

General Topics :: Why KJV?**Why KJV? - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/8/22 15:15**

After reading several discussion on this board, I have seen a trend. There seems to be a deep reliance on the KJV as the only authoritative "Word of God", and any other version is being dismissed as inaccurate or insufficient. (Which, this seems to me as being a dangerous position to occupy as such would give the bible more authority than the Spirit and thus deny the power of the Spirit.)

And so, I would like to know why this is? Why do you (if this is you), rely on the KJV as the only authoritative "Word of God"? Why do you only trust the KJV of the bible?

Re: Why KJV?, on: 2005/8/22 15:30

Nothing "dangerous" about it at all.

So much research has been done on all versions and which Manuscripts and Translators were used for each and the main thing is the "Comparative Charts" found on the web, that makes some of us side with the KJV.

No transliteration (not interpretation) is 100 % perfect, and in my e-sword, I compare all verses to the original Hebrew, Greek or Aramaic first, and then all the Versions, and see which comes closest to the original language and it's Grammar.

Sometimes the Analytical-Literal Translation comes closest to the grammar, (done by some nice young Baptist boy up in PA.), sometimes the Young's comes closest, etc. etc.

But for regular reading of a version in Book form, I prefer the KJV because it is closest and because it is one that Most Study Aids are numbered to with the Strongs numbering and if I need to find a verse in the Strongs Concordance or Englishman's Concordance, because I've memorized or read the KJV ... I have no problem finding the verses I'm looking for.

When I read the NIV for 5 yr.s, from about '79 to about '84, I had to relearn the KJV to do Word Studies and found that the meanings of the verses in the NIV were so off, that I had to relearn the 'spirit' of the verse too, besides just the wording.

Look for some comparison charts, especially those that show what other versions do to the Deity of Christ, etc. etc.

God Bless.

Annie

Re: Why KJV?, on: 2005/8/22 16:41

Blake.. it's a good question, and within a day or so this thread will be 15 pages long. I think just about everything that can be written by everyone on site concerning Bible versions has already been written... and if you have read several threads, then you have already read the answers. It's my experience here that nothing new will be added to this thread that hasn't already been written.

Having said that... I will refer you to the threads you've read. I'll only respond as I feel led to.

But I am glad you're asking questions. Have a teachable spirit and you will learn much. I pray we all come to this site with a teachable spirit. The wisdom of many here runs pretty deep. I've learned a lot from people on this site.

Krispy

General Topics :: Why KJV?

Re: I'm not a KJV follower - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/8/22 18:58

I have to admit that I'm NOT one of the many KJV fans because I find myself having to guess at the meaning too many times. I don't speak or understand the old language, even though it may be very accurate. I'm not a very good reader. I have been using the NIV (and sometimes a few others, and Strongs, Vines, etc) - doing word studies with it. I put my studies on my web site, and I sure would like to know if my use of the NIV has caused me to stray or be inaccurate. I invite anyone to check my site and let me know where I am off. I don't mind.

I agree that we need the Spirit to make God's truths understood. They must be SPIRITUALLY DISCERNED.

It would be interesting to know if various versions have led people off track more than others. Can anyone ever assess that objectively!!!

If spiritual fruit is an indication of the accuracy of one's Bible, then maybe the Chinese bible is one of the most accurate. Yet in their persecution, many would only have a few pages at a time.

James 1:13 "...by his own evil desires he is dragged away and enticed".

Also, scripture says that people are led away when they follow after a man - false prophet etc, or by sticking to one truth while omitting others. (straining the gnat)

Just my own opinions.....

Diane

Re: Why KJV? - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/8/23 0:11

Hi Blake,

Quote:
-----After reading several discussion on this board, I have seen a trend. There seems to be a deep reliance on the KJV as the only authoritative "Word of God"

I would have to disagree with you. If the general consensus on SI was that the KJV was the *only* authoritative Bible, then the plethora of discussions and debates--and arguments--would not exist on this forum. True there is probably a highly held opinion among many of the members here of the KJV translation, even among those who would debate with our KJV only brothers on SI.

Quote:
-----And so, I would like to know why this is? Why do you (if this is you), rely on the KJV as the only authoritative "Word of God"? Why do you only trust the KJV of the bible?

Once again I would GREATLY encourage you to search the forum and re-read the threads pertaining to this subject and this question will be more than answered without having to start a whole new thread on this subject.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

edit: I guess I should have read Krispy's post first...lol. It would have made my post a lot simpler. I would only have had to type, "Yeah, what Krispy said." 8-)

Re: Why KJV? - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/8/23 5:19

Who is the morning star according to the NIV?

In Isaiah, it is Lucifer. In Revelation it is Christ.

What is Christ referred to in the NKJV?

The Coming One. All the new-agers are looking for the Coming One. Just do the web search.

Just compare and see for yourself. Don't rely on anyone's opinion. Honestly compare verse for verse for a few weeks. Study what happened in history as a result of what version. Study what Greek text was under attack, and what version is under more heat to be 'phased out.' Don't trust any of us. The Spirit will guide you into all truth. The first thing to understand is that what we call 'Christianity' today doesn't hold a candle to the New Testament. So anyone's take is just another opinion. Do the research yourself.

Re: KJV only? - posted by saved_matt (), on: 2005/8/23 6:30

I was wondering with all the debate started up about the King James, are there actually *any* KJV ONLY people on SI, i would define myself as a KJV preferer, but not a KJV only person, i am quite happy to consider/compare/study other translations, but like i said i prefer the KJV.

Re:, on: 2005/8/23 8:29

Quote:
-----I have to admit that I'm NOT one of the many KJV fans because I find myself having to guess at the meaning too many times. I don't speak or understand the old language, even though it may be very accurate. I'm not a very good reader.

There are so many resources out there to help us understand the extremely small percentage of archaic words in the KJV... beginning with the dictionary. Many of these resources are available for free online. Some don't want to be bothered with having to look things up... but what's the problem with making oneself a better reader and studier of the Word? It can only make oneself stronger.

The KJV is by far more accurate because it is based upon what many of us here believe is a superior stream of Greek text. The KJV and the modern versions are based upon completely different texts. This is something that most people do not understand. They believe the myth propagated by the publishing companies that the only difference is between old English and modern English... and that is a lie.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/8/23 8:37

Quote:
-----I was wondering with all the debate started up about the King James, are there actually any KJV ONLY people on SI, i would define myself as a KJV preferer, but not a KJV only person, i am quite happy to consider/compare/study other translations, but like i said i prefer the KJV.

There are different "degrees" of KJV-Only. There are those who prefer the KJV over other versions because of its poetic beauty.

There are those who prefer the KJV because of its accuracy and dependence on the Received Text, understanding that the Received Text is far superior to the Alexandrian, and believing that the RT is the preserved Word of God... however, do not believe that the KJV is an inspired translation, and think that a version in modern English would be fine **IF** it were actually based on the SAME manuscripts as the KJV, without losing any of the meaning.

Then there are the extremists who believe the KJV was an inspired translation as much as the original autographs were,

and that the KJV is the perfectly preserved Word of God... and even corrects errors in the Greek.

I am in the middle. I DO NOT believe as the extremists do. It wouldn't bother me to see a version in modern English based upon the RT. So far there has only been one: Green's Modern KJV. Personally I do not care for this version myself, but I know some do... and that's ok with me.

Krispy

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2005/8/23 13:40

Hi Krispy...!

I think that there may be a miscommunication, misconception or improper generalization of those who are not *KJV-only*. I totally agree that there are several degrees of separation between those who prefer the common KJV (1769 edition) and those who are *quite vocal* concerning their opposition to other translations.

Your assessment of the different beliefs of adherents of *KJV-only* is quite fair. However, there are also several degrees of separation for those who are not *KJV-only*. It would only be fair to consider their beliefs as well.

There are those who would receive any translation or version of the Bible without question. Unfortunately, it is dangerous to accept any "translation" or "version" on blind faith. There are "translations" of the Bible that are fundamentally flawed -- like the *New World Translation* of the Jehovah's Witnesses. Its "translation" was meant to preserve the particular beliefs of that sect (like rejection of the trinity). There are also modern versions of the Bible that are merely paraphrased editions of earlier translations. An example would be *The Living Bible*, which was a paraphrase of the *American Standard Version* by Kenneth Taylor. Of course, it is the interpretation of a single man, and contains controversial usage (like the infamous "*Barney the Preacher*" term in Acts 4:36).

There are groups who accept a version of the Bible based upon the good faith placed in it by another person or spiritual leader. Their pastor may preach that the *NIV*, *NKJV*, *ASV*, or even the *KJV* is a good translation, and that is good enough for them. Again, this is dangerous because the pastor or leader (despite their seemingly good intentions) is still a flawed human being. They may just be stating second-hand or third-hand knowledge that they were taught (by their pastor or in Bible School). Pardon the old anecdote, but this is like tuning a piano with another piano. You may end up with two out-of-tune pianos.

There is another group of individuals who have received serious instruction and read books about the reliability of certain *non-KJV* (or even *KJV*) translations. Thus, they accept certain other versions that they deem to be acceptable. The danger in this is that such instruction or books also contain secondhand knowledge. Regardless of how spiritual or academically sounding their argument may be (or how sincere the giver of such knowledge is), the fact remains that the information given is still coming from a secondhand source. There is a lot of "authoritative-sounding" but prejudiced material readily available concerning Bible translations (especially online). Because of such pre-existing prejudices *for or against* certain translations, the judgment can be tainted. Such sources should be used carefully, and not for the purpose of using as "*proof*" to reinforce a pre-existing argument.

There are also those who have sincerely and thoroughly considered the matter. These individuals have heard both sides of the argument, and have searched for the truth. They have researched the arguments presented (without prejudice), and have attempted to find source material concerning the matter. Unfortunately, the greatest "source material" is the original text from which the translations are taken (such as the "Textus Receptus"). Even if they had access to original manuscripts, few (if any) researchers can read the original ancient Hebrew or Greek text. Thus, they are confined to studying the history of, intent of, methods for, and instructions given to the translators. With such stringent instruction given to the Catholic translators of the KJV by the Roman Catholic clergy and Catholic King James, some debate remains concerning the "infallibility" of this translation.

Just like there are *extremist KJV-only* groups, it is possible that there are also *extremist non-KJV* groups. But it seems that most of the *non-KJV-only* groups recognize the validity of the KJV (both the original and the subsequent translations). It's just that they also accept other translations as well. Sometimes, they view the KJV as a good translation, but they view its old-English grammar, terminology and usage as just slightly dated -- and thus it is difficult to understand or comprehend by current day English-speakers (especially non-believers).

Quote:

-----"There are so many resources out there to help us understand the extremely small percentage of archaic words in the KJV... beginning with the dictionary. Many of these resources are available for free online. Some don't want to be bothered with having to look things up... but what's the problem with making oneself a better reader and student of the Word? It can only make oneself stronger."

While this is true, it is completely against the intent of the KJV translators. In their preface to the KJV, the translators stated that they wanted to produce a version of the Bible in the language of the common-man. Most people (outside of serious believers) do not own Bible dictionaries or dictionaries that explain 17th century English grammar usage. I have noticed that when sharing Scripture from the King James Version, I am often asked, "What does that mean?" by both the saved and unsaved. I am thus forced to offer commentary, which again is contrary to the desire and intent of the translators. They hoped for a translation that was commonly understood by all.

Quote:
-----"The KJV is by far more accurate because it is based upon what many of us here believe is a superior stream of Greek text. The KJV and the modern versions are based upon completely different texts. This is something that most people do not understand. They believe the myth propagated by the publishing companies that the only difference is between old English and modern English... and that is a lie."

Perhaps it is not wise to make such an open-ended remark. It may have been better to state, "*Some of us* here at SermonIndex are of the persuasion that the KJV is far more accurate..." There are alot of people here at SermonIndex. And it is unknown just how many hold to the *KJV-only* persuasion. Just because others may not be as vocal or post as often, they still are a part of this community of believers. Some may be frightened of conflict, or have been bombarded with contradictory comments after having stated a belief or opinion. And of course, alot of non *KJV-only* people (including here at SermonIndex) realize that the KJV is based on some other texts and former translations than some other versions. However, to say that our beliefs rely on the "myths propagated by the publishing companies" is simply untrue. There are many of us that have diligently, honestly and sincerely researched this matter and have simply arrived to a different conclusion than the others.

It can be quite dangerous to have a *believe-me-or-you-are-believing-a-lie* or *I'm-right-and-you're-sadly-misguided* type of attitude in this matter. Such an attitude is often viewed as prideful or arrogant by those who disagree. Instead, people should be encouraged to make up their own mind on the matter through intense study. Perhaps a better thread for such a topic is not "*Why KJV?*" Perhaps it would be better to lay the axe to the root about the source texts through which other translations were taken, rather than comparisons between the KJV and other versions.

Perhaps it would be helpful for those who believe one way or the other to offer the source material for which they based their beliefs (such as the source information that they found regarding the "Received Text," "Alexandrian Text," etc...). There is also first-hand material available from the translators themselves (through the instructions, preface, intent, etc...). Such material may be helpful to those who are eagerly and honestly searching for the truth.

We are all on a journey looking toward our same destination (to be closer to the Lord -- and to know the Truth). There are several areas of belief that are debated here at SermonIndex. From discussions about Judgment, Spiritual Gifts and Music -- we do not all believe the same way. I pray that we can humbly encourage one another (including those with whom we disagree) with all sincerity and devoted love that is evident to all.

:)

Re: - posted by ColinM, on: 2005/8/23 14:32

2 Pet 1:21 for no prophecy was ever made by an act of human will, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God.

1 Peter 1:10 As to this salvation, the prophets who prophesied of the grace that would come to you made careful searches and inquiries, 11 seeking to know what person or time the Spirit of Christ within them was indicating as He predicted the sufferings of Christ and the glories to follow. 12 It was revealed to them that they were not serving themselves, but you, in these things which now have been announced to you through those who preached the gospel to you by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven--things into which angels long to look.

Acts 3:18 "But the things which God announced beforehand by the mouth of all the prophets, that His Christ would suffer, He has thus fulfilled"

2 Sam 23:2 "The Spirit of the LORD spoke by me, And His word was on my tongue."

How could a prophet prophesy his God's message by inspiration, using his own thoughts and words, if he did not always

General Topics :: Why KJV?

know what he was writing about?

Scripture is clear: THE WORD is Jesus, and the word is the Scriptures:our Bible. To assume that this one english word c an only mean Jesus, HS, and not the Scriptures is bad interpretation.

John 15:7

"If you abide in Me, and My words abide in you, ask whatever you wish, and it will be done for you

John 8:31 So Jesus was saying to those Jews who had believed Him, "If you continue in My word, then you are truly disc iples of Mine;

32and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free."

Jesus said if His word abides in us, then we will know the truth, and the truth will set us free. What is His word? The Spiri t abiding in us, and HIS COMMANDMENTS abiding in us (JOhn 14:15; 1 John 2:4)

Re:, on: 2005/8/23 14:39

ccchhhrrriiiss... A very gracious response, even though I disagree on some of your points.

Even tho we dont see eye to eye, unlike extremist KJV-O's, I still call you brother. And I do respect anyone who has studied and come to a different conclusion that I. Unfortunately most Christians dont.

I do take exception to some things you said.

Quote:
-----With such stringent instruction given to the Catholic translators of the KJV by the Roman Catholic clergy and Catholic King James

When you make a statement such as this, I have to wonder how thoroughly you have really studied this topic.

King James, tho certainly not a perfect man, was no Roman Catholic. The Cathoic Church was certainly **NOT** in favor of the KJV work being done. 80% of the KJV is based on Tyndale's work, and the RCC had him murdered 75 years earlier.

Here are direct quotes from King James' own writings:

Quote #1

"As for Purgatory and all the trash depending thereupon, it is not worth the talking of; Bellarmaine cannot find any groun d for it in all the Scriptures...But as for me I am sure there is a Heaven and a Hell...for the elect and reprobate...Heaven and Hell are there revealed to be the eternal home of all mankind, let us endeavor to win the one and eschew the other."

Quote #2 (Concerning the infallibility of the Pope)

"...so I utterly deny that there is an earthly monarch thereof, whose word must be a Law, and who cannot err in his Sente nce, by an infallibility of Spirit...Christ did not promise before his ascension to leave Peter with them to direct and instruct them in all thins; but he promised to send the Holy Ghost unto them for that end...But how they are now come to be Chri sts Vicars, nay, Gods on earth, triple crowned, Kings of heaven, earth and hell, judges of all the world, and none to judg e them; heads of the faith, absolute deciders of all controversies by the infallibility of their spirit, having all power both spi ritual and temporal in their hands; the high bishops, monarchs of the whole earth, superiors to all emperors and kings; y ea supreme vice-gods, who whether will or not cannot err; how they now come is say to the top of greatness I know not but sure I am we that are kings have greatest need to look into it. As for me, Paul and Peter I know, but these men I kno w not...but I am sure none will condemn for an heretic save such as make the Pope their God, and think him such a spe aking Scripture as they can define heresy no otherwise...Rome shall be the seat of the Antichrist--Rome is the Seat of th e Antichrist."

General Topics :: Why KJV?

Quote #3

"And first for the blessed virgin Mary, I yield her that which the Angel Gabriel pronounced of her...I reverence her as the Mother of Christ,...But I dare not mock her and blaspheme God, praying her to command and control her Son, who is her God and her Savior, nor yet not I think that she hath no other thing to do in heaven, than to hear every idle mans suite, and busy herself in their errands; while requesting, while commanding her Son, while coming down to kiss and make love with Priests, and while disputing and brawling with Devils. In heaven she is in eternal glory and joy, never to be interrupted with any worldly business, and there I leave her with her blessed Son our Savior and her in eternal felicity."

The RCC had this to say about King James:
"King James is no Catholic, neither is he a Christian."

King James' response to that was: *"...not only having ever been brought up in that Religion which I presently profess...and so cannot be properly an heretic, by their own doctrine, since I never was of their Church."* --King James, Basilicon Doron, p. 15

And of course he had this to say about the Pope:
"I am sure none will condemn for an heretic save such as make the Pope their God." --King James, Basilicon Doron, p. 36

I conclude that King James was no Catholic. (Nor was he gay, which many try and say today. I can refute that as well.)

As for the translators... Erasmus merely passed on the Greek Text that was considered the traditional and received text. Even Westcott and Hort admitted this.

Also... **they were not Catholic**. They were Anglican, and the Anglican Church of today is but a thin shadow of what it was 400 years ago. As for the Anglicans who worked on the KJV, they were merely editing the Tyndale Bible, and he was a separatist, Bible-believing Christian who was martyred for his faith. Further, in spite of their Anglicanism, the translator of the KJV did accept the Bible as the infallible Word of God.

Quote:
-----It can be quite dangerous to have a believe-me-or-you-are-believing-a-lie or I'm-right-and-you're-sadly-misguided type of attitude in this matter. Such an attitude is often viewed as prideful or arrogant by those who disagree.

I understand what you are saying. However, for me this is not an issue of pride. I am very confident about my convictions and what I perceive the truth to be. My motivation is to encourage and point people in the direction of truth. If it is misunderstood as pride or a bad attitude... well, from experience I can tell you that no matter how you stand for truth, someone isn't going to like it.

Krispy

PS: Let me add that when we make statements such as "The Catholic King James" or the "Catholic Translators of the KJV"... we need to be very careful. The **facts** are that they were not. Therefore, when we make false statements, even about people who have been dead for 4 centuries, we are bearing false witness. Whether intentional or not, we are lying about them. Also, there are those who claim that King James was gay. He was not. It's a lie. When that lie is spouted out in Bible version debates... it is gossip. It is lying. It is bearing false witness.

We need to know what we are talking about, or we run the risk of committing sin.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2005/8/23 15:54

Hi Krispy...!

Thanks for the reproof about my remarks concerning the translators or King James himself being "Catholic" in belief. It has been a little while since I read in this, but I was under the impression that he had "made peace" with the Roman Church. But you are correct in that he was indeed a rather spiritually-questionable man, and his conflict with the Puritans and other religious groups is well documented.

However, whether or not King James and the translators were indeed Anglican or Catholic is quite insignificant (some might argue that the Anglican Church was even more corrupt than the Roman Catholic Church because of the events concerning its conception) when considering what was still quite strigent and questionable instructions concerning the translation itself by the major clergy. These instructions were included in the words of the translators themselves.

Quote:
-----"I understand what you are saying. However, for me this is not an issue of pride. I am very confident about my convictions and what I perceive the truth to be. My motivation is to encourage and point people in the direction of truth. If it is misunderstood as pride or a bad attitude... well, from experience I can tell you that no matter how you stand for truth, someone isn't going to like it."

Krispy, I know that you are a very sincere man of God. But again, it appears that you are saying that you hold the truth in this matter, and thus, you are the one standing for truth. These very comments, no matter how sincere or misunderstood, still reflect an "I-am-right-and-everyone-else-is-wrong" type of attitude. Such attitudes can mistakenly be viewed as pompous or arrogantly self-righteous. We must be patient with those who disagree with us, with the hope of edifying one another in the Lord. Besides, if we are gently honest, we may actually learn something from one another.

There are those of us who have sincerely and intensely studied this issue (yes, even though I included the words about *catholicism*) and still do not agree with *your opinion* concerning this matter. Yes, facts are facts. But some of the facts that are provided through the "great translation debate" are from second-hand sources. We too believe that we are standing for truth on this issue, but we believe that all such issues are open for study and debate. A person must be allowed the room to make their own decision on this issue (or any issue of doctrine), instead of having it presented to them by a second-hand authority. This is so contrary to the intent of having a version of the Bible that is commonly understood -- rather than explained by other sources.

There are many of us on this board that have sincerely searched this issue and still disagree (or don't *fully* agree) with all of the "evidence" that has been presented by the various *KJV-only* arguments. No one has the authority to say that one group is entirely wrong in this matter. I believe that we should be careful to say, "It is my belief" or "my persuasion" concerning the issue, rather than exhibiting a "this is the truth -- believe it or else" or "if you *really* studied, you would realize that I am right" type of attitude. The best thing to do is to present the facts (again, not from second-hand sources), and be patient enough to allow others to come to form their own set of beliefs. In the end, they *may* or *may not* agree with you.

But that is still okay. There are a lot of controversial issues that are discussed in these threads. Some may disagree on this subject, or on the subject of music, or "eternal security," or judgment, or spiritual gifts, or Bible prophecy, etc... The point is that no one is an *all-knowing* authority on this board. Not everyone will agree on such issues. But that is still okay. We do not all have to agree on every matter -- just on the issues that bind us together as believers.

Let's humbly encourage one another in our search for truth!

:)

Re:, on: 2005/8/23 16:07

Quote:
-----But again, it appears that you are saying that you hold the truth in this matter, and thus, you are the one standing for truth. These very comments, no matter how sincere or misunderstood, still reflect an "I-am-right-and-everyone-else-is-wrong" type of attitude. Such attitudes can mistakenly be viewed as pompous or arrogantly self-righteous.

My dad's favorite saying when I was growing up was: You've got to stand for something, or you'll fall for anything. Notice in my response I used the word "perceive". This means that I acknowledge that there are those who disagree, and that I

General Topics :: Why KJV?

am not always right. I do believe very strongly on this issue, and I do feel it is one of the most important issues facing the church today. Before we can ever address any other issues, we must first know what the Bible is... and what it is not.

As I have already said, I respect you and others who have really studied the issue and for whatever reason have drawn different conclusions. Let each man be fully convinced in his own heart.

By the way, I'm well aware that King James was a religious persecutor. Especially toward the groups that would eventually evolve into baptists on down the time line. But King James had little to do with the actual work of the translation, other than autorizing it. He didnt even fund the work. So his personal beliefs and behaviors dont effect the KJV one way or the other...

Krispy

Re: - posted by dougkristen (), on: 2005/8/23 16:09

I studied Biblical Greek in College and we translated the greek text and the KJV seemed to be the closest to what we translated it... BUT, our teacher said that the NASB was more close to the actual greek text...

Hmmm...

In Christ,
Doug Renz

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2005/8/23 16:15

Hi dougkristen...!

That is very interesting. Which greek text was it that you were translating while in college? And since you have studied this in college, how many actual greek texts are available for research today?

Thanks for any help you can give on this matter!

:)

Re:, on: 2005/8/23 16:35

Quote:
-----I studied Biblical Greek in College and we translated the greek text and the KJV seemed to be the closest to what we translated it...
BUT, our teacher said that the NASB was more close to the actual greek text...

I echo Chris' question... which text? Since the KJV and the NASB are based on completely different texts, this would be an important question.

Quote:
-----our teacher said that the NASB was more close to the actual greek text...

Do you know this as a fact, or did you take your instructor's word on it?

Krispy

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/8/25 13:01

Dear Krispy,

Out of curiosity, how do you know which greek text is more authentic?

Blake

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/8/25 13:10

Dear Chris,

I agree with your post. It was beautifully written.

Yes, let us be humble. And the "us" certainly includes me. I need to be humbled every day just the same.

Blake

Re:, on: 2005/8/25 13:19

Quote:

-----Out of curiosity, how do you know which greek text is more authentic?

Thats not easily answered here in a single post. Thats why AGAIN I refer you to threads that have covered this topic extensively and are easily accessible to you.

Let me ask you... How do you know the RT isnt more authentic?

If you give it an honest study, and really research it... then I will be glad to share my own views on it. So far you've kinda demonstrated that you're here to stir things up more than anything else. You seem to have ignored the advise of several (including admins) that you go back and search thru the past threads.

I wonder if you are teachable. Are you teachable?

Krispy

P.S. To partially answer your question... there is something called "faith" that plays a part in all of this. You want hard facts and human reasoning. You seem to have a very humanistic bent to your theology. If it isnt something you can see or touch... you reject it.

Re: The Vicious Circle - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/8/25 13:51

Hi Blake,

Here are some of the previous discussions:

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order1&topic_id6133&forum35&post_id&refreshGo) Textual Criticism

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id6729&forum35&75) Which version of the Bible is closest to the original?

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id6781&forum35&post_id&refreshGo) Bible Versions

General Topics :: Why KJV?

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id6111&forum35&post_id&refreshGo) What about the ESV?

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id5324&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) Corrupted Text

These are just a few that you might want to browse through. There are MANY more.

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/8/25 16:40

Thank you Hulsey. I will read them.

Blake

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/8/25 16:51

Dear Krispy,

I am not trying to stir up trouble (if I did I apologize for that was not my intent). I am sincere. However, as you pointed out , there are thousands of posts. I did not know where to start. I tried looking around as people suggested, but it's like looking for gold in a retired mine.

In love,
Blake