



**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why KJV Only?**

**Why KJV Only? - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/4/12 15:09**

I know there are some on here that are KJV only, could you please explain why? I'm not wanting to debate I just want to know your reasons.

Thanks!

Jordan

**Re: Why KJV Only?, on: 2007/4/12 15:27**

You might find this thread interesting, Jordan.

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic\\_id12785&forum35&start110&viewmodefplat&order1](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id12785&forum35&start110&viewmodefplat&order1)) Call me King James only, but only if.... I really liked the article by David Cloud.

As to why I am KJV only...because I think it's the best translation of the Textus Receptus that is available.

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/4/12 15:32**

Thanks, looks like I'll have to have some time on my hands to read that thread through. :-P

Jordan

**Re:, on: 2007/4/12 16:27**

I agree with Roniya, I think the thread that is linked to Roniya's post is probably the best thread on here for explaining our position. I'm not just saying that because I started the thread, but because it was actually a very civil discussion about the topic... which is rare.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/4/12 16:30**

Quote:

-----

KrispyKrittr wrote:

I agree with Roniya, I think the thread that is linked to Roniya's post is probably the best thread on here for explaining our position. I'm not just saying that because I started the thread, but because it was actually a very civil discussion about the topic... which is rare.

Krispy

-----

Krispy,

I hope everything is burning well over there. ;-)

Would you say that article is the normal stance of a "KJV only" person? Isn't that more of a "TR Only" position?

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/12 16:39**

Krispy,

I have read the other posts but I am still confused on some terminology. Are you KJV-only or KJV preferred?

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/12 16:49**

Some more reading if anyone is interested:

Why I Do Not Think the King James Bible Is the Best Translation Available Today

By:

Daniel B. Wallace , Th.M., Ph.D.

[http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page\\_id=665](http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=665)

**Re: Why KJV Only? - posted by nadine, on: 2007/4/12 17:05**

Here's a thought concerning the King James (version)...

When listening to revival testimonies, what version of the Bible do the witnesses quote when referring to scripture?

I always hear the King James. That is just something to think about. But one thing is for sure...any version that leaves a ny reference to the BLOOD of Jesus Christ out is NO GOOD.

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/12 19:00**

Quote:

-----any version that leaves any reference to the BLOOD of Jesus Christ out is NO GOOD.  
-----

I agree...can you provide any examples?

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/4/12 19:04**

Here's were I'm coming from... I've had people tell me that the text that the KJV came from is the original text so that ma kes it better then the other translations, but we don't have the original text. I'm against the translations like the NIV and T NIV, but I think ESV is a valid translation.

Thank you all for the info you have given, it has been helpful to hear from people who prefer the KJV.

This is something that keeps coming to my mind occasionally and I was just wondering about the reasoning behind it.

Jordan

**Re: Why KJV Only?, on: 2007/4/12 21:01**

Quote:

-----could you please explain why?  
-----

Jordon, I started out reading the "Living Bible" when I was about 15 years old. When I was 19 the LORD led me to the K JV, when I began to read it, I felt that it had more authority than the one that I was reading, so I discarded the Living Bibl e.

The Living Bible served it's purpose, it was a starting point, but the wording in the KJV made the text come alive. I can't

explain it any other way.

I've tried reading other versions such as the NIV, LAMSA, ASV, but there is such a removal of important data that it literally strips away the dignity and authority of the word of God.

Remember that a great part of the New Testament was translated by a man named William Tyndale, he was martyred for just translating the New Testament into English. The New Testament of the KJV has most of his translations, so when you read it you are reading from a man who gave his life that you and I can have our own bible to read.

That's what the King James Version means to me.

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/12 21:06**

Quote:

-----but I think ESV is a valid translation.  
-----

Don't let anyone tell you different.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2007/4/12 21:30**

Hi Compliments...

Quote:

-----...other versions such as the NIV...but there is such a removal of important data that it literally strips away the dignity and authority of the word of God.  
-----

I heartily disagree! I prefer to study with the KJV, but it isn't because I believe that it is a "superior" translation from the NIV (1978). I've studied the issue with great diligence and concluded that the KJV is a great translation from the Textus Receptus and the NIV is a great translation using the other sources. Nothing was "removed" or "stripped away." It was simply translated from an entirely different set of ancient sources.

However, as Krispy suggested, there is another thread (actually, MANY threads) that already delves within this issue!

:)

**Re: - posted by Jacob19, on: 2007/4/13 0:26**

I know this has been said a million times but for people that use anything but KJV or NKJV (translations from the TR) where is Matthew 18:11?

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/4/13 2:28**

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

I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. (Gal 2:20 ESV)

Very subtle.

Changing the faith of the Son of God that now lives in me, to my faith in the Son of God by which I live in Him, instead of His Faith in me by which I now have faith in Him. Not my faith, but His Faith making my faith as His.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: King James Only...Only if... - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/4/13 3:06**

Quote:  
-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:  
I agree with Roniya, I think the thread that is linked to Roniya's post is probably the best thread on here for explaining our position. I'm not just saying that because I started the thread, but because it was actually a very civil discussion about the topic... which is rare.  
  
Krispy  
-----

Thank you for finding that article - it is strange to find one's reason's for why one thinks a certain way laid out so clearly.  
  
Keep on crackling,  
  
Forrest

**Re: Why KJV Only? - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/4/13 3:28**

Quote:  
-----  
HomeFree89 wrote:  
I know there are some on here that are KJV only, could you please explain why? I'm not wanting to debate I just want to know your reasons.  
  
Thanks!  
  
Jordan  
-----

Jordan,

Many people have great translation issues that tend them to the KJV or NKJV. Since there are deliberate errors in the Hebrew Masoretic text, particularly in the Hebraic rewrite somewhere between 800ad to 1100ad, I can't claim it is the most perfect translation into English.

I would love to read the Old Testament in Greek and Aramaic, to use the Scriptures that Jesus used, but I am not good with languages.

Much of what I love about the King James is that it, when written, was so lovingly and carefully translated from what manuscripts were available. The English used is the English of Shakespeare, adding to the beauty of the verses.

Also, so much care was used by the translators to make the translations accurate, yet poetic.

The men involved in what I call the King James Project date back to England breaking away from the Roman Catholic Church, yet clinging to the Latin and Greek texts they had by the Catholics that very little was changed, or misinterpreted.

Indeed, the first inclination of the translators of the KJV was to adhere to what they knew so clearly in the languages they had through the Catholic Church. They were throwing out the Pope, not the literature.

Most of all, I love the KJV for the men who died to get it written, and into the hands of the 'little people', who read good, old fashioned English, and wanted, with a depth of desire lost to us in our generation, to simply be able to read the Bible.

God knows how to look after His own Word, so that the errors that are in the KJV are honestly done, and in no way compromise the Word in the translation from the original languages. The gospel is plainly set out, yet in beautiful language.

I have over 20 different versions of the Bible, and yet always I come back to the KJV, for the loving care and reverence that

hat permeates the translation of the KJV must be returned with equal love and reverence.

Blessings,

Forrest

**Re: KJV - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/4/13 3:33**

Quote:

-----  
JaySaved wrote:  
Krispy,

I have read the other posts but I am still confused on some terminology. Are you KJV-only or KJV preferred?  
-----

Jaysaved,

Read the article Krispy found for us by clicking on the link in Roniya's post.

It's neither KJV only nor KJV preferred...It's a variable option under the right conditions.

Blessings,

Forrest

**Re: Translation KJV - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/4/13 3:46**

Quote:

-----  
Christinyou wrote:

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

I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. (Gal 2:20 ESV)

Very subtle.

Changing the faith of the Son of God that now lives in me, to my faith in the Son of God by which I live in Him, instead of His Faith in me by which I now have faith in Him. Not my faith, but His Faith making my faith as His.

In Christ: Phillip  
-----

Wow!

Very subtle indeed.

If it were my faith, instead of His, I wouldn't be headed for heaven, for I cannot rely on myself. I know me too well.

Thanks for pointing this out.

Forrest

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 9:01**

Someone commented that it sounds as tho I am more TR-Only than KJV-Only. I suppose that would be correct. I am KJV-Only in the sense that I believe the KJV is the superior translation of the preserved Word of God. I do not believe that the text that the modern versions is based on is God's preserved Word of God.

However, I am in favor of a possible update of the KJV, updating words that we simply don't use anymore. I am **not** in favor of removing the "Thee's" and "Thou's" and "Ye's" because they mean something grammatically. They are **not** simply there because that's how they talked in the 1600's.

I have a William Tyndale Bible that actually is the foundation of the KJV NT ...up almost 80% of the KJV. I love it, and at times refer to it.

There are many who believe the KJV is Holy Spirit inspired, and actually corrects the Greek. I don't believe that. What I believe is laid out clearly in the other thread that was linked in this one.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 9:07**

Quote:  
-----I know this has been said a million times but for people that use anything but KJV or NKJV (translations from the TR) where is Matthew 18:11?  
-----

It is in Luke 19:10, "For the Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost."  
What we have here is that the early manuscripts do not have this sentence in Matthew. The modern translations did not include it because it isn't there. Apparently, a scribe inserted it when copying and it has been included. Now, what you want me to believe is that there is a conspiracy in the newer translations to remove the reference to Jesus coming to 'seek and save the lost'. BUT, if this was the case...why not remove it from Luke as well?

Christinyou wrote:

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

I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. (Gal 2:20 ESV)

Very subtle.

Changing the faith of the Son of God that now lives in me, to my faith in the Son of God by which I live in Him, instead of His Faith in me by which I now have faith in Him. Not my faith, but His Faith making my faith as His.

In Christ: Phillip  
-----

UWR wrote:

Quote:  
-----Wow!

Very subtle indeed.

If it were my faith, instead of His, I wouldn't be headed for heaven, for I cannot rely on myself. I know me too well.

Thanks for pointing this out.

Forrest  
-----

Ron (Philologos) has already spoken about this verse

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id14639&forum36&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id14639&forum36&post_id&refreshGo)) here. There is no conspiracy in the newer versions. I am including what he wrote.

Ἐγὼ νῦν ἐν σαρκὶ ζῶ καὶ ἐν πίστει ζῶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἐκ οὐρανοῦ ἐκτεθειμένου, (Gal 2:20 GNT-TRS)

The literal translation of this phrase would be something like in/by faith I live the of the Son of the God so its one of those places where an interlinear struggles to get to the real meaning. Let's unpack it

Ἐγὼ νῦν ἐν σαρκὶ ζῶ καὶ ἐν πίστει ζῶ. This would give something like 'I live by faith'. The Greek preposition 'en' means 'in' or 'within' but it is sometimes used 'instrumentally' (bet you wished you hadn't asked now!) When Biblical Greek want to say 'kill with the sword' it would use 'en' in the sense of 'by the sword'; the sword being the 'instrument' of the killing. We have to take note of the context to see which is most appropriate. In this instance my judgement would be that it means 'by faith'. It should be noted that there is no definite article here and those Cambridge Bibles that we have been hearing about should have put the word 'the' into italics so that it read "I now live in the flesh I live in faith" (Gal 2:20 KJVS) More modern versions have sometimes corrected this eg

"I now live in the flesh I live in faith" (Gal 2:20 ASV)

"I live by faith" (Gal 2:20 NKJV)

So it is not 'the faith' of the Son of God but 'faith'.

Next we have the bit ἡ πίστις; ἡ πίστις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἐκ οὐρανοῦ ἐκτεθειμένου; where

ἡ πίστις; is 'the definite article' and is Dative, Singular, Feminine. It is referring backwards to the feminine gender word 'faith'. I think it could best be translated as 'that'. So that the sentence now reads "I live by faith, that (faith)"

ὁ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ; is the definite article and is Genitive, Singular, Masculine followed by the word 'son'. This is the Greek way of saying 'belonging to the son'.

τοῦ Θεοῦ; the definite article and is Genitive, Singular, Masculine followed by the word 'God'. This is the Greek way of saying 'belonging to God'.

So we have a reference to God's Son's faith. The question then is does this mean 'faith in him' or 'faith from him'? I think it means the kind of faith that he had, which was the faith of a son. In Roman's Paul refers to Abraham's faith

"And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised." (Rom 4:12 KJVS)

Again the word 'faith' is without the definite article. It is literally 'in the steps of our father Abraham's faith'; this is the same kind of construction as Galatians 2:20.

It is referring to 'Abrahamic faith', the kind of faith that Abraham had; we sometimes call this 'justifying faith'. Jews had to have both circumcision AND Abrahamic faith. The point I am making is that Abraham did not give them this faith, it was faith like Abraham's. If we carry through this idea of a 'kind of faith' into Galatians it seems that Paul is referring to the 'kind of faith' that the Son had. This would be significant because Paul later goes on to point out that 'faith' has now arrived (Gal 3:25) and is part of the way in which we become 'sons' of God, God giving us the Spirit of his Son.

John Wesley was questioned about his claims that before his 'warm heart' experience he did not have 'faith'. His questioners reminded him that he was Anglican priest and had been a missionary to the American colonies. His answer was that the faith he had then was the faith of a slave not that of a son.

I don't think Galatians 2:20 is talking about Christ's own personal faith being given to us, but of Paul's experience of a Son-like faith. Slaves obeyed God because they had to; sons because they chose to. Slaves were kept in check by a law; sons walk in the Spirit. Personally I would rather take both broad interpretations than an either/or choice. This is Christ

stwards and Sonlike faith, but it is not, I think, Christ's faith instead of Paul's faith.

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/4/13 10:57**

I have a copy of the KJV that I read personally. (3 copies: nelson reference, cambridge concord reference, cambridge pitt minion)

I have a copy of the NIV that I use in church. (4 copies: zondervan study, life application, thinline and cambridge pitt minion)

I have a copy of the NASB that I use when preparing to teach sunday school or for deeper studies. (cambridge pitt minion)

I also have copies of NKJV, The Living Bible and The Message (which I recieved as a raffle prize) that rest on my shelf.

Frankly I'd love to learn greek and hebrew and throw all my bibles away... I just realized I have a lot of bibles.

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 11:04**

Quote:  
-----The modern translations did not include it because it isn't there. Apparently, a scribe inserted it when copying and it has been included.  
-----

Thats conjecture.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 11:07**

Quote:  
-----Frankly I'd love to learn greek and hebrew and throw all my bibles away...  
-----

Well, Ian... praise the Lord He preserved His Word for us in English so that we all wouldnt have to learn Greek and Hebrew. He is truly a faithful God, isnt He?

Now all you have to do is decide which one is right. I tell you, if you do an **honest** comparison between the NIV and the KJV you can only come to one of two conclusions: either one is correct and the other wrong, or they are both wrong... but they cant both be right.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 11:38**

I wrote:

Quote:  
-----The modern translations did not include it because it isn't there. Apparently, a scribe inserted it when copying and it has been included.  
-----

Krispy wrote:

Quote:  
-----Thats conjecture.  
-----

If that is conjecture then please be intellectually honest enough to say that the 'conspiracy' to downgrade or eliminate certain doctrines in the newer translations is conjecture as well.

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 11:55**

Using the logic of Krispy and others we see a problem with the KJV as follows:

1. The KJV downgrades the Deity of Jesus.

John 1:18, KJV, says:

“No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.  
”

But the NRSV reads:

No one has ever seen God. It is God the only Son, who is close to the Father's heart, who has made him known.

2. The KJV does not tell us that we can pray to Jesus

John 14:14 NASB reads:

“If you ask Me anything in My name, I will do it.”

But look at the KJV:

“If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.”

3. Another instance of the KJV downgrading the Deity of Jesus

Compare the KJV at Rev. 1:8:

I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

But the NASB:

"I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, "who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty."

4. The KJV downgrades the adoption we have as sons

1 John 3:1 NASB:

“See how great a love the Father has bestowed on us, that we would be called children of God; and such we are.”

But Look at the KJV!

“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God:”

According to the logic presented by Krispy and others, we should all avoid the KJV because it downgrades or eliminates certain fundamental doctrines of the faith.

Now, I am having a little fun here, but I hope I have made a point. It is easy to cry conspiracy over certain translations but in fact there is no conspiracy at all. The KJV, NASB, NIV, ESV are all great translations, but are simply that...translations. There are certain variations over the years in the manuscripts but the fact that so many manuscripts in so many different parts of the world over so many years agree to such an amazing degree, proves that what we have is the inspired and preserved word of God.

Note: Information taken from KJV Only powerpoint slide by James White.

Re: - posted by cchhhrrriiss (), on: 2007/4/13 12:03

Hi Krispy...

Quote:  
-----Now all you have to do is decide which one is right. I tell you, if you do an **honest** comparison between the NIV and the KJV you can only come to one of two conclusions: either one is correct and the other wrong, or they are both wrong... but they cant both be right.  
-----

I disagree. Both the KJV and the NIV are taken from sources that were taken from sources that were also probably taken from sources (etc...). Somewhere along the line, either one or both mistranslated or added/deleted words, phrases and/or sentences. Translation from one language into another is a very difficult process. For instance, there are several translations of *Don Quixote* available in English -- yet these translations do not always say exactly the same thing. We are not talking about the possibility of examining one completely original work (such as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*) against the various editions translated into Spanish. We are talking about translations that were poured into many different languages by flawed (but well meaning) men who relied upon translations that were taken from other sources. Thus in my opinion, it is unwise to state that only one is absolutely "right" or both are absolutely wrong. It is possible that both of them (and their sources) were grammatically flawed in one way or another.

Does God have the power to "preserve" His Word? Of course! But does it mean that one particular translation or set of sources is absolutely perfect compared with another? Not necessarily.

There is a famous painting called "*The Last Supper*" by Leonardo da Vinci. However, did you know that EVERY copy of this painting is incorrect? The painting, finished in 1498, faded, peeled and deteriorated. There are remnants of the painting left, but even some of that was painted over in attempts to preserve the original. No one knows for sure which copy best depicts the original. However, most of them present a nearly accurate view of the work.

While the Word of God is far more important than the mere work of a man, we must remember that the individuals who attempted to "preserve" the Word are unknown. What is the lineage of the Textus Receptus? No one knows for sure. What is the lineage of the older Alexandrian manuscripts? No one really knows for sure. What is the lineage of the Dead Sea Scrolls? We aren't even sure of that! We must be very careful about what we consider perfect and what we consider mortally flawed. I often worry in these discussions that individuals (including myself) might be in danger of "bearing false witness" against what might in fact be the very Words of God.

We know that the KJV was revised at least five times over a period of 350 years. The NIV was also revised during the translation process and before its publication. Does the fact that there might be imperfections in the KJV or NIV take away the power of Christ to bring LIFE through these translations of men? I don't think so. The power is with God's Word -- and not the translations or script of His Word by men.

Like I have said before, I rely mostly upon the KJV when studying. It isn't because I am CERTAIN that it is better or more accurate than the NIV, but because of the plethora of sources available. I feel that it is a faithful translation of the Textus Receptus. On the other hand, I also consult the NIV (1978) because I feel that it is probably the most faithful translation of the other sources.

I know that Krispy and I share a much more similar view on this issue than it might seem. However, I simply feel that it is time to not speak with absolutes about an issue that is not absolutely clear. Honest and well-meaning individuals have arrived at different conclusions, and many of their arguments are worth noting.

:-)

Re: - posted by nadine, on: 2007/4/13 12:24

JaySaved:

Quote:  
-----I agree...can you provide any examples?  
-----

Versions that leave the blood of Jesus out:

Variations of Revelation 1:5

"and from Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, the firstborn Son who was raised from death, who is also the ruler of the kin

gs of the earth. He loves us, and by his death he has freed us from our sins" -Good News for Modern Man

"and from Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, the first to be raised from death and who is also the ruler of the kings of the world. He loves us, and by his sacrificial death he has freed us from our sins" -Today's English Version

Now for the accurate version:

"And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood," King James

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 13:09**

Quote:  
-----If that is conjecture then please be intellectually honest enough to say that the 'conspiracy' to downgrade or eliminate certain doctrines in the newer translations is conjecture as well.  
-----

I'm not of the opinion that it was a conspiracy of humans... but I will say that I believe it was a demonic conspiracy. What else could it be?

If you know anything of the history of Wescott and Hort and how their greek translation was introduced to the translators of the Revised Version of 1881, you cant mistake that on their behalf (W&H) there was indeed deception involved (i.e. conspiracy).

I greatly respect philologos... however on this fine point he and I may disagree.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 13:10**

nadine,

Do you like CEV, NASB, NLT, and ESV? They "leave in the blood".

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 13:11**

Quote:  
-----but I will say that I believe it was a demonic conspiracy  
-----

If I may quote a man that I respect greatly..."Thats conjecture."

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 13:12**

Quote:  
-----Using the logic of Krispy and others we see a problem with the KJV as follows:  
-----

... Jay, brother... get a little more educated in this issue. Not so that you'll agree with me, but so that you may understand the issues. I'm convinced you really dont understand the root issues of this topic.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 13:17**

Quote:  
-----If I may quote a man that I respect greatly..."Thats conjecture."  
-----

LOL... I agree. Altho it may be fact, I cant prove it conclusively, so at the end of the day it is my opinion.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 13:19**

Quote:  
-----Does God have the power to "preserve" His Word? Of course! But does it mean that one particular translation or set of sources is a  
bsolutely perfect compared with another? Not necessarily.  
-----

So you're saying God didnt preserve His Word... He either preserved it in tact, or He didnt perserve it at all. But He prom  
ised He would, so He did. Thats the God I serve.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 13:19**

Quote:  
-----... Jay, brother... get a little more educated in this issue.  
-----

Krispy, educate me on this issue by responding to that last post. I feel you will see that I took the same logic you use ag  
ainst the modern translation, applied it to the KJV to show you how ridiculous it really is.

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/4/13 13:21**

I like KJV because it sounds pretty.

**Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/4/13 13:24**

while we Christians will probably debate this issue of bible translations to the very end, the only thing that bothers me is  
what i should tell people is the word of God? an example is, what do i say to a Muslim who wonders what bible he shoul  
d read? because they are all different? this is what is the problem to me, what do i tell the unsaved? we have different bi  
ble versions and they say different things, witch one is the Word of God?

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/4/13 13:29**

hmmhmm,

The good thing about most bibles is that while about 3-5% of scriptures have subtle differences between translations, th  
e other 95-98% is virtually the same... surely Jesus can work through any just about any bible.

There are some absolute heathens who only read the KJV (the church of england would be a good reference point) and  
some completely sold out and on-fire people reading the NIV, Living Bible and The Message (although i don't necessaril  
y like the latter).

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 13:33

Quote:  
-----So you're saying God didnt preserve His Word... He either preserved it in tact, or He didnt perserve it at all. But He promised He would, so He did. Thats the God I serve.  
-----

This is a very good point that needs to be addressed. I believe that God did preserve His word, but not like some of us believe.

For example, let's use a courtroom situation. Suppose we have a man on trial for stealing a Ham sandwich (it could happen!). You are all on the jury and we have four witnesses.

The first witness says:

"I saw this man come into the store wearing a black baseball cap. He took the sandwich and ran away."

The second witness says:

"I was outside the store when I saw a man leave the store with a sandwich in his hand. He seemed nervous and in a great hurry to get away."

The third witness says:

"I saw a man in a white T-shirt grab the sandwich and say 'Nobody will stop me!' After he said those words I hid behind a table."

The fourth witness says:

"I saw a white man in his mid 30s quickly run into the store and take a bite out of a sandwich on the counter. He got into an argument with a worker and shouted something at the worker. As he was running away, he pushed me down and I hurt my leg."

Now, we have four witnesses who all speak of the same event...in different ways from different perspectives. Are all of them telling the truth? Yes. Do all of them agree? Yes. Do all of them say the exact same thing? No. Does this negate their stories? No, if anything it enhances them.

"This is a good point for the Gospels but it can also be used for the manuscripts we have (that we know about). They agree with one another to an amazing degree. What is remarkable is that no one or organization in the history of the world has ever had all copies. Therefore we know that no one has changed anything that has passed our inspection. We can rest assured that even though the manuscripts do not all agree word for word, we have the preserved word of God.

Re:, on: 2007/4/13 13:39

There is a difference between perspectives (Matt, Mark, Luke & John) and what we see between versions. There is harmony between the four gospels, yet they bring out a different perspective without contradiction. This is not true for versions... and therein lies the flaw in your reasoning.

I'm gonna bow out of this as I have said everything over and over and over and over again on this site... and I don't reckon I have anything new to add, and I certainly haven't changed my position.

Not trying to question your motives, Jay, but after reviewing another thread that you started which concerns how different versions render a particular verse, I am getting the feeling that your goal is to shoot holes in the KJV. Correct me if I'm wrong, but that's the impression I get.

The original poster of this thread was asking a legit question, which I love to answer when it's asked in honesty. But your intent here is to engage me in a debate about something which you've made your mind up about already. I'm finding the debate to be a tad boring. I don't mind answering folks who really want to learn, but I grow tired of the endless debate when there is no clear end to it.

On to better things...

Krispy

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 13:51**

Krispy, please do not bow out yet. Here is an example of what I wrote about earlier:

Luke 24:53

English Standard Version (ESV)

"and were continually in the temple blessing God."

King James Version (KJV)

"And were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God. Amen."

New International Version (NIV)

"And they stayed continually at the temple, praising God."

New American Standard Bible (NASB)

"and were continually in the temple praising God.

What were they doing? Were they praising God? Were they blessing God? Were they praising and blessing God?

The truth is that one set of manuscripts says that they were blessing God and another set of manuscripts says they were praising God. Another set of manuscripts says they were praising and blessing God.

Which is right? We don't know. Does this inconsistency mean that God did not preserve His word? Of course not! Whether they were praising, blessing or both the truth behind the words is still intact...preserved by God throughout the many ages.

Praise His glorious name. I hope this is as insightful to you and it was to me when I first heard it.

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 14:05**

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

One of my favorite verses in the Bible. It's completely gone from the NIV, and other versions that are more direct translations of the Alexandrian Text. Why? Because it's completely gone from the Alexandrian Text. In those versions that don't remove it, there is footnote saying that it isn't in the most "older and more reliable" texts (which are neither).

But it's right there in the TR, and every English Bible translated from it.

This isn't a different reading... or perspective. It's in one, and not in the other. And it is a doctrinal difference. It shows a confession of Christ as Son of God for salvation. It shows that this confession of Christ needs to happen before Baptism. It confirms that the Ethiopian was saved, and understood what Philip explained to him... and shows that Baptism happened after his confession.

Remove that verse, and it's all gone.

I don't remember off the top of my head which early church father it was who wrote about Philip and the Ethiopian, but his verse showed up in writings very very early. Earlier than KJV critics say it was added by some scribe.

This is a strong doctrinal verse for salvation and baptism... and isn't it odd that it's removed in the Alexandrian Text? They didn't remove "Jesus wept", or something insignificant... it was *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*

And that's just one example out of **hundreds** like it. And almost all the differences have to do with major doctrines. That's no coincidence.

If you want an iron clad, doctrinal Bible... the KJV is the strongest one available.

Now... I'm done. I simply don't have time right now to go tit-for-tat on this. :-)

Please don't take that personally, Jay. You know I like ya just fine, brutha.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2007/4/13 14:06**

Hi Krispy...

Quote:  
-----So you're saying God didn't preserve His Word... He either preserved it in tact, or He didn't preserve it at all. But He promised He would, so He did. That's the God I serve.  
-----

Herewith lies the problem (as I see it). Neither the *King James Version* (nor any of its five revisions) NOR the *Textus Receptus* is the "preserved Word of God." The fact that there were at least five revisions shows that either God didn't have the power to perfectly preserve the manuscript -- or it is not the supposed "promised preserved Word."

It is my opinion that the "preservation" of the Word of God deals more with the *RHEMA* rather than a translated manuscript of the *LOGOS*. The Word of God (which is Christ) has been preserved for us forever -- even if the translations of flawed men sometimes disagree or are found to contain flaws.

This is the "Word" that I serve! (wow -- it rhymes!)

:-)

p.s. - Gotta run! I am defending a portion of my doctoral dissertation in about two hours. I need to prepare my powerpoint slides! Please remember me in your prayers!

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 14:37**

Hmmm... seems I remember something about jots and tittles not passing from what is written until heaven and earth pass away. (That's forever, for those who were wondering)

Sounds like preservation to me. There are also other passages of scripture that talk about God's Word lasting forever.

Sooo... basically, I don't agree.

Hey... may God be with you as you defend a portion of your doctoral dissertation! Let me know how it goes! (You're making this ol' mountain boy feel inadequate!)

Krispy

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 14:39**

Quote:  
-----Act 8:37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.  
One of my favorite verses in the Bible. It's completely gone from the NIV, and other versions that are more direct translations of the Alexandrian Text. Why? Because it's completely gone from the Alexandrian Text. In those versions that don't remove it, there is a footnote saying that it isn't in the most "older and more reliable" texts (which are neither).  
But it's right there in the TR, and every English Bible translated from it.  
This isn't a different reading... or perspective. It's in one, and not in the other. And it is a doctrinal difference. It shows a confession of Christ as Son of God for salvation. It shows that this confession of Christ needs to happen before Baptism. It confirms that the Ethiopian was saved, and understood what Philip explained to him... and shows that Baptism happened after his confession.  
Remove that verse, and it's all gone.  
-----

If I may sound like Yogi Berra for a moment, "What you are saying is true if it is true."  
Krispy, what you are saying is that if we remove Acts 8:37, then we have no biblical basis for:

1. Confession of Christ as Son of God for salvation
2. This confession of Christ needs to happen before Baptism
3. That for one to be saved, they must understand what Philip explained to them
4. Baptism happening after confession.

Do you honestly believe that these doctrines would disappear if that one verse is not in scripture? No doctrine is based upon one verse. I hope you believe and understand that. If there was a conspiracy, why did they forget to remove Romans 10:6-10, "But the righteousness based on faith says, "Do not say in your heart, 'Who will ascend into heaven?' (that is, to bring Christ down) or "'Who will descend into the abyss?" (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what does it say? "The word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart" (that is, the word of faith that we proclaim); because, if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. For with the heart one believes and is justified, and with the mouth one confesses and is saved."

I will be honest with you I wish that the above verse was included in all translations because I like that verse as well, I also like the story of the woman caught in adultery, but I appreciate the truthfulness of the translators when they say these verses are not found in the earlier manuscripts.

My prayer is that you would understand that it is ok for a person to read and study a non-KJV bible. I personally like the KJV and have no problem telling others to read it, but I dare not tell someone to only read that version.

**Re:, on: 2007/4/13 14:54**

No... but it seriously weakens it... and that has been our contention.

And what version a believer reads is not a salvation issue, so I don't reject people who read an NIV. It doesn't hamper our fellowship. Interesting to me though that most Christians who are truly seeking a deeper walk with the Lord... the more serious believers, do come to at least an appreciation for the KJV... as you say you have as well.

My observation has been that those who are openly critical and hostile (and mocking) of the KJV, and those who prefer it, are generally not what I would consider to be serious Christians.

(I know you appreciate the KJV... that wasn't a shot at anyone...)

Done, brutha. Getting bored. If you want to know more of my beliefs there are hundreds of posts I've done on the topic.

:-)

Krispy

**Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/13 15:07**

Krispy, we disagree on this issue, but I can always rest assured that I will have a productive conversation with you.

I am moving on as well unless someone asks a question directed at me. God bless.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/4/13 17:11**

...As a relative newcomer to the SI site I've been "listening in" on this interesting debate. Seems some of you are saying goodbye to the thread (it being something that has apparently been discussed at great length). But anyway, just thought I'd weigh in with a thought or two.

First, I've searched this matter out thoroughly enough to convince me that the Received Text is the authoritative text. I've read John Burgon's writings, and if you can get Which Bible by David Otis Fuller, and True or False by the same author, they give you a pretty good insight into the reasons why the Westcott and Hort Greek text (from which come the NAS and the NIV and most of the modern translations) is suspect.

And so... while the King James did not spring directly from the Received Text, but from one Erasmus brought forth (which is so similar to the Textus Receptus as to be almost identical) ...I therefore lean heavily on the King James Version as

being the authoritative English translation of the scriptures. I shy away from the NIV, although I do use it, refer to it, check it out at times.

When I am asked my counsel by someone who wants to know the scriptures I advise them to make the King James their "home base," and then use some of the others just to compare and help along.

I always advise that without the help of the Holy Spirit who inspired the scriptures in the first place-- without giving Him His lordship in your reading, and in your whole life for that matter-- you might as well spend your time reading the phone book.

I do encourage people to STAY away from the proliferation of modern translations that have pretty much obliterated the word of God and made it more or less unrecognizable as the word of God.

Another thing I want to bring out, though, is that (at least for me personally) I have felt the Holy Spirit caution me not to "major" on this matter of Bible translations. Yes, it is important to have a sense of confidence about the version one is using. But it's possible to drown in this debate. And... you get so into it that you have lost touch with the Living Word Himself.

We are told in The Acts that "the word (logos) of God grew and multiplied" (Acts 12.24). He wasn't talking about the abundance of translations that were available. He was talking about the living Word that had been planted in the hearts and lives of the disciples, and was GROWING, not only in numbers, but in FRUIT. It's THIS word that impacted their world.

And so I have felt the Lord caution me not to give myself to the study of this debate and in doing so neglect to "eat His flesh and drink His blood" ...to feed on the Living Word Himself, I mean.

Jeremiah mourned, "The priests said not, Where is the LORD? And they that handle the law knew Me not" (Jer. 2.8). How many, I wonder, over the centuries, have felt the scriptures to be their home territory... but have lost touch with, didn't know, the Living Word Himself?

I ask, why is it that in our land (I'm in Canada) there is such an abundance of Bibles and various Bible translations... till it is more or less coming out our ears... yet so so little of the Revelation of the living Jesus Christ HIMSELF in His people in a way that actually impacts OUR sin-sick world, I mean. Back there in The Acts when the Word of God was GROWING they turned their world upside down because of it! Help us Lord, become THAT KIND OF TRANSLATION! We can have Bibles by the TON... even the precious King James... and still the world around us not SEE YOUR WORD!

AD

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/4/13 21:27**

Quote:

-----  
I believe the KJV is the superior translation of the preserved Word of God.  
-----

What do you base that on? What makes it superior to other translations. Is it because it was taken from the TR? What makes the TR the best text anyway?

I truly want to know the answer to this issue, thanks again for all the response.

Jordan

**Re:KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/4/13 21:59**

Quote:

-----Another thing I want to bring out, though, is that (at least for me personally) I have felt the Holy Spirit caution me not to "major" on this matter of Bible translations. Yes, it is important to have a sense of confidence about the version one is using. But it's possible to drown in this debate. And... you get so into it that you have lost touch with the Living Word Himself.  
-----

Quote:

-----"The priests said not, Where is the LORD? And they that handle the law knew Me not" (Jer. 2.8).  
-----

Well said brother and much appreciated. It is something that has been discussed here in depth and will admit that when it does arise again as a new topic there is a certain cringing due to the hostilities that often come about.

This has been pretty well handled by all from what I can tell perusing through it, and that is appreciated as well Brethren.

Jordan, have you tried a search here on this? There are some pretty in depth break downs regarding the source material that the translations are drawn from.

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/4/13 22:02**

Hi Crsschk,

No I haven't read everything or searched it all out here. How is the best way to go about this? I'm not very good with searching a site.

Thanks,  
Jordan

P.S.

I've read some of the thread that Roniya gave the link to, but not all of it.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/4/14 3:11**

Jaysaved wrote:

"I don't think Galatians 2:20 is talking about Christ's own personal faith being given to us, but of Paul's experience of a Son-like faith. Slaves obeyed God because they had to; sons because they chose to. Slaves were kept in check by a law; sons walk in the Spirit. Personally I would rather take both broad interpretations than an either/or choice. This is Christwards and Sonlike faith, but it is not, I think, Christ's faith instead of Paul's faith."

Christ's Faith is Paul's faith. Is that hard to say?

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

The same origin of faith, It comes from Jesus Christ. "but by the faith of Jesus Christ" should by the context of the whole chapter should read: but in the faith Jesus Christ. "of" is not even there. All that Christ, is especially His Faith, is what we are in if we are in Him at all. Either we have the Spirit of Christ or we are none of His. That includes His Faith, that did nothing unless the Father told Him to, He did it in obedience and faith. This is what our Faith is and should be, as son's of God by the Son Himself.

"even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ,"

The Faith in this is also in Gal 2:20, it is rendered, "especially," "especially reliance upon Christ for salvation; abstractly, constancy in such profession; by extension, the system of religious (Gospel) truth itself:--assurance, belief, believe, faith, fidelity." All are "pistis".

This Faith leads to what Christ has been made in us. 1 Corinthians 1:30 But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption:

"made unto us" Unto us should read in context of the statement, "But of Him, (God) But of God are you in Christ.

"Made unto us," (made us also), wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

Wisdom: Strong's Greek Dictionary

4678. sophia

Search for G4678 in KJVSL

sojia sophia sof-ee'-ah

from 4680; wisdom (higher or lower, worldly or spiritual):--wisdom. Which one do we have worldly or spiritually? Jam

3:17 But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

Righteousness: Strong's Greek Dictionary

1343. dikaiosune

Search for G1343 in KJVSL

dikaioṣunh dikaiosune dik-ah-yos-oo'-nay

from 1342; equity (of character or act); specially (Christian) justification:--righteousness. Mat 5:48 Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. How can we be perfect? In Christ only, including His Faith.

Sanctification: Strong's Greek Dictionary

38. hagasmos

Search for G38 in KJVSL

agiasmoV hagasmos hag-ee-as-mos'

from 37; properly, purification, i.e. (the state) purity; concretely (by Hebraism) a purifier:--holiness, sanctification. Jud 1:20 But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost. Who Holy Faith? How is it Holy? Christ has been made in us this Holy Faith.

Redemption: Strong's Greek Dictionary

629. apolutrosis

Search for G629 in KJVSL

apolutrwsiv apolutrosis ap-ol-oo'-tro-sis

from a compound of 575 and 3083; (the act) ransom in full, i.e. (figuratively) riddance, or (specially) Christian salvation:--deliverance, redemption. 2Cr 1:10 Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver ;

We are made all these by Jesus Christ's birth in us. Do you really believe that the faith of Abraham could bring this Christ to us? Abraham's faith was imputed to him because he believed. We that believe God about Jesus Christ, that He is the Son of God have by that faith of Abraham received the Promise, that is the Seed Jesus Christ and All that He is, including His Faith. Was the faith of Christ Perfect? Even if we don't understand God will reveal that also. Phl 3:15 Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.

How can a man be presented perfect to the Father? Including our faith which is now the "faith Son of God or faith Christ Jesus".

Colossians 1:27-29 To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles ; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: Whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.

If it is His working working in us and mightily on top of that, it must include all the attributes of Jesus Christ the Son of God and that includes His Faith which is now our faith along with all else in 1 Corinthians 1:30.

Did Christ Have the Faith of the Father?

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by RumbleBee, on: 2007/4/19 23:10**

Forgive my being a "newbie" to this site...

I guess I am what you would call a "King James Only" type of a Christian.

For the beginning of my church life, I thought everyone read from the same Bible, and the only other "versions" were the KJV in different languages. I was raised very old-fashioned, and now, looking back, I feel that "that" was not a "bad" thing.

No one worried about the accuracy or doubted its content.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why KJV Only?**

It was what it was, "THE WORD", Gods inspired word, infallible, non-contradicting. It backed itself up 100% backwards and forwards, and I had (and still have) total faith in it. My Pastors and teachers through my early life always used the same Bible, no exceptions.

I was, like everyone, taught Bible memory verses and the books of the Bible in Sunday school, and "ALL" we kids were surprisingly good. Back then, it was common for small children to be able to quote vast passages of the Bible word-for-word, and it was the norm for that time.

That was then.

Now, mention the "KJV", and you will be politely informed that your Bible's expiration date has already expired, and you are no longer up to date. At least that is the tone that most people lovingly give.

Now do not get me wrong, I do live in a modern age, and feel that my life has kept up with the times, however... I get the impression that the modern Church is trying to "suddenly" evolve, move "up" so to say.

My opinion is that they may not be moving up.

Now I know God is not changing, and with that in mind, what has changed in the past forty or so years?

We no longer see children reciting the Bible, or even remember the books of the Bible.

Sunday school for kids seems more like day care with coloring, games, etc... with a Biblical theme, but still day care.

Sadly, (to me) it seems so does the modern Church, adult day care, with a Biblical theme.

We have become less afraid of God, less afraid of Hell, and more at ease with sin.

If my way of looking at what the Church of today is striving to become makes anyone feel uncomfortable, then I would hope that what that person is experiencing, is "conviction". It may feel odd, because not many Churches of today feel that conviction is necessary for salvation, merely attendance, tithing, and agreement.

I do not think that having several different versions of the Bible is the reason for Churches modern day fall, but that it does create confusion.

I for one want to seek out the old paths....

**Re: KJV - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/4/20 0:04**

Quote:  
-----No I haven't read everything or searched it all out here. How is the best way to go about this? I'm not very good with searching a site.  
-----

Hi Jordan,

Go to the main Discussion Forum link on the front page.

Towards the bottom, there is an "advanced search" that will allow you to search the forum itself.

Try "KJV or "King James version", variations thereof. Also try experimenting with different combinations in the "Forum", "Author", "Sort by", "Search in" etc. boxes.

**Re: Why KJV Only? - posted by Isleander (), on: 2007/4/20 7:36**

You may find this info helpful

<http://www.regal-network.com/chm/bibles.htm>

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why KJV Only?**

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/4/20 13:41**

Quote:

-----  
crsschk wrote:

Hi Jordan,

Go to the main Discussion Forum link on the front page.

Towards the bottom, there is an "advanced search" that will allow you to search the forum itself.

Try "KJV" or "King James version", variations thereof. Also try experimenting with different combinations in the "Forum", "Author", "Sort by", "Search in" etc. boxes.

-----  
Thanks!