaint of heresy should be aimed at Nebuchadnezzar rather than bible translators who have faithfully translated the word as they found it.

Bible Question #2: Who was Jesus' father?

Who did Mary think Jesus' father was? Luke 2:48 (KJVS) And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. 'father' used in this sense is not pointing to biology but to relationship. Joseph was Jesus' father in every sense but the biological. For modern translators to have used 'father' in your reference is not an indication of their views on the incarnation but of 'textual criticism'.

In comparing different mss Erasmus and Stephens etc 'judged' that the correct Greek word here was the name for Joseph. Tyndale did not do his own 'textual criticism' but based his translation of that of Erasmus. Subsequently later 'textual critics' came to a different judgment. Griesbach 1805, Tischendorf 1869, Tregelles 1857, Alford 1849 as revised in 1871, Westcott & Hort 1881, Nestle-Aland 1979, judged that the original Greek had read "his father" instead of "Joseph". My own favourite is Wordsworth, following Scrivener 1856, who stuck to the Erasmus, Stephens view, but these later editors' judgments have absolutely nothing to do with their view of the incarnation. You will notice how many of these earlier editors predate Westcott and Hort. This was not started by W & H.

Bible Question #3: What was Jesus' purpose in coming to earth?

The editors were not trying to alter the purpose otherwise they would have also removed the verse from Luke 19:10 "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." (Luke 19:10, KJVS)

The answer to this question is found in Q2 above. This is a difference of opinion among scholars. You may listen to their evidence and make their choice but to imply conspiracy is unjustified.

Bible Question #4: Noah was a great man used by God to build the Ark. To be called for such a task required Noah to be approved by the Lord, God. So, how was Noah 'justified' before God? Was Noah's justification by his own works? These questions are becoming more bizarre. 'favour' is just another translation of the Hebrew and Greek words

rds. The Hebrew word 'chen' is translated 'grace' in the KJV of Gen 6:8 and in 37 other places but is translated 'favour' 26 times in the OT.

You are mixing up the modern idea of favour meaning to 'prefer' with the biblical concept of 'unmerited favour' or 'grace'. In fact, your own KJV uses 'favour' in reference to both Moses and David...Acts 7:10 (KJVS) And delivered him out of all his afflictions, and gave him favour and wisdom in the sight of Pharaoh king of Egypt; and he made him governor over Egypt and all his house.

Acts 7:46 (KJVS) Who found favour before God, and desired to find a tabernacle for the God of Jacob. ...as a translation of the word 'charis-grace'

I think I have answered sufficient of these questions to show that you have clearly made up your mind and will bend each instance to support your view. However your view remains unjustified.

...and all this from a confirmed KJV user!!

Re: - posted by Billy7 (), on: 2006/1/13 9:25

I just read through the last 15 pages of this thread (to catch up), and all I can say is, "WOW!" Some of you will go to great lengths (and great lengthy post) to prove your point!

Bro. Stever, one question: Do you have a job or do you ever go to bed? :-P

Laying all jokes aside, I did enjoy reading your thoughts, and learned some things that I didn't know. However, when all was said and done, none of you really revealed any new or substantial information that would cause me to change my stance on this issue. (Not saying that that was any of you guys purpose, either though.)

It seems to me that when it is all been said, the real issue comes down to the matter of the manuscripts--which one is really the most accurate, the Textus Receptus or the Latan Vulgate?

Personally, I go with the Textus Receptus (and thus the KJV) mainly because it appears to be a more complete text. I desire to hear and declare the WHOLE council of God. For instance, suppose you were a pastor that chose to use only the NIV, then you could never preach a sermon on Matt. 18:11, "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost" because it's simply not in there! This is a very substantial passage, and there are many others that the new versions omit as well.

My question has always been, why aren't there ever any new translations from the Textus Receptus? I know there's the NKJV, but that's just a watered down KJV. Why not a true, reliable, modern translation from the Textus Receptus? Why do all the modern translations use the Latan Vulgate?

Also, another thing that I like about the KJV is that it causes me to ponder what I read. Since I don't speak 16th century english, I am forced to ponder and consider God's word, rather than simply blow through it like I would a newspaper or something.

Well, that's my thoughts on all of this, so now you guys can get back to the deep stuff. ;-)

God bless,
Billy

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2006/1/13 9:44

Quote:
-----Personally, I go with the Textus Receptus (and thus the KJV) mainly because it appears to be a more complete text. I desire to hear and declare the WHOLE council of God. For instance, suppose you were a pastor that chose to use only the NIV, then you could never preach a sermon on Matt. 18:11, "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost" because it's simply not in there! This is a very substantial passage, and there are many others that the new versions omit as well

I would just turn to Luke 19:10

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/13 10:12

Billy 7's

Quote:
----- It seems to me that when it is all been said, the real issue comes down to the matter of the manuscripts--which one is really the most accurate, the Textus Receptus or the Latin Vulgate?

Billy, you are comparing apples with pears here. The textus receptus is not a manuscript, it is an edited text which was created by comparing a several manuscripts and trying to decide what the original writings actually said. The Latin Vulgate is not a manuscript either, it is a Latin translation from a few manuscripts.

Quote:
-----My question has always been, why aren't there ever any new translations from the Textus Receptus? I know there's the NKJV, but that's just a watered down KJV. Why not a true, reliable, modern translation from the Textus Receptus? Why do all the modern translations use the Latin Vulgate?

I don't know of any modern translation which is based on the Vulgate although parts of the KJV are. As regards a modern translation based on the textus receptus you could try.
(http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1878442759/refpd_sim_b_4/102-3035247-6031360?%5Fencoding=UTF8&vglance&n283155) Jay Green's translation, this is also available for most computer Bible programmes. It is also available online at (<http://www.mkjvonline.com/>) Sovereign Grace Publishers.

Re: - posted by Billy7 (), on: 2006/1/13 20:19

Thanks for the correction, Philologos. I meant to say the Alexandrian Text instead of the Latin Vulgate--my bad.

Also, thanks for the links to the MKJV. I'll check it out.

Re: Corrupted King James?, on: 2006/1/14 9:26

Why is it that we have to consult these other versions to see which is right or not, why don't we just translate the bible ourselves?

Since the KJV is my personal preference and the base of what I would use to translate from Olde Englishe to Modern English.

The problem with these other versions is how they take out the verb ETH, and replace it with for example, Believeth in the KJV and Believes in the modern.

It's not just that one believes which is only plural I might add whereas that Believeth is speaking of something we ought to continually do.

So if I were to take on the task of translating this word, it would be a series of words for this one word believeth. For example;

"For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son that whosoever in Him should not perish but have everlasting life".

There would be other tricky words in the KJV that would be difficult to translate in which I would consult such minds as Ron (Philologos) for a different opinion, he seems to have a handle on a lot of issues.

For my translation, I would regroup the books in the order as given and I would add another book called the book of Enoch as Jude quotes from it, if Jude quoted from it then it must be sacred writ.

I would move all the minor prophets and put them where they belong in amongst the other books as some of those writers were alive during the time of the kings.

By the way, I would only make about 5 copies :-P

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2006/1/14 15:09

Healingwaters, I would be careful to say you would add the book of Enoch. There is a good reason it's not in scripture: the early church didn't consider it to be inspired. Just b/c Jude quoted it doesn't mean it's inspired. He used it as a teaching tool. What Enoch said may have been correct in the sight of the Lord, but it doesn't mean his book was inspired. If I say something and the Lord puts His seal of approval on it, does that mean everything I write or say is now sacred writ? Of course not. Paul quoted Greek philosophers, but only to teach a point, not b/c God inspired them. Be careful before you go proclaiming scripture that isn't.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/14 17:45

Quote:
-----For my translation, I would re group the books in the order as given and I would add another book called the book of Enoch as Jude quotes from it, if Jude quoted from it then it must be sacred writ.

this is faulty thinking. Paul, Acts 17, also quoted from heathen poets but this does not mean that all their sayings were true. The leaders of Israel prophesied at the time of Jesus but this does not validate their behaviour or their other words.

Additionally... the Book of Enoch is a fake.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/1/14 19:36

Bro Ron

You've said before the book of Enoch is a fake. If i remember correctly you said because the experts thought it to be fake (correct me if i'm wrong) Experts have been wrong in the past, what if this is one of those occasions. i find it interesting that Jesus Christ told the disciples about the rich man who went to Sheol, into the holding place of the rich while Lazarus went to Abraham's bosom (in Luke 16) and yet there is no mention of Sheol being so divided anywhere else in scripture (as far as i know but if there is please let me know) it is interesting that the book of enoch does speak of how the Lord's angel Uriel showed Enoch this place (among other things) so Christ was certainly aware of this. i've heard it said that the book of Enoch was written some time after Christ yet i find it hard to believe that someone would go to such trouble and write such a story and manage to get Christ's mention of Sheol in Luke 16 perfectly in the mix. seems a bit of a stretch to me.

The book of Enoch is canon scripture in the Orthodox Church of Ethiopia interestingly enough, i wonder why it's not canon scripture in the western church...it seems to me we should seek the Lord's counsel concerning these so-called apocryphal books. if the Lord has the book of Enoch as canon in the Ethiopian church it is certainly because He willed it to be so. The Lord in times past has allowed (or should i say purposefully made it so) that the enemy has a hand in the goings on of the world and in God dealing with man so that His manifold wisdom would be displayed before all creation (Adam and Eve in the garden, job etc). i would not be surprised if it was so concerning the compilation of the canon as we know it in the western church and the eastern.

it seems most people are not for delving into the book of Enoch for one reason or another. we would do well so let the Lord search us and see if this position is because of our own fleshly motives or really because of the Lord.

i've not read the book of Enoch, the closest i've come to it thus far is "the called" by Rahman Reuben (Rahman on this site) and a lot of gaps concerning creation and what happened thereafter were indeed filled in after reading that book. Such things as where the wives for Cain and Abel came from, how man came to learn all these evil things (war, idolatry, murder etc from the fallen angel Azazel and co) as were some other things.

Re: The Book of Enoch?, on: 2006/1/15 4:59

Quote:

IRONMAN wrote:

Bro Ron

You've said before the book of Enoch is a fake. If i remember correctly you said because the experts thought it to be fake (correct me if i'm wrong) Experts have been wrong in the past, what if this is one of those occasions. i find it interesting that Jesus Christ told the disciples about the rich man who went to Sheol, into the holding place of the rich while Lazarus went to Abraham's bosom (in Luke 16) and yet there is no mention of Sheol being so divided anywhere else in scripture (as far as i know but if there is please let me know) it is interesting that the book of enoch does speak of how the Lord's angel Uriel showed Enoch this place (among other things) so Christ was certainly aware of this. i've heard it said that the book of Enoch was written some time after Christ yet i find it hard to believe that someone would go to such trouble and write such a story and manage to get Christ's mention of Sheol in Luke 16 perfectly in the mix. seems a bit of a stretch to me.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Steever's response:

Have you read the book of Enoch? I have read it, and I consider it to be as fake as a \$3 bill. Pray about it, read it, and compare it to the rest of the Bible (Canon) and give us your response to what the early Church considered to be a spurious book that was not inspired by the Holy Spirit.

God bless,

Steever

Re: Erasmus Restores the Scriptures, on: 2006/1/15 13:06

ERASMUS RESTORES THE RECEIVED TEXT (GREEK)

The Greek upon which the King James translation was based was first printed in A.D. 1516 at Basle, Switzerland, under the editorship of the famous Dutchman, Desiderius Erasmus. As a Scholar, Erasmus was without peer – the intellectual giant of Europe in his day. Erasmus was ever at work, visiting libraries, collecting, comparing, writing and publishing. Europe was rocked by his works which exposed the ignorance of the monks, the superstitions of the priesthood, and the general bigotry and wickedness within the Roman church.

He classified the Greek manuscripts and read the "Fathers" letters (letters written by the early Church fathers to each other and others) which taken as a whole contain almost the entire New Testament-. Today, many who deprecate the pure teachings of the Received Text mock Erasmus and pervert the facts in order to belittle his work. All this by men who could never have intellectually tied Erasmus' boot straps. While he lived, Europe was at his feet. Several times the King of England offered him any position in the kingdom, at his own price! The Emperor of Germany likewise. Indeed, the Pope offered him the position of Cardinal. Erasmus resolutely declined not being willing to compromise his beliefs or conscience. France and Spain beckoned him to their realm while Holland proudly claimed him as her most distinguished son.

Book after book came from his labors. The demand for them was overwhelming. His crowning work was the New Testament in Greek. At last, after one thousand years, the New Testament was printed in its original tongue (A.D.1516). Astonished and confounded, Europe – the intellectual, civilized cradle of the world – deluged by superstitions, coarse traditions, and monkeries, read the pure story of the Gospel.

When Erasmus came to Basle in A.D. 1515 for the purpose of assembling a complete Greek New Testament, he had only five Greek cursive minuscules of the New Testament at his disposal. For the most part, he utilized a 15th century manuscript for the Gospels but used an 11th or 12th century manuscript on occasion. He used a 12th or 13th century manuscript for the Acts and the Epistles. Erasmus had a 15th century manuscript of the Acts and the Epistles which he also used occasionally, and he had a 12th century manuscript of Revelation. The last six verses of the Revelation manuscript were missing so he used the Latin Vulgate version to complete the chapter.

Erasmus' Greek New Testament has been often criticized on the grounds that he had so little data at his command from which to draw and that they were "late" copies. However, Erasmus did not go to the task unprepared. Although he had only five late minuscules, he had already translated a Latin New Testament and in preparation for this labor had

collected and gathered variant readings from many Greek manuscripts. He journeyed all over Europe to libraries and to anyone from whom he could gather readings from manuscripts. Erasmus organized his findings and made notes for himself concerning the different readings. These travels brought him into contact with several hundred manuscripts and Erasmus divided them into two camps, i.e., those he considered spurious and those he deemed genuine and trustworthy. The spurious group was a small percentage of the whole and mainly agreed with the Latin Vulgate readings. Of the several hundred, between 90 to 95% had the same text. This group Erasmus judged to contain the true God given text.

Naturalistic critics think that the presence and availability for Erasmus' use of these five Basle minuscules was merely an unhappy accident. But these men do not reckon sufficiently with the providence of God — that God has promised to overlook His Word. The text which Erasmus published was really not his own. It was taken virtually without change from these few manuscripts which God providentially placed at his disposal. The text contained in these manuscripts eventually came to be known as the "Textus Receptus" (the Received Text).

To emphasize and demonstrate the above, we quote the late Herman C. Hoskier. Hoskier gave thirty years to the task of collating a majority of the available manuscripts containing the text of Revelation. His conclusion, based upon the 200 plus extant manuscripts he examined, was:

"I may state that if Erasmus had striven to found a text on the largest number of existing MSS in the world of one type, he could not have succeeded better ... "

As Moorman relates, this is truly a powerful example of God's guiding providence in preserving the true text though but one late mss containing the Revelation was available to Erasmus at Basle.

ERASMUS AND THE WORK HE PRODUCED

Erasmus knew almost all of the important variant readings known to scholars today — more than 470 years ago. This may be proven from a perusal of his notes. Dr. Frederick Nolan (1784-1864 A.D.) was a Greek and Latin scholar who, as an eminent historian, researched Egyptian chronology and spent twenty eight years tracing the Received Text to its apostolic origin. After surveying Erasmus' notes, Nolan recorded:

"With respect to manuscripts, it is indisputable that he was acquainted with every variety which is known to us; having distributed them into two principle classes, one of which corresponds with ... the Vatican manuscript ... the church, he was aware, was infested with Origenists and Arians; and affinity between any manuscript and that version, consequently conveyed some suspicion that its text was corrupted."

In producing his first edition, Erasmus was under an incredible work load. Due to publication problems and deadline pressure, his first edition had many typographical errors, misprints, and misspellings. This led to much undue criticism. His work was greatly disfigured only in the sense mentioned, but the Text was providentially protected. God has not preserved the Text miraculously for then there would have been no such glosses, and all the various uncials and cursives would read the same, word for word. In the case of providential guidance, we can see that there is a human as well as a divine side to the preservation of the Text. For the most part, these errors were eliminated by Erasmus in his later editions. Such things as these are, however, not factors which need to be taken into account insofar as evaluating the "Textus Receptus" — a designation by which his work later came to be known.

The year after Erasmus published, Luther used the Textus Receptus (TR) for the basis of a German translation of the New Testament. Shortly thereafter, God — using Luther and his translation, brought about the Reformation. Luther and Erasmus knew each other. They did not always agree. One of the chief areas of disagreement between them was Luther's conviction that the Roman church was incapable of being reformed and he thought that Erasmus should join him in leaving.

However Erasmus believed that he could better bring about reform by working from within the system. He was quite wrong.

God bless,

Stever

Erasmus read the "Fathers" letters (letters written by the early Church fathers to each other and others) which taken as a whole contain almost the entire New Testament

Re: Would you want this man to Pastor your church?, on: 2006/1/15 14:05

Stever posts:

With this explanation of what his views are, would you consider hiring the man that penned the words below to be the Pastor of your Church??

"I doubt greatly whether I possess some of the qualifications..in views, and still more in sympathies. I do not sufficiently conform to any of the recognized standards..on what might be called the details of even these matters of FAITH. I am not sure that my views so far as they are fixed would be generally accepted...o give an instance, there are certain parts of the Old Testament. have led me to doubt whether the Christian faith is adequately or purely represented in all respects in the accepted doctrines of any living school..I have...a keen interest in philosophy, a conviction that their vigorous and independent progress is to be desired for the sake of mankind, even when for the time they seem to be acting to the injury of the faith... fundamental difference is the subject of the ATONEMENT, IF IT EXISTED, would place me in a false position as your examining chaplain...I have friends of various creeds and creedless, from whom I believe I should do wrong to dissociate myself. It is quite possible that I might wish to write papers or books in which some of these facts would unavoidably come to light."

The man who wrote the letter? FENTON ANTHONY HORT.

The reference can be found in the book by Arthur Hort- "The Life and Letters of Fenton Anthony Hort Volume 1 pp. 154-159; see also Volume 1, p. 252 and is the written response of Hort to the Bishop of Ely in 1871. The Bishop had asked if Hort had any interest in becoming a chaplain of the Church. (This is also the same year that he joined the New Testament Revision Committee)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

How about a man with these ideas, would you trust him to be in charge of the Revision Committee of the New Testament?

"During the last 15 years my thoughts and pursuits have grown and expanded but not consistently changed. In Theology itself I am obliged to hold a peculiar position, belonging to no party, yet having important agreements and sympathies with all...I perhaps have more in common with the LIBERAL PARTY than with others..I look upon freedom and a wide toleration as indispensable.."

The reference can be found in the book by Arthur Hort- "The Life and Letters of Fenton Anthony Hort Volume II p. 63; also see page 92.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

Not a pretty site by any means, yet there are those today that will come to his defense when I post this. Why? How can this happen? How can this be?

God bless,

Stever

Hort said: "ATONEMENT, IF IT EXISTED"

Re:, on: 2006/1/15 14:40

Of Westcott a friend wrote:

"What a theology it was—how broad...anti-dogmatic; how progressive"

See Arthur Westcott: The Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott, Volume II (London: Macmillan and Co. 1903) p. 32

Hort's views of his mother, and other "Evangelicals" that had theological views of the "ANCIENT WAY"

"Her religious feelings were deep and strong... mother was..an adherent of the Evangelical school and she was to a certain degree hampered by it..She was unable to enter into his theological views which to her generation seemed a desertion of the ancient way; thus pathetically enough, there came to be a barrier between mother and son. The close intercourse on subjects which lay nearest to the hearts of each was broken;;; her different point of view...he ..had to recognize that at the point of view was different. She studied and knew her bible well"

Arthur Hort- "The Life and Letters of Fenton Anthony Hort Volume 1 pp. 7,41,77
xxxxxxxxxxxxx

I pray that this at least opens one persons eyes to the truth about these two men.

God bless,

Stever

Re: The Revision Committee, on: 2006/1/17 1:55

Stever posts:

Meet Mr. Westcott & Mr. Hort, the two men responsible for creating ALL OF THE NEWER VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT in 1888, including the one you are reading (if it is not the King James Bible):

Hort said, "I am a staunch sacerdotalist....the sacraments must be the center. The bond of a common divine life derived in Sacraments is the most comprehensive bond possible."

The Life of Hort Vol 1, pg. 99--
Sounds more like a Catholic than a Protestant Christian, doesn't it?

xxxxxxxxxxxxx

The scheme of the two men:

"I have a sort of craving that our text should be cast upon the world before we deal with matters likely to brand us with suspicion. I mean, a text, issued by men already known for what will undoubtedly be treated as dangerous heresy will have great difficulty finding its way to regions which it might otherwise hope to reach, and whence it would be banished by subsequent alarms

...if only we speak our mind, we shall not be able to avoid giving offense to ..the miscalled orthodoxy of the day..Evangelicals seem to me perverted..There are, I fear still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority and especially the authority of the Bible..At present very many orthodox but rational men are being unawares acted upon by influences which will assuredly bear fruit in due time if the process is allowed to go on QUIETLY; but I cannot help fearing that a premature crisis would frighten back many into the merest traditionalism."
Life of Hort, Vol 1, pp 445, 421, 400

"But no doubt there was an element of mystery about Westcott. He took his turn preaching in chapel, but he dreaded and disliked the duty and he was quite inaudible"
Life of Westcott, Volume 1, p. 198

Westcott, in speaking of Revelation, admits, "On this , my views are perhaps extreme."
Westcott, Volume 1, p. 225

Referring to the Traditional Greek Text, then currently in use, Westcott says, "I am most anxious to provide something to REPLACE THEM. He admits the drastic changes he plans and calls it, "our proposed RECENSION of the New Testament (1852)
Westcott, Volume 1, p. 229

Then we have Mr. Hort:

"It was during these weeks with Mr. Westcott, who had come to see him, at Umberslade, that the plan of a joint REVISION of the text of the Greek Testament was first definitely agreed upon." (1853)
Hort, Vol 1, p. 240

"About this time Mr. Daniel Macmillan suggested to him that he should take part in an interesting and comprehensive 'New Testament SCHEME. Hort was to edit the text in conjunction with Mr. Westcott, the latter was to be responsible for a commentary, and Lightfoot was to contribute a New Testament Grammar and Lexicon."
Hort, p.241

"We came to a distinct and positive understanding about our Greek Text and the details thereof. We still do not wish to be talked about but are going to work at once and hope we may have it out in a little more than a year. This of course gives good employment."
Hort, Vol. 1, p.264

"How certainly I should have been proclaimed a heretic"
Westcott Vol 1, p. 233

"Campbell's book on the Atonement...unluckily he knows nothing except Protestant theology."
Hort, Vol 1, p. 322

"Evangelicals seem to me perverted..There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, especially the authority of the Bible."
Hort Vol 1, p. 400

"If you make a decided conviction of the absolute infallibility of the New Testament a sine qua non for cooperation, I fear I could NOT JOIN YOU." 1860
Hort, Vol 1, p. 420

"I REJECT the word infallibility of Holy Scriptures overwhelmingly."
Westcott, Vol 1, p.207

"I am also glad that you take the same provisional ground as to infallibility that I do..In our rapid correspondence about the New Testament, I have been forgetting Plato."
Hort's letter to Lightfoot- Hort, Vol 1, p. 424

"English clergy are not compelled to maintain the absolute infallibility of the bible."
Hort, Vol 1, p. 454

"Dr. Westcott and myself have for about seventeen years been preparing a Greek text...we hope to have it out early next year."
Hort, Vol 2, p. 137

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

I surely hope that this is not only an eye opener to all, but also acts as a catalyst to research this critical subject for yourself.

Westcott & Hort are responsible for the two most popular manual editions of the Greek text today. Nestles-Aland and U. B.S. (United Bible Society) really vary little from the W-H (Westcott-Hort) text. Why is that? Westcott and Hort are generally credited with having furnished the death blow to the King James bible and the Greek Text which was used for the previous 1880 years and replacing it with the corrupt Alexandrian text that is behind all of the newer Bible Versions, and the Catholic Bible as well!

God bless,

Stever

Westcott: "It is impossible to suppose that two beings distinct in essence could be equal in power (God & Jesus Christ). We find ourselves met by difficulty which belongs to the idea of begetting.."

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/17 5:19

Quote:
-----i've not read the book of Enoch, the closest i've come to it thus far is "the called" by Rahman Reuben (Rahman on this site) and a lot of gaps concerning creation and what happened thereafter were indeed filled in after reading that book. Such things as where the wives for Cain and Abel came from, how man came to learn all these evil things (war, idolatry, murder etc from the fallen angel Azazel and co) as were some other things.

This results in a theology whose gaps can be 'filled' with any kind of rubbish. The more open a person is to extra-biblical revelation the more likely they are to accept Rahmans' fairy tales. It is part of that ancient curse of wanting to be 'wiser than what has been written'.

The pseudographic (fake) book of Enoch is thought to have been written about 200 years before Christ during the times of the Maccabean struggles. It has frequently had a strong attraction to people with 'angel obsessions'.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/17 5:33

Stever's

Quote:
-----Meet Mr. Westcott & Mr. Hort, the two men responsible for creating ALL OF THE NEWER VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT in 1888, including the one you are reading (if it is not the King James Bible):

Stever, this is just obsessive nonsense. To say that W & H are responsible for 'all the newer versions of the NT' is just wildly inaccurate.

Re:, on: 2006/1/17 6:32

I like to read straight from the Greek.

In the Greek Christians were called "the outcalled." I LOVE THAT!!!!

I encourage every Christian to get a copy of the original Greek, just to refer to every now and then.

It's a little difficult at first reading backwards but you'll get used to it.

Re:, on: 2006/1/17 8:00

Did I say Hebrew? I meant Greek. I'll have to edit that.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Corrupted King James?

Locked - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/17 10:23

This thread has been locked.