



General Topics :: no more kjv

**no more kjv - posted by coops (), on: 2007/8/23 8:50**

I'm not a regular poster on these forums. However, I do lurk and read a lot. I've been around and seen these issues come around so many times.

All I can say is that these sorts of discussions have so much potential to be divisive. I love theology, and let's go deep in discussion about it, but let's remember there are different types of theological discussions: Dogmas (the non-negotiable), Doctrines (the stuff you can have different views about, but still be saved), and Adiophora (the stuff that is generally irrelevant to life and sound doctrine, if we never resolve it, it will never make any difference).

I believe the "KJV only" discussion fits firmly into this category. Let's not bring up more stuff to argue about, and walk away with no application to our lives or ministry besides the translation we read.

**Re: no more kjv - posted by coops (), on: 2007/8/23 8:52**

And I haven't posted for so long I hit the stupid "Post New Topic" button instead of appending my reply to that KJV thread! How embarrassing! :-P

**Re:, on: 2007/8/23 8:57**

Jesus was **very** divisive... and even said that He intended to be divisive. Are you suggesting that we avoid discussing Jesus too?

If you've lurked here for a long time, then how in the world did you miss all the great, civil, friendly discussions we've had over the KJV in the past 12 months?

Just because something might be divisive doesn't mean we must avoid it.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2007/8/23 10:02**

Quote:  
-----Jesus was very divisive... and even said that He intended to be divisive. Are you suggesting that we avoid discussing Jesus too?  
-----

Come on Krispy, that's not what I got out of his post, you're taking this to an extreme. We know that we are always to talk about Jesus and even the things that were divisive in His ministry. The poster was trying to convey that in regards to **translation and salvation** we shouldn't walk away from the forum thinking that our brother is not saved because he reads the NIV and not the KJV. 8-)

**Re: no more kjv, on: 2007/8/23 10:32**

Compliments... I think you're correct. I misunderstood the post. Sorry coops. My bad.

Let me address this:

Quote:  
-----Adiophora (the stuff that is generally irrelevant to life and sound doctrine, if we never resolve it, it will never make any difference).

I believe the "KJV only" discussion fits firmly into this category.  
-----

I disagree with this assertion. I believe the version one reads is extremely relevant to life and sound doctrine, and it makes

es a great difference.

Yes, one can be saved and not ever use a KJV. But I personally believe this is a very relevant topic when discussing sound doctrine. And what's interesting to me is that most folks who prefer modern versions usually don't think versions make a difference concerning doctrine... but I have never met a KJV supporter who didn't think it makes a big difference.

So on that point, we do not agree. And I believe it is a very worthy topic for discussion. There is a wonderful testimony on the other KJV thread that bears witness to that fact.

:~)

Krispy

**Re: Really - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2007/8/23 12:10**

Quote:

-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote::

Quote:

-----Adiophora (the stuff that is generally irrelevant to life and sound doctrine, if we never resolve it, it will never make any difference).

I believe the "KJV only" discussion fits firmly into this category.  
-----

I disagree with this assertion. I believe the version one reads is extremely relevant to life and sound doctrine, and it makes a great difference.  
-----

How to say this without you getting prickly... :-)

I do not think that it has got much to do with versions, but everything to do with the people who are our 'teachers'. If someone who reads the niv teaches spirit-filled correct doctrine, then it is spirit-filled correct doctrine. It is not dependent on the version you read but on the teaching that you receive from the word.

Fire in the hole...I'll get my helmet. :-P

**Re:, on: 2007/8/23 12:18**

Fire at will!!

Just kidding... I would agree with you for the most part. I'm not knocking teaching because God has gifted some thru His Holy Spirit to be teachers. But in the church today there is an over-reliance on teachers, and I think that's why we're in so much trouble.

I think the believer has an obligation to study to show themselves approved... on their own. The Bereans utilized teachers, but at the same time they studied scripture on their own to see if what they were being taught was true.

And that is where versions make a difference.

See... I threw you a soft ball. Quit whimpering in the corner of your foxhole! lol

Krispy

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2007/8/23 14:26

Quote:

-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:

But in the church today there is an over reliance on teachers, and I think thats why we're in so much trouble.

-----  
Well from my church background, that is why leadership is so important. From what i can gather you understand just how important leadership is in a local assembly. It pains me to say this but most folk are just plain sheep, the just follow what they are told(taught). In my mind this doesn't make much sense. Added to your scripture is Peters admonishen to give a reason for the hope we have.

If you are going to give your life for something at least have the common sense to find our why, but alas the majority of folk are not like that.

Quote:

-----  
I think the believer has an obligation to study to show themselves approved... on their own. The Bereans utilized teachers, but at the same time they studied scripture on their own to see if what they were being taught was true.

-----  
I have wondered about the implications of this verse. The fact that he went into a synagogue at least gives us a little clue that they would have known what the word was. My point is that they at least could look and see and test what was being said. Many believers, and I think you would agree, have no clue what even John 3:16 says. Whether they have a KJV, NIV, ASV, Good news etc is not the issue, they just plain don't know the bible. In saying that though, the most dangerous people by a country mile (to borrow an Americanism) are those who think that they know the bible or at least think they know what it says.

Quote:

-----  
See... I threw you a soft ball.

-----  
I am truly surprised, God does work modern day miracles. :-P

Quote:

-----  
-----Quit whimpering in the corner of your foxhole!

-----  
Sorry mate, this board is not big enough for the both of us. I'd rather sit in my foxhole and watch while the Christians chop each other up. I just care a bit too much for the members of this site and for Greg to stand up for every perceived error. I must admit though that it has been really good for the last while.

Anyway, all the best..

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/8/23 16:12

Quote:

-----  
KrispyKrittr wrote:

Jesus was **very** divisive... and even said that He intended to be divisive. Are you suggesting that we avoid discussing Jesus too?

If you've lurked here for a long time, then how in the world did you miss all the great, civil, friendly discussions we've had over the KJV in the past 12 months?

Just because something might be divisive doesn't mean we must avoid it.

Krispy

It's interesting to note that rock music isn't mentioned in the Bible and neither are Bible translations.

Jordan

**Re: no more kjv - posted by wildhorse86 (), on: 2007/8/23 17:33**

These debates often end in tears. Sometimes, some people who say KJV ONLY! Seem to take on a 'I'm holier than you' persona.

I use NIV because it is easier to read. The bible no matter what version including KJV will most likely have small translation errors. If you can bring someone to Christ with it, does it really matter if I used a recent translation or an old one? Stop bickering over such minor things. If one can tell me why KJV is so much better... Go for it. I'm listening.

God bless  
Michael

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/8/23 17:56**

My dear brother Michael, until this past year I said similarly to you. However, I ask you to please carefully consider what this means:

Imagine if you found out that the NIV is not just *another translation* of the same ancient texts, but is a translation of a TOTALLY DIFFERENT text?

The so-called "KJV people" are typically concerned about which of the TWO texts was used for translation, Textus Receptus or the Alexandrian text.

It is the thorough conclusion of myself and others that the **underlying text** of the NIV, NASB, etc. is of a *different sort* than that of the TR versions, and is permeated with subtle doctrinal differences that, with time and without the Spirit, lead to false converts into most grievous and damnable heresies.

When I speak about this subject, it is with a great and sincere burden of spiritual affection. I desire no one to be drawn out by erroneous omissions and alterations of our sacred word. For this reason we persuade others to hunger after the purest sources possible.

Here is a verse-for-verse comparison of major doctrines in the NIV, NASB, and KJV:

(<http://www.watch.pair.com/scriptures.html>) Verse Comparison Chart

It is not exhaustive, but helpful.

**Re:, on: 2007/8/23 19:21**

As I have stated before in other KJV threads that when I first got saved at age 15 I was reading the Living Bible. When I turned 19 I felt the LORD nudge me towards the KJV (1944 edition of the Gideon bible) When I started reading that I felt thoroughly enriched in my spirit. The LB served its purpose and I was blessed by its contents, but the KJV was a totally different experience altogether. I looked at the Living Bible as milk and the KJV as meat.

I never knew anything about the Textus Receptus or the Alexandrian Text, I just obeyed the LORD.

I do not judge you if you are reading the NIV or any other translation. What I am concerned with is just because a verse is not written in the NIV that we should negate what the KJV says about that verse.

The other translations were never written to make the text easier to read. If that were so, why go to another text other than the Textus Receptus, why not just make the KJV more readable for our modern readers?

White Sugar and White Flour was never put on the shelf for our health, it was put there for the benefit of making money, by removing the Bran out of the flour and the molasses out of the sugar it made the product last longer on the shelf, while giving the consumer an empty product void of anything healthy.

This is how I see these other translations other than the KJV. Instead of giving the public what they need for health, they take out certain ingredients, the health benefits of the word, and has given us a product that was never made for our best interest, but only for the company that produced it.

Am I a KJV only? No!, however, all I read is the KJV. If anyone has a copy of the Geneva Bible, I sure would like to buy it from you.

God Bless

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/8/24 16:42**

Openlife,

Who said that the TR is the best text?

Check out this website and tell me what you think: <http://www.kjvonly.org/>

Jordan

**Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/8/24 16:53**

if TR is not a good text, that means there was no Word of God before westcott and hort was it 1881? so to assume God did not have his word before that would be absurd i think.

and the only "proof" of that alexandrian text is older is because catholic church says it is.... anyone want to take their word for it.

i checked how many manuscripts that say the same thing, we have 4730 manuscripts from the byzantine text , TR

and then we have from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus text which they claim is from around 350 if i remember correct and the total amount of manuscripts are 31, if i remember right..... 31!

TR = 4000 manuscripts  
Alexandrian = 31 manuscripts

which one do we trust?

and as i said, the only "proof" that alexandrian text is older than TR is because The catholic church says it is, and was it not them who tried and kill so many that tried to give the Word to the common people?

i go for TR....

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/8/24 17:01**

It's still not the original texts.

**Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/8/24 17:04**

, i just read a swedish book that claims the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus texts differ in about 3000 places just in the four Gospels.... do you really trust those texts? aren't the TR to be preferred?

**Re: - posted by wildhorse86 (), on: 2007/8/24 17:52**

Two source texts? What on earth...

**Re: - posted by Talkn2u, on: 2007/8/24 19:33**

That verse comparison chart is excellent!

**Re: - posted by BenBrockway, on: 2007/8/24 20:12**

Quote:

-----  
Compliments wrote:

If anyone has a copy of the Geneva Bible, I sure would like to buy it from you.

God Bless  
-----

I have a copy of the Geneva Bible, but I just got it and I ain't gonna give it up! ;-)

It's a great read. Hard to understand in some places, but a great read, nonetheless.

**Re: - posted by swsojourner (), on: 2007/8/24 20:26**

Hello hmmmhmmm

I think the Latin Vulgate is based on the Textus Receptus, and I don't know what claims that the Catholic Church has made about the Alexandrian texts...it seems odd though, since the Vulgate is the approved Bible (which dates back to 400 A.D. or so) I know the KJV only crowd likes to claim a catholic conspiracy (hehehe) in Anglican scholars and other Protestants endorsing modern translations, but it makes no sense.

just my .02 cents,  
Karsten (ESV)