

**General Topics :: Translations of the Bible****Translations of the Bible - posted by murdog (), on: 2006/9/14 13:43**

Members,

I am not looking to get a controversy going, I just wanted to make an observation.

I use an NIV translation and I am thinking about getting a KJV translation. (Krispy would be so proud, LOL).

I was reading the purpose driven thread and how Rick Warren used so many translations and paraphrases to get the quotes that fit his purposes.(Ha Ha). But it really surprised me to see how different the newer translations were in their interpretation of the scriptures.

That's all for now!

Murray

Re: Translations of the Bible - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2006/9/14 13:47

I know that there were 2 strains of manuscripts, the older and more complete were done at "antoich" which are commonly called the Textus Receptus. The KJV version was translated from that manuscript strain. ALL other modern day translations have been taken from the other strain of manuscripts called the "Alexandrian". I think it is worthy for the church to decide on which "strain" is the best and stick to it, I have decided that the manuscript from "antioch" is best and therefore my choice of using the KJV version. I use NIV to get alternative readings in a more contemporary language so that is useful but the KJV is my main platform that I teach, read and do devotions from.

Re: - posted by murdog (), on: 2006/9/14 13:50

Greg,

That is so cool, right after I posted my translations of the bible statement. You posted Spurgeon's article about altering the Word of God. God is so amazing!

Murray

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/9/14 14:27

bro Murray

i read the good news, i also use the NIV and have been learning to use the KJV. our Lord has ministered to me through them all and i've found that although some things are lost in translation, Holy Spirit communicates exactly what the Father intends irrespective of what version i use. on s.i. i do use the KJV when i have to quote scripture since most people use that version and it has Krispy's seal of approval! :-P

Re: Translations of the Bible - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/14 17:37

Hi Murray,

I also read the NIV but found verses missing. I didn't want anything to with a "Bible" that was missing verses. So I switched to the NASB, "Not Always Scriptural Bible", Ha! And left it to. I didn't like the KJV so I went to the NKJV. After all this the Lord spoke to me and I accepted the KJV and haven't looked back. I find that I have a more sure faith in what it says. The problem... Now I have memory verses from NLT, NIV, ESV, NKJV, and KJV. I get them confused sometimes with other translations and the end result is frustrating. I stick with the KJV now.

I also had one of those guys that writes Chick tracts call me a rebel for using a modern translation. That was funny!

bro Doug

Re: Translations of the Bible - posted by PaulBenson (), on: 2006/9/14 21:05

I have a book I offer for free to all who request it. It is titled 'Is the Bible you read: The True Sayings of God?' In it I show almost 500 places the bibles founded upon the alexandrian manuscripts delete or alter the Word.

If interested send your request to:

True Witness Press

P.O. Box 5519

Kalispell, MT. 59903

or e-mail paulbenson@fastmail.fm

P.S. I also have a booklet showing the error of a pre-trib rapture. Lord Bless :-)

Re:, on: 2006/9/15 1:59

Dougmore, thats funny I went through nearly the same process, 1st english bible,then nkjv then niv then nasb then nkjv and now resting in KJV.To all I have said this before I am KJV "PREFERED" not KJV ONLY. Big difference in my book.

Re:, on: 2006/9/15 7:30

Oh boy... this just made my day. I got up this morning with a lot of personal things rolling around in my head. Nothing bad, just a lot going on with football and everything. So as is my custom, I checked in to SI to see if there was anything being discussed... and I found this thread. And as I read thru the posts, y'all made me chuckle right out loud! So thanx for the humor! ;-)

Just call me "Good Housekeeping" (seal of approval!)

I dont have anything to add at this point, but I do give glory to God that He has used me to bring this issue to the forefront, and that people here have actually given consideration to the things I have brought up concerning the KJV and the modern versions. The more I dig into the Word of God (using the KJV) the more the rich treasures come alive in my soul. Captain Jack Sparrow has nothing on the Bible when it comes to buried treasure!

Let's keep in mind that there are two types of KJV-Only.

1.) KJV is THE Word of God, and is perfect in everyway, and there need be no other translation. It is so perfect that it actually corrects errors in the Greek & Hebrew. Anyone who rejects the KJV as God's perfectly preserved Word of God is not saved.

2.) The Textus Receptus is the preserved Word of God, and the KJV is the most excellent translation in English that we have. Since English is an ever evolving language, a retranslation of some passages today would be beneficial for clearer understanding so long as the retranslation was based solely on the Textus Receptus. It also recognized that people can be saved using a modern version, and that those who hold to modern versions are our brothers.

I fall into catagory #2. I think catagory #1 is wrong, especially when it comes to how they view other believers who do not stand on the KJV. I believe with all my heart that modern versions are grossly corrupted, and as long as I draw breath I will work to show and convince others of the same... but as I have demonstrated on this forum since the day I arrived here, I do not break fellowship with those who disagree with me.

Krispy

Re: - posted by lovegrace, on: 2006/9/18 0:30

I suggest the NASB. It correctly translates words in ways that the KJV fails. (Likewise the other way) but in my studies NASB has shown itself as a better translation than KJV. So I recommend the NASB. (New American Standard Bible)

Re: - posted by Kedric (), on: 2006/9/18 6:00

As a student of New Testament Greek I have to also make sure that it is mentioned that the Alexandrian texts are found to be much older than the Byzantine text (Textus Receptus).

The Alexandrian text are from the 4th Century A.D. These text were the text believed to be read by the earliest church fathers. When studying these texts compared with the other found text families (Byzantine, Western, Caesarian) it can be seen how the other texts evolved from the Alexandrian.

The verses in the KJV that people say were "deleted" or "cut out" were not in the newer translations because they were not in the Alexandrian text. Nor are they found in the other text. So it is believed that these verses came from monk scholars who wrote notes next to the text. Then when the next generation was copying the text they couldn't distinguish between some of the notes and the text and included these notes in the new manuscript. They were added in. However I am not denying that it couldn't have been the work of the Holy Spirit.

I just thought it would be a good idea to cover the tradition of the manuscripts. I didn't like the idea of just mentioning that "newer translations use the Alexandrian text" and "newer translations exclude some verses" without explaining why.

I personally use the NIV. NIV is used almost everywhere in America. When I am preaching and I use a verse, I want the church to be able to follow along in the pew Bibles.

Kedric

Re:, on: 2006/9/18 7:38

Uuuuhhhh....????? Kedric I'm confused by your post. If Alexandrian texts are "older" And yet from the "4th" century a.d., that doesn't make sense.

Secondly if they are from 4th century a.d. then the claim they were read by the earliest church fathers doesn't make sense either. The "early" church fathers writings start at around 90 a.d. to 300-350 a.d. Lord bless, John

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2006/9/18 12:55

Hello...

I really appreciate the description of the *KJV-only* ideas as mentioned by Krispy. His assessment seems to be the dividing line. Sadly, it seems that there are many more that take the first view rather than the more sensible second view.

Personally, I have not found any concrete evidence of an overall supremacy of either text sources (either the Textus Receptus or the Alexandrian sources) -- even after much serious and unbiased study of this issue.

My conclusion is that I prefer to use the KJV because of the immense amount of resources available for study. Like Krispy, I consider the KJV the best translation derived from the Textus Receptus. However, I also refer to the NIV (1978). In my opinion, I consider it the best translation derived from the other sources. The argument often used against the NIV is that it deletes verses. However, it does not delete anything -- since those verses or words are not found in the source used for translation.

When giving a Bible to new believers, I prefer to give them an NIV -- because they often tend to have difficulty understanding the archaic language of the 17th century usage found in the KJV. I also explain the differences in versions, and tell them that it is important that they eventually grow accustomed to the KJV (since it is the best translation from the Textus Receptus).

:)

Re: - posted by lovegrace, on: 2006/9/18 14:06

Chris, is "However, I also refer to the NIV (1978)." different from the NIV Teen Study bible?

Because I now completely dislike the NIV because of many 'missing words' and mistranslations.

I don't have 'specific' examples, but when I first starting reading the bible it was NIV for 4 months. I read that more than I ate. Studied with other believers (and thats were the curve ball comes in) When I was in a study others would quote a p salm that has the word 'blood' in it and in my NIV nothing EVEN close was in my bible. After about 5+ examples, I praye d about a different translation.

I don't mind paraphrase (even though some do, but I dont) but when a scripture isn't on the same topic, I don't care how you translated, I don't want to hear it.

(The studies that we had were diverse but the translations they used was KJV, NKJV, NASB, and AMP)

Re:, on: 2006/9/18 14:13

Thats good reasoning Chris. I would probably give them a New KJV and encourage them to get used to the KJV and do there scripture memorizing from the KJV. I memorised All of Jude and Matt chap 5 in NASB several years ago. Now that I have settled in on KJV it's a challenge to re memorise those scriptures in the new text maybe I'm just lazy. But whats al so good about KJV is the text won't change. Even New KJV differ from publication to publication. God bless, John

Re:, on: 2006/9/18 16:04

Quote:
-----As a student of New Testament Greek I have to also make sure that it is mentioned that the Alexandrian texts are found to be much older than the Byzantine text (Textus Receptus).

I do respect your expertise on this matter, however it should be noted that you (we all are, really) a product of those who teach us. Yes, it is true that the oldest manuscript evidence for the Alexandrian Text is older than the evidence for the TR, however... your assumption is mistaken when you take that to mean it was around longer. Not true.

Quote:
-----The Alexandrian text are from the 4th Century A.D. These text were the text believed to be read by the earliest church fathers. When studying these texts compared with the other found text families (Byzantine, Western, Caesarian) it can be seen how the other texts evolved from the Alexandrian.

The Alexandrian Text came out of Alexandria Egypt. Therefore, just by the names of the texts you can see the origin of the TR is from the area from where the apostles came out of... for instance, Caesarian. Also, the earliest church fathers wrote much about the gnostics who were at that time destroying the Word of God with there variances, omissions, etc. This is fact. Even Paul mentioned about those who were perverting the Word. Where were most of the Gnostics? There were a ton of them in... Alexandria.

Quote:
-----The verses in the KJV that people say were "deleted" or "cut out" were not in the newer translations because they were not in the Alexandrian text. Nor are they found in the other text. So it is believed that these verses came from monk scholars who wrote notes next to the text. Then when the next generation was copying the text they couldn't distinguish between some of the notes and the text and included these notes in the new manuscript. They were added in. However I am not denying that it couldn't have been the work of the Holy Spirit.

It's interesting that you say all of this... which is somewhat true... but you leave out the fact that what is called the Alexandrian Text is comprised of mainly TWO manuscript witness. Both of which dont even agree with each other. Yet, there are over 5,000 manuscript evidences supporting and comprising the TR... and with the exception of minor variances in grammar... they agree over 98% of the time.

General Topics :: Translations of the Bible

Quote:
-----I just thought it would be a good idea to cover the tradition of the manuscripts. I didn't like the idea of just mentioning that "newer translations use the Alexandrian text" and "newer translations exclude some verses" without explaining why.

Explanation is great, and your welcome at any time to give your point of view on this. Hope you dont mind if I counter you on it. :-)

Quote:
-----I personally use the NIV. NIV is used almost everywhere in America. When I am preaching and I use a verse, I want the church to be able to follow along in the pew Bibles.

Just because something is popular doesnt make it right. In my opinion, the NIV is perhaps the worst offender. Abortion is legal in all 50 states... does that mean it's ok?

Have you ever tried to witness to a JW using an NIV? Do you realize they have a guide in the back of the Bible they carry door to door that helps them to argue with people who try to counter their claims with a MODERN VERSION? Did you know they can eat you alive if you come at them with an NIV especially?

But they seem to run to the hills when I pull out my ol' KJV. The KJV seemingly shuts the door on their false doctrine.

So let me ask you... given that I can take all the modern versions available, and I can show you where they all differ from one another... either in omissions, additions, or meaning... My question is: What is your final authority? If you say "the Word of God", my reply will be "Which one? NIV, NASB, RSV?" ... your reply will be "I believe the original autographs were inspired." And then my reply will be "The original autographs no longer exist... so again, what is your Final Authority!"

If you're intellectually honest, you'll have to admit that you have no Final Authority because you dont know what it is for sure.

Thats a scarey place to be.

I believe God preserved His Word. He's God. He can do anything. Is anything too big for God? I believe the evidence points to His preservation of His Word, and it also involves faith. Without faith it is impossible to please God. I get mocked by believers when I say that I believe God preserved His Word like He said He would. Everyone wants iron clad evidence. Well, I believe He has left evidence for us, but it also involves faith.

I am confident that I have a Final Authority... and it IS the Word of God. Preserved in the TR, and translated into English via the KJV, brought to us by men who gave their lives like William Tyndale.

Krispy

Re: - posted by mamaluk, on: 2006/9/18 18:42

KrispK,

Great post, learned a lot from it.

fellow KJV-er

Praise Him!

Re: - posted by Kedric (), on: 2006/9/20 16:02

Thanks for your time in replying to my post. I like a lot of from what you had to say. Yet I still don't understand why it is believed that the KJV is "The word of God" and modern translations are not. I have explained what I have learned both in school and in personal studies.

You asked if I have ever tried to witness to a JW with a NIV and I did last summer in Africa. However, they were so completely close minded they were not even willing to look at my Bible.

Being intellectually honest, as you have asked, I would have not replied with any of the replies that you believe I would have made. This brings me to the question about final authority. I would have to say scripturally as an authority would be my Greek Bible. It shows the differences between major text families in the notes. However if this was my final authority would I be forced to accept everything in it? For example, I don't believe that the earth is in the center of the universe but the Bible certainly implies in.

For my authority I turn to the Wesleyan quadrilateral. The base is scripture then the other three sources are reason, tradition, and experience. Does anybody see anything wrong with this, let me know.

Your friend Kedric

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/20 16:13

Quote:
-----I am confident that I have a Final Authority... and it IS the Word of God. Preserved in the TR, and translated into English via the KJV, brought to us by men who gave their lives like William Tyndale.

Although most of the KJV agrees with the Tyndale version, Tyndale's several versions made it clear that for him translation was always 'a work in progress'. The KJV translators consciously altered several key doctrinal points by their change of words from Tyndale's translation.

Quote:
-----Have you ever tried to witness to a JW using an NIV? Do you realize they have a guide in the back of the Bible they carry door to door that helps them to argue with people who try to counter their claims with a MODERN VERSION? Did you know they can eat you alive if you come at them with an NIV especially?

But they seem to run to the hills when I pull out my old KJV. The KJV seemingly shuts the door on their false doctrine.

I think I mentioned this before but I actually bought my first bible, a KJV, from the JW's at the door. No JW 'scholar' will run from the KJV.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/9/20 20:58

brethren
I hope that whatever version one decides to use or is led to use that we consult the Final Final authority, Holy Spirit. irrespective of the text used, without Him we're not going to learn anything of any use to God anyway.

Re: - posted by MR_CPK (), on: 2006/9/21 0:11

Funny thing, I saw Ron's post about Tyndale so I decided to google "Tyndale's translation" to do some studying on it and the FIRST hit was a copy of Tyndale's translation at some Wesleyan school of applied theology made available by none other than Ron. So thanks for making that available Ron.

-quote"The KJV translators consciously altered several key doctrinal points by their change of words from Tyndale's translation."

Hey Ron, I was wondering what some of the "key doctrinal points" are. If there's a good website or something with good info I'd be most appreciative. I am also curious as to what you would consider to be the best English translation of the Bible.

General Topics :: Translations of the Bible

Re:, on: 2006/9/21 12:53

Quote:
-----I think I mentioned this before but I actually bought my first bible, a KJV, from the JW's at the door. No JW 'scholar' will run from the KJV.

I dont know how long ago it was that you bought a KJV from a JW, but they use the New World Translation... which is actually more true to the Wescott & Hort Greek than any other Bible. They ceased using the KJV a long time ago. But hey, you're considerably older than me, right? (I'll be 39 tomorrow!)

Krispy

Re:, on: 2006/9/21 13:00

Quote:
-----I still don't understand why it is believed that the KJV is "The word of God" and modern translations are not. I have explained what I have learned both in school and in personal studies.

Well... Since we both agree there is two different schools of text, the Alexandrian and the Textus Receptus, and we both agree that they differ from each other quite drastically... then we must conclude that a) either they are both corrupted... or b) one is the preserved Word of God and the other is not. They cant both be the preserved Word of God. It would be like taking two John Grisham books, say The Client and A Time To Kill... and saying that they are the same book. Hey, they have the same author... the story lines both take place in the South... they are the same book!

Thats where I am coming from. Either one is corrupt or they are both corrupt... but they cant both be the preserved Word of God. If one of them is the preserved Word of God then it is every Christians duty to learn about this and ask God to reveal the truth about it. Then reject the false and embrace the true.

And I believe with all my heart that that is what I have done. Do I understand everything there is to know about this issue? No. But I understand and have studied it enough to be completely convinced.

And I was once a staunch NIV person. And I used the NASB, the Amplified, and the RSV. I've now rejected them all and stick to the KJV.

And I have Tyndale Bible... I would be interested in knowing what was changed from his renderings to the KJV. And who's to say that the KJV translators didnt get it right when Tyndale might have gotten it wrong? Why do we assume corruption on the part of the KJV translators? Perhaps Tyndale was capable of making a mistake. I am sure he was not perfect, just as the KJV translators were not all perfect human beings.

Krispy

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2006/9/21 13:58

Just curious,

What is the "preserved Word of God" to an Albanian believer who doesn't speak a lick of English, and who doesn't know anything save the power and purity of the Word of God from his own Albanian bible?

Would someone be so arrogant and pharisaical to tell him he needs to learn English so he can understand the KJV and get the "genuine" Word? What about the millions of Chinese and Korean believers who have great fellowship and prayer and devotion *without* the English KJV being read and taught from their pulpits? Indeed, it's not the KJV that counts, but the manuscript from which the Word of God is translated, and the believer's faith which activates it (Hebrews 4:2) and the anointing of the Holy Spirit which illuminates it (John 14:26; I Cor. 2:14).

So, I guess the question now is: If all the Chinese and Mongolian and Punjabi and Abkhasian and Russian Bibles are tra

translated from the same Greek and Hebrew texts the KJV was, would not these Bibles be the "preserved" Word of God as well? Of course! It would be the epitome of ignorance to think otherwise.

Now, as an advanced Russian linguist and one fluent in the intricacies of the modern slang and colloquialisms of the language, I know that there are many Russian words, idioms, phrases, and grammatical concepts that would seem quite foreign and nonsensical in English if translated directly. Most Slavic and Baltic languages have a completely different way of grammatical thinking and many English words and ideas sound utterly foolish when translated verbatim. Yet all these exotic and highly complicated and incompatible-to-English languages have produced native Bibles which, in turn, have produced saved and sanctified believers with remaining fruit, and many of these believing fellowships see moves of God equal to, and if not greater than what we see here in the West with all our empty theology, translation-squabbling and KJV glorying.

Personally, I believe God is so far beyond our translation squabbles; indeed, there is a matter so much more dire at hand! The KJV doesn't need to be deliberated, defended, downsized or demagogued - rather, it needs to be obeyed and lived! The NIV, NLT, NASB and CEV all need to be lived. I believe that through any one of these translations God can bring sweeping revival, if their adherents would only humble themselves and trust and obey what they read.

Brother Paul

(edit. - I study, read, teach, and preach from the KJV. It is my preference for the Word of God in English. But I also read the Russian New Testament and experience the same majesty, joy and cleansing when I read the words of Jesus Christ in that language.)

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2006/9/21 14:42

I'm not particularly fond of the KJV translation of Romans 8:1

Romans 8:1 (KJV)

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Almost all of the new versions translate it something like this:

There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus.

The KJV makes justification a matter of works (in this verse) and if that is what is in the Textus Receptus, I have to lean toward the Alexandrian texts.

My opinion

Feel free to disagree without being disagreeable

Re: - posted by mamaluk, on: 2006/9/21 15:16

This issue is indeed a bit of a headache for the English-speaking Christian communities. As much as I love and embrace the KJV, I do believe that God, the Holy Spirit, can use any Bible to teach anything if HE so pleases anytime.

Whenever I fellowship with the Chinese-speaking Christians, I appreciate the simplicity of studying the Chinese Bible without hardly any debates over translation problems. Even though there will still be debates over exegesis.

God can teach us with any version, I believe, but there are times, one does have to speak out against falsity and errors, whether they be translations, interpretations, or doctrines.

Have we forgotten Holy Spirit in all this? - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/9/21 15:50

bro Paul

i'm with you,at the end of the day it is not the text but the Spirit which inspired the text. the believers of old didn't have copies of the scriptures to study for themselves daily, they listened to them and Holy Spirit illuminated the scriptures for them. i use a few different versions and God ministers to me irrespective of which text i use. i think also the testimony of the believers who despite not having a KJV or T.R. derived version of the word on hand still do mighty things for God WITH OUT it speaks to the work of the Spirit of God in this matter. what of us who do have the T.R. derived versions, what have we to show for having the supposedly preserved word of God? isn't it amazing that we are put to shame by people who often times don't have resources like we do in as much as their labours for the kingdom of God? it seems to me we have tapped into every resource except the one which counts, Holy Spirit. it is evident that we neither have much knowledge of nor appreciation for this third member of the Godhead, if we did we'd know that it is by Him that the scriptures are illumined for us. Brethren let us repent of our prides and call out to God that He may send His Holy Spirit upon us afresh!

If nothing else let this be plain to us all, even if one has the T.R. or the very original writings themselves, without God's Holy Spirit to illumine the scriptures, it simply doesn't matter.

Re:, on: 2006/9/21 16:21

Quote:
-----Would someone be so arrogant and pharisaical to tell him he needs to learn English so he can understand the KJV and get the "genuine" Word?

Go back and read my posts. If his Albanian Bible is based on the Textus Receptus, then he has the preserved Word of God. Same for Spanish, French, etc...

At no time did I ever claim the KJV is the perfectly preserved Word of God.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2006/9/21 16:25

TrueWitness... the KJV is merely clarifying that if you are in Christ then you will be walking not after the flesh, but in the Spirit.

Not sure how you've drawn your conclusion on your interpretation of that passage.

Walking not after the flesh is the **result** of being in Christ.

Krispy

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2006/9/21 16:25

Quote:
-----At no time did I ever claim the KJV is the perfectly preserved Word of God.

And at no time did I ever say you did. :-)

My point was that God can anoint and give life through both texts. People have been soundly saved through reading the NIV, CEV, NLT. I had my first encounter with God's Spirit while reading John chapter 10 in the TEV back in 1989. Are you prepared to sharpshoot because of the version's text? I think this is what happens when people get puffed up with knowledge, and are no longer content to rest in the simplicity of Christ and contend for their own walks. Because of the inward emptiness from leaving their first love, they have to now project their biases and become a type of 'theological watchdog

og' and argue over stuff as inconsequential as how much water to use in baptism and which version of the Bible holds the magic key to get them into heaven. Many of those KJV-only websites and fundamental, Bible-based discernment ministries are grievous and completely unctious. Revolting.

I preach, teach and meditate on the KJV (there are a few translations that I disdain), but I also recognize that God uses the other translations as well (yes, even those based on the Alexandrian manuscripts) to soundly save people and feed them. But my choice is the KJV because of its poignancy, its exaltation of the deity of Jesus and its amazing history of God-stamped approval. William Tyndale, to me, should be heralded as the greatest Englishman EVER; Shakespeare and Newton can't hold a candle to his genius. They say he spoke eight languages with native fluidity.

Anyway, these conversations have a tendency to turn ugly real fast. The cause is not which version is God's - the real cause, rather, is pride, and a lack of submission unto the Word, regardless of which translation you subscribe to. The NIV has some very beautiful, powerful passages. I sincerely believe that one can read the NIV all their life, live holy, experience personal revival, see God move, continually abide in the Holy Spirit, have a lasting, weeping burden for souls, and be taken up to glorious heaven when they die - never having opened a page of the KJV or studied the Textus Receptus.

And God won't hold it against them.

Can you dig? 8-)

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2006/9/21 20:36

I have been wondering working on the amount of today's version and New _____ you can put in the bible.

Will they make these new bibles so unreadable I mean with the degradation of language through the influences of television and the media what is going to be the products that are sooner or later going to line are christian bookstore shelves.

The average readership of the Sun in England is for a 12 year old, how illiterate will bible readers get. Sooner or later they will combine the children's section with the adult section of bibles because the readability is so much more easier I would hate to think if it got down that low.

Also when a new translation comes out when people are trying to modernize it, they do not think about the increase in sin in society which has affected the bible but that is not saying that there was sin before. That the English language although modernized I do not disdane making the bible easier to read or translating the bible into a language so that people understand it and cultures can be changed by it. How dumb are we going to get? I have been studying languages and have realised that languages do change but is it not better than rather dumbing down the scriptures that we educate ourselves to understand them. Charles Spurgeon started polytechnics or was influential in learning and education. I am paraphrasing from this book

Charles Spurgeon: The Prince of Preachers (Heroes of the Faith) (Mass Market Paperback)
(<http://www.amazon.co.uk/Charles-Spurgeon-Prince-Preachers-Heroes/dp/1593106254>) Book

Working in a christian bookshop recently it breaks my heart to see a sell on bibles and noone is buying them.

Are country desperately needs the word of god as the church could more likely quote friends than something from the word of god(jesus) and I want to use every waking hour to get the bible out to the masses.

Dom

Re: - posted by Kedric (), on: 2006/9/22 4:48

I too am looking for truth. However, I am very unlikely to accept the KJV as "The only Word of God" for the reasoning given thus far. I would like to ask a couple more questions to those KJV readers.

"Since we both agree there is two different schools of text"
I am aware of 4 different families of text.

"They cant both be the preserved Word of God. It would be like taking two John Grisham books, say The Client and A Time To Kill... and saying that they are the same book. Hey, they have the same author... the story lines both take place in the South... they are the same book!"

I am sorry, but I can't agree with this at all. I have read most of the major differences between the translations. They both tell the same story. This argument doesn't make any sense to me. Please tell me why they both can't be the word of God. Also, what do you mean when you say the word of God? Please explain.

Also, back to what somebody else said earlier. It was mentioned by them that they believed that the Alexandrian texts were skewed by gnostics. However, after looking through the differences between the translations, I do not see the Alexandrian texts favoring gnostic ideology at all. Could you please explain your research in this area further?

Your friend Kedric

Re:, on: 2006/9/22 10:42

Hey Paul... I was saved in a Charismatic Church that used the NIV. It's the Bible I "read" the first 5 years of my Christian life. I said "read" because in retrospect I spent the first 5 years letting people and teachers tell me what the Bible said instead of reading it for myself. Once I began to read it, I rejected most of the doctrines of the Charismatic Movement. As time went on I started hearing about the KJV controversy, and my best friend was a proponent of the KJV. So I spent 2 years reading everything I could on the topic, and from both sides. At the end of the day I emerged with a KJV.

So I absolutely agree that there is truth in the NIV. But I believe it has been tampered with and corrupted. But because of the truth contained in it, people can and are saved by it. But I feel that if we are truly interested in truth, then we all must address this issue.

I'm **not** one of those folks who believes that people who read the NIV are not saved, or in some way 2nd class Christians. Not at all.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2006/9/22 10:45

Kedric... in the interest of time I wont answer your questions today, ok? If you done real study into this issue then you already know the answers anyway. They are basic to the entire issue.

Krispy

Re: - posted by lovegrace, on: 2006/9/22 12:28

PaulWest, wow, I've been deeply blessed by your posts. It very much stretched me spiritually.

Dom, I'm reading that book right now!! About Spuregon. Woo hoo!

Kedric, I know exactly where your coming from. I feel the same way. But when I say exactly what you said. I get the response "If you change the words, you change the meanings. Different words have different meanings and implications." And I still don't think that is a solid enough response.

For example, I telemarket. (Sigh, leaving soon though! Yea!!!) Anywho, we say. "Did you rebottle them?" Or "Did you give them a good quality response back?" rebottle and response are the same thing. Very similar and I don't see a 'major' difference to say, one word is better than the other. The point comes across and that's really all that matters (at least to me)

Krispy, "So I absolutely agree that there is truth in the NIV. But I believe it has been tampered with and corrupted." I totally agree with that!! I used the NIV and with the studies that I did, man o man, the word 'blood' was missing and many of her things untop of that. I'm a NASB man!

Ha. Thanks for the blessings guys!!

Re: - posted by deathdancer (), on: 2006/9/28 16:02

Hi Krispy,.I agree with what you say about the KJV. What a masterpiece.The other versions pale in comparison to this translation. I have found the web site <http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/> very interesting and informative on the KJV issue.I believe one can be saved with the minimal of biblical knowledge .The bible also puts a limit on itself by stating that its purpose is .Â.....All 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, throughly furnished unto all good worksÂ.....

The bible also states that Â...So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.

The points I want to make is that the version you read wont save you, and that the bible has a power of its own irrespective of the talking head quoting it.

However, the integrity of God is at stake as he has promised to preserve his word forever.If he cannot preserve his word then he is a liar and he cannot save mankind.So the question is..has he done this? I believe he has and the KJV in the English language is proof of this.

A kilogram is a kilogram,a pound a pound.We have one ruler,,the KJV bloodline.Why conquer and divide by using other rulers?For the record I do not worship the bible but the God it points me to.There is no knowledge outside the bible.

Greetings

Great Perspective - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/9/28 23:50

Dear Paul,

This is so well stated it bears repeating, and so it is below. Here is another piece that is very helpful; (http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id10811&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) Preface to the King James Version 1611

~~~~~  
Just curious,

What is the "preserved Word of God" to an Albanian believer who doesn't speak a lick of English, and who doesn't know anything save the power and purity of the Word of God from his own Albanian bible?

Would someone be so arrogant and pharisaical to tell him he needs to learn English so he can understand the KJV and get the "genuine" Word? What about the millions of Chinese and Korean believers who have great fellowship and prayer and devotion without the English KJV being read and taught from their pulpits? Indeed, it's not the KJV that counts, but the manuscript from which the Word of God is translated, and the believer's faith which activates it (Hebrews 4:2) and the anointing of the Holy Spirit which illuminates it (John 14:26; I Cor. 2:14).

So, I guess the question now is: If all the Chinese and Mongolian and Punjabi and Abkhasian and Russian Bibles are translated from the same Greek and Hebrew texts the KJV was, would not these Bibles be the "preserved" Word of God as well? Of course! It would be the epitome of ignorance to think otherwise.

Now, as an advanced Russian linguist and one fluent in the intricacies of the modern slang and colloquialisms of the language, I know that there are many Russian words, idioms, phrases, and grammatical concepts that would seem quite foreign and nonsensical in English if translated directly. Most Slavic and Baltic languages have a completely different way of grammatical thinking and many English words and ideas sound utterly foolish when translated verbatim. Yet all these exotic and highly complicated and incompatible-to-English languages have produced native Bibles which, in turn, have pro

duced saved and sanctified believers with remaining fruit, and many of these believing fellowships see moves of God equal to, and if not greater than what we see here in the West with all our empty theology, translation-squabbling and KJV glorying.

Personally, I believe God is so far beyond our translation squabbles; indeed, there is a matter so much more dire at hand! The KJV doesn't need to be deliberated, defended, downsized or demagogued - rather, it needs to be obeyed and lived! The NIV, NLT, NASB and CEV all need to be lived. I believe that through any one of these translations God can bring sweeping revival, if their adherents would only humble themselves and trust and obey what they read.

Brother Paul

*(edit. - I study, read, teach, and preach from the KJV. It is my preference for the Word of God in English. But I also read the Russian New Testament and experience the same majesty, joy and cleansing when I read the words of Jesus Christ in that language.)*

**Re:, on: 2006/9/29 2:16**

Krispy Wrote:

Quote:

-----('I'll be 39 tomorrow!)

Abit belated but hope you had a blessed birthday :-)

**Re: - posted by Kedric (), on: 2006/10/13 7:35**

Hello. I took a look into 1 John 3:6 and thought you would like to see what I found. I found that both the alexandrian and textus receptus have exactly the same Greek. This is my work if you are interested.

1 John 3:6

&#960;&#945;&#962; &#959; &#949;&#957; &#945;&#965;&#964;&#969; &#956;&#949;&#957;&#969;&#957; &#959;&#965;&#967; &#945;&#956;&#945;&#961;&#964;&#945;&#957;&#949;&#953; &#960;&#945;&#962; &#959; &#945;&#956;&#945;&#961;&#964;&#945;&#957;&#969;&#957; &#959;&#965;&#967; &#949;&#969;&#961;&#945;&#954;&#949; &#957; &#945;&#965;&#964;&#959;&#957; &#959;&#965;&#948;&#949; &#949;&#947;&#957;&#969;&#954;&#949;&#957; &#945;&#965;&#964;&#959;&#957;

All/Everyone/whoever - the - in - (to) him - remains/abides/stands - Not - sin (present active passive) - All/Everyone/whoever - the - one who sins (present active Indicative) - not - experience/behold/perceive/see (Perfect active indicative) - Him - nor - know (Perfect active indicative) - him

My translation: Whoever remains in Him does not sin (now): The one who sins (now) has not experienced Him nor knew him.

(In the Greek there is an emphasis on the fact that they have not seen him or known him and the emphasis is showing that it is greatly affecting them now and will continue to affect them in the future.)

After looking at the translation I have found that I have no idea where the NIV gets "keeps on sinning." This is indeed a thought which the authors believed was in the Greek text. I will explain why they would add it.

There are three types of Bible translations

Literal - Word for word (Tries to match straight from the Greek)

Dynamic Equivalent - Thought for thought (Tries to match straight from original message and tries to fix an easier read)

Paraphrase - Not a translation at all (How the authors translates the thoughts and language)

The NIV translation must be a Dynamic Equivalent translation. One in which I should stop using as my primary Bible. I want to use a literal translation that is not worried about the thought of the text but translates straight words from Greek to English.

The list of literal Bible translations that I have found is a sad list of only 9 translations. Some I have never heard of. The list of the more mainstream ones include: King James Version, American Standard Version, New American Standard Bible, New King James Version, and New American Standard Bible.

The NASB translation is the translation that most scholars and most denominations agree is the closest to the literal Greek from what I understand. It is also highly respected because of its great use of some of the oldest Greek manuscripts discovered (most discovered after KJV was published). I am not trying to bash the KJV because I agree that it is a literal translation. I also now know that despite the translation issues, there are some issues that could go deeper.

Those who search for the truth with all of their heart and soul will find it as I will soon find out the Bible translation in which God wants me to use.

I will let you know what I find.

Your friend Kedric

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/13 9:27**

Kedric

Quote:

-----All/Everyone/whoever  $\hat{\alpha}$ - the  $\hat{\alpha}$ - in  $\hat{\alpha}$ - (to) him  $\hat{\alpha}$ - remains/abides/stands  $\hat{\alpha}$ - Not  $\hat{\alpha}$ - sin (present active passive)  $\hat{\alpha}$ -  
-----

I think you must mean that menO is "Present, Active, Participle". It could not, of course, be active and passive at the same time. It is the switching between the indicative and the participle which has caused the NIV to try to make its point. I am not saying they do it well but a comparison of other translations will show how they have tried to convey the truth of this verse; (<http://www.blueletterbible.org/cgi-bin/versions.pl?book1Jo&chapter3&verse6&versionKJV#6>) 1 John 3:16

The participle is often used to convey the sense of something which is characteristic. eg John 3:16 refers not to one who 'believed' as a crises event but one who is a 'believing one'. This is achieved in John 3:16 by the use of the definite article with the present participle of the verb. 1 John 3:6 has a combination of present indicative and present participles (and two perfects). If you drift the cursor over the Greek words in (<http://www.zhubert.com/bible?sourcegreek&verseref1John+3%3A6>) 1John 3:6 you will see, in particular the switch from the present indicative to the present participle of the verb harmartano - to sin. (this is a great site, btw, for folks dipping in to Greek although it does use the Nestle Alland text.)

So what is the significance of this construction? The more literal equivalence version would be something like: 'the abiding one' (participle: whose characteristic is that he 'abides') in Him, sins (indicative) not. (In other words the one who is habitually abiding in Him sins not.) 'the sinning one' (present participle) has not seen him, nor known him. (seen and known are both in the Perfect tense).

The Greek Present Indicative is more akin to our present continuous tense so the NIV has tried to convey that. I have put it, above, into a simple present form.

As regards Literal Equivalence and Dynamic Equivalence, no translation is 'either/or' of these positions. It is just that some translations are 'more' Literal Equivalence and some are 'more' Dynamic Equivalence.

The sense of 1 John 3:6 is... someone who is habitually abiding in Christ is not going to sin, whereas someone who is habitually sinning has neither seen nor known Christ. An individual cannot be characterised by 'abiding in Him' and 'sinning' at the same time; these two habitual or characteristic conditions are mutually exclusive.

**Re:, on: 2006/10/13 10:00**

Who can understand all that academia or needs to if their heart is set on God. Is not the context of His word sufficient to explain the broad picture of His desires for union with Himself? Any sincere for Him will readily see that the word abide connotes a continual action that will bring intimacy with Him. No one need to have to jump thru the hoops of participate indicators for understanding. All of that way will produce nothing more than "Academia nuts".

Orm

:-{

**Re:, on: 2006/10/13 10:27**

Ormy... it is a question of truth. What is the truth? What is God's Word? Ultimately... the question is... what is our Final Authority?

Krispy

**Re: Great Perspective, on: 2006/10/13 10:28**

Quote:  
-----What is the "preserved Word of God" to an Albanian believer who doesn't speak a lick of English, and who doesn't know anything save the power and purity of the Word of God from his own Albanian bible?  
-----

I answered that question in a thread I started the other day... here's the link:

[http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id=12785&forum=35#99115](http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=12785&forum=35#99115)

Read My original post on that thread.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2006/10/13 10:29**

Quote:  
-----After looking at the translation I have found that I have no idea where the NIV gets "keeps on sinning." This is indeed a thought which the authors believed was in the Greek text. I will explain why they would add it.  
-----

That's just good ol reformed thinking seeking to persuade the unlearned.. Obviously if the one keeps on sinning he was never saved, saved being made to be the new birth experience.

All translations should be viewed with the critical eye of objectivity. KJV still stands alone in being the most objective regardless of it's detractors from the academic field of higher learning.

Orm

**General Topics :: Translations of the Bible**

**Re:, on: 2006/10/13 10:38**

I, for one, think that a literal translation is the best. If the Holy Spirit is our teacher, let Him teach.

At least the translators of the KJV were honest enough to put the words that needed to be added in order to translate from Hebrew/Greek to English in italics. They did this so we would know that that particular word was not in the original language.

You don't get that in any modern version, yet many words were added in order to render a meaning. The Living Bible being one of the worst offenders.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2006/10/13 10:45**

Quote:  
-----

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Orly... it is a question of truth. What is the truth? What is God's Word? Ultimately... the question is... what is our Final Authority?

Krispy  
-----

Who can understand the truth from that which is being presented as such? I'm not implying that it isn't the truth however, truth becomes opinion when reduced to the academic level, mine as opposed to yours. Therefore, truth lies with relationship in/with Jesus Christ. He makes the difference between my head knowledge and my heart actually knowing from the desire to know Him. Take a closer look at 1 John 3.16 in that light.

John 14:26 (KJV)

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.....And that from a hunger to know.

:)

**Re:, on: 2006/10/13 10:51**

Quote:  
-----

KrispyKrittr wrote:

I, for one, think that a literal translation is the best. If the Holy Spirit is our teacher, let Him teach.

At least the translators of the KJV were honest enough to put the words that needed to be added in order to translate from Hebrew/Greek to English in italics. They did this so we would know that that particular word was not in the original language.

You don't get that in any modern version, yet many words were added in order to render a meaning. The Living Bible being one of the worst offenders.

Krispy  
-----

Speaking in general, the KJV may contain several truths contained in a particular passage, most of which are selectively left out of the modern trans. I have found this to be so many times, when comparing them, concluding them to be slanted towards an agenda.

Orm

Re:, on: 2006/10/13 14:56

**2Ti 3:16-17** *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.*

Let's all remember that if we do not have the truth, the preserved Word of God available to us today... it is impossible for this verse to be true for us in this age. Without the true Word of God how do we know what is sound doctrine? How do we reproof? How do we correct? How do we give instruction in righteousness? How can the man of God be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works?

Since God spoke those words, and inspired Paul to write them down, and intended for it to be true and **eternal**... I have to believe that means He has preserved His Word.

If He hasn't... and we've ended up with confusion as to what school of manuscripts are correct... and a possibility that neither of them are correct... then we serve a God with whom **not** all things are possible.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2006/10/13 15:16

Quote:

-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:

**2Ti 3:16-17** *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.*

Let's all remember that if we do not have the truth, the preserved Word of God available to us today... it is impossible for this verse to be true for us in this age. Without the true Word of God how do we know what is sound doctrine? How do we reproof? How do we correct? How do we give instruction in righteousness? How can the man of God be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works?

Since God spoke those words, and inspired Paul to write them down, and intended for it to be true and **eternal**... I have to believe that means He has preserved His Word.

If He hasn't... and we've ended up with confusion as to what school of manuscripts are correct... and a possibility that neither of them are correct... then we serve a God with whom **not** all things are possible.

Krispy

-----  
Read the verse again... It is directed toward to "man of God". How did he become so and won't he know the truth that is perfecting him? Answer that correctly and you will have your answer. ;-)

Re:, on: 2006/10/16 7:17

Are you assigning the term "man of God" to "clergy"... because I don't believe that's the case. I believe that applies to every believer... unless I don't understand your post? Can you clarify what you're getting at?

It's early on Monday morning, and I haven't had any coffee yet... I'm completely capable of not understanding yet! LOL

Krispy

Re:, on: 2006/10/16 7:40

Quote:

-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:

Are you assigning the term "man of God" to "clergy"... because I don't believe that's the case. I believe that applies to every believer... unless I don't understand your post? Can you clarify what you're getting at?

It's early on Monday morning, and I haven't had any coffee yet... I'm completely capable of not understanding yet! LOL

Krispy

I'm with you in believing the man of God is not necessarily clergy but simply one/those in whom the Spirit of the Lord has access; one/those who is/are in the process of becoming son's.. That alone would eliminate most and alot of clergy.

As for coffee --- my electric pot just hollered, "It's ready". Hope your day is profitable in Him.

Orm :-D

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/19 8:31**

Quote:  
-----Who can understand all that academia or needs to if their heart is set on God. Is not the context of His word sufficient to explain the broad picture of His desires for union with Himself? Any sincere for Him will readily see that the word abide connotes a continual action that will bring intimacy with Him. No one need to have to jump thru the hoops of participle indicatives for understanding. All of that way will produce nothing more than "Academia nuts".  
-----

&#959;&#965; &#948;&#965;&#957;&#945;&#964;&#945;&#953; &#948;&#949; &#959;&#966;&#952;&#945;&#955;&#956;&#959;&#962; &#949;&#953;&#960;&#949;&#953;&#957; &#964;&#951; &#967;&#949;&#953;&#961;&#953; &#935;&#961;&#949;&#953;&#945;&#957; &#963;&#959;&#965; &#959;&#965;&#954; &#949;&#967;&#969;Â &#951; &#960;&#945;&#955;&#953;&#957; &#951; &#954;&#949;&#966;&#945;&#955;&#951; &#964;&#959;&#953;&#962; &#960;&#959;&#963;&#953; &#935;&#961;&#949;&#953;&#945;&#957; &#965;&#956;&#969;&#957; &#959;&#965;&#954; &#949;&#967;&#969;.

...which is a way of saying, if some godly men had not used their linguistic abilities your New Testament would still be in Greek. :-)