Hey everyone, the more i read the KJV the more i want to read it. God drew me toward the KJV when i got closer to Him and it is such a great blessing to posses one.

This site is a good one......

http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads.html

By far the most accurate, and complete english translation.

I go to a greek evangelical church, all the elder greeks in my church agree that the KJV is the best english version available.

Verily i say unto ye, "the KJV woops the other worldly version"

God bless u all!

I would be instrested to discuss more about the changes made in the NKJV. I know many people that like the KJV but wouldn't like to have a modernized version of the language which is totally understandable. I personally have used the NKJV and find it much easier to contextualize to people at times.

Here is a file that talks about the changes the NKJV makes which is not that good from first glance:
http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/LOTKJB/preview.PDF

Hi all,

I usually keep well away from comparing versions of scripture, but I was reading in the NKJV (which does make comprehension easier in some places, mainly by modernising words no longer in common usage - not in usage at all, actually), when I noticed the stunning loss of meaning where the NKJV drops the 'I am' in sentences which seem to be in the past tense, or are negative in meaning. It doesn't drop them every time in the positive statements, but, I did find one, (below) and there are more:

(NKJV) John 12:46
*I have come* a light into the world, that whoever believes in Me should not abide in darkness.

(KJV) John 12:46
*I am come* a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness.

For me - and probably everyone else - the IMPACT of Jesus' words is increased, every time one reads or hears 'I AM'.

(NKJV) Matthew 5:17
*Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come* to destroy but to fulfill.

(KJV) Matthew 5:17
Think not that *I am come* to destroy the law, or the prophets: *I am not come* to destroy, but to fulfill.
(NKJV) Matthew 9:13
"But go and learn what means: 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice.' For I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance."

(KJV) Matthew 9:13
But go ye and learn what meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

(NKJV) Matthew 10:34
"Do not think that I came to bring peace on earth. I did not come to bring peace but a sword.

I notice that 'I am come' is sometimes translated 'I came' - another loss of the I AM.... this time in the KJV.... although its many more uses of 'I am' than the NKJV, redeems it somewhat.

(KJV) Matthew 10:34
Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.

(NKJV) Matthew 10:35
"For I have come to 'set a man against his father, a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mot her-in-law';

(KJV) Matthew 10:35
For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law.

The above is no way exhaustive, but, I just wanted to say it's important to note how the Holy Spirit uses the words 'I am' to minister to our minds, souls and spirits, and how His ability to do this is hampered by its loss.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/22 11:14
dorcas'
Quote:
------------------The above is no way exhaustive, but, I just wanted to say it's important to note how the Holy Spirit uses the words 'I am' to minister to our minds, souls and spirits, and how His ability to do this is hampered by its loss.
------------------

mmm? This is a little more complicated that it appears. Biblical Greek tenses are different to English tenses in many wa ys and it is difficult to get a strict equivalence of tenses from Biblical Greek to English.

The mental associations you have with regard to "I am the door" etc is that this is a divine witness and you are right. Th e Greek verbal form for 'I AM the door...' is 'εγώ εἰμί' which means "I (emphasised) am" and is a clear connection to the I AM of divinity. The word 'am' is a simple present tense of the verb 'to be' and "I am" is the best way of conveying this i n English. However the Greek present tense is more like our present continuous tense and a pedantic translation would read "I am continually being the door..." etc.

However your John 12:46 is a completely different construction. The "I" is still emphasised but the tense is the Greek Pe rfect tense NOT the present TENSE. It is the Present tense which gives the I AM sense, the Perfect tense means somet hing quite different. It is not the eternal present of the I AM but the history of a process. If we were to translate it pedanti cally we would translate it "I have come and am still here" The present tense has the sense of 'being' constantly and is p erfectly suited to convey the eternal present of 'I AM' but the 'I am come...' of the KJV John 12:46 is really an 'accident' o f archaic English which does not have a foundation in the Biblical Greek.

The loss of 'impact' which you feel is because you have been 'conditioned' by 17th century English of the KJV.
Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/22 11:44

Greg's
Quote:
----------------------------------Here is a file that talks abit about the changes the NKJV makes which is not that good from first glance:
----------------------------------

The list of 'errors and omissions from the King James Version' betrays the prejudiced position of its writers. As an example we might take the word JEHOVAH. According to the chart it is a 'key Christian word' which has been omitted from the NKJV. Let's look at the facts more objectively.

The King James Version uses the proper name of JEHOVAH only 4 times; Ex 6:3; Psa 83:18; Is 12:2; 26:4. The practice of the KJV is to substitute for the proper name of JEHOVAH the word LORD in upper case. In 4 instances it has not kept to its own rules and consequently we have 4 uses of the proper word JEHOVAH. The NKJV is simply more consistent and uses LORD throughout. Before we condemn the NKJV for not using the word JEHOVAH we should present our facts in a different manner. ie
1. the ASV uses the proper word JEHOVAH 7333 times.
2. The KJV omits the proper name 7329 times.
3. The NKJV omits the proper name 7333 times.

On this basis the KJV should have its own list of errors and omissions.

To include this as an evidence of the 'errors and omissions of the NKJV' only shows the prejudice of the article. One of the reasons I use the ASV OT in my studies is because of its faithfulness in rendering the proper name JEHOVAH.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2006/7/22 12:57

Ron,

Great clarification. Do you think the NKJV is trying to dumb down the language at all or is intentional in taking out divinity references? Do you think it is a viable translation that is worthy of use? I think many people are looking for a more contemporary KJV, are there other attempts out there that you think are worthy of mention?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/22 16:40

Greg's
Quote:
----------------------------------Do you think the NKJV is trying to dumb down the language at all or is intentional in taking out divinity references? Do you think it is a viable translation that is worthy of use? I think many people are looking for a more contemporary KJV, are there other attempts out there that you think are worthy of mention?
----------------------------------

Can I remind 'new readers' that my regular version for devotion and study is the KJV? :-D

I don't think the NKJV is trying to negate references to Christ's divinity or to the Godhead generally. It has tried to be more contemporary. For example, you probably don't get a lot of lords over your side of the water so 'Sir' is not an inappropriate translation of kurios. But then you don't get a lot of kings over there either so what word do we substitute for that? President? CEO? :-? This is the constant struggle of all translations, to convey older ideas from an entirely different culture into a contemporary form of speech.

The Message is not my favourite version but the introduction makes a good point when it says that God chose to give us the New Testament, not is classical Greek, but in street Greek (koine). The KJV was already archaic when it was first published. Thes and thous had pretty much died out other than among the Quakers. The translators used a quaint and majestic style which is now thought of as being 'holy'. As far as my knowledge of Greek goes the language of the Bible is not majestic and noble. On the contrary, at times its expressions are very crude. It is a very 'earthly' book. Its ideas are majestic but its language is very down to earth.

To cut to the chase... yes, I think the NKJV is a 'viable translation'. Is it perfect? No. Will it disappoint at times? Yes. But then that would be true of the KJV too.

Don't give away your KJV for close word for word Bible study but the inspiration of the Bible is not just 'verbal' ie words but also in its great sweeps of truth. For that reason a more dynamic equivalence translation can be really useful for narr
ative sections and a real help to getting the general sweep of things.

The ESV came in with a great fanfare from great conservative Bible believers like Packer but it has been a real disappoi
tntment to me. Perhaps I expected too much of it. The OT of the ESV is still a very valuable addition to any thoughtful st
dent of the scripture but it does not fulfil its promise to be a 'word for word' translation. At times its interpretations obsc
ure important truths.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/22 20:40

The NKJV, NIV and others takes away from the God Head putting His SON in the believer and then the Life of the
believer not being the Life of Christ. It puts man in Charge of his own destiny as it was before the Cross. This is a real
attack on the believer depending on the Christ In Him to bring forth the deity of Christ in the spirit of believer. We are
quickened by this transformation and new Creatures in Christ Jesus and anything that can dull this experience is going
to be done. Like the the terrorist it is with us and we must take them head on or they will destroy us.

As Linn says it degrades the way we think about God and gives us excuses to make the new translations ok because
they are easier to understand. Lets try the U.N. For a peace treaty between translations. That is not the Problem, it is
the Asking Of The Holy Spirit to teach us and show us the difference and not make it easier for us to understand the
words for ourselves.

There is no greater attack than the Faith of Christ that we are birthed with, that is changed to man's faith in Christ.
These new translation take the Faith of Jesus Christ in us and change it to our faith in Christ.

Galatians 2:16 KJV (King James Version)
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.

Galatians 2:16 NIV (New International Version) 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.

Galatians 2:20 KJV (King James Version)
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 2:20 NIV (New International Version) 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.

Philippians 3:9 KJV (King James Version) 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

Philippians 3:9 NIV (New International Version) 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.

Any person would be able to see the difference if they believed they were born again and now possess the Faith of
Jesus Christ and it is that faith that give us life, not my faith of myself and not of Christ, which give me death.

These are just tiny changes from of to in. But you can see the destruction of the great mystery that Paul was given to
bring forth this Gospel of his given him by Christ Himself.

KJV
Rom 2:16 In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.
KJV
Rom 16:25 Now to him that is of power to establish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ,
according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began,
KJV
2Ti 2:8 Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel:
Romans 2:16 TNIV (Today's New International Version) This will take place on the day when God judges everyone's secrets through Jesus Christ, as my gospel declares.

Romans 16:25 NIV (New International Version) Now to him who is able to establish you by my gospel and the proclamation of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery hidden for long ages past,

2 Timothy 2:8 TNIV (Today's New International Version) Remember Jesus Christ, raised from the dead, descended from David. This is my gospel,

There is a difference and it attacks our very Seed of Jesus Christ form the Father that we are born again with.

KJV
1 Peter 1:23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

1 Peter 1:23 NIV (New International Version) For you have been born again, not of perishable seed, but of imperishable, through the living and enduring word of God.

The Word of God, This is the (logos) the Devine expression of the Christ of God, Jesus Christ Himself Living and abiding forever.

This is the written word of God. (Rhema)
1 Peter 1:25 But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

1 Peter 1:25 NIV (New International Version) but the word of the Lord stands forever." And this is the word that was preached to you.

NIV Makes them both (Rhema)

And on and on it goes.

In Christ: Phillip

---

Re: - posted by RevKerrigan (), on: 2006/7/24 0:05
Personally, I like the NASB best. If it was good enough for Paul, then it's good enough for me! :-)

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2006/7/24 0:46
I like the accuracy of the NASV too. I've got a big NASV study bible. Of course, you probably know of all these changes (and deletions) and dropping the title "Christ" from the texts. I stick to the KJV, and I just feel safer. I use an interlinear KJV - Greek Textus Receptus bible. Just my own personal preference. I'm not a KJV-only guy by any stretch. Just an old-fashioned holiness preacher. God bless!

Leviticus 6:21 NASV: "... as a soothing aroma to the Lord." KJV: "for a sweet savour unto the Lord." (Whoever heard of soothing a sovereign God!) The same is found in Leviticus 8:28, 17:6, and 23:18.

1 Kings 19:12 NASV: "... a sound of a gentle blowing." KJV: "... a still small voice." (In the English language, there's a vast difference between "a gentle blowing" and "a still small voice!" I'm sure the reader will agree.)

I Kings 20:38 NASV: "... with a bandage over his eyes." KJV: "... with ashes upon his face." (In English, "ashes" and "bandage" are two different words entirely.)
Isaiah 53:10 NASV: "... If He would render Himself as a guilt offering." KJV: "... When thou Shalt make his soul an offering for sin..." (This, in our humble opinion, is a very serious perversion.)

Hosea 11:12 NASV: "... Judah is also unruly against God, Even against the Holy one who is faithful." KJV: "... but Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints." (What is this but perversion!)

Matthew 12:6 NASV: "... that something greater than the temple is here." KJV: "... That in this place is one greater than the temple."

Matthew 12:42 NASV: "... behold, something greater than Solomon is here." KJV: "... behold, a greater than Solomon is here."

Matthew 19:17 NASV: "... &#8216;Why are you asking Me about what is good?&#8217;"

KJV: "... Why callest thou me good?"

Mark 3:5 NASV: "... and his hand was restored." KJV: "his hand was restored whole as the other."

Mark 6:51b NASV: "... and they were greatly astonished." KJV: "... and they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered."

Mark 7:16 NASV: The verse is eliminated here and is placed in the margin in very small italicised type. KJV: "If any man have ears to hear, let him hear." (This would cause the reader to doubt the accuracy or authenticity of this verse.)

Mark 9:24 NASV: "... &#8216;I do believe; help me in my unbelief'" KJV: "... Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

Mark 9:46 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note referring to verse 43 which says, "Verses 44 and 46, which are identical with verse 48, are omitted by the best ancient manuscripts." (The "best ancient manuscripts" are Codex B and Codex Aleph, both of which are the worst of manuscripts with the most errors and have proved to be the most unreliable.) KJV: "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

Mark 10:24 NASV: "... &#8216;Children how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!'" KJV: "... Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!"

Mark 11:10 NASV: "... &#8216;Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David!'" KJV: "Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest."

Mark 11:26 NASV: Omitted entirely but placed in the margin in italics explaining that "later manuscripts add verse 26." (The later manuscripts in many cases are better by far than the earlier ones.) KJV: "But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses."

Mark 16:9-20 NASV: Gives the footnote, "Some of the oldest manuscripts omit from verse 9 through 20." (In John Burgon's book, The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel of Mark, he has written over 400 pages proving conclusively that this section was in the original manuscripts. Burgon's book remains unanswered and is unanswerable.)

Luke 2:33 NASV: "And His father and mother were amazed at the things which were being said about Him." KJV: "And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things that were spoken of him." (God was the father of our Lord Jesus Christ - not Joseph!)

Luke 4:8 NASV: Omits entirely, "Get thee behind me, Satan."

Luke 4:18 NASV: Omits entirely, "he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted." (There's no explanation whatever.)
Luke 9:55, 56 NASV: "But He turned and rebuked them. And they went on to another village." In the margin they say "Later manuscripts add, 'and said, You do not know what kind of spirit you are of. For the Son of Man did not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.' (Again, this casts doubt on the veracity, the authenticity of this passage.)

Luke 11:2 NASV: "And He said to them, 'When you pray, say: Father, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come.' KJV: "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.'"

Luke 11:29b NASV: "... but the sign of Jonah." KJV: "... but the sign of Jonas the prophet." Luke 23:17 NASV: Omitted, but has a marginal note stating: "Some manuscripts insert verse 17, 'Now he was obliged to release to them at the feast one prisoner.' KJV: "(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)" (Again, this casts doubt on a passage in God's Word.)

Luke 23:23b NASV: "... And their voices began to prevail," KJV: "And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed"

Luke 23:42 NASV: "And he was saying, 'When you pray, say: Father, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come.' KJV: "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

Luke 24:40 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note, reading, "Some manuscripts add verse 40, 'When He had said this, He showed them His hands and His feet.' KJV: "(This again casts doubt on such a wonderful verse.)

John 3:13b NASV: "... even the Son of Man." KJV: "... even the Son of man which is in heaven."

John 5:4 NASV: Omitted, but refers to a marginal note which says, "Many authorities insert wholly or in part." (This injects another doubt as to the authority and accuracy of God's Word.)

John 5:16 NASV: "And for this reason the Jews were persecuting Jesus, because He was doing these things on the Sabbath." KJV: "And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day." (There is no reason given for omitting this phrase.)

John 6:33 NASV: "For the bread of God is that which comes down out of heaven, and gives life to the world." KJV: "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth Life unto the world."

John 6:69 "And we have believed and have come to know that You are the Holy One of God." KJV: "And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."

John 7:53 NASV: "And everyone went to his home." There is a marginal note here stating that "John 7:53-8:11 is not found in most of the old manuscripts." (This is not true. The British Museum has 73 manuscripts and 61 have this passage. Doubtless Aleph and B are referred to as "old manuscripts" and they are two of the worst as we have noted before.)

John 8:9 NASV: "And when they heard it, they began to go out one by one..." KJV: "And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one..." (No reason is given for omitting this phrase.)

John 8:59 NASV: "Therefore they picked up stones to throw at Him; but Jesus hid Himself and went out of the temple." KJV: "Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by" (Quite a different thought.)

John 9:4 NASV: ""When He sent Me..." KJV: "I must work the works of him that sent me..."

John 9:35b NASV: ""Do you believe in the Son of Man?" KJV: "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?"
John 10:30 NASV: "&amp;#8217;I and the Father are one.&amp;#8217;" KJV: "I and my Father are one."

John 17:5 NASV: "...&amp;#8217;glorify Thou Me together with Thyself...&amp;#8217;" KJV:

"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

Acts 8:37 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note stating, "Late manuscripts insert verse 37, &amp;#8216;And Philip said, If you believe with all your heart, you may. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.&amp;#8217;" (Both Codex Aleph and B leave this verse out and they are two of the worst manuscripts: again this casts doubt upon another section of God&amp;#8217;s Word.) KJV: "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he an swered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

Acts 9:5, 6 NASV: "And he said, &amp;#8216;Who art Thou, Lord?&amp;#8217; And He said, &amp;#8216;I am Jesus whom you are persecuting, but rise, and enter the city, and it shall be told you what you must must do.&amp;#8217;" KJV: "And he said, Wh o art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembled 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. (Truly the translators have emasculated these two verses and give no rea son at all for their omission. Again they would inject a doubt into the mind of the one who believes the Bible to be the verbally inspired Word of God.)"

Acts 9:20 NASV: "and immediately he began to proclaim Jesus..." KJV:

"And straightway he preached Christ..."

Acts 10:37 NASV: "you yourselves know the thing which took place throughout all Judea, starting from Galilee, after the baptism which John proclaimed." KJV: "That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judaea, and begun from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached."

Acts 15:11 NASV: "But we believe that we are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus in the same way as they also are." KJV: "But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."

Acts 15:34 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note "Some manuscripts add verse 34, &amp;#8216;But it seemed good to Silas to remain there.&amp;#8217;" KJV:

"Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still." (Another doubt cast on God&amp;#8217;s Word.)

Acts 16:31 NASV: "And they said, &amp;#8216;Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you shall be saved, you and your household.&amp;#8217;" KJV: "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Again they omit the name "Christ.")

Acts 20:24 NASV: The following is omitted, "But none of these things move me," and no reason is given for the omission. KJV: "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy..."}

Acts 24:6, 7 NASV: Most of this has been omitted and only a weak explanation is given in the margin.

Acts 28:29 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note saying, "Some manuscripts add verse 29..." (The vast majority "add" this verse. This is still another doubt cast upon the Word of God.)

Romans 1:16 NASV: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God..." KJV: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." (The translators seem to dislike the word "Christ" very much!)

Romans 15:19 NASV: "in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Spirit so that from Jerusalem and round a bout..." KJV: "Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God..."

Romans 16:24 NASV: Omitted with a marginal note stating, "Some ancient manuscripts add verse 24, &amp;#8216;The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.&amp;#8217;" (The vast majority add this verse, not just "some").
1 Corinthians 5:4 NASV: "In the name of our Lord Jesus, when you are assembled, and I with you in spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus." (In both cases the name "Christ" is omitted with no reason given. Why do the translators of the NASV dislike the name "Christ" so much?)

1 Corinthians 5:7b NASV: "... For Christ our Passover also has been sacrificed." KJV: "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." (If Christ is not sacrificed FOR US we cannot be saved!)

1 Corinthians 6:20 NASV: "For you have been bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body." KJV: "For ye are brought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's;" (Reasons for omitting this are inadequate.)

1 Corinthians 9:1b NASV: "... Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" KJV:

"... Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" (There is no reason given for omitting the name "Christ," and again they show their dislike for the name "Christ.")

1 Corinthians 11:11b NASV: "... nor is man independent of woman." KJV:

"... neither the woman without the man, in the Lord."  

1 Corinthians 11:24 NASV: "and when He had given thanks, He broke it, and said, &‘This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of Me.’" KJV: "And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, ‘This is my body, which is broken for you...’"

1 Corinthians 16:23 NASV: "The grace of the Lord Jesus be with you." KJV: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you." (Why do they keep insisting on eliminating the name "Christ")

2 Corinthians 5:17b NASV: "... behold, new things have come." KJV:

"... behold, all things are become new."

2 Corinthians 10:4 NASV: "for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but divinely powerful for the destruction of fortresses." KJV: "(For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.)"

2 Corinthians 11:31 NASV: "The God and Father of the Lord Jesus..." KJV: "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." (We ask in all sincerity, "Are the translators anxious to get rid of the name ‘Christ’ altogether?")

Galatians 2:20 NASV: "&‘I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me.’" KJV: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

Galatians 6:17b NASV: "... for I bear on my body the brand-marks of Jesus." KJV: "... for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." (It seems as if they don’t like the name "Lord" either.)

Ephesians 3:14 NASV: "For this reason, I bow my knees before the Father." KJV: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. " (We ask in all sincerity, "Would the translators wish to get rid of the name entirely?")

Ephesians 5:9 NASV: "(for the fruit of the light consists in all goodness and righteousness and truth)." KJV: "(For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth.)"

Colossians 1:14 NASV: "in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins." KJV: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." (Why omit the blood?)

Colossians 2:2 NASV: "... resulting in a true knowledge of God's mystery, that is, Christ Himself." KJV: "... the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ."
Colossians 2:11b NASV: "... in the removal of the body of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." KJV: "... in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ."

1 Thessalonians 2:19b NASV: "... in the presence of our Lord Jesus at His coming?" KJV: "... in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?"

1 Thessalonians 3:11 NASV: "Now may our God and Father Himself and Jesus our Lord direct our way to you." KJV: "Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you."

1 Timothy 1:1 NASV: "... and of Christ Jesus, who is our hope." KJV: "... and Lord Jesus Christ, which is our hope."

1 Timothy 1:17 NASV: "... the only God, be honour and glory..." KJV: "... the only wise God, be honour..."

1 Timothy 3:16 NASV: "... He who was revealed in the flesh." KJV: "... God was manifest in the flesh."

1 Timothy 5:21 NASV: "I solemnly charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus..." KJV: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ."

1 Timothy 6:1b "... that the name of God and our doctrine may not be spoken against." KJV: "... that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed."

2 Timothy 3:3b NASV: "... haters of good." KJV: "... despisers of those that are good." (Quite a difference in the meaning of the two phrases.)

2 Timothy 4:1 NASV: "I solemnly charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus." KJV: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ..."

Titus 1:4b NASV "... from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Saviour." KJV: "... from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour."

Philemon 6b NASV: "... which is in you for Christ's sake." KJV: "... which is in you in Christ Jesus."

Hebrews 3:3b NASV: "... when He had made purification of sins, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high." KJV: "when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." (Jesus Christ did it A LONE and FOR US!)  

Hebrews 3:1 NASV: "Therefore, holy brethren; partakers of a heavenly calling, consider Jesus the Apostle and High Priest of our confession." KJV: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession Christ Jesus."

Hebrews 7:21b "Thou art a priest forever." KJV: "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." (There is no explanation for the omission.)

Hebrews 10:30 NASV: "For we know Him who said, &amp;#8216;Vengeance is Mine, I will repay.&amp;#8217;" KJV: "For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord."

Hebrews 11:6b NASV: "... He is a rewarder of those who seek Him." KJV: "he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."

1 Peter 3:15 NASV: "but sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts..." KJV: "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts." (Is this
another attempt to do away with the Deity of our Lord as in 1 Timothy 3:16?)

1 John 1:7b NASV: "... and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin." KJV: "... and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (Let's not stop the translators of getting rid of the name "Christ," they're on a roll!)

1 John 2:20 NASV: "But you have an anointing from the Holy One, and you all know." KJV: "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things."

1 John 3:16 NASV: "We know love by this..." KJV: "Hereby perceive we the love of God."

1 John 4:19 NASV: "We love because He first loved us." KJV: "We love him because he first loved us."

1 John 5:6, 7 NASV: The majority of both of these verses is omitted and there is no mention in the margin as to why there is an omission.

1 John 5:13b NASV: "... in order that you may know that you have eternal life." KJV: "... that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the Name of the Son of God." (No reason is given for this phrase being omitted.)

2 John 3 NASV: "Grace mercy and peace will be with us, from God the Father and from Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love." KJV: "Grace be with you, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love."

Jude 25 NASV: "to the only God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord..." KJV: "To the only wise God our Saviour bes glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen." (Another attempt to remove the Deity of our Lord?)

Revelation 1:9b NASV: "... and the testimony of Jesus." KJV: "...and for the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Revelation 6:17 NASV: "for the great day of their wrath has come; and who is able to stand?" KJV: "For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" (There is quite a difference between THEIR wrath and HIS wrath!)

Revelation 8:13 NASV: "... and I heard an eagle flying..." KJV: "... and I heard an angel flying..."

Revelation 15:3b NASV: "... Thou King of the nations." KJV: "... thou King of saints."

Revelation 16:7 NASV: "And I heard the altar saying..." KJV: "And I heard Another out of the Altar say..."
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Re: - posted by WorldView (), on: 2006/7/24 4:49

NASV, good stuff there. It works for me. Once had a guy that I worked with say that my NASV is of the devil and that only an authorized version of KJV is the legitimate Word of God. I would be lying if I said that I wasn't a bit shaken, so I did a study on the different versions of the Bible.

My conclusion. Make sure you have a Bible that you can understand.

Handing a KJV to a new convert greatly intimidates them, and they rarely read it, in my experience.
Re: KJV..., on: 2006/7/24 6:07

Quote:
-------------------------------
and they rarely read it, in my experience.
-------------------------------
What do you say and how do you look when you offer a new convert a KJV?

You say: 'This Bible contains the word of God, and He will speak to you every time you read it. Like any unfamiliar text, you might need to use a dictionary for words you don't understand, but you'll get along fine!' Then you smile - encouragingly.... :-)

Re:, on: 2006/7/24 8:44

Quote:
-------------------------------
and they rarely read it, in my experience
-------------------------------

I have found that the main reason new converts may shy away from the KJV is because many of them already have been exposed to prejudiced opinions against the KJV by Christians. And make no doubt, there is a prejudice against it. It's mainly a prejudice propagated by the publishing companies. How many modern versions would they sell if they admitted the KJV was the best English version? Not many.

But people I have led to the Lord have always received a KJV from me, and most of them stick to it. If they have been truly born again and filled with His Spirit they have a hunger for the Word... and they will read. I've found that those who don't have probably not truly been born again. Not just because they don't desire God's Word, but because they exhibit no other fruit either.

Krispy

Re: - posted by W_D_J_D, on: 2006/7/24 9:45
Amen Krispy u took the words right out of my mouth..................

When i first believed i recevied a NIV which i thought was great.............

little did i know.....i look back now and regret that day i continued in that bible.....

KJV is what the Lord is using to talk to me with.....

"Give me that ol time religion give me that....."

God bless yall!

Re: - posted by WorldView (), on: 2006/7/24 12:15

Well, I disagree that the KJV is the best english version but I dont want to get into a translation war. I will tell you one thing though, your not going to convince me otherwise so dont waste your time.

I dont dislike the KJV. I like other versions better.

And by the way, I was just giving my experience of what I have encountered. I have no doubt that there are new converts that have begun and continued with the KJV but I find more new converts that are intimidated by it. Can a person learn and grow from the KJV? Most certainly.

Quote:
-------------------------------
W_D_J_D wrote:
KJV is what the Lord is using to talk to me with.....
I can agree with that. Everyone should use the version that the Lord best ministers to them with. It is just that for some people they need a translation that they don't have to retranslate into current day English. If KJV works for you then fine, if it doesn't then fine.

It irritates me when people rise up and say that you have to have KJV an anything else is incorrect, which begins to sow confusion and doubt in peoples minds, especially in new converts, causing them to switch from a translation that they were being matured through to one that doesn't minister to them as well, due to the old english grammar (once again, I am not implying that this is the case for every new convert). I think some people (not necessarily referring to people here), just need to shut their mouth and work on their own salvation rather then tell people who are doing well, and may even be doing better than them how to work out theirs. I'm not suggesting that we refrain from ministering to people but to be led by the Spirit in what we do and say that way we are not sowing confusion.

I have a low tolerance for people who sow confusion, especially those who do it out of religious traditions.

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/7/24 12:30

Amen worldview

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/24 12:36

Christinyou's

Quote:
------------------------- The NKJV, NIV and others takes away from the God Head putting His SON in the believer and then the Life of the believer not being the Life of Christ. It puts man in Charge of his own destiny as it was before the Cross. This is a real attack on the believer depending on the Christ In Him to bring forth the deity of Christ in the spirit of believer.
-------------------------

WorldView's

Quote:
------------------------- Well, I disagree that the KJV is the best English version but I don't want to get into a translation war. I will tell you one thing though, you're not going to convince me otherwise so don't waste your time.
-------------------------

The folly is that we do get into these 'version wars'. The KJV is an excellent translation with some severe weaknesses but with a great heritage. To question it is, in some circles, just not acceptable. Instead of putting the KJV in the 'blue corner' and the NKJV/NIV/NASV/ESV in the 'red corner' we ought to be able to examine each one on its own terms and not to compare one against another.

I have probably written more about the weaknesses of the KJV than any one else on Sermonindex and yet I continue to use it for study, devotion and preaching. Each of these Bible versions has its own weaknesses and strengths. The comparison 'chart' that Greg referred to in his earlier post is a case in point. It lists 'errors and omissions' in the NKJV. What it should have called its comparison was 'Differences to the KJV'. The implication is that the KJV is already perfect and any change is inevitably an 'error or omission'. The listing ends with the sentence

Quote:
------------------------- The NKJV also omits historical Christological headings in the Old Testament (Isaiah, Psalms, Song of Solomon, etc.)
-------------------------

What this is saying is that the later printings of the KJV were more inspired than the earlier printings and the editorial comments now have the same authority as the inspired text. This, of course, is nonsense but it is the same kind of crazy reasoning we have seen on SL where people declared that the VKV was more accurate than the Textus Receptus!

What version would I recommend to a new convert? Without a doubt the NKJV. One of its greatest strengths is that it is such a good introduction to the KJV! ;-) Each version will have strengths and weaknesses. It is folly to pretend otherwise.
Re: - posted by freedbyjc (), on: 2006/7/24 12:47

Quote:
-------------------------
Everyone should use the version that the Lord best ministers to them with. It is just that for some people they need a translation that they don't have to retranslate into current day English. If KJV works for you then fine, if it doesn't then fine.
-------------------------

Amen. I grew up with the KJV, re-started out with a NIV STUDY to learn the truth, have used a NASB to dive deeply into the precepts of the Word and have enjoyed study with the amplified but NOW am now using the HCSB after reading the following article two years ago and it is speaking volumes to me...

Quote:
-------------------------
King James Only, Sometimes, Never Examining the Modern Versions of the Bible
William D. Barrick, Professor of Old Testament, The Master's Seminary

What Bible translations are best for use in the pulpit? Which ones are best for private Bible study? Good questions like these are the reason for this seminar. Contrary to the impression that the seminar title might give, I will not be lecturing on the “King James Only” debate. Our purpose is to answer the preceding questions about Bible translations. Pastors and churches ask about modern Bible translations because they want to use the most accurate Bible translation available for preaching, teaching, and personal devotional reading.

With the plethora of so-called “literal” Bible translations available on the market, how is a pastor or church member to know which is the best choice? We will not look at obviously inappropriate Bible translations in this seminar (e.g., Revolve New Testament). Instead, we will focus on the following versions: King James Version (KJV), New King James Version (NKJV), New American Standard Bible (NASB), New American Standard Bible Update (NASU), English Standard Version (ESV), New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), New International Version (NIV), and the Holman Christian Standard Bible (HCSB). These eight versions have the greatest potential of being chosen by evangelicals for pulpit, pew, or personal use. For those of you who are already wondering why the more dynamic NIV is listed with the seven more formal translations, just stick around. There is method to my madness.

-------------------------

Interested? Read more (http://audio.gracechurch.org/shepnew/2006notes/King%20James%20Only,%20Barrick.pdf) HE RE

Re:, on: 2006/7/24 13:09

Quote:
-------------------------
I will tell you one thing though, your not going to convince me otherwise so dont waste your time.
-------------------------

While I do take a strong stand for the KJV, I dont think I have ever muttered those words. I certainly hope that is not true of all of your opinions that you bring to the table on this forum. I know for me, someone who takes a strong stand on most things, I have had my mind changed on several different issues because of this forum and those involved.

If someone showed me compelling evidence that I should leave the KJV for a modern version (and I was a die hard NIV supporter earlier in my Christian walk) I would be open to change. So far it hasn't happened... but my point is that when we enter into some of the discussions here we should at least be open to hearing what others have to say.

Krispy

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2006/7/24 15:49

Quote:
-------------------------
The KJV is an excellent translation with some severe weaknesses
-------------------------

Phil,
Could you please tell me what these "severe weaknesses" are? I am not an authoritarian on Bible versions; I have a copy of about every modern version you can think of (my favorite paraphrase is probably JB Phillips), but after reading and examining all of them, the Holy Spirit has always led me back to the Authorised 1611 KJV with the Textus Receptus parallel for my serious study and meditation. I know the KJV in itself is a revision of the Bishop's bible. And the reason I shelled my NASV and NKJV is because of the many omissions from the KJV and the Textus Receptus.

I respect your knowledge! Like I said, Bible versions are not my forte. Since I've come to rely so strongly on the KJV, I'd like to know of the "severe" weaknesses it has (does the 1550 Stephens Greek have the same weaknesses?) and what versions I can use to offset them.

Much blessings to you, brother!

Brother Paul

---

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/7/24 16:43

Quote:

PaulWest wrote:

Quote:

The KJV is an excellent translation with some severe weaknesses

Phil,

Could you please tell me what these "severe weaknesses" are? I am not an authoritarian on Bible versions; I have a copy of about every modern version you can think of (my favorite paraphrase is probably JB Phillips), but after reading and examining all of them, the Holy Spirit has always led me back to the Authorised 1611 KJV with the Textus Receptus parallel for my serious study and meditation. I know the KJV in itself is a revision of the Bishop's bible. And the reason I shelled my NASV and NKJV is because of the many omissions from the KJV and the Textus Receptus.

I respect your knowledge! Like I said, Bible versions are not my forte. Since I've come to rely so strongly on the KJV, I'd like to know of the "severe" weaknesses it has (does the 1550 Stephens Greek have the same weaknesses?) and what versions I can use to offset them.

Much blessings to you, brother!

Brother Paul

---

I also want to know about the severe weaknesses. :-)

---

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/24 17:54

Quote:

Could you please tell me what these "severe weaknesses" are?

The Jacobean era was the forerunner to England's Civil War. King James was determined to maintain monarchical authority and commissioned a Bible which maintained the 'status quo'. The concepts of authority and hierarchy which are found throughout the KJV are consequences of this. King James insisted that earlier choices by people like Tyndale were reversed to maintain this policy. He insisted on the use of 'church' rather than congregation which has been a stumbling block ever since. King James wanted 'ecclesiastical words' like bishop and church and confession reinstated in his 'united religion' version.

Most scholars of the period, and earlier, had learned their Greek through the medium of Latin which does not have the same tenses as Greek. Consequently the tenses of the KJV are often confusing. Similarly its use of prepositions is not nearly so consistent as later versions.

Another 'weakness/strength' of the KJV is the way it used many different words to translate the same Greek word. "Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall I remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father."
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(1John 2:24 KJVS)...is a classic example where the same Greek word 'menO' has been translated by three different words in the same sentence; abide/remain/continue are all translations of the word 'menO'. This is known as 'studied variety' and although it sometimes helps to give the breadth of a word it loses the power of the repetition. Sometimes it does the opposite which is to use the same English word to translate different Greek words; it often does not distinguish between 'child' and 'son' although part of Paul's letter to the Galatians is dependent on the distinction. 'studied variety' is the legacy of William Tyndale.

Its strengths include its use of the archaic 'thee' and 'thou'. Not because they sound more reverent but because 'you' is not the same as 'thee'.

I won't go on; this should give the flavour.

Re: - posted by RevKerrigan (), on: 2006/7/24 18:07
Paul West said:

Quote:
--------------------I like the accuracy of the NASV too. I've got a big NASV study bible. Of course, you probably know of all these changes (and deletions) and dropping the title "Christ" from the texts.
--------------------

There have been no changes brother. You have come to this conclusion due to false presuppositions. You think that all other versions must be judged by the KJV. If they were to be judged by the KJV, then there would be "errors", "deletions" and "changes." However, the KJV is NOT the standard. The manuscripts used for the other versions are different, older and more accurate because they are closer to the originals. If you were to look at the quotes of Scripture from the early Church fathers, you would see that their quotes are much more in line with the manuscripts used for the NASB. I would challenge you and any other KJV0 people on here to go to my website's, (http://pinpointevangelism.com/23.html) Apologetics Page and listen to the audios that I have there where KJVO people and others debate this issue. Most of the arguments (if not all) that I have seen on this message board as well as others were refuted during these sessions. It is titled "Which Bible Translation Is Most Trustworthy And Which One Should You Use?" and there are eight shows to it. God Bless brother...

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/24 18:17

"Severe weaknesses"? I dare say, Less than most.

This is a very good site to give information of KJV. http://www.ccel.org/bible/kjv/preface/thesis.htm

The weaknesses are taken up in the Holy Spirit revelation of His Truth. I have been reading along and studying a particular passage and The Holy Spirit will stop me and ask a question, Is that concurrent with what I have been teaching you? I stop and listen for more. Then I go back and read and read and soon the Truth comes in as to what the Question was. Example: NASB: Galatians 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, 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 up for me.

I was studying faith and where it comes form. With the Studies in John and Col and Gal in the King James, it was becoming clear that this faith before salvation was lacking to be able to believe what God says about His Son Jesus Christ. I looked at a mustard seed and it took a magnifying glass to tell it was a seed. This is the faith that it took to move mountains. That meant that I had so little faith that it could not even be seen without a magnifying glass. No mountains move and not even a pile of sand in the back yard, not even a grain of sand I put on the table. In this context, how could my faith believe in Jesus Christ? How could I be saved by Grace through faith? I came to the conclusion that I could not. So how could I be saved, I believe in Jesus Christ that He is the Son of God. Where did that come from? Then the Light came on. It was not my faith at all that saved me, it was the Faith of The Son of God's conviction in me by the Holy Spirit that actually would be the means of My Salvation, and after my conversion It would be the Faith of The Son of God that I would live this life in. Not in my faith but His.

So when I read the NASB and it said, "I live by faith in the Son of God", I was confused. It takes faith in the Son of God, but I don't have that Kind of Faith, what is going on?

The Holy Spirit pulled me to the KJV. It says, "KJV: Galatians 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet no
t I, but Christ lives 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.

There it was, I live by the faith of the Son of God. Wow, now I understood why the Holy Spirit stopped me and took me back, over and over and over again, until I could reconcile The Truth that my faith could not save me, it took a much greater faith than that which I had. It was the Faith of The Son of God, not my faith in the Son of God. So, for my proof of translations I use all the KJV “faith of the Son of God as the test for which one I will choose”. Very small word but a great, great difference. So I just change the word in to of in my NASB and thing work our fine, I have changed words also in the KJV when it takes away from the Christ that is in me and His Work on the Cross revealed By the Holy Spirit.

There are even differences in the context of KJV of the Word of God and the Holy Spirit even reveals them to us if we listen and are seeking this Christ that is In us. I personally like the KJV, I like the NASB, and used it for many years over the KJV, because it was easier to understand, well I understand The KJV more now than I ever understood the NASB because I am relying on the Holy Spirit for Truth, and He has never let me down yet and will never, from what I understand in Scripture.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2006/7/24 18:48

Quote:
-----------------------------I would challenge you and any other KJVO people
-----------------------------

I never said I was KJV only, brother. Please do not jump to conclusions. If you go back and read my post, you'll see I actually made it a point to say I WASN'T a KJV only. Also, I've never said that KJV was the standard all other versions should be measured by. I only provided a comparative list between KJV and NASV. It seems to me that the NASV is basically like the KJV, only with the appellation of “Christ” deleted out of many verses (for whatever reason) and the deity of Jesus diminished in certain areas, and with other important verses deleted out all together. I think it's plain to see that the KJV is much more honorable in its glorification of Jesus Christ in so many verses than the NASV is.

The truth is, I don't care a hill of beans about the age of the manuscript when it comes to this. The KJV just seems to be more honorable and more Christ-exalting, and this pleases my soul. Examine the verse comparisons if you doubt this. I think many here would agree with me. Again, I'm not saying the KJV is the ONLY, but what I am saying is that the KJV manuscript is so very majestic and Christ-honoring. And quite faithful to the Textus Receptus as well.

Have you read Ray Comfort's book “Springboards for Evangelism”? He basically blackballs the NASV as a version that looks as though someone “took a pair of scissors and cut out a bunch of verses” from the KJV. It's quite amusing! I sort of agree with him... owning and examining both KJV and NASV versions. I guess I have the best of both worlds!

However, brother, I agree with Ravenhill - the KJV is the best. I'm not looking to debate you or anyone else on this. It's just simply my own personal preference. I also love the JB Phillips translation.

Blessings,

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/7/24 19:51

Quote:
-----------------------------
RevKerrigan wrote:
Paul West said:

Quote:
-----------------------------I like the accuracy of the NASV too. I've got a big NASV study bible. Of course, you probably know of all these changes (and deletions) and dropping the title "Christ" from the texts.
-----------------------------
There have been no changes brother. You have come to this conclusion due to false presuppositions.

---------------------

Kerrigan,

You have a very large presupposition yourself.

You are assuming that earlier is better, which is generally true-- but this is still a large assumption.

Consider the earliest complete manuscripts we have are Coxex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus (AKA the "Alexandrian Textform"). These two codex's are what most new translations are translated from. These are 4th century manuscripts and this leaves PLENTY of room for a copiest to come in and alter/remove the text-- especially considering the fact that gnostics were already invading the church during the time of the apostles as is mentioned by John in his epistles.

Also consider that Codex Vaticanus included the Apocrypha, which was not part of the Hebrew OT. But if you want to depend on these two codex's for your translations, you might as well include the apocryphal writings in your Bible.

Also consider that Codex Sinaiticus has been edited with several different hands (possibly 8!)... It is obvious there was confusion as to what was the original text even during the making of these manuscripts.

Also consider that Codex Sinaiticus was found by Constantin von Tischendorf-- and on his first visit they were inside a waste basket and he was told was told by a librarian that "they were rubbish which was to be destroyed by burning it in the ovens of the monestary". ("http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex_Sinaiticus") source)

Also consider that these two manuscripts are very much in disagreement with the majority readings of the other 5,000+ byzantine manuscripts.

So which is better, majority (5,000+) or minority(2ish)?

Also let me point out that these two codex's were not discovered until recently-- so to say the Alexandrian textform is the best is to say that the church has been using the wrong readings with all of these "additions" for the majority of her years.

I submit to you that we have been using the right manuscripts throughout the centuries, and now we have shot ourselves in the foot and are using altered manuscripts from EGYPT(!) which have key verses removed (e.g. the ending of Mark, the name of Jesus Christ replaced with Him throughout the NT, the end of the Lord's prayer, etc...).

Let me give you a simple illustration I came up with.

I work in a grocery store. When I tidy up and straighten the shelves at the end of the day, I sometimes will find a whole row of merchandise, and a couple other similiar (but different) items in the back of the shelf.

So the question is, which item really belongs in this place on the shelf? The Majority items, or the minority (yet probably older) in the back?

Let's add more detail, let's say I have 20 Strawberry soaps lined up in the front of the shelf neatly, and 1 Orange soap and 1 Lemmon soap in the back of the shelf behind the 20 Strawberry soaps.

When I straighten shelves, I find probably 99% of the time the majority will be right, even though the minority in the back has been there longer. I then remove the minority in the back and put it in its proper place. I find that whoever stocked shelves in the past was correct in his placement of the 20, regardless of someone's error of the past in placing the orange and lemon in the incorrect place!

So based on this simple illustration, let us atleast consider that majority readings, even though they are older, have weight and may indeed be correct.

I have a simple question for you.
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How is it that the ending of Mark is not included in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus (therefor according to you, being an "addition", and Mark 16 in your Bible should end with, "and they were afraid") -- anyways, how is it, that Irenaeus quoted the ending of Mark (Against Heresies III:10.5-6, which was written c. 185) a good 100 years before the Alexandrian Textform?

Also consider one more fact, "The Vaticanus manuscript has left an empty space at the end of Mark exactly large enough to contain those twelve missing verses; How did the copyist know how much space to leave if he was not looking at a still older manuscript with the last 12 verses of Mark in it? As for the Sinaiticus manuscript, it is written in the same-size letters throughout until you come to the place where the last twelve verses of Mark belong, then the letters become large and spread out, taking up enough extra space to allow the last twelve verses of Mark to appear in the smaller letters that had been used up until this time." -Jay P. Greens Interlinear N.T. introduction ... Also I'm pretty sure Ron (philologos) is witness to these facts himself.

Of course, if you had believed the traditional majority text to be Scripture, you would have known the ending of Mark was canonical all along.

Lastly-- a good, commonly asked question: Why do we not have earlier manuscripts with the byzantine readings, if they are indeed the original readings? The answer is quite simple, the good manuscripts were copied and used and copied and used and used until they were worn out, and thus destroyed-- and the good copies were passed down. This also explains why vaticanus and sinaiticus are still in existence-- because nobody wanted to use inferior manuscripts.

PS. I am not "King James Only".

Adam

Re: - posted by MR_CPK (), on: 2006/7/24 22:36

Quote: "If you were to look at the quotes of Scripture from the early Church fathers, you would see that their quotes are much more in line with the manuscripts used for the NASB." -Mr. Kerrigan

This statement is 100% FALSE! When you reconstruct the the New Testament from early Church Fathers ALONE you end up with a New Testament that is missing 11 verses and lines up perfectly with the Byzantine text types.

Secondly the older is better is retarded on so many levels (I use to believe it myself, so I use to be retarded too, but praise the Lord he will lead you into the Truth if you'll only follow) Think about this. Before the printing press there were much fewer copies of Scripture. EVERY single copy would be used. Who doesn't want to read God's Holy Word right? They would use the copies they had and would make more copies of that copy and over time each one would fall apart with use, and the cycle would continue. I've gone through 2 very nice Cambridge Bible's in the last 2 years alone. They fell apart because they got used. On my bookshelf there is a copy of the book of mormon. PERFECT condition. Why is it in perfect condition? It doesn't get used. Why doesn't it get used? It's not the Word of Almighty God. Now I'm not comparing the Minorit/Critical text with the book of mormon. It's just an analogy. I'll just leave that there.

Philologos-you mentioned that the tenses are different in the KJV. Can you explain exactly how that is. I've never heard that it had anything to do with translators learning greek in a sub-par form. I have a NASB "Key Word Study Bible" (AMG Publishers- Spiro Zodhiates) and in the notes it gives the literal tense of the words and when it does it always seems to line up with the KJV (or Youngs-or any other truly literal translation)
Re: - posted by MR_CPK (), on: 2006/7/24 23:00

First off I am NOT KJV only but I would like to make another random point as to why I trust the KJV more than any other translation (I really like Youngs Literal too) I like the fact that 91% is still exactly the same as William Tydale's translation. My Bible translation was made by a man that died so I could have the Word of Almighty God in English. He was persect uted from city to city and finally murdered. Truly one of the scribes Christ promised to send to us. The new translations however were all made by men who were willing to make lots of money so I could have the Word of Almighty God in a litt e bit more contemporary version of the English language, and that would divide the body of Christ just a little bit more.

One more random point. Genealogies are wrong in the minority text (clearly scribal errors). Also Jesus either lies or chan ges His mind (John 7:8) These two things were what set me to study. A few years back about a year after I got saved I ha d just bought an awesome new super-soft calfskin NASB Wide-Margin and was doing some hardcore studying to fill in th e margins and noticed these two afore mentioned things. So I went to every translation I had in my library, NIV, ASV, RS V, NRSV, ESV, HCSB, and on and on to reconcile this problem..... finally I went up into my parents attic to find this old K JV I found on the side of the road when I was 9 and it did not have the problem. I then went on to study the manuscript e vidence and I had to concede to the truth.

Bible-Researcher.com has some good resources for the textual stuff.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/25 4:45

Quote:

-------------------------Bible-Researcher.com has some good resources for the textual stuff.
-------------------------

Indeed he does but read with care; he is not a supporter of the Byzantine Textform. I have had lots of email conversatio ns with him on many of these topics.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/25 4:57

Quote:

-------------------------Philologos-you mentioned that the tenses are different in the KJV. Can you explain exactly how that is. I've never heard that it had a nything to do with translators learning greek in a sub-par form. I have a NASB "Key Word Study Bible" (AMG Publishers- Spiro Zodhiates) and in the n otes it gives the literal tense of the words and when it does it always seems to line up with the KJV (or Youngs-or any other truly literal translation)

----------------------------

Hi
I suggest you look at Darby's translation (available free online). My own favourite study tool is the Newberry Bible which shows me most of the tenses by means of diacritical marks.

Here is an example of what I am talking about that came from my reading this morning.Â“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,Â” (Heb 2:11 KJV) The verb form of the 'who are sanctified' is Present, Passive Participle, nominative, masculine. The KJV, at this point gives the impression that 'sanctified' is 'done and dusted' but the NKJV has captured the nuance of the Gree k tense...Â“For both He who sanctifies and those who are being sanctified are all of one, for which reason He is not asha med to call them brethren,Â” (Heb 2:11 NKJV) The writer to the Hebrews has the process of sanctification in mind rather than the crisis. I don't have my NASB to hand so I cannot comment on that here.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/25 5:04

Quote:

-------------------------I submit to you that we have been using the right Bible throughout the centuries, and now in this dark age of intellectualism --(begin ning with the RSV, which used the minority manuscripts and the translators felt it necessary to allegorize and twist the creation in Genesis to make it fit with the pop-science of evolution...)  

-------------------------

Just to try to prevent confusion but the first to base its translation on the Western Texts was not the RSV (1948) but the RV of 1881. The RV is the older sister of the ASV. The Revisers of the late 19th century were not trying to accommodat
e Darwinian evolution. It was only just getting started at that time.

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/7/25 6:24
Thanks for the correction. :-)

Re: - posted by MR_CPK (), on: 2006/7/25 12:01
Philologos thanks for the example and the mention of the Newberry Bible. I just checked it out and ordered one.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/25 13:09
There was a brief thread about Bullengers's Companion Bible and the Newberry Bible some time ago. There are several versions of Newberry. The most comprehensive has just a central column for the text as in my illustrations (http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id175&forum36&post_id&refres hGo) here.

BTW if you are familiar with the Bagster's Greek NT based on the Received Text you may be interested to know that it was created by Thomas Newberry but his name never appeared on it. It is still the best Greek Interlinear in my view.

If you have both the KJV Newberry AND the Newberry Greek Interlinear you have an amazing collection of information regarding the different manuscript evidences and the different Greek text editors. The two books together are a library of information about textual matters.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2006/7/25 13:20

Quote:
-------------------------If you have both the KJV Newberry AND the Newberry Greek Interlinear you have an amazing collection of information regarding the different manuscript evidences and the different Greek text editors. The two books together are a library of information about textual matters.
-------------------------

Thank you so much for this. I will certainly be on the prowl for these two sources!

Paul

Re: - posted by MR_CPK (), on: 2006/7/25 13:25
You can also get the Newberry in an interleaved version, which is rare and very nice. They're reissuing the wide-margin version too. You can pre-order that now at various places.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/26 0:23
Reachout Trust - Jehovah's Witnesses - The New World Translation
Various editions of the KJV have been used, some with concordances, maps and marginal ... Murdock's translation from ancient Syriac; The Newberry Bible; ... http://www.reachouttrust.org/articles/jw/jwnt.htm

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/26 4:35
This is a quote from Christinyou's URL
Quote:
-------------------------Over the years the Society has used and distributed many different versions of the Bible. Various editions of the KJV have been used, some with concordances, maps and marginal references; also Leeser's translation, with the English text placed alongside the Hebrew; Murdock's translation from ancient Syriac; The Newberry Bible; Tischendorf's New Testament; the Variorum Bible and Young's literal translation. The Newberry Bible was especially useful in that it incorporated marginal references that drew attention to occurrences of the divine name 'Jehovah' (used instead of 'he LORD') in the original language.
-------------------------
I want to come to the defence of (http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id175&forum36&post_id&refres hGo) The Newberry Bible here. The Newberry Bible was (and is) a KJV Bible with many diacritical printing marks whic
h show what he called 'the lights and perfections' of the word of God. The KJV did not use the name JHWH (or Jehovah) other than in about 4 places. The actual word JHWH is used over 7000 times in the Hebrew Old Testament (never in the Greek New Testament).

The Jews had developed a pattern where they substituted the word 'Adonai' for JHWH in their public readings of the scripture; Adonai means 'Lord'. The original pronunciation of JHWH was probably something like 'Ya-Wa' with soft guttural 'h's at the end of each syllable; it is now usually written as 'Yahweh' by scholars. At some stage when the name of JHWH was officially pronounced, as at public blessings, the proper name was 'defended' by including the vowels of Adonai into the YHWH which produced the sound 'YaHoWaH' which with has now settled at 'Jehovah'.

The idea of defending the proper name of God in this was to prevent accidental taking of his name 'in vain'. The safest way to prevent accidental use of the divine name was not to use it at all and to substitute Adonai (Lord) or Jehovah.

The KJV translators adopted a similar reticence. Rather than have the proper name Jehovah scattered on every page of the scripture they opted for the word 'Lord' but tried to show that it was the proper name by printing it in full upper case letters hence the word LORD (not lord, nor Lord).

What Newberry did was draw attention to the fact that each time the KJV had 'LORD' (in the OT) it was in truth the proper name for God, YHWH or as we have become used to it... Jehovah. When Newberry draws attention to the word in upper case in the New Testament he is doing something slightly different which is showing that the original quotation in the Old Testament had the word Jehovah; the name Jehovah does not appear in the New Testament. (If you ask Jehovah's Witnesses why it is omitted from the New Testament they will say that it was removed by early Christians; needless to say there is absolutely no evidence for this statement.)

The ASV of 1901 has the word Jehovah almost 7000 times. Newberry's scholarship in this was impeccable but was used to bolster false JW doctrines. It is always painful to see truth used to entrap the unwary but it has ever been the Enemy's method.

Re: KJV........, on: 2006/7/26 12:57
I realise that the thread has moved on, but I wanted to acknowledge this response on p1.
philologos said:

Quote:
-----------------------------mmm? This is a little more complicated that it appears. Biblical Greek tenses are different to English tenses in many ways and it is difficult to get a strict equivalence of tenses from Biblical Greek to English.

The mental associations you have with regard to "I am the door" etc is that this is a divine witness and you are right. The Greek verbal form for 'I AM the door:' is 'egO eimi' which means 'I (emphasised) am' and is a clear connection to the I AM of divinity

-----------------------------
It was a relief to have this confirmation (in bold) and thank you for explaining the difference when the perfect tense pertains.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/26 17:27
I thought it ironic that the J.W.'s would pick up on this and then use it to promote the KJV, Newberry version. It is only a good version as long as it is correctly interpreted by the J.W. scholars at the watch tower head quarters. Sorry Ron if I implied it was not a good version of the KJV. I hope we have not gotten a critical spirit toward each other because of our differences in Theology. I respect your learned knowledge of the scripture, lets not loose the spirit of our love that is Christ in us, for the Word and each other.

In Christ: Phillip
Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/26 17:30

Quote:
-------------------------
So Ron if I implied it was not a good version of the KJV. I hope we have not gotten a critical spirit toward each other because of our differences in Theology.

-------------------------
No, I didn't think that you were criticizing Newberry; I only commented for the sake of others who might be reading.

Quote:
-------------------------
I don't think that you were criticizing Newberry; I only commented for the sake of others who might be reading.

-------------------------
I'm not so critical as you might think.

Quote:
-------------------------
I respect your learned knowledge of the scripture

-------------------------
I love the book; that's why I chose the name!