

Scriptures and Doctrine :: KJ Error??**KJ Error?? - posted by beenblake (), on: 2006/1/22 17:21**

I happened upon this scripture and was wondering why the author's of the King James interpreted the following as they did.

Proverbs 8:5 (KJ Strongs)

For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour.

The word used here for "angels" is the Hebrew word "elohiym" which is the Hebrew word for "God." It is translated every where else in the King James version of the bible as "God" except for this one scripture where it is translated "angels." There is no other scripture in the entire bible where the King James writers translated this word as "angels."

Does anyone know why they would translate it incorrectly in this scripture?

Re: KJ Error?? - posted by Smokey (), on: 2006/1/22 17:39

bb

H430

אלהים

'ĕlôhîym

el-o-heem'

Plural of H433; gods in the ordinary sense; but specifically used (in the plural thus, especially with the article) of the supreme God; occasionally applied by way of deference to magistrates; and sometimes as a superlative: - ***angels***, X exceeding, God (gods) (-dess, -ly), X (very) great, judges, X mighty.

If you read right to the bottom of the description, you can see that "angels" IS still an acceptable rendering of this term.

Greg

Re: KJ Error?? - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/1/22 17:41

This verse is a big thorn in the flesh for the KJV-only debate. Some believe that the translators didn't put God, because then there was a point of separation between the king and the subject. In other words, the hierarchy would go God - king - angels - God.

I don't know if I agree with that, or if the verse is saying that God has placed us on the world as a servant, lower than the angels, until we inherit our eternal right to "rule and reign with Him". Just as the son of the king is like unto the servant (even worse, because he is obliged to work despite wages and standards, knowing the inheritance awaits) except for his bloodline (I know it's badly paraphrased, but I can't remember which epistle it's in :oops:).

For myself, this verse was brought up by someone defending his use of the Good News Bible (which renders Elohim as God). We even looked up "lower" thinking that perhaps the psalmist meant lower, as in (for want of a better word) spatially. However, it means "lower in social standing".

Perhaps God allowed it to help us to realise that even the inspired Word is not immune to errors (I know I could get in a lot of trouble for saying that).

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/1/22 17:44

Quote:

Smokey wrote:
LOL Greg

Greg,

Is LOL a title or initials? You seem to always preface your name with it;-).

Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2006/1/22 17:59

In e-mailing back and forth with my son, we have gotten into the habit of signing off with LOL (lots of love)Jon/ LOL dad . Sorry to cause concern I will adjust my sign off..

Greg

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2006/1/22 18:44

Dear Greg,

Quote:

-----If you read right to the bottom of the description, you can see that "angels" IS still an acceptable rendering of this term.

If you look again, it says...

"God 2346, god 244, judge 5, GOD 1, goddess 2, great 2, mighty 2, angels 1, exceeding 1, God-ward + (04136) 1, godly 1"

This word is translated as "angels" only once. This means it was only translated as "angels" in this scripture but not anywhere else.

After making this post, I happened upon the scripture in Hebrews which highlights as to why the translators did such a thing.

Hebrews 2:7 (KJ Strongs)

Thou madest him a little * * lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands:

The writer of Hebrews alluded to this scripture in the Psalms using the word "angels." Thus, the translators of the King James took the liberty to change the original verse to make it fit with this one.

This raises many new questions including...Why did the writer of the book of Hebrews translate the original scripture as speaking of "angels" rather than of "God"?

Is the writer of Hebrews correct in his or her interpretation of the Psalms (does "Elohiym" translate "God", or does it translate to include all spirits, God and angels)? Or did the writer of Hebrews make a small mistake and it should say "God" and not "angels"?

This calls into question not only the authenticity of the King James version of the bible, but the authenticity of the whole bible itself as a precise and exacting book.

Blake

Scriptures and Doctrine :: KJ Error??

Re., on: 2006/1/22 19:21

Stever posts (in response to Blake's post that includes: "....."If you look again, it says...
"God 2346, god 244, judge 5, GOD 1, goddess 2, great 2, mighty 2, angels 1, exceeding 1, God-ward + (04136) 1, godly 1"

This word is translated as "angels" only once. This means it was only translated as "angels" in this scripture but not anywhere else..... This calls into question not only the authenticity of the King James version of the bible, but the authenticity of the whole bible itself as a precise and exacting book. "):

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever continues:

Colossians tells us that while Jesus was upon this earth, he had the fullness of the Godhead bodily within his flesh:

Col 2:9

9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Hebrews 2:7-10 tells us that God made him a little lower than the angels when he came to this earth:

7. Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands:

8. Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him.

9. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. 10. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

The Holy Spirit is the one who revealed the truth to the translators of the KJV that Jesus was NOT made a little god, when He came down to this earth. He (Jesus) is God, and set His Godliness aside, and became a man. The difference between Him and us? Within His flesh was the fullness of the Godhead bodily. We are merely man, with an earthly father full of the sin of Adam. His father was the Holy Ghost!

Luke 1:35 tells us: "35. And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that HOLY thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

God bless,

Stever

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

beenblake wrote:
Dear Greg,

Quote:
-----If you read right to the bottom of the description, you can see that "angels" IS still an acceptable rendering of this term.

If you look again, it says...
"God 2346, god 244, judge 5, GOD 1, goddess 2, great 2, mighty 2, angels 1, exceeding 1, God-ward + (04136) 1, godly 1"

This word is translated as "angels" only once. This means it was only translated as "angels" in this scripture but not anywhere else.

After making this post, I happened upon the scripture in Hebrews which highlights as to why the translators did such a thing.

Hebrews 2:7 (KJ Strongs)

Thou madest him a little * * lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands:

The writer of Hebrews alluded to this scripture in the Psalms using the word "angels." Thus, the translators of the King James took the liberty to change the original verse to make it fit with this one.

This raises many new questions including...Why did the writer of the book of Hebrews translate the original scripture as speaking of "angels" rather than of "God"?

Is the writer of Hebrews correct in his or her interpretation of the Psalms (does "Elohiym" translate "God", or does it translate to include all spirits, God and angels)? Or did the writer of Hebrews make a small mistake and it should say "God" and not "angels"?

This calls into question not only the authenticity of the King James version of the bible, but the authenticity of the whole bible itself as a precise and exacting book.

Blake

King James error, or is it the "textual critics" that err?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/23 18:35

beenblake's

Quote:

-----Is the writer of Hebrews correct in his or her interpretation of the Psalms (does "Elohiym" translate "God", or does it translate to include all spirits, God and angels)? Or did the writer of Hebrews make a small mistake and it should say "God" and not "angels"?

The original quote, by the way, is from Ps 8 not Proverbs 8. In each of these references the word 'elohiym' is translated by the word 'judge/s' in the KJV. Ex. 21:6 (KJVS) Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an aul; and he shall serve him for ever. Ex. 22:8 (KJVS) If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall be brought unto the judges, to see whether he have put his hand unto his neighbour's goods.

Ex. 22:9 (KJVS) For all manner of trespass, whether it be for ox, for ass, for sheep, for raiment, or for any manner of lost thing, which another challengeth to be his, the cause of both parties shall come before the judges; and whom the judges shall condemn, he shall pay double unto his neighbour.

1Sam. 2:25 (KJVS) If one man sin against another, the judge shall judge him: but if a man sin against the LORD, who shall intreat for him? Notwithstanding they hearkened not unto the voice of their father, because the LORD would slay them. The word 'elohiym' derives from a word meaning 'strength or power' consequently at times we need to examine the word and 'interpret' it. In the above references the translators have interpreted the word and concluded that the 'mighty one' referred to is a national or local leader and have translated 'elohiym' as 'judges'. That is a perfectly legitimate 'interpretation' and hence a justifiable 'translation'.

In the Septuagint of Psalm 8 a similar process has taken place and the translators used the word 'aggelous' ie angels. They asked what 'mighty ones' might be in view here and decided that they were angels. The fact that Hebrews quotes the Septuagint at this point indicates that it was a legitimate interpretation/translation and so has quoted Psalm 8 in Heb 2:7 from the Septuagint. This is not to say that the Septuagint translation is endorsed by the NT at all points but that at this point the Septuagint conveyed God's truth and so is quoted in Hebrews.

To sum up, elohiym can mean 'mighty ones'. The KJV translators taking their cue from the Hebrews 2:7 quotation have interpreted/translated the word 'elohiym' in Psalm 8 as 'angels'. This is a legitimate interpretation/translation and not a weakness of the KJV in this instance.

Sometimes the question is not 'what does it say?' but 'what does it mean'. The Septuagint gave its view of the 'meaning' and the inspired writer of Hebrews is saying they were right.

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/26 13:43

Quote:
----- He (Jesus) is God, and set His Godliness aside, and became a man. The difference between Him and us? Within His flesh was the fullness of the Godhead bodily. We are merely man, with an earthly father full of the sin of Adam. His father was the Holy Ghost!

Christ is the Eternal Son of God made flesh. He is the embodiment of the Triune God. IN incarnation He is God coming into Humanity, IN resurrection He brought humanity into God. His resurrected humanity was permeated with the Divine Life and he was glorified and "designated the Son of God, according to the Spirit of Holiness out of the resurrection of the Dead.

So we also as those born of God through Christ are made "sons of God". As He has shared in our humanity, we also share in His Divinity.

Christ became as we are to make us the same as He is.

Christ is God made flesh. And in Him, by Him and through Him we are born of God and share in His sonship.

As He was "made a little while lower than the angels and "partook of flesh and blood" so as He in resurrection has been glorified by the "Spirit of Holiness" so we also are made partakers of all He is and we also shall "reign with Him.

As Hebrews says, "because both He who sanctifies (Christ) and those who are being sanctified (us) are all of one (source, the Father) He is not ashamed to call them brothers".

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by brentw (), on: 2006/1/26 14:27

God gave us the Word. What about Christians who don't have all the translations to read and just have KJV. And who don't have Greek and Hebrew etc...

"The same anointing shall teach.."

The question is...Is the KJV THEE word of God?? I think we can confuse people and not know if what they read is right interpretation. The panel of the NIV had a homosexual on it and it had a man who didn't believe the first 5 books of the Bible. The panel of KJV were to have their heads cut off if they were wrong...

Again God gave us the Word! I have to..HAVE TO depend on the Holy Spirit. What is the word of God???

;-)

Re: recap - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/27 0:07

Christ came in to humanity, partook of humanity to redeem humanity and through death and resurrection to bring humanity into the Divine Sonship by bringing humanity into the Divine Glory.

In Christ humanity has been sonized and brought into the Divine Glory.

2 Thess 2:15 We have been called through my gospel unto the obtaining of the Glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2006/1/27 0:39

Hi brentw...

Quote:
-----The panel of the NIV had a homosexual on it and it had a man who didn't believe the first 5 books of the Bible.

I looked into this rumor, and it was confirmed by several sources to be an incorrect urban legend. None of the translators were homosexuals. And all of the translators were scholars that belonged to various Protestant churches.

Here is a link about many of the misconceptions and lies that are often spread about the NIV, and how they are addressed

ed by the translators themselves:

http://www.ibs.org/niv/accuracy/NIV_AccuracyDefined.pdf

:-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/27 13:40

Quote:

-----I looked into this rumor, and it was confirmed by several sources to be an incorrect urban legend.

Brethren, you be surprized at how often these urban legends spread through the evangelical community. Whenever you hear one of these things check it back to its source if at all possible.

I'm not just talking about Bible translations.

Re: - posted by brentw (), on: 2006/1/27 13:45

ccchhrrriiisss,

Thanks for the info! I read this years ago about the NIV. I guess you cant believe everything you read. ;-)

Re: KJ Error?? - posted by mloaks, on: 2006/1/27 15:52

What if...

The KJV writers would've had th edead sea scrolls, etc, we have now?

He who is not against us, is for us...

Re: Sodomy and the NIV- Mollencott & others, on: 2006/2/12 8:08

Quote:

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:
Hi brentw...

Quote:

-----The panel of the NIV had a homosexual on it and it had a man who didnt believe the first 5 books of the bible.

I looked into this rumor, and it was confirmed by several sources to be an incorrect urban legend. None of the translators were homosexuals. And all of the translators were scholars that belonged to various protestant churches.

Here is a link about many of the misconceptions and lies that are often spread about the NIV, and how they are addressed by the translators themselv es:

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response: The above statements are totally false. Dr. Virginia Mollencott is a homosexual, and was a homosexual when she was on the NIV committee.

This is a long read, but is well worth it. It documents my statements above:

"Updated September 17, 2001 (first published October 20, 1997) (David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061-0368, 866-295-4143, fbns@wayoflife.org)

- On January 25, 1997, we published an article on Virginia Mollencott, a literary consultant for the New International Version. Many have asked us for information on this woman because of her connection, however significant, with this popular modern version. Thus we gave a general overview of her life and writings as follows. (A more complete overview is contained in the article "Virginia Mollencott," which can be viewed at the Way of Life website.)

"Mollencott is a pro-abortion feminist who claims to be a 'left-leaning' evangelical. In reality she denies the very God of the Bible and worships an idolatrous female god of her own imagination. She grew up in a Plymouth Brethren fellowship and moved in Fundamentalist circles during her early years. She studied at Bob Jones University and taught at Shelton College in the 1950s. She has moved miles from that position, though. Today she moves in the most radical ecumenical feminist circles. In the 1970s, Virginia Mollencott was a consultant to the New International Version translating committee.

tee. She was involved with this project through its completion.

“In 1978 Mollenkott co-authored (with Letha Scanzoni) the book entitled "Is the Homosexual My Neighbor?", in which she called for nondiscrimination toward homosexuality. The book argues that the Sodom account in Genesis does not teach the evil of homosexuality, but the evils of violent gang rape and inhospitality to strangers. The book also claims that ‘the idea of a life long homosexual orientation or ‘condition’ is never mentioned in the Bible’ (p. 71), and that Romans 1 does not ‘fit the case of a sincere homosexual Christian’ (p. 62).

“In 1979 Mollenkott participated in the 9th General Conference of the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Church (a denomination composed largely of homosexuals). In a report which was published by the Christian Century, Sept. 26, 1979, Mollenkott stated, ‘This was the most grateful celebration of Christ I had ever attended...’

In the early 1980s Mollenkott was a member of the National Council of Churches' committee that produced an inclusive-language lectionary which addressed God in feminine terms. At a news conference at the NCC's governing board meeting on November 10, 1983, Mollenkott claimed there is some evidence that Jesus Christ was really a woman.

In October 1985, Mollenkott's signature appeared on a statement supporting homosexuality which was published in the Sojourners magazine.

In her plenary address before the July 1986 convention of the Evangelical Women's Caucus International (EWCI), in Fresno, California, Mollenkott warned against ‘heterosexism,’ the idea that everyone must be heterosexual.

In 1987 Mollenkott wrote an article claiming that refusal to ordain homosexual ‘clergywomen’ is unscriptural discrimination.

In the June 1991 issue of the Episcopal monthly entitled The Witness, Mollenkott testified, ‘My lesbianism has always been a part of me. ... I tried to be heterosexual. I married myself off. But what I did ultimately realize was that God created me as I was, and that this is where life was meaningful.’

In 1993 Mollenkott published a book entitled Sensuous Spirituality: Out from Fundamentalism (New York: Crossroad), in which she reflected on her rejection of fundamentalism, her lesbian ‘coming out,’ and her belief in a female God. Mollenkott concludes that ‘in a very physical sense we are all gay, we are all lesbian, we are all heterosexual, we are all bisexual--because we are all one’ (p. 153). Her view of the kingdom of God on earth is a society in which ‘lesbian women, bisexual people, and gay men are going to be accepted as first-class citizens in the church and in society as a whole’ (p. 153). Mollenkott claims that providing mutual sexual pleasure, whether it be homosexual or bisexual or whatever, is one of the most important things in life.

At the November 1993 Re-imagining conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota, which was sponsored by the World Council of Churches, Mollenkott said: ‘is. . . First born only in the sense that he was the first to show us that it is possible to live in oneness with the divine source while we are here on this planet. ... As an incest survivor, I can no longer worship in a theological context that depicts God as an abusive parent and Jesus as the obedient, trusting child.’

In 1994 Mollenkott published The Divine Feminine: The Biblical Imagery of God as Female (New York: Crossroad). In this book she describes God as ‘the One Mother of us all’ (p. 19).

In the year 2001, Mollenkott published Omnigender: A Trans-religious Approach. Among other things, she describes her aversion to wearing dresses. ‘One of the greatest benefits of coming out publicly as lesbian was that I could go through my closets and give away all my dresses and skirts except for a few Gertrude Stein-ish floor-length skirts that somehow seemed less of an affront to my nature’ (David W. Cloud, ‘Virginia Mollenkott,’ Fundamental Baptist Information Service, Jan. 25, 1997, updated August 24, 2001).

After publishing this article we received some harsh comments from certain fundamentalists who are defenders of the modern versions. One Bible college professor sent me a note saying, ‘publish the truth; don't stoop to supermarket tabloidism.’ In our reply to him I made three points:

1. When I first published the article on Mollenkott, I was not trying to make a direct connection between Mollenkott and the NIV's weakness on the issue of homosexuality. My goal in printing the article originally was simply to reply to our readers who are asking for information about this woman.

2. A public letter issued by Kenneth Barker (undated but distributed in late 1993 or early 1994), Executive Director of the International Bible Society, says that they knew nothing about Mollenkott's homosexuality in the early 1970s. That is possibly true, but I do know that others knew of it or at least strongly suspected it. I have heard from people who have known her since the 1950s, both personally and professionally, and her homosexuality was suspected even then. Dr. Donald Waite used to teach at Shelton College, where Mollenkott once taught. In his Bible for Today publication for March-April 1994, Dr. Waite gave the following report: ‘Mollenkott's perversity was known about long before the NIV was first published, so that one man (Arthur Steele) refused to accept the full presidency of Shelton College, Ringwood, New Jersey, where Mollenkott taught during the 1960's unless she was removed from the staff.’ By 1978 Mollenkott had co-authored Is the Homosexual My Neighbor? As noted previously, the book claims that the Sodom account in Genesis does not teach the evil of homosexuality, that ‘the idea of a life long homosexual orientation or ‘condition’ is never mentioned in the Bible’ (p. 71), and that Romans 1 does not ‘fit the case of a sincere homosexual Christian’ (p. 62).

3. Even though Barker's letter claims that Mollenkott was consulted only in a minor way in matters of English style, the fact remains that her name has been plainly listed in their literature for almost three decades under the heading ‘Literary Critics and Other Consultants.’ Only recently were we told her role was inconsequential. Furthermore, Mollenkott's own account differs from Barker's. ‘Barker is playing little word games. It would be a different story if Edwin Palmer were still alive; he knew me; had heard me speak and sent me sheaf after sheaf of translations to review over a period of three or more years, including several gift editions for the committee members when the work was first completed’ (Mollenkott's reply to Robert Kastan, Jan. 20, 1995, cited from Why Not the NIV? by G.R. Guile). Mollenkott said, further: ‘... they would send me big swatches of translations . . . many chapters at a time . . . perhaps several shorter books from the Old Testament or the New Testament. . . . I would write notes all over manuscripts which I was sent, both praising phraseology . . . and asking questions . . . something I would typically write would be, ‘Would the Greek or would the Hebrew permit this word’ which would seem to me to be much more understandable...’ (Ibid.).

If we had known earlier what we know today, we would not have hesitated, as we originally did, to suggest that the New International Version is weak on homosexuality due to the influence of homosexuals. The parallels are too striking to be incidental.

THERE WAS ANOTHER HOMOSEXUAL ON THE NIV COMMITTEE

Virginia Mollenkott was not the only homosexual who worked on the New International Version. Consider the following letter we received from a friend in Britain --

"A while ago I heard a rumour that Marten Woudstra, who was apparently not just on the Committee for Bible Translation of the NIV, but actually head of the Old Testament Committee, was a homosexual and friend of Evangelicals Concerned. He has been dead for a couple of years at least, but I thought this was vitally important information considering the way the NIV handles homosexuality/sodomy.

"I took the opportunity today to telephone New York psychologist, Dr. Ralph Blair, who in 1976 founded Evangelicals Concerned, Inc. (ECI). Amazingly, both Ralph Blair and Virginia Mollenkott (and Billy Graham) all originally went to Bob Jones University! This is a nationwide task force and fellowship for gay and lesbian 'evangelical Christians' and their friends. The address of ECI is 311 East 72nd Street, New York, NY 10021. They can be found on the internet easily by putting the two words, evangelical + concerned onto a search engine like Alta Vista.

"I asked Dr. Blair if he knew Marten Woudstra. Yes, he was very familiar with him. Woudstra had been on the mailing list of Evangelicals Concerned from its inception. Although Woudstra had no formal ties with ECI, once when he was in New York he called in and had tea with Dr Blair. Dr Blair told me that Marten Woudstra was a life long bachelor, was a homosexual (Dr Blair would not commit himself as to whether Woudstra was celibate or active), and shared the viewpoint of ECI that a life long 'loving monogamous relationships' between gay men or women was acceptable to God.

"Dr Blair categorically stated to me on the phone today (23.9.97) that other members of the NIV translation committee were quietly supportive of ECI, but he was not able to tell me any names for obvious reasons.

"Woudstra was once the OT Professor at Calvin Seminary, the college of the Christian Reformed Church (Dutch Calvinistic). Over 70% of CRC churches now use the NIV. Dr Woudstra wrote a commentary on Joshua which appears in a series of commentaries also contributed to by such illustrious 'evangelical' names as F.F. Bruce.

"In the early 80's (this date would be good to have more accurately) there was a synod meeting of the CRC. At the beginning of the week there was a debate as to whether or not graduates of Calvin Seminary should be required to hold that Adam and Eve were literal persons. Later that week there was to be a debate about homosexuality.

"Woudstra championed the cause of a literal belief in Adam and Eve. The conservatives in the denomination rallied behind his stand and the vote was won. However, later in the week, Woudstra stunned the conservatives by stating (in the homosexuality discussions) that we cannot go to the OT to formulate our views on homosexuality. He limited his comments to the OT (his specialty) and stated that there was nothing in the OT that corresponded to the homosexual orientation and monogamous life long loving relationships among gay people today. The 'sodomy' of the OT simply involved temple rites and gang rape (Gen 19). Woudstra lost this debate but had made his position clear. He was a supporter of homosexuality, and was 'orientated' that way himself.

"Is it any wonder that the OT and NT of the NIV is soft on homosexuality with the involvement of Woudstra, others on the CBT and the likes of Mollenkott? Dr Blair's phone call today has confirmed that to me in no uncertain terms.

"I hope this letter has been helpful. It is merely a report of a phone call, but I feel it is a very revealing one. I have tried to report what Dr Ralph Blair told me as accurately and unexaggeratedly as possible.

"Yours in Christ,
"Michael Penfold
"PenfoldBooks@characterlink.net"

We will probably never know exactly what role Woudstra, Mollenkott, and perhaps other homosexuals had in the translation of the New International Version. The NIV publishers are not necessarily in a position to be candid about all of this. After Carl Graham published his booklet "Sodomy and the NIV" in 1991, he was threatened with a lawsuit by the publishers of the NIV. The following is his description of this:

"Someone must have mailed a copy to the New International Bible Society, for in the fall of 1993 I got a registered letter from them which was threatening in nature. They accused me of slandering the members of the NIV Committee and insisted that I withdraw the booklet immediately or face a possible lawsuit. This is where I called on Dr. D.A. Waite for advice as I knew that he had also been threatened in a similar situation about one of his publications. Following his advice, I got an attorney.

"My attorney assured me that I was on firm legal grounds. He seemed most anxious to get the issue into court because he believed there was a freedom of speech issue involved which should not go unnoticed. He basically told the NIV people to take their best shot and we would see them in court. His communication with the International Bible Society resulted in an apology for the threatening letter, and I have heard no more from them.

"In their letter to me, the NIV people denied that Dr. Mollenkott had any influence on the final product. However, they have not been consistent in their explanation of her input, for one letter from them says she was dismissed in the late 60's and another from the same office says she was dismissed in 1972. From what I have read about Dr. Mollenkott's relationship with the NIV, I am left with the impression that she was there for the duration of the project. I really don't know where the truth lies about her influence on the final product, but I know for certain that she is a homosexual, she served on the committee, and the sin of the Sodomites has never appeared on the pages of the NIV" (Carl Graham, introduction to the 2nd edition of Sodomy and the NIV, p. iii).

The following article was written by Graham after he researched the connection between the NIV's rendering of passages touching on homosexuality and the presence of a homosexual on the translation review team. It is amazing to see many direct parallels between Mollenkott's views about homosexuality and the translation of the New International Version. In some people's book, two and two still equals four. IF MOLLENKOTT OR WOULDSTRA (

ALONE, OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH SOME OTHER HOMOSEXUAL) DID NOT DIRECTLY INFLUENCE THESE TRANSLATIONS, THERE MUST HAVE BEEN OTHER MEMBERS OF THE NIV COMMITTEE WHO WERE AMAZINGLY LIKE-MINDED WITH THESE MODERN "EVANGELICAL" SODOMITES.

THE SIN OF HOMOSEXUALITY CAN BE CONDEMNED OUT OF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION, BUT IT IS NOT AS PLAIN AS IT IS IN THE AUTHORIZED VERSION. We have seen repeatedly that this is one of the devil's tactics. He does not completely change or remove a doctrine; he merely tampers with it. In a fierce warfare, the difference between winning and losing often depends upon very small details. To clandestinely dull a warrior's sword is tantamount to open sedition.

The sad fact which must be faced is this: IN SCHOLARLY EVANGELICAL CIRCLES, THE IDEA THAT HOMOSEXUALITY IS SOMEHOW COMPATIBLE WITH CHRISTIANITY IS GAINING A WIDENING SYMPATHY. The book by Virginia Mollenkott and Letha Scanzoni, *Is the Homosexual My Neighbor?* (Harper & Row, 1978), received favorable reviews in *Christianity Today*, *The Christian Century*, *The Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, and *The Christian Ministry*. Joe Dallas, author of *A Strong Delusion: Confronting the 'Gay Christian' Movement* (Harvest House Publishers, Eugene, Oregon, 1996), made the following conclusion: "ENDORSEMENTS FROM SUCH RESPECTED CHRISTIAN PUBLICATIONS WAS PROOF THAT THE GAY CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT WAS GAINING MOMENTUM AND CREDIBILITY."

The rest of this report is written by Carl Graham of Angier, North Carolina. We are thankful for his permission to reproduce his study:

SODOMY AND THE NIV

By Carl Graham

Revised 1996

Twogistates Publishers, 500 Wheeler Dr., Angier, NC 27501

(919) 639-3143

The question is often asked, "Is the New International Version of the Bible (NIV) a reliable translation?" The answer depends entirely on the basic belief structure of the one replying. It is a general consensus among the evangelical community that the NIV is an excellent rendition of what God has said to mankind. The positive answer among this group is probably brought about for two reasons: (1) the translators claimed to be evangelicals, and (2) the evangelicals endorse the modern techniques of textual criticism which were employed. Others who subscribe to the theory of textual criticism will also hold a high opinion of the NIV. From a scholarly standpoint, the NIV seems to have been accepted.

However, there are those who are comfortable with the King James Bible (KJB) and hold a totally different view about the NIV. They see many new words and concepts and are convinced that these changes not only aren't necessary, some even detract from God's Word. They believe the truth never changes and if the NIV were a true translation of the Bible, it would reflect the same thoughts and comparable words as the KJB which has been around for centuries.

Clearly, there is disagreement between NIV and KJB supporters. While there are many minor problems, the major difficulty falls in the area of providential preservation of the Scriptures and the implications this has on how God has protected His Word and kept it accurate over the passing years.

The KJB translators were fully committed to an accurate translation based on their personal convictions that the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of God, and that He had preserved it in its pure form for all generations. The texts they used were the Hebrew Masoretic and the Greek Textus Receptus.

On the other hand, the NIV translators held the view that the Bible had become corrupted over the centuries and they could reproduce the original words by various literary techniques. They discarded the work of the KJB translators and developed an eclectic text. The major discrepancies between the KJB and the NIV are due in part to the two different underlying texts, but the most radical changes stem from the foundational beliefs of the two translating committees.

The NIV committee was made up of over 100 people with various Biblical backgrounds and doctrinal beliefs. There were many who professed inerrancy, but believed the texts of the KJB were severely corrupted. Somewhere between this and the liberal view were those who professed partial inerrancy which basically means the Bible is inerrant in matters of faith and practice but is in error in matters of history and science.

Then there were the extreme group who claimed to hold a high view of Scripture, but whose doctrine was either liberal (didn't believe the Bible was God's inspired Word), or was just generally confused regarding God's Word. The sad part of the whole situation is those who knew better let those with liberal leanings control the process and this resulted in a doctrinally deficient version of the Bible. This is clearly illustrated by the influence of Dr. Virginia Ramey Mollenkott and the treatment of homosexuality in the NIV.

Dr. Mollenkott, one of the literary consultants for the NIV translating committee, is a professed homosexual. This is verified by her own words in an interview in the Episcopal publication, *Witness* (June, 1991, pages 20-23). The interviewer, Sue Pierce, asked the question, "Why was it important to both of you to come out as lesbians?" Dr. Mollenkott's reply was, "My lesbianism has always been a part of me. I tried to kill myself in my teens because they told me I'd never be healed, that God had no use for people like me. I couldn't stand the thought of living a life that was useless and offensive to God. I tried to be heterosexual. I married myself off. But what I did ultimately realize was that God created me as I was, and that this is where life was meaningful."

Realizing Dr. Mollenkott's moral direction, one could expect her views to strongly affect the outcome of the NIV translation, and it does, as can be seen in the treatment of the sin of Sodom from which the term "sodomy" is derived. This word, generally used for homosexual behavior, is defined in Webster's *New Collegiate Dictionary* as "copulation with a member of the same sex or with an animal." As can be seen, sodomy implies more than homosexual behavior, but Dr. Mollenkott was not interested in the human-beast relationship, she was only concerned about justifying the same sex relationship of sodomy.

In her book, *Is The Homosexual My Neighbor?* (V. Mollenkott and L. Scanzoni, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978), Dr. Mollenkott explains fully why she thinks the homosexual got bad press in the Bible. She presents all kinds of fanciful notions that the Old Testament Holiness Codes which forbid sodomy do not apply to the New Testament church. She explains in detail that Jesus did not condemn homosexuality as a loving relationship between two consenting adults. Therefore, she concludes, it has to be OK. Where Paul mentions homosexuality, she again says that it only applies to promiscuous homosexuality. The NIV clearly reflects her views.

THE FOLLOWING READINGS COMPARE THE KJB AND THE NIV IN SEVERAL AREAS WHERE SODOMY OR HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR IS MENTIONED. Going over these, it is easy to see that sodomy was never considered as a viable concept in the NIV and homosexuality was presented from Dr. Mollenkott's viewpoint. The comments of Dr. Mollenkott are from her book, *Is The Homosexual My Neighbor?* (abbreviated as ITHMN).

GENESIS 19:5 - THE SIN OF SODOM

KJB - And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, where are the men which came into thee this night? Bring them out unto us, that we may know them.

NIV - They called to Lot, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out so that we can have sex with them."

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 57 ". . . the Sodom story seems to be focusing on two specific evils: (1) violent gang rape and (2) inhospitality to the stranger."

LEVITICUS 18:22 - SODOMY

KJB - Thou shall not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is an abomination.

NIV - Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman: that is detestable.

Author's note: There is quite a degree of difference between the meaning of the words "abomination" and "detestable."

LEVITICUS 20:13 - SODOMY

KJB - If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death: their blood shall be upon them.

NIV - If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them has done what is detestable. They must be put to death: their blood will be on their own heads.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, pages 110 through 121 - "Dr. Mollenkott argues that this is part of the ceremonial laws, and as such, are to be disregarded by the Christian. She places this act on the same level as wearing clothes of two different materials."

DEUTERONOMY 23:17 - SODOMITE

KJB - There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel.

NIV - No Israelite man or woman is to become a shrine prostitute.

JUDGES 19:22 - SODOMY

KJB - Now as they were making their hearts merry, behold, the men of the city, certain sons of Belial, beset the house round about, and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, the old man, saying, Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him.

NIV - While they were enjoying themselves, some of the wicked men of the city surrounded the house. Pounding on the door, they shouted to the old man who owned the house, "Bring out the man who came to your house so we can have sex with him."

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 57 - "Violence -- forcing sexual activity upon another -- is the real point to this story."

I KINGS 14:24 - SODOMITES

KJB - And there were sodomites in the land: and they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the Lord cast out before the children of Israel.

NIV - There were even male shrine prostitutes in the land; the people engaged in all the detestable practices of the nations the Lord had driven out before the Israelites.

I KINGS 15:12 - SODOMITES

KJB - And he took away the sodomites out of the land and removed all the idols that his fathers had made.

NIV - He expelled all the shrine prostitutes from the land and got rid of the idols his fathers had made.

I KINGS 22:46 - SODOMITES

KJB - And the remnant of the sodomites, which remained in the days of his father Asa, he took out of the land.

NIV - He rid the land of the rest of the shrine prostitutes who remained there even after the reign of his father Asa.

II KINGS 23:7 - SODOMITES

KJB - And he brake down the houses of the sodomites, that were by the house of the Lord, where the women wove hangings for the grove.

NIV - He also tore down the quarters of the male shrine prostitutes, which were in the temple of the Lord and where women did weaving for Asherah.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 59 & 60 - "Most scholars agree that in the fertility religions of Israel's neighbors, male cult prostitutes were employed for homosexual acts. The people who loved and served the God of Israel were strictly forbidden to have anything to do with such idolatry, and the Jewish men were commanded to never serve as temple prostitutes."

MATTHEW 11:24 - JUDGMENT UPON SODOM

KJV - But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, in the day of judgment, than for thee.

NIV - But I tell you it will be more bearable for Sodom on the day of judgment than for you.

LUKE 10:12 - JUDGMENT UPON SODOM

KJB - But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom than for that city.

NIV - I tell you, it will be more bearable on that day for Sodom than for you.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 59. "Jesus refers to Sodom, not in the context of sexual acts, but in the contents of inhospitality." And on page 71, she expands this thought with "the idea of a life long homosexual orientation or 'condition' is never mentioned in the Bible."

ROMANS 1:26 & 27 - HOMOSEXUALITY

KJB - For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections; for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in lust one toward another; man with man working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.

NIV - Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 62 - "The key thought here seems to be lust, 'unnaturalness,' and, in verse 28, a desire to avoid the acknowledgment of God. But although the censure fits idolatrous people with whom Paul was concerned here, it does not seem to fit the case of a sincere homosexual Christian. Such a person loves Jesus Christ and wants above all to acknowledge God in all of life, yet for some unknown reason feels drawn to someone of the same sex, for the sake of love rather than lust. Is it fair to describe that person as lustful or desirous of forgetting God's existence?"

I CORINTHIANS 6:9 - REJECTION OF HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR

KJB - Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind...

NIV - Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral nor idolators nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders...

Here we would point out that this is the only place in the NIV where the word "homosexual" occurs. It is not clear from the context if this means heterosexuals who abuse homosexuals or homosexuals who abuse each other. See Dr. Mollenkott's explanation in the 1st Timothy comments following.

I TIMOTHY 1:9 & 10

KJB - Knowing this, that the law is not made for righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers. For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.

NIV - We also know that law is not made for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers, and for whatever else is contrary to sound doctrine...

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 67 - "Interpretation of these passages depends on two Greek words used in I Cor. 6:9 which have presented a problem for translators in the King James Version, they translated 'effeminate' and 'abusers of themselves with mankind.' In the Revised Standard Version of 1952, they were combined and rendered simply 'homosexuals,' which implied that all persons whose erotic interests were oriented to the same sex were by the very fact excluded from membership in the kingdom of God. But the original intent seems to have been to single out specific kinds of same-sex practices which were deplorable."

JUDE 7 - STRANGE FLESH

KJB - Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are

e set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

NIV - In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and perversion. They serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 59 - "The 'unnatural lust' thus could, in the context, and in view of the apocryphal texts to which Jude made allusion, refer to a desire for sexual contact between human and heavenly beings."

IT WOULD NOT BE FAIR TO SAY THAT ALL THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN PRODUCING THE NIV FAVORED HOMOSEXUALITY AS AN ALTERNATE LIFESTYLE, BUT IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT THOSE WHO WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FINAL WORDINGS WERE AT LEAST SYMPATHETIC TO DR. MOLLENKOTT'S CAUSE. One only has to look at the treatment of sodomy in the NIV to reach this conclusion.

While many believe practicing homosexuals can be Christian, there are many others who have a different conviction about what the Bible says about sodomy. For this group, it is hardly acceptable to call sodomites temple prostitutes, nor to think of same-sex relationships as natural. These same people would take a viewpoint that God hates the sin of homosexuality and will bring judgment on those who live this kind of lifestyle.

The information presented here is not all inclusive, but is intended to sound an alarm. If the NIV is your Bible of choice, it would be prudent to look closely in other areas as well, for there are many other subjects handled just as loosely as sodomy. Don't take anyone's word for what God says. Check it out! After all, He'll hold you alone responsible.

This ends "Sodom and the NIV" by Carl Graham.

This also ends Brother Cloud's report "Homosexuality and the NIV."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's conclusion:

For anyone interested, get onto the Google search engine and type Dr. Virginia Mollenkott and see what comes up.

It is sad to see anyone that would try to hide the truth of this matter.

God bless,

Stever

"In 1978 Mollenkott co-authored (with Letha Scanzoni) the book entitled "Is the Homosexual My Neighbor?", in which she called for nondiscrimination toward homosexuality. The book argues that the Sodom account in Genesis does not teach the evil of homosexuality

Re:, on: 2006/2/12 8:15

Quote:

mloaks wrote:
What if...

The KJV writers would've had the dead sea scrolls, etc, we have now?

He who is not against us, is for us...

xxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

The dead sea scrolls were written by a cult- the essenes. What value is that to us today? Only the Levites were allowed by God to write His Words, not the essenes or Jewish Scholars.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by cchhhrrriiss (), on: 2006/2/12 12:40

Brother Stever...

I do not like arguing with you, because you seem to be completely closed to the possibility that the information that you have received is incorrect. You continually copy long passages that supposedly support your belief that the NIV is not only flawed, but purposely flawed (or evil). Yet much of the biased information that you provide is either incorrect, skewed or has nothing to do with the root topic at hand. In fact, it appears that you post nothing in the forums except long passages of *KJV-only* information. As a result of the long *KJV-only* passages that you have posted, I have received e mails asking whether or not the SermonIndex website is a *KJV-only* site (since I was involved in your "discussions" in the past). I replied that I use the KJV -- but I also use the NIV. Indeed, I believe that you should be careful about what you write, because sometimes you write information that is not correct, but it seems that you do not notice or realize this. You ask, "When and where?" When we point it out, you either change the subject, offer more long passages of *KJV-only* material, or you ask for a line-by-line breakdown of your excessively long (and frankly, often ridiculous) pro-*KJV-only* passages. Be careful, because you may find yourself *bearing false witness* against others (such as the translators of both the KJV, the NASB or the NIV) -- or worse, against the Word of God Himself.

Quote:
-----Stever's response: The above statements are totally false. Dr. Virginia Mollenkott is a homosexual, and was a homosexual when she was on the NIV committee.

As I stated before, there were no homosexual translators of the NIV. The original translation committee included the following individuals:

Quote:
-----E. Leslie Carlson, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.
Carlson died in 1967 and was replaced by Larry Walker.
Edmund P. Clowney, Westminster Theological Seminary.
Clowney resigned in 1968 and was replaced by Robert Preus.
Ralph Earle, Nazarene Theological Seminary
Burton L. Goddard, Gordon Divinity School
R. Laird Harris, Covenant Theological Seminary
Earl S. Kalland, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary (Denver)
Kenneth S. Kantzer, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.
Kantzer resigned in 1969 and was replaced by Richard Longenecker.
Robert Mounce, Bethel College (St. Paul).
Mounce resigned in 1967 and was replaced by Youngve Kindberg.
Kindberg resigned in 1983 and was replaced by Donald Wiseman.
Stephen W. Paine, Houghton College
Charles F. Pfeiffer, Central Michigan University
In 1974 the "long-inactive" Pfeiffer was replaced by Kenneth L. Barker
Charles C. Ryrie, Dallas Theological Seminary.
Ryrie resigned in 1977 and was replaced by Ronald Youngblood (appointed 1979).
Francis R. Steele, North Africa Mission.
Steele resigned in 1969 and was replaced by William J. Martin.
Martin died in 1980 and was replaced by Bruce Waltke.
John H. Stek, Calvin Theological Seminary
John C. Wenger, Goshen Biblical Seminary
Marten H. Woudstra, Calvin Theological Seminary

There were other committees that contributed to newer versions, such as the NIRv or the TNIV. I do not read that version, particularly since it is not a real translation, but an alteration of an existing translation. In 2002, there was another list offered that included editors that were added to these new versions. Here is the list of this committee:

Quote:
-----John Stek, Chairman of the Committee on Bible Translation
Calvin Theological Seminary, Part-time Professor of Old Testament
Denominational Affiliation: Christian Reformed Church
Donald H. Madvig,* Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Bible Translation
Retired Pastor and Professor of Biblical Studies
Denominational Affiliation: Evangelical Covenant
Kenneth L. Barker, Secretary of the Committee on Bible Translation
Dallas Theological Seminary, Adjunct Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Studies
Denominational Affiliation: Southern Baptist
Gordon Fee*
Regent College, Professor of New Testament Studies
Denominational Affiliation: Assemblies of God
Richard T. France*
Parrish Minister, England and Wales
Denominational Affiliation: Church of England
Karen H. Jobes*

Westmont College, Associate Professor of New Testament
 Denominational Affiliation: Presbyterian Church of America
 Walter Liefeld*
 Tyndale Theological Seminary, The Netherlands, Interim President
 Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Professor Emeritus of New Testament
 Denominational Affiliation: Independent
 I. Howard Marshall*
 University of Aberdeen, Scotland. Professor of New Testament Exegesis
 Denominational Affiliation: Methodist
 Alan R. Millard*
 University of Liverpool, England. Professor of Hebrew and Ancient Semitic Languages
 Denominational Affiliation: Christian Brethren (Open Brethren)
 Douglas Moo*
 Wheaton College Graduate School, Professor of New Testament
 Wheaton College, PhD Coordinator in Biblical and Theological Studies
 Denominational Affiliation: Independent
 Martin J. Selman*
 Spurgeon's College, London, Deputy Principal
 Denominational Affiliation: Baptist
 Larry L. Walker
 Beeson Divinity School of Samford University, Visiting Professor
 Denominational Affiliation: Southern Baptist
 Bruce K. Waltke
 Regent College, Professor Emeritus of Old Testament Studies
 Reformed Theological Seminary, Professor of Old Testament
 Denominational Affiliation: Baptist
 Herbert M. Wolf
 Wheaton College Graduate School
 Denominational Affiliation: Independent Baptist
 Ronald F. Youngblood
 Chairman of the Board of Directors, International Bible Society
 Bethel Seminary San Diego, Professor Emeritus of Old Testament and Hebrew
 Denominational Affiliation: Baptist General Conference

Finally, there was a list of all translators and editors for the original 1978 NIV (and the later revision made in 1984):

Quote:

-----Robert L. Alden. Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary. Conservative Baptist.
 Gleason L. Archer, Jr. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Evangelical Free.
 Glenn W. Barker. Fuller Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Kenneth L. Barker. Capital Bible Seminary. Evangelical Free.
 James R. Battenfield. Grace Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 S. Herbert Bess. Grace Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Harvey J.S. Blaney. Asbury Theological Seminary. Nazarene.
 W. Gordon Brown. Central Baptist Seminary, Toronto. No church affiliation given.
 Donald W. Burdick. Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary. Conservative Baptist.
 Frederick W. Bush. Fuller Theological Seminary. Presbyterian.
 E. Leslie Carlson. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Southern Baptist.
 Philip S. Clapp. Western Evangelical Seminary. United Methodist.
 Edmund Clowney. Westminster Theological Seminary. Presbyterian.
 Ralph R. Covell. Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary. Conservative Baptist.
 John J. Davis. Grace Theological Seminary. Grace Brethren.
 Wilber T. Dayton. Wesley Biblical Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Raymond B. Dillard. Westminster Theological Seminary. Orthodox Presbyterian.
 Ralph Earle. Nazarene Theological Seminary. Nazarene.
 David Engelhard. Calvin Theological Seminary. Christian Reformed.
 Milton C. Fisher. Reformed Episcopal Theological Seminary. Reformed Episcopal.
 Lewis A. Foster. Cincinnati Bible Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Francis Foulkes. Bible College of New Zealand. Church of England.
 Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. Westminster Theological Seminary. Orthodox Presbyterian.
 Wesley L. Gerig. Fort Wayne Bible College. No church affiliation given.
 Donald R. Glenn. Dallas Theological Seminary. Independent.
 Burton L. Goddard. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. Orthodox Presbyterian.
 Louis Goldberg. Moody Bible Institute. Baptist.
 David Gooding. The Queens College, Belfast, Ireland. No church affiliation given.
 J. Kenneth Grider. Nazarene Theological Seminary. Nazarene.
 Clarence B. Hale. Wheaton College. No church affiliation given.
 Murray J. Harris. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Open Brethren.
 R. Laird Harris. Covenant Theological Seminary. Reformed Presbyterian.
 Everett F. Harrison. Fuller Theological Seminary. United Presbyterian.
 Roland K. Harrison. Wycliffe College, Toronto. No church affiliation given.
 Gerald F. Hawthorne. Wheaton College. Plymouth Brethren.
 Roy E. Hayden. Oral Roberts University. United Methodist.
 William Hendriksen. Boca Raton, Florida. Christian Reformed.

D. Edmond Hiebert. Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary. Mennonite Brethren.
 Mark E. Hillmer. Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary. Lutheran, Missouri Synod.
 F. B. Huey. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Southern Baptist.
 John C. Jeske. Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary. Lutheran, Wisconsin Evangelical Synod.
 S. Lewis Johnson. Dallas, Texas. Independent.
 Walter C. Kaiser. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Evangelical Free.
 Earl S. Kalland. Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary. Conservative Baptist.
 Kenneth S. Kantzer. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Evangelical Free.
 Homer A. Kent. Grace Theological Seminary. Grace Brethren.
 F. Derek Kidner. Tyndale House, Cambridge, England. Church of England.
 Y. R. Kindberg. International Bible Society. Christian and Missionary Alliance.
 Simon Kistemaker. Reformed Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Meredith G. Kline. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Fred C. Kuehner. Reformed Episcopal Seminary. Reformed Episcopal.
 William L. Lane. Western Kentucky University. No church affiliation given.
 G. Irvin Lehman. Eastern Mennonite College. Mennonite.
 Paul E. Leonard. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Brethren.
 Arthur H. Lewis. Bethel College. Baptist.
 Jack P. Lewis. Harding Graduate School of Religion. Church of Christ.
 Walter L. Liefeld. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Plymouth Brethren.
 G. Herbert Livingston. Asbury Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Richard N. Longenecker. Wycliffe College, University of Toronto. Baptist.
 Allan A. MacRae. Biblical School of Theology. Bible Presbyterian.
 Donald H. Madvig. Bethel Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 W. Harold Mare. Covenant Theological Seminary. Presbyterian.
 William J. Martin. Regent College, Vancouver. Christian Brethren.
 Thomas E. McComiskey. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Evangelical Free.
 J. Ramsey Michaels. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Alan R. Millard. University of Liverpool, England. Christian Brethren.
 Leon Morris. Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia. No church affiliation given.
 Robert Mounce. Western Kentucky University. No church affiliation given.
 Roger Nicole. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. American Baptist.
 John N. Oswalt. Asbury Theological Seminary. United Methodist.
 Stephen W. Paine. Houghton College. Wesleyan Methodist.
 Edwin H. Palmer. Executive Secretary, NIV Committee on Bible Translation. Christian Reformed.
 J. Burton Payne. Covenant Theological Seminary. Presbyterian.
 Charles F. Pfeiffer. Central Michigan University. Reformed Presbyterian.
 Robert D. Preus. Concordia Theological Seminary, Ft. Wayne. Lutheran, Missouri Synod.
 Stephen M. Reynolds. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. Orthodox Presbyterian.
 Robert P. Roth. Northwestern Lutheran Seminary. Lutheran.
 Charles C. Ryrle. Dallas Theological Seminary. Baptist.
 Jack B. Scott. Reformed Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Elmer B. Smick. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. No church affiliation given.
 Francis Steele. Upper Darby, Pennsylvania. No church affiliation given.
 John H. Stek. Calvin Theological Seminary. Christian Reformed.
 Harold C. Stigers. Covenant Theological Seminary. Presbyterian.
 Marvin E. Tate. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Southern Baptist.
 G. Aiken Taylor. Ashville, North Carolina. No church affiliation given.
 Merrill C. Tenney. Wheaton College. No church affiliation given.
 Gerard Van Gronigen. Reformed Theological Seminary. Christian Reformed.
 Larry L. Walker. Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary. Southern Baptist.
 Wilber B. Wallis. Covenant Theological Seminary. Presbyterian.
 Bruce K. Waltke. Regent College, Vancouver. Baptist.
 Rowland Ward. Ulvestone, Australia. No church affiliation given.
 G. Henry Waterman. Wheaton College. Christian and Missionary Alliance.
 J. C. Wenger. Goshen Biblical Seminary. Mennonite.
 John R. Werner. International Linguistics Center. Reformed Presbyterian.
 Walter W. Wessel. Bethel Theological Seminary, West Campus. Baptist.
 David John Williams. Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia. Church of England.
 William C. Williams. Southern California College. No church affiliation given.
 Marvin R. Wilson. Gordon College. Conservative Baptist.
 Donald J. Wiseman. University of London, England. No church affiliation given.
 Herbert M. Wolf. Wheaton College Graduate School. Independent.
 Leon J. Wood. Grand Rapids Baptist Bible Seminary. Baptist.
 Marten H. Woudstra. Calvin Theological Seminary. Christian Reformed.
 Ronald Youngblood. Bethel Theological Seminary, West Campus. Baptist.
 John M. Zinkand. Dordt College. No church affiliation given.

 Notice that Dr. Virginia Mollencott's name does not exist on this list. If you are referring to "Dr. Virginia Mollencott," she was merely one of numerous later consultants that were not involved in any sort of translation. So, in fact, the statement is true. None of the translators were homosexuals.

Stever, as much as you seem to hate the NIV, you must understand that the NIV is merely a translation. If it were a "*diabolical pro-homosexual version of the Bible*" -- then why does it include so many clearly anti-homosexuality passages? Homosexuality is a sin. The NIV is very clear about this. But this is the case with nearly everything you constantly bring up. You constantly say things like "The NIV does not support the Trinity" -- when you know that there are many passages in the NIV that state otherwise.

Brother Stever, I do not know any of the translators of the NIV personally. I have written emails and letters, and a few of them have been kind enough to respond. The publisher even stated that the possibility arose about whether or not a lawsuit should be employed against the publishers of some anti-NIV propaganda. The publisher stated that they believed that, while such a lawsuit might be helpful in stopping some of the lies that are being spread by some wrong but well-meaning groups, it might not be helpful to the overall purpose of the NIV. On the other hand, I also do not know any of the translators of the KJV. We don't know if any of them had some "secret" or "blatant" sin in their lives (like King James himself). Thus, it becomes convenient to analyze the translators of the NIV when you cannot do the same with the translators of the KJV.

I urge you: When you conduct your "research," I urge you to go to the sources. If you want to make public allegations, please make certain that you distinguish between what is certain to be truth, what is opinion, or what is something that you have read in a book or webpage.

:-)

Re: "Marten H. Woudstra. Calvin Theological Seminary. Christian Reformed.", on: 2006/2/12 14:32

Dear Ccchhhrrriiss: I took the time to read your entire post. One of the last names on your post list members of the NIV committee. Actually he was head of the Old Testament committee:

The mans name?????

"Marten H. Woudstra. Calvin Theological Seminary. Christian Reformed."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's continued response:

If you would have read my "Long Post" in detail, you would have found this information out about Woudstra:

"THERE WAS ANOTHER HOMOSEXUAL ON THE NIV COMMITTEE

Virginia Mollenkott was not the only homosexual who worked on the New International Version. Consider the following letter we received from a friend in Britain --

"A while ago I heard a rumour that Marten Woudstra, who was apparently not just on the Committee for Bible Translation of the NIV, but actually head of the Old Testament Committee, was a homosexual and friend of Evangelicals Concerned. He has been dead for a couple of years at least, but I thought this was vitally important information considering the way the NIV handles homosexuality/sodomy.

"I took the opportunity today to telephone New York psychologist, Dr. Ralph Blair, who in 1976 founded Evangelicals Concerned, Inc. (ECI). Amazingly, both Ralph Blair and Virginia Mollenkott (and Billy Graham) all originally went to Bob Jones University! This is a nationwide task force and fellowship for gay and lesbian 'evangelical Christians' and their friends. The address of ECI is 311 East 72nd Street, New York, NY 10021. They can be found on the internet easily by putting the two words, evangelical + concerned onto a search engine like Alta Vista.

"I asked Dr. Blair if he knew Marten Woudstra. Yes, he was very familiar with him. Woudstra had been on the mailing list of Evangelicals Concerned from its inception. Although Woudstra had no formal ties with ECI, once when he was in New York he called in and had tea with Dr Blair. Dr Blair told me that Marten Woudstra was a life long bachelor, was a homosexual (Dr Blair would not commit himself as to whether Woudstra was celibate or active), and shared the viewpoint of ECI that a life long 'loving monogamous relationships' between gay men or women was acceptable to God.

"Dr Blair categorically stated to me on the phone today (23.9.97) that other members of the NIV translation committee w

ere quietly supportive of ECI, but he was not able to tell me any names for obvious reasons.

"Woudstra was once the OT Professor at Calvin Seminary, the college of the Christian Reformed Church (Dutch Calvinistic). Over 70% of CRC churches now use the NIV. Dr Woudstra wrote a commentary on Joshua which appears in a series of commentaries also contributed to by such illustrious 'evangelical' names as F.F. Bruce.

"In the early 80's (this date would be good to have more accurately) there was a synod meeting of the CRC. At the beginning of the week there was a debate as to whether or not graduates of Calvin Seminary should be required to hold that Adam and Eve were literal persons. Later that week there was to be a debate about homosexuality.

"Woudstra championed the cause of a literal belief in Adam and Eve. The conservatives in the denomination rallied behind his stand and the vote was won. However, later in the week, Woudstra stunned the conservatives by stating (in the homosexuality discussions) that we cannot go to the OT to formulate our views on homosexuality. He limited his comments to the OT (his specialty) and stated that there was nothing in the OT that corresponded to the homosexual orientation and monogamous life long loving relationships among gay people today. The 'sodomy' of the OT simply involved temple rites and gang rape (Gen 19). Woudstra lost this debate but had made his position clear. He was a supporter of homosexuality, and was 'orientated' that way himself.

"Is it any wonder that the OT and NT of the NIV is soft on homosexuality with the involvement of Woudstra, others on the CBT and the likes of Mollenkott? Dr Blair's phone call today has confirmed that to me in no uncertain terms.

"I hope this letter has been helpful. It is merely a report of a phone call, but I feel it is a very revealing one. I have tried to report what Dr Ralph Blair told me as accurately and unexaggeratedly as possible.

"Yours in Christ,
"Michael Penfold
"PenfoldBooks@characterlink.net"
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever continues:

I am not trying to be difficult. I have given specific examples in my "LONG POST" that compare what the NIV has done to specific words in the King James when "translating" them into the NIV". That is the point here. The NIV has erased the sin of homosexuality and replaced it with who knows what---temple prostitution. Sodomite is only found once in the NIV, and has been replaced with the word "temple prostitute" and other meaningless words. The outcome? Today many Christian Churches think that the sin of homosexuality is no sin at all.

That is the real issue here. Not the missing of a word here or there. What is missing is Christian doctrine in all of the Newer Versions that is still present in the Old King James- doctrine that determines if we are going to heaven or if we are headed for hell.

I truly wish there was a more gentle way of presenting this, but with the constant denials of others, this seems to be the only approach- direct with examples. I truly wish that you would reply to the examples, and then at the same time give me a reason why most of the main denominations today think that homosexuality is not only O.K. but endorsed as a lifestyle, with the false understanding that homosexuality is not a SIN?

God bless,

Stever

Re: Sodomy and the NIV, on: 2006/2/12 14:52

ccchhrrriiisss, this was part of my LONG POST that should be addressed. It is still "long" but specific to the text I am concerned with:

"THE FOLLOWING READINGS COMPARE THE KJV AND THE NIV IN SEVERAL AREAS WHERE SODOMY OR HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR IS MENTIONED.

Going over these, it is easy to see that sodomy was never considered as a viable concept in the NIV and homosexuality was presented from Dr. Mollenkott's viewpoint. The comments of Dr. Mollenkott are from her book, *Is The Homosexual My Neighbor?* (abbreviated as ITHMN).

GENESIS 19:5 - THE SIN OF SODOM

KJB - And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, where are the men which came into thee this night? Bring them out unto us, that we may know them.

NIV - They called to Lot, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out so that we can have sex with them."

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 57 ". . . the Sodom story seems to be focusing on two specific evils: (1) violent gang rape and (2) inhospitality to the stranger."

LEVITICUS 18:22 - SODOMY

KJB - Thou shall not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is an abomination.

NIV - Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman: that is detestable.

Author's note: There is quite a degree of difference between the meaning of the words "abomination" and "detestable."

LEVITICUS 20:13 - SODOMY

KJB - If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death: their blood shall be upon them.

NIV - If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them has done what is detestable. They must be put to death: their blood will be on their own heads.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, pages 110 through 121 - "Dr. Mollenkott argues that this is part of the ceremonial laws, and as such, are to be disregarded by the Christian. She places this act on the same level as wearing clothes of two different materials."

DEUTERONOMY 23:17 - SODOMITE

KJB - There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel.

NIV - No Israelite man or woman is to become a shrine prostitute.

JUDGES 19:22 - SODOMY

KJB - Now as they were making their hearts merry, behold, the men of the city, certain sons of Belial, beset the house round about, and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, the old man, saying, Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him.

NIV - While they were enjoying themselves, some of the wicked men of the city surrounded the house. Pounding on the

door, they shouted to the old man who owned the house, "Bring out the man who came to your house so we can have sex with him."

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 57 - "Violence -- forcing sexual activity upon another -- is the real point to this story."

I KINGS 14:24 - SODOMITES

KJB - And there were sodomites in the land: and they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the Lord cast out before the children of Israel.

NIV - There were even male shrine prostitutes in the land; the people engaged in all the detestable practices of the nations the Lord had driven out before the Israelites.

I KINGS 15:12 - SODOMITES

KJB - And he took away the sodomites out of the land and removed all the idols that his fathers had made.

NIV - He expelled all the shrine prostitutes from the land and got rid of the idols his fathers had made.

I KINGS 22:46 - SODOMITES

KJB - And the remnant of the sodomites, which remained in the days of his father Asa, he took out of the land.

NIV - He rid the land of the rest of the shrine prostitutes who remained there even after the reign of his father Asa.

II KINGS 23:7 - SODOMITES

KJB - And he brake down the houses of the sodomites, that were by the house of the Lord, where the women wove hangings for the grove.

NIV - He also tore down the quarters of the male shrine prostitutes, which were in the temple of the Lord and where women did weaving for Asherah.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 59 & 60 - "Most scholars agree that in the fertility religions of Israel's neighbors, male cult prostitutes were employed for homosexual acts. The people who loved and served the God of Israel were strictly forbidden to have anything to do with such idolatry, and the Jewish men were commanded to never serve as temple prostitutes."

MATTHEW 11:24 - JUDGMENT UPON SODOM

KJV - But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, in the day of judgment, than for thee.

NIV - But I tell you it will be more bearable for Sodom on the day of judgment than for you.

LUKE 10:12 - JUDGMENT UPON SODOM

KJB - But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom than for that city.

NIV - I tell you, it will be more bearable on that day for Sodom than for you.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 59. "Jesus refers to Sodom, not in the context of sexual acts, but in the contents of inhospitality ." And on page 71, she expands this thought with "the idea of a life long homosexual orientation or 'condition' is never mentioned in the Bible."

ROMANS 1:26 & 27 - HOMOSEXUALITY

KJB - For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections; for even their women did change the natural use into that w

high is against nature: And like wise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in lust one toward another; man with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.

NIV - Because of this, God gave him over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 62 - "The key thought here seems to be lust, 'unnaturalness,' and, in verse 28, a desire to avoid the acknowledgment of God. But although the censure fits idolatrous people with whom Paul was concerned here, it does not seem to fit the case of a sincere homosexual Christian. Such a person loves Jesus Christ and wants above all to acknowledge God in all of life, yet for some unknown reason feels drawn to someone of the same sex, for the sake of love rather than lust. Is it fair to describe that person as lustful or desirous of forgetting God's existence?"

I CORINTHIANS 6:9 - REJECTION OF HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR

KJB - Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind...

NIV - Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral nor idolators nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders...

Here we would point out that this is the only place in the NIV where the word "homosexual" occurs. It is not clear from the context if this means heterosexuals who abuse homosexuals or homosexuals who abuse each other. See Dr. Mollenkott's explanation in the 1st Timothy comments following.

I TIMOTHY 1:9 & 10

KJB - Knowing this, that the law is not made for righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers. For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.

NIV - We also know that law is not made for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers, and for whatever else is contrary to sound doctrine...

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 67 - "Interpretation of these passages depends on two Greek words used in I Cor. 6:9 which have presented a problem for translators in the King James Version, they translated 'effeminate' and 'abusers of themselves with mankind.' In the Revised Standard Version of 1952, they were combined and rendered simply 'homosexuals,' which implied that all persons whose erotic interests were oriented to the same sex were by the very fact excluded from membership in the kingdom of God. But the original intent seems to have been to single out specific kinds of same-sex practices which were deplorable."

JUDE 7 - STRANGE FLESH

KJB - Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and doing after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

NIV - In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and perversion. They serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire.

Mollenkott, ITHMN, page 59 - "The 'unnatural lust' thus could, in the context, and in view of the apocryphal texts to which Jude made allusion, refer to a desire for sexual contact between human and heavenly beings."

IT WOULD NOT BE FAIR TO SAY THAT ALL THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN PRODUCING THE NIV FAVORED HOMOS

EXUALITY AS AN ALTERNATE LIFESTYLE, BUT IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT THOSE WHO WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FINAL WORDINGS WERE AT LEAST SYMPATHETIC TO DR. MOLLENKOTT'S CAUSE. One only has to look at the treatment of sodomy in the NIV to reach this conclusion.

While many believe practicing homosexuals can be Christian, there are many others who have a different conviction about what the Bible says about sodomy. For this group, it is hardly acceptable to call sodomites temple prostitutes, nor to think of same-sex relationships as natural. These same people would take a viewpoint that God hates the sin of homosexuality and will bring judgment on those who live this kind of lifestyle.

The information presented here is not all inclusive, but is intended to sound an alarm. If the NIV is your Bible of choice, it would be prudent to look closely in other areas as well, for there are many other subjects handled just as loosely as sodomy. Don't take anyone's word for what God says. Check it out! After all, He'll hold you alone responsible."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Steve concludes:

Please respond to the forest above, not the specific trees. The "forest" would mean the eradication of the word SODOMY and the replacement with meaningless words---the replacement of Christian Doctrine with meaningless and confusing words. Put yourself in the place of Mollenkott and tell me why they have been erased and replaced with meaningless terminology.

Thank you, and God bless,

Stever

Be thou careful... - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2006/2/12 15:03

Brother Stever...

Quote:
-----I am not trying to be difficult. I have given specific examples in my "LONG POST" that compare what the NIV has done to specific words in the King James when "translating" them into the NIV. That is the point here. The NIV has erased the sin of homosexuality and replaced it with who knows what---temple prostitution. Sodomite is only found once in the NIV, and has been replaced with the word "temple prostitute" and other meaningless words. The outcome? Today many Christian Churches think that the sin of homosexuality is no sin at all.

That is the real issue here. Not the missing of a word here or there. What is missing is Christian doctrine in all of the Newer Versions that is still present in the Old King James- doctrine that determines if we are going to heaven or if we are headed for hell.

I truly wish there was a more gentle way of presenting this, but with the constant denials of others, this seems to be the only approach- direct with examples. I truly wish that you would reply to the examples, and then at the same time give me a reason why most of the main denominations today think that homosexuality is not only O.K., but endorsed as a lifestyle?

As many people have stated before, the NIV makes it clear that homosexuality is a sin. And as many people have also stated many times before, nothing is "missing" from the NIV. It is an entirely different translation taken from a different set of source material. All of the doctrine that you claim is non-existent in the NIV is there. The trinity, the deity of Christ, the gifts of the Spirit, the need to be born again, etc... -- they are all there. While the passages (and inclusions thereof) may not be the same -- the doctrine is still sound.

I would be very careful. It often sounds like you are attributing the scriptures as found in the NIV to the devil. And it sometimes sounds like you question whether or not a person is saved that uses a translation like the NIV.

Like I stated before, I use the KJV. Why? Because it is what I feel to be the best English translation from the Textus Receptus. But I also use the NIV. Why? Because I feel that (after a great deal of study and research) that it is the most reliable English translation of the other sources. The NIV is also the translation that I recommend to most new believers. Why? Because most Americans seem to have a difficult time with the 17th century grammar and language usage of the King James Version. In fact, it seems like the only ones that don't have difficulty with the language are the ones that have been raised on the King James Version all their lives -- or those who study 17th century English Literature.

I would just urge you to be cautious with your words. It would be a terrible crime to bear false witness against a version of the Bible (or translators of the Bible) in which you do not know the issue from a firsthand position.

:-)

EDIT:

On a side note, as I wrote earlier, Dr. Mollenkott was not a translator. I would like to also know whether or not you have really researched the slander that you include, or have you trusted in the words of other men? Have you called or written to the people to find out their roles in the NIV? Or have you relied completely on the testimony of other men and women, along with some writing that you attribute to them.

Real research may include secondhand sources, but only after you have exhausted all firsthand sources. Secondhand sources must also be verified by the firsthand sources too. Unfortunately, we can't do this with the King James Version. What kind of lives did the translators of the KJV live? We may never know. All we have left is propaganda. Perhaps there was a homosexual or adulterer in the KJV committee? Or maybe one of the men may have been just as corrupt as King James himself?!? Or perhaps worse, there was an dedicated Anglican that didn't want to lose some of the language and wording that had become a tradition in the Roman and English churches?

Re: Be thou careful..., on: 2006/2/12 15:23

It is as it always has been. Why will you not answer specifically to what I have posted?

GENESIS 19:5 - THE SIN OF SODOM

NIV - They called to Lot, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out so that we can have sex with them."

The King James Bible plainly states that the sin for which God judged Sodom was connected with gross and strange immorality. 2 Peter 2:7 refers to Sodom's "filthy conversation." The same Greek word is translated "wantonness" in Romans 13:13 and 2 Peter 2:18. Jude 7 refers to Sodom's fornication and "going after strange flesh." God did not send fire upon Sodom for its inhospitality.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

LEVITICUS 18:22 - SODOMY

KJB - Thou shall not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is an abomination.

NIV - Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman: that is detestable.

Author's note: There is quite a degree of difference between the meaning of the words "abomination" and "detestable."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

LEVITICUS 20:13 - SODOMY

NIV - If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them has done what is detestable. They must be put to death: their blood will be on their own heads.

xxxxxxx

DEUTERONOMY 23:17 - SODOMITE

NIV - No Israelite man or woman is to become a shrine prostitute.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

JUDGES 19:22 - SODOMY

NIV - While they were enjoying themselves, some of the wicked men of the city surrounded the house. Pounding on the door, they shouted to the old man who owned the house, "Bring out the man who came to your house so we can have sex with him."

I KINGS 14:24 - SODOMITES

NIV - There were even male shrine prostitutes in the land; the people engaged in all the detestable practices of the nations the Lord had driven out before the Israelites.

The rendering "male shrine prostitutes" is an interpretation as is the rendering "sodomite." According to Strong's, the Hebrew term is "qadesh, kaw-dashe"; from H6942; a (quasi) sacred person, i.e. (techn.) a (male) devotee (by prostitution) to licentious idolatry. In the Authorized Version this Hebrew word is translated "sodomite" and "unclean." The term "sodomite" was brought over from the Geneva Bible. Many older Bible dictionaries connect sodomy with homosexuality. Eadie defines Sodomite as "not dwellers in Sodom, but practisers of unnatural lust--the sin of Sodom (John Eadie, A Biblical Cyclopaedia, London: Charles Griffin, 1872). This sin was consecrated in many Eastern kingdoms." The People's Bible Encyclopedia by Charles Randall Barnes (1903) says: "The sodomites were not inhabitants of Sodom, nor their descendants, but men consecrated to the unnatural vice of Sodom (Gen. 19:5; comp. Rom. 1:27) as a religious rite." Note that Barnes connects the sin of sodomy with the homosexuality described in Romans 1:27. Hastings (1898) says: "The term 'Sodomite' is used in Scripture to describe offences against the laws of nature which were FREQUENTLY connected with idolatrous practices" (emphasis ours). Note that Hastings did not claim that the offences against the laws of nature were restricted solely to idolatrous temple worship. The term "sodomy" in these passages probably did refer, at least in part, to homosexuality connected with immoral pagan religions. The problem with the NIV translation is that it LIMITS this sin to that particular connection rather than allowing the larger meaning of homosexuality in general. It also creates the confusion that the practice of sodomy in the Old Testament and the sin of Sodom itself was limited to male prostitution.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I KINGS 15:12 - SODOMITES

NIV - He expelled all the shrine prostitutes from the land and got rid of the idols his fathers had made.

xxxxxxx

I KINGS 22:46 - SODOMITES

NIV - He rid the land of the rest of the shrine prostitutes who remained there even after the reign of his father Asa.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

II KINGS 23:7 - SODOMITES

NIV - He also tore down the quarters of the male shrine prostitutes, which were in the temple of the Lord and where women did weaving for Asherah.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

MATTHEW 11:24 - JUDGMENT UPON SODOM

NIV - But I tell you it will be more bearable for Sodom on the day of judgment than for you.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

LUKE 10:12 - JUDGMENT UPON SODOM

NIV - I tell you, it will be more bearable on that day for Sodom than for you.

ROMANS 1:26 & 27 - HOMOSEXUALITY

KJB - For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections; for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And like wise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in lust one toward another; man with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.

NIV - Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I CORINTHIANS 6:9 - REJECTION OF HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR

KJB - Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind...

NIV - Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral nor idolators nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders...

Here we would point out that this is the only place in the NIV where the word "homosexual" occurs. It is not clear from the context if this means heterosexuals who abuse homosexuals or homosexuals who abuse each other. See Dr. Mollenkott's explanation in the 1st Timothy comments following.

NOTE --- We also see that the New International Version replaces the "effeminate" of the KJV with "male prostitutes." The word "effeminate" in the KJV is from the Greek word "malakos," which Strong defines as "soft, i.e. fine (clothing)." The Greek word appears three times in the New Testament, and in the Authorized Version it is translated "effeminate" one time (1 Cor. 6:9) and "soft" two times (Matt. 11:8; Lk. 7:25). The New International Version translators had no authority to translate this word as "male prostitutes." They have replaced the New Testament term "effeminate," which aptly describes male homosexuality in general, with the term "male prostitutes," thus diluting and perverting the meaning of the passage.

xxxxxxxxxxxxx

I TIMOTHY 1:9 & 10

KJB - Knowing this, that the law is not made for righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers. For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.

NIV - We also know that law is not made for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers, and for whatever else is contrary to sound doctrine...

xxxxxxxxxxxxx

JUDE 7 - STRANGE FLESH

KJB - Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

NIV - In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and perversion. They serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire.

IT WOULD NOT BE FAIR TO SAY THAT ALL THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN PRODUCING THE NIV FAVORED HOMOSEXUALITY AS AN ALTERNATE LIFESTYLE, BUT IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT THOSE WHO WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FINAL WORDINGS WERE AT LEAST SYMPATHETIC TO DR. MOLLENKOTT'S CAUSE. One only has to look at the treatment of sodomy in the NIV to reach this conclusion.

While many believe practicing homosexuals can be Christian, there are many others who have a different conviction about what the Bible says about sodomy. For this group, it is hardly acceptable to call sodomites temple prostitutes, nor to think of same-sex relationships as natural. These same people would take a viewpoint that God hates the sin of homosexuality and will bring judgment on those who live this kind of lifestyle.

xxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxx

Would appreciate your response to the above, ccchhrrriiiss.

Thank you,

Stever

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2006/2/12 16:22

Brother Stever...

Your excessively long posts don't seem to indicate anything that would be important to this issue. The NIV shows that homosexuality is a sin. To say otherwise would be dishonest. Therefore, there is no need to engage in a excessively long and time-wasted verse-by-verse comparison about this issue. I have far too many things to do than to pick apart verses -- when the doctrine of both translations state the same truths (albeit differently and in different passages). The NIV and KJV differ somewhat because they are translated from different sources.

I believe that it is time to "move on" from this argument. The argument that that "the KJV is the only 'perfect' translation, the only 'preserved Word of God,' and the only version acceptable unto God" is filled with holes. Not only does such an argument attempt to destroy any credibility in the NIV -- your constant and long-running argument seems to indicate that the NIV is not the Word of God, and it is perhaps the Word of "Satan." That is a dangerous accusation to make. Be mindful of the consequences of such statements.

:-)

Re: Long Posts require reading, on: 2006/2/13 20:48

Stever's response: My posts only appear long to you because you do not read them. You respond to them without reading and understanding what has been posted.

Stever Continues:

Ccchhrrriiiss posts: " EDIT:

On a side note, as I wrote earlier, Dr. Mollenkott was not a translator. I would like to also know whether or not you have really researched the slander that you include, or have you trusted in the words of other men? Have you called or written the people to find out their roles in the NIV? Or have you relied completely on the testimony of other men and women, along with some writing that you attribute to them."

Xxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response to the above:

Again, you did not read my post. Is it any wonder that we cannot get anywhere if we do not read what others post?

In your post, you listed KENNETH L. BARKER:

Kenneth L. Barker, Secretary of the Committee on Bible Translation
Kenneth L. Barker. Capital Bible Seminary. Evangelical Free.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever continues:

My post goes into detail about the fact that Mollenkott was a LITERARY CONSULTANT for the NIV. Not until after she c

ame out of the closet did the NIV distance themselves from her and her involvement with the NIV.

xxxxxxxxxxxxx

This is what Kenneth Barker, Executive Director of the International Bible Society had to say about Mollenkott:

1. "In their letter to me, the NIV people denied that Dr. Mollenkott had any influence on the final product. However, they have not been consistent in their explanation of her input, for one letter from them says she was dismissed in the late 60's and another from the same office says she was dismissed in 1972. From what I have read about Dr. Mollenkott's relationship with the NIV, I am left with the impression that she was there for the duration of the project. I really don't know where the truth lies about her influence on the final product, but I know for certain that she is a homosexual, she served on the committee, and the sin of the Sodomites has never appeared on the pages of the NIV" (Carl Graham, introduction to the 2nd edition of *Sodomy and the NIV*, p. iii).

The following article was written by Graham after he researched the connection between the NIV's rendering of passages touching on homosexuality and the presence of a homosexual on the translation review team. It is amazing to see many direct parallels between Mollenkott's views about homosexuality and the translation of the New International Version. In some people's book, two and two still equals four. IF MOLLENKOTT OR WOULDSTRA (ALONE, OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH SOME OTHER HOMOSEXUAL) DID NOT DIRECTLY INFLUENCE THESE TRANSLATIONS, THERE MUST HAVE BEEN OTHER MEMBERS OF THE NIV COMMITTEE WHO WERE AMAZINGLY LIKE-MINDED WITH THESE MODERN "EVANGELICAL" SODOMITES.

2. Even though Barker's letter claims that Mollenkott was consulted only in a minor way in matters of English style, the fact remains that her name has been plainly listed in their literature for almost THREE (3) DECADES under the heading "LITERARY CRITICS AND OTHER CONSULTANTS." Only RECENTLY WERE WE TOLD THAT HER ROLE WAS INCONSEQUENTIAL.

MOLLENKOTT'S OWN ACCOUNT:

"Furthermore, Mollenkott's own account differs from Barker's. "Barker is playing little word games. It would be a different story if Edwin Palmer were still alive; he knew me; had heard me speak and sent me sheaf after sheaf of translations to review over a period of three or more years, including several gift editions for the committee members when the work was first completed" (Mollenkott's reply to Robert Kasten, Jan. 20, 1995, cited from *Why Not the NIV?* by G.R. Guile). Mollenkott said, further: "... they would send me big swatches of translations . . . many chapters at a time . . . perhaps several shorter books from the Old Testament or the New Testament. . . . I would write notes all over manuscripts which I was sent, both praising phraseology . . . and asking questions . . . something I would typically write would be, 'Would the Greek or would the Hebrew permit this word' which would seem to me to be much more understandable..." (Ibid.).

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's conclusion:

The bottom line is the NIV is weak on homosexuality. Was this by design, or by human error. It really doesn't matter which one it is---it should be avoided!

God bless,

Stever

My posts only appear long to you because you do not read them. You respond to them without reading and understanding what has been posted.

Re: KJ Error?? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/13 22:02

If you read the quote of this passage in Hebrews 2:7, the greek is clear that it says "angels." The passage in Hebrews 2:7 is quoting Psalm 8:5, and in the LXX (Greek OT, which the NT writers would have used), it also says "angels."

It's possible the KJV translators were trying to do what many scribes often did, and create a more even exactness between citations. But, in Psalm 8, it would seem according to the Hebrew that "angels" is also an appropriate translation.

You might consider looking it up in a more technical commentary such as Word Biblical Commentary to see what scholars think of the matter.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/13 22:17

Quote:

The question is...Is the KJV THEE word of God?? I think we can confuse people and not know if what they read is right interpretation. The panel of the NIV had a homosexual on it and it had a man who didn't believe the first 5 books of the bible. The panel of KJV were to have their heads cut off if they were wrong...

Translating is translating. Just because somebody was perhaps of more noble character in translating and did so in a more difficult circumstance doesn't mean they produced a better translation. In the Greek 2 class I'm taking this semester in seminary, I might be much more devoted than a number of my fellow students, some, perhaps, who might not even be saved. However, when the rubber meets the road, and we have to translate & parse the Greek sentences before us come test time, many of them have fared better than I did.

Some simply grasp Greek better than I do, and are better Greek scholars than I. I study hard and pray over my schoolwork, yet they still do better than me.

So, my point in all this is: The translation done by the better Greek scholar will produce a better translation. It doesn't matter how moral or righteous they are, it ultimately boils down to is who knows their stuff. Otherwise, we should just go a head and get the godliest men we know, and have them translate the Greek and Hebrew, even if they don't actually know Greek or Hebrew.

Of course, to do that would be silly.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/13 22:20

Quote:

Brethren, you be surprised at how often these urban legends spread through the evangelical community. Whenever you hear one of these things check it back to its source if at all possible.

It's sad to see how bad we as Christians are often about doing our homework. Quick to believe gossip and close our mind to anything that might be truth.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/13 22:28

Quote:

Only the Levites were allowed by God to write His Words

This is simply untrue and has no Biblical basis to it whatsoever.

Quote:

The dead sea scrolls were written by a cult- the essenes. What value is that to us today?

The dead sea scrolls contain ancient copies of the Hebrew scriptures. Prior to their discovery, the oldest copy of the Hebrew scriptures we had was from the dark ages! And when these Scriptures are unrolled, they show a very careful scholarship by which the essenes hand copied the sacred texts.

For example, the book of Isaiah reports a 99.99% accuracy in copying, with the only copyists errors being a very very very small typo's. Such is important for scholarship, for it shows how carefully the Scriptures were often copied by scribes throughout the ages.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/13 22:44

Quote:

The bottom line is the NIV is weak on homosexuality. Was this by design, or by human error. It really doesn't matter which one it is----it should be avoided!

Is this a simply guilt by association? Let's presume one of the consultants was as gay as they come. Let's assume they had a shrine to satan in every room in their house. Let's assume they were cannibalists.

Even if all this and more is true, you still have a number of things to prove and consider, such as:

- 1) Exactly what passage(s) they were involved or not involved with.
- 2) The extent to which the passage(s) they were involved with. For example, did they just make a recommendation that a panel of scholars considered but ultimately rejected as the best possible translation?
- 3) Did their sinful lifestyle bias their professional scholarly work?

Also, if you suspect their influence tainted the translation to be incorrect, can you prove the translation you are offering is better? Do you know Greek? Do you know Hebrew? Do you know Aramaic?

If you don't, then you have no way of verifying if their translation is in error. And no, looking up something in Strong's doesn't in anyway count as "knowing" a language. And to say which translation is better when you don't actually know these languages (I'm assuming you don't), is simply FOOLISH.

Re: - posted by cchhhrrriiss (), on: 2006/2/13 22:54

Brother Stever...

Quote:
-----Stever's response: My posts only appear long to you because you do not read them. You respond to them without reading and understanding what has been posted.

Please refrain from making direct accusations like this. To put it bluntly -- you are wrong. I do read your posts -- even though they are usually very long and seem to often skirt around the very issues that you raise. But I do understand the perspective of your opinion. I just don't agree with your opinion, nor the opinion of the sources from which you appear to cut-and-paste large amounts of examples from.

The NIV is not "soft on homosexuality." While you are indeed allowed to have such an opinion, you need to be careful before making such a slanderous accusation. The NIV is very clear that homosexuality is a sin. There are many verses that show this. To state otherwise would be either done out of ignorance or dishonesty. But I have noticed your tone change a little over the past several months. At first, you made it sound as though there was an NIV conspiracy that condoned homosexuality. But now you are saying it is "soft" on the sin. I disagree, as do the original translators and the publisher that vouch for this. None of the translators were homosexuals. In the past, I directed you to the actual publisher about refuting this urban legend. (http://www.ibs.org/niv/accuracy/NIV_AccuracyDefined.pdf) Click here for that same link. It is a book published by the publishers and translators that answers a lot of questions and myths about the NIV.

Brother, I believe that this type of argument is often unproductive. You seem very convinced that the KJV is superior in every way to the NIV. In fact, you have stated in past posts that the KJV is perfect -- even though I have pointed to inconsistencies in the translation, as well as changes that were made in the KJV over a period of 158 years (in order to correct translation mistakes). You also seem to be convinced that the NIV was a part of some sort of evil conspiracy created to pervert the Word of God. I totally disagree with this assertion. I would just urge you to be very careful about making such slanderous public statements in the eyes of even babes in Christ. Remember, if you are uttering such statements and find out that they are actually false, then you have borne false witness against not just the translators -- but against the Word of God.

As for me, I am going to refrain as much as possible from this argument. In previous threads about the KJV-only debate, I wrote my conclusions after having contacted the publishers, the original translators, Bible scholars, and other experts in the field. I also contacted some of the KJV-only individuals. Interestingly, most of them did not return my calls, emails or letters. And I also found it interesting that very few of the Bible scholars and experts that I wrote (without knowing their stand on this issue) did not agree with the KJV-only argument. The common consensus seemed to be that the KJV is superior among translations taken from the Received Text. They also seemed to agree with the fact that most people in the world today have difficulty understanding the language and grammar of the KJV. But the majority of those scholars also stated that they believed that the Alexandrian Texts are more reliable.

I do not agree that the Alexandrian Texts are more reliable than the Received Text. I simply do not know. I have read information on both sides -- but I cannot arrive to the conclusion that one is much more reliable than the other. I do not read Hebrew well enough (let alone ancient Hebrew) to translate -- and I do not speak Greek at all. Should I then take the word of the KJV-only websites? Should I take the word of the best modern scholars and translation experts? No. I will trust in the Lord. He will lead me and guide me into all truth. I have searched diligently concerning this matter. Right now, I am quite secure in my belief that the NIV is a proper translation. And I will continue to use both. I will continue to view the KJV as a Received Text translation, and the NIV as a translation taken from other sources.

:)

Re:, on: 2006/2/13 22:56

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:
If you read the quote of this passage in Hebrews 2:7, the greek is clear that it says "angels." The passage in Hebrews 2:7 is quoting Psalm 8:5, and in the LXX (Greek OT, which the NT writers would have used), it also says "angels."
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Why would the New Testament Writers, who were Jews use the LXX, ever? When Christ said that NOT one jot nor one tittle was missing, and would not pass away from the Law until Heaven & earth passed away--- He was not talking about the LXX. He was talking to Jews about the Hebrew Bible (the only Bible God allowed them to read) that was passed down from Moses and the Prophets (that was inspired by the Holy Spirit). Only Levites were allowed to copy and pass it down (not Hebrew "Scholars" that supposedly translated it into Greek). The Hebrew Bible (The Old Testament--Tanakh) is the one they would have studied and trusted, while they were living and writing the New Testament in Koine Greek.

Mat 5:18. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

xxxxxxxxxxx

Would appreciate your response.

God bless,

Stever

Re: "SACRED TRUST GIVEN TO THE LEVITES TO SAFEGUARD THE SCRIPTURES", on: 2006/2/14 0:17

Quote:

Stever wrote:

Quote:

Only the Levites were allowed by God to write His Words

KingJimmy's response to Stever:

This is simply untrue and has no Biblical basis to it whatsoever.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response to KingJimmy:

You should spend some time Studying the Old Testament! You don't even know what you are talking about! God placed all sacred things in the hands of the Levites-please study Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers & Deuteronomy.

Jews Entrusted With Scripture.

"What advantage then has the Jew, or what is the profit of circumcision? Much in every way! Chiefly because to them were committed the oracles of God." Romans 3:1-2.

God told Moses in Deuteronomy 4:2, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you."

Again in Deuteronomy 12:32, God said "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it."

Because of this command, the Jewish Torah was not copied in a haphazard fashion. The process was so accurate it still amazes historians today. For thousands of years, Jewish scribes carefully copied the original manuscripts of sacred Scriptures without any error.

Notice the beginning of the history of biblical preservation: "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the LEVITES, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee," Deuteronomy 31:24-26.

Here we see the beginning of the SACRED TRUST GIVEN TO THE LEVITES TO SAFEGUARD THE SCRIPTURES. The "writings of words" referred to here are the first five books of the Bible: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, also known as the Law or Torah (Hebrew) or Pentateuch (Greek). From that time forward, the religious leaders of Israel became the zealous guardians of the Scriptures. Later, after the Babylonian captivity of Judah, these Scriptures were practically worshipped as much as was the Creator Himself. It could be said that the love that the Jews had for the Law was tantamount to idolatry! They watched over these Sacred Writings more carefully than any other possession in the Holy Land. Joshua, Moses' successor, also instructed the Israelites to have a special concern for all the words of the Law, Joshua 8:35. In the time of Joshua, the entirety of the Torah was read to the children of Israel. A great reverence for the Scripture had developed within one generation after the Exodus. We also see that, the Levites were not the only ones involved in preserving the Scriptures. God knew that the day would come when His people would reject Him as their king and that they would insist on having a human king, Deuteronomy 17:14-15.

But notice what God instructed the new king to do: "And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them," verses 18-19.

The kings of Israel not only had to study and obey the Law, they also had to write their own personal copies of that Law!

THE RULES OF COPYING

Now, the result of this reverence was the creation of a system of copying which is nothing less than astounding. The LEVITES had to create a system of making new copies of the Bible as old copies wore out and had to be destroyed. They knew it would be easy to make a mistake in copying a new transcript, so here is what they did. They developed elaborate and meticulous rules for transcribing. They decreed that when a person was making a new text, he had to copy the original page with such exactness that the number of words on a page could not be changed. If the original page had 288 words, then the page being copied had to have the same 288 words. Each line on a new page had to be the exact same as the line on the old page. If the first line on the original page had nine words, the first line on the copy page had to have nine words. After a page was copied, the number of letters on that page was counted and compared with the original. After a page was copied, each letter was counted and compared with the original. After a page was copied, someone would check to see what the middle letter was on the copy and the original.

"A synagogue roll must be written on the skins of clean animals, the length of each column must not extend less than 48 or more than 80 lines; the breadth must consist of 30 letters. No word or letter, not even a yod, must be written from memory... Between every consonant the space of a hair or three and must intervene, between every book three lines. Besides this the copyist must sit in full Jewish dress, and wash his whole body" (Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, Davidson). The scribes were not allowed to copy sentence for sentence or even word for word. They had to copy letter for letter. After a page was copied and checked by another, still a third person would check to see what the middle word was on the page. Then, when the whole book was finished, another would count the phrases. This process was so accurate they could pinpoint the exact middle of a book simply by letter count and would check the verse at that point as one of the methods of confirmation. If a single error was found, the entire manuscript was destroyed to ensure that it could never be used as a master copy in the future.

These are just a few examples of the great detail that went into ensuring the accuracy of the Scriptures. There were many more steps taken in the process. All of this could be characterized as a "fence to the Scriptures (Massorah) because it locked all words and letters in their places... It records the number of times the several letters occur in the various books of the Bible; the number of words, and the middle word; the number of verses, and the middle verse; the number of expressions and combinations of words, etc... All this ...for the set purpose of safeguarding the Sacred Text, and preventing the loss or misplacement of a single letter or word" (Bullinger, The Companion Bible).

The Role of the Scribes

The ancient Israelites kept a copy of the Scriptures in the first Temple. They put it inside the Ark of the Covenant. This copy became known as "The Temple Scriptures." Even though the first temple was destroyed and the Jews were taken to Babylon, the Scriptures were preserved. In the Babylonian captivity, A GROUP OF LEVITES WHO BECAME KNOWN AS THE SCRIBES painstakingly copied and disseminated the Scriptures to other Jews. One of the most important historical figures during this time was Ezra. He was not only a scribe, but the last of the Old Testament prophets. He probably wrote Chronicles and is said to have fixed the Old Testament canon around 400 B.C. After the Jews returned to Palestine, the Scribes continued to take an active part in preserving and distributing the Scriptures. When the second temple was built, another master copy was put in the Holy Place. Even after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., the Scribes continued their work.

What Does the Bible Say About The Scripture?

1. "The WORDS (extent of preservation) of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven time. THOU (agent of preservation, God) shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation FOR EVER (period of preservation)." Psalms 12:6,7 This verse shows that the very WORDS are inspired and preserved by God, not just the ideas or teaching.
2. "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled," Matthew 5:18. Jesus had a chance to correct the scribes if they were wrong. Not only did He not make any corrections, but He insisted that "the Scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35).
3. Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my WORDS shall not pass away," Matthew 24:35. He did not say that His Word would not pass away. He testified that the very WORDS would stand forever.
4. "The counsel of the Lord standeth for ever," Psalms 33:11. What is the counsel of the Lord? The Word of God. How long does this verse say it will stand?
5. "and His truth endureth to all generations," Psalms 100:5c Every generation will have a copy of the Word of God.
6. Psalms 111:7, 8 says, "ALL his commandments are sure. They stand fast FOR EVER and EVER." If I understand this correctly, God will preserve EVERY commandment FOR EVER.
7. How about this one? "Thy word is true from the beginning; AND EVERY ONE OF THY RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENTS ENDURETH FOREVER," Psalms 119:160.
8. "But the word of our God shall stand for ever" Isaiah 40:8b Pretty self-explanatory.
9. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my WORDS shall not pass away," Matthew 24:35. Notice the emphasis He place on the WORDS. Again, not just his ideas but the very words.
10. In Matthew 28:19,20 Jesus required the church to teach ALL THINGS whatsoever he commanded. How could the church teach ALL THINGS from a Bible with thousands of deletions, additions, and changes?
11. "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail," Luke 16:17. A tittle is smaller than an apostrophe.

God bless,

Stever

SACRED TRUST GIVEN TO THE LEVITES TO SAFEGUARD THE SCRIPTURES
"A GROUP OF LEVITES WHO BECAME KNOWN AS THE SCRIBES"

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2006/2/14 0:51

Quote:
-----Why would the New Testament Writers, who were Jews use the LXX, ever? When Christ said that NOT one *jot nor one tittle* was missing, and would not pass away from the Law until Heaven & earth passed away--- He was not talking about the LXX. He was talking to Jews about the Hebrew Bible (the only Bible God allowed them to read)

Stever,

Please do not take the strong language I'm about to use as an attack against you, but I feel it necessary in this situation

The quote above from which I quoted you only shows the ignorance and absolute absurdity of your position that you are taking. The words for "Jot" and "Tittle" are Yod (Hebrew) and Iota (GREEK). The two smallest articles from both the Hebrew language (Thus the Hebrew Scriptures) and the GREEK language (Thus the LXX). To say that Christ was excluding the LXX is complete nonsense.

Re:, on: 2006/2/14 1:15

Dear Hurley:

The Law prohibited anyone other than the Levite to have anything to do with the Scripture. If you look at the "long post" that I posted, you will find Scripture that supports that truth.

Just because Christ used a Greek word when he gave his example does not mean that he was referring to the LXX.

Do you seriously think that the Saducees and the Pharisees would have anything to do with the LXX, based upon what the Law demanded of them? Would Christ even refer to the LXX, that was prohibited in His own Law?

God bless,

Stever

P.S.

Some Scriptural examples of who the Levites (Scribes) were and what they were all about:

1. "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee,"

In ancient times, scribes were Levites that held various important offices in the public affairs of the nation. The Hebrew word so rendered (sopher) is first used to designate the holder of some military office (Judg. 5:14; A.V., "pen of the writer;" R.V., "the marshal's staff;" marg., "the staff of the scribe"). The scribes acted as secretaries of state, whose business it was to prepare and issue decrees in the name of the king (2 Sam. 8:17; 20:25; 1 Chr. 18:16; 24:6; 1 Kings 4:3; 2 Kings 12:9-11; 18:18-37, etc.).

They discharged various other important public duties as men of high authority and influence in the affairs of state.

Scribes were also engaged in various ways as writers. Such, for example, was Baruch, who "wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the Lord" (Jer. 36:4, 32).

In later times, after the Captivity, when the nation lost its independence, the scribes turned their attention to the law, gain

ing for themselves distinction by their intimate acquaintance with its contents. On them devolved the duty of multiplying copies of the law and of teaching it to others (Ezra 7:6, 10-12; Neh. 8:1, 4, 9, 13).

It is evident that in New Testament times the scribes belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, who supplemented the ancient written law by their traditions (Matt. 23), thereby obscuring it and rendering it of none effect. The titles "scribes" and "lawyers" (q.v.) are in the Gospels interchangeable (Matt. 22:35; Mark 12:28; Luke 20:39, etc.). They were in the time of our Lord the public teachers of the people, and frequently came into collision with him. They afterwards showed themselves greatly hostile to the apostles (Acts 4:5; 6:12).

Some of the scribes, however, were men of a different spirit, and showed themselves friendly to the gospel and its preachers. Thus Gamaliel advised the Sanhedrin, when the apostles were before them charged with "teaching in this name," to "refrain from these men and let them alone" (Acts 5:34-39; compare 23:9).

Re: Who were the Scribes in in the Bible?, on: 2006/2/14 2:40

Stever writes:

Please find the following Scripture, which paints a picture to us of the importance of the Scribes (who were all Levites):

Ancient:

"And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the LEVITES, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee,"

Judges 5:14 Out of Ephraim was there a root of them against Amalek; after thee, Benjamin, among thy people; out of Machir came down governors, and out of Zebulun they that handle the pen of the writer.

Wore an inkhorn at their girdles.

Ezekiel 9:2-3 And, behold, six men came from the way of the higher gate, which lieth toward the north, and every man a slaughter weapon in his hand; and one man among them was clothed with linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side: and they went in, and stood beside the brasen altar. And the glory of the God of Israel was gone up from the cherub, whereupon he was, to the threshold of the house. And he called to the man clothed with linen, which had the writer's inkhorn by his side;

FAMILIES CELEBRATED FOR FURNISHING;

Kenites.

1 Chronicles 2:55 And the families of the scribes which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. These are the Kenites that came of Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab.

Zebulun.

Judges 5:14 Out of Ephraim was there a root of them against Amalek; after thee, Benjamin, among thy people; out of Machir came down governors, and out of Zebulun they that handle the pen of the writer.

Levi.

1 Chronicles 24:6 And Shemaiah the son of Nethaneel the scribe, one of the Levites, wrote them before the king, and the princes, and Zadok the priest, and Ahimelech the son of Abiathar, and before the chief of the fathers of the priests and Levites: one principal household being taken for Eleazar, and one taken for Ithamar.

2 Chronicles 34:13 Also they were over the bearers of burdens, and were overseers of all that wrought the work in any manner of service: and of the Levites there were scribes, and officers, and porters.

Generally men of great wisdom.

1 Chronicles 27:32 Also Jonathan David's uncle was a counsellor, a wise man, and a scribe: and Jehiel the son of Hachmoni was with the king's sons:

Often learned in the law.

Ezra 7:6 This Ezra went up from Babylon; and he was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the LORD God of Israel had given: and the king granted him all his request, according to the hand of the LORD his God upon him.

Were ready writers.

Psalms 45:1 My heart is inditing a good matter: I speak of the things which I have made touching the king: my tongue is the pen of a ready writer.

ACTED AS

Secretaries to kings.

2 Samuel 8:17 And Zadok the son of Ahitub, and Ahimelech the son of Abiathar, were the priests; and Seraiah was the scribe;

2 Samuel 20:25 And Sheva was scribe: and Zadok and Abiathar were the priests:

2 Kings 12:10 And it was so, when they saw that there was much money in the chest, that the king's scribe and the high priest came up, and they put up in bags, and told the money that was found in the house of the LORD.

Esther 3:12 Then were the king's scribes called on the thirteenth day of the first month, and there was written according to all that Haman had commanded unto the king's lieutenants, and to the governors that were over every province, and to the rulers of every people of every province according to the writing thereof, and to every people after their language; in the name of king Ahasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king's ring.

Secretaries to prophets.

Jeremiah 36:4 Then Jeremiah called Baruch the son of Neriah: and Baruch wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the LORD, which he had spoken unto him, upon a roll of a book.

Jeremiah 36:26 But the king commanded Jerahmeel the son of Hammelech, and Seraiah the son of Azriel, and Shelemiah the son of Abdeel, to take Baruch the scribe and Jeremiah the prophet: but the LORD hid them.

Notaries in courts of justice.

Jeremiah 32:11-12 So I took the evidence of the purchase, both that which was sealed according to the law and custom, and that which was open: And I gave the evidence of the purchase unto Baruch the son of Neriah, the son of Maaseiah, in the sight of Hanameel mine uncle's son, and in the presence of the witnesses that subscribed the book of the purchase, before all the Jews that sat in the court of the prison.

Religious teachers.

Nehemiah 8:2-6 And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month. And he read therein before the street that was before the water gate from the morning until midday, before the men and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law. And Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose; and beside him stood Mattithiah, and Shema, and Anaiah, and Urijah, and Hilkiyah, and Maaseiah, on his right hand; and on his left hand, Pedaiah, and Mishael, and Malchiah, and Hashum, and Hashbadana, Zechariah, and Meshullam. And Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people; (for he was above all the people;) and when he opened it, all the people stood up: And Ezra blessed the LORD, the great God. And all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands: and they bowed their heads, and worshipped the LORD with their faces to the ground. ...

Writers of public documents.

1 Chronicles 24:6 And Shemaiah the son of Nethaneel the scribe, one of the Levites, wrote them before the king, and the princes, and Zadok the priest, and Ahimelech the son of Abiathar, and before the chief of the fathers of the priests and Levites: one principal household being taken for Eleazar, and one taken for Ithamar.

Keepers of the muster-rolls of the host.

2 Kings 25:19 And out of the city he took an officer that was set over the men of war, and five men of them that were in the king's presence, which were found in the city, and the principal scribe of the host, which mustered the people of the land, and threescore men of the people of the land that were found in the city:

2 Chronicles 26:11 Moreover Uzziah had an host of fighting men, that went out to war by bands, according to the number of their account by the hand of Jeiel the scribe and Maaseiah the ruler, under the hand of Hananiah, one of the king's captains.

Jeremiah 52:25 He took also out of the city an eunuch, which had the charge of the men of war; and seven men of them that were near the king's person, which were found in the city; and the principal scribe of the host, who mustered the people of the land; and threescore men of the people of the land, that were found in the midst of the city.

Modern:

Were doctors of the law.

Mark 12:28 And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all?

Matthew 22:35 Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying,

Wore long robes and loved pre-eminence.

Mark 12:38-39 And he said unto them in his doctrine, Beware of the scribes, which love to go in long clothing, and love salutations in the marketplaces, And the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts:

Sat in Moses' seat.

Matthew 23:2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat:

Were frequently Pharisees.

Acts 23:9 And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God.

Esteemed wise and learned.

1 Corinthians 1:20 Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?

Regarded as interpreters of Scripture.

Matthew 2:4 And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born.

Matthew 17:10 And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come?

Mark 12:35 And Jesus answered and said, while he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that Christ is the Son of David?

Their manner of teaching contrasting with that of Christ.

Matthew 7:29 For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.

Mark 1:22 And they were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes

Condemned by Christ for hypocrisy.

Matthew 23:15 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.

Often offended at our Lord's conduct and teaching.

Matthew 21:15 And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David; they were sore displeased,
Mark 2:6-7 But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts, Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only?
Mark 3:22 And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out devils.

Tempted our Lord.

John 8:3 And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst,

Active in procuring our Lord's death.

Matthew 26:3 Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas,
Luke 23:10 And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused him.

Persecuted the early Christians.

Acts 4:5 And it came to pass on the morrow, that their rulers, and elders, and scribes,
Acts 4:18 And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus.
Acts 6:12 And they stirred up the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon him, and caught him, and brought him to the council,

Illustrated of well-instructed ministers of the gospel.

Matthew 13:52 Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/14 10:30

Quote:

Why would the New Testament Writers, who were Jews use the LXX, ever?

In ancient Palestine and the Mediterranean region, they used the LXX because they were not as comfortable with Hebrew as they were Greek. The further one got away from Jerusalem, the more they relied on the LXX. In fact, the LXX came into existence to supply people who could not read Hebrew with a translation of the Scriptures in the vernacular. Since Koine Greek was the vernacular, a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures were made available in such.

If you actually study the Scriptures, and compare quotations of the Old Testament within the New, you will find that when you reference something in the NT from the OT, the quotes don't always exactly match. Sometimes, there is even a noticeable difference. There are a number of reasons for this.

Chief among them is that often the New Testament writer is quoting from the LXX, and not the Hebrew. The fact of the

matter is, the LXX was the Bible of the early Church. That's not to say they never made use of the Hebrew Scriptures. However, they never cited the Scriptures in Hebrew when they did, as is evidenced by the fact that our NT is written in Greek, instead, they would provide their own translation in Greek.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/14 10:50

Quote:

But notice what God instructed the new king to do: "And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them," verses 18-19.

The kings of Israel not only had to study and obey the Law, they also had to write their own personal copies of that Law!

And thus, the statement you made is entirely untrue. The fact that the king was to make a copy of the Law, and was of the tribe of Judah, shows that it was not simply the business of the Levites, and solely the Levites, to make copies of the Scriptures. Nor were they the only ones to do so. Nor is there any command in all of the Law that they are only ones permitted to do so. For that matter, many of the prophets were not even from Levi.

In fact, individuals were to have phylacteris on them containing miniature parts of the Scriptures, and people were to write the Law upon their doorposts, etc.

No doubt, the Levites had a major role in copying the Hebrew Scriptures, but they were, in fact, not the only ones that did. For that matter, even though they had an elaborate system for copying the Scriptures, copyists mistakes still slipped in the copies that were made of the OT. You can deny this all you want, but the fact that we have differing Hebrew manuscripts proves this to be the case.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/14 10:57

Steve,
Could you just please give us the link to the web site that you copy & paste from instead of posting entire articles that were written by other people on the site? It would be much easier to read this thread if you actually did.

For I believe the nature of the forums is for discussion, and not simply spamming long articles. Also, it might be more fruitful if you actually DISCUSS things, instead of simply spamming.

Re: "Would Christ even refer to the Septuagint?" - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/14 13:58

Steve's
Quote:
-----Do you seriously think that the Sadducees and the Pharisees would have anything to do with the LXX, based upon what the Law demanded of them? Would Christ even refer to the LXX, that was prohibited in His own Law?

Well, as a matter of fact he did, although I am sure you will find some reason to disbelieve it.

Here is an English equivalent of the Masoretic text, in other words the KJV: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn;" (Is 61:1-2 KJVS)

Now here is a quotation from Luke's account: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, To preach the acceptable year of the Lord." (Luke 4:18-19 KJVS) I have underlined a line in Luke's account which you will find missing in the original Masoretic text. This is interesting in that Luke says "...when he had opened the the book, he found the place where is was written..." But the words "recovering of sight to the blind" are not WRITTEN in the Masoretic text, so how did Jesus read them?

Well, he read them from here...1 The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me; he has sent me to preach glad tidings to the poor, to heal the broken in heart, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind; 2 to declare the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of recompence; to comfort all that mourn; **This is** (an English translation of) **the Septuagint**, the Greek translation of the OT scriptures used from c200BC. *Galilee of the Gentiles* was predominantly a Greek speaking part of the land. It seems that the synagogues in Galilee were actually using the Septuagint! This has been disputed but I think the most natural reading and understanding of Luke 4:17 demands it. It is almost indisputable that Christ spoke Greek as well as He spoke Aramaic. It is inconceivable that Pilate could have conducted the conversation of John 18:33-38 in Aramaic. The only other alternative is that Christ spoke in Greek.

Server's posts have now become such a mixture of misinformation and illogicality that it becomes increasingly difficult to provide sensible answers to them.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/14 14:50

Quote:

Server's posts have now become such a mixture of misinformation and illogicality that it becomes increasingly difficult to provide sensible answers to them.

This sadly is the typical result of individuals who take a dogmatic-you'll-never-convince-me-otherwise stance concerning the KJV-only debate. Sadly, many people will believe all sorts of hearsay (e.g. so and so was a homosexual) that they read on web sites and such, yet they actually don't deal with any real evidence at hand, evidence from the Scriptures they so claim to cherish.

It's fatalistic and spiritual suicide. We should always remain teachable, and humbly open to being shown where we might err in. We should be truth seekers.

If one really wants to see if the KJV is in error, or is indeed, the best text, here is a suggestion: in the amount of time you spend researching this stuff on web sites that perhaps are not credible sources to begin with, and debating it on the internet, you could have probably earned a masters degree in textual criticism.

Yet, after all your years and hours of research on the internet, you never once actually come any closer to knowing the truth of the matter. All you have is hearsay: such and such person says such and such. The fact of the matter is, you'll never actually know for yourself, and it is dangerous to be dogmatic about information you have only from second hand sources.

What you should actually do is go pickup some Greek and Hebrew grammars, and spend a couple years learning these languages. Perhaps take some night classes at your local Bible college or Seminary if studying on your own is not your thing.

Because, frankly, unless you can read the Scriptures in the original languages (and no, if you know anything about languages, opening a Stronog's Concordance is not a valid substitute), and compare the many textual variants out there, you'll NEVER really be able to say with any real certainty if the Byzantine texts are better than the Alexandria or Western texts. You'll also never be able to determine which of the English translations is most faithful to the original languages.

This subject matter requires real, serious, disciplined, hard study. There are so many complexities to the area of textual criticism and translation. If I were to show you a UBS4 and NA27 (Critical Greek editions of the NT), many of you would be baffled beyond comprehension.

Word to the wise: STUDY.