

Well what follows here is an exchange in emails between a Christian (David Hodges a ‘deacon’ or ‘GREEKon!!!’) who has NO Final Authority in which to turn to, & ‘ME’, a Bible Believer who believes (KNOWS!) the Authorized Version Bible is the PERFECTLY PRESERVED word of God! You will see from Hodges, as you read the emails, just how weak some Christians are when it comes to answering a Bible BELIEVER! To admit that God HAS NOT (‘cannot’) preserve His word for us PERFECT today is beyond belief - I mean, according to Hodges, how do we KNOW what Scriptures we can trust ‘if’ there are ‘errors’ in the Bible? Like ALL Bible ‘correctors & rejectors’, they are a waste of time & do NOT please God at all in their foolishness & immaturity. Here at Time for Truth! we treat *them* with the contempt they deserve, as you will see from the following correspondence!

To state, once again, our position regarding the Authorized Version Bible (*as if you didn’t know by now*), it is 100% PERFECT i.e. WITHOUT one single error! You can TRUST it TOTALLY as your Final Authority on all matters of faith & practice. When ANYONE (no matter how ‘clever’) says it has ‘errors’ in it, they are MORONS!

ENJOY!!! (By the way, it gets better towards the end!!! Thanks again to Alan O'Reilly for all his help!)

It all ‘kicked-off’, when I sent an email out regarding the website; Hodges came back with the following...

David – **black**

John – **red**

Alan – **blue**

Thanks John - however I do find it hard to believe that the translators of the AV were inspired. They were translators only, the original text is surely what God has preserved. Also I'm one of those who don't share the view that the Bible (even the AV!) teaches that the rapture is some intermediate event. When Christ comes He will come to rapture His own, and to judge the rest - an event which will bring this created order to an end and usher in a new creation in which there will be no sin.

Getting hung-up on secondary issues is a great danger - I'm very keen on issues to do with Creation (I love the CMI website!) but I have to recognize that the thrust of our interest must be Christ Himself ... and that the hidden things are for God alone to know. He hasn't told us the date of His coming, so why speculate?

Anyway, I'm encouraged by your enthusiasm for the gospel ... just a bit concerned that secondary issues create a lop-sided (even potentially "wacky") impression.

God bless you

David

How can't the original text be preserved when it no longer exists???

We only have copies by man!!!

So are you saying that God can't preserve his word perfect??? I find that incredible!

The church gets raptured in the early part of revelation and isn't seen again till the marriage supper! You won't find the church anywhere in-between!

You're right about being Christ centred though

Every blessing

John Davis

Hi John, thanks for the reply... response below

How can't the original text be preserved when it no longer exists???

Not sure what you mean here - can or can't? I accept that (maybe) none of the actual manuscripts we have are "originals".

We only have copies by man!!!

You don't mean that God re-wrote the manuscripts as He wrote on the tablets of stone given to Moses do you? If you mean we only have copies made by man - yes we do, but that doesn't mean they are not accurate.

So are you saying that God can't preserve his word perfect??? I find that incredible!

No - I'm saying that God has preserved a vast number of manuscripts transcribed by men with the utmost care. That doesn't mean that individual manuscripts could have flaws but the vast body of early texts allow us to discern what was in the originals almost exactly. Where there is doubt, it only relates to issues/words which do NOT affect the teaching originally given. As God gave the Jewish nation scribes to transcribe the texts, so He has raised up many who have sought to faithfully transcribe the New Testament texts.

What God CAN do and what He CHOOSES to do are not always the same. I see no problem in using the skill of men who have a knowledge of the ancient languages to give us a faithful translation.

We must be careful not to ascribe to God actions which He has not said He has done in scripture. He has not said that the translators of the AV were inspired. It's a great translation, but there are also other worthy translations.

The church gets raptured in the early part of revelation and isn't seen again till the marriage supper! You won't find the church anywhere in-between!

This depends on your interpretation of Revelation. I do not believe it was ever intended to be a chronological outworking of the plan of God in these last days. It was written to a persecuted and suffering church to help them realize that even the harshest circumstances are in the hands of a sovereign God. The church appears throughout Revelation as we are given different overlapping views of God's dealings with mankind up to the Day of judgement. There is given us a view of all things working according to God's sovereign plan - culminating in the new heaven and earth.

You're right about being Christ centred though

Hallelujah!!

David

My apologies for spelling errors etc. I was at a trade show & emailing from my iPhone is a nightmare!

There is NO 'maybe' about it! Check it out! There are NO 'original' manuscripts extant today!

All you have is copies of copies of copies!!!

A few questions...

- 1) How do you KNOW the original manuscripts WERE perfect?**
- 2) With over 100 Greek texts, which ONE is the PRESERVED one?**
- 3) To you, where is God's PERFECTLY PRESERVED word of God between two covers?**

No - I'm saying that God has preserved a vast number of manuscripts (**But God said EVERY word is PURE & EVERY word is incorruptible! If that is so, EVERY incorruptible word MUST be PRESERVED according TO THE WORD!** So where is EVERY SINGLE WORD?), transcribed by men with the utmost care (**But according to you, there MUST be errors in them! If not WHERE is THE word of God preserved PERFECT... unless of course, you are saying that God CAN'T give us a PERFECT BOOK?**). That doesn't mean that individual manuscripts could have flaws (**This is very hypocritical! If 'they' may not have flaws, maybe the AV hasn't any flaws! Why not? Both are either copied or translated by MEN!!!**), but the vast body of early texts allow us (**So now WE become the Final Authority to decide what is right & what is wrong!**) to discern what was in the originals almost exactly. (**You DON'T know as you have NEVER seen them! You are trusting in what MAN has copied down through the ages... see where this leads!!!?**) Where there is doubt, it only relates to issues/words which do NOT affect the teaching originally given. (**RUBBISH! In the NIV Jesus is kicked out of Heaven & Elhanan killed Goliath!!! There are over 60,000+ changes from the NIV to the AV & the Roman Catholic manuscripts which the NIV was based on attack the Deity of Christ among many other DOCTRINES including blood atonement! I don't think you have researched this in any depth to make a statement like that!** <http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/the-niv-perversion/>) As God gave the Jewish nation scribes to transcribe the texts, so He has raised up many who have sought to faithfully transcribe the New Testament texts. (**Including the AV!**)

What God CAN do and what He CHOOSES to do are not always the same. I see no problem in using the skill of men who have a knowledge of the ancient languages to give us a faithful translation. **I have MORE faith in God than you regarding this! I believe that God could give & use sinful translators (AV) the same skill, mind-set & knowledge to translate the Hebrew & Greek to give us a PERFECT Bible as He did in the beginning!**

Where does it say He can't?

Why would God give a PERFECT Bible in the beginning & then allow everyone else to have a Bible with errors in after the originals wore out? Doesn't make sense & God wouldn't do that as His word states! (<http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1300041269.pdf> I would suggest reading this!)

Here's another one of 'those' questions... 'Can a TRANSLATION be inspired?'

When Joseph spoke Egyptian in the OT, it was recorded in HEBREW!!! Was the 'translation' inspired? Think long & hard about that!

We must be careful not to ascribe to God actions which He has not said He has done in scripture. (**Again this is soooooo hypocritical! God has PROMISED to preserved His PERFECT word! I believe we have it between two covers & it is MY Final Authority! YOU DON'T have a Final Authority that you can point to that is PERFECT if you are honest!**) He has not said that the translators of the AV were inspired. (**How do you KNOW they were not? You assume!**) It's a great translation, (**NO! It's PERFECT! & if it isn't, where is the PERFECT word of God He promised to preserve! I noticed that you still have avoided answering that!**) but there are also other worthy translations. (**NIV, NKJV et al. 'ALL' have grave errors in them!**) They're not even using the same Greek texts!

On Sunday, I shall hold my AV Bible up & say this "This is God's PERFECT word of God. It is without error! It is perfectly preserved & it is my final authority on ALL matters of faith & practice!"

What will you say to your congregation.... "This is the BEST translation BUT it has errors in it!"

By the way, I am 100% convinced that the Holy Spirit has NEVER shown YOU an error in the AV! Am I right? I'd like an answer to THAT question please!

This depends on your interpretation of Revelation. I do not believe it was ever intended to be a chronological outworking of the plan of God in these last days. It was written to a persecuted and suffering church to help them realize that even the harshest circumstances are in the hands of a sovereign God. The church appears throughout Revelation as we are given different overlapping views of God's dealings with mankind up to the Day of judgement. There is given us a view of all things working according to God's sovereign plan - culminating in the new heaven and earth. **The word CHURCH/ES suddenly disappears from Rev 3v22 & DOESN'T show up again until Rev 22v16! THAT has absolutely NOTHING to do with interpretation! I think someone is wresting the Scriptures (2 Pet**

3v16) - When anyone can't answer Scripture they always run to 'well it's the interpretation!' Paul expected the Rapture & so do I as immediate! Christ comes in the clouds & THEN to the earth - & that is without any interpretation! (See my study on the Rapture -

<http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1300042208.pdf> NOTE, according to Scripture there are 'THREE' MAIN Raptures! Very interesting! Read it!)

The church is in such a mess today because it has departed from the word of God! The majority of ministers these days have NO Final Authority in which to turn, like you! You trust in man's scholarship rather than in the word of God! By the way, modern day translators couldn't hold up a candle to the AV translators! Check out THEIR qualifications & stop assuming!

Without a Final Authority in which to turn you have NOTHING!

Christ when tempted by the Devil said "It is WRITTEN!" & He wasn't talking about 'original' anything!!! He was talking about Scripture! The AV is pure Scripture WITHOUT ERROR! The day you 'correct' it is the day YOU become the Final Authority! (God forbid!!!)

The Lord lead & guide you into ALL TRUTH! I know where that ALL TRUTH IS! If you want a copy I'll send you one!

No offence intended! I think we can talk man to man without getting upset can't we? (We shall see, after I have received your answers!)

God bless you

**John
Bible Believer (AV ONLY!)**

John - thanks again for the considerable effort you've put into your reply. However, I'm not convinced by your arguments. When writing "on the fly" it's very easy to fail to convey what you (I in this case) wish/intend to - so I reply with trembling.

By the way, I'm not a pastor, just a deacon in my local fellowship - but we have a good man who expounds the Word of God each Lord's Day, and I believe in the infallible inerrant Word of God as originally given as does he. (www.bulkingtoncongregational.org)

Let me summarise my position/concerns again, since I think our exchange has become a little confused....

1. The original texts were infallible and inerrant

2. Men are fallible - but God uses infallible men. He uses me and you, and though what we do is often/always flawed He can bring about His sovereign purpose come what may.

3. Translations are nothing more than translations. Languages differ in the way things are expressed. The vernacular tongue contains idioms which may not translate directly from one language to another. Hence, apart from problems with errors creeping in by transcription, there is the difficulty of comprehension of what was originally intended by the idioms used.

4. Before you get hot under the collar, I believe that there are sufficient, good quality ancient manuscripts to make the issue of "errors" a minor problem - many of them being simply spelling errors. God COULD have prevented these from occurring, but it would seem that He hasn't. If He has, then He hasn't TOLD us which ones are the ones He has.

5. The closest you can get to reading the original text is to read it in the original language. Since most people (including myself) can't read Hebrew, Greek, or the other ancient languages used in these texts we are dependent on men who can to give us a translation. They will translate according to their understanding - hence we get rubbish translations from godless men who think they can put a spin on the text to suit their own ends.

6. God CAN cause a totally inerrant translation to be made. However, unless HE TELLS US which one this is we need to use discernment and consider the qualifications of the men who make the translation (as I believe you pointed out). I believe that Wycliffe translators spend years learning languages and understanding idioms etc before they attempt a translation into a native tongue. They would then, I believe, seek to translate from the original languages. I also understand (but am ready to be corrected) that not all the men engaged in the production of the AV were convinced believers - King James insisted on having some of his own men involved

7. The claim that the AV as a translation is inerrant and inspired smacks to me of heresy in that it makes a claim which goes beyond what scripture claims for itself.

8. If the AV were "inspired" then where does that leave translations into other languages - how do we know which of them (if any) are inspired? Also what about those who believed before the AV?

9. I'm sure that the translators of the AV with their Christ-centred attitude, would have had the humility to accept that theirs was simply an attempt to convey the meaning of the original language (let's avoid the issue of text/manuscript). I'm sure they would also have rejoiced to have the increased understanding of the meaning of specific idioms which more modern translators have.

10. I've not checked with my pastor (who has a good understanding of Hebrew and Greek etc) where there are "errors" in the AV - but he frequently explains to us where the original language is difficult to translate. Often the difficulty is that alternative translations are equally valid - there seems to be an intentional ambivalence which conveys not one, but two or more ideas, all of which are valid and helpful, but which cannot be expressed in a single translation. God used the original languages to in-errantly and infallibly convey what He wished to.

11. We must take care not to have a view on what God SHOULD have done, and then insist that this is what God HAS done. To ask "why would God do ..?" expecting an answer when God Himself has not made the answer clear is to stand in judgement on God Himself, or to presume to stand in the place of God when we answer - so we need to take care when applying our own fault-ridden logic to the actions of the Almighty - in case we stand accused of doing something which doesn't make sense to us, calling His actions into question.

12. On the issue of the book of Revelation - although the word "church" may not be used throughout, the church is frequently alluded to in "type" or figure. Also when we have described God's dealings with humanity as a whole there is no need to separate out the church - since we partake to a great extent in the temporal judgements which God brings on mankind. And again beware of imposing on scripture pre-conceived systems as to how God will work when He has chosen to hide many things of a temporal nature from us all. The scripture contains all that is necessary for faith and practice - not fortune telling. Men need to come to repentance for sin and faith in a Saviour who will keep them - not to know times and seasons which are deliberately hidden.

God bless you brother

David

To think that your 'Almighty' God who can create everything out of nothing 'can't' give you a perfect book in English is truly amazing!!! He can create life and the worlds and universe but He just wasn't able to give you His perfect word in English!!!

I mean, he could originally, but he is not powerful enough to keep those words and give us a perfect translation! The Almighty God I serve CAN!!! He also promised to do so, but you won't find that in the NIV!

I shall deal with your other errors when I get home tonight?

I noticed that you STILL haven't told me WHAT is 'your' final authority between two covers??!!

Christian love

John Davis

Hi John - sorry you didn't get to point 6. I believe God CAN preserve a perfect - I just don't believe that He has given us to understand that this is His intention. To answer your unanswered question - my final authority in everything is the Bible - God's inerrant Word. Perhaps I accept that we have to do a little more work to discover what He has revealed than just accepting a single translation. This seems to create a problem for you.

Cheers

Look forward to your response - but mind the blood pressure!

David

Hi John - sorry you didn't get to point 6. (**I think it is 'you' who has evaded all my questions D!**) I believe God CAN preserve a perfect translation (**No you don't!**) - I just don't believe that He has given us to understand that this is His intention. (**He has promised to preserve it but YOU don't believe that, because you are NOT a Bible 'believer' you are a Bible CORRECTOR!**) To answer your unanswered question - my final authority in everything is the Bible (**Which one?**) - God's inerrant Word. (**Which one? Where?**) Perhaps I accept that we have to do a little more work to discover what He has revealed than just accepting a single translation. (**Who says?**) This seems to create a problem for you. (**I don't have a problem because I have a PERFECT Book that God has given to me... i.e. WITHOUT ERROR! You have NO Final Authority in which to turn!**)

I think I'll have to start to speak slower so you get it!!!

Let's try it one more time around, with feeling!!!

WHERE (does that make sense?) is the PERFECTLY PRESERVED word of God today? Between two covers?

Now take your time, sit down, don't rush, THINK ABOUT IT!

One more time just in case!

WHERE is the word of God that He promised to preserve? I want to buy a copy! Where do I go to obtain it?

Now once you have answered THAT question, we shall try to get you into some meat!

If you haven't got a final authority that is PERFECT, how do you know what is truth & what is error? Are you trusting men, scholars etc?

How do you know that 1 John 5v7 should be in the Bible?

How do you KNOW that you are saved?

WHERE is the Scripture of TRUTH TODAY?

Now you haven't answered one single question yet, so I await your answer to this before we start getting into some depth!

Don't blow a gasket!

Come on D, dig deep!

Christian love

John

Bible Believer with a PERFECT FINAL AUTHORITY!!! (Found in the AV of course!)

More RED below... (Read right to the bottom old boy!)

Cheers

Look forward to your response - but mind the blood pressure! **Cool as a cucumber thank you!**

David

John - thanks again for the considerable effort you've put into your reply. However, I'm not convinced by your arguments. When writing "on the fly" it's very easy to fail to convey what you (I in this case) wish/intend to - so I reply with trembling.

By the way, I'm not a pastor, just a deacon in my local fellowship - but we have a good man who expounds the Word of God **That of course depends on the VERSION!!!** each Lord's Day, and I believe in the infallible inerrant Word of God as originally given **(But no longer exists of course!)** as does he. (www.bulkingtoncongregational.org)

Let me summarise my position/concerns again, since I think our exchange has become a little confused....

1. The original texts were infallible and inerrant

How do you know they were?

2. Men are fallible - but God uses infallible men. He uses me and you, and though what we do is often/always flawed He can bring about His sovereign purpose come what may. **But NOT to give us a PERFECT translation of course!**

How hypocritical! I noticed you never answered the translation question regarding Joseph (I understand why!!!)

3. Translations are nothing more than translations. **OH dear!!! What about Joseph & his Egyptian INTO Hebrew!!! WHICH ONE was the PERFECT translation!!!** Languages differ in the way things are expressed. The vernacular tongue contains idioms which may not translate directly from one language to another. Hence, apart from problems with errors creeping in by transcription, there is the difficulty of comprehension of what was originally intended by the idioms used.

4. Before you get hot under the collar, I believe that there are sufficient, good quality ancient manuscripts to make the issue of "errors" a minor problem - many of them being simply spelling errors. (**Like Jesus being kicked out of Heaven!!!!!!!!!! Like Christ's BLOOD missing, which is the ONLY way we can be REDEEMED! Yeah, sure, just spelling errors! What idiot told you that lie???**) God COULD have prevented these from occurring, but it would seem that He hasn't. **In YOUR opinion! God PROMISED to preserve His word & YOU are calling God a LIAR!** If He has, **Are YOU joking???** then He hasn't TOLD us which ones are the ones He has. **I have a PERFECT Bible thanks! Want a copy?**

5. The closest you can get to reading the original text is to read it in the original language. **Why? We have it in PERFECT English!!!** Since most people (including myself) can't read Hebrew, Greek, or the other ancient languages used in these texts we are dependent on men who can to give us a translation. They will translate according to their understanding **YOU trust MEN to tell you what it means & I trust GOD to PRESERVE it! East to West & never the twain shall meet!** - hence we get rubbish translations **What like the NKJV, NIV RSV RV, NASB etc. You're RIGHT there!!!** from godless men **Like some of those on the NIV committee who were SODOMITES!** who think they can put a spin on the text to suit their own ends.

6. God CAN cause a totally inerrant translation to be made. **He has in the AV!!! I note YET AGAIN David that you haven't said whether the Holy Spirit has shown you ONE SINGLE ERROR in the AV (I wonder why!!!)** However, unless HE TELLS US which one this (**I KNOW! Want a copy?**) is we need to use discernment and consider the qualifications of the men who make the translation (as I believe you pointed out). I believe that Wycliffe translators spend years learning languages and understanding idioms etc before they attempt a translation into a native tongue. They would then, I believe, seek to translate from the original languages. I also understand (but am ready to be corrected) **I think NOT! But I hope you're not too arrogant to see the TRUTH! We shall see!** that not all the men engaged in the production of the AV were convinced believers - King James insisted on having some of his own men involved

7. The claim that the AV as a translation is inerrant and inspired smacks to me of heresy **It does to ever Bible CORRECTOR & that is what YOU are! Bible correctors serve an inferior God who CAN'T preserve His word PERFECT! He can do absolutely anything BUT give us a perfect Book! Pure hypocrisy!!!** in that it makes a claim which goes beyond what scripture claims for itself.

8. If the AV were "inspired" then where does that leave translations into other languages **The same place it left the originals!!! Same scenario!!! See how it works???**

- how do we know which of them (if any) are inspired? Also what about those who believed before the AV?

9. I'm sure that the translators of the AV with their Christ-centred attitude, would have had the humility to accept that theirs was simply an attempt to convey the meaning of the original language (let's avoid the issue of text/manuscript). I'm sure they would also have rejoiced to have the increased understanding of the meaning of specific idioms which more modern translators have. **You think the original writers were 'different? 'David, Paul etc.**

10. I've not checked with my pastor (who has a good understanding of Hebrew and Greek etc) where there are "errors" in the AV **I SEE!!!! You run to a man to try to find errors in the Bible! Now I understand! You'll do anything but believe the Book! You are foolish enough to think that your pastor has the wisdom & knowledge to find errors in the word of God! No wonder the church is in dire-straits!!!** - but he frequently explains to us where the original language is difficult to translate. Often the difficulty is that alternative translations are equally valid - there seems to be an intentional ambivalence which conveys not one, but two or more ideas, all of which are valid and helpful, but which cannot be expressed in a single translation. **In YOUR opinion! God used the original languages to in-errantly and infallibly convey what He wished to. As one preacher said... TOTAL UTTER RUBBISH! Not a day in your life!**

11. We must take care not to have a view on what God SHOULD have done, **Hypocrisy PERSONIFIED!!!** and then insist that this is what God HAS done. To ask "why would God do ..?" expecting an answer when God Himself has not made the answer clear is to stand in judgement on God Himself, or to presume to stand in the place of God when we answer - so we need to take care when applying our own fault-ridden logic **Just beautiful D! Poetic in fact! I have never heard such TOSH!** to the actions of the Almighty **How do you KNOW He is Almighty? He can't even give YOU a perfect Book! Quality!!!!!!** - in case we stand accused of doing something which doesn't make sense to us, calling His actions into question.

12. On the issue of the book of Revelation - although the word "church" may not be used throughout, the church is frequently alluded to in "type" or figure. Also when we have described God's dealings with humanity as a whole there is no need to separate out the church - since we partake to a great extent in the temporal judgements which God brings on mankind. And again beware of imposing on scripture pre-conceived systems as to how God will work when He has chosen to hide many things of a temporal nature from us all. The scripture contains all that is necessary for faith and practice - not fortune telling. Men need to come to repentance for sin and faith in a Saviour who will keep them - not to know times and seasons which are deliberately hidden.

You obviously haven't read the Rapture sermon! & you certainly CAN'T rightly divide the word of truth! To be in a leadership position WITHOUT a PERFECT Final Authority is ridiculous! God bless you brother

May God take away those scales David so you finally can SEE, you'll be amazed at the Book God has given us PERFECT!!!!!!

David

Big Brother Alan O'Reilly's response...

If this doesn't 'sort out your errors' I fear nothing will!

Enjoy!!!

John - thanks again for the considerable effort you've put into your reply. However, I'm not convinced by your arguments.

They weren't arguments but factual statements, supported by scripture. To imply otherwise is to betray the attitude of a dishonest sceptic, in disobedience to Romans 12:17, which gives a command to "Provide things honest."

When writing "on the fly" it's very easy to fail to convey what you (I in this case) wish/intend to - so I reply with trembling.

By the way, I'm not a pastor, just a deacon in my local fellowship - but we have a good man who expounds the Word of God each Lord's Day, and I believe in the infallible inerrant Word of God as originally given as does he. (www.bulkingtoncongregational.org)

"Word" is not the correct term when applied to the scriptures. Check John 1:1, 14, 1 John 1:1, 5:7, Revelation 19:13. Where is this 'original' between two covers that can be said to be "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16? I have contact with a church that makes exactly the same profession. They will not, and cannot, answer the above question and have not been able to for 32 years since the church's inception. Anyone who tried to pull the "as originally given" scam in a court of law would be required to produce an original manuscript and would be exposed for the fraud he is. However, there's a lot that you can get away with in a 'fundamentalist-mutual-admiration-society' compared with what you could in a properly constituted court of law.

Nevertheless, to overcome the charge of dishonest scepticism, an 'originals onlyist' MUST answer the above question, explicitly, with respect to what is extant between two covers, otherwise he is also a Nicolaitan usurper who has violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, Revelation 2:15.

Let me summarise my position/concerns again,since I think our exchange has become a little confused

On one side only. Bible believers “by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil”
Hebrews 5:14.

1. The original texts were infallible and inerrant
“Were” infallible and inerrant? What about NOW?

2. Men are fallible - but God uses infallible*** men.

*****Freudian Slip. Check Ecclesiastes 7:20.**

He uses me and you, and though what we do is often/always flawed He can bring about His sovereign*** purpose come what may.

*****As a point of information, the word “sovereign,” strictly speaking, should not be applied to either God or any of His doings. The word does not appear in any English Bible for 1,000 years between the 7th and 17th centuries. It first appears in the Jesuit Douai-Rheims Bible, revised by Challoner in the 18th century. See Judges 5:11, Isaiah 3:1, 10:16, 33, 51:22, Amos 5:16, Jude 4. ‘Sovereign’ is a weak French word imported into English in the 12th century by French-speaking kings of England and applies to a mortal, earthly ruler, not “the LORD God of hosts” 2 Samuel 5:10.**

Naturally, the Frenchman John Calvin used the term to deny the free will of men with respect to salvation, even though “freewill” is a Biblical term, Leviticus 22:18, 21, 23, 23:38. See The Language of the King James Bible by Gail Riplinger, p 66.

3. Translations are nothing more than translations. Languages differ in the way things are expressed. The vernacular tongue contains idioms which may not translate directly from one language to another. Hence, apart from problems with errors creeping in by transcription, there is the difficulty of comprehension of what was originally intended by the idioms used.

May we please see chapter and verse to substantiate any and all of the above obfuscation?

4. Before you get hot under the collar, I believe that there are sufficient, good quality ancient manuscripts to make the issue of "errors" a minor problem - many of them being simply spelling errors.

Examples? None – which is typical of dishonest sceptics. The truth is that many other, far more serious errors are to be found in certain manuscripts effectively worshipped by today's 'originals-onlyists.'

John Burdon, Dean of Chichester and exhaustive researcher into the Text of the New Testament, pin-pointed the satanic conspiracy against the holy scriptures as follows. See The Revision Revised, p 334.

“Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel...Corrupting influences...were actively at work throughout the first hundred and fifty years after the death of St John the Divine.”

God COULD have prevented these from occurring, but it would seem that He hasn't. If He has, then He hasn't TOLD us which ones are the ones He has.

He has. Please don't insult our intelligence by bearing false witness, Romans 13:9.

Check The Revision Revised by Dean Burdon, The King James Bible Defended by Edward F. Hills, Final Authority by Dr William Grady, New Age Versions and Hazardous Materials by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger. See also Our Authorized Bible Vindicated by Benjamin Wilkinson, available online,
http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicate.html

Did the Catholic Church Give Us the Bible? by David Daniels is a good place to start.

5. The closest you can get to reading the original text is to read it in the original language.

Chapter and verse? None given, typical.

Since most people (including myself) can't read Hebrew, Greek, or the other ancient languages used in these texts we are dependent on men who can to give us a translation. They will translate according to their understanding - hence we get rubbish translations from godless men who think they can put a spin on the text to suit their own ends. **An implied slur on the King's men. See The Translators to the Reader by Dr Miles Smith and note the underlined statement.**

"Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark"

6. God CAN cause a totally inerrant translation to be made. However, unless HE TELLS US which one this is we need to use discernment and consider the qualifications of the men who make the translation (as I believe you pointed out). I believe that Wycliffe translators spend years learning languages and understanding idioms etc before they attempt a translation into a native tongue. They would then, I believe, seek to translate from the original languages.

Examples? None – again, typical.

It may be of interest to note that a Bro. Peter Heisey and colleagues are preparing a Romanian translation from the 1611 Holy Bible. Bro. Heisey is best not trifled with about "the original languages." Rest assured that he will tie you in knots. The anti-priesthood-of-all-believers 'originals-onlyists' of the Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee members know this to their cost and have been forced to 'plead the 5th' instead of answering Bro. Heisey's penetrating questions on Scrivener's Greek Text.

I also understand (but am ready to be corrected) that not all the men engaged in the production of the AV were convinced believers -

Be advised to avoid insinuation.

"Thou shalt not raise a false report: put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness" Exodus 23:1.

King James insisted on having some of his own men involved
Scripturally, he would have been entitled to do so. To imply otherwise is in direct defiance of scripture, Ecclesiastes 8:4. Check The Men Behind the KJV by Gustavus Paine for insight into the appointment of the translators.

7. The claim that the AV as a translation is inerrant and inspired smacks to me of heresy

Chapter and verse? None given, typical.

in that it makes a claim which goes beyond what scripture claims for itself.

Then "what saith the scripture?" Romans 4:3. It seems that yet again, 'Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.'

8. If the AV were "inspired" then where does that leave translations into other languages -

Where God appropriately placed them. See Hazardous Materials p 115.

"Yet God's inspired words can still be found for those who seek them, in Bibles such as the Spanish Valera 1602 Purificada, the Morrison Chinese Bible, Bible King James Française and others."

how do we know which of them (if any) are inspired?

Because inspired translations feature repeatedly in the scriptures. See <http://samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=29.htm> and <http://samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=30.htm>.

Also what about those who believed before the AV?

They followed the faithful precursors of the AV1611 such as the English Bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation; Tyndale, Matthew, Great, Geneva, Bishops', in fulfilment of Psalm 12:6, 7. See The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship by Dr Peter S. Ruckman pp 110ff.

9. I'm sure that the translators of the AV with their Christ-centred attitude, would have had the humility to accept that theirs was simply an attempt to convey the meaning of the original language (let's avoid the issue of text/manuscript).

How about obeying 1 Thessalonians 5:21, to "Prove all things"?

See The Epistle Dedicatory for the explanation of what the King's men sought to achieve. Note the under-linings, with reference to today's 'originals-onlyists' and their ideological ancestors.

"So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor Instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their Anvil; we may rest secure, supported within by truth and innocency of a good conscience, having walked the ways of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord; and sustained without by the powerful protection of Your Majesty's grace and favour, which will ever give countenance to honest and Christian endeavours against bitter censures and uncharitable imputations."

I'm sure they would also have rejoiced to have the increased understanding of the meaning of specific idioms which more modern translators have.

Examples? None. Again, typical. Check the expression "God forbid" in the 1611 Holy Bible and the modern counterfeits and expressions such as "is baptised," "is dead," "is freed," "are saved," "am crucified," "is risen" etc. in the 1611 Holy Bible versus the modern counterfeits for the mastery of the King's men with respect to idiom and note the observation of Dean Burgon with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible vs. the RV. Dean Burgon's remarks apply to all subsequent modern counterfeits. See The Revision Revised pp 154ff and New Age Versions pp 242ff.

"The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout. We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far...Examples of their inconsistency reduces the whole matter to a question of Taste...The vast number of cases in which they have forsaken their own rule shows that it could not be followed without changing elements of the original.. They virtually admit that they have been all along unjustly forcing on an independent language an alien yoke.""

10. I've not checked with my pastor (who has a good understanding of Hebrew and Greek etc) where there are "errors" in the AV - but he frequently explains to us where the original language is difficult to translate.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable. The King's men explained any such places better. See the material from Challenges #5, #6, #7 in Flotsam Flush on the TfT website.

Often the difficulty is that alternative translations are equally valid - there seems to be an intentional ambivalence which conveys not one, but two or more ideas, all of which are valid and helpful, but which cannot be expressed in a single translation.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable. Thus far, not one specific 'just exception' to the Text of the 1611 Holy Bible has been raised. None will be in what remains.

"As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come" Proverbs 26:2.

God used the original languages to in-errantly and infallibly convey what He wished to.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

This time, it must be shown that God is limited to "the original languages" in what He can say and how He chooses to say it.

Otherwise the ‘originals-onlyist’ is guilty of calling God a liar in response to Jeremiah 32:27.

“Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh: is there any thing too hard for me?”

11. We must take care not to have a view on what God SHOULD have done, and then insist that this is what God HAS done. To ask “why would God do ..?” expecting an answer when God Himself has not made the answer clear is to stand in judgement on God Himself, or to presume to stand in the place of God when we answer - so we need to take care when applying our own fault-ridden logic to the actions of the Almighty - in case we stand accused of doing something which doesn't make sense to us, calling His actions into question.

See response to point 3 above.

12. On the issue of the book of Revelation - although the word “church” may not be used throughout,

The word “church” IS not used throughout the Book. Note again Romans 13:9.

the church is frequently alluded to in “type” or figure.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

The truth (and when was any ‘originals-onlyist’ ever genuinely interested in THAT?) is that the word “saints” is mentioned 13 times in the Book of Revelation, referring explicitly and specifically to – wait for it – saints, i.e. saints, s-a-i-n-t-s, showing that the notion of supposed “types” and “figures” is irrelevant. However, the word “saints” has FIVE applications in the Book of Revelation, some of which overlap.

1. All living and martyred Revelation 6:9-11 saints during the events of the great tribulation, Matthew 24:21, Luke 20:38, Revelation 7:14, Revelation 5:8, 8:3, 4.

2. Tribulation saints on earth during the great tribulation, many of whom suffer martyrdom, Revelation 6:9-11, 13:7, 10, 14:12.

3. Old Testament, Church Age and Tribulation saints martyred i.e. murdered by Catholics and all others e.g. Mohammedans, Marxists, pre-papal Babylonians etc. who are part of MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH, Revelation 17:5 (count the number of words and letters to see if the 1611 Holy Bible is/is not ‘inspired’), Revelation 16:6, 17:6, 18:24.

4. Old Testament e.g. Enoch Genesis 5:24, Jude 14, Church Age and Tribulation saints, martyred or not martyred, who return with the Lord Jesus Christ at the Second Advent, Revelation 19:8. See Psalm 45:14, Ephesians 3:15.

5. ALL saints, past i.e. Old Testament, present i.e. New Testament Church Age, future i.e. Tribulation and Millennial saints, Revelation 11:18, 15:3, 20:9.

So-called “types” and “figures” don’t figure, at all. 2 Timothy 2:15 DOES but since when was any ‘originals-onlyist’ ever genuinely interested in studying the SCRIPTURES (not ‘the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek’) and rightly dividing “the word of truth”?

Also when we have described God's dealings with humanity as a whole there is no need to separate out the church - since we partake to a great extent in the temporal judgements which God brings on mankind. And again beware of imposing on scripture pre-conceived systems as to how God will work when He has chosen to hide many things of a temporal nature from us all.

See response to point 3 above.

The scripture contains all that is necessary for faith and practice - not fortune telling.

“But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled” Matthew 26:56.

"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" Luke 24:27.

"(Which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures)," Romans 1:2.

"But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:" Romans 16:26.

"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed" Galatians 3:8.

"Despise not prophesying" 1 Thessalonians 5:20.

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation" 2 Peter 1:20.

"...for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" Revelation 19:10.

"Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another" Ephesians 4:25.

Men need to come to repentance for sin and faith in a Saviour who will keep them - not to know times and seasons which are deliberately hidden.

Chapter and verse? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

However, note the following.

"And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power" Acts 1:7, NOT "which are deliberately hidden."

The disciples were simply told to WAIT for God's revelation of "the times and the seasons" 1 Thessalonians 5:1, like they were told to "tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high" Luke 24:49.

What follows is an example of progressive revelation, Amos 3:7.

"Surely the Lord GOD will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."

"But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night" 1 Thessalonians 5:1-2.

What follows in 1 Thessalonians 5:3-9 is an outline of events relating to the Second Advent and what the believers are to do in advance preparation for it, as the Lord inserted a reminder in Revelation 16:15.

"Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

The surest way to accumulate "shame" at "the judgment seat of Christ" Romans 14:10, 1 Corinthians 3:11-15 is to wallow in wilful ignorance, 1 Corinthians 14:38, instead of searching the scriptures as the Lord commanded and commended as nobility within the Body of Christ, John 5:39, Acts 17:11.

Deacons in particular should do so, in that they are commanded to be "Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience" 1 Timothy 3:9.

God bless you brother
David

David replies (**IN GREEN!**)

Here goes... but from previous responses I don't hold out much hope. My response in **green**

On 14/09/2011 19:43, John Davis wrote:

David, if this doesn't 'sort out your errors' I fear nothing will!

Enjoy!!!

John - thanks again for the considerable effort you've put into your reply. However, I'm not convinced by your arguments.

They weren't arguments but factual statements, supported by scripture. To imply otherwise is to betray the attitude of a dishonest sceptic, in disobedience to Romans 12:17, which gives a command to "Provide things honest." I thought you were trying to establish a case with statements - which in my thinking is an "argument" (thinks - this is gonna be tough!)

When writing "on the fly" it's very easy to fail to convey what you (I in this case) wish/intend to - so I reply with trembling.

By the way, I'm not a pastor, just a deacon in my local fellowship - but we have a good man who expounds the Word of God each Lord's Day, and I believe in the infallible inerrant Word of God as originally given as does he.
(<http://www.bulkingtoncongregational.org/>)

"Word" is not the correct term when applied to the scriptures. Check John 1:1, 14, 1 John 1:1, 5:7, Revelation 19:13. OK - so we know that the term "Word" refers to the Son of God - but it also commonly used to refer to what God has spoken and we have written down in the scriptures/ the Bible - sorry if I confused you.

Where is this 'original' between two covers that can be said to be "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16? (Ref 1) We no longer have the originals. The originals were the inspired text. We have translations of well-preserved copies and not-so-well preserved copies.

I have contact with a church that makes exactly the same profession. They will not, and cannot, answer the above question and have not been able to for 32 years since the church's inception. Does that bring to mind the 32 years? Anyone who tried to pull the "as originally given" scam in a court of law would be required to produce an original manuscript and would be exposed for the fraud he is. However, there's a lot that you can get away with in a 'fundamentalist-mutual-admiration-society' compared with what you could in a properly constituted court of law. You might wish to apply the same reasoning to the claim that the AV is "perfect".

Anyway which version of the AV do you mean - the one we have now or the "original" - according to the Cambridge University library we do not have any authoritative copies of the original. One existed in 1655 but apparently perished in the Great fire of London?

Nevertheless, to overcome the charge of dishonest scepticism, an 'originals onlyist' MUST answer the above question, explicitly, with respect to what is extant between two covers, otherwise he is also a Nicolaitan usurper who has violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, Revelation 2:15.

So between two covers we no longer have a "perfect" copy of the complete scriptures. We may have "perfect" or near-perfect copies of specific parts of the "original text".

Let me summarise my position/concerns again, since I think our exchange has become a little confused

On one side only. Bible believers "by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil"
Hebrews 5:14.

I will assume that this is not meant as an insult,

only a claim that you believe you have perfect discernment of good and evil.

1. The original texts were infallible and inerrant

"Were" infallible and inerrant? What about NOW? see (Ref 1)

2. Men are fallible - but God uses infallible*** men.

*****Freudian Slip. Check Ecclesiastes 7:20. Not a freudian slip, a typo - I meant fallible - sorry!**

He uses me and you, and though what we do is often/always flawed He can bring about His sovereign*** purpose come what may.

*****As a point of information, the word "sovereign," strictly speaking, should not be applied to either God or any of His doings. The word does not appear in any English Bible for 1,000 years between the 7th and 17th centuries. It first appears in the Jesuit Douai-Rheims Bible, revised by Challoner in the 18th century. See Judges 5:11, Isaiah 3:1, 10:16, 33, 51:22, Amos 5:16, Jude 4. 'Sovereign' is a weak French word imported into English in the 12th century by French-speaking kings of England and applies to a mortal, earthly ruler, not "the LORD God of hosts" 2 Samuel 5:10.**

Why do you want to argue about this? God is the KING of kings - King=sovereign.

Naturally, the Frenchman John Calvin used the term to deny the free will of men with respect to salvation, even though "freewill" is a Biblical term, Leviticus 22:18, 21, 23, 23:38. See The Language of the King James Bible by Gail Riplinger, p 66.

Calvin didn't exactly deny "free will" - he explained that our wills are only free to do what we will to do - and that we, by nature, will to rebel against God. This is, in one sense, an absence of free will - in that we by nature WILL NOT obey God. We need the new birth and a new will.

3. Translations are nothing more than translations. Languages differ in the way things are expressed. The vernacular tongue contains idioms which may not translate directly from one language to another. Hence, apart from problems with errors creeping in by transcription, there is the difficulty of comprehension of what was originally intended by the idioms used.

May we please see chapter and verse to substantiate any and all of the above obfuscation?

I'm sorry if I've not made myself clear that translation from one language to another may (depending on the ideas being expressed) involve a change to the meaning.

4. Before you get hot under the collar, I believe that there are sufficient, good quality ancient manuscripts to make the issue of "errors" a minor problem - many of them being simply spelling errors.

Examples? None – which is typical of dishonest sceptics. Sceptics of what - the claim that the AV is perfect?

The truth is that many other, far more serious errors are to be found in certain manuscripts effectively worshipped by today's 'originals-onlyists.'

Agreed - so be careful which version you use, and compare translation with translation - or if you can master the original languages (which I can't) see what the original language said!

John Burdon, Dean of Chichester and exhaustive researcher into the Text of the New Testament, pin-pointed the satanic conspiracy against the holy scriptures as follows. See The Revision Revised, p 334.

"Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel...Corrupting influences...were actively at work throughout the first hundred and fifty years after the death of St John the Divine."

I don't dispute that corrupt translations have been made, only that an altogether perfect translation has ever been made.

God COULD have prevented these from occurring, but it would seem that He hasn't. If He has, then He hasn't TOLD us which ones are the ones He has.

He has. Please don't insult our intelligence by bearing false witness, Romans 13:9.

You seem to enjoy asking for chapter and verse but here you seem to invest infallibility and inspiration in men's arguments.

I, in response, ask for chapter and verse for where God has SAID that the AV is perfect.

The idea is complete nonsense since the AV came later in history than the revelation which God gave.

**Check The Revision Revised by Dean Burgon, The King James Bible Defended by Edward F. Hills, Final Authority by Dr William Grady, New Age Versions and Hazardous Materials by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger. See also Our Authorized Bible Vindicated by Benjamin Wilkinson, available online,
http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicate.html**

Thanks for the reference - I haven't read all of it, but I don't believe it answers the point I made.

Anyway in his conclusion he says

"The original Scriptures were written by direct inspiration of God. This can hardly be said of any translation."

Did the Catholic Church Give Us the Bible? by David Daniels is a good place to start.

5. The closest you can get to reading the original text is to read it in the original language.

Chapter and verse? None given, typical.

Aw common! Be serious. If you expect me to find a Bible reference for every reasonable every-day statement we'll be here for ever.

Since most people (including myself) can't read Hebrew, Greek, or the other ancient languages used in these texts we are dependent on men who can to give us a translation. They will translate according to their understanding - hence we get rubbish translations from godless men who think they can put a spin on the text to suit their own ends.
An implied slur on the King's men.

I thought you would have agreed that translations like the Douey or "Good News" were rubbish

See The Translators to the Reader by Dr Miles Smith and note the underlined statement.

"Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark"

a "good one better" NOT a "good one perfect".

6. God CAN cause a totally inerrant translation to be made. However, unless HE TELLS US which one this is we need to use discernment and consider the qualifications of the men who make the translation (as I believe you pointed out). I believe that Wycliffe translators spend years learning languages and understanding idioms etc before they attempt a translation into a native tongue. They would then, I believe, seek to translate from the original languages.

Examples? None – again, typical.

My point was - how do we know which TRANSLATION is perfect unless God tells us

It may be of interest to note that a Bro. Peter Heisey and colleagues are preparing a Romanian translation from the 1611 Holy Bible. Bro. Heisey is best not trifled with about “the original languages.” Rest assured that he will tie you in knots. The anti-priesthood-of-all-believers ‘originals-onlyists’ of the Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee members know this to their cost and have been forced to ‘plead the 5th’ instead of answering Bro. Heisey’s penetrating questions on Scrivener’s Greek Text.

I also understand (but am ready to be corrected) that not all the men engaged in the production of the AV were convinced believers -

Be advised to avoid insinuation.

“Thou shalt not raise a false report: put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness” Exodus 23:1.

King James insisted on having some of his own men involved
Scripturally, he would have been entitled to do so. To imply otherwise is in direct defiance of scripture, Ecclesiastes 8:4. Check The Men Behind the KJV by Gustavus Paine for insight into the appointment of the translators.

I wish I could remember where I read this comment. By the way most of those involved in the translation would have agreed with Calvin and Luther on the "bondage of the will" - so perhaps in your eyes they're not perfect either.

7. The claim that the AV as a translation is inerrant and inspired smacks to me of heresy

Chapter and verse? None given, typical.

It was a statement which I thought was explained by the 2nd half of the sentence

in that it makes a claim which goes beyond what scripture claims for itself.

Then “what saith the scripture?” Romans 4:3. It seems that yet again, ‘Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.’

Surely it's for you to provide chapter and verse for where the scripture claims that the AV is a perfect translation

8. If the AV were "inspired" then where does that leave translations into other languages -

Where God appropriately placed them. See Hazardous Materials p 115.

“Yet God’s inspired words can still be found for those who seek them, in Bibles such as the Spanish Valera 1602 Purificada, the Morrison Chinese Bible, Bible King James Française and others.”

how do we know which of them (if any) are inspired?

**Because inspired translations feature repeatedly in the scriptures. See
<http://samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=29.htm> and <http://samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=30.htm>.**

The point he makes is that it was the words which were WRITTEN which were inspired - he is dealing with people speaking in one language and it being recorded in another - so my question remains - how do we know which WRITTEN translations are inspired if WRITTEN translations of the scriptures are inspired as you claim?

Also what about those who believed before the AV?

They followed the faithful precursors of the AV1611 such as the English Bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation; Tyndale, Matthew, Great, Geneva, Bishops', in fulfilment of Psalm 12:6, 7. See The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship by Dr Peter S. Ruckman pp. 110ff.

So God had left them without the perfect translation.

9. I'm sure that the translators of the AV with their Christ-centred attitude, would have had the humility to accept that theirs was simply an attempt to convey the meaning of the original language (let's avoid the issue of text/manuscript).

How about obeying 1 Thessalonians 5:21, to "Prove all things"?

I don't follow - I accept that we are to "prove"/test all things - which is why I'm concerned that you seem to have a wacky idea about the AV TRANSLATION being inspired

See The Epistle Dedicatory for the explanation of what the King's men sought to achieve. Note the under-linings, with reference to today's 'originals-onlyists' and their ideological ancestors.

"So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor Instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their Anvil; we may rest secure, supported within by truth and innocency of a good conscience, having walked the ways of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord; and sustained without by the powerful protection of Your Majesty's grace and favour, which will ever give countenance to honest and Christian endeavours against bitter censures and uncharitable imputations."

I'm sure they would also have rejoiced to have the increased understanding of the meaning of specific idioms which more modern translators have.

Examples? None. Again, typical. Check the expression "God forbid" in the 1611 Holy Bible and the modern counterfeits and expressions such as "is baptised," "is dead," "is freed," "are saved," "am crucified," "is risen" etc. in the 1611 Holy Bible versus the modern counterfeits for the mastery of the King's men with respect to idiom and note the observation of Dean Burgon with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible vs. the RV. Dean Burgon's remarks apply to all subsequent modern counterfeits. See The Revision Revised pp. 154ff and New Age Versions pp. 242ff.

"The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout. We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far...Examples of their inconsistency reduces the whole matter to a question of Taste...The vast number of cases in which they have forsaken their own rule shows that it could not be followed without changing elements of the original.. They virtually admit that they have been all along unjustly forcing on an independent language an alien yoke.""

Sorry - I don't have a knowledge of the original languages so I can't check which translation is the more accurate.

10. I've not checked with my pastor (who has a good understanding of Hebrew and Greek etc) where there are "errors" in the AV - but he frequently explains to us where the original language is difficult to translate.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable. The King's men explained any such places better. See the material from Challenges #5, #6, #7 in Flotsam Flush on the TfT website.

Sorry, again I don't understand the original languages - but where my pastor explains that the original language can be rendered in different ways and tells us what they are, I tend to think that he's not telling "porkies".

Often the difficulty is that alternative translations are equally valid - there seems to be an intentional ambivalence which conveys not one, but two or more ideas, all of which are valid and helpful, but which cannot be expressed in a single translation.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable. Thus far, not one specific 'just exception' to the Text of the 1611 Holy Bible has been raised. None will be in what remains.

This is taking a long time!! If you really would be convinced by examples of poor translation in the AV I'll have a word with my pastor and get some - but don't please waste my time if you're not prepared to listen to reason.

"As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come" Proverbs 26:2.

"Like a thorn that goes into the hand of a drunkard, so is a proverb in the mouth of fools" Proverbs 26:9 - not that I think you to be a fool

God used the original languages to in-errantly and infallibly convey what He wished to.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

Why do you need the above statement justified???

This time, it must be shown that God is limited to "the original languages" in what He can say and how He chooses to say it.

NO - God is NOT LIMITED to anything except good - what MUST be shown is that He ordained inerrant and infallible translations through fallible men.

Otherwise the 'originals-onlyist' is guilty of calling God a liar in response to Jeremiah 32:27.

Nonsense - because we're NOT claiming that God is limited.

There is indeed nothing too hard for Him. What I am questioning is what He has ACTUALLY done - not wishing to ascribe an act of infallible inspiration to something which is not. To claim divine inspiration where there is none (i.e. the process of translation however good and well intentioned) is to claim to speak from God when God has not spoken - exactly the what the false prophets of Jeremiah's day did.

"Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh: is there anything too hard for me?"

11. We must take care not to have a view on what God SHOULD have done, and then insist that this is what God HAS done. To ask "why would God do ..?" expecting an answer when God Himself has not made the answer clear is to stand in judgement on God Himself, or to presume to stand in the place of God when we answer - so we need to take care when applying our own fault-ridden logic to the actions of the Almighty - in case we stand accused of doing something which doesn't make sense to us, calling His actions into question.

See response to point 3 above.

I can't see what your response to point 3 has to do with this!

12. On the issue of the book of Revelation - although the word "church" may not be used throughout,

The word "church" IS not used throughout the Book. Note again Romans 13:9.

the church is frequently alluded to in "type" or figure.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

The truth (and when was any 'originals-onlyist' ever genuinely interested in THAT?) is that the word "saints" is mentioned 13 times in the Book of Revelation, referring explicitly and specifically to – wait for it – saints, i.e. saints, s-a-i-n-t-s, showing that the notion of supposed "types" and "figures" is irrelevant. However, the word "saints" has FIVE applications in the Book of Revelation, some of which overlap.

1. All living and martyred Revelation 6:9-11 saints during the events of the great tribulation, Matthew 24:21, Luke 20:38, Revelation 7:14, Revelation 5:8, 8:3, 4.
2. Tribulation saints on earth during the great tribulation, many of whom suffer martyrdom, Revelation 6:9-11, 13:7, 10, 14:12.
3. Old Testament, Church Age and Tribulation saints martyred i.e. murdered by Catholics and all others e.g. Mohammedans, Marxists, pre-papal Babylonians etc. who are part of MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH, Revelation 17:5 (count the number of words and letters to see if the 1611 Holy Bible is/is not ‘inspired’), Revelation 16:6, 17:6, 18:24.
4. Old Testament e.g. Enoch Genesis 5:24, Jude 14, Church Age and Tribulation saints, martyred or not martyred, who return with the Lord Jesus Christ at the Second Advent, Revelation 19:8. See Psalm 45:14, Ephesians 3:15.
5. ALL saints, past i.e. Old Testament, present i.e. New Testament Church Age, future i.e. Tribulation and Millennial saints, Revelation 11:18, 15:3, 20:9.

So-called “types” and “figures” don’t figure, at all. 2 Timothy 2:15 DOES but since when was any ‘originals-onlyist’ ever genuinely interested in studying the SCRIPTURES (not ‘the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek’) and rightly dividing “the word of truth”?

Also when we have described God’s dealings with humanity as a whole there is no need to separate out the church - since we partake to a great extent in the temporal judgements which God brings on mankind. And again beware of imposing on scripture pre-conceived systems as to how God will work when He has chosen to hide many things of a temporal nature from us all.

See response to point 3 above.

I can't see what your response to point 3 has to do with this!

Anyway let's concentrate on one issue at a time - when we've resolve the issue of the good but NOT infallible AV the we might come back to this

The scripture contains all that is necessary for faith and practice - not fortune telling.

“But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled” Matthew 26:56.

“And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself” Luke 24:27.

“(Which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures,)” Romans 1:2.

“But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:” Romans 16:26.

“And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed” Galatians 3:8.

“Despise not prophecyings” 1 Thessalonians 5:20.

“Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation” 2 Peter 1:20.

“...for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy” Revelation 19:10.

"Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another"
Ephesians 4:25.

Men need to come to repentance for sin and faith in a Saviour who will keep them - not to know times and seasons which are deliberately hidden.

Chapter and verse? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

See Deuteronomy 29:29 - admittedly the word may be secret things - but I think you'll see from the context that these are contrasted with things revealed. Hence I think hidden is probably OK as an alternative - unless you think that God has told us EVERYTHING He could have I don't think there would be enough books in the world!

However, note the following.

"And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power" Acts 1:7, NOT "which are deliberately hidden."

The disciples were simply told to WAIT for God's revelation of "the times and the seasons" 1 Thessalonians 5:1, like they were told to "tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high" Luke 24:49.

What follows is an example of progressive revelation, Amos 3:7.

"Surely the Lord GOD will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."

"But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night" 1 Thessalonians 5:1-2.

What follows in 1 Thessalonians 5:3-9 is an outline of events relating to the Second Advent and what the believers are to do in advance preparation for it, as the Lord inserted a reminder in Revelation 16:15.

"Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

The surest way to accumulate "shame" at "the judgment seat of Christ" Romans 14:10, 1 Corinthians 3:11-15 is to wallow in wilful ignorance, 1 Corinthians 14:38, instead of searching the scriptures as the Lord commanded and commended as nobility within the Body of Christ, John 5:39, Acts 17:11.

Deacons in particular should do so, in that they are commanded to be "Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience" 1 Timothy 3:9.

God bless you brother

David

John and Alan strike back in **BLUE this time...**

Here goes... but from previous responses I don't hold out much hope. My response in green You have NO hope & what 'hope' you have you can't depend on because you DO NOT have a Final Authority in which to turn! In fact, you can't be sure you are even saved according to Scripture because you have a book that has errors in & you trust men like your deceived pastor (who is a Bible 'corrector') to tell you WHERE those 'errors' are! As stated a number of times now, YOU have NO Final Authority! YOU do NOT have a PERFECT Bible! YOU cannot even read the so called 'authority' you keep trying to point to as YOU don't read Hebrew or Greek! In fact, you have absolutely NOTHING to offer any single Christian in regard to TRUSTING in the word of God!

I have a **PERFECT FINAL AUTHORITY** in which to turn - YOU don't!
I am a Bible BELIEVER - YOU are a Bible 'corrector'!

That really is the nuts & bolts of the whole matter!

I trust the AV 100%

YOU trust nothing & have nothing to trust!

I KNOW where the Scripture of truth IS - YOU have no idea!

You keep talking about the 'originals' yet you have never seen them so how do you KNOW they were EVEN 'inspired' or PERFECT? How do you know seeing as they DON'T exist!

YOU limit God! I don't!

God has told me in His word that He would preserve His WORDS - I believe Him, YOU don't!

My God has PRESERVED His word for me today! YOUR 'god' hasn't!

Like I said 'East to West' we stand & NEVER the twain shall meet!

You haven't even told me what Bible you use have you???

You have NOT shown me one single 'error' in the AV (which of course is impossible!)

You haven't DARED to say that the Holy Spirit has shown you an 'error' in the AV!!!

I accept what God has said - YOU deny His very words & by NOT taking heed to this warning you will reap what you have sown at the Judgment Seat of Christ (NOT the Great White Throne - just in case you were wondering!) So I shall address your ERRORS as usual, but because of pride & stubbornness, I fear you are not man enough to check them out yourself, but instead you keep running to ANOTHER Bible 'corrector' (i.e. your 'pastor' - & he certainly is NOT qualified to even BE a pastor according to Scripture!!! Show me one pastor in the Scripture who corrected the word of God? & as stated in previous emails, the word 'Scripture' NEVER refers to the originals... funny ain't it!!!)

So here we go again, eyes down for a full house!!! Hold on tight because you are in for a rough ride yet again!

On 14/09/2011 19:43, John Davis wrote:

David, if this doesn't 'sort out your errors' I fear nothing will!

Enjoy!!!

John - thanks again for the considerable effort you've put into your reply. However, I'm not convinced by your arguments.

They weren't arguments but factual statements, supported by scripture. To imply otherwise is to betray the attitude of a dishonest sceptic, in disobedience to Romans 12:17, which gives a command to "Provide things honest." I thought you were trying to establish a case with statements - which in my thinking is an "argument" (thinks - this is gonna be tough!)

"Factual statements supported by scripture". Omission is a besetting sin of Bible critics. Bible 'correctors' are always weak on evidence & very shallow when it comes to Scripture BACK-UP!

When writing "on the fly" it's very easy to fail to convey what you (I in this case) wish/intend to - so I reply with trembling.

By the way, I'm not a pastor, just a deacon in my local fellowship - but we have a good man who expounds the Word of God each Lord's Day, and I believe in the infallible inerrant Word of God as originally given as does he. (<http://www.bulkingtoncongregational.org/>)

"Word" is not the correct term when applied to the scriptures. Check John 1:1, 14, 1 John 1:1, 5:7, Revelation 19:13. OK - so we know that the term "Word" refers to the Son of God - but it also commonly used to refer to what God has spoken and we have written down in the scriptures/ the Bible - sorry if I confused you.

No confusion at this end. Simply error at the other. We know how to RIGHTLY DIVIDE THE WORD OF TRUTH, hence we understand the difference between the Rapture & the 2nd Advent; the Kingdom of God v the Kingdom of Heaven; justification & imputed righteousness in the OT compared to the NT & WHERE we can find a copy of the PROMISED, PERFECT word of God between two covers! No Bible 'corrector' has that knowledge, understanding or 'enlightenment!!!'

Where is this 'original' between two covers that can be said to be "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16? (Ref 1) We no longer have the originals. The originals were the inspired text. We have translations of well-preserved copies and not-so-well preserved copies.

Examples? As usual, none given, as always! How do you KNOW the originals were PERFECT, God used sinful men didn't He? Hypocrisy as normal!

I have contact with a church that makes exactly the same profession. They will not, and cannot, answer the above question and have not been able to for 32 years since the church's inception. Does that bring to a halt the 32 years? Anyone who tried to pull the "as originally given" scam in a court of law would be required to produce an original manuscript and would be exposed for the fraud he is. However, there's a lot that you can get away with in a 'fundamentalist-mutual-admiration-society' compared with what you could in a properly constituted court of law. You might wish to apply the same reasoning to the claim that the AV is "perfect".

Mere insinuation. Check out the standard for truthful witness in a court of law in this country for centuries.

Anyway which version of the AV do you mean - the one we have now or the "original" - according to the Cambridge University library we do not have any authoritative copies of the original. One existed in 1655 but apparently perished in the Great fire of London?

Any AV1611 extant. The typos/omissions in the early editions are well-known and have been corrected, so they are not an issue. It's up to the critics to show where imperfections exist in any of the extant copies so that it is not "finally authoritative." So far, zero success rate, which will be the pattern for the future. This is a very lame & weak argument that ALL Bible 'correctors' jump on thinking they know something! This has been answered so many times it is amazing that they still run to this! If you want info on this just let me know!

Nevertheless, to overcome the charge of dishonest scepticism, an 'originals onlyist' MUST answer the above question, explicitly, with respect to what is extant between two covers, otherwise he is also a Nicolaitan usurper who has violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, Revelation 2:15.

So between two covers we no longer have a "perfect" copy of the complete scriptures. We may have "perfect" or near-perfect copies of specific parts of the "original text".

In other words, no final authority between two covers exists that can be called "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God." Sheer Nicolaitanism!!! Now that is an absolutely amazing statement for a Christian to make! Did you hear what you just said? Think about that for a while! A man gets saved & comes to you & says "Is this Bible you have given me that God wrote, perfect?" What are you going to say? Then he asks "So how do I KNOW what is right & what is wrong? Do I have to keep running to you & your Bible correcting pastor?" NOW who has the Final Authority... see how it works! You name me ONE Bible you can TRUST other than the AV? Now like ALL the questions I ask... YOU NEVER ANSWER THEM! Don't get me wrong David, I KNOW why!!!

Let me summarise my position/concerns again, since I think our exchange has become a little confused

On one side only. Bible believers "by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil"
Hebrews 5:14.

I will assume that this is not meant as an insult,

It's meant to draw attention to "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21, something Bible critics have a hard time finding. I'm interested in THE TRUTH, but along the way I haven't found a modern day Bible that comes even close to giving DISCERNMENT like the AV!!!

only a claim that you believe you have perfect discernment of good and evil.

Simply an application of James 1:5- Scripture ALL the time, see how it works! (Heb 5v13 For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe.)

1. The original texts were infallible and inerrant

"Were" infallible and inerrant? What about NOW? see (Ref 1)

2. Men are fallible - but God uses infallible*** men.

***Freudian Slip. Check Ecclesiastes 7:20. Not a freudian slip, a typo - I meant fallible - sorry! You're forgiven, I make many!

He uses me and you, and though what we do is often/always flawed He can bring about His sovereign*** purpose come what may.

***As a point of information, the word "sovereign," strictly speaking, should not be applied to either God or any of His doings. The word does not appear in any English Bible for 1,000 years between the 7th and 17th centuries. It first appears in the Jesuit Douai-Rheims Bible, revised by Challoner in the 18th century. See Judges 5:11, Isaiah 3:1, 10:16, 33, 51:22, Amos 5:16, Jude 4. 'Sovereign' is a weak French word imported into English in the 12th century by French-speaking kings of England and applies to a mortal, earthly ruler, not "the LORD God of hosts" 2 Samuel 5:10.

Why do you want to argue about this? God is the KING of kings - King=sovereign.

Yet again, the authority of "the scripture of truth" has been bypassed, typical Nicolaitanism. Ducking & diving a bit David!

Naturally, the Frenchman John Calvin used the term to deny the free will of men with respect to salvation, even though "freewill" is a Biblical term, Leviticus 22:18, 21, 23, 23:38. See The Language of the King James Bible by Gail Riplinger, p 66.

Calvin didn't exactly deny "free will" - he explained that our wills are only free to do what we will to do - and that we, by nature, will to rebel against God. This is, in one sense, an absence of free will - in that we by nature WILL NOT obey God. We need the new birth and a new will.

Chapter and verse? None given – as usual!!!

3. Translations are nothing more than translations. Languages differ in the way things are expressed. The vernacular tongue contains idioms which may not translate directly from one language to another. Hence, apart from problems with errors creeping in by transcription, there is the difficulty of comprehension of what was originally intended by the idioms used.

May we please see chapter and verse to substantiate any and all of the above obfuscation?

I'm sorry if I've not made myself clear that translation from one language to another may (depending on the ideas being expressed) involve a change to the meaning.

Examples as they affect "the scripture of truth"? Again, none given. Not being funny David, but you're saying NOTHING & giving NO examples, NO Scripture back up, NO not anything!!! You just keep saying "You don't convince me!" Very poor!

4. Before you get hot under the collar, I believe that there are sufficient, good quality ancient manuscripts to make the issue of "errors" a minor problem - many of them being simply spelling errors.

Examples? None – which is typical of dishonest sceptics. Sceptics of what - the claim that the AV is perfect?

Dishonest Sceptics, noting the omission again, who cannot specify a final authority between two covers - to think that you DON'T have a Final Authority in which to turn is MIND BLOWING? Argue with a JW & by pulling out your NIV & he'll laugh at you! Talk to a Roman Catholic about confessing your sins to each other, by pulling out your NKJV & he'll think it's Christmas!!! Are you 100% sure you don't think God has preserved His word? Do you KNOW why signs & wonders were once used? (Read Mark 16v20) Do you KNOW what we have TODAY instead? 2 Pet 1v19 - & do you KNOW why we DON'T need the sign gifts anymore??? See where it's going?

The truth is that many other, far more serious errors are to be found in certain manuscripts effectively worshipped by today's 'originals-onlyists.'

Agreed - so be careful which version you use,

The correct word is "believe." Bible critics are loathe to specify which final authority between two covers that they actually believe. What is YOURS?

and compare translation with translation - or if you can master the original languages (which I can't) see what the original language said!

Chapter and verse with respect to the necessity for "the original languages" in order to know what God actually said? None given – as usual. Very poor again! Why compare a SATANIC counterfeit with another SATANIC counterfeit?

John Burdon, Dean of Chichester and exhaustive researcher into the Text of the New Testament, pin-pointed the satanic conspiracy against the holy scriptures as follows. See The Revision Revised, p 334.

"Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel...Corrupting influences...were actively at work throughout the first hundred and fifty years after the death of St John the Divine."

I don't dispute that corrupt translations have been made, only that an altogether perfect translation has ever been made.

Examples of imperfections in the 1611 Holy Bible? None given. Some Bible critics, e.g. James White, have sought to. They lied. See The Scholarship-Only Controversy by Dr Ruckman. Show me an ERROR in the AV that the Holy Spirit has shown YOU, not what another man (which you seem to want to keep running to) has shown you!

God COULD have prevented these from occurring, but it would seem that He hasn't. If He has, then He hasn't TOLD us which ones are the ones He has.

He has. Please don't insult our intelligence by bearing false witness, Romans 13:9.

You seem to enjoy asking for chapter and verse - Jesus quoted Scripture, Paul preached Scripture, Peter lived in the Scriptures!

More evasion. The Lord Jesus Christ repeatedly answered His critics with scripture, check the expression "Have ye not read" in the Gospels. Bible believers are exhorted to follow Him, 1 Corinthians 11:1. Also 1 Cor 2v13!!!!!!

but here you seem to invest infallibility and inspiration in men's arguments.

An unsubstantiated assertion yet again!!!

I, in response, ask for chapter and verse for where God has SAID that the AV is perfect.

NOW, YOU, want chapter & verse - how ironic!!! Here we go... Psalm 12:6, 7 with Ecclesiastes 8:4. Specify any other possible fulfilment – as yet none has been given! Want some more? There are plenty (<http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1300041269.pdf> - How about READING IT!!!)

The idea is complete nonsense since the AV came later in history than the revelation which God gave.

More Nicolaitanism. Especially insofar as no explicit source for any such revelation has been given, just as no final authority between two covers has been given. PRESERVATION IS AS IMPORTANT AS INSPIRATION - but sadly your 'god' isn't powerful enough to be able to KEEP His words!

Check The Revision Revised by Dean Burgon, The King James Bible Defended by Edward F. Hills, Final Authority by Dr William Grady, New Age Versions and Hazardous Materials by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger. See also Our Authorized Bible Vindicated by Benjamin Wilkinson, available online, http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicate.html

Thanks for the reference - I haven't read all of it, but I don't believe it answers the point I made.

The issue is deliberate corruptions of scripture. The references highlight those.

Anyway in his conclusion he says

"The original Scriptures were written by direct inspiration of God. This can hardly be said of any translation."

The references were given to show how God has revealed the deliberate corruptions imposed on Biblical mss. by heretics e.g. Catholics, not for the opinions of individual authors. The above quote can be discarded because it is a direct contradiction of 2 Timothy 3:16.

Did the Catholic Church Give Us the Bible? by David Daniels is a good place to start.

5. The closest you can get to reading the original text is to read it in the original language.

Chapter and verse? None given, typical.

Aw cummon! Be serious. If you expect me to find a Bible reference for every reasonable every-day statement we'll be here for ever.

Proverbs 14:16. Thus far, no relevant scriptures have been put forward at all, which is typical of Bible critics. Can't you see what you are doing? You are hanging yourself with your very own rope!!! It amazes me, astounds me, how BLIND Bible 'correctors' & rejectors are; they just CAN'T see it at all! They are calling God a LIAR & deny His the very words He has written! They are enemies of God without even realising it! What 'good' are you doing by telling the man that has just got saved that there are 'errors' in the word of God... DON'T YOU GET THAT? What good is Greek & Hebrew to the drug addict or alcoholic? BLIND leading the BLIND!

Since most people (including myself) can't read Hebrew, Greek, or the other ancient languages used in these texts we are dependent on men who can to give us a translation. They will translate according to their understanding - hence we get rubbish translations from godless men who think they can put a spin on the text to suit their own ends.

An implied slur on the King's men.

I thought you would have agreed that translations like the Douey or "Good News" were rubbish

The second part of the statement has been ignored (for obvious reasons!!!)

See The Translators to the Reader by Dr Miles Smith and note the underlined statement.

"Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark"

a "good one better" NOT a "good one perfect".

Where are the imperfections? Thus far, none has been given. NOT ONE SINGLE 'error' - Do you KNOW why? I do!

6. God CAN cause a totally inerrant translation to be made. However, unless HE TELLS US which one this is we need to use discernment and consider the qualifications of the men who make the translation (as I believe you pointed

out). I believe that Wycliffe translators spend years learning languages and understanding idioms etc before they attempt a translation into a native tongue. They would then, I believe, seek to translate from the original languages.

Examples? None – again, typical.

**My point was - how do we know which TRANSLATION is perfect unless God tells us
What are the imperfections in the 1611 Holy Bible that GOD has shown anyone? Bible critics have thus far come up with zero. See reference to James White above.**

It may be of interest to note that a Bro. Peter Heisey and colleagues are preparing a Romanian translation from the 1611 Holy Bible. Bro. Heisey is best not trifled with about “the original languages.” Rest assured that he will tie you in knots. The anti-priesthood-of-all-believers ‘originals-onlyists’ of the Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee members know this to their cost and have been forced to ‘plead the 5th’ instead of answering Bro. Heisey’s penetrating questions on Scrivener’s Greek Text.

I also understand (but am ready to be corrected) that not all the men engaged in the production of the AV were convinced believers -

Be advised to avoid insinuation.

“Thou shalt not raise a false report: put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness” Exodus 23:1.

King James insisted on having some of his own men involved

Scripturally, he would have been entitled to do so. To imply otherwise is in direct defiance of scripture, Ecclesiastes 8:4. Check The Men Behind the KJV by Gustavus Paine for insight into the appointment of the translators.

I wish I could remember where I read this comment. By the way most of those involved in the translation would have agreed with Calvin and Luther on the "bondage of the will" - so perhaps in your eyes they're not perfect either.

Specify one ‘original’ writer who was ‘perfect.’ Please specify examples from the 1611 Holy Bible where the translation was compromised by the theology of any of the translators. You have dug yourself into such a deep hole that I don’t think there is a rope ladder long enough to help you out!

7. The claim that the AV as a translation is inerrant and inspired smacks to me of heresy

Chapter and verse? None given, typical.

**It was a statement which I thought was explained by the 2nd half of the sentence
The second half of the sentence is not an explanation. It is an unproven assertion AS USUAL!**

in that it makes a claim which goes beyond what scripture claims for itself.

Then “what saith the scripture?” Romans 4:3. It seems that yet again, ‘Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.’

**Surely it's for you to provide chapter and verse for where the scripture claims that the AV is a perfect translation
The point of the statement is in order for the “the scripture” to be specified between two covers, given that the 1611 Holy Bible has been denied to be “the scripture.” Again, the issue has been evaded. In fact, you EVADE everything!!! Of all the Bible correctors I've had dealings with I would say that you haven't even stayed on the track? You have answered nothing, you have given NO evidence on ANY points raised & you shift, squirm, 'slither' all over the place!**

8. If the AV were "inspired" then where does that leave translations into other languages -

Where God appropriately placed them. See Hazardous Materials p 115.

“Yet God’s inspired words can still be found for those who seek them, in Bibles such as the Spanish Valera 1602 Purificada, the Morrison Chinese Bible, Bible King James Française and others.”

how do we know which of them (if any) are inspired?

Because inspired translations feature repeatedly in the scriptures. See <http://samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=29.htm> and <http://samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=30.htm>.

The point he makes is that it was the words which were WRITTEN which were inspired - he is dealing with people speaking in one language and it being recorded in another -

The point he makes is that translations can be given by inspiration of God. Inspiration is not limited to Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek. Job is the earliest Book of scripture written. Job was of Uz, not of Israel, so that the ‘inspired’ Hebrew version would have to be a translation of the ‘original’ writing of Job. Acts 2, with citations from Joel (i.e. written scriptures) provides more examples.

so my question remains - how do we know which WRITTEN translations are inspired if WRITTEN translations of the scriptures are inspired as you claim?

Not as I claim but as the scripture shows. Check Acts 22 again. That was clearly overlooked. Canon was established by the end of the First Century, the Old Testament Canon being confirmed by the Lord Jesus Christ in Matthew 23:35, that of the New by the apostle John before he died. Translations of those established canonical scriptures into other, later languages, Latin, Syriac, Gothic, German, English, were the fulfilment of Psalm 12:6, 7.

Also what about those who believed before the AV?

They followed the faithful precursors of the AV1611 such as the English Bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation; Tyndale, Mathew, Great, Geneva, Bishops’, in fulfilment of Psalm 12:6, 7. See The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship by Dr Peter S. Ruckman pp. 110ff.

So God had left them without the perfect translation.

No. Each stage of translation was perfect to go on to the next stage as part of Psalm 12:6, 7. God is not limited by the idle speculations of Bible critics. Very lame again David! I think we’re clutching at straws again aren’t we!

9. I’m sure that the translators of the AV with their Christ-centred attitude, would have had the humility to accept that theirs was simply an attempt to convey the meaning of the original language (let’s avoid the issue of text/manuscript).

How about obeying 1 Thessalonians 5:21, to “Prove all things”?

I don’t follow - I accept that we are to “prove”/test all things - which is why I’m concerned that you seem to have a wacky idea about the AV TRANSLATION being inspired

Point 9 was more speculation about the King’s men. It was not about inspiration with respect to anything. Shifting the goal posts is yet another well-worn satanic tactic of Bible critics.

As for the accusation of ‘wackiness,’ Bible believers are in good company, Mark 3:21, Acts 26:24. It’s also evident from those verses who their accusers are allied to. Moreover ‘originals-onlyism’ is not merely ‘wacky.’ It amounts to calling God a liar in the light of Psalm 12:6, 7, 119, 138:2 and is gross sin, Titus 1:2. ‘Wood for the trees’ David! Deeper & deeper you go!

See The Epistle Dedicatory for the explanation of what the King’s men sought to achieve. Note the under-linings, with reference to today’s ‘originals-onlyists’ and their ideological ancestors.

“So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor Instruments to make God’s holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their Anvil; we may rest secure, supported within by truth and innocency of a good conscience, having walked the ways of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord; and sustained without by the powerful

protection of Your Majesty's grace and favour, which will ever give countenance to honest and Christian endeavours against bitter censures and uncharitable imputations.

I'm sure they would also have rejoiced to have the increased understanding of the meaning of specific idioms which more modern translators have.

Examples? None. Again, typical. Check the expression "God forbid" in the 1611 Holy Bible and the modern counterfeits and expressions such as "is baptised," "is dead," "is freed," "are saved," "am crucified," "is risen" etc. in the 1611 Holy Bible versus the modern counterfeits for the mastery of the King's men with respect to idiom and note the observation of Dean Burgon with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible vs. the RV. Dean Burgon's remarks apply to all subsequent modern counterfeits. See The Revision Revised pp. 154ff and New Age Versions pp. 242ff.

"The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout. We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far...Examples of their inconsistency reduces the whole matter to a question of Taste...The vast number of cases in which they have forsaken their own rule shows that it could not be followed without changing elements of the original.. They virtually admit that they have been all along unjustly forcing on an independent language an alien yoke.""

Sorry - I don't have a knowledge of the original languages so I can't check which translation is the more accurate. Dishonest scepticism writ large. Burgon had that knowledge, which is why the citation was given. How about running to Burgon INSTEAD of your Bible 'correcting' pastor for a change! Burgon would eat him for breakfast & spit out all the pips!!!

10. I've not checked with my pastor (who has a good understanding of Hebrew and Greek etc) where there are "errors" in the AV - but he frequently explains to us where the original language is difficult to translate.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable. The King's men explained any such places better. See the material from Challenges #5, #6, #7 in Flotsam Flush on the TfT website.

Sorry, again I don't understand the original languages -

More dishonest scepticism writ large, along with deliberate evasion. A knowledge of the original languages is not necessary to check the above material. Not only DEEPER & DEEPER into the hole you go, but WEAKER & WEAKER your last few passing shots are becoming! (Reminds me of the last arrow Robin Hood shot before he died, where did it land?)

but where my pastor explains that the original language can be rendered in different ways and tells us what they are, I tend to think that he's not telling "porkies".

Hello Bible 'correcting' pastor AGAIN!!! He seems to be YOUR Final Authority! But that is not the issue. The issue is that the work of the King's men explains "all things that pertain unto life and godliness" 2 Peter 1:3 in a manner that cannot be improved upon, certainly not according to anything that has come from Bible critics in the last 400 years.

Often the difficulty is that alternative translations are equally valid - there seems to be an intentional ambivalence which conveys not one, but two or more ideas, all of which are valid and helpful, but which cannot be expressed in a single translation.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable. Thus far, not one specific 'just exception' to the Text of the 1611 Holy Bible has been raised. None will be in what remains.

This is taking a long time!! If you really would be convinced by examples of poor translation in the AV I'll have a word with my pastor and get some -

By all means do so. It may help to give him some light as well, Psalm 119:130. In fact, by doing so, you'll perhaps work together ('collaborate') & you'll both come to the 'knowledge of the truth!' I hope so, because you are NOT helping Christians at all as Bible 'correctors!' I have 'girls' in my church that would chew your arguments to shreds!!!

but don't please waste my time if you're not prepared to listen to reason.

That is just one beautiful statement! I loved it! I smiled with a little 'coy' smile! DON'T waste YOUR time, & here I am dealing with a Bible 'corrector!' That wasn't just 'rich', that was perhaps the most idiotic statement in all the emails we have exchanged! I'm still kicking off about it!!! A request for specific examples is not unreasonable. A refusal to back up assertions with them is.

"As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come" Proverbs 26:2.

"Like a thorn that goes into the hand of a drunkard, so is a proverb in the mouth of fools" Proverbs 26:9 -

Which has NOTHING to do the issues under consideration!!!! Congratulations, I think this is your FIRST Scripture!

not that I think you to be a fool

Think again. 1 Corinthians 4:10. "And of the rest durst no man join himself to them" Acts 5:13a

God used the original languages to in-errantly and infallibly convey what He wished to.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

Why do you need the above statement justified???

Because nothing from you has been justified so far, including the above statement.

This time, it must be shown that God is limited to "the original languages" in what He can say and how He chooses to say it.

NO - God is NOT LIMITED to anything except good - what MUST be shown is that He ordained inerrant and infallible translations through fallible men.

Name one infallible original writer of scripture? Deeper... (you know it by now!!!)

Otherwise the 'originals-onlyist' is guilty of calling God a liar in response to Jeremiah 32:27.

Nonsense - because we're NOT claiming that God is limited.

Except that, according to Bible critics like yourself, He can't preserve His words, contrary to Psalm 12:6, 7. Of course YOU are limiting God!!! BLIND as usual!

There is indeed nothing too hard for Him. What I am questioning is what He has ACTUALLY done - not wishing to ascribe an act of infallible inspiration to something which is not. To claim divine inspiration where there is none (i.e. the process of translation however good and well intentioned) is to claim to speak from God when God has not spoken - exactly the what the false prophets of Jeremiah's day did.

Which again begs the basic question (thus far unanswered by all Bible critics for the last 400 years including yourself), where is "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" between two covers? Provision of an unequivocal answer appears according to the testimony of history to be far too hard for 'originals-onlyists.' Any ideas? Will you FINALLY try to answer the question?

"Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh: is there anything too hard for me?"

11. We must take care not to have a view on what God SHOULD have done, and then insist that this is what God HAS done. To ask "why would God do ..?" expecting an answer when God Himself has not made the answer clear is to stand in judgement on God Himself, or to presume to stand in the place of God when we answer - so we need to take care when applying our own fault-ridden logic to the actions of the Almighty - in case we stand accused of doing something which doesn't make sense to us, calling His actions into question.

See response to point 3 above.

I can't see what your response to point 3 has to do with this!

The response had to do with the obfuscation of point 3, which, like all the other points, is totally unsupported by scripture.

12. On the issue of the book of Revelation - although the word "church" may not be used throughout,

The word "church" IS not used throughout the Book. Note again Romans 13:9.

the church is frequently alluded to in "type" or figure.

Examples? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

The truth (and when was any 'originals-onlyist' ever genuinely interested in THAT?) is that the word "saints" is mentioned 13 times in the Book of Revelation, referring explicitly and specifically to – wait for it – saints, i.e. saints, s-a-i-n-t-s, showing that the notion of supposed "types" and "figures" is irrelevant. However, the word "saints" has FIVE applications in the Book of Revelation, some of which overlap.

1. All living and martyred Revelation 6:9-11 saints during the events of the great tribulation, Matthew 24:21, Luke 20:38, Revelation 7:14, Revelation 5:8, 8:3, 4.

2. Tribulation saints on earth during the great tribulation, many of whom suffer martyrdom, Revelation 6:9-11, 13:7, 10, 14:12.

3. Old Testament, Church Age and Tribulation saints martyred i.e. murdered by Catholics and all others e.g. Mohammedans, Marxists, pre-papal Babylonians etc. who are part of MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH, Revelation 17:5 (count the number of words and letters to see if the 1611 Holy Bible is/is not 'inspired'), Revelation 16:6, 17:6, 18:24.

4. Old Testament e.g. Enoch Genesis 5:24, Jude 14, Church Age and Tribulation saints, martyred or not martyred, who return with the Lord Jesus Christ at the Second Advent, Revelation 19:8. See Psalm 45:14, Ephesians 3:15.

5. ALL saints, past i.e. Old Testament, present i.e. New Testament Church Age, future i.e. Tribulation and Millennial saints, Revelation 11:18, 15:3, 20:9.

So-called "types" and "figures" don't figure, at all. 2 Timothy 2:15 DOES but since when was any 'originals-onlyist' ever genuinely interested in studying the SCRIPTURES (not 'the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek') and rightly dividing "the word of truth"?

Also when we have described God's dealings with humanity as a whole there is no need to separate out the church - since we partake to a great extent in the temporal judgements which God brings on mankind. And again beware of imposing on scripture pre-conceived systems as to how God will work when He has chosen to hide many things of a temporal nature from us all.

See response to point 3 above.

I can't see what your response to point 3 has to do with this!

See response to point 11. Note carefully Job 13:7. (Note the Scripture again David!)

Anyway let's concentrate on one issue at a time - when we've resolve the issue of the good but NOT infallible AV the we might come back to this

By what standard (between two covers) is the 1611 Holy Bible judged to be fallible? Thus far, no such standard has been advanced. Fancy a crack at it? How about your Bible 'correcting' pastor?

The scripture contains all that is necessary for faith and practice - not fortune telling.

"But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled" Matthew 26:56.

"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" Luke 24:27.

"(Which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures)," Romans 1:2.

"But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:" Romans 16:26.

"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed" Galatians 3:8.

"Despise not prophesying" 1 Thessalonians 5:20.

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation" 2 Peter 1:20.

"...for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" Revelation 19:10.

"Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another" Ephesians 4:25.

Men need to come to repentance for sin and faith in a Saviour who will keep them - not to know times and seasons which are deliberately hidden.

Chapter and verse? Again, Chapter-and-verse-number unobtainable.

See Deuteronomy 29:29 - admittedly the word may be secret things - but I think you'll see from the context that these are contrasted with things revealed. Hence I think hidden is probably OK as an alternative - unless you think that God has told us EVERYTHING He could have I don't think there would be enough books in the world!

That is not the issue. The overarching issue is the wilful, indeed grossly sinful denigration of prophecy as mere "fortune telling," coupled with an attitude that mirrors Isaiah 14:14 "I will be like the most High." Your last final shot in the dark & MISSED AGAIN! Deeper & DEEPER you go & DARKER & DARKER it gets! I wonder if THIS TIME, we shall see some answers to the questions I have raised? If I don't, I shall recap over the emails & present them to you in a bullet format to make things easier!

So what have we all learnt from this exchange?

I have a Bible I can trust 100% - YOU DON'T!

I have a Final Authority between two covers which I can turn to as 100% TRUSTWORTHY - YOU DON'T!

I get people to BELIEVER the Book - you & your Bible 'correcting' pastor get people to DOUBT the word of God!

My God is ALL powerful & promised to KEEP & PRESERVE His words - YOUR 'god' didn't or can't (take your pick!)

The AV is 100% PERFECT - YOU have 'proved' absolutely NOTHING!

Let me guess, 'You're not convinced!'

I rest my case!

I run to GOD - YOU run to 'man'!

The AV is BETTER than the Hebrew & Greek & gives advanced revelation - but at this point, I think it's just too heavy for you! (Maybe next time!)

(Forgive me for any spelling errors; I often put 'the' for the & because it is late I won't read over it again!)

I hope that you wake up very soon David, because you really are asleep in the LIGHT when it comes to FINAL AUTHORITY & its importance!

Christ had a Final Authority & so did Peter, Paul & John - I also have one & it is as PERFECT as theirs because God used sinful men (like He did in the beginning) & they were guided by Him (like they were in the beginning!) to PRESERVE HIS WORDS (Ps 12v6+7)

Amen & Amen!

However, note the following.

"And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power" Acts 1:7, NOT "which are deliberately hidden."

The disciples were simply told to WAIT for God's revelation of "the times and the seasons" 1 Thessalonians 5:1, like they were told to "tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high" Luke 24:49.

What follows is an example of progressive revelation, Amos 3:7.

"Surely the Lord GOD will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."

"But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night" 1 Thessalonians 5:1-2.

What follows in 1 Thessalonians 5:3-9 is an outline of events relating to the Second Advent and what the believers are to do in advance preparation for it, as the Lord inserted a reminder in Revelation 16:15.

"Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

The surest way to accumulate "shame" at "the judgment seat of Christ" Romans 14:10, 1 Corinthians 3:11-15 is to wallow in wilful ignorance, 1 Corinthians 14:38, instead of searching the scriptures as the Lord commanded and commended as nobility within the Body of Christ, John 5:39, Acts 17:11.

Deacons in particular should do so, in that they are commanded to be "Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience" 1 Timothy 3:9.

God bless you brother

David

Hi John - sorry for the delay in replying but I've been busy sorting out accounts.

I don't feel that our exchanges have been very helpful and at times hardly gracious.

I trust that we will both obey our Lord's command that we are meek and willing to hear what has to be said (entreated) .. James 3:12-18 "Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him show out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom. ¹⁴But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. ¹⁵This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. ¹⁶For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. ¹⁷But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. ¹⁸And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace.

I have concluded that the frequent appeals for chapter and verse are often no more than a smoke screen for avoiding the point being made.

At times I have had the impression that if I said "one and one make two", but that for the case of your defence the point is inconvenient, you will demand chapter and verse.

Where we claim that scripture says something then indeed it's helpful to quote scripture, particularly if we have reason to believe that the person we're engaged with is unfamiliar with it. However, I don't believe that you are unfamiliar with scripture. If I allude to what scripture says without quoting a text then it's because I've assumed you are conversant with what it says.

Let me try to summarise our different understandings/beliefs. I suspect that we will have to agree that we differ.

1. You believe that I have no hope which can be depended on because I don't have a final authority on which I can depend. That to have such an authority requires that it is perfect and without error, and seemingly between two covers.

Ans: I believe I do have a final trustworthy authority for what God has said on which I can depend. I do not believe that when I read it in my own language every word or phrase has to be a perfect rendering of the words originally given (in the sense that perfect is without improvement). What God has spoken we need to comprehend - it was not just "words" which God gave us - but the ideas etc which are conveyed by the words. The words are important, but only as a vehicle for conveying the message which is important because of the effect it should have on us. 2 Tim 3:16 All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: ¹⁷That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

I also believe (but without explicit scripture warrant) that He chose the languages in which the revelation was given - this is simply a deduction that God has given the revelation in those languages when He could have chosen to develop any language in advance of His revelation (even the English tongue) but actually used the ones which were extant. What matters is what it was intended to convey.

I believe we have a perfectly adequate revelation of the mind of God in many translations - bearing in mind that we need to view the scripture as a whole and check what they truly say.

We need to follow the example of the Bereans Acts 17:11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so. ¹²Therefore many of them believed

But no translation of the whole of scripture is perfect (in the sense that it could not be improved).

I believe (as you quoted from Psalm 12) that the Lord's words are perfect, and that He will keep them and preserve them - but nowhere does scripture claim that these "words" will always in their entirety in one place be perfectly (in the sense of no improvement) accurately translated into English, let alone other languages.

Your reference to Ecclesiastes 8:4 says nothing about this issue.

Languages have idiomatic terms which are specific to them. When language is used by men to convey meaning idioms are often employed. These idioms don't always translate easily e.g. "ma petite chou" in french is a term of endearment, but I don't suppose your wife would like to be called "my little cabbage". Similarly a "Pomme de terre" we know to be a potato - not an "apple of the earth". So an understanding/knowledge of how these idioms are used in the original languages is important if we are to be faithful (if not perfect in the sense of without improvement) rendering of the meaning from one language to another.

William Tyndale had as his objective in translating the Bible into English that even the boy at the plough should understand what God's message is.

He employed the vernacular language of his day. The Geneva Bible which was largely based on his work was the most popular and faithful translation available in the 17th century - although you may wish to disagree. The 1611 Bible came about, by the grace of God, due to dissatisfaction of the Puritans/ "evangelicals" with the Bishop's Bible - a cobbled-together attempt to undermine the influence of the Geneva Bible. When James came to be king the church was in a sad state, and the Hampton Court conference which he called only involved 4 "evangelical" men - the majority being representatives from the liberal, pseudo-catholic bishopric and intelligentsia. He called the conference because he was afraid his authority might be threatened by divisions in the "church" ... a group of "evangelicals" having raised objections to bowing, the use of vestments etc in "church" services. It was on the last day of this conference that he agreed to a request from one of the "evangelicals", probably shamefaced for not having made many (if any) concessions to them.

James gave strict instructions that in the new translation the Bishop's Bible should be followed (and here's the saving feature) except where Tyndale, Matthews, Geneva could be shown to be a more faithful translation of the text. He also insisted that references to the "church" should adopt terms which continued the old hierarchical view of the church with the king at its head (Tyndale had used the word congregation to represent the body of the church - which was seen to undermine this king-centred view).

Those involved in the translation of the 1611 Bible were far from being "evangelical" men, except in a few instances (statements praising specific men need to be evaluated against the "party" making those statements). The Greek scholars who were involved were the most eminent of the day - but they were only familiar with classical Greek, and not familiar with the "vulgar" Greek in which the New Testament was given. The texts on which their work was based were also "recent" compared with older texts which have subsequently been discovered.

Given all of this it is a miracle of God's grace that the 1611 Bible is as good as it is. It was not immediately popular, however, people preferring the Geneva Bible. Archbishop Laud (a man set against the "evangelicals" and their common-man gospel) promoted the 1611 Bible as he saw it as less undermining of the Hierarchical "church" over which he held sway. He appealed to the fact that the Geneva Bible was printed abroad and to patriotism as a way of replacing it.

The 1611 Bible has two dedications which are not part of the inspired text, but which show the mind-set of those involved in its production. The first is a fawning, greasy note on how good the king is.

The second is much better (written by one of the "evangelicals") to the reader. Strangely(?), this contributor quotes scripture to his readers predominantly from the Geneva Bible rather than the 1611 version he has helped to produce.

So ..

2. You seem to believe that the 1611 Bible is perfect

Ans: I see the 1611 Bible as a good translation - amazing given the character of the king who agreed to have it done and of the majority of those involved in its translation.

It did not use the vernacular tongue in the way in which Tyndale had, and was therefore less accessible to the man-in-the-street than the Geneva Bible available at the same time.

I believe that latter translators have the benefit of earlier texts and greater understanding of the vernacular idioms used in the original languages.

You seem preoccupied with the need for evidence that the 1611 has flaws. I trust you believe in the personality of each of the members of the Godhead; Father, Son, and Spirit. The 1611 says in Romans 8:16

¹⁶The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: It would have been better to say "Himself" rather than "itself". This is an error. However, it's not an error which troubles me because the whole of scripture testifies to the personality of the Holy Spirit.

I think I've gone on long enough, but to answer the question which Bible do I use, I use the NKJV for my personal devotions, and often read the ESV. If I come across a passage which I don't understand I will compare translations, and compare the passage to the wider body of the scriptures (i.e. other similar passages).

I don't think that further exchanges on this subject will help. But if there are issues you want to debate, let's take them one at a time.

Meanwhile I trust in a Sovereign God who has preserved His revelation, and given us an understanding of all things necessary for faith and practice.

Greetings

David

My response as normal in RED!!!

It's hard to soar with eagles when you're surrounded by turkeys!!!

Hi David,

Thought you'd been Raptured it's been that long!!! Been running for cover & reloading I'd say!

Two verses that are just perfect for all Bible 'correctors' & 'rejectors' are these...

Ecc 1v15 That which is crooked cannot be made straight: and that which is wanting cannot be numbered.

2 Thes 2v11 And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:

Pride gets the better of all Bible 'correctors' & 'rejectors', especially those who have NO WRITTEN FINAL AUTHORITY as we shall see!

Here we go again... hold on tight!

I don't feel that our exchanges have been very helpful and at times hardly gracious. **I believe that our exchanges are very beneficial to others who read them so they can see the difference between a Christian who has a WRITTEN FINAL AUTHORITY THAT IS FOUND IN ENGLISH BETWEEN TWO COVERS & a Christian who trusts in the originals (which he has NEVER seen & which do NOT 'exist') & says he 'has' a Final Authority (which he CERTAINLY doesn't) in the Hebrew & Greek (But never tells you WHICH manuscripts!!!), PLUS, he can't even READ that 'Final Authority!' Total madness & like the above verses imply... he is on a crooked path (which he has chosen) & he is DELUSED! So I think it is imperative that many Christians read these exchanges to warn them about the ERRORS that 'creep' into churches regarding Bible 'correctors & rejectors'!**

Regarding being 'gracious', I think you really ought to read Matthew 23 before even considering the word 'gracious', & see how the Lord treated Bible 'correctors' & 'rejectors'!!! I hope you can see the similarities here!!! Also note...Luke 11:52!!!

Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.

I trust that we will both obey our Lord's command that we are meek and willing to hear what has to be said (entreathed) .. James 3:12-18 "Who *is* a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him show out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom.¹⁴ But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth.¹⁵ This wisdom descendeth not from above, but *is* earthly, sensual, devilish.¹⁶ For where envying and strife *is*, there *is* confusion and every evil work.¹⁷ But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, *and* easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.¹⁸ And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace.

The 1611 Holy Bible has been quoted. Is it therefore "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16? If not, why not and where is "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" between two covers? Thus far, that source has not been identified. You just won't answer this question will you David? You just can't find that 'all Scripture' can you!

I have concluded that the frequent appeals for chapter and verse are often no more than a smoke screen for avoiding the point being made.

On the contrary, the smoke screen consists of a refusal to provide them, because the point being made is unscriptural according to Nehemiah 6:8:

"...There are no such things done as thou sayest, but thou feignest them out of thine own heart." You need to get in the habit David, when dealing with 'anyone', of using your ONLY offensive weapon THE WORD OF GOD! BUT, alas, you haven't even got THAT weapon & you DON'T know where to find it! You certainly do NOT have the

sword of the spirit & that is why, every time, the Scripture just carves you up! You will NEVER deal with false religions & cults by jumping to different versions of the Bible! If I were to debate with you on any doctrine (& I would happily do that all day & every day!) & you pull out your NKJV I'd hit you so hard with the following that you wouldn't be found till the following year!!! You don't believe me? Check this out & let me know your answers...

<http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1300137286.pdf> - Read the NKJV sections!!!!!!

<http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1311767813.pdf> - I hope you have checked this out!!! Incredible!

At times I have had the impression that if I said "one and one make two", but that for the case of your defence the point is inconvenient, you will demand chapter and verse.

Sheer speculation that doesn't amount to anything, AS USUAL!

Where we claim that scripture says something then indeed it's helpful to quote scripture, particularly if we have reason to believe that the person we're engaged with is unfamiliar with it. However, I don't believe that you are unfamiliar with scripture. If I allude to what scripture says without quoting a text then it's because I've assumed you are conversant with what it says.

Evasion, along with no identification of what "the scripture" is between two covers, AS USUAL!

Let me try to summarise our different understandings/beliefs. I suspect that we will have to agree that we differ.

1. You believe that I have no hope which can be depended on because I don't have a final authority on which I can depend. That to have such an authority requires that it is perfect and without error, and seemingly between two covers.

Of necessity between two covers. Otherwise no "Bible" exists. You just DON'T get it do you fella? Wilful ignorance???

Ans: I believe I do have a final trustworthy authority for what God has said on which I can depend. I do not believe that when I read it in my own language every word or phrase has to be a perfect rendering of the words originally given (in the sense that perfect is without improvement). What God has spoken we need to comprehend - it was not just "words" which God gave us - but the ideas etc which are conveyed by the words. The words are important, but only as a vehicle for conveying the message which is important because of the effect it should have on us. 2 Tim 3:16 All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: ¹⁷That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

2 Timothy 3:16 has been quoted from the KJB, except for the error of "thoroughly" instead of "throughly." Is the KJB therefore "the scripture"? If not, the question remains, what is "the scripture"?

Again, the question arises, chapter and verse for any of the above? W.r.t. "what God has said," where are God's actual words between two covers? An appeal to "the words originally given" is pointless unless their source can be stipulated. This has not been done, AS USUAL!!!

I also believe (but without explicit scripture warrant)

Then no authority exists for saying anything. The correspondence could rightly be terminated at this point!!!

that He chose the languages in which the revelation was given - this is simply a deduction that God has given the revelation in those languages when He could have chosen to develop any language in advance of His revelation (even the English tongue) but actually used the ones which were extant.

Sheer speculation!

What matters is what it was intended to convey.

What matters is what God SAID and where are God's words – between two covers? A refusal to answer that question comes under 1 Samuel 15:23.

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry..."

I believe we have a perfectly adequate revelation of the mind of God in many translations - bearing in mind that we need to view the scripture as a whole and check what it truly says.

Sheer subjective opinion with any scripture to back it up and therefore useless w.r.t edifying the body of Christ, Ephesians 4:12. Show me just one verse where it says WHAT YOU SAY? It doesn't!

We need to follow the example of the Bereans Acts 17:11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.
¹²Therefore many of them believed

Again, the KJB has been quoted, this time correctly, it seems. Is the KJB "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" therefore and if not, why not and what is, between two covers? As usual, NO FINAL AUTHORITY in which to turn to!

But no translation of the whole of scripture is perfect (in the sense that it could not be improved).

Again, sheer subjective opinion with no "scripture" from anywhere to support it, again, useless for edifying the body of Christ, Ephesians 4:12. Absolutely no USE whatsoever to any Christian alive! You are doing NO GOOD at all regarding your subjective opinions, I find that incredible!

I believe (as you quoted from Psalm 12) that the Lord's words are perfect, and that He will keep them and preserve them - but nowhere does scripture claim that these "words" will always in their entirety in one place be perfectly (in the sense of no improvement) accurately translated into English, let alone other languages.

More evasion. Where is the scripture that denies that God's words can be in languages other than "the original sacred tongues"?

Where is the scripture that declares that ONLY Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek are the languages for God's words?

Check references to the word "book" in a KJB.

Where else would God preserve His words except in a book i.e. in one place? Revelation 5:1 speaks of "a book...with seven seals." Check the spine of a KJB - get it???

Nehemiah 9:3 speaks of "the book of the law of the LORD their God." God's people at that time had the words of God in one place – a BOOK.

They have it now in one place – a BOOK:

Isaiah 34:16 commands "Seek ye out of the book of the LORD, and read:" KJB believers can obey that command, KJB rejectors can't and are forced to disobey God therefore. So what do you say? They are scattered among manuscripts that we must trust the scholars to find for us!!! Back to the DARK AGES you take us...2 Pet 2v2 And many shall follow their pernicious ways... BUT US BIBLE BELIEVERS WON'T!!! You maybe in the majority with all your ilk of 'correctors' & 'rejectors', but ALAS, there are a few of us left who will STAND upon the word of God until the Rapture! By the way, WE WIN!!! (It's about time you realised who side GOD is on, & it certainly is NOT yours!)

Your reference to Ecclesiastes 8:4 says nothing about this issue.

Ecclesiastes 8:4 establishes the power and authority of the KING's word, 2 Samuel 24:4. Later English versions have no authority because they were not translated under a king – in addition to coming from corrupt sources. I suggest you re-read the TEXT in the CONTEXT to find out WHAT it is talking about! You actually missed the whole

point, but you're not alone, ALL Bible 'correctors' & 'rejectors' miss the WHOLE point!

Languages have idiomatic terms which are specific to them. When language is used by men to convey meaning idioms are often employed. These idioms don't always translate easily e.g. "ma petite chou" in french is a term of endearment, but I don't suppose your wife would like to be called "my little cabbage". Similarly a "Pomme de terre" we know to be a potato - not an "apple of the earth". So an understanding/knowledge of how these idioms are used in the original languages is important if we are to a a faithful (if not perfect in the sense of without improvement) rendering of the meaning from one language to another.

None of which has anything to do with "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21. NOTHING AT ALL!

William Tyndale had as his objective in translating the Bible into English that even the boy at the plough should understand what God's message is.

Deliberate distortion and falsehood. Tyndale referred to "the Scriptures" in that statement, not "the message." Oh dear David, what are you doing, apart from losing every single point? I think it time you gave up & went back to what you're good at, because Bible 'correcting' is a complete waste of the time that God has given you! You are doing NO GOOD whatsoever to the church, the Body of Christ! You speak with NO authority or power because of the SATANIC Bibles you use! (see the links, do your homework!)

He employed the vernacular language of his day. The Geneva Bible which was largely based on his work was the most popular and faithful translation available in the 17th century - although you may wish to disagree. The 1611 Bible came about, by the grace of God, due to dissatisfaction of the Puritans/ "evangelicals" with the Bishop's Bible - a cobbled-together attempt to undermine the influence of the Geneva Bible. When James came to be king the church was in a sad state, and the Hampton Court conference which he called only involved 4 "evangelical" men - the majority being representatives from the liberal, pseudo-catholic bishopric and intelligentsia. He called the conference because he was afraid his authority might be threatened by divisions in the "church" ... a group of "evangelicals" having raised objections to bowing, the use of vestments etc in "church" services. It was on the last day of this conference that he agreed to a request from one of the "evangelicals", probably shamefaced for not having made many (if any) concessions to them.

Secondary issues that have nothing to do with "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21 available now as the 1611 Holy Bible – for which NO imperfections have been identified so far in any of this correspondence – the later example, Romans 8:16, is answered below. (You still have never answered this question... DID THE HOLY SPIRIT SHOW YOU AN 'ERROR' IN THE AUTHORIZED VERSION BIBLE???) We know David don't we! I guess we'll NEVER know will we, because IF & when you answer this email, you will NOT answer THAT question will you?

James gave strict instructions that in the new translation the Bishop's Bible should be followed (and here's the saving feature) except where Tyndale, Matthews, Geneva could be shown to be a more faithful translation of the text. He also insisted that references to the "church" should adopt terms which continued the old hierarchical view of the church with the king at its head (Tyndale had used the word congregation to represent the body of the church - which was seen to undermine this king-centred view).

Check the Appendix to The KJB Story 1611-2011 for specific answers to those objections and think about why today churches, including independent churches, call themselves churches and not congregations. Today's churches have little or nothing to do with the supposed "king-centred view." They could call themselves "congregations" if they preferred to.

The setting up of the rules for translation etc. were actually the work of Bishop Bancroft assisted by Lancelot Andrewes but in any event, find chapter and verse to prove that any of those instructions were unjustified or invalid.

The repeated requests for chapter and verse simply indicate that no Bible believer has any obligation to take any notice of the unsubstantiated opinions of a Bible rejector, Proverbs 14:7.

Those involved in the translation of the 1611 Bible were far from being "evangelical" men, except in a few instances (statements praising specific men need to be evaluated against the "party" making those statements). The Greek scholars who were involved were the most eminent of the day - but they were only familiar with classical Greek, and

not familiar with the "vulgar" Greek in which the New Testament was given. The texts on which their work was based were also "recent" compared with older texts which have subsequently been discovered.

Mere ad hominem attacks. Check out the history of revival, soul-winning and church planting in the last 400 years and check which version spearheaded them all. Tell me of another BOOK that has produced more fruit than the Authorized Version Bible?

Given all of this it is a miracle of God's grace that the 1611 Bible is as good as it is. It was not immediately popular, however, people preferring the Geneva Bible. Archbishop Laud (a man set against the "evangelicals" and their common-man gospel) promoted the 1611 Bible as he saw it as less undermining of the Hierarchical "church" over which he held sway. He appealed to the fact that the Geneva Bible was printed abroad and to patriotism as a way of replacing it.

A mere distraction with a feeble attempt at guilt by association. The 1611 Holy Bible had the field to itself by the mid-17th century. John Bunyan also promoted the 1611 Holy Bible.

The 1611 Bible has two dedications which are not part of the inspired text, but which show the mind-set of those involved in its production. The first is a fawning, greasy note on how good the king is.

A deliberate lie. The Epistle Dedicatory calls the pope "that man of sin" and denounces "Popish persons." Find one modern version committee with the boldness in the Lord Jesus Christ to do the same. Oh dear David, what a mess you're making, spewing out all this nonsense!

The second is much better

It is more detailed, for the purpose for which it was written, as set out in the opening statements. To declare it as "better," therefore, shows a lack of discernment, WHICH IS A CHARACTERISTIC OF EVERY BIBLE 'CORRECTOR' & 'REJECTOR'!

(written by one of the "evangelicals") to the reader. Strangely(?), this contributor quotes scripture to his readers predominantly from the Geneva Bible

Irrelevant, in that in no way would that be even an implied criticism of the 1611 Holy Bible – for which the Preface was written.

Moreover, no examples are given, which is typical.

rather than the 1611 version he has helped to produce.

Read the concluding paragraphs of the Preface for a summary of the translators' perception of their work and how it should be received. Try doing a thorough job rather than speculate all the time!

So ..

2. You seem to believe that the 1611 Bible is perfect

Ans: I see the 1611 Bible as a good translation - amazing given the character of the king who agreed to have it done and of the majority of those involved in its translation.

Check In Awe of Thy Word and King James Unjustly Accused before denigrating James 1st and his translators. "...Thou shalt not bear false witness..." Romans 13:9. Again, you haven't done your homework! These two books will answer all your questions regarding King James; you must STOP making FALSE accusations without checking things out first!

It did not use the vernacular tongue in the way in which Tyndale had, and was therefore less accessible to the man-in-the-street than the Geneva Bible available at the same time.

It displaced the Geneva Bible by the mid 17th century and won the title "Authorized" by popular appeal.

"...Thou shalt not bear false witness..." Romans 13:9. Doing it again David! Naughty, naughty, naughty!!!

I believe that latter translators have the benefit of earlier texts and greater understanding of the vernacular idioms used in the original languages.

Examples? None. Typical. In fact, the translators had at their disposal all the necessary resources available to modern translators – and used them much more wisely. Check The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship by Dr Ruckman, but will you? I doubt it, because of WILFUL PRIDE!

You seem preoccupied with the need for evidence that the 1611 has flaws. I trust you believe in the personality of each of the members of the Godhead; Father, Son, and Spirit. The 1611 says in Romans 8:16¹⁶ The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: It would have been better to say "Himself" rather than "itself". This is an error. However, it's not an error which troubles me because the whole of scripture testifies to the personality of the Holy Spirit.

Of course the Holy Spirit showed you this 'error' didn't 'HE'?

OR are we chasing your Bible rejecting pastor again? I notice you make no mention of him in this email (deliberate? Making some progress are we, or is he suppling the bullets?)

Ready? Here we go, now follow closely because I will not repeat myself...

"Itself" is not an error in Romans 8:16, 26. The term is consistent with what the Lord Jesus Christ said in John 16:13 "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come."

Check the context of Romans 8:16-26. Substitution of the word "himself" is open defiance of and blasphemy against the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

However, since when did that ever bother a Bible rejector? "I will be like the most High" Isaiah 14:14.

I think I've gone on long enough, but to answer the question which Bible do I use, I use the NKJV for my personal devotions, and often read the ESV. If I come across a passage which I don't understand I will compare translations, and compare the passage to the wider body of the scriptures (i.e. other similar passages).

With no final authority between two covers, likewise with no explicit identification of "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God." AS USUAL! You are using a PERVERTED Bible that has a SATANIC symbol on the front of it! How apt!

I don't think that further exchanges on this subject will help. But if there are issues you want to debate, let's take them one at a time. (**Anything, anytime!**)

Meanwhile I trust in a Sovereign* God who has preserved His revelation, and given us an understanding of all things necessary for faith and practice.

With no final authority between two covers, likewise with no explicit identification of "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" and *deferring yet again to unsaved, medieval French-speaking Catholics and a church-state reformer whose theology and background in the papal priesthood prevented him for getting 3/4 of the Bible* right.

***Now the 1611 Holy Bible, in English, the language of the End Times.**

Well David, you are an enemy to the word of God but you can't see it! You have joined the other side & you will be judged accordingly at the Judgment Seat of Christ. If this issue was really an important one to you, you would do your homework... but you won't because you really are NOT interested! The above books will BLOW every single point you have raised completely out of the water.

You are doing NO GOOD to the Body of Christ in regard to your stand as stated above & for all those reasons.

Every single time YOU correct THAT BOOK, I personally will CORRECT YOU BY THAT BOOK!

I think it right that we both stand up & be counted, therefore I will add this correspondance to the Bible 'correctors' section of my website.

I would URGE you as soon as possible to repent of your sin in trying to find 'errors' in the Authorized Version Bible & submit to THE Book that God has promised to PRESERVE!

May God help you deal with your pride regarding your attack on the Scripture of Truth! If you get yourself on track, I am sure God could use you in a great way! See the comments at the front of NEW AGE BIBLE VERSIONS regarding Dr Frank Logson & the NASV! Have YOU that humility David?

In Christ

**John E Davis
Bible BELIEVER (AV of course!)**

OK John let's call it a day. I can see I'm not going to get anywhere with you. Sadly your rather gentle and humble (??) responses have given me little hope that you will yield to reason. All scripture is everything which God gave to be written down and preserved. This was done in the original languages, and despite us not having the original manuscripts we do have sufficient copies in the original languages to be certain of what God gave us. You, however, ignore that the 1611 translators chose a particular set of manuscripts (and prior translations) on which to base their work. This does NOT diminish the fine work they undertook and the value of the translation which they produced.

I do not, as you seem to do, accept that God has given us a guarantee that any translation will be perfect. You have not established from scripture that the 1611 was somehow more inspired than the texts from which it was translated. The "all scripture" which was inspired was the original text. The use of the word "book" and the insistence that it should be "between two covers" is a total irrelevance - did our Lord not read from scripture when He read from a scroll !!!!?

The technique of invoking invective and critical and/or abusive terms to try to make your case does not endear your arguments to me.

Your WEB site (I like all the family 'photos!) also clearly indicates that you consider yourself better informed than poor old Calvin - so there seems little point in trying to make headway with you - you are clearly THE man.

Cheers

David

OK John let's call it a day. I can see I'm not going to get anywhere with you. (**PRIDE has sadly gotton the better of you David! YOU have an unteachable spirit that will NOT YIELD to THE TRUTH! YOU have made too many mistakes to count & YOU are happy following MEN rather than GOD. You're in for a rough ride!**) Sadly your rather gentle and humble (??) (**I treat, & WILL ALWAYS treat, Bible 'correctors' & 'rejectors' with the contempt they deserve! I have a 100% PURE Bible thank you very much! It is WITHOUT 'error' & YOU & your ilk will NEVER take it from me, it is a Book that God has given to me... it is HIS word & I love it! I pity the FOOL that tries to find 'errors' in the AV!**) responses have given me little hope that you will yield to reason. All scripture is everything which God gave to be written down and preserved. (**An idiotic statement proving YET AGAIN that YOU have NO Final Authority in which to turn! YOU are not open to THE TRUTH!**) This was done in the original languages, and despite us not having the original manuscripts we do have sufficient copies in the original languages to be certain of what God gave us. (**RUBBISH as usual!**) You, however, ignore that the 1611 translators chose a particular set of manuscripts (and prior translations) on which to base their work. This does NOT diminish the fine work they undertook and the value of the translation which they

produced. **GOD preserved His word through sinful men from START to FINISH!**

I do not, as you seem to do, accept that God has given us a guarantee that any translation will be perfect. (**YOU have NO Final Authority, PERIOD!**) You have not established from scripture that the 1611 was somehow more inspired than the texts from which it was translated. The "all scripture" which was inspired was the original text. The use of the word "book" and the insistence that it should be "between two covers" is a total irrelevance - did our Lord not read from scripture when He read from a scroll !!!!!? **YOU will always stay on teh milk I fear rather than get into the STRONG MEAT! You can't even understand the simplist of Scriptures & the PROOF they present, & you're in a 'leadership' position??? I wonder what kind of Christians your church is producing - they certainly won't be BIBLE BELIEVING CHRISTIANS!**

The technique of invoking invective and critical and/or abusive terms to try to make your case does not endear your arguments to me. **A whipping is never pleasureable but you got what you deserved - you tried to pervert the word of God & God dealt with you in a way that certainly seemed fitting to me! You got off lightly, I was just gearing up for the final onslaught!!!**

Your WEB site (I like all the family 'photos!) also clearly indicates that you consider yourself better informed than poor old Calvin (**Calvin was a man of God used in his day! I am not a TULIP sniffer & NOT all Biblical revelation STOPPED with Calvin! Calvinists don't get that sadly to say!**) - so there seems little point in trying to make headway with you - you are clearly THE man.. **I am clearly a Bible BELIEVER that will NOT take the rubbish that Bible 'correctors' & 'rejectors' dish out, that is ALL! I have a Final Authority that is PERFECT.... YOU DON'T!**

Now seeing you haven't answered any of the questions, in any of my previous emails, AS USUAL, I must press on as another of your 'kind' has just reared his ugly head & needs dealing with! He will also be added to the Bible 'correcting' part of the website!

See you in Heaven! I'll be there of my own FREE WILL... go ahead!!!

I trow not!

IN Christ without being 'FORCED'

**John
AV Bible Believing Christian 100%**

Cheers

David

John - Funny ... I thought you'd want the last word (I wonder why?). Invective and abuse again.

Why is "All scripture is everything which God gave to be written down and preserved" an idiotic statement? It is surely self-evident.

God has indeed preserved His word through sinful men from start to finish .. when it was originally given and faithfully transcribed.

But we must remember that I have no final authority, so whatever I say ... true or false ... can be dismissed as rubbish.

If I meet you in heaven it will be by the grace and mercy of God - not your free will - as it is for all who truly trust in Christ alone for salvation.

Ephesians 2

⁴But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, ⁵Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) ⁶And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: ⁷That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. ⁸For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: ⁹Not of works, lest any man should boast. ¹⁰For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

and of course

Romans 9

¹⁴What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. ¹⁵For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. ¹⁶So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. ¹⁷For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. ¹⁸Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.

Farewell (maybe)

David

(A man who believes in God's free will to do as He chooses)

I thought you were 'finished'?

In RED as usual...

John - Funny ... I thought you'd want the last word (I wonder why?). Invective and abuse again. **Just TRUTH! Obviously you haven't read ANYTHING quoted in previous emails! I wonder why?**

Why is "All scripture is everything which God gave to be written down and preserved" an idiotic statement? It is surely self-evident. **Because YOU don't have a PERFECT Final Authority in which to turn! Man alive! How many more times??? Where is the PERFECT word of God TODAY that we all can read & quote from?**

God has indeed preserved His word through sinful men from start to finish .. when it was originally given and faithfully transcribed. **The AV is that PERFECT word!**

But we must remember that I have no final authority, **(AT LAST!!! The TRUEST statement you have said so far!)** so whatever I say ... true or false ... can be dismissed as rubbish. **Not everything! Only your Bible 'correcting' & your Calvinistic JUNK!**

If I meet you in heaven it will be by the grace and mercy of God - not your free will **(Following a MAN yet again rather than the Scriptures, Oh dear Davey boy, when will you ever grow up & stand as a MAN?)** - as it is for all who truly trust in Christ alone for salvation.

Ephesians 2

⁴But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, ⁵Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) ⁶And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: ⁷That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. ⁸For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: ⁹Not of works, lest any man should boast. ¹⁰For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

Boy do you get sucked into this Calvinistic RUBBISH!

To be 'quickened' YOU have to do something (John 1v12+13) but you never look up teh Scriptures do you?

You're NOT IN Christ until you TRUSTED Christ! God 'chose' the people for 'election' who were IN Christ (Eph 2v12) (By the way, the word 'elect' has FIVE meanings in Scripture old boy - but YOU knew that of course!!!)

You're NOT IN Christ BEFORE Gen 1v1 (If you are, you will BREAK YOUR PRETTY LITTLE NECK on my response to that!)

Babies that die, are they IN Christ? Are they ELECT?

Read also 2 Pet 2v1 - What a kick in the pants for a Calvinist!!! Get that one??? I doubt it!

and of course I'm gonna have to spoon feed you this one! Boy oh boy, you Calvinists really can't rightly divide the word of God can you...

Rom 9 (The Calvinist chestnut!) Well let's crack that one for you shall we Dave?

NOT a word in Rom 9 is about...

- 1) Personal salvation!**
- 2) Individual Redemption!**
- 3) Universal Redemption!**

It is about God's eternal purposes in individuals, how He chose some FOR SERVICE & not others! It is to do with SERVICE & NOT salvation!

It's NOT for 'destiny' it's for 'purpose'!!! There is NO question in this passage about Jacob going to Heaven & Esau going to Hell!

Come on Dave, let's read the Scriptures (AV) rather than follow Johnny Calvin Or your Bible correcting pastor!

READ THE BIBLE OLD BOY! It will do wonders for you!

Romans 9

¹⁴What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. ¹⁵For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. ¹⁶So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. ¹⁷For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. ¹⁸Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.

Farewell (maybe) **Not if you keep spewing out this rubbish!**

By the way a few questions for you... (seeing I answer every single one of yours & you haven't answered any of mine?)

- 1) When did the OT saints get Imputed Righteousness & Justification? Was it the same time that you & I do?**
- 2) What is the difference between the K of God & teheK of Heaven?**
- 3) Where is the PERFECT word of God TODAY between two covers IN ONE SINGLE PLACE in which we can turn to & read! (WHOOPS! That slipped out!)**
- 4) What GOSPEL will be preached in the Tribulation??? Now there's a beauty for ya!**
- 5) Did Jesus go to HELL when He died??? Ouch, that one will throw you a 'Wobbler'**

Few more next time?

Be a good boy & click on the link & follow instructions... <http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/contents-tft-news/>

David

(A man who believes in God's free will to do as He chooses)

So there you have it, a MORON with no Final Authority, who keeps saying that there are 'errors' in the Authorized Version Bible! What am I supposed to say to him, "Thanks, I appreciate your 'help'?"

I mean, WHO do they think they are? What good are these idiots doing to & for the Body of Christ?

Not only has he NO Final Authority, he can't even READ the so called 'authority' he keeps pointing to i.e. the Hebrew & the Greek! *Come on give us a break!* You & I KNOW that this kind of Christian is just a waste of time when it comes to anything doctrinal/Scriptural.

Whoever is ‘teaching’ Hodges all this ‘dung’ (Phil 3v8) (What would the modern update for THAT word be? Little inconsistent regarding ‘translation’aren’t we Mr Bible ‘corrector?’) ought to give up the ministry & sell shoes for a living!

No wonder the church is in such a mess today when Christians like ‘Laurel & Hardy’ above haven’t a clue about the Scriptures!

Anyway, must go, as there are so many souls to reach with the Gospel & I have spent enough time on these ‘milk-sop-Christians!’

Have a *nice* day!