

## Bible Versions

First, I believe the Bible is absolutely the Word of God, inspired by God, God breathed, and He attested those 39 books commonly referred to as “scriptures”. Those OT books are I believe written by men as they were instructed by the Holy Spirit. Further, it is by the Holy Spirit that we are taught. As God breathed, He taught us.

### 2 Timothy 3:15-17 (King James Version)

<sup>15</sup> And that from a child thou hast known the **Holy Scriptures**, which are able **to make thee wise unto salvation through faith** which is **in Christ Jesus**.

<sup>16</sup> **All Scripture is given by inspiration of God**, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

Inspiration is from NT:2315 θεόπνευστος **theopneustos** (teh-op'-nyoo-stos); from NT:2316 and a presumed derivative of NT:4154; **divinely breathed in: KJV** - given by inspiration of God.

<sup>17</sup> That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

The Scriptures in the 2 Tim 3:15 refer to the 39 books of the OT.

### Jeremiah 30:2

Thus speaketh the LORD **God** of Israel, saying, **Write** thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book.

God instructed Jeremiah and others to write in the books what God, alone, spoke.

Because I believe that all Scripture is God breathed, I most certainly want the English translation to be as close to Hebrew as possible and that would include all 39 books of the OT. We have a pretty good handle on the Hebrew OT (smattering of Aramaic). We know we have the Hebrew books of the OT from 2000 years ago because Jesus referred to “scriptures” a number of times... He referred generally to all the books and it was known in the time of Christ as we know today that those 39 books were Holy Scripture. The 27 books of the NT I believe to be God inspired books that document the fulfillment of OT law and prophets. And the Dead Sea Scrolls confirmed to us that the Hebrew text, from which the English was translated, is very close. By the way, to say that it is very close is not to say that has parts that are wrong, but rather that the variations do not in any way take away the actual meaning when compared to the Hebrew in context. Many times the English was embellished to keep the meaning clear.

As for the versions, I am not concerned with the English translation as much as I am concerned about the source of the translation. Wycliffe, in the 1300's, did provide an English Bible, however, it was translated from the Latin to English. In the 1400's a physician by the name of Thomas Linacre learned Greek and translated the Greek

## Bible Versions

scriptures, of the NT, to English. Again in the late 1400's John Colet read the Greek NT and translated Greek to English. Around 1500, Tyndale was the first to print the New Testament in the English language. However, this was based upon the Erasmus translation directly, but instead, Tyndale flees to Germany and completes the work based upon the work done by Martin Luther which was based on the work of Erasmus.

Still an English translation of OT and NT had not been accomplished.

Myles Coverdale and John "Thomas Matthew" Rogers continued the work of the martyred Tyndale. They accomplished a translation, in 1535, of the OT into English. This "version" was still not based on scholarly translation from Hebrew and Greek. This was referred to by the name the **English Bible**.

In 1537, John Rogers, completed the 2<sup>nd</sup> **English Bible**. This Bible was the first however translated from the Hebrew and Greek texts to English. Still unpublished...

In 1539 the English Bible was produced under authority of King Henry VIII and called the "Great Bible" due to its size.

The Geneva Bible was the first completed Bible OT and NT to be published in 1560.

All of the versions including the KJV included the 14 Apocryphal books up until around 1880 when the **ERV, English Revised Version** (England's replacement for their own KJV) was published **without** the 14 Apocryphal books.

An **ASV, the American Standard Version**, an American rendition of the ERV was published in 1901 and later updated as the **NASB** in 1971.

In 1973, the **NIV**, New International version was produced but was not a translation, but rather written as a paraphrase, often referred to as thought-for-thought

In 1982 the **NKJV** was introduced

In 2002 the **English Standard Version ESV** was developed, which was sort of a cross between the NIV and the ERS.

Although, there are other variations including some "magazine" styles or other dramatic attempts the scholarly examples are listed above.

**All but the KJV and the NKJV were based on Alexandrian text type** because this is where many scholars have chosen to go, principally, because it is believed to be the older text. However, there are thousands of words missing from the **Alexandrian text types** of the New Testament when they are compared to the **Byzantine text types**.

Thus, **I rely upon the more reliable Byzantine text upon which ONLY the KJV and the NKJV is based** upon. These are, I believe, the more complete and best translations to use and, amazingly, even those who use other so called versions of The Bible admit that the Byzantine text is a better text. The reading of other versions may be easier but that doesn't make it better.

## Bible Versions

Interestingly enough the comparisons show that the KJV is about 98 percent in agreement with known Greek manuscripts. Again, although variations exist in the remaining 2% of the KJV, the variations are rare and insignificant compared to the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts.

Definitions:

I think we need to clear up some definitions with respect to the discussion of versions of biblical material:

**Translation** is rendering from the original languages in OT or NT to English. Thus the definitions of the Hebrew and Greek are rendered in English words that mean the same.

**Paraphrase** is a free rendering from the original languages in the OT or NT to English. Thus the definitions of the Hebrew and Greek are freely express in English words that express the meaning of the original text.

You described the KJV as a paraphrase which is technically INCORRECT. We know, of course, that we should NOT put the translated English words in the order of the original language, but, rather, arrange the verbiage into English we MUST consider the normal and accepted English syntax to express the same meaning. That is NOT paraphrasing.

You seem to like to list a rendition of the original text into English sequentially in the order or arrangement of the original text. ...and frankly that is fine, and generally accepted in paralleling text between the English and Hebrew or Greek. However, it absolutely does not generally express the translated understanding in English without the grammatical understanding of the original language. Thus, the proper arrangement is made to express not only the meaning of original text, but to express the same understanding in English.

We can absolutely translate other current languages into English and have an exact meaning. But even with the best understanding of the language to be translated, it may require the arrangement to be adjusted for syntax in English, or conversion to a multiple of words or an expression, rather than a single synonymous English word, to clearly translate the meaning or the original text.

**Interpretation** is NOT the same thing as translation.

During the translation part of taking text in the original language and converting it to English, the translator may take the liberty of interpreting the translation or expressing his belief of what he thinks was meant by the translation. I would prefer to know and believe what the original text said.

Based on the above, I use the KJB, King James Bible, and rely upon the translation of the KJB as a basis of my belief. I have confirmed over and over the accuracy of the KJB, as it is written, and that, without interpretation, I teach that we accept what it says as written. This, I and others do because we believe it to be God's Word which is the only book that absolutely confirms itself as it is written.

## **Bible Versions**

Other so called versions are not that. Rather, those versions (NKJV included) have been corrupted just as the Latin Vulgate, which may have been a reasonably accurate translation when first translated, was in subsequent printing moved away from the original translation and became corrupted by often enterprising interpretive rendering according to the personal agenda of the interpreters or ecclesiastical groups or religious orders.

Now having said this, I recognize that the **differences** can be enumerated and, by percentage, are generally small. However, I have evaluated probably all or most of the differences and confirmed that the KJV is consistent with the translation from Hebrew or Greek and verified that the other “versions” have been modified by a contrary interpretation or contrary agenda of the authors of those representations of The Holy Bible.

Dr Stuart McCutcheon. Pastor  
Church on the Rock Assembly