



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

Easter or Passover?, on: 2008/11/19 2:28

Is there a difference in Bible Versions?

Many critics of the King James Bible point to Acts 12:1-4 to prove that the King James is a mistranslation. The King James indicates that Peter was to be kept in prison until after "Easter". All of the newer Bible versions have changed this to "Passover" instead.

Is this change from the King James from Easter to Passover by the textual critics Biblically sound? What does the Bible itself have to say about Passover and the feast of unleavened bread?

What Was Easter Originally? The word "Easter" is found one time in the entire authorized King James Bible:

Acts 12:1-7 (KJV)

"Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread.) And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quarters of soldiers to keep him; intending after **Easter** to bring him forth to the people."

So here we have a situation in Acts chapter 12. Herod had just beheaded James, it made the Jews happy. Now Herod wanted to kill Peter also, but he wanted to wait until after "Easter" according to the King James Bible. **Notice that the NIV bible has the word "Passover" instead of "Easter."**

Scripture from the King James Bible proves that "Easter" is in fact, the proper word to use.

The word "Easter" here, does NOT refer to "Easter" as we know it today, nor does it refer to the word "Passover" as it is wrongly translated in all newer Bible versions.

Though many Christians celebrate "Easter" in remembrance of the resurrection, Easter was originally a pagan festival (etymology of your dictionary should confirm this), **which is what Acts 12:4 refers to and not the Passover.** We can determine this by looking at the passage.

The Webster's New World Dictionary gives the following etymology (origin and development of a word), for the word "Easter":

originally, name of pagan vernal festival ALMOST COINCIDENT in date with paschal festival of the church,

--Eastre, dawn goddess --Austro, dawn

In other words, Easter was originally a pagan festival celebrated in the spring time.

"Easter" is Only Translated Correctly in the King James Bible

The word, "Easter" has been incorrectly translated "Passover" in ALL Bible versions except for the authorized King James Bible.

How do we know this? The Bible proves it (the Bible is always its own proof-text). Notice again in the passage of Acts 12:1-4, King Herod killed James. When he saw that it pleased the Jews, he also took Peter. Notice that Herod took Peter DURING the DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD and was going to bring him forth to the people AFTER Easter.

"In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the LORD's passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread." (Leviticus 2

3:5,6)

So we learn from this Scripture that the day of Passover fell on the 14th day of the first month, and then the "FEAST of UNLEAVENED BREAD" began upon the 15th day of the first month.

The days of unleavened bread came AFTER Passover! Acts 12:3 tells us that Peter was apprehended DURING the "days of unleavened bread." This means that the day of Passover had ALREADY occurred. "Easter" could not have been Passover, because Passover occurred BEFORE the days of unleavened bread. Passover had come and gone. Herod decided to bring Peter forth AFTER Easter. This is the sequence:

1. PASSOVER
2. DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD
3. EASTER

Let's look at it from the book of Numbers as well:

Passover only comes once a year on one day, the 14th of Abib (Num 28:16). After the Passover comes the days of unleavened bread (Numbers 28:17), extending from the fifteenth day through the twenty first day of Abib. So when Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (Acts 12:3), Passover had come and gone! The Bible says that Herod was going to bring him forth AFTER Easter (which had not come yet).

When the King James Bible says " EASTER" in Acts 12:4, it is correct; when the other versions say " PASSOVER" in Acts 12:4, they are incorrect. " Easter" in this passage is referring to a pagan festival (remember the etymology teaches that the pagan " Easter" is almost coincident with paschal (Passover)...

Just imagine what other "changes" to God's Spirit Breathed Word have been performed by the "textural critics", with their scissors and black markers. What a shame, yet many cannot see any difference, and even prefer the " newer" versions!

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: Easter or Passover? - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/11/19 6:19

What a peculiar exegesis. The Greek word translated 'Easter' here is used on 28 other occasions in the KJV where it is translated 'Passover'. As a strong advocate of the KJV I prefer to regard it as wrong in Acts 12:4 and right in the other 20 instances rather than wrong 28 times and right only once.

The Greek word 'pascha' is a transliteration of the Hebrew (<http://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongsh6453&tKJV>) pechach (Strong's H6453) The Hebrew word is pronounced "peh-â-sakh" and hence the Greek version "pascha". In the LXX text of On the fourteenth day of the first month at twilight is the LORD'S Passover. Lev 23:5 NKJV the word for 'Passover' is 'pascha'.

The KJV translators were simply complying with Instruction No 3 of King James instructions to 'return to' ecclesiastical language(*). The pattern can be seen clearly by comparing Tyndale, Geneva and the KJV.

(t) and when he had caught him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternion of soldiers to be kept, intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.

(g) And when he had caught him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to be kept, intending after the Passover to bring him forth to the people.

(k) And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep h

im; intending after Easter {Gr. Passover} to bring him forth to the people.

* No 3. The ould ecclesiasticall words to be kept viz. as the Word Church not to be translated 'Congregation' etc.

This specific instruction of King James has had a profound effect on the KJV and on all subsequent translations.

Re:, on: 2008/11/19 11:25

To Philogos:

My response would be that God has supernaturally preserved His Word, like He has promised us He would do. In this case, by the instruction #3 of the King.

Acts 12:3 tells us that Peter was apprehended DURING the "days of unleavened bread."

Passover occured BEFORE the feast of unleavened bread. Passover was the 14th of Abib, starting at 6:00 P.M. Wednesday night and ending at 6:00 P.M. Thursday. At 6:00 P.M. Thursday, the 15th of Abib, started the seven day "Feast of Unleavened Bread". This day (the 15th) was a High Holy Day, and celebrated as a Sabath day, eventhough the day did not occur on Saturday (the real Sabath day).

Scripture is clear, specifically, as I posted earlier:

Passover only comes once a year on one day, the 14th of Abib (Num 28:16). **After the Passover comes the days of unleavened bread (Numbers 28:17), extending from the fifteenth day through the twenty first day of Abib. So when Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (Acts 12:3), Passover had come and gone! The Bible says that Herod was going to bring him forth AFTER Easter, it is referring the Pagan celebration of Easter, not the Passover. He was arrested after the Passover had actually occurred.**

When the King James Bible says " EASTER" in Acts 12:4, it is correct; when the other versions say " PASSOVER" in Acts 12:4, they are incorrect. " **Easter" in this passage is referring to a pagan festival (remember the etymology teaches that the pagan " Easter" is almost coincident with paschal (Passover))...**

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Philogos, please respond with Scripture to prove your point. Passover (Pascha) had already occurred before Peter was arrested. Herod intended to bring Peter before the people after Easter. How do we know this? Because he was arrested AFTER Pascha (Passover).

Instruction # 3 definitely has merit in this case and surely did not come from fallen man, but from God through the Holy Spirit and placed into the mind of the King.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

philologos wrote:

What a "peculiar exegesis". The Greek word translated 'Easter' here is used on 28 other occasions in the KJV where it is translated 'Passover'. As a strong advocate of the KJV I prefer to regard it as wrong in Acts 12:4 and right in the other 20 instances rather than wrong 28 times and right only once.

The Greek word 'pascha' is a transliteration of the Hebrew (<http://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong'sH6453&tKJV>) pechach (Strong's H6453) The Hebrew word is pronounced "peh-Á-sakh" and hence the Greek version "pascha". In the LXX text of On the fourteenth day of the first month at twilight is the LORD'S Passover. Lev 23:5 NKJV the word for 'Passover' is 'pascha'.

The KJV translators were simply complying with Instruction No 3 of King James instructions to 'return to 'ecclesiastical language'(*). The pattern can be seen clearly by comparing Tyndale, Geneva and the KJV.

(t) and when he had caught him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternion of soldiers to be kept, intending after Easter to bring him fo

rth to the people.

(g) And when he had caught him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to be kept, intending after the Passover to bring him forth to the people.

(k) And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter (Gr. Passover) to bring him forth to the people.

* No 3. The ould ecclesiasticall words to be kept viz. as the Word Church not to be translated 'Congregation' etc.

This specific instruction of King James has had a profound effect on the KJV and on all subsequent translations.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/11/19 12:15

Quote:
-----My response would be that God has supernaturally preserved His Word, like He has promised us He would do. In this case, by the instruction #3 of the King.

Where was God when the Geneva Bible was translated? Do you really want me to show you the errors in the KJV?

Quote:
-----When the King James Bible says "EASTER" in Acts 12:4, it is correct; when the other versions say "PASSOVER" in Acts 12:4, they are incorrect. "Easter" in this passage is referring to a pagan festival (remember the etymology teaches that the pagan "Easter" is almost coincident with paschal (Passover))...

Even if this were right, and it isn't, this would be an interpretation built into the translation.

Quote:
-----Passover only comes once a year on one day, the 14th of Abib (Num 28:16). After the Passover comes the days of unleavened bread (Numbers 28:17), extending from the fifteenth day through the twenty first day of Abib. So when Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (Acts 12:3), Passover had come and gone! The Bible says that Herod was going to bring him forth AFTER Easter, it is referring to the Pagan celebration of Easter, not the Passover. He was arrested after the Passover had actually occurred.

If this were the case why not use the Greek word for Easter? In any case you clearly don't understand that the word Passover relates to both a day AND a period of time.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/19 12:16

Hi waltern...

Quote:
-----My response would be that God has supernaturally preserved His Word, like He has promised us He would do. In this case, by the instruction #3 of the King.

I think that this is your argument -- regardless of what the evidence says.

It seems, at least to me, that this was a poorly translated word in the KJV translation. The source for the KJV literally says that the word is "paschal" (literally, "the passover"). So one might ask: Was the source part of God's promise to "preserve" His Word -- or was the eventual product (the KJV) the promise?

Or perhaps God's promise to preserve His Word has nothing to do with a written collection of 66 books (or more, if you use the original KJV). I wonder: What about all of those nations, languages and years in which there wasn't a KJV...or a Textus Receptus...etc...?

:-)

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

Re:, on: 2008/11/19 14:40

To Philologos:

You stated:

"If this were the case why not use the Greek word for Easter? In any case you clearly don't understand that the word Passover relates to both a day AND a period of time."

my response:

Please provide Biblical prooftext to your statement above that "the word Passover related to both a day AND a period of time".

Thank you,

Walter

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----My response would be that God has supernaturally preserved His Word, like He has promised us He would do. In this case, by the instruction #3 of the King.

Where was God when the Geneva Bible was translated? Do you really want me to show you the errors in the KJV?

Quote:

-----When the King James Bible says " EASTER" in Acts 12:4, it is correct; when the other versions say " PASSOVER" in Acts 12:4, they are incorrect. " Easter" in this passage is referring to a pagan festival (remember the etymology teaches that the pagan " Easter" is almost coincident with paschal (Passover)...

Even if this were right, and it isn't, this would be an interpretation built into the translation.

Quote:

-----Passover only comes once a year on one day, the 14th of Abib (Num 28:16). After the Passover comes the days of unleavened bread (Numbers 28:17), extending from the fifteenth day through the twenty first day of Abib. So when Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (Acts 12:3), Passover had come and gone! The Bible says that Herod was going to bring him forth AFTER Easter, it is referring to the Pagan celebration of Easter, not the Passover. He was arrested after the Passover had actually occurred.

If this were the case why not use the Greek word for Easter? In any case you clearly don't understand that the word Passover relates to both a day AND a period of time.

Re:, on: 2008/11/19 21:39

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:

Hi waltern...

Quote:

-----My response would be that God has supernaturally preserved His Word, like He has promised us He would do. In this case, by the instruction #3 of the King.

I think that this is your argument -- regardless of what the evidence says.

It seems, at least to me, that this was a poorly translated word in the KJV translation. The source for the KJV literally says that the word is "paschal" (literally, "the passover"). So one might ask: Was the source part of God's promise to "preserve" His Word -- or was the eventual product (the KJV) the promise?

Or perhaps God's promise to preserve His Word has nothing to do with a written collection of 66 books (or more, if you use the original KJV). I wonder : What about all of those nations, languages and years in which there wasn't a KJV...or a Textus Receptus...etc...?

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Walter's response to Ccchhrrriiiss:

Since I am waiting for Philogos to answer my post by Bible Proof text, I will now address your post, Ccchhrrrii sss.

My post has nothing to do with a poor translation or anything. Please, sir, prove your position by Scripture instead of by condescension, insinuation and innuendo. This might work well in a college classroom with young adults designed to lead them away from one position and to another position that the professor supports, **but it has no value here.**

Please, prove the following incorrect, by Bible proof-text---**only then ccchhrrriiiss will you be able to prove your position.**

This was my post, please respond to it line by line with Scripture, (with no insinuation, innuendo, or condescension):

What Was Easter Originally? The word "Easter" is found one time in the entire authorized King James Bible:

Acts 12:1-7 (KJV)

"Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread.) And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quarters of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people."

So here we have a situation in Acts chapter 12. Herod had just beheaded James, it made the Jews happy. Now Herod wanted to kill Peter also, but he wanted to wait until after "Easter" according to the King James Bible. Notice that the NIV bible has the word "Passover" instead of "Easter."

Scripture from the King James Bible proves that "Easter" is in fact, the proper word to use.

The word "Easter" here, does NOT refer to "Easter" as we know it today, nor does it refer to the word "Passover" as it is wrongly translated in all newer Bible versions.

Though many Christians celebrate "Easter" in remembrance of the resurrection, Easter was originally a pagan festival (etymology of your dictionary should confirm this), which is what Acts 12:4 refers to and not the Passover. We can determine this by looking at the passage.

The Webster's New World Dictionary gives the following etymology (origin and development of a word), for the word "Easter":

originally, name of pagan vernal festival ALMOST COINCIDENT in date with paschal festival of the church,

--Eastre, dawn goddess --Austro, dawn

In other words, Easter was originally a pagan festival celebrated in the spring time.

"Easter" is Only Translated Correctly in the King James Bible

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

The word, "Easter" has been incorrectly translated "Passover" in ALL Bible versions except for the authorized King James Bible.

How do we know this? The Bible proves it (the Bible is always its own proof-text). Notice again in the passage of Acts 12:1-4, King Herod killed James. When he saw that it pleased the Jews, he also took Peter. Notice that Herod took Peter DURING the DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD and was going to bring him forth to the people AFTER Easter.

"In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the LORD's passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread." (Leviticus 23:5,6)

So we learn from this Scripture that the day of Passover fell on the 14th day of the first month, and then the "FEAST OF UNLEAVENED BREAD" began upon the 15th day of the first month.

The days of unleavened bread came AFTER Passover! Acts 12:3 tells us that Peter was apprehended DURING the "days of unleavened bread." This means that the day of Passover had ALREADY occurred. "Easter" could not have been Passover, because Passover occurred BEFORE the days of unleavened bread. Passover had come and gone. Herod decided to bring Peter forth AFTER Easter. This is the sequence:

1. PASSOVER
2. DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD
3. EASTER

Let's look at it from the book of Numbers as well:

Passover only comes once a year on one day, the 14th of Abib (Num 28:16). After the Passover comes the days of unleavened bread (Numbers 28:17), extending from the fifteenth day through the twenty first day of Abib. So when Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (Acts 12:3), Passover had come and gone! The Bible says that Herod was going to bring him forth AFTER Easter (which had not come yet).

When the King James Bible says "EASTER" in Acts 12:4, it is correct; when the other versions say "PASSOVER" in Acts 12:4, they are incorrect. "Easter" in this passage is referring to a pagan festival (remember the etymology teaches that the pagan "Easter" is almost coincident with paschal (Passover)...

Just imagine what other "changes" to God's Spirit-Breathed Word have been performed by the "textual critics", with their scissors and black markers. What a shame, yet many cannot see any difference, and even prefer the "newer" versions!

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by cchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/20 0:08

Walter...

Brother, how can I prove something that already speaks for itself?!

The Greek word used for "Easter" in Acts 12:4 -- from the very source used for the KJV itself -- is the word used for "Passover" every other time it is used!!!

Yet you see what others attribute as an apparent "mistake" -- and embrace something that is entirely EXTRA-Biblical!!!

Brother, you believe that God has "perfectly preserved" His Word...and that it is found in the KJV (even though, in this case, the original source used for this passage disagrees with the way it was translated). So you argue away this apparent

mistake. But what about the other mistakes in the KJV? I pointed these out in another thread. Most of these examples are from the Old Testament (and, thus, not from the Textus Receptus). Yet they are undeniable mistakes nonetheless. If God "perfectly preserved" His written Word "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

How about the differences in numbers between II Samuel 24:24 and I Chronicles 21:22-25? I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25? I Kings 5:16 and II Chronicles 2:2? I Kings 7:15-22 and II Chronicles 3:15-17? I Kings 7:26 and II Chronicles 4:5? I Kings 16:6-8 and II Chronicles 16:1? II Kings 8:25-26 and II Chronicles 22:2?

Should I go on? These are apparent contradictions that occur in the Old Testament of the KJV (and some other versions). Is God's Word perfectly preserved to the last "dot and tittle" -- or does it contain some errors?

Your entire argument for the KJV seems based upon the notion that the KJV (and almost, the KJV alone) is supernaturally "preserved" as entirely and completely perfect in every way. Yet even the translators refute this in their preface! Not only did the KJV include the books of the Apocrypha, but it included (and still includes) several apparent errors. While many of these were handed down in sources BEFORE the KJV, the fact that they exist in the KJV bears testimony against your claim that the KJV is perfect down to that last dot and tittle.

Brother, I believe that God has preserved His Word. I just don't believe that this perfection is found in the written form (at least, from a single, unified source). The various books of the Bible were separate and copied independently by men over thousands of years. It is difficult to lay accusation against such men who might very well have tried to keep their copies pure. However, as these examples suggest, sometime they erred.

So what is that perfectly preserved Word of God? It is none other than Jesus Christ! He is the Author and Finisher of our faith! He is the perfect Word of God to whom we can turn in times of need. The best efforts of men are still flawed -- but our Word of God is living! We can turn to Him for the best adequate understanding of His Word!

But to conclude that the KJV was entirely perfect (down to the last dot and tittle) is to simply make excuses for what are obvious (but probably unintentional) errors.

Re:, on: 2008/11/20 0:34

Well Ccchhhrrriiss, I have learned to expect nothing more from you than what you continue to post, and that seems to be high on opinion and low to non-existent on Bible Scripture to support your opinions.

My challenge to you still stands. Prove to me, through scripture why the King James is wrong. Prove to all of us how Peter could be arrested during the feast of unleavened bread, that started on the 15th of Abib, and continued for seven days through the 21st of Abib, and then be turned over to the people by Herod at the Passover. The Passover HAD ALREADY OCCURRED ON THE 14TH OF ABIB, BEFORE THE FEAST OF UNLEAVED BREAD OCCURRED!

The King James rightly translates this word as the pagan ceremony of easter, that was celebrated after the feast of unleavened bread, going back in history all the way to Babylon.

Was the pagan festival of Easter known at the this time in history? Were the Romans keeping Easter as a day of celebration?

This is what History has to say about this event:

The pagan festival of Easter, with its hot cross buns and Easter Sunday sunrise services was well known in ancient Babylon and Rome centuries before the events recorded in Acts 12.

Let me quote a short passage about EASTER from Alexander Hislop's book The Two Babylons. (ISBN 0 7136 04 70 0):

Quote: "Then look at Easter. What means the term Easter itself? It is not a Christian name. It bears its Chaldean origin on its forehead. Easter is nothing else than Astarte, one of the titles of Beltis, the QUEEN OF HEAVEN, whose name, as pronounced by the people of Nineveh, was evidently identical with that now in common use in th

is country. That name, as found by Layard on the Assyrian monuments, is Ishtar. The worship of Bel and Astarte was very early introduced into Britain, along with the Druids, "the priests of the groves" (page 103)

xxxxxxxxxxx

No scholar doubts the fact that Easter is a pagan festival which came down from ancient times, long before the Christian era.

The next question is: Did some Israelites keep Easter and worship the QUEEN OF HEAVEN? Did they bake hot cross buns for Ishtar - Easter? THE ANSWER, SURPRISINGLY, IS AGAIN--YES!

Ancient Israel worshipped THE QUEEN OF HEAVEN- ISHTAR and they honoured her each year with special cakes (buns) and drink offerings.

I quote Scripture, as prooftext for my position:

Jeremiah 7:18 The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the QUEEN OF HEAVEN, and to pour out drink offerings unto other gods, that they may provoke me to anger.

Jeremiah 44:18 But since we left off to burn incense to the QUEEN OF HEAVEN, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by the famine. 19: And when we burned incense to the QUEEN OF HEAVEN, and poured out drink offerings unto her, did we make her cakes to worship her, and pour out drink offerings unto HER, without our men? 20: Then Jeremiah said unto all the people, to the men, and to the women, and to all the people which had given him that answer, saying, 21: The incense that ye burned in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem, ye, and your fathers, your kings, and your princes, and the people of the land, did not the LORD remember them, and came it not into his mind? 22: So that the LORD could no longer bear, because of the evil of your doings, and because of the ABOMINATIONS which ye have committed; therefore is your land a desolation, and an astonishment, and a curse, without an inhabitant, as at this day.

23: Because ye have burned incense, and because ye have sinned against the LORD, and have not obeyed the voice of the LORD, nor walked in his law, nor in his statutes, nor in his testimonies; therefore this evil is happened unto you, as at this day. 24: Moreover Jeremiah said unto all the people, and to all the women, Hear the word of the LORD, all Judah that are in the land of Egypt: 25: Thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel, saying; Ye and your wives have both spoken with your mouths, and fulfilled with your hand, saying, We will surely perform our vows that we have vowed, to burn incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her: ye will surely accomplish your vows, and surely perform your vows.

Oh yes, many ancient Israelites kept Easter. Modern Israelis still do today. In summary we can say that when Herod, after the Passover and during the days of unleavened bread shut up Peter intending to bring him out after Easter, Herod meant EXACTLY WHAT THE KING JAMES VERSION IS SAYING. HE MEANT EASTER NOT PASSOVER WHICH HAD ALREADY COME AND GONE. THIS MEANS THAT EVERY TRANSLATION WHICH USES THE WORD PASSOVER IN ACTS 12:3-4 IS, STRICTLY SPEAKING, INCORRECT. EASTER IS THE CORRECT WORD AND THE KING JAMES USES IT.

In conclusion, I challenge you to post Scripture instead of opinion TO REFUTE MY POST. OPINION WITHOUT THE PROOF OF SCRIPTURE IS NOTHING MORE THAN ERROR!

"Solo Scriptura"

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:

Walter...

Brother, how can I prove something that already speaks for itself!?

Delted

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2008/11/20 1:27

Walter...

Try reading my post again. This time, check out the examples that I listed in the KJV. Tell me if there are any reasons for these apparent contradictions -- and if not, why you continue to claim that the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God. You previously claimed that the KJV is "perfect and preserved down to the last dot and tittle." Yet these examples say otherwise.

: -)

BTW, I reject your defense of the word "Easter" in the KJV's version of Acts 12:4. It seems like you are really stretching on this one...when the answer seems to point to a simple translation error. In fact, nearly EVERY OTHER VERSION of the Bible -- older and newer, and from the same source -- translate the word as "Passover." The same word used for "Easter" in the KJV's translation of that verse is translated as "Passover" every other time.

If you can't tell, I used the Bible to show you that the word used for "Easter" in that passage appears elsewhere throughout the KJV as "Passover" (look it up, would you, in the Strong's). You, on the other hand, have simply created (or repeated?) an argument to explain the apparent mistranslation of a particular translation that you deem to be flawless.

Brother, is it possible that you are trying to place a square into a round hole? If a person reading Greek were to read that passage...from the TR...in Greek...what do you think that he would understand it to mean? It seems like you are saying that the source used for the KJV "got it wrong."

Re: - posted by philologos () , on: 2008/11/20 4:57

Quote:

-----Please provide Biblical prooftext to your statement above that the word Passover related to both a day AND a period of time.

“In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month, you shall observe the Passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten. Ezek 45:21 NKJV

Now on the first day of the Feast of the Unleavened Bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying to Him, “Where do You want us to prepare for You to eat the Passover?” 18 And He said, “Go into the city to a certain man, and say to him, ‘The Teacher says, ‘My time is at hand; I will keep the Passover at your house with My disciples.’” Matt 26:17-18 NKJV

And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King! John 19:14 KJVS

You will see that Passover is used of the time of preparation, the meal itself and the period of 7 days of unleavened bread. This was the way the Jews used the word.

Re: - posted by philologos () , on: 2008/11/20 9:43

The greatest expert on the Jewish custom of Christ's day is (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred_Edersheim) Alfred Edersheim. In his "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah" he addresses the question as to whether there is a disagreement between John and the Synoptic gospels on the timing of the Passover. (The quotes in the previous post illustrate the point) He then goes on to show how the whole period of the Unleavened Bread was regarded as the Passover. (Page 1382)

It is recorded, that they who brought Him would not themselves enter the portals of the Palace, “that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover.” Few expressions have given rise to more earnest controversy than this. On two things at least we can speak with certainty. Entrance into a heathen house did Levitically render impure for that day - that is, till the evening. The fact of such defilement is clearly attested both in the New Testament and in the Mishnah, though its reasons might be various. 5977 A person who had so become Levitically unclean was technically called Tebhul Yom (

‘bathed of the day’). The other point is, that, to have so become ‘impure’ for the day, would not have disqualified for eating the Paschal Lamb, since the meal was partaken of after the evening, and when a new day had begun.

In fact, it is distinctly laid down that the ‘bathed of the day,’ that is, he who had been impure for the day and had bathed in the evening, did partake of the Paschal Supper, and an instance is related, when some soldiers who had guarded the gates of Jerusalem ‘immersed,’ and ate the Paschal Lamb. It follows that those Sanhedrists could not have abstained from entering the Palace of Pilate because by so doing they would have been disqualified for the Paschal Supper.

The point is of importance, because many writers have interpreted the expression ‘the Passover’ as referring to the Paschal Supper, and have argued that, according to the Fourth Gospel, our Lord did not on the previous evening partake of the Paschal Lamb, or else that in this respect the account of the Fourth Gospel does not accord with that of the Synop tists. But as, for the reason just stated, it is impossible to refer the expression ‘Passover’ to the Paschal Supper, we have only to inquire whether the term is not also applied to other offerings. And here both the Old Testament and Jewish writings show, that the term Pesach, or ‘Passover,’ was applied not only to the Paschal Lamb, but to all the Passover sacrifices, especia lly to what was called the Chagigah, or festive offering (from Chag, or Chagag, to bring the festive sacrifice usual at each of the three Great Feasts). According to the express rule (Chag. i. 3) the Chagigah was brought on the first festive Paschal Day. It was offered immediately after the morning-service, and eaten on that day - probably some time before the evening, when, as we shall by-and-by see, another ceremony claimed public attention. We can therefore quite understand that, not on the eve of the Passover but on the first Paschal day, the Sanhedrists would avoid incurring a defilement which, lasting till the evening, would not only have involved them in the inconvenience of Levitical defilement on the first festive day, but have actually prevented their offering on that day the Passover, festive sacrifice, or Chagigah. For, we have these two express rules: that a person could not in Levitical defilement offer the Chagigah; and that the Chagigah could not be offered for a person by some one else who took his place (Jer. Chag. 76 a, lines 16 to 14 from bottom). These considerations and canons seem decisive as regards the views above expressed. There would have been no reason to fear ‘defilement’ on the morning of the Paschal Sacrifice; but entrance into the Prætorium on the morning of the first Passover-day would have rendered it impossible for them to offer the Chagigah, which is also designated by the term Pesach.

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2008/11/20 12:50

N/A

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2008/11/20 13:39

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:
Walter...

Brother, how can I prove something that already speaks for itself?!

The greek word used for "Easter" in Acts 12:4 -- from the very source used for the KJV itself -- is the word used for "Passover" every other time it is used!!!

This is because ALL the other 27 times it is used, it is used to actually refer to the Jewish Passover, but in Acts 12:4 it is used to refer to just as it is said " easter" (NOT the jewish passover)

All the other 26 times when Pascha is rendered "passover" is because that is what it is actually referring to, and you can clearly tell from the context of the scriptures, but this is not the case in Acts 12:4.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/11/20 13:55

Quote:
-----by BlazedbyGod on 2008/11/20 18:39:11
All the other 26 times when Pascha is rendered "passover" is because that is what it is actually referring to, and you can clearly tell from the context of the scriptures, but this is not the case in Acts 12:4.

I suggest you read the thread. Error does not become truth just because you keep on repeating it.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/20 14:15

Hi BlazedbyGod...

So upon what are you basing this assumption? If the greek word from the source text is translated as "Passover" and the KJV is one of the only major translations to use the word "Easter" (including other translations taken from the same source), then why would we assume that the translators of the KJV were "the only ones to get it right?"

This just seems like a cut and dry mistake. Yet people are so secure in the myth that the KJV is PERFECT that they invent arguments (or gather inventions) that substantiate such a claim.

If the KJV is so perfect and preserved, then what about the other examples that I included earlier? These are obvious ERRORS. Sure, those errors were included in the sources for the KJV, but they are undeniable errors. Of course, I have read some KJV-only advocates who ruthlessly defend those obvious errors to the point of creating a new doctrine that calls the KJV "infallible" and argues that any "error" can only come from our own interpretation of those verses.

Let me make this clear: I do not think that the KJV is PERFECT, although I think that it is a faithful translation by flawed men from the sources used.

Re: - posted by fuehrerbe21 (), on: 2008/11/20 14:35

I do not know anything about Bible translation, nor do I understand greek or latin, but I am curious if walter could provide other texts to prove that the KJV is the perfect translation or scripture.

The Acts example is the only one mentioned in this thread so far, and I am simply curious what other passages would support Walter's stance.

Again, I am no authority in any of this, so I am not trying to make a point or argue in either direction (even though I do have an opinion of my own).

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2008/11/20 14:36

bump

Re:, on: 2008/11/20 14:44

To Philogos:

You are pulling at straws, trying to prove the improvable. You either have no knowledge of the Old Testament and the Feasts of the Jews, or you are trying to prove your point having full knowledge of the Old Testament.

This is nothing more than a combination of two feasts--the Passover & the Feast of Unleavened Bread. In Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, & Ezra the timing is clear of these two separate Feasts of the Lord. The Passover is celebrated on one day, the 14th of Abib (Tishre), the day that God led the Jews out of bondage in Egypt, the same day that Jesus Christ became our "Passover". The Feast of Unleavened bread followed the Passover, starting on the 15th and continuing for 7 days through the 21st.

The Passover, established by God in Exodus 12: 1-14 is a one day event that was to be celebrated forever. This

event (the Passover) was so important that God had the Jews change their calendar. The first month had always been Nissan, since the beginning of time. Now God commanded them to change the calendar to make the 7th month, Abib (Tishre) their first month. Since He led them out of Egypt by signs and wonders he never wanted them to forget this specific event. The Jews accomplished this by having two calendars—a Sacred calendar, starting with Abib and then continuing in order for a total of 12 months. They also continued their regular calendar, starting with Nissan, the month of creation, the first month.

In any event, you are incorrect. The Passover occurs on one day, and one day alone. The day? The 14th of Abib (Tishre), the day that God led the Jews out of Egypt with a mighty hand. It is also the same day that Jesus Christ was crucified for our sins, the day of Passover, the 14th of Abib (Tishre). He was crucified at the 3rd hour (9:00 A.M.), at the time of the MORNING SACRIFICE that had taken place at the Tabernacle, and later at the Temple since God commanded it in Exodus, and gave up the Ghost at the 9th hour (3:00 P.M.), the time of the evening sacrifice at the Temple.

Please check out the following for a full understanding of the Passover and when it was celebrated. Passover was commanded by God to ALWAYS be celebrated on the 14th of Abib (Tishre):

Exodus, Chapter 12; Leviticus 23:5-6; Numbers Chapter 9; Numbers Chapter 28; Numbers Chapter 23; Deuteronomy Chapter 16; Joshua, Chapter 5; 2nd Kings Chapter 23; Chronicles Chapter 35; Ezra Chapter 6

Christ is our Passover (1 Cor 1:5). Christ is our Firstfruits (1 Cor. 15:20).

Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of the Original Passover picture, given to us in the Old Testament. Christ is the fulfillment of the Firstfruits, given to us in the Old Testament. Christ was sacrificed on Passover, the 14th of Abib and He resurrected from the dead on the 17th of Abib, the day of the feast of Firstfruits. Also, on the 17th of Abib the Ark rested on the mountains of Ararat: Genesis 8:4. And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat.

(God changed the 7th month to the first month, when He brought the nation of Israel out of Egypt with a mighty hand on the 14th day of Abib, Passover, a day He commanded to be celebrated forever!) What is the work of the Christian? Our Work is to believe on Him who He has sent. We are commanded to rest in Him (Jesus Christ)-pictured by those who "rested" in the ark where God kept them safe- the ark- RUDDERLESS, and controlled by God HIMSELF.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----Please provide Biblical proof-text to your statement above that the word Passover related to both a day AND a period of time.

“In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month, you shall observe the Passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten. Ezek 45:21 NKJV

Now on the first day of the Feast of the Unleavened Bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying to Him, “Where do You want us to prepare for You to eat the Passover?” 18 And He said, “Go into the city to a certain man, and say to him, ‘The Teacher says, ‘My time is at hand; I will keep the Passover at your house with My disciples.’” Matt 26:17-18 NKJV

And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King! John 19:14 KJVS

You will see that Passover is used of the time of preparation, the meal itself and the period of 7 days of unleavened bread. This was the way the Jews used the word.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/20 16:09

I repeat, Waltern...

If God "perfectly preserved" the KJV "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

How about the differences in numbers between II Samuel 24:24 and I Chronicles 21:22-25?

I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25?

I Kings 5:16 and II Chronicles 2:2?

I Kings 7:15-22 and II Chronicles 3:15-17?

I Kings 7:26 and II Chronicles 4:5?

I Kings 16:6-8 and II Chronicles 16:1?

II Kings 8:25-26 and II Chronicles 22:2?

How do you explain these obvious errors? If the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God -- then why did the translators include the Apocrypha? Why did they claim that their work was less than perfect in the version's preface?

Are you going to answer -- or simply continue to inform us that we are "pulling at straws" for failing to admire your own reasoning?

:-{

Re:The Apocrypha ?????, on: 2008/11/20 21:23

To Ccchhrrriiiss:

Well, let's start with your last statement, Ccchhrrriiiss. I will post one answer at a time:

You posted:

"How do you explain these obvious errors? If the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God -- then why did the translators include the Apocrypha? Why did they claim that their work was less than perfect in the version's preface?"

My response to your Ccchhrrriiiss, and his false charge:

A favorite ploy of textual critics like yourself, Ccchhrrriiiss, is to say that the original KJV of 1611 included the Apocrypha, which no true Christian today accepts as Scripture.

The Apocrypha is a collection of several pagan writings which the Catholic church accepts as inspired Scripture. In fact, the Council of Trent (1546) pronounced a CURSE upon anyone who denied that these books were inspired.

The King James translators did NOT consider the books to be inspired Scripture, nor did they include them in the canon as such. They merely placed the Apocryphal books BETWEEN the Old and New testament as a historical document, not as Scripture. Their reasons for not accepting the Apocrypha as Scripture are listed on page 185-186 of the book Translators Revived, by Alexander McClure. The seven reasons are basically as follows:

1. Not one of them is in the Hebrew language like the rest of the Old Testament books.

2. Not one of the writers lays any claim to inspiration.

3. These books were never acknowledged as sacred Scriptures by the Jewish church, and therefore were never sanctioned by our Lord.

4. They were not allowed a place among the sacred books, during the first four centuries of the Christian church.

5. They contain fabulous statements, and statements which contradict not only the canonical Scriptures, but themselves. For example, in the Books of Maccabees alone, Antiochus Epiphanes dies three times in three places!

6. It inculcates doctrines at variance with the Bible, such as prayers for the dead and sinless perfection.

7. It teaches immoral practices, such as lying, suicide, assassination and magical incantation.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:
I repeat, Waltern...

If God "perfectly preserved" the KJV "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

How about the differences in numbers between II Samuel 24:24 and I Chronicles 21:22-25?

I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25?

I Kings 5:16 and II Chronicles 2:2?

I Kings 7:15-22 and II Chronicles 3:15-17?

I Kings 7:26 and II Chronicles 4:5?

I Kings 16:6-8 and II Chronicles 16:1?

II Kings 8:25-26 and II Chronicles 22:2?

How do you explain these obvious errors? If the KJV is the "perfect and preserved" Word of God -- then why did the translators include the Apocrypha? Why did they claim that their work was less than perfect in the version's preface?

Are you going to answer -- or simply continue to inform us that we are "pulling at straws" for failing to admire your own reasoning?

:-(

Re:, on: 2008/11/20 21:51

Ccchhrrriiiss posted:

by ccchhrrriiiss on 2008/11/20 16:09:53

I repeat, Waltern...

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

If God "perfectly preserved" the KJV "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

Walter's response to ccchhrrriiiss:

Let's look at the verses you posted, above, found in the King James Version:

II Samuel 24:9 "And Joab gave up the sum of the number of the people unto the king: and there were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant men that drew the sword; and the men of Judah were five hundred thousand men."

I Chronicles 21:5 "Jehoram was thirty and two years old when he began to reign, and he reigned eight years in Jerusalem."

Walter continues:

These two verses have NOTHING IN COMMON WITH EACH OTHER, AND HAVE NO RELATION TO EACH OTHER WHATSOEVER!

Ccchhrrriiiss, you had better check your handy reference book for "textual critics", your "King James Discrepancies book" or whatever you are using, and get the correct verses that you think are in error.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:
I repeat, Walter...

If God "perfectly preserved" the KJV "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

DELETED.....

:-(
.....

Re:, on: 2008/11/20 22:24

Ccchhrrriiiss previously posted:

What about the differences in numbers between II Samuel 24:24 and I Chronicles 21:22-25?

Walters response:

These are the verses you are asking me to compare:

II Samuel 24:4 (KJV)

"Notwithstanding the king's word prevailed against Joab, and against the captains of the host. And Joab and the captains of the host went out from the presence of the king, to number the people of Israel.

I Chronicles 21:22-25

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

22. Then David said to Ornan, Grant me the place of this threshingfloor, that I may build an altar therein unto the Lord: thou shalt grant it me for the full price: that the plague may be stayed from the people. 23. And Ornan said unto David, Take it to thee, and let my lord the king do that which is good in his eyes: lo, I give thee the oxen also for burnt offerings, and the threshing instruments for wood, and the wheat for the meat offering; I give it all. 24. And king David said to Ornan, Nay; but I will verily buy it for the full price: for I will not take that which is thine for the Lord, nor offer burnt offerings without cost. 25. So David gave to Ornan for the place six hundred shekels of gold by weight.

WALTERÂ'S CONTINUING RESPONSE:

Ccchhhrrriiiss, are you sure that you are even looking up the Scriptures that you want me to compare?

How embarrassing for you!!! THERE ARE NO NUMBERS TO COMPARE!!THE VERSES DO NOT EVEN RELATE TO EACH OTHER!!

PLEASE, Ccchhhrrriiiss, CHECK YOUR SOURCES, only next time take the extra time to look up the verses in your King James Bible, that you "supposedly" prefer to all the other versions that you own & study---even though you use every version under the sun---- and really find no Doctinal differences between any of them.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiiss wrote:
I repeat, Waltern...

DELETED

How about the differences in numbers between II Samuel 24:24 and I Chronicles 21:22-25?

DELETED

:-(

Re:, on: 2008/11/21 0:28

Ccchhhrrriiiss asked:

How about the differences in numbers between I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25?

Walter responds to ccchhhrrriiiss:

The Scripture:

I Kings 4:26 (KJV)

26. And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

II Chronicles 9:25 (KJV)

25. And Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen; whom he bestowed in the chariot cities, and with the king at Jerusalem. 26. And he reigned over all the kings from the river even unto the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt.

Finally, you have provided something to compare!

Walter continues

First cchhhrrriiss, instead of approaching this Bible scripture with suspicion, looking for any "discrepancy", instead of approaching Scripture as a "textual CRITIC" (which you are), try to approach it as God's Spirit breathed Word, in prayer, and in reverence and in fear.

What is the Book of First Kings all about?

The first half of First Kings traces the life of Solomon. Under his leadership Israel rises to the peak of her size and glory. Solomon's great accomplishments, including the unsurpassed splendor of the temple which he constructs in Jerusalem, bring him worldwide fame and respect. However, Solomon's zeal for God diminishes in his later years as pagan wives turn his heart away from worship in the temple of God. As a result, the King with the divided heart leaves behind a divided kingdom. For the next century, the Book of Kings traces the twin histories of two sets of kings and two nations of disobedient people who are growing indifferent to God's prophets and precepts.

Like the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings were originally one in the Hebrew Bible. The original title was Melech, "Kings," taken from the first word in 1:1, Vehamelech, "Now king."

The time of First Kings

The Book of Kings was written to the remaining kingdom of Judah before its Babylonian exile. The majority was compiled by a contemporary of Jeremiah, if not by Jeremiah himself (c. 646-570 B.C.) It is a record of the Babylonian captivity of Israel (722 B.C.) and the Babylonian Captivity of Judah (586 B.C.). First Kings covers the 120 years from the beginning of Solomon's reign in 971 B.C. through Ahaziah's reign ending in 851 B.C. The key date is 931 B.C., the year the kingdom is divided into the northern nation of Israel and the southern nation of Judah.

The Books of Chronicles (both of them) cover the same period in Jewish history described in Second Samuel through Second Kings, but the perspective is different. These books are no mere repetition of the same material, but rather form a divine editorial on the history of God's people. While Second Samuel and First and Second Kings give a political history of Israel and Judah, First and Second Chronicles present a religious history of the Davidic dynasty of Judah. The former are written from a prophetic and moral viewpoint, and the latter from a priestly and spiritual perspective. The Book of First Chronicles begins with the royal line of David and then traces the spiritual significance of David's righteous reign. The 1st and 2nd Chronicles were originally one continuous work in the Hebrew. The title was Dibere Hayyamin, meaning "The Word of Days." The equivalent meaning today would be "The Events of the Times." The time of 1st Chronicles: The genealogies in Chapters 1-9 cover the time of Adam to David, and chapter 10-29 focus on the 33 years of David's rule over the United Kingdoms of Israel and Judah (1004-971 BC). However, the genealogies extend to about 500 B.C., as seen in the mention of Zerubbabel, grandson of King Jeconiah, who leads the first return of the Jews from exile in 538 B.C., and also Zerubbabel's two grandsons Pelatiah and Jeshaiiah (3:21).

The time of 2nd Chronicles is covered as follows: Chapters 1-9 cover the forty years from 971 B.C. to 931 B.C., and chapters 10-36 cover the 494 years from 931 B.C. Jeremiah's prediction of a seventy-year captivity in Babylon (36:21; Jer 29:10) is fulfilled in two ways: 1) a political captivity in which Jerusalem is overcome from 605 B.C. to 536 B.C., and (2) a religious captivity involving the destruction of the temple in 586 B.C. and the completion of the new temple in 516 or 515 B.C.

Now, with this understanding, we can see that we have two different "types" of Books. We can also see that Solomon was a King for 40 years, a very long time. If we were to pray about this difference in the number of horses, and why they might vary, it is easy to determine that since Solomon was the King for 40 years, and his love for horses, which was forbidden by the law, increased right along with his increase in passion for foreign women who did not worship Jehovah (also forbidden by the law) we can see that early on in his reign Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen. Later in his reign, as his appetite for horses and foreign women increased, he later had FORTY THOUSAND stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

However, Cchhhrrriiss, if you pick up your non King James version you will not find any difference at all between these verses. How could that be??? Because a textual critic came along, with his scissors and indelible black pen, and made them say the same thing!

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

That is what is wrong, terribly wrong with all of the "newer" versions created since 1881—ALL OF THEM ARE FULL OF ERROR.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:
I repeat, Waltern...

If God "perfectly preserved" the KJV "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

How about the differences in numbers between II Samuel 24:24 and I Chronicles 21:22-25?

I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25?

DELETED

Are you going to answer -- or simply continue to inform us that we are "pulling at straws" for failing to admire your own reasoning?

:-(

Now

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/11/21 0:33

Waltern...

Try reading the numbers correctly before you go about spewing your ridicule, okay?

The comparison was between **II Samuel 24:24** and I Chronicles 21:22-25 (not II Samuel 24:4).

But let's look at them from the KJV:

Quote:

II Samuel 24:24

And the king said unto Araunah, Nay; but I will surely buy it of thee at a price: neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the LORD my God of that which doth cost me nothing. So David bought the threshingfloor and the oxen **for fifty shekels of silver.**

I Chronicles 21:22-25

22 Then David said to Ornan, Grant me the place of this threshingfloor, that I may build an altar therein unto the LORD: thou shalt grant it me for the full price: that the plague may be stayed from the people.

23 And Ornan said unto David, Take it to thee, and let my lord the king do that which is good in his eyes: lo, I give thee the oxen also for burnt offerings, and the threshing instruments for wood, and the wheat for the meat offering; I give it all.

24 And king David said to Ornan, Nay; but I will verily buy it for the full price: for I will not take that which is thine for the LORD, nor offer burnt offerings without cost.

25 So David gave to Ornan **for the place six hundred shekels of gold by weight.**

So was the Temple Mount purchased for 50 shekels or 600 shekels?

You argue that the KJV is perfect down to the last "dot and tittle." Really? Then what is your explanation for this error?

:-(

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/21 0:38

Quote:

waltern wrote:

Ccchhrrriiiss asked:

How about the differences in numbers between
I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25?

I Kings 4:26 (KJV)

26. And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

II Chronicles 9:25 (KJV)

25. And Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen; whom he bestowed in the chariot cities, and with the king at Jerusalem. 26. And he reigned over all the kings from the river even unto the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt.

Finally, you have provided something to compare!

First ccchhrrriiiss, instead of approaching this Bible scripture with suspicion, looking for any "discrepancy", instead of approaching Scripture as a "textural CRITIC" (which you are), try to approach it as God's Spirit breathed Word, in prayer, and in reverence and in fear.

What is the Book of First Kings all about?

The first half of First Kings traces the life of Solomon. Under his leadership Israel rises to the peak of her size and glory. Solomon's great accomplishments, including the unsurpassed splendor of the temple which he constructs in Jerusalem, bring him worldwide fame and respect. However, Solomon's zeal for God diminishes in his later years as pagan wives turn his heart away from worship in the temple of God. As a result, the King with the divided heart leaves behind a divided kingdom. For the next century, the Book of Kings traces the twin histories of two sets of kings and two nations of disobedient people who are growing indifferent to God's prophets and precepts.

Like the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings were originally one in the Hebrew Bible. The original title was Melechim, "Kings" taken from the first word in 1:1, Vehamelech, "Now king."

The time of First Kings

The Book of Kings was written to the remaining kingdom of Judah before its Babylonian exile. The majority was compiled by a contemporary of Jeremiah, if not by Jeremiah himself (c. 646-570 B.C.) It is a record of the Babylonian captivity of Israel (722 B.C.) and the Babylonian Captivity of Judah (586 B.C.). First Kings covers the 120 years from the beginning of Solomon's reign in 971 B.C. through Ahaziah's reign ending in 851 B.C. The Key date is 931 B.C., the year the kingdom is divided into the northern nation of Israel and the southern nation of Judah.

The Books of Chronicles (both of them) cover the same period in Jewish history described in Second Samuel through Second Kings, but their perspective is different. These books are no mere repetition of the same material, but rather form a divine editorial on the history of God's people. While Second Samuel and First and Second Kings give a political history of Israel and Judah, First and Second Chronicles present a religious history of the Davidic dynasty of Judah. The former are written from a prophetic and moral viewpoint, and the latter from a priestly and spiritual perspective. The Book of First Chronicles begins with the royal line of David and then traces the spiritual significance of David's righteous reign. The 1st and 2nd Chronicles were originally one continuous work in the Hebrew. The title was Dibere Hayyamin, meaning "The Word of Days." The equivalent meaning today would be "The Events of the Times." The time of 1st Chronicles: The genealogies in Chapters 1-9 cover the time of Adam to David, and chapter 10-29 focus on the 33 years of David's rule over the United Kingdoms of Israel and Judah (1004-971 BC). However, the genealogies extend to about 500 B.C., as seen in the mention of Zerubbabel, grandson of King Jeconiah, who leads the first return of the Jews from exile in 538 B.C., and also Zerubbabel's two grandsons Pelatiah and Jesaiah (3:21).

The time of 2nd Chronicles is covered as follows: Chapters 1-9 cover the forty years from 971 B.C. to 931 B.C., and chapters 10-36 cover the 494 years from 931 B.C. Jeremiah's prediction of a seventy-year captivity in Babylon (36:21; Jer 29:10) is fulfilled in two ways: 1) a political captivity in which Jerusalem is overcome from 605 B.C. to 536 B.C., and (2) a religious captivity involving the destruction of the temple in 586 B.C. and the completion of the new temple in 516 or 515 B.C.

Now, with this understanding, we can see that we have two different "types" of Books. We can also see that Solomon was a King for 40 years, a very long time. If we were to pray about this difference in the number of horses, and why they might vary, it is easy to determine that since Solomon was the King for 40 years, and his love for horses, which was forbidden by the law, increased right along with his increase in passion for foreign women who did not worship Jehovah (also forbidden by the law) we can see that early on in his reign Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen. Later in his reign, as his appetite for horses and foreign women increased, he later had thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

However, Ccchhrrriiiss, if you pick up your non King James version you will not find any difference at all between these verses. How could that be??? Because a textural critic came along, with his scissors and intelligible black pen, and made them say the same thing!

That is what is wrong, terribly wrong with all of the "newer" versions created since 1881—ALL OF THEM ARE FULL OF ERROR.

Sincerely,

Walter

I Kings 4:26 (KJV)

26 And Solomon had **forty thousand** stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

II Chronicles 9:25 (KJV)

25. And Solomon had **four thousand** stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen; whom he bestowed in the chariot cities, and with the king at Jerusalem.

So are you saying this isn't an "error?"

Wow, that is incredible! It looks so much like a simple number error. In fact, after all of your words and wordy explanation -- it still looks like an obvious error to me.

I guess that the KJV is NOT perfect down to the "last dot and tittle."

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/21 0:50

Brother waltern...

Before you go about calling my charges "false" (which is a LIE, brother), you need to read what I wrote without adding to it. I said that the KJV included the Apocrypha. How is that false? It did include the Apocrypha!

Now, you are basing your rationale behind it on a book written by who? I don't suppose that would be a KJV-only book, now would it? I trust that you would perform REAL research that traced just WHY the translators included the Apocrypha?

Brother, you need to be extremely careful with your words. You write long and difficult to follow posts (which I don't know whether they are yours or someone else's, because you seem to miss PROPER citations sometimes). Yet I am bothered by your pretense of acting as though you know what I am believing. YOU DO NOT KNOW ME. You cannot pretend to know my motives...or my rationale. Why do you pretend so often?

I am not ANTI-KJV. I am simply saying that the KJV is not perfect to the last "dot and tittle" (as you have claimed several times before). I am not even trying to say that the KJV is not the most accurate version of the Scriptures in English. I am simply saying that I cannot make a determination based upon all of the evidence that I have seen.

By your many posts and threads, you seem to be consumed with the idea that this is a pressing issue in today's world. Forgive me if I am wrong, but you almost seem to hate any translation other than the KJV. You spew allegation after insinuation on "modern versions" that often seem to be short on evidence. You question the extent of my research -- yet you never include all of yours.

Brother, we can agree to disagree. I don't think that you are willing to consider anything other than what you already believe about the KJV. But please don't sit there assuming that I am attacking the Word of God. I'm not. The Word of God is living and active. But praise God that it is not confined to the words of the KJV only!

Re:, on: 2008/11/21 1:05

To ccchhrrriiiss:

My response was quite long because the subject deserved clarification. But, then I should have known that you had no interest in reading it through entirely anyway.

This is the summary:

1) Now, with this understanding, we can see that we have two different "types" of Books. The Books of Chronicles (both of them) cover the same period in Jewish history described in Second Samuel through Second Kings, but the

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

perspective is different. These books are no mere repetition of the same material, but rather form a divine editorial on the history of God's people. While Second Samuel and First and Second Kings give a political history of Israel and Judah, First and Second Chronicles present a religious history of the Davidic dynasty of Judah. The former are written from a prophetic and moral viewpoint, and the latter from a priestly and spiritual perspective

2) We can also see that Solomon was a King for 40 years, a very long time.

3) If we were to pray about this difference in the number of horses, and why they might vary, it is easy to determine that since Solomon was the King for 40 years, and his love for horses, which was forbidden by the law, INCREASED right along with his INCREASE in passion for foreign women who did not worship Jehovah (also forbidden by the law) we can see that EARLY ON IN HIS REIGN SOLOMAN HAD FOUR THOUSAND STALLS FOR HORSES AND CHARIOTS, AND TWELVE THOUSAND HORSEMEN.

4) Later in his reign, AS HIS APPETITE FOR HORSES AND FOREIGN WOMEN INCREASED, HE LATER IN HIS REIGN, AT ANOTHER TIME, HAD FORTY THOUSAND STALLS FOR HIS CHARIOTS AND TWELVE THOUSAND HORSEMEN.

But ccchhhrrriiss, you don't have to worry it at all. Just pick up your favorite NIV. The textual critics have cut and pasted it so that you see no difference. There definitely is a difference between the two texts, but there is a rational reason for the difference that corresponds to Solomon, who started off with zeal to the Lord, but as he got older the zeal diminished in direct proportion to his foreign wives who did not worship Jehovah. But, not to worry with your newer version that they (textual critics) have cut and pasted everything together for you just right. Now it is so clear, you do not have to pray before you read and study your NIV or any other newer version, they have simplified it for you.

But yet, Ccchhhrrriiss, both of these "versions", the King James Version and ALL of the newer versions--- are the same to you. Both are suspect, and all scripture is subject to textual criticism and erasure and correction if and when necessary.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiss wrote:

Quote:

DELETED

So are you saying this isn't an "error?"

Wow, that is incredible! It looks so much like a simple number error. In fact, after all of your words and wordy explanation -- it still looks like an obvious error to me.

I guess that the KJV is NOT perfect down to the "last dot and tittle."

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2008/11/21 1:13

Brother Waltern...

Quote:
-----My response was quite long because the subject deserved clarification. But, then **I should have known that you had no interest in reading it through entirely anyway.**

???

Could you please stop making such false statements and damaging assumptions?

Brother, I disagree with you on this. As far as I can see, these are obvious errors. There are many more, and you would probably write a book trying to explain them away. My guess: Someone probably just wrote them down wrong, and they were passed along that way. But these errors aren't important to my salvation or my relationship with Christ.

Quote:
-----Now it is so clear, you do not have to pray before you read and study your NIV or other newer version, they have simplified it for you.

But, brother, could you refrain from making such mean-spirited or personal remarks? I use the NIV (but I use the KJV even more). Yet I pray every time I read either of them. In fact, I know many good and sincere believers who use both versions and pray before they read too.

Re:, on: 2008/11/21 2:34

Ccchhrrriiiss previously posted:

“If God "perfectly preserved" the KJV "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

Walter's response to Ccchhrrriiiss:

Lets look up the Scripture:

II Samuel 24:9 (KJV)

9. And Joab gave up the sum of the number of the people unto the king: and there were in Israel EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND VALIANT MEN that drew the sword; and the men of Judah were FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND MEN.

1 Chronicles 21: 5 (KJV). And Joab gave the sum of the number of the people unto David. And all they of Israel were a THOUSAND THOUSAN AND AN HUNDRED THOUSAND MEN that drew sword: and Judah was FOUR HUNDRED THREESCORE AND TEN THOUSAND MEN that drew sword.

Walter continues in response to ccchhrrriiiss above:

The reason we have a difference is because in the Book of Chronicles Joab did not count the tribes of Levi and Benjamin. How do I know that? BECAUSE I READ THE NEXT VERSE IN 1 Chronicles 21:6

6.But Levi and Benjamin counted he not among them: for the king's word was abominable to Joab.

**That is why the numbers of the tribes differ. THE TRIBES OF LEVI AND BENJAMIN WERE NOT INCLUDED BY JOAB IN THE BOOK OF 1 CHRONICLES, BUT WERE INCLUDED IN THE COUNT IN THE BOOK OF 2ND SAMUEL!!
!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!**

This is such a sad thing to see. You have looked this up somewhere, probably on Metzger's anti-King James website, and posted it here without even checking it out to see if it is true. And then you expect to be taken seriously? Ccchhrrriiiss, this is not your work. You have not searched the King James on your own and found these "discrepancies", but merely cut and pasted them from the works of others who are opposed the King James enough to do everything in their power to malign it, even to deceive others. You were deceived by their work.

k, and then passed it on her unknowingly trying to deceive others.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:
I repeat, Waltern...

If God "perfectly preserved" the KJV "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

DELETED

:-(

:-(

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/21 3:15

Waltern...

Quote:

-----This is such a sad thing to see. You have looked this up somewhere, probably on Metzger's anti-King James website, and posted it here without even checking it out to see if it is true. And then you expect to be taken seriously? Ccchhrrriiiss, this is not your work. You have not searched the King James on your own and found these "discrepancies", but merely cut and pasted them from the works of others who are opposed to the King James enough to do everything in their power to malign it, even to deceive others. You were deceived by their work, and then passed it on her unknowingly trying to deceive others.

Waltern, I have already asked you to refrain from such false assumptions and character assassination. I heard of these discrepancies a long time ago and then looked them up myself.

Before you LIE again, please think before you write. This, by the way, is a rebuke...in love, dear brother. I know that you embrace the KJV, but I would hope that you could discuss this without such a poor choice of words regarding your assumptions of those with whom you disagree (which I hope that you can't be so strange as to believe).

Should I, however, make a list of all such apparent errors so that you can explain them away in the effort to preserve your belief that the KJV is perfectly preserved down to the last "dot and tittle?" So far, you haven't provided one satisfactory defense other than an opinion (and a quote from a KJV-only source).

:-(

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/11/21 10:38

Bro. Waltern,

I use the KJV because I believe it is a reliable version to the original but I do not believe that the translation is as perfect as the original writings. I will not worship the KJV because I will only worship God.

I must say I was disappointed that you took the word Easter which is translated 26 other times as Passover to try and defend the accuracy of the KJV.

It is also clear that the scripture before it mentions the days of unleavened bread.

I do hope that we can all get along in Christian love and move on to more profitable studies.

Re:KJV, NIV, NASB, ETC., on: 2008/11/21 16:26

To ccchhrrriiss:

I have answered your first question about the difference between II Samuel 24:9 (KJV) & 1 Chronicles 21: 5 (KJV).

The reason the verses do not agree is that they are from two separate Books from God's Word, written by two separate men at different times in history, empowered by the Holy Ghost, that are explaining the counting that David ordered performed of the Israelites. God did not want David to do this, but he did it anyway.

In one book (2nd Samuel), we see the full count. In another book (1 Chronicles), the count is different. Why is the count different? Because God, through the power of the Holy Spirit, reveals to us that when Joab counted the tribes, he purposely did not include the tribes Levi and Benjamin.

Can you understand this concept, Chris? God is revealing to us what really happened. David got the final count by including the tribes of Levi and Dan once he became aware of what Joab had done.

God has revealed to us through one of His Books (1 Chronicles) how Joab miscounted the people on purpose. Then, in a parallel book (2 Samuel), going over the same event, by another author, empowered by the Holy Spirit, God has revealed to us the actual count of all the tribes of Israel.

This is a further help to understand this issue:

The 800,000 from Israel in 2 Samuel 24:9 may not have included the 300,000 listed in 1 Chronicles 27, which would make the total (as in 1 Chronicles) 1,100,000. The 470,000 in Judah may not have included the 30,000 of 2 Samuel 6:1, which would bring the total to 500,000. Or, perhaps the Chronicles figure represents a round number.

In conclusion, if you really studied your NIV, in the Old Testament, the same "discrepancy" (as you like to characterize it) found in your reference above between 2nd Samuel 24:9 & 1 Chronicles 21: 5 EXISTS IN THE NIV AND THE NEWER VERSIONS AS WELL.

So, that must mean that you do not trust the Authorized version (the King James Bible) nor do you trust the NIV or other "newer" versions. WHY? Because they all quote the same text, the same numbers, identical to the King James Version!!!!!!

The King James quotes 2nd Samuel 24:9 as:

" 9. And Joab gave up the sum of the number of the people unto the king: and there were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant men that drew the sword; and the men of Judah were five hundred thousand men.

The King James quote 1 Chronicles 21:5 as:

" 5. And Joab gave the sum of the number of the people unto David. And all they of Israel were a thousand thousand and an hundred thousand men that drew sword: and Judah was four hundred threescore and ten thousand men that drew sword."

2nd Samuel 24:9 & 1 Chronicles 21:5

American Standard= identical to the KJV

New King James= identical To the KJV

Living Bible= identical to the KJV

Revised Standard= identical to the KJV

New American Standard= identical to the KJV

New Jerusalem Bible= identical to the KJV

NIV= identical to the KJV

So the answer is, all of the versions, including the King James, agree with each other And have an identical rendering of the NUMBERS.

Well, here were again ccchhhrrriiisss and it appears that you have not done your homework to prove your post before making blatant accusations. Specifically:

XX
POSTED BY CCCHHHRRRIIISSS EARLIER:
I repeat, Waltern...

If God "perfectly preserved" the KJV "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come those mistakes exist in the text? Take, for instance, the difference between II Samuel 24:9 and I Chronicles 21:5. Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

XX

ccchhhrrriiisss---does this drastic error of yours have any affect on you? Only wondering.

Sincerely,

Walter

Re:, on: 2008/11/21 17:05

To Rbanks:

I provided this on a previous post. In order to understand the Feasts of the Lord, given by God through Moses in the Old Testament, it is imperative to study them.

The feasts we are focused on in this thread are: the feast of Passover, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the Feast of Firstfruits.

These Feasts were established by God to take place at specific times of the year, on specific months on specific days--- forever and were celebrated in the month of Abib:

14th of Abib= Passover--one day Feast

15th of Abib= Feast of Unleavened Bread-

the first day of this feast, the 15th was celebrated as a Sabath day, even though it occurred on different days of the week than Saturday. It was called a "High Holy Day". It was to be celebrated for 7 days, finishing at the end of the 21st.

17th of Abib= Feast of Firstfruits. One day Feast

The year Christ died on the Cross for our sins:

1. The 14th occurred on a Thursday, just like it did in the year that God led the Jews out of Egypt with a mighty hand.
2. The 15th occurred on a Friday. The Jewish "day" starts at 6:00 P.M. and continues until the next day, at 6:00 P.M. when the next day would start. Jesus had to be taken off the cross before the High Day (a High Holy Day). The 15th was celebrated as a High Holy Day--see John 19:31 that proves that Christ was taken down from the cross before the start of the Feast of Unleavened bread, which was a "High day", that started on the evening of the 14th, that occurred at 6:00 P.M.--and not the regular Sabath day (Saturday)
John 19:31. The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.

The 17th occurred on a Sunday, and is the feast of Firstfruits. It is also the day that Jesus Christ resurrected from the dead--Jesus Christ is our FIRSTFRUITS!

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

If this has any interest to you, the following verses will be helpful:

The Passover occurs on one day, and one day alone. The day? The 14th of Abib (Tishre), the day that God led the Jews out of Egypt with a mighty hand. It is also the same day that Jesus Christ was crucified for our sins, the day of Passover, the 14th of Abib (Tishre). He was crucified at the 3rd hour (9:00 A.M.), at the time of the MORNING SACRIFICE that had taken place at the Tabernacle, and later at the Temple since God commanded it in Exodus, and gave up the Ghost at the 9th hour (3:00 P.M.), the time of the evening sacrifice at the Temple.

Please check out the following for a full understanding of the Passover and when it was celebrated. Passover was commanded by God to ALWAYS be celebrated on the 14th of Abib (Tishre):

Exodus, Chapter 12; Leviticus 23:5-6; Numbers Chapter 9; Numbers Chapter 28; Numbers Chapter 23; Deuteronomy Chapter 16; Joshua, Chapter 5; 2nd Kings Chapter 23; Chronicles Chapter 35; Ezra Chapter 6

Christ is our Passover (1 Cor 1:5). Christ is our Firstfruits (1 Cor. 15:20).

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

rbanks wrote:
Bro. Waltern,

I use the KJV because i believe it is a reliable version to the original but I do not believe that the translation is as perfect as the original writings. I will not worship the KJV because I will only worship God.

I must say I was disappointed that you took the word Easter which is translated 26 other times as passover to try and defend the accuracy of the KJV.

It is also clear that the scripture before it mentions the days of unleavened bread.

I do hope that we can all get along in christian love and move on to more profitable studies.

Re: - posted by paulamicela (), on: 2008/11/21 17:11

It is sad that this thread has turned into another full-fledged Bible version debate.

Waltern, the sermonindex.net moderators have already given warnings.

Chris, I know that this is an interesting topic (I like to discuss it myself), but this debate is getting absolutely nowhere. It might be most expedient to end the discussion.

-Paul

Re:, on: 2008/11/21 20:11

To Paulamicela:

Come on Paul, be nice.

Have you studied this entire thread, or did you just look at the last one or two posts?

What has been posted on this thread has been of great interest to some. I pray that those who participate in it will have a better understanding of Scripture and will have a closer walk with our Lord, Jesus Christ.

Sincerely,

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

Walter

:~)

Quote:

paulamicela wrote:

It is sad that this thread has turned into another full-fledged Bible version debate.

Walter, the sermonindex.net moderators have already given warnings.

Chris, I know that this is an interesting topic (I like to discuss it myself), but this debate is getting absolutely nowhere. It might be most expedient to end the discussion.

-Paul

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/21 20:43

Hi Walter...

I read your answer, and still do not agree with it. I was wondering: Do you have an explanation for each of the other examples of error? I could include more examples of KJV errors (if you need them).

My point? Just to show you that although the KJV is a good translation, it is not "perfect" and "preserved" down to the "last dot and tittle."

Re:Discrepancies? NOT!, on: 2008/11/21 23:26

Ccchhrrriiiss posted the following to Walter:

I read your answer, and still do not agree with it. I was wondering: Do you have an explanation for each of the other examples of error? I could include more examples of KJV errors (if you need them).

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Walter's response to ccchhrrriiiss:

When have you ever agreed with anything that I have ever posted?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

ccchhrrriiiss continues:

Brother, you believe that God has "perfectly preserved" His Word...and that it is found in the KJV (even though, in this case, the original source used for this passage disagrees with the way it was translated). So you argue away this apparent mistake. But what about the other mistakes in the KJV? I pointed these out in another thread. Most of these examples are from the Old Testament (and, thus, not from the Textus Receptus). Yet they are undeniable mistakes nonetheless. If God "perfectly preserved" His written Word "down to the last dot and tittle" (as you have said before), then how come these mistakes exist in the text?

How about the differences in numbers between II Samuel 24:24 and I Chronicles 21:22-25? I Kings 4:26 and II Chronicles 9:25? I Kings 5:16 and II Chronicles 2:2? I Kings 7:15-22 and II Chronicles 3:15-17? I Kings 7:26 and II Chronicles 4:5? I Kings 16:6-8 and II Chronicles 16:1? II Kings 8:25-26 and II Chronicles 22:2? Notice a discrepancy in the numbers here?

Should I go on? These are apparent contradictions that occur in the Old Testament of the KJV (and some other versions). Is God's Word perfectly preserved to the last "dot and tittle" -- or does it contain some errors?

Your entire argument for the KJV seems based upon the notion that the KJV (and almost, the KJV alone) is supernatural

ly "perserved" as entirely and completely perfect in every way

XX

Walter responds to ccchhrrriiiss:

Guess what? There are no differences between the KJV and other versions in regards to the MISTAKES OR DISCREPENCIES IN THE "NUMBERS" THAT YOU POST ABOVE. THE SAME "MISTAKES OR DISCREPANCIES": AS YOU CALL THEM, EXIST IN EACH OF THE TRANSLATIONS THAT I LOOKED AT. IT IS NOT A KING JAMES PROBLEM, IT IS A CCCHHRRRIIISSS PROBLEM!

I have checked the KJV against the ASV, NIV and other Bible versions. Guess what? They all agree with the KJV. There are no "MISTAKES" between these different versions. The mistake rests in the eyes and understanding of the beholder. Like I posted previously:

First ccchhrrriiiss, instead of approaching Bible scripture with suspicion, looking for any "discrepancy", instead of approaching Scripture as a "textual critic"---instead, approach the Bible as God's Spirit breathed Word, in prayer, and in reverence and in fear.

What is the Book of First Kings all about?

The first half of First Kings traces the life of Solomon. Under his leadership Israel rises to the peak of her size and glory. Solomon's great accomplishments, including the unsurpassed splendor of the temple which he constructs in Jerusalem, bring him worldwide fame and respect. However, Solomon's zeal for God diminishes in his later years as pagan wives turn his heart away from worship in the temple of God. As a result, the King with the divided heart leaves behind a divided kingdom. For the next century, the Book of Kings traces the twin histories of two sets of kings and two nations of disobedient people who are growing indifferent to God's prophets and precepts.

Like the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings were originally one in the Hebrew Bible. The original title was Melech, "Kings," taken from the first word in 1:1, Vekhamelech, "Now king."

The time of First Kings

The Book of Kings was written to the remaining kingdom of Judah before its Babylonian exile. The majority was compiled by a contemporary of Jeremiah, if not by Jeremiah himself (c. 646-570 B.C.) It is a record of the Babylonian captivity of Israel (722 B.C.) and the Babylonian Captivity of Judah (586 B.C.). First Kings covers the 120 years from the beginning of Solomon's reign in 971 B.C. through Ahaziah's reign ending in 851 B.C. The key date is 931 B.C., the year the kingdom is divided into the northern nation of Israel and the southern nation of Judah.

The Books of Chronicles (both of them) cover the same period in Jewish history described in Second Samuel through Second Kings, but the perspective is different. These books are no mere repetition of the same material, but rather form a divine editorial on the history of God's people. While Second Samuel and First and Second Kings give a political history of Israel and Judah, First and Second Chronicles present a religious history of the Davidic dynasty of Judah. The former are written from a prophetic and moral viewpoint, and the latter from a priestly and spiritual perspective. The Book of First Chronicles begins with the royal line of David and then traces the spiritual significance of David's righteous reign. The 1st and 2nd Chronicles were originally one continuous work in the Hebrew. The title was Dibere Hayyamin, meaning "The Word of Days." The equivalent meaning today would be "The Events of the Times." The time of 1st Chronicles: The genealogies in Chapters 1-9 cover the time of Adam to David, and chapter 10-29 focus on the 33 years of David's rule over the United Kingdoms of Israel and Judah (1004-971 BC). However, the genealogies extend to about 500 B.C., as seen in the mention of Zerubbabel, grandson of King Jeconiah, who leads the first return of the Jews from exile in 538 B.C., and also Zerubbabel's two grandsons Pelatiah and Jeshaiiah (3:21).

The time of 2nd Chronicles is covered as follows: Chapters 1-9 cover the forty years from 971 B.C. to 931 B.C., and chapters 10-36 cover the 494 years from 931 B.C. Jeremiah's prediction of a seventy-year captivity in Babylon (36:21; Jer 29:10) is fulfilled in two ways: 1) a political captivity in which Jerusalem is overcome from 605 B.C. to 536 B.C., and (2) a religious captivity involving the destruction of the temple in 586 B.C. and the completion of the new temple in 515 B.C.

Now, with this understanding, we can see why they don't match 100%. They are not authored by God, through the power of the Holy Ghost to satisfy an ACCOUNTANT. They are meant to present religious history, a prophetic and moral viewpoint (from a priestly and spiritual perspective), and to bring believers closer to Jesus Christ through the power of His Word and the Holy Spirit.

ccchhhrrriiss, here is the analysis, prepared just for you:

II Samuel 24:24 and KJV

24. And the king said unto Araunah, Nay; but I will surely buy it of thee at a price: neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which doth cost me nothing. So David bought the threshingfloor and the oxen for fifty shekels of silver.

ASV

24. And the king said unto Araunah, Nay; but I will verily buy it of thee at a price. Neither will I offer burnt-offerings unto Jehovah my God which cost me nothing. So David bought the threshing-floor and the oxen for fifty shekels of silver.

I Chronicles 21:22-25? KJV

22. Then David said to Ornan, Grant me the place of this threshingfloor, that I may build an altar therein unto the Lord: thou shalt grant it me for the full price: that the plague may be stayed from the people. 23. And Ornan said unto David, Take it to thee, and let my lord the king do that which is good in his eyes: lo, I give thee the oxen also for burnt offerings, and the threshing instruments for wood, and the wheat for the meat offering; I give it all. 24. And king David said to Ornan, Nay; but I will verily buy it for the full price: for I will not take that which is thine for the Lord, nor offer burnt offerings without cost. 25. So David gave to Ornan for the place six hundred shekels of gold by weight.

ASV

22. Then David said to Ornan, Give me the place of this threshing-floor, that I may build thereon an altar unto Jehovah: for the full price shalt thou give it me, that the plague may be stayed from the people. 23. And Ornan said unto David, Take it to thee, and let my lord the king do that which is good in his eyes: lo, I give thee the oxen for burnt-offerings, and the threshing instruments for wood, and the wheat for the meal-offering; I give it all.

24. And king David said to Ornan, Nay; but I will verily buy it for the full price: for I will not take that which is thine for Jehovah, nor offer a burnt-offering without cost.

25. So David gave to Ornan for the place six hundred shekels of gold by weight.

I Kings 4:26 and KJV

26. And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

ASV

26. And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

II Chronicles 9:25?KJV

25. And Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen; whom he bestowed in the chariot cities, and with the king at Jerusalem.

ASV

25. And Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen, that he bestowed in the chariot cities, and with the king at Jerusalem.

I Kings 5:16 and KJV

16. Beside the chief of Solomon's officers which were over the work, three thousand and three hundred, which ruled over the people that wrought in the work.

ASV

16. besides Solomon's chief officers that were over the work, three thousand and three hundred, who bare rule over the people that wrought in the work.

II Chronicles 2:2? KJV

2. And Solomon told out threescore and ten thousand men to bear burdens, and fourscore thousand to hew in the mountain, and three thousand and six hundred to oversee them.

ASV

2. And Solomon counted out threescore and ten thousand men to bear burdens, and fourscore thousand men that were hewers in the mountains, and three thousand and six hundred to oversee them.

I Kings 7:15-22 and KJV

15. For he cast two pillars of brass, of eighteen cubits high apiece: and a line of twelve cubits did compass either of them about. 16. And he made two chapiters of molten brass, to set upon the tops of the pillars: the height of the one chapter was five cubits, and the height of the other chapter was five cubits: 17. And nets of checker work, and wreaths of chain work, for the chapiters which were upon the top of the pillars; seven for the one chapter, and seven for the other chapter.

18. And he made the pillars, and two rows round about upon the one network, to cover the chapiters that were upon the top, with pomegranates: and so did he for the other chapter. 19. And the chapiters that were upon the top of the pillars were of lily work in the porch, four cubits. 20. And the chapiters upon the two pillars had pomegranates also above, over against the belly which was by the network: and the pomegranates were two hundred in rows round about upon the other chapter. 21. And he set up the pillars in the porch of the temple: and he set up the right pillar, and called the name thereof Jachin: and he set up the left pillar, and called the name thereof Boaz. 22. And upon the top of the pillars was lily work: so was the work of the pillars finished.

ASV

15. For he fashioned the two pillars of brass, eighteen cubits high apiece: and a line of twelve cubits compassed either of them about. 16. And he made two capitals of molten brass, to set upon the tops of the pillars: the height of the one capital was five cubits, and the height of the other capital was five cubits. 17. There were nets of checker-work, and wreaths of chain-work, for the capitals which were upon the top of the pillars; seven for the one capital, and seven for the other capital. 18. So he made the pillars; and there were two rows round about upon the one network, to cover the capitals that were upon the top of the pillars: and so did he for the other capital.

19. And the capitals that were upon the top of the pillars in the porch were of lily-work, four cubits. 20. And there were capitals above also upon the two pillars, close by the belly which was beside the network: and the pomegranates were two hundred, in rows round about upon the other capital. 21. And he set up the pillars at the porch of the temple: and he set up the right pillar, and called the name thereof Jachin; and he set up the left pillar, and called the name thereof Boaz.

22. And upon the top of the pillars was lily-work: so was the work of the pillars finished.

II Chronicles 3:15-17? KJV

15. Also he made before the house two pillars of thirty and five cubits high, and the chapter that was on the top of each of them was five cubits.

16. And he made chains, as in the oracle, and put them on the heads of the pillars; and made an hundred pomegranates, and put them on the chains.

17. And he reared up the pillars before the temple, one on the right hand, and the other on the left; and called the name of that on the right hand Jachin, and the name of that on the left Boaz.

ASV

15. Also he made before the house two pillars of thirty and five cubits high, and the capital that was on the top of each of them was five cubits. 16. And he made chains in the oracle, and put them on the tops of the pillars; and he made a hundred pomegranates, and put them on the chains. 17. And he set up the pillars before the temple, one on the right hand, and the other on the left; and called the name of that on the right hand Jachin, and the name of that on the left Boaz.

I Kings 7:26 and KJV

26. And it was an hand breadth thick, and the brim thereof was wrought like the brim of a cup, with flowers of lilies: it contained two thousand baths.

ASV

26. And it was a handbreadth thick: and the brim thereof was wrought like the brim of a cup, like the flower of a lily: it held two thousand baths.

II Chronicles 4:5? KJV

5. And the thickness of it was an handbreadth, and the brim of it like the work of the brim of a cup, with flowers of lilies; and it received and held three thousand baths.

ASV

5. And it was a handbreadth thick; and the brim thereof was wrought like the brim of a cup, like the flower of a lily: it received and held three thousand baths.

I Kings 16:6-8 and KJV

6. The nethermost chamber was five cubits broad, and the middle was six cubits broad, and the third was seven cubits broad: for without in the wall of the house he made narrowed rests round about, that the beams should not be fastened in the walls of the house. 7. And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither: so that there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building. 8. The door for the middle chamber was in the right side of the house: and they went up with winding stairs into the middle chamber, and out of the middle into the third.

ASV

6. The nethermost story was five cubits broad, and the middle was six cubits broad, and the third was seven cubits broad; for on the outside he made offsets in the wall of the house round about, that the beams should not have hold in the walls of the house.

7. And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready at the quarry; and there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building.

8. The door for the middle side-chambers was in the right side of the house: and they went up by winding stairs into the middle story, and out of the middle into the third.

II Chronicles 16:1? KJV

1. In the six and thirtieth year of the reign of Asa Baasha king of Israel came up against Judah, and built Ramah, to the intent that he might let none go out or come in to Asa king of Judah.

ASV

1. In the six and thirtieth year of the reign of Asa Baasha king of Israel came up against Judah, and built Ramah, to the intent that he might let none go out or come in to Asa king of Judah.

II Kings 8:25-26 and KJV

25. In the twelfth year of Joram the son of Ahab king of Israel did Ahaziah the son of Jehoram king of Judah begin to reign.

26. Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Athaliah, the daughter of Omri king of Israel.

ASV

25. In the twelfth year of Joram the son of Ahab king of Israel did Ahaziah the son of Jehoram king of Judah begin to reign.

26. Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Athaliah the daughter of Omri king of Israel.

II Chronicles 22:2?

2. Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. His mother's name also was Athaliah the daughter of Omri.

ASV

2. Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem: and his mother's name was Athaliah the daughter of Omri

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Walter concludes:

Well ccchhrrriiss, in conclusion, it appears that your references posted here as to all of the "errors in the King James Bible" did not come from Bruce Metzger (like I thought before-As much as I disagree with Metzger, he would never post anything like you have posted here), but from another website altogether that rejects the entire Bible!

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/22 1:51

Walter...

I didn't say that these errors were confined to the KJV. In fact, I admitted that these errors are found in other versions too. The problem that these errors create is in your insistence that the KJV is "perfect" and "preserved" -- down to "the last dot and tittle." There are errors in it. Yet it is astounding that you create arguments to defend the errors!

Nothing that you have written substantiates the fact that these are errors. Your premise seems based upon a notion that *the KJV can't possibly be wrong...so there must be another explanation.* Is this correct? In your eyes, these errors are not a KJV problem but a "ccchhrrriiiss problem."

You use so much scrutiny toward other versions. Yet when that same sort of scrutiny is applied to a version that you deem entirely "perfect" -- you seem to lose that ability to apply scrutiny. You question the backgrounds and motives of the NIV translators. Yet the translator of the TR (a single, Dutch Roman Catholic humanist named Erasmus) and the translators of the KJV (including those who held to "high church" heresies, like the doctrines of "adoration" and the "eucharist") get a free ride. You point out what you think are "mistakes" in the NIV (mostly because they differ from the KJV), yet you create arguments to defend apparent errors in the KJV. You even deny the notion that the Apocrypha was included in the KJV (and was the first section translated) -- but then seemingly defend its inclusion as if the translating committee must have been led by God to include it!

Brother, look at the verses about the amount of money that David paid for the threshing floor. How do you explain that seeming error? I fear that you create human arguments to defend a premise, rather than using real history and facts to make a proper defense. You are making presumptuous claims to defend these errors with no fact to tie your defense to the verse itself.

Easter, brother? The word is PASSOVER. It has NEVER been translated as "Easter" -- except in the KJV (and version s borrowed from it). It would be nice to actually read the footnotes from the KJV translators about this passage. Alas -- they were forbidden to include those footnotes in the final product! Yet it smells like a Roman holiday was accidentally snuck into the text of Acts 12:4 by an erring translator.

Brother, I was thinking about bringing a list of these...but I have a feeling that you would simply continue to use the same sort of arguments for it. It seems that the bottom line for you is the belief that the KJV must be right to the last "dot and tittle" -- and any error must have an explanation. There can be no reasoning with such an argument, because the premise itself (in my view) is flawed.

Don't get me wrong: The KJV is a good translation. But is it perfect down to the last "dot and tittle?" NOT EVEN THE KJV TRANSLATORS FELT THIS WAY! It is as if you must know something that they didn't know or believe.

Walter, you spend a lot of time here defending your view that the KJV is the perfect and preserved Word of God. I don't mind that you have such an opinion, but not at the expense of truth...or public contempt for any other opinion.

Can I ask you a question?

Are there any other versions of the Bible that you think fit into your "perfect and preserved down to the last dot and tittle" argument? Any?

EDIT

Quote:
-----Now, with this understanding, we can see why they don't match 100%. They are not authored by God, through the power of the Holy Ghost to satisfy an ACCOUNTANT. They are meant to present religious history, a prophetic and moral viewpoint (from a priestly and spiritual perspective), and to bring believers closer to Jesus Christ through the power of His Word and the Holy Spirit.

So you don't believe that the Book of Chronicles is inspired? Or is it Kings? Both? It seems like you are admitting that there are errors in one or the other. So correct me if I am wrong, but you are simply saying that one is inspired and the other is not?

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/11/22 12:08

I'm just reading through this thread, so sorry if this has been covered.

Quote:

-----My challenge to you still stands. Prove to me, through scripture why the King James is wrong.

Would you prove to us by using the Bible, that the KJV is the only valid version? I know, I know, the Scriptures are inspired by God, etc. but that doesn't prove that it's only the KJV.

BTW, since we're talking about the Scriptures being inspired, did you know that "inspiration" wasn't the best translation choice in the KJV?

Re:, on: 2008/11/22 12:31

Ccchhrrriiiss, I have just proved to you, on this thread, that the King James Bible is different than all of the newer versions. What did I prove to you? That the King James presents God's Word. The other versions, who rely on the minority text, as well as the work of the Gnostics, do not have the same Words. The reason is that the Gnostics cut and pasted God's Word to conform to their own understanding of what God should have said.

In this thread, Scripture proves the King James to be the only version that supports Bible Doctrine. The other versions, cut and pasted by men, have used the word Passover instead of the **ONLY word it could be-EASTER**. If these men, who cut and pasted the newer version that you rely on knew the scriptures, they would have known that it was an impossibility to arrest Peter during the Feast of Unleavened bread and release him at Passover. Passover precedes (comes before) the Feast of Unleavened Bread by one day. Passover is celebrated on the 14th of Abib, while the Feast of Unleavened Bread begins on the 15th of Abib and continues for 7 days, through the 21st of Abib. Peter was not going to release from Prison until AFTER EASTER!

Can you understand this, ccchhrrriiiss? It was an impossibility to release Peter at the Passover, because he was arrested one day after the Feast of Passover and put into prison the next day, at the beginning of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

Easter, the Pagan holiday of Ishtar, going all the way back in time to ancient Babylon is the correct rendering of the celebration that Herod would release Peter to the people. The Romans celebrated this holiday, as well as many of the Jews. In fact today, many Jews still celebrate this pagan Holiday in reverence to the fertility God Ishtar. I have proven this to you in my prior posts, on this thread.

The King James is the only Translation today for the Christian that stays true to God's **Inspired Word, period.**

Acts 12:4

King James Version 4. And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quarters of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.

New King James 4. So when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four squads of soldiers to keep him, intending to bring him before the people after **Passover**.

American Standard: 4. And when he had taken him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quarters of soldiers to guard him; intending after the **Passover** to bring him forth to the people.

Living Bible: 4. and imprisoned him, placing him under the guard of sixteen soldiers. Herod's intention was to deliver Peter to the Jews for execution after the **Passover**.

Revised Standard 4. And when he had seized him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four squads of soldiers to guard him, intending after the **Passover** to bring him out to the people

International English (NT) 4. Herod had Peter arrested and put in jail. He turned Peter over to a group of 16 soldiers to guard

guard him. Herod wanted to wait until after the **Passover Festival**. Then he planned to bring Peter before the people.

Literal Bible with Strongs **Passover (Feast)**

New American Standard 4. When he had seized him, he put him in prison, delivering him to four squads of soldiers to guard him, intending after the **Passover** to bring him out before the people.

New Jerusalem Bible (Catholic) 4. As it was during the days of Unleavened Bread that he had arrested him, he put him in prison, assigning four sections of four soldiers each to guard him, meaning to try him in public after the **Passover**.

New American with Apocrypha 4. He had him taken into custody and put in prison under the guard of four squads of four soldiers each. He intended to bring him before the people after **Passover**.

New Revised Standard with Apocrypha 4. When he had seized him, he put him in prison and handed him over to four squads of soldiers to guard him, intending to bring him out to the people after the **Passover**.

Youngs Bible 4. whom also having seized, he did put in prison, having delivered to four quaternions of soldiers to guard him, intending after the **passover** to bring him forth to the people.

Darbys Bible 4. whom having seized he put in prison, having delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep, purposing after the **passover** to bring him out to the people.

Weymnouths N.T. 4. He had him arrested and lodged in jail, handing him over to the care of sixteen soldiers; and intended after the **Passover** to bring him out again to the people.

Websters Bible 4. And when he had apprehended him, he put in prison, and delivered to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after the **passover** to bring him forth to the people.

New Living Translation 4. and imprisoned him, placing him under the guard of four squads of four soldiers each. Herod's intention was to bring Peter out for public trial after the **Passover**.

International Standard 4. When he arrested him, he put him in prison and turned him over to four squads of soldiers to guard him, planning to bring him out to the people after the **Passover**

Williams NT 4. He had him seized and put into prison, and turned him over to four squads of soldiers to guard him, planning after the **Passover** to bring him out again to the people.

Montgomery NT 4. He had him arrested and thrown in prison, and put under guard of sixteen soldiers. He intended, after the **Passover**, to bring him forth to the people.

In Conclusion:

Only the King James offers us the Inspired Word of God. The others fall short, over and over throughout the Scripture.

SCRIPTURE PRESERVATION- PROMISED TO US IN THE SCRIPTURES!

Scripture Preservation

Are the Scriptures just the "ideas" of God, or are they the very WORDS of God? You decide!

God promises to preserve His words!

**The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.
(Psalms 12:6-7)**

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

You shall not add or take away, says God!

Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the LORD God of your fathers giveth you. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.(Deuteronomy 4:1-2)

God cares about every one of His words!

"Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."(Proverbs 30:5-6)

God's words will never pass away!

"Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." (Jesus Christ, Son of God) (Mark 13:31)

God will curse those who change His Word!

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." (Revelation 22:18-19)

This doesn't sound like God inspired only the "concepts" in Scripture. He clearly directed every word and will not tolerate man's meddling with it. He calls them "His Words."

If your Bible is a King James Bible, it preserves God's words because it was translated using "FORMAL EQUIVALENCE." All other Bibles were translated using "DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE," in which the TRANSLATOR IS FREE TO CHANGE WORDS AS LONG AS HE/SHE CONVEYS THE "IDEA."

Read the above Scriptures again. Which kind of Bible do you think God wants you to have?

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:
Walter...

I didn't say that these errors were confined to the KJV. In fact, I admitted that these errors are found in other versions too. The problem that these errors create is in your insistence that the KJV is "perfect" and "preserved" -- down to "the last dot and tittle." There are errors in it. Yet it is astounding that you create arguments to defend the errors!

DELETED

EDIT

Quote:

-----Now, with this understanding, we can see why they don't match 100%. They are not authored by God, through the power of the Holy Ghost to satisfy an ACCOUNTANT. They are meant to present religious history, a prophetic and moral viewpoint (from a priestly and spiritual perspective), and to bring believers closer to Jesus Christ through the power of His Word and the Holy Spirit.

So you don't believe that the Book of Chronicles is inspired? Or is it Kings? Both? It seems like you are admitting that there are errors in one or the other. So correct me if I am wrong, but you are simply saying that one is inspired and the other is not?

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2008/11/22 13:23

Hi walter...

Quote:

-----Ccchhrrriiiss, I have just proved to you, on this thread, that the King James Bible is different than all of the newer versions.

Actually, I already knew that the KJV is different than EVERY other translation (modern or otherwise). What you have demonstrated through this thread is that the errors found in the KJV are present in some other translations as well.

Quote:

-----What did I prove to you? That the King James presents God's Word .

...and I never said that the KJV was anything less than a translation of God's Word. However, it seems like your argument is built upon a sandy foundation that claims that the KJV is the ONLY acceptable, perfect and preserved version of God's Word. For instance...

Quote:

-----In this thread, Scripture proves the King James to be the only version that supports Bible Doctrine.

Do you see what you are doing here? You are trying to argue that the KJV is the only version of the Bible that is correct. I fear that you don't realize what you are doing.

You once asked me where I performed my research. I have gone over this in the past with you, but I still provided examples of how and why I came to the conclusions that I have arrived at. But what about you? Where did YOU get your beliefs? Upon what evidence, through research, did you come to such a conclusion about the KJV being "perfect and preserved" to the "last dot and tittle?" I know that you had to do research (given your choice to "cut and paste" words from other KJV-only sources). But I take it that you didn't just research KJV-only books, right? You had to have tested everything by researching the claims in those books in order to prove the truth, right? Where did you do YOUR research? I know you must have prayed (like I did). But upon what evidence, other than a few KJV-only books, have you based your arguments?

Where did you get this notion about Easter? Are you a text scholar or an expert in the field of Jewish anthropology (especially in regard to your claims about Easter)? Where did you get your information about the word/passage of Acts 12:4 and the notion that this word should be "Easter" instead of "Passover" (which is the word choice for nearly every other version -- including those taken from the same sources and those that predate the KJV).

Your argument about "Easter" is something entirely extra-Biblical. You seem to argue that the translators must have used their own intellect to reason that the word should be Easter. Upon what evidence are you basing this? Do you have proof that this was their rationale? Do you have proof that their rationale was anything except a typo?

You haven't proven anything...except that the premise for YOUR argument is based upon a notion that the KJV cannot have a single misplaced letter or error -- and that all other versions are unacceptable. You also seem to get upset when anyone applies the same sort of scrutiny toward the KJV that you use to question or belittle others versions. In fact, your argument seems to already be predetermined, thus negating the need for a discussion. There can be no errors in the KJV, because you believe it is perfect. Any apparent error must have an explanation (other than the idea that it is an obvious error). Thus, your defense utilizes "circular reasoning" in that "*the KJV is perfect and cannot have mistakes*" -or- "*there can be no mistakes because the KJV is perfect.*"

Quote:

-----Only the King James offers us the Inspired Word of God. The others fall short, over and over throughout the Scripture.

Brother, the translators of the KJV disagreed with your argument. They didn't suppose to have created a flawless, perfect version. They simply wanted a faithful, modernized version of the Scriptures in the "vulgar" (common) tongue that could be easily understood. We don't have many of their notes in which they considered other possible word choice for some passages (including their rationale behind the use of the word "Passover" in Acts 12:4). But no worry -- they HAD to have created a PERFECT version! According to what seems to be the rationale behind KJV-only advocates -- we don't have to think about the validity of their different sources, their doctrinal opinions and lifestyles, or their finished product -- because it is PERFECT! Yet, it seems, that KJV-only advocates can apply that sort of scrutiny to any other version.

Brother, I don't know that anything (including evidence) could ever move you from your stance regarding the infallibility of

f the KJV. Yet you continue to post, create threads and malign all other versions in your attempt to get out what you assume to be "truth."

Believe it or not, there are many of us who were not prejudiced one way or the other when we began our research about this matter. We honestly and openly looked into this matter with great diligence -- considering truth over presumption. In the end, I couldn't find a reason to dismiss certain academic versions (like the NIV) any more than I could dismiss certain academic translations like the KJV. Thus, I primarily read the KJV (due to the immense amount of sources available in English) but also the NASB, NIV and a couple other versions that I deem to be academically sound.

:-)

Re: Character of Reformation believers, on: 2008/11/23 10:36

CHARACTER?

What was the character like of those Protestant Christians of the reformation, in the early days, before error came into God's Word? Men from 1703 to 1899 and beyond. Were they proud & boastful, lovers of themselves, high minded, full of their own flesh, impossible to teach? Or were they truly men of God, following the commands of Jesus Christ. Were they humble, meek, lowly, self effacing, daily crucifying their own flesh on the cross of Christ within their hearts in order for Christ to be able do HIS work in and through them?

Let us all look at each one of these men, and compare ourselves to them. One thing that each of these men had in common was the King James Bible, the very Spirit breathed and preserved Word of God.

Pastor Charles Chiniquy

1809-1899

“Fifty Years in the Church of Rome”

<http://www.whatsaiththescripture.com/Voice/Fifty.Years.Church.Rome.html>

Two Excerpts from “Fifty Years in the Church of Rome”

<http://www.whatsaiththescripture.com/Voice/Two.Excerpts.html>

John Wesley

(1703-1791)

A Plain Account of Christian Perfection

<http://www.whatsaiththescripture.com/Fellowship/Wesley.Christian.Perfectio.html>

The Use of Money

<http://www.whatsaiththescripture.com/Voice/The.Use.of.Money.html>

J. Hudson Taylor

(1832-1905)

Founder of China Inland Mission

A Letter from Dr. Hudson Taylor

<http://www.whatsaiththescripture.com/Fellowship/Letter.from.Hudson.Taylor.html>

Timely Supplies

<http://www.whatsaiththescripture.com/Fellowship/Taylor.Timely.Supplies.html>

Meditations on Cross Bearing

<http://www.whatsaiththescripture.com/Voice/Meditations/On.Cross.Bearing.html>

Meditations on the Great Father

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Voice/Meditations/The.Great.Father.html>

Union and Communion

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Voice/Union.and.Communion.html>

Meditations on the First Psalm

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Voice/Meditations/The.First.Psalm.html>

Meditations on the History of Job

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Voice/Meditations/The.History.of.Job.html>

A New Years Address

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Voice/New.Years.Address.html>

Meditations on the Book of Ruth

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Voice/Meditations/The.Book.of.Ruth.html>

Comments on the Song of Solomon

Judith Bront

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/The.Holy.Bible/Comments.Song.of.Solomon.html>

From the book:

"The Song of Solomon" has been one of the most misunderstood books of the Bible. However, this has not always been the case. In the days of the Reformation, and in times when persecution of Jesus Christ's Church was the greatest, His Bride tenaciously clung to the love song He had given her. It was one of the most memorized books of the Bible. But with the passing of time, to our great shame, we have forgotten the meaning of this most precious book.

For, "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, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." ~ 2 Timothy 3:16, 17 ~

In the short eight chapters of "The Song of Solomon", we find the close and intimate communion of the Royal Bridegroom, King Solomon, and his bride. The example of their complete unity and oneness of love is the same experience we should have with our Royal Bridegroom, Jesus Christ. It is my fervent desire that we now remember the love promise that Jesus has bestowed on us, and cling to Him as the Church did so long ago.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

George Mueller

(1805-1898)

A Sample of his Book: Answers on Prayer

(<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Voice/George.Mueller.of.Bristol/George.Mueller.of.Bristol.html>) Answers to Prayer

A book on George Mueller by A.T. Pierson

(<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Voice/George.Mueller.of.Bristol/George.Mueller.of.Bristol.html>) George Mueller

Andrew Murray

1828-1917

The writings of Andrew Murray

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Fellowship/Andrew.Murray.html>

Charles G. Finney

1792-1875

<http://www.whatsaiththescriture.com/Fellowship/Charles.G.Finney.html>

Walter continues:

Finney made this statement from his pulpit in the early 1800's. Do we hear this being Preached and Taught in our Churches today?

"Prophets, Christ, and his apostles, have left on the pages of inspiration no dubious testimony against every form of sin.

**THE SPIRIT OF THE WHOLE BIBLE
BREATHES FROM EVERY PAGE
BLASTING and ANNIHILATION
UPON EVERY UNHOLY ABOMINATION,**

while it smiles upon everything
of good report
that **PROMISES BLESSING TO MAN
and GLORY TO GOD.**"

In this day of declension, at the end of the age, have you heard anyone say and believe these words, that God's Word is Spirit Breathed and has the power to destroy and annihilate every unholy abomination?

No, what we hear is the hiss of Satan, who spoke to Eve in the Garden, questioning God's authority, God's goodness, and God's power, that hisses to us: "There are errors in every Bible version, all of them. There is no difference, whether I have a King James Bible or any other Bible translation in my hands, even a Catholic Bible, an NIV Bible---there is no difference", they tell us. "We just have to pick and choose what we like from this one, and then what we like from that one," they tell us. "God has not preserved His Word, we only have bits and pieces of His Word, that ANYONE that understands Greek and a little bit of Hebrew can cut and paste together into a better version", they tell us.

Brother and sister in Christ, **DO NOT BELIEVE THE LIE. GOD has PROMISED us, IN HIS VERY WORD, that HE WILL PRESERVE HIS WORD FOREVER.**

God promises to **PRESERVE HIS WORDS.**
(Psalms 12:6-7)

The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

You shall not add or take away, says God.
(Deuteronomy 4:1-2)

Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the LORD God of your fathers giveth you. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.

God **CARES** about **EVERY ONE** one of **HIS WORDS.**
(Proverbs 30:5-6)

Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.

God's **WORDS WILL NEVER PASS AWAY.**
(Mark 13:31)

Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. (Jesus Christ, Son of God)

God WILL CURSE THOSE WHO CHANGE HIS WORD.

(Revelation 22:18-19)

For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

GOD DID NOT PROMISE US ONLY THE INSPIRED "CONCEPTS" IN SCRIPTURE FOREVER. GOD PROMISED US HIS VERY WORD WOULD BE PRESEVED FOREVER. HE CLEARLY DIRECTED EVERY WORD AND WILL NOT TOLERATE MAN'S MEDDLING WITH IT. HE CALLS THEM "HIS WORDS".

If your Bible is a King James Bible, it preserves God's words because it was translated using "formal equivalence." All other Bibles were translated using "dynamic equivalence," in which the translator is free to change words as long as he conveys the "idea."

Read the above Scriptures again. Compare your walk with Jesus Christ with those of the Protestant Reformation, that all relied on the King James Bible. Which kind of Bible do you think God wants you to have?

Leave the "unclean thing", run from it, RUN, RUN!

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/11/23 12:17

Walter,

Please use the "URL" button to present links. Copying and pasting *long* URL's make the page wide, out of proportion.

It is very simple to use. Rather than embedding the copied link directly into the reply, click on "URL". A box opens up. Paste the link into it. Click OK. Another box opens whereby you can give it a title. Click OK. The link is now complete.

Yes, it does place it at the bottom of your reply, simply cut and paste accordingly into your reply as needed.

To the matter at hand ...

It's old, worn out, beaten to death and being that there is nothing of consideration, no challenge to your permanently set, obstinate conclusions, and they are obstinate, your character disavows your convictions. There is no room for consideration, no 'you might have a point there' to any of your rhetoric in all the long discourses you have presented here time and again ... So much so that even this will slide right on by ...

You have an agenda, *not* matter for discussion. You continually overlook the obvious, barking at those who generally agree with the superiority or veracity of that version in question. Even this latest entry of yours is ridiculous by the obviousness that those names mentioned, these great stalwarts of the faith ...

What version would you think they might be using? "The Message"? It's practically absurd when that is what was then available.

You have notion in your head that is *fixed* that somewhere, mid-stream in the course of all human civilization the KJV came breathed into existence as the final, authoritative, "breathed" and *only* communication from God to man. The argument itself is defaulted by everything that came before it, namely the Holy writ ... "preserved" in the 'originals', in that language that they were written in, at the *time* they written in. Translations and all that we fallen men have ever done is to get as close as possible by *translation* because that is all that we can do being that the world is full of variant languages is so

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

blatantly obvious that it somehow escapes the nefarious idea that *only, this* version is the be all end all of all argument.

Your accusations of others for their use of cut and paste is ludicrous when you have posted reams of material in like fashion.

In the past you have abused the privileges, abused the fonts by over exaggeration in size and scheme and color and continue to abuse the intentions of this forum, bringing contention, fostering it, manufacturing it. All things that you choose to overlook. We have locked your posts time and again and yet you would turn around and defy the generosity given by turning out yet one more in an attempt to justify your poor conduct.

And that is what is quite incredible. For what the scriptures *teach* - of the heart, of our sin, of the remedy of all the things that truly matter, it has not yet gotten down into the fabric of being. Strange thing that a so called poorer, weaker version still has the desired effect on the many than it does those who are so adamant in this delusion of 'onliness' that is espoused.

Here is your opportunity to reconsider your character against the long-suffering of the many here. Have we not been more than patient? Will you not at the very least take a step back and think about it, how it might all sound to your hearers, how the stirring up and agitation of those around you is not edification but spreading of unnecessary division, strife and ill-will? All over something *already* largely agreed upon even if for very different reasons, that this is the preferred version ..

There is nothing left to appeal to Waltern and you are forcing us to make a decision, only you yourself can alter it.

Think about it long and hard before you reply.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/11/23 13:46

Waltern...

I am not talking about scrutinizing the "character" of the men that you listed (who had NOTHING to do with the translation efforts for the KJV). I am talking about the character and doctrinal views of the men who actually translated the KJV. You feel safe and secure to scrutinize those translators of versions like the NIV...but hesitate to allow the same sort of scrutiny to the KJV. You would think that they were "inspired" in their translation efforts -- yet they held to some questionable doctrinal views. I am not saying that I would want to scrutinize these men, but I find it interesting that you reject the same sort of scrutiny that you freely give. If we applied the same sort of scrutiny that you give to versions like the NIV, we could arrive to the same conclusion about the KJV.

As for the discussion at hand: I completely reject the notion that the KJV is perfect and preserved down to "the last dot and tittle." It contains quite a few apparent errors, was translated by men who held to the Roman "high church" doctrinal traditions, and the translators themselves admitted that it was not perfect.

It is odd that your opinion differs with the opinions of those who actually translated the KJV!

Re: Which Version, on: 2008/12/8 20:24

Dear Moderator:

What you have posted is being taught as curriculum in most Bible Colleges today. However, just because something is taught in Bible College does not guarantee its veracity.

I have posted the difference between the Received Text, the Textus Receptus, as found in the King James Bible with all of the newer versions. No matter which new version I use (the NASB, the NIV, the New King James Bible, etc. etc.) it differs from the "Textus Receptus" as found in the King James Bible.

In 1881 Westcott & Hort published their "Revised" New Testament. One year later, in 1882 Dean John Burgon

published a book, totally refuting ALL OF THEIR WORK. His book is entitled **“The Revision Revised- A Refutation of Westcott and Hort’s False Greek Text and Theory”** and is 549 pages that not only refutes the **“New Greek Text”** of Westcott and Hort, but also refutes their **“New English Version”** as well as totally refuting their (Westcott & Hort’s) **“New Textual Theory”**.

It was originally published in 1882 and had its second printing on September 1, 2000 and can be ordered from: Dean Burgeon Society Press; Box 354; Collingswood, New Jersey 08108; ISBN 1-888328-01-0; (<http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/>) The Dean Burgeon Society

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

There are three texts that are in agreement: 1) The Textus Receptus; 2) The Byzantine Text; 3) Antiochan Text.

There is one group that is not in agreement with the texts above- The Alexandrian Text. In fact, the Alexandrian text is not even in agreement with itself!

All of the newer Bible versions rely on the Alexandrian Text, where the discrepancies can all be found (that I, as well as others have previously posted).

Textual History of the Bible

(<http://www.chick.com/information/bibleversions/history.asp?wpchistory.asp&wppa>) The Textual History of the Bible

Many Christians are completely unaware that modern Bible versions differ from the King James Bible in a way they never expected. ... they are not translated from the same Bible text!

The "Received Text"

Down through history, long before the advent of the printing press, men made copies of the Scriptures by hand. However, they did not all do so with the same attitude toward the Scriptures. Many made their copies with a sense of spiritual awe, not daring to change a word, because it was the Word of God. Archaeologists have found thousands of these copies from all over the ancient world, and been amazed at how they agree! Truly God did preserve His Word in His church. The text they give us is often called by one of the following names:

Textus Receptus (Latin for "Received Text")

Byzantine Text - because of the part of the world in which we find it.

Antiochan Text - the church at Antioch used it

The "Alexandrian Text"

However in Alexandria, Egypt, a group of "scholars" thought they could do better. When they made their copies, they made "corrections" that they thought better presented what the Scriptures should say. Some of their errors were gross blunders (like quoting Malachi and calling it Isaiah) but others were more subtle (slight word changes to take away the deity of Christ). They removed verses they didn't like. The Alexandrian copyists had one more characteristic ... they couldn't agree with each other! Their copies differ not only from the vast majority of existing Scripture texts, but even from each other. A very small number of these manuscripts exist today. This is called the Alexandrian Text.

Choosing which text to use

All of our existing copies come from one of the two textual streams described above. We call them "streams" because they are made of copies made from copies. By comparing them and noting their differences, it is easy to determine from which stream each copy came.

Honest scholars understood that if God really kept His promise to preserve His Word, then we would expect to find copies all over the church at large that agree. Sure enough, they found that 95% of all existing copies agreed, coming from the Antiochan (or Byzantine) text, so it was clear that the Received Text, based upon these agree

ing copies all over the ancient church, was the correct one. This is the text used by Luther, Tyndale, Calvin, Matthews, Coverdale. When King James commissioned his famous English Bible translation, the scholars naturally used this Received Text.

Not everyone believed God kept His promise:

In the mid nineteenth century, two scholars came along who helped to change everything. Their names were Fenton John Anthony Hort and Brook Foss Westcott. From their personal correspondence, it is clear that Hort and Westcott did not hold a faith comparable to that held by millions of evangelical Christians today.

Dr. Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., writes:

"It cannot be said that they believed that one could attain Heaven by either works or faith, since both believed that Heaven existed only in the mind of man.

Westcott believed in and attempted to practice a form of Communism whose ultimate goal was communal living on college campus's which he called a "coenobium. "

Both believed it possible to communicate with the dead and made many attempts to do just that through a society which they organized and entitled "The Ghostly Guild."

Westcott accepted and promoted prayers for the dead. Both were admirers of Mary (Westcott going so far as to call his wife Sarah, "Mary"), and Hort was an admirer and proponent of Darwin and his theory of evolution.

It is obvious to even a casual observer why they were well equipped to guide the Revision Committee of 1871-1881 away from God's Antiochian text and into the spell of Alexandria." From "The Answer Book" by Samuel Gipp

Gaining positions on the committee to "revise" the King James Bible, Hort and Westcott persuaded the committee to abandon the Received Text which had been preserved by the ancient church. Instead, the committee was convinced to use the Alexandrian text, provided by the Roman Catholic Church who had preserved it. They accepted the notion that God had not preserved His Word in the ancient Church, but had instead entrusted it to the hand of the Roman Catholic Church, the organization which had hunted and slaughtered Christians who dared possess their own copy of God's Word!

Is this any way to translate a Bible?

Having sold the Alexandrian text to the revision committee, Hort and Westcott became the "gurus of Bible texts". The translators often faced an impossible problem. Having abandoned the broad evidence of history, throwing out 95% of the available copies, they had to decide exactly what each verse should say based upon only 5% of the available evidence. And there was the problem. These few texts could not even agree with each other! How do you decide which is correct?

Enter Hort and Westcott. They decided what the text should say, and the committee dutifully translated it. So instead of the authority of the Bible text coming from the broad evidence of history, it was coming from the intellect of two respected scholars. God doesn't do things that way. A study of the lives and theology of these two men helps explain why their biblical text began to have holes in it... verses were missing!

It's a simple choice:

All modern Bible versions are based upon the work of Hort and Westcott, using the corrupt Alexandrian text. The King James Bible is based upon the Received Text. If you believe that God allowed his Word to be hidden from the church for centuries, only to be revealed much later by the Roman Catholic Church, you will want a modern Bible based upon the Alexandrian text.

If you believe that God preserved His Word in His church, throughout the centuries, you will want a King James Bible, based upon the historical Received Text.

The choice is yours.

Back to Bible versions information page

©1984-2008 Chick Publications, Inc. All rights reserved. Some portions of www.chick.com are copyrighted by others and reproduced by permission, as indicated by copyright notices on individual pages.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

QUESTION: Who was Dean Burgon?

ANSWER: He was an outstanding 19th century Bible scholar.

EXPLANATION: **John William Burgon (1813-1888) was a man of tremendous intellect and ranks among men such as Lancelot Andrews (1555-1626) and Robert Dick Wilson (1856-1930) in scholarship. He became the Dean of Chichester and has since been known as "Dean" Burgon. Dr. Burgon was contemporary with Westcott and Hort. He was an advocate of the Textus Receptus and was the nemesis of Westcott and Hort's feeble arguments against it. He believed, unlike Westcott and Hort, in basing all conclusions on the solid foundation of facts rather than the sand of theory. He would leave no stone unturned in his quest for truth and no blow undelivered in his defense of it.**

His serious scholarship, quick wit and acid tongue drove Westcott and Hort and all other Alexandrian scholars from the field of battle. His arguments against the Alexandrian text and in favor of the last 12 verses of Mark and other questioned portions have proven to be as unanswerable by modern scholarship as they were to his contemporaries.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Walter,

Please use the "URL" button to present links. Copying and pasting *long* URL's make the page wide, out of proportion.

It is very simple to use. Rather than embedding the copied link directly into the reply, click on "URL". A box opens up. Paste the link into it. Click OK. Another box opens whereby you can give it a title. Click OK. The link is now complete.

Yes, it does place it at the bottom of your reply, simply cut and paste accordingly into your reply as needed.

To the matter at hand ...

It's old, worn out, beaten to death and being that there is nothing of consideration, no challenge to your permanently set, obstinate conclusions, and they are obstinate, your character disavows your convictions. There is no room for consideration, no 'you might have a point there' to any of your rhetoric in all the long discourses you have presented here time and again ... So much so that even this will slide right on by ...

You have an agenda, *not* matter for discussion. You continually overlook the obvious, barking at those who generally agree with the superiority or veracity of that version in question. Even this latest entry of yours is ridiculous by the obviousness that those names mentioned, these great stalwarts of the faith ...

What version would you think they might be using? "The Message"? It's practically absurd when that is what was then available.

You have notion in your head that is *fixed* that somewhere, mid-stream in the course of all human civilization the KJV came breathed into existence as the final, authoritative, "breathed" and *only* communication from God to man. The argument itself is defaulted by everything that came before it, namely the Holy writ ... "preserved" in the 'originals', in that language that they were written in, at the *time* they written in. Translations and all that we fallen men have ever done is to get as close as possible by *translation* because that is all that we can do being that the world is full of variant languages is so blatantly obvious that it somehow escapes the nefarious idea that *only, this version is the be all end all of all argument.*

Your accusations of others for their use of cut and paste is ludicrous when you have posted reams of material in like fashion.

In the past you have abused the privileges, abused the fonts by over exaggeration in size and scheme and color and continue to abuse the intentions of this forum, bringing contention, fostering it, manufacturing it. All things that you choose to overlook. We have locked your posts time and again and yet you would turn around and defy the generosity given by turning out yet one more in an attempt to justify your poor conduct.

And that is what is quite incredible. For what the scriptures *teach* - of the heart, of our sin, of the remedy of all the things that truly matter, it has not yet gotten down into the fabric of being. Strange thing that a so called poorer, weaker version still has the desired effect on the many than it does those who are so adamant in this delusion of 'onliness' that is espoused.

Here is your opportunity to reconsider your character against the long-suffering of the many here. Have we not been more than patient? Will you not at the very least take a step back and think about it, how it might all sound to your hearers, how the stirring up and agitation of those around you is not edification but spreading of unnecessary division, strife and ill-will? All over something *already* largely agreed upon even if for very different reasons, that this is the preferred version ...

There is nothing left to appeal to Waltern and you are forcing us to make a decision, only you yourself can alter it.

Think about it long and hard before you reply.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2008/12/8 20:48

Hi Brother Waltern...

Just a thought, but the first paragraph of your last post could be rewritten to reflect a different opinion.

Quote:

-----"Dear Walter:

What you have posted is being taught as curriculum in most *KJV-only* websites and organizations today. However, just because something is taught in *KJV-only* websites does not guarantee it's veracity."

Re: Revision Revised, on: 2008/12/10 23:38

I have found the actual book, written and published in 1882 by Dean John Burgon. It can be found and read online: (http://books.google.com/books?as_brr1&idnXkw1TAatV8C&dqRevision+revised&jtp1#PPR3,M1) The REVISION REVISSED, by Dean John Burgon

It was originally published in 1882 and had its second printing on September 1, 2000 and can be ordered from: Dean Burgeon Society Press; Box 354; Collingswood, New Jersey 08108: ISBN 1-888328-01-0; If you want the actual book in your library it can be ordered from:

(http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/idx_dbs_press.htm#The%20Revision) WEB LINK TO ORDER THE BOOK- THE " REVISION REVISSED"

Another book of tremendous value, to understand the corruption of God's preserved Word, that occurred by the Revision Committee and their Revision of the New Testament by Westcott & Hort is:

"The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels"

(<http://www.archive.org/stream/causesofcorrupti00burgiala>) The Causes of Corruption On-Line-Book

In this book Dean Burgon gives detailed illustrations of five accidental causes and ten intentional causes of the corruption of the original traditional text. The book is replete with condemnation of the B & Aleph, Vatican & Sinai, and The Westcott and Hort New Testament Greek Text.

More background information on Dean John Burgon from Wikipedia:

John William Burgon (August 21, 1813 - August 4, 1888), English Anglican divine who became the Dean of Chichester Cathedral in 1876. He is remembered for his passionate defense of the historicity and Mosaic authorship of Genesis and of Biblical inerrancy in general. Burgon is also the only person to have an academic hood shape named after him.

Burgon was born at Smyrna, the son of a Turkey merchant who was a skilled numismatist and afterwards became an assistant in the antiquities department of the British Museum. His mother was Greek.

After a few years of business life, Burgon went to Worcester College, Oxford, in 1841, and took his degree in 1845. The same year he took the Newdigate Prize for his sonnet *Petra*, referring to Petra, the inaccessible city in the present Jordan, which he had heard described but had never seen:

"It seems no work of Man's creative hand,
by labor wrought as wavering fancy planned;
But from the rock as if by magic grown,
eternal, silent, beautiful, alone!
Not virgin-white like that old Doric shrine,
where erst Athena held her rites divine;
Not saintly-grey, like many a minster fane,
that crowns the hill and consecrates the plain;
But rose-red as if the blush of dawn,
that first beheld them were not yet withdrawn;
The hues of youth upon a brow of woe,
which Man deemed old two thousand years ago,
match me such marvel save in Eastern clime,
a rose-red city half as old as time.
The poem is now chiefly remembered for the famous final line."

(A textual puzzle: Burgon published "*Petra, a Poem*" in 1885. That book-length poem is a minor epic of 371 lines. It exhibits some variations from the version shown here: "consecrates" becomes "sanctifies"; "deemed" becomes "call'd"; "But rose-red as if the blush of dawn" becomes "But rosy-red,--as if the blush of dawn," and so on. Though "*Petra*" is usually referred to as a "sonnet," the couplet rhyme-scheme would make it unusual among mid-nineteenth-century sonnets. It is not clear whether the 1845 prize poem was 14 lines that Burgon later greatly expanded, or the lines usually quoted are an excerpt from a much longer original.)

Burgon was elected to an Oriel fellowship in 1846. He was much influenced by his brother-in-law, the scholar and theologian Henry John Rose (1800-1873), a conservative Anglican churchman with whom he used to spend his long vacations. Burgon made Oxford his headquarters, while holding a living at some distance. **In 1863 he was made vicar of the University Church of St Mary the Virgin, having attracted attention by his vehement sermons against Essays and Reviews, a series of messages on biblical inspiration in which he defended against the findings of textual criticism and higher criticism the historicity and Mosaic authorship of Genesis, and Biblical inerrancy in general: "Either, with the best and wisest of all ages, you must believe the whole of Holy Scripture; or, with the narrow-minded infidel, you must disbelieve the whole. There is no middle course open to you."**

In 1867 he was appointed Gresham Professor of Divinity. In 1871 he published a defence of the genuineness of the twelve last verses of the Gospel of Mark. He then began an attack on the proposal for a new lectionary for the Church of England, based largely upon his objections to the principles for determining the authority of manuscript readings in the Greek New Testament adopted by Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, which he assailed in a memorable article in the Quarterly Review for 1881.

His biographical essays on Henry Longueville Mansel and others were also collected, and published under the title of Twelve Good Men (1888). Protests against the inclusion of Dr Vance Smith among the revisers, against the nomination of Dean Stanley to be select preacher in the University of Oxford, and against the address in favour of toleration in the matter of ritual, followed in succession. In 1876 Burgon was made the Dean of Chichester.

His life was written by Edward Meyrick Goulburn (1892).

Passionate in his convictions, Burgon nevertheless possessed a warm and kindly heart. He may be described as a high churchman of the type prevalent before the rise of the Tractarian school. His extensive collection of transcripts from the Greek Fathers, illustrating the text of the New Testament, was bequeathed to the British Museum. He is also the only person to have an academic hood named after him, and in honour of this The Burgon Society is named after him.

Burgon in modern times

Today, the name of Burgon is known almost exclusively in connection with the Dean Burgon Society, and the Ki

ng-James-Only Movement. This latter identifies itself with Burgon, perhaps to distance itself from allegations that the King James Only movement had its origins in the writings of Seventh-day Adventist author Benjamin G. Wilkinson. However, while Burgon was outspoken about the Revised Version, and maintained the position that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, his positions were not exactly the same as today's King James Only movement.

Another society which takes on the Burgon name is the Burgon Society which was founded to promote the use and study of academical dress, named so because Burgon is the only person to have a hood shape named after him.

Publications

Apart from the sonnet Petra, Burgon's most notable work for which he is remembered today is The Revision Revised which was a critique of the then-new Revised Version of the Bible (1881), The Last Twelve Verses of Mark, The Traditional Text, and Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels.

Notes and references

- 1.the "g" in Burgon is now generally pronounced like the "g" in "Burgundy", not like the "g" in "burgeoning"
 - 2.this is an ecclesiastical position, not an academic title. Burgon is widely known today by his ecclesiastical title, "Dean Burgon", which is mistakenly often either taken to be his name, or (equally mistakenly) to indicate an academic deanship
 - 3.not the same as The Burgon Society previously mentioned
 - 4.Google Books: Revision Revised
 - 5.Google Books: The Last Twelve Verses of Mark
 - 6.Google Books: The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels
- Sources

• This article incorporates text from the Encyclopædia Britannica Eleventh Edition, a publication now in the public domain.

External links

• "What did John William Burgon really believe about the Textus Receptus and the King James Version?" Researcher Doug Kutilek reconstructs Burgon's original views.

• The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels at CCEL.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_William_Burgon) Wikipedia Link to John William Burgon

Sincerely,

Walter :-)

Re: , on: 2008/12/12 22:25

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:
Hi Brother Walter...

Just a thought, but the first paragraph of your last post could be rewritten to reflect a different opinion.

Quote:

-----"Dear Walter:

What you have posted is being taught as curriculum in most *KJV-only* websites and organizations today. However, just because something is taught in *KJV-only* websites does not guarantee its veracity."

My response to Ccchhrrriiiss:

What is important is Truth. What is the truth of the matter?. It is your position, based upon your voluminous posts that there is no difference between two separate Biblical texts, from two separate sources. You truly believe that they are of equal value, that they are both God's unchanging Word and we can pick and choose which one of the two to preach a sermon from or which one to study from for teaching and edification and internalization of God's Eternal Word.

However, the truth of the matter is that we have to make a choice. We only have two "Streams" of Bible Text that are available to mankind, that have been passed down to us through history-one from the Believing Church, and one from Scholars in Alexandria, Egypt.

Textural History of the Bible

(<http://www.chick.com/information/bibleversions/history.asp?wpchistory.asp&wppa>) Textural History of the Bible

1) The First "Stream" of Text is The Received Text that has been copied and re-copied by "believers" in the early Church, by men who knew the Words they were copying were the very Words of God. Just like the Jewish Scribes, they did not want to miss one jot or one tittle, and copied the text word for word. This "stream" of Bible text is in agreement with itself- The Byzantine Text, The Antiochian Text, and the Textus Receptus. Archeologists have found thousands of these copies from all over the ancient world, and have been amazed at how they agree (by 95%) These streams are the Textus Receptus, the Byzantine Text - because of the part of the world in which we find it and the Antiochian Text - the church at Antioch used it.)

2) The Second Stream of Text is the Alexandrian Text, that was provided to us by a group of "scholars" who did not have the same reverence for God's Word. Instead of copying word for word, they thought they could do better, and made corrections that they thought better presented what the scriptures should say. Some of their errors were gross blunders (like quoting Malachi and calling it Isaiah) but others were more subtle (slight word changes to take away the deity of Christ). They removed verses they didn't like. The Alexandrian copyists had one more characteristic... they couldn't agree with each other! Their copies differ not only from the vast majority of existing Scripture texts, but even from each other. A very small number of these manuscripts exist today. This is called the Alexandrian Text.

Today, in 2008 we only have two Bibles to choose from. If we choose the King James, we have the Received Text in our hands. However, if we choose the NIV, NASB, American Standard, New King James, Living Bible, Douay-Rheims, The Jerusalem Bible, etc. etc. etc. we have the Alexandrian Text in our hands. It was the Alexandrian Text that was first used to create the Catholic Bible, and is the version full of error.

In the end, we have a choice to make when we decide which Bible to use. If we want the Bible passed down to us from the believing Church, with the very preserved Words of God, then we must choose the Received Text. However, if we are drawn to the Alexandrian Text, then we must also discount God's PROMISE in His Word, that He would PRESERVE His Word, and must look to fallen man and believe in Textural Criticism and Higher Criticism and man's ability to interpret what God really meant to say. We would then choose any of the following newer version Bibles:

NIV, NASB, American Standard, New King James, Living Bible, Douay-Rheims, The Jerusalem Bible, etc. etc. etc.

Again, the choice is ours to make. But, let's be honest with ourselves and others about what we are doing.

Sincerely,

Walter

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Easter or Passover?

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/12/12 23:01

Quote:

-----It is your position, based upon your voluminous posts ...

Beyond ironic ...

Locked.