

ARE MODERN TRANSLATIONS DANGEROUS?

Randy Kea

#1 July 2018

<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/stoptop718.pdf>

I am not saying we know everything about everything, but there are some things we cannot be wrong about and be right with God.

For a number of years now, one of the greatest threats to the cause of Christ has been the proliferation of modern versions/translations. Let me say at the outset that I do not hold that all modern translations are in the same category as far as errors are concerned. However, I have not run across one that does not have something critical that should be exposed. I maintain that the best (not perfect) translation in English continues to be the King James Version (see my recent articles in *Seek The Old Paths*: January-June, 2018. seektheoldpaths.com).

There are four groups of people in the church on this subject:

- 1) Those who believe the truth and understand that modern translations are very dangerous;
- 2) Those who do not believe in verbal inspiration, preservation, and translation, and therefore see nothing wrong with modern-speech translations;
- 3) Those who are indifferent and unconcerned who really don't care to investigate and study the matter;
- 4) Those who have heard the Gospel and believe the Truth but have not informed themselves on this critical issue.

Here are at least four reasons why modern versions/translations should be considered dangerous:

- 1) As a teacher, you cannot teach the Truth if you are using a translation that promotes Calvinism, Pentecostalism, Premillennialism, etc.
- 2) As a student, you cannot learn the Truth through a translation that promotes the

above fatal theological errors.

- 3) How can a young person or a new convert become grounded in the Truth by reading and studying a translation promoting the above theological errors?
- 4) If a person has already embraced these errors promoted by a version, how do you bring them out of the error by using an erroneous version?

A number of years ago when my wife was getting her bachelor's degree, she had a fellow student who was a Calvinist. He was convinced of this by using the NIV. She could not teach him the Truth using this version. When she tried to reason with him, he actually showed her out of the NIV in Romans 8-9 the phrase "sinful nature" which of course is an erroneous translation for the Greek word "flesh." I've heard some of my brethren say, "You can teach someone out of any translation." Yes, you can teach them some Truth, but not all of it! One who would make a statement like this either doesn't know the Truth or doesn't believe the Truth. Should we not be concerned about the "whole counsel" of God, "all truth," the totality of the "doctrine of Christ?"

I am not saying we know everything about everything, but there are some things we cannot be wrong about and be right with God. For example, you must be right about the subject of adultery or you cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven (1 Cor. 6:9-11). Almost all modern-speech translations allow for more reasons for a divorce and remarriage besides "fornication" which of course would result in adultery (Matt. 5:32; 19:9).

Here are some Bible warnings: "*ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish ought from it*" ... "*thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it*" ... "*turn not from it to the right-hand or to the left, that thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest*" ... "*add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar*" ... "*all the words that I command thee to speak unto them; diminish not a word*" ... "*let him speak my word faithfully*" ...

"but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ" ... "for we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God" ... "if any man shall add unto these things...if any man shall take away from the words of the book..." (Deut. 4:2; 12:32; Josh. 1:7-10; Prov. 30:6; Jer. 23:28; 26:2; Gal. 1:7; 2 Cor. 2:17; Rev. 22:18-19).

A number of years ago when our children were very young, we were advised to make a will (a last will and testament), which is good advice. As time has gone by, we have changed that will to adapt it to changing circumstances in our lives. At the point of our death our will legally cannot be changed. It will be enforced by the power of constituted civil law. We would be very distressed if someone obtained a copy of our will and started adding words or taking away words or modifying it in any way. Just one word can make a huge difference in the probation process of a will.

Please note this passage with reference to Jesus and His will: *"And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth"* (Heb. 9:15-17).

While our Lord was on earth during His earthly ministry, He distributed His blessings as He pleased. But at the time of His death, He repealed the Old Testament and ratified His New Testament. Since that time, blessings can only be obtained from the Lord by complying with the terms of His last will and testament (Matt. 26:28; 2 Cor. 3:6-18; Col. 2:14-16; Heb. 13:20).

If we, as mere humans, would not want anyone to tamper with our last will and testament, not even a word of it, what do you think the Lord feels when men change any of His words in any way? The double curse of Galatians 1:6-9 will be brought to bear on the Day of Judgment upon those who would engage in such a nefarious business (John 12:48).

#2 August 2018

<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/stop/stop818.pdf#page=4>

NIV New International Version

In our previous article (June/18) we pointed out that all the words of the Bible should be left intact and unaltered. Deuteronomy 4:2, *"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you."* Proverbs 30:5-6, *"Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."* Galatians 1:7, *"Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ."* We further noted that the New Testament is the last will and testament of Christ, and just as we would not want one single word modified in our personal wills, in like manner the Lord will not hold one guiltless who tampers with His last will and testament.

In this second article on dangers present in modern translations, we will focus on the New International Version. The preface of the NIV is truly enlightening to one who carefully studies modern translations. Here are some points gleaned by reading the preface:

1. The NIV claims to be "a completely new translation of the Holy Bible."
2. The Old Testament Hebrew Masoretic text is altered by using other sources (Dead Sea Scrolls, etc).
3. The New Testament text is based on what they call an "eclectic text" which means they used a text based on the fallacious reasoning of two theologians by the names of Westcott and Hort who lived in the 1800s.
4. The preface indicates that they did not believe in plenary, verbal inspiration — "to achieve clarity the translators sometimes supplied words not in the original texts — have striven for more than a word for word translation." Remember, the Bible specifically condemns those who "add words" (Prov. 30:5-

6; Rev. 22:18-19).

5. As translators, they operated on the faulty idea of thought translation — “fidelity to the thought of biblical writers.” This technique of translating would result in nothing more than a paraphrase.

I don’t know of anyone who has influenced modern theology more than John Calvin. One of his fundamental tenets was the doctrine of “total hereditary depravity.” This false doctrine asserts that: 1) man is born a sinner from the womb, 2) he has inherited the sin of Adam, 3) his will is not free, it is in bondage to his evil nature, 4) he cannot choose good over evil without the direct power of the Spirit of God. Clearly these concepts are not in harmony with plain Bible teaching, and yet the NIV translates Psalm 51:5: *“Surely I have been a sinner from birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me.”*

We further note the infamous renditions of the word for “flesh” in Romans chapters 8 and 9 and Galatians 5 as “sinful nature.” Edwin H. Palmer was the executive secretary of the New International Version and the general editor of the NIV Study Bible. He wrote a book entitled “The Five Points of Calvinism” defending and explaining the doctrines of John Calvin. It is not surprising therefore to find the NIV laced with Calvinistic error.

Here are some additional critical issues and glaring errors found in the NIV:

1. With reference to the marriage and divorce passages, the generic phrase “marital un-faithfulness” is used in place of the specific word “fornication” (Matt. 5:32; 19:9). Also, the last part of Matthew 19:9, *“whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery,”* is completely omitted.
2. Because the translators used the Critical Text (Westcott/Hort basis), entire paragraphs are deleted or relegated to a footnote (Mark 16:9-20; John 7:53-8:11).
3. By rewriting the Bible, these translators have essentially inserted modern denominational doctrines into the text of God’s Word. For example:
 - a) the NIV has people saved at the point of *hearing* (Eph. 1:13) and *faith only* (Rom. 1:17) without any further acts of

obedience. I’m sure the Calvinists and Methodist preachers love this.

- b) Premillennialism is inserted into the text with the phrase “at the renewal of all things” (Matt. 19:28).
- c) Neo-pentecostalism is promoted in the phrase “but when perfection comes” (1 Cor. 13:10), thus opening the door for the continuation of miraculous powers even unto today.
- d) The NIV omits “only begotten” in John 1:14,18; 3:16,18; 1 John 4:9, undermining the *virgin birth* and *deity of Christ*.

These examples could be multiplied, but these are sufficient for one to discard the NIV as an accurate and reliable translation.

As with essentially all modern translations that have attained any prominence, the problem is two-fold with the NIV.

First, the NIV uses a faulty text base for the New Testament and alters the Old Testament by using spurious sources (these are noted in the preface);

Second, the translators employed the dangerous dynamic equivalence technique in the translation process which allows them to add and delete words and insert theological errors at their whims. The very first thing Satan did was to alter what God said, thus resulting in the deception of Eve and the tragic consequences that followed (Gen. 3:1-6). Our Lord said that the devil would continue to use this method: *“then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved”* (Luke 8:12). We maintain a primary way that our adversary has done this is through the massive production and widespread acceptance of psuedo-translations. John describes Satan as our arch enemy *“which deceiveth the whole world”* (Rev. 12:9).

KJV King James Version Issues

In any discussion of the dangers of modern translations, one must acknowledge and deal with criticisms leveled against the King James Version. At this point in our articles on dangers of modern translations I wanted to address the so-called “problems” with the KJV. Let me state at the outset that I maintain that the “issues” concerning the KJV are not in the same category or eternal consequence as “problems” with modern translations. Following are criticisms leveled against the KJV:

1. *The KJV of 1611 is different than the KJV of today.* It is true that the KJV of today is not the same as the KJV of 1611, but the differences have to do with spelling and matters in this category. For example, “wordes” is changed to “words,” “amongst” is changed to “among.” So don’t let anyone ever tell you that we don’t have the same King James today. This is much ado about nothing.

2. *People say the KJV cannot be understood today by the average person because of so many archaic words found in it.* The immediate response to this criticism is that the word archaic simply means “old.” It does not mean it’s not accurate. Some time ago the Trinitarian Bible Society of London, England, put out a list of archaic words found in the KJV and they only noted some 618 words. There are 791,328 words in the KJV. So clearly, the 618 number (0.00078%) is insignificant when compared to the whole Bible. A couple well known examples are “conversation” (Phil. 1:27) which today means “conduct” and “prevent” (1 Thess. 4:15) which today means “precede.” Many KJV’s update these words in their margin and a good Bible student will get a concordance or a collegiate dictionary to update these archaic words. Remember, an archaism is old; it is not error. I will say more about the readability of the KJV later.

3. *The KJV uses the word “Easter” instead of*

the correct translation “Passover” in Acts 12:4. In this verse, the word “easter” is a seasonal reference only. It is not advocating the observance of the Old Testament Passover festival. R. C. Trench and other scholars, I believe, correctly conclude that it was simply an oversight on the part of the KJV translators who had removed the word “Easter” from every other place it had been in earlier translations and correctly rendered “*paska*” Passover (*On Bible Revision*, pp.34-35). In either case, it does not teach the observance of Easter or Passover today.

4. *The KJV uses the English word “hell” which is inaccurate.* The old English word hell denotes something that is covered and unseen which would include the *temporary abode of the dead* (*hades* [Strong’s #86], found 10 times) and the *everlasting punishment of the wicked* (*gehenna* [Strong’s #1067], found 12 times). This can easily be verified by using Strong’s concordance. In fact, if you check collegiate dictionaries, both of these concepts are a part of the defined word hell. So after checking the etymology of the English word hell, the so-called error of the KJV disappears. However, this is one of those occasions when one would want to go back to the original Hebrew and Greek word for further word studies.

5. *The KJV tends to be Calvinistic.* This is one of the most absurd of all of the charges against the KJV because Restoration leaders and the great debaters among churches of Christ all used the KJV to annihilate the tenets of Calvinism. I was raised in the Methodist Church. In 1972, the preacher who converted me used the KJV to show me the errors of Calvinism and denominationalism. I have been preaching for 44 years and as many preachers do, I preach on the errors of Calvinism by using only the KJV.

6. *The KJV originally contained the Apocrypha.* Many major translations of the Bible have included the Apocrypha (uninspired writings used to shed light upon the intertestamental period). These writings are never included as a part of the Old Testament or New Testament text or canon. This is another unwarranted criticism.

7. *The KJV is in “Elizabethan English” which*

nobody speaks today. We certainly don't agree with his theology, but textual scholar Edward Hills speaks on the misconception that the English of the KJV is Elizabethan: "The English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century. To be exact, it is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by the translators who produced the King James Version...One need only compare the preface written by the translators with the text of their translation to feel the difference in style...Its style is that of the Hebrew and of the New Testament Greek. Even in their use of thee and thou, the translators were not following 17th century English usage but biblical usage, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural you in polite conversation" (*The King James Version Defended*, pp.218). In other words, "thee" and "thou" usage shows how accurate and precise the KJV translators were when translating singular and plural pronouns (see John 3:7, thee, singular; ye, plural). I get very weary when people start talking to me about the "thees" and the "thous" found in the KJV. They are showing their ignorance. These same people would not advocate taking these words out of our songbooks — as an example: "*my faith looks up to Thee, thou Lamb of Calvary.*"

I would further comment about the KJV that as far as readability is concerned, when various readability software programs have been applied to the KJV, the results show that it is just as readable and sometimes easier to read than modern translations. I would also point out that in the translation process, accuracy is more important than simplicity. It has been said that it is better to "educate up" than "translate down," and I would agree!

Clearly, there are things that must be addressed and pointed out in connection with the KJV. I emphasize again that the issues that we must deal with when critiquing the KJV are not in the same category as the damnable doctrines that have entered into the modern translations of the Bible.

It's also important to note that not all modern translations are equally egregious or erroneous. When I started this series of articles I said that I recognized that the King James translators were not perfect men or inspired men. I further stated that I recognized that, on occasion, we must go back to the original languages of the Bible for word studies and full meaning and clarification. My position is therefore again stated — the King James Version is superior and best, not perfect.

#4 Oct. 2018

<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/stopo18.pdf#page=6>

ESV English Standard Version

In my study of the ESV, I have learned it is a "light revision" of the notorious Revised Standard Version. By putting them side by side, one can see the great similarity between the two. In fact, in most places there is no difference at all. I believe this point is generally unknown among many in the Lord's church who have "latched on" to this modern translation. We note here, to their credit, they did change "young woman" to "virgin" in Isaiah 7:14.

As we have emphasized in previous articles, there are two dangerous issues in connection with modern translations generally: (1) Modern translations, as a rule, do not use the text-base used by the KJV. (The KJV uses the Received Text for the New Testament and the Masoretic Hebrew text for the Old Testament.) (2) Modern translations that have attained any notoriety use for their translation technique a "dynamic equivalency" technique instead of a "verbal and formal" technique. See my previous articles for a full discussion of this: www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/HowWeGotTheBible.pdf

Although in the preface of the ESV the claim is made that the ESV is in harmony with the "Tyndale-King James legacy," upon close examination this is a claim that cannot be substantiated.

(1) The Textus Receptus (Received Text) was used as the textual basis for translation in the New Testament by the KJV. The text base of the ESV in the New Testament was the modern UBS 4th edition/Nestle-Aland 27th edition Greek Text (this is a faulty text base).

(2) The Hebrew Masoretic Text was used by the KJV for Old Testament translation. The ESV used the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch...and other sources for Old Testament translation purposes. (See the preface of the ESV). They used these spurious sources to modify the Hebrew text which underlies the KJV.

(3) The KJV used italics to indicate when a word was not represented in the original text but was demanded by syntax, grammatical structure, etc. The ESV has no use of italics like this whatsoever.

(4) Here are a few of some other serious issues with the ESV:

a) In John 7:53-8:11 and Mark 16:9-20, brackets are used and footnotes that cast serious doubt on the integrity of these whole sections of the Word of God.

b) "Only begotten" is deleted from these precious passages: John 1:14,18; 3:16-18; 4:9. The original word for only begotten is *mono-genes*. The unparalleled linguists of the KJV rendered this word as "only begotten." The ASV (American Standard Version), the NASV (New American Standard Version), and the NKJV (New King James Version) all retain the words "only begotten" as the correct translation of this word. The ESV along with the RSV (Revised Standard Version), TEV (Today's English Version), and the NIV (New International Version) have abandoned "only begotten" as the correct translation. To remove "only begotten" from these passages is an attack on the virgin birth and deity of Christ. One of the best brief summaries of the cumulative evidence through the centuries concerning the truth of this matter that I've run across is found in a lecture by brother Robert Taylor entitled "Jesus, The Only Begotten Son" (Sixth Annual Firm Foundation Lectureship on John, 1989, pp 81-91).

c) Clearly, changing "regeneration" to "in the new world" has a premillennial slant in Matthew

19:28. The word "regeneration" is also found in Titus 3:5 where it refers to the period of the new birth which is the New Testament or Gospel period under which we now live.

d) Matthew 19:9. Changing the specific word "fornication" to "sexual immorality" which is generic and too inclusive and also leaving out the last phrase of Matthew 19:9 has far-reaching implications. The last phrase says, "*and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.*" Lasciviousness is a type of sexual immorality but it is not fornication. In other words, all fornication is sexual immorality, but not all sexual immorality is fornication.

e) By cross examining Matthew 5:17 and Ephesians 2:15, the ESV has Jesus and Paul contradicting each other with reference to the "abolishing" of the Old Testament Mosaical Law. The ESV says: "Do not think that I have come to *abolish* the Law or the Prophets; *I have not come to abolish* them but to fulfill them." The KJV says: "Think not that I am come to *destroy* the law, or the prophets: *I am not come to destroy*, but to fulfil." Now, consider also Ephesians 2:15: ESV: "by *abolishing* the law of commandments expressed in ordinances..." KJV: "Having *abolished* in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments..." The ESV has Jesus contradicting Paul in these passages (Matt. 5:17; Eph. 2:15) on the termination of the Mosaical system at the cross. One of the reasons Jesus came into the world was to "abolish" the Law of Moses. He did not come to "destroy" it, we still have it. We learn from it (Rom. 15:4). But Jesus did "abolish" it. He took it out of the way "*nailing it to his cross*" (Col. 2:14).

Other errors could be noted but these are enough to demonstrate that the ESV is not trustworthy.

We conclude by saying the ESV has the wrong text base in both testaments and translation issues with doctrinal consequences. We continue to urge all to stay with the accurate and reliable KJV.

A review of the ESV by Robert R. Taylor, Jr. is available at:
<http://seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/ESV-Taylor.pdf>

#5 Nov. 2018
<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/stop/stopn18.pdf#page=7>

NKJV New King James Version

The NKJV is widely used among churches of Christ. I know some younger preachers who have done all their memory work from this modern translation. Let me say at the outset in this article that the NKJV is certainly not dangerous in the sense that the NIV is dangerous. Another preliminary matter is the fact that not all editions of the NKJV are the same. They differ from year to year and from country to country. So not all editions through the years will have the same issues that we will emphasize in this article.

One of the first passages I check when reviewing a translation is the Marriage-Divorce-Remarriage passages (Matt. 5:32; 19:9, etc.). Unfortunately, the NKJV joins other pseudo-translations in not translating the ‘one’ and ‘only one’ reason for divorce and remarriage, i.e. “fornication.” It uses the broad phrase “sexual immorality.” This is too inclusive and would allow for multiple reasons for divorce and remarriage. For example: Ephesians 4:19 and Jude 4 speaks of “lasciviousness,” defined as “unbridled lust, indecent bodily movements, the unchaste handling of males and females.” All of these activities are sexually immoral and can lead to fornication, but they are not fornication. The modern dance is sexually immoral but is not fornication. In a world where people marry and divorce at will, and even in the church where many brethren persist in their error concerning M-D-R, we certainly don’t want a “Bible” that opens the gate for more reasons than the Scripture gives for divorce and remarriage. This is a doctrinal issue. One cannot teach a doctrine that promotes adultery or leaves people in an

adulterous state and please the Lord.

Let’s consider some (not all) textual issues. The NKJV purports to be in line with the KJV history and tradition by their claim to use the Hebrew Masoretic text in the Old Testament (which underlies the KJV) and the Textus Receptus in the New Testament (which underlies the KJV). It is true that they use these two texts as their basis; however, in some editions of the NKJV there are numerous marginal notes in both the Old Testament and the New Testament that indicate clearly that they give equal credence and authority to various spurious sources in both testaments. Here are some of the abbreviations you will see: 1) the Old Testament — DSS (Dead Sea Scrolls); Tg (targum, an Aramaic paraphrase of the Old Testament); LXX (Septuagint, an ancient translation of the Old Testament into Greek); 2) the New Testament — NU (Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament and in the third edition of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament); M (Majority Text).

The claim in the preface that the NKJV is following in the steps of the KJV history is not in harmony with what they practice by using these above faulty sources which cast doubt upon the integrity of the textual basis of the KJV. If you have an edition of the NKJV that uses these marginal notes, you can check Mark 16:9-20, John 7:53-8:11, Acts 8:37, and 1 Timothy 3:16 and see that the Critical Text (NU) is given equal standing alongside the Textus Receptus. (Remember the Critical Text changes the Textus Receptus in some 5,600 places involving almost 10,000 words in the Greek New Testament).

We have maintained from the beginning that the Hebrew Masoretic Text should be exclusively used for translating the Old Testament and the Textus Receptus should be exclusively used for translating the New Testament. (See my previous articles in “Seek The Old Paths” for internal and external evidence for this position.)

Another area of concern is that there are examples that can be noted that show there is a touch of dynamic equivalence in the NKJV although the claim in the preface is for complete equivalence in translation technique. For

example, it can be shown in numerous places where pronouns have been used in place of nouns and nouns have been used in place of pronouns. For example: in Job 40:7 “loins” (noun, KJV) is changed to “yourself” (pronoun, NKJV). In Numbers 5:21 “priest” (KJV) is changed to “he” (NKJV). In Leviticus 8:15 “he” (KJV) is changed to “Moses” (NKJV).

Further, it has been pointed out by conservative textual scholarship that the NKJV omits the subjunctive mood in the translation process. The English language, along with other world languages such as Spanish, French, and so on, have three moods, *indicative*, *imperative* and *subjunctive*. The *indicative mood* is used to make factual statements. The *imperative mood* is used to express a request or command. The *subjunctive mood*, although comparatively rare, is still used in proper English to denote an action or a state as “conceived” (and ‘not’ as a ‘fact’) and therefore used to express a “wish, command, exhortation, or a contingent, hypothetical, or prospective event” ... (Oxford English Dictionary, Vol 11). Here are some examples: John 3:2, “*except* God be with him” (KJV), “*unless* God is with him” (NKJV). John 3:5, “*except* a man be born...” (KJV), “*unless* one is born...” (NKJV). This change runs through the whole New Testament repeatedly.

If God uses a noun in His inspired word, does anyone have a right to change it to a pronoun? If He uses a pronoun, does anyone have the right to change it to a noun? When God uses a grammar mood, does man have the right to change a grammar mood? Remember, the Bible claims that “every word” therein is from God (Matt. 4:4; 1 Cor. 2:13; Matt. 24:35). If the NKJV takes such liberties with nouns, pronouns and moods, where else does it take liberty to change what the inspired record says? Do we want what the Holy Spirit revealed or alterations of it?

Finally, the preface of the NKJV makes the rather braggadocio claim that it will “unlock the spiritual treasures found uniquely in the King James Version.” We do not need any of the new translations to “unlock” anything found in the accurate, reliable, and faithful-to-the-text King James translation. If we encounter a word that we do not know in the KJV, we can get a

dictionary and look it up while still having the confidence that it is the correct word used in the translation.

#6 Dec. 2018

<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdfs/top/stopd18.pdf#page=8>

NASV New American Standard Version

This translation is not to be confused with the American Standard Version (ASV) of 1901. The NASV was completed in 1971. It was a production of the Lockman Foundation (California) which prior to that had produced the so-called Amplified Version. As with all translations there are two concerns: 1) What are the texts underlying the translation? 2) Are there translational problems that result in doctrinal error?

The texts underlying the NASV in the Old and New Testaments are faulty. Concerning the Old Testament, they did not use exclusively the Masoretic text. You will see in marginal notes DSS (Dead Sea Scrolls) and GK (Septuagint — LXX). These sources are used in addition to the Hebrew Masoretic text. Because of this you will see those distressing marginal notes that cast doubt on the verbal preservation of the Old Testament text. Remember as we have emphasized in previous articles, Jesus only used the Hebrew text and claimed that it was verbally preserved (Matt. 5:17-18; 23:35; Luke 16:17; 24:44). I am aware of the popular line of thinking that takes the position that Jesus did not use exclusively the Hebrew Masoretic text (even in the Lord’s church). However, we maintain that internal evidence such as the above Scripture references is inspired evidence and therefore conclusive for anyone who believes in the verbal inspiration and preservation of the Bible.

Concerning the text underlying the New Testament, as with essentially all modern translations, the NASV uses the Critical Text (Nestle/Aland); therefore you will see brackets in

parts of the New Testament and footnotes — again casting doubt on the integrity of the passage under consideration. For example, see Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11. Remember the Nestle/Aland text is shorter than the Received Text (King James Version) by 2,886 words. This would be equivalent to dropping out entirely the books of First and Second Peter. How can anyone say it does not make any difference which text base one uses to produce a Bible?

The NASV is much better than the NIV. However, it does have problems in several passages. Here are some doctrinal issues with the NASV:

1. It has errors on the subject of marriage, divorce, and remarriage. It allows divorce for “unchastity” in Matthew 5:32 and “immorality” in Matthew 19:9. Both of these words allow divorce for more reasons than *fornication*. As previously noted, dirty jokes and lust would be immoral, but they are not grounds for divorce and remarriage.

2. The NASV has Paul expressing his “opinion” in 1 Corinthians 7:25,40. This would be error concerning the Biblical doctrine of *inspiration*. Paul was giving an inspired apostolic judgment (1 Cor. 14:37), not merely expressing his personal, human opinion.

3. The NASV lends credence to premillennial errors. The Greek present tense participle “receiving” is translated *receive* (future kingdom error). Re-phrasing Revelation 20:4-5 lends support to the “rapture” error. The NASV has “the rest of the dead did not come to life” rather than “the rest of the dead lived not...”

4. The NASV has Jesus contradicting Paul. In Matthew 5:17 it has Jesus saying, “Do not think that I came to abolish the law;” then in Ephesians 2:15 it has Paul saying, “by abolishing in his flesh the enmity, which is the law of commandments...”

5. The NASV has salvation at the point of *confession* (Rom. 10:10). They change the key word “unto,” to “resulting in.”

Here are some final considerations. In the introductory notes of the NASV, they have these format policies listed:

1. Paragraphs are designated by bold-faced numbers or letters.

2. Quotation marks are used in the text in accordance with modern English usage.

3. “Thou, thy, and thee” are changed to “you” except in the language of prayer when addressing deity.

4. Personal pronouns are capitalized when pertaining to deity.

5. Small caps in the New Testament are used in the text to indicate Old Testament quotes.

Here are a few comments about these policies. In the first place, there are no paragraphs or quotation marks in the Greek text. To this extent, this would be an interpretive procedure, not purely a translational procedure on their part. Changing the singular forms “thou, thy and thee” to “you” (singular or plural) can lead to erroneous conclusions by the English reader (See Luke 22:31-32). Finally, concerning using caps for direct quotations from the Old in the New Testament, would have Jesus misquoting the Old Testament. For example, in Luke 4:18-19, Jesus does not quote verbatim the Isaiah passages (Isa. 61:1-2; 58:6), but adds the clause “to set at liberty them that are bruised.” He therefore paraphrased, or targumed this Old Testament passage. I know this is technical but it shows their erroneous policy.

Because of the above facts, we cannot endorse the NASV as reliable, accurate or trustworthy as a translation.

#7 Jan. 2019

<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/sto/stop119.pdf#page=5>

RSV Revised Standard Version

Before I specify some erroneous translations of the RSV, it is a good place to note two important (often overlooked) points about modern translations.

1. *Transmission of the text (preservation)*. Modern translations are corrupt because of faulty presuppositions of textual critics. Modern textual critics treat the Bible as any other book. They don’t believe in *verbal inspiration* and they

certainly don't believe in *verbal preservation*. In other words, they don't hold to what the Bible claims for itself. Bible words are *inspired* (1 Cor. 2:13). Bible words are *preserved* (Matt. 24:35). Westcott and Hort (two heretics from the church of England in 1881 who published a Greek text rejecting the Textus Receptus) did not believe in *verbal inspiration* or *verbal preservation*; therefore had no problem in changing the text (Textus Receptus — King James Version) in over 5,600 places involving almost 10,000 words. The modern Nestle/Aland Greek Text is essentially the Westcott/Hort text (this is the Greek text that underlies modern translations). Dr. Kurt Aland was the principal editor of the Nestle/Aland Greek text. It can be demonstrated from books he wrote that he denies the verbal plenary inspiration of Scripture. Textual critics who do not believe in *verbal inspiration* or *verbal preservation* will have no problem in tampering with the text (cf. Deut. 4:2; 12:32; Prov. 30:5-6; Rev. 22:18-19).

2. *Translation of the Text.* Modern Translations are corrupt also because of faulty presuppositions of the translators. By surveying the views of modern translators concerning *verbal inspiration* and *verbal preservation* one is not surprised that they would produce translations saturated with doctrinal error. For example, Harry Orlinsky, an unbelieving Jew who does not believe that Jesus is the Christ, is a prominent translator of the RSV (see Isaiah 7:14, "young woman" instead of "virgin"). Another example, Edward Palmer (a rank Calvinist), was the executive secretary of the NIV translating team (consider the repeated mistranslation "sinful nature" instead of "flesh"). No wonder the RSV and the NIV are so corrupt.

"New translations are no better than the new theology of the translators" (Foy E. Wallace, Jr., *A Review of the New Versions*, p.298). Brother Wallace, I believe, foresaw the immensity and pervasiveness of the modern translation issues among churches of Christ.

Let us now point out several attacks on the deity, sonship, and virgin birth of Christ by the Revised Standard Version (RSV).

- 1) By removing "firstborn" from Matthew 1:25.
- 2) By removing "God" from First Timothy 3:16.

- 3) By changing "only begotten" to "only son" in John 1:14, 3:16, etc.
- 4) By changing "Joseph and his mother" to "his father and his mother" in Luke 2:33.
- 5) By changing Mary's statement "I know not a man" to "I have no husband" in Luke 1:34.
- 6) And perhaps the most infamous, by changing "virgin" to "young woman" in Isaiah 7:14.

To further demonstrate the loose, liberal, and irreverent handling of the text of the Bible, I have in my possession a copy of the Revised Standard Version (copyright 1946) that at the end of Mark's account of the Gospel takes the last 12 verses of Mark 16 (vs.9-20) and relegates them to a mere footnote, and then in a later edition puts them back into the text with only a marginal note comment. Well, should they be in the text of the Bible or not?! It would seem these so-called translators can't make up their mind. The ending of Mark has been vindicated as scripture by a legion of competent Bible-believing scholars and critics.

In addition, please consider carefully (once again, as in so many other modern versions) the Revised Standard Version, in Matthew 5:17 and Ephesians 2:15, make Paul and Jesus contradict each other. Also, note the phrase "new world" as a translation of "regeneration" making a pre-millennial slant in Matthew 19:28.

Finally, we list First Corinthians 2:14 which says in the RSV, "The unspiritual man does not receive the gifts of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him, and he is not able to understand them." The KJV says, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned." Paul, by inspiration, is contrasting "inspired men" with "uninspired men," not Christians and non-Christians. Also, there is a big difference between knowing something and understanding something. We do not naturally know the "things of God;" they must be revealed to us through inspired men. See verses 9-13.

8 Feb. 2019

<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/stops/stop219.pdf#page=4>

Dangers Of Modern Translations

In this article instead of reviewing a particular modern speech version, I want to: 1) clarify again my KJV position; 2) answer a few (not all) objections and criticisms I have received and 3) emphasize again the unsurpassed linguistic scholarship of the King James translators.

First, let me clarify again my position about the KJV. If the readers of *Seek The Old Paths* would read all of my articles written in this series (beginning in Jan/2018) they would see clearly that I do not advocate a “KJV onlyism” position as some have concluded. Here are some excerpts from my 2018 articles in STOP (archived at seektheoldpaths.com/stop2018.htm): “I am not affirming the KJV is an absolutely perfect translation (1/18),” “I am not affirming that the KJV translators were perfect or inspired men (1/18),” “I am not saying it is a sin to own or ever read and check what other translations say (1/18),” “The King James Version is superior to all other English translations (5/18),” “There are no inspired translators (6/18),” “The King James Bible is trustworthy, reliable, and accurate...the superior English translation...it is the best English yet today...” (6/18). I have received emails, letters, and phone calls highly commending my articles for which I am thankful, but I have also received communications which falsely accuse me of holding a “KJV only” position. I believe the above excerpts will answer my critics on this point.

Secondly, in various emails we've received, some have made numerous unwarranted attacks on the King James Version. It is beyond the scope of this series to address each one that has been noted. However, I would like to consider a few and respond to the charges. I would like to point out here that before someone levels an accusation against the KJV translators they should consider the credentials of the men they are criticizing and make sure they've done their

homework. There is no other version that has the scholarship behind it as does the KJV.

SUPPOSED ERRORS IN THE KJV

1. Supposed error in Matthew 27:44 – *“Cast the same in his teeth.”* The idiom “cast in teeth” means “to revile.” It is not a translation error to use an English idiom that uses a word referring to an anatomical part (teeth).
2. Supposed error in Matthew 23:24. The KJV reads, *“strain at a gnat.”* The NKJV reads, “strain out a gnat.” “Strain at” is found in previous translations to the KJV and was regarded as accurate and reliable. Technically, there is no preposition “out” in the Greek text. Neither is there a preposition “at” in the original. The Greek is literally “straining the gnat.” So either preposition could be used to convey the sense of the sentence, i.e. the extremism of the religious leaders of the day.
3. Supposed error in Romans 6:2. The KJV has *“God forbid.”* The NKJV has “certainly not.” Critics of the KJV charge that the word “God” is not in the Greek text. It is true that the Greek text literally says, “Become not.” Weighty scholarship has repeatedly pointed out that the verb in the optive mood expresses a strong negative wish in the strongest terms, even invoking “a prayer.” The idiom of Hebrew origin (not English) is first seen in 1 Samuel 24:6, “the Lord forbid.” Even the extremely verbally literal ASV (American Standard Version) renders this verse in Romans 6:2 as “God forbid.” This idiom brings the point into English in the strongest terms possible, which the original conveys.

These sophomoric criticisms are characteristic of the numerous “supposed” errors leveled against the KJV that have been sent to me throughout this series. These petty charges are not in the same category as the egregious and doctrinal errors found in modern-speech translations. Yes, archaisms and obsolete words need to be updated and defined, but an archaic word is not error — it's simply old. Where have the days gone when we did not whine about not

knowing the meaning of a word, but rather sought out its meaning in serious study!?

Further, in the face of these unsubstantiated criticisms by those who don't have the qualifications to be making such attacks, let us give ear to what actual eminent scholars say about the reliability, beauty and accuracy of the King James Version:

1. "The conscientious task is to take the actual word of the original and transplant it unchanged" (Richard Trench) ...and that is exactly what occurred with the KJV.
2. "The merits of the King James Version in point of fidelity to the original are universally acknowledged...no other version ancient or modern surpasses it...it conveys the mind of the Spirit with great exactness." (Talbot W. Chambers)
3. "That it is the imperative duty of translators, with solemn warning, to give the Bible unadulterated form...and absolutely astonishing to find how large extent this grand old version (KJV) must be confessed to be still the most adequate and accurate translation." (William Henry Green)
4. "There is no reason to doubt the qualifications of the KJV translators...in the nature of all differences, the KJV stands the test." (George E. Day)
5. "When our Shakespeare was packing up for Stratford, there came out another priceless thing: a correct translation of the Bible, of importance unspeakable." (Carlyle)

These above assessments and praises come from those qualified to make such an evaluation, unlike some of the prating critics today.

#9 March 2019

<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/stop/stop319.pdf#page=7>

Dangers Of Modern Translations

In our further study of dangers of modern translations, by way of summary I want to place before you a comparison and contrast between the King James Version and modern translations:

1. KJV — The translators were multilingualistic. (An example: Lancelot Andrews was conversant in 15 languages. He wrote private daily devotionals for himself in the New Testament Greek language. Another example: John Bois was a child prodigy who at the age of 5 had read the Old Testament in Hebrew. For further study, it would be worth your time if you could find these books: *Translators Revived* by Alexander McClure and also, *The Men Behind the King James Version* by Gustavus S. Paine).

Modern Translations — These translators are not in the same category as KJV translators when it comes to credentials and acumen.

2. KJV — They translated and cross-checked multiple times as individuals and groups. No less than 14 different times the translation for each book was gone over from beginning to end.

Modern Translations — Nowhere near this type of scrutiny before or since has been given to any modern translation.

3. KJV — They used a verbal (words) and formal (parts of speech) technique.

Modern Translations — Dynamic equivalence (adding and taking away words and modifying sentence structure) is widely used in modern translations (see the preface of the NIV).

4. KJV — These translators believed in verbal inspiration (1 Cor. 2:13) and verbal preservation (Matt. 24:35) and therefore produced a verbal translation.

Modern Translations — These translators either have a low view of inspiration and preservation or don't believe in them at all.

5. KJV — The *Traditional Received Text* was used for the New Testament and the *Masoretic Text* for the Old Testament.

Modern Translations — Faulty Greek texts

are used. (Based on the works of *Westcott and Hort* for the New Testament. Various other documents are used to "correct or modify" the Hebrew *Masoretic* text. See prefaces.)

6. KJV — There are 140,521 Greek words in the Traditional Received Text which underlies the King James Version.

Modern Translations — Modern Greek texts have deleted enough Greek words that would equal the books of First and Second Peter in total.

In this article I want to place before you for your consideration a host of examples where these deletions have occurred when compared with the KJV. You can take the time and do this for yourself. Take the NIV which is based on the UBSGNT text (which grows out of the Westcott and Hort Greek text) and look up the passages below and compare to the KJV. Space prohibits typing out or listing every example of how modern Greek texts have eliminated various Greek New Testament words and phrases. In some cases *entire sections* have been removed, sometimes *whole sentences* and *sometimes individual words and phrases*. Here are enough samples to prove my point and therefore alarm all who believe in verbal inspiration and preservation:

1. Whole passages questioned — Mark 16:9-20; John 7:53-8:11 (consider the comments in the marginal notes: "most reliable early manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9-20" and "the earliest and most reliable and other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53-8:11)." These marginal notes are misleading and cast doubt on the integrity and verbal preservation of the text.

2. Entire verses omitted — the NIV omits Matt. 17:21; 18:11; 23:14; Mark 7:16; 9:44,46; 11:26; 15:28; Luke 17:36; 23:17; John 5:4; Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29; Rom. 16:24; 1 John 5:7.

3. Parts of verses deleted or modified (because of space, I will only note a few in Matthew) — "*without a cause*"(5:22); "*by them of old time*" (5:27); "*for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever. Amen*" (6:13); "*to repentance*" (9:13); "*among the people*" (9:35); "*Lebbaeus, whose surname was*" (10:3); "*of the heart*" (12:35); "*Jesus saith unto them*" (13:51);

"draweth nigh unto me with their mouth" (15:8); "*at his feet*" (18:29); "*from my youth*" (19:20); "*for many be called but few chosen*" (20:16); "*and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with*" (20:22-23); "*take him away, and*" (22:13); "*observe*" (23:3); "*wherein the Son of man cometh*" (25:13); "*false witnesses*" (26:60b); "*that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet: they parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots*" (27:35). Deletions like this run throughout the New Testament.

4. At the end of the day, if you go through the entire New Testament, modern translations, such as the NASV (New American Standard Version), NIV (New International Version), ASV (American Standard Version), and others, have shortened the Greek New Testament by basing their work on faulty Greek texts such as Nestle-Aland, thus depriving their readers of all of God's Word.

5. Any time you see in the preface or notes in a modern translation references made to which Greek text is used for the translation and they refer to United Bible Society texts, Nestle-Aland editions, eclectic texts, or the critical text, you will know that a faulty text base is being used with hundreds of words and phrases missing from the Bible.

All the "uproar" about the archaic words in the King James Bible pales into insignificance when compared to the above mutilation of God's Holy Word.

Heed the warnings: "*What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it*" (Deut. 12:32); "*For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ*" (2 Cor. 2:17); "*but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ*" (Gal 1:7).

HOW WE GOT THE BIBLE by Randy Kea

<http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/pdf/HowWeGotTheBible.pdf>