



**General Topics :: Which Version is the Bible? by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones**

**Which Version is the Bible? by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/4/22 14:31**

To read the book, click on this link: (<http://www.bbconfire.com>) Bible Believers Church

It is posted on this site for reading. It will strengthen your view of the authority of Scripture and help give back to the church our sole standard for what we believe and do.

**Re: Which Version is the Bible? by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, on: 2005/4/22 15:02**

Dude...I love your name. It's a little more spiritual than mine too!

:-P

Krispy

**Re: Which Version is the Bible? by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones - posted by taco, on: 2005/4/22 15:55**

"which version is the bible?"

Obviously no version is "THE bible" in the absolute sense of the word. All of them are translations of the bible. Perhaps the question should be "which version is the best translation of the bible?".

**Re: Which Version is the Bible? by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/22 16:29**

Quote:  
----- Which Version is the Bible? by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones  
-----

Ask a silly question and you'll most likely get a silly answer.

**Re:, on: 2005/4/22 16:39**

Quote:  
----- Obviously no version is "THE bible" in the absolute sense of the word. All of them are translations of the bible.  
-----

It's not obvious to everyone... it kinda depends on your take on the doctrine of preservation.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2005/4/23 4:51**

Quote:  
----- it kinda depends on your take on the doctrine of preservation.  
-----

I don't think so. If by preservation you mean that God has preserved accurate greek manuscripts for us then the question is - "which text is the true bible". If, on the other hand, you mean that God has preserved a particular english translation of the bible, then it is surely obvious that no english translation was preserved from the time scripture was first written.

You may say, of course, that God preserved certain manuscripts and subsequently saw to it that, for example, the KJV

was a perfect translation of these texts.

Which do you mean by preservation?

**Re: Preservation - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/4/23 16:24**

This is what we mean by preservation:

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

What we mean is that God has promised to preserve His words in EVERY generation. So if we have them purely today, where are they? Almost any so called "Bible scholar" today will tell you that many passages are in doubt and shouldn't be included in the text. The NIV has taken many scriptures out of the Bible. But because people today are not Bible readers, consumers, they haven't given much of a fight. The ones that do, get marginalized by the rest.

Other scriptures have been outright changed. The truth of the matter is that if you have a corrupt textual underpinning, you will have a corrupt vernacular translation. You just get the corruption in another language. To see scriptures that have been changed, just look at Phil. 2:6 where the NIV says that Jesus didn't think He could be equal with God. Or look at 1 Tim. 3:16 where the NIV, NASB omits that "God" was manifest in the flesh. We are left in doubt as to the deity of Christ. It says, "He who." Who is that? An angel? Of course this is what Thayer of Thayer's Lexicon would have believed. He vehemently denied the deity of Christ. Why? He had this "new" text. (Its not new, it was created over a thousand years ago in Alexandria)

But I challenge you all to read at least the first chapter of the book. Here's the link again:

(<http://www.bbconfire.com/articles/whichversion/table.asp>) <http://www.bbconfire.com/articles/whichversion/table.asp>

Maybe some of you would like to check out an introductory article on this issue. Here is the link for that:

(<http://www.bbconfire.com/articles/drdauidbrown/greatuncials.asp>) <http://www.bbconfire.com/articles/drdauidbrown/greatuncials.asp>

Get ready for some serious info. God bless all who seek His truth and love His Word.

TR

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/23 18:13**

Quote:

-----The truth of the matter is that if you have a corrupt textual underpinning, you will have a corrupt vernacular translation.  
-----

These discussion have been discussed at length in the past on this site by very learned men. Do these topics in a forum as this where many have little understanding of the depth of the issues can only be sifted by the attack on translations of the bible that you may feel are inferior based on your personal preference of manuscripts profit us? This is a forum dedicated to REVIVAL- not discussion of topics that undermine peoples faith and introduce great controversy. This is the enemies business and the time has come to put legs on our prayers and see a stop to all this.

I have yet one word for such behavior- **REPENT!** Cease and desist from expressing your faith by introducing controversy.

*5. If a minister means to promote a revival, he should be very careful not to introduce controversy. He will grieve away the Spirit of God. In this way probably more revivals are put down, than in any other. Look back upon the history of the church from the beginning, and you will see that ministers are generally responsible for grieving away the Spirit and causing declensions by controversy. It is the ministers who bring forward controversial subjects for discussion, and by and by they get very zealous on the subject, and then get the church into a controversial spirit, and so the Spirit of God is grieved away.*

*If I had time to go over the history of the church from the days of the Apostles, I could show that all the controversies that have taken place, and all the great declensions in religion, too, were chargeable upon ministers. I believe the ministers of the present day are responsible for the present state of the church, and it will be seen to be true at the judgment. Who does not know that ministers have been crying out "Heresy," and "New Measures," and talking about the "Evils of Revivals," until they have got the church all in confusion? Look at the poor Presbyterian church, and see ministers getting up their Act and Testimony, and keeping up a continual war! O God, have mercy on ministers. They talk about their days of fasting and prayer, but are these the men to call on others to fast and pray? They ought to fast and pray themselves. It is time that ministers should assemble together, and fast and pray over the evil of controversy, for they have caused it. The church itself never would get into a controversial spirit unless led into it by ministers. The body of the church are always averse to controversy, and will keep out of it, only as they are dragged into it by ministers. When Christians are revived they are not inclined to meddle with controversy, either to read or hear it. But they may be told of such and such "damnable heresies," that are afloat, till they get their feelings enlisted in controversy, and then farewell to the revival. If a minister, in preaching, finds it necessary to discuss particular points, about which Christians differ in opinion, let him BY ALL MEANS avoid a controversial spirit and manner of doing it. (CHARLES G. FINNEY)*

**Re: RobertW - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/4/23 21:39**

RobertW,

Why are you so bent on shutting me down?

Quote:  
-----This is a forum dedicated to REVIVAL- not discussion of topics that undermine peoples faith and introduce great controversy.  
-----

Amen. But is contending for a pure Bible controversy? I think not. At least not among saints.

How can you have revival without the Bible? If a man doesn't know he has a pure Bible, how can he preach with conviction? I think not having a pure Bible hinders revival. Do you deny this? Can we have revival without a Bible??? Maybe you want fluff, but I want fire!

I have done nothing to attack you. Please give me the same common courtesy. It is you who are causing dissention. I want peace. No one is forcing you to read what I post. If you don't like it, don't read it. Pretty simple.

"Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" - Galatians 4:16

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2005/4/23 21:48**

Quote:  
-----What we mean is that God has promised to preserve His words in EVERY generation. So if we have them purely today, where are they?  
-----

Did the Kings translators have a pure translation in their day?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/23 22:00**

Quote:  
-----I have done nothing to attack you. Please give me the same common courtesy. It is you who are causing dissention. I want peace.  
-----

Well, 28 posts in a little over 24 hours is quite a progression. At that pace you will overtake the administrator in less than 7 months. You have come onto the site with 'guns blazing' and have not had a chance to even get to know us through c

onversation in these forums.

Quote:

-----No one is forcing you to read what I post. If you don't like it, don't read it. Pretty simple.

"Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" - Galatians 4:16

-----

That is a bold statement to throw out for a newcomer, but such as it is, I am concerned for those who DO read your post s and ARE influenced by what you write. You came on this site and have tried to establish an agenda before anyone had a chance to respond. I logged off Thursday and in no time here we are. My suggestion would be to get to know what we are even here for before trying to slam us with all manor of controversy. Do a search and find we have already discussed at length these topics.

Quote:

-----Maybe you want fluff, but I want fire!

-----

I believe what we need today are people who are full of the Holy Ghost and FIRE and are walking in true holiness free from besetting sins- preaching the Gospel until. (<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/viewcat.php?cid306>) OVERWHELMING CONVICTION comes upon the people and they turn their life to Christ. You could preach from the Greek and if you have sin in your life you will be powerless to see conviction of sin upon the people. I propose we let God tend to keeping His word pure and we tend to keeping our hearts pure.

**RobertW - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/4/23 23:20**

Quote:

-----That is a bold statement to throw out for a newcomer

-----

Are you against newcomers? You sure sound like it.

Quote:

-----Well, 28 posts in a little over 24 hours is quite a progression. At that pace you will overtake the administrator in less than 7 months.

-----

Is this kindness? What is it to you how much I have posted? I have received many responses to my posts. This is a forum. You should stop attack me personally and use your energy trying to refute what I write (if you can).

Quote:

-----I am concerned for those who DO read your posts and ARE influenced by what you write.

-----

What is wrong with ANYTHING I have posted? Again, I urge you to calm down. Deal with the substance of what I have written. You are making your spirit evident to all. Do you normally attack people you disagree with???

As for me, I refuse to attack you.

Much love in Christ,

TR

**Re: RobertW - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2005/4/23 23:29**

RT,

Quote:

-----You should stop attack me personally and use your energy trying to refute what I write (if you can).  
-----

What is this? a challenge?

I know you are new here, but many of us on SI have been here for ever a year or more and are more like a family. we ha  
ve grown and been broken and wept for each other. we have encouraged and exhorted (when need be).

This forum belongs to Greg Gordon- but ultimately to God. It has been God's since the beginning- which is what has ma  
de it different from other forums. It is not men's but God's.

At SI we like to encourage members to post prayerfully (meaning: praying, considering before posting.) that the posts be  
spirit led especially in cases involving debates.

In Christ, Chanin

**Re: taco - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/4/24 1:23**

Quote:

-----Did the Kings translators have a pure translation in their day?  
-----

Of course they did. The Anglo-Saxon (pre-English) and Gothic (pre-German) people have had translations almost since  
Pentecost. In her book "In Awe of Thy Word", Gail Riplinger traces the history of the English Bible from Pentecost to tod  
ay. Remember that by 500 A.D., the Bible had been translated into over 500 languages. But also around that time, the  
Catholic church tried to reduce it to one: Latin.

But you would probably not have asked this question if you had read the book. Have you read it?

**I would like to ask everyone to please use this thread to discuss the contents of the book. You may paste the p  
ortions of the book you are discussing. Thank you all for your consideration. I don't want us to miss the point  
here.**

Blessings,

TR

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2005/4/24 5:12**

Quote:

-----Of course they did. The Anglo-Saxon (pre-English) and Gothic (pre-German) people have had translations almost since Pentecost.  
In her book "In Awe of Thy Word", Gail Riplinger traces the history of the English Bible from Pentecost to today.  
-----

You misunderstand me. My question is was there a "pure word of God in English" in the days immediatly prior to the KJ  
V. If God has promised to preserve his word in every generation, did the translators parents, for instance, have access t  
o the word of God in their vernacular?

Also, just out of curiosity, what drew you to Sermonindex?

**Re: Pre-English Bibles - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/4/24 12:12**

**Please use this thread to discuss the book. If you have a question about something you read or couldn't find in the book, then ask. Thank you so much. I don't want to type the whole book.** I hope you understand this.

But to answer your question, yes of course there were many pure Bibles in English. English as we know it today really came about around the time of John Wycliffe in the 1300's. But in every early form of English you had a Bible (i.e. Bede 600's, King Alfred AD 849-899). After Wycliffe's Bible came Tyndale's (first printed English Bible since the printing press was just recently invented). This came to England under the alias of the Matthew's Bible. Then there was the Great Bible, Bishop's Bible, Geneva Bible. Then this evolving language unified in the KJV. Just go and try to read the Geneva or Wycliffe Bible. This will become evident to you. Up until the KJV, there were so many different words from different influences to the English you speak today like Latin, Norman, Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, etc. One in that day, one would speak of lamb, another would speak of mutton. This is evident to all who study the history of the English language.

It was the KJV that unified the language to what it is today how you speak it. England was much more godly then than it was today. People in Wycliffe's day paid one month's salary to purchase a single page of his hand written Bible! (He made hundreds if not thousands) People today think it is a big deal that they tithe! They had such a hunger for the word that it was their highest priority. Is it ours?

Do you ever wonder why our "respected" leaders don't teach us this precious history??? It is our heritage.

**Now, please, everyone go read the book and let's discuss it. Please use this thread how it is intended.**

Blessings,

TR

**Some clarification - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/4/24 13:03**

TR,

Please take heed to what others are saying here. You have not responded to the issues others have raised, namely that there has been previous discussion on this as well as this penchant toward pushing across what you want to discuss without that consideration.

You are not in the midst of an anything goes mindset and as Chanin well stated:

Quote:  
-----I know you are new here, but many of us on SI have been here for ever a year or more and are more like a family. we have grown and been broken and wept for each other. we have encouraged and exhorted (when need be).

This forum belongs to Greg Gordon- but ultimately to God. It has been God's since the beginning- which is what has made it different from other forums. It is not men's but God's.

At SI we like to encourage members to post prayerfully (meaning: praying, considering before posting.) that the posts be spirit led especially in cases involving debates.  
-----

Don't lose the effect of that, we are protective of our 'own' here and that is not in the sense of exclusivity. In such a short time it is impossible to get a feel for all that has gone on before without taking some time to get to know the brethren. It is conduct not content necessarily that will bring about this type of response every time. We have had some come barging in here in times past and want to rearrange the furniture so to speak or worse destroy the place.

Though the attempt is to have some patience an attitude of humility and consideration will go a long way. We have probably to our own chagrin not been quick enough to cut off some who will not understand that they are in effect joining a community of heart seeking after the Lord individuals and we don't need to be educated by someone who hasn't taken the time to find out if topics have been discussed prior. That may not be the intention but it leaves that impression.

"Members" are welcome, but we do not take kindly to those barging into the family room. Please keep this all in mind here

e.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/24 14:42**

Quote:  
-----How can you have revival without the Bible? If a man doesn't know he has a pure Bible, how can he preach with conviction? I think not having a pure Bible hinders revival. Do you deny this? Can we have revival without a Bible??? Maybe you want fluff, but I want fire!  
-----

Perhaps revival is possible with God? All the apostles of old were fisherman who didn't have a copy of the holy writs and yet they had a hand in the changing of the word? Is Christ not THE word of God who was with Him in the beginning? The one who was made flesh? It would seem that the word of God is a bit more than just text. Perhaps I am wrong though.

**crsschk - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/4/25 0:10**

OK, I have no idea why you just wrote what you did. I didn't get it. What was wrong with asking folks to read the book? You have not clarified anything here. It's pretty vague.

You have, however, discouraged discussion on this book. To be honest, I am the one who feels hi-jacked on this thread. The heading of the section is Book Review. Well, I posted a book that I think is great and a blessing to the body of Christ. Immediately people want to use this thread to discuss everything about the book without reading it (or even part of it). So far, no one in this thread has referred to the BOOK. Do I need to start a new thread and make this clear.

crsschk, I totally respect all of your friendships. But you really need to respect folks that come in here and want to dialogue. I haven't posted ANYTHING here that is over the top. Check me out. I am a born again, Bible believing Christian who loves Jesus with all of my heart. You may want to re-assess whether you want to open this up to new people at all. I am getting things like, "We have already discussed this." Who is we??? I thought new folks were coming in all of the time. I don't mean to rain on anybody's parade. This all smacks of "click." Not good if you are the new-comer. The truth is that new people will come in all the time. Certain topics will cycle. If you see one you are tired of, don't click. Discipleship starts over for every new Christian. As the bishop of our church, I am well aware of this. Love makes us want to bear long with people, even though it is inconvenient.

But I am not leaving. I don't hold anything against anyone here. I just think this is all such a HUGE over-reaction by everyone. Man, if we can't deal with controversial topics as adults we have serious problems.

If this is not how you want to operate, I suggest nixing the term "forum" and go with "club" or something exclusive like that. If I thought this was a good ol' boys club, I wouldn't have bothered. But a forum? Cool. Let's talk. :-)

But as far as this book review section. **Can we please review the book?** Here's the link again:  
(<http://www.bbconfire.com/articles/whichversion/table.asp>) <http://www.bbconfire.com/articles/whichversion/table.asp>

God bless you,

TR

**Re: crsschk - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/25 5:16**

We have chatted over this subject in Which Version and in other places. Rather than go through the discussion again I thought folks might like to visit here.

Re: crsschk - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/25 8:19

Quote:

-----Check me out. I am a born again, Bible believing Christian who loves Jesus with all of my heart.  
-----

Tried to do that yesterday but the profile was all blanks. Not as much as a first name. I took it for granted that your legal name was NOT actually Received Text. Please correct me if I'm wrong here.

Quote:

-----If this is not how you want to operate, I suggest nixing the term "forum" and go with "club" or something exclusive like that. If I thought this was a good ol' boys club, I wouldn't have bothered. But a forum? Cool. Let's talk.  
-----

No, this is not a "good ole' boys" club and nor is it a discussion board dedicated to debating "KJV only". We surely have discussed the topic at length and have had the privilege of having Ron Bailey guiding us through the subject as he is very versed on the topic. Many here have a basic understanding of the issues, but His understanding extends well beyond reading any one book on the subject or any one position. If you will look through the thread he suggests you will find he has actually viewed in person certain of the old manuscripts that pertain to this whole debate.

Personally I am KJV also, but as Ron mentioned in one of his first responses to your postings, your posture in this is not helpful to the cause. Moreover, the name of the book in question is a major turn off.

Re: crsschk - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/4/25 9:08

At the risk of falling further on my face...

Brother, here is the rub.

We have no idea of who you are.

Perhaps a little about yourself *before* jumping into an area that tends towards such controversy.

Yes, maybe a bit gun shy around here, but recent event's (over the preceding months) have seen this once not so hostile forum being manipulated and capitulated into all kinds of grievous area's.

It has been of such a great matter that many good people have just left over it.

Being that you came suddenly out of nowhere and began with primarily two area's, the issues with the Catholic Church and now this coupled with your choice of member name... What might you suspect the members of this site to get a picture of?

Quote:

-----I am getting things like, "We have already discussed this." Who is we???  
-----

Precisely! Who is 'we' and who is 'you!' :-)

Misunderstandings abound so do forgive us for where we have missed your intent, but at the same time can not the thoughts brought up by us 'we' people be taken into consideration here?

As was alluded to there is an awful lot of prior discussion here on any number of topics, have you read any of them? Including this issue here?

Again, the *perception* is one of an agenda and that may be of our own misunderstanding, but it is not without some truth to it. There is an awful lot of this kind of thing going on, where someone's opinion is pushed to the point of being exalted above and without consideration for everyone else around here. In other words it is basically ignored.

It also is a jump to assume that being guarded is equal to an idea of being a 'click' or a 'good ol boy's club'. How can one make that assumption in such a short time span? This is what we are driving at, get a feel for the place, that's all. Have you listened to any of the messages?

Tell us a little about yourself... really, we are not that hostile, just a little paranoid maybe :-?

**Re:, on: 2005/5/25 4:32**

Hello, I am a new poster here. I have read "Which Version Is The Bible" by Jones, as well as "Ripped from the Bible" and found both books fascinating. It might be a good idea to at least read "Which Version" before jumping to conclusions about it. It is fully documented and provides hard evidence for the reasons behind the apostasy taking place inside the Christian Body today. Look at the debacle taking place in the Episcopal Church and others and we have to look no farther. Up until the 1880's the Christian knew he had the very word of God in his hands when he picked up the Bible. After the "textual Critics" Westcott & Hort- who did not even believe in the Divinity of Christ- got through with their mission of eliminating the Received Text (Textus Receptus) and replacing it with the corrupt Alexandrian text (relied upon by the Catholic Bible). They released their "Newer Version" on an unsuspecting public. Their initial charge was to update the language. What they ended up doing is gutting the text itself that was relied upon by the early Church all the way to the time that Erasmus did his translation. He (Erasmus) had all of the versions to choose from- the "Received Text" (Textus Receptus) as well as the Alexandrian Text (Vaticanus B & Sinaiticus Aleph)

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/25 5:16**

Quote:

-----After the "textual Critics" Westcott & Hort- who did not even believe in the Divinity of Christ-----

Please give documentary evidence for this statement. How much Westcott have you read?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/5/25 11:13**

Quote:

-----Its a deep study, but if you give it a little thought, it is no wonder that the Catholics have so much trouble with Doctrine. Their Text is the same one that the NIV relies on- the corrupt Alexandrian (Egyptian) text.-----

The Catholics got into so much trouble because they allowed the Pagan Greek culture to assimilate into Christian practice. They had done it no matter what text they used. Certainly we cannot fault their manuscripts for their corruption.

**Re:, on: 2005/5/30 17:07**

The Book documents everything and I take it you haven't had the time to read it. Just some of the references to Westcott & Hort consist of:

Herman C. Hoskier, The John Rylands Bullentin, 19-1922/23, p. 118. Hoskier stood with Burgon & Scrivener against the Revised text. He produced the two famous comprehensive works Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae and its Allies and Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse.

Jack A. Moorman, When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text, (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press, #1617, 1988), p. 26.

Westcott, B. F. and F. J. A. Hort, Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek, (NY: Harper and Bros., 1882), p. 107.

Ibid., p. 2.

Kurt Aland, "The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research" the Bible in Modern Scholarship, n.P. Hyatt ed., (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 337.

Further documentation:

Arthur Westcott, Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, (London: Macmillan, 1903) Vol. I, p. 81. The Pieta was a

life sized statue of Mary holding Jesus' dead body. For a detailed documentation of all the following regarding W-H's beliefs see: George H. Coy, *The Inside Story of the Anglo-American Revised New Testament* (Dallas, OR: Itemizer-Observer, 1973), pp. 79-88.

Ibid., Vol. I, p. 251. Mariolatry is the Catholic doctrines concerning Mary and her veneration.

Ibid., Vol. I, p. 8, cp. 81.

A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, 2 Vols. (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1896), Vol. I, p. 400. This is from an October 21, 1858 correspondence to Rev. Rowland Williams.

Ibid., Vol. II, p. 50.

Ruckman, *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, op.cit., p. 39. On page 186 in his footnotes, Dr. Ruckman cites *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 50; yet the material is not on that page. He adds that he is referencing that which he heard from Dr. Edward F. Hills in March of 1969. Although this author considers the above statement attributed to Hort by Ruckman as accurate, I have thus far been unable to locate and thereby independently confirm the citation in any of Hort's work at my disposal.

A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 86. Belief that by virtue of ordination into the priesthood, one is given supernatural powers.

Ibid., Vol. II, p. 51.

A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 78.

A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 69.

A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 76-77.

Ibid., Vol. I, p. 49.

Ibid., Vol. II, p. 31.

Ibid., Vol. I, p. 449

And Further documentation:

Ibid., Vol. II, p. 155.

A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 11.

A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 42.

Ibid., Vol. I, p. 416, also p. 414.

A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 52.

Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, op. cit., p. 280.

A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 117.

There is a lot more specific documentation in the book, specifically 156 references that not only documents Westcott & Hort, but everything else as well.

It is worth the read. I have it in zip format if you would like to read & study it.

God bless,

Stever

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----After the "textural Critics" Westcott & Hort- who did not even believe in the Divinity of Christ-  
-----

Please give documentary evidence for this statement. How much Westcott have you read?

-----

:-)

**Re:, on: 2005/5/30 17:21**

that is where we disagree. The Scripture that they used is not Spirit breathed, anymore than all of the newer versions in use today.

Several examples of what I mean:

Colossians 1:14

Regarding the son, Jesus, from verse 13, we read:

In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: (KJ)

In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. (NAS,NIV,RSV)

Comment: "Through his blood" is deleted – a major difference! Beloved, if your "Bible" does not contain these three words, someone has tampered with it such that it is no longer the Word of God. If it is wrong here how can you be certain that many other such omissions do not exist?

First Timothy 3:16

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. (KJ)

This verse, as recorded in the King James, clearly teaches that Jesus is God!

And by common confession great is the mystery of godliness: He who was revealed in the flesh, Was vindicated in the Spirit, Beheld by angels, Proclaimed among the nations, Believed on in the world, Taken up in glory. (NAS,NIV,RSV,NEB)

Comment: There is a great difference between someone named "he" being manifest in the flesh and "God". By changing "God" to "He who", the fact that Jesus is God is removed. This is one of the most powerful and clear verses in all of Scripture concerning the deity of Christ Jesus – the alteration therefore is seen as a direct attack upon His deity.

Over 300 mss read "God was manifest", only 8 mss say something else; of those 8, five say "who" instead of "God" and three have private interpretations. This means that of the extant Greek manuscripts of the New Testament that bear witness to the true reading of this verse, 97% agree with the King James as opposed to 2% that read "who".

The verse should read as the 1611 KJB has rendered it, but the question that should be burning in the mind of the reader is "why did the other translations chose the minority text"? The reason will be forthcoming in later chapters – but for now, let us continue with the exposé.

Isaiah 7:14

Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJ)

"A young woman is going to have a baby." (Jerusalem Version)

"A young woman who is pregnant will have a son." (Good News)

"Behold a young woman shall conceive ..." (RSV)

Comment: There is nothing new about a young woman's having a baby, yet this is supposed to be a sign whereby God is promising deliverance in an almost impossible situation!

The Hebrew word "almah" (hmlu) occurs only seven times in the O.T. It should be rendered "virgin" here for although "almah" could mean "young woman", every time it is used in the Old Testament the context demands that it means "virgin".

The other six times it is translated "virgin" in most of the various versions. One wonders why the sudden departure in the verse before us. The miracle was going to be that a virgin was going to conceive!

Furthermore, the New Testament confirms the fact in Mat.1:23 that Mary was a virgin: "Behold, a virgin (Greek = "parthenos" = parqeno") shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."

All languages contain both "weak" and "strong" words. By "weak" is meant a word that has many shades of meaning or even widely different meanings, i.e., the word "cool" in today's English. Such words can defy etymological studies. "Strong" words, on the other hand, are words which have a very limited narrow meaning – often only one possible sense.

We begin to see the manifold wisdom of God in choosing to reveal His Word to man in two tongues. Weak words in one which could lead to confusion could be covered by strong words in the other by cross references and quotations. Such is the case before us. The "weak" Hebrew word "almah" (though we have already shown that by its Biblical usage it is not so weak) is covered in the N.T. by the "strong" Greek word "parthenos" which can only be translated one way – "virgin".

Moreover, context is the decisive factor for determining the final connotation of any word or phrase, not the dictionary definition or etymology. Etymology, though often helpful, is not an exact science. It should be used for confirmation, not as the deciding factor.

The translators of the modern versions are well aware of the incontrovertible decisive nature of "parthenos" hence the translation of Isaiah 7:14 into any other word represents deliberate willful alteration of the Word of God. In denying the virgin birth of Christ, they are saying:

- 1) Jesus was a bastard as Mary was unmarried when she conceived;
- 2) Mary was a fornicator;
- 3) God has lied to us in Mat. 1:22-23;
- 4) Christ was not God, not deity (having a physical father, He was only human); and
- 5) Christ was a sinner as he would then be a descendant of Adam and inherit Adam's nature as in Rom. 5:12.

The three verses placed before us should serve as an excellent barometer for the reader to use in determining whether a given version is trustworthy or not.

God bless

Stever

**Re:, on: 2005/5/30 17:42**

My previous post was in response to Robert Wurtz and was in regards to his comments on Catholicism.

God Bless,

Stever

**Re:, on: 2005/5/30 18:12**

Quote:

-----  
philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----After the "textural Critics" Westcott & Hort- who did not even believe in the Divinity of Christ-  
-----

Please give documentary evidence for this statement. How much Westcott have you read?  
-----

Are you aware that Westcott doubted the Biblical account of miracles?  
From the Book- Which Version is the Bible:

. Writing in his diary, August 11, 1847, Bishop Westcott penned:

"I never read an account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it."

Indeed, Westcott and Hort did not even believe the original autographs of the Scriptures were God inspired! Writing in their "Introduction", they impiously stated:

. Writing in his diary, August 11, 1847, Bishop Westcott penned:

"I never read an account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it."

Indeed, Westcott and Hort did not even believe the original autographs of the Scriptures were God inspired! Writing in their "Introduction", they impiously stated:

. Writing in his diary, August 11, 1847, Bishop Westcott penned:

"I never read an account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it."

Indeed, Westcott and Hort did not even believe the original autographs of the Scriptures were God inspired! Writing in their "Introduction", they impiously stated:

"Little is gained by speculating as to the precise point at which such corruptions came in. They may be due to the original writer, or to his amanuensis if he wrote from dictation, or they may be due to one of the earliest transcribers." (emphasis author's)

Troubling to you? It is to me because before Westcott & Hort came on the scene, the Christian knew that he had the very word of God in his hands. Thanks to these two men, who: Did not believe in the Divinity of Christ; Did not believe in the Biblical account of miracles; and did not believe that the Scripture was Spirit Breathed and that God had the power to Preserve the Scriptures in their original---were able to create misunderstanding throughout the entire body of Christ with their "work". Sort of like letting the fox take care of the henhouse.

All of the sources for this information is documented in the Book.

God bless,

Stever

Re:, on: 2005/5/30 19:43

Dear Ironman:

What they had was the Old Testament. Just like Christ who met the Disciples on the road to Emmaus. He walked them through the entire Old Testament, from one end to the other--with all of the Prophecies about Him, starting with Genesis 3:15.

What we have to day is one new version after another. Every "New" version is copywrited, which means MONEY. Every new version relies upon the corrupt Alexandrian Text. The "blood" is removed and there is mass confusion and no one today can say what the Disciples could say when they were looking at their Bible---This is the very Spirit Breathed Word of God.

God bless,

Stever

Quote:

-----  
IRONMAN wrote:

Quote:  
-----How can you have revival without the Bible? If a man doesn't know he has a pure Bible, how can he preach with conviction? I think not having a pure Bible hinders revival. Do you deny this? Can we have revival without a Bible??? Maybe you want fluff, but I want fire!  
-----

Perhaps revival is possible with God? All the apostles of old were fisherman who didn't have a copy of the holy writs and yet they had a hand in the changing of the word? Is Christ not THE word of God who was with Him in the beginning?The one who was made flesh? It would seem that the word of God is a bit more than just text. Perhaps I am wrong though.  
-----