

# Which Bible Should I BELIEVE?

By: David A. Sargent

From: <http://moira.meccahosting.com/~a00088bb/framework.htm>

The Prophet's Chair

Article Entitled "Which Bible Should I Read?"

Sargent Answers: In the critique my responses will be in RED and will be dispersed throughout this critique to respond to each statement on this web page which I stumbled upon researching the book of Jasher. The writer of this document has some issues with the King James Bible among other things which we will deal with in due course. And so we start:

The Prophet's Chair writes: "Which Bible Should I Read?"

Sargent Answers: I read all kinds of Bibles, even the worst of the bunch; mainly to show that they are in drastic error and in contrast to the King's Bible in the King's English in the King James Bible known as the Authorized Version. To make this very understood: I am a Bible Believer before anything else: even before being a Christian. We get the very word "Christian" from the Bible, so it is of vital importance to understand WHICH Bible you should BELIEVE. I believe ONLY ONE Bible.

The Prophet's Chair writes: "The question of which Bible to read is an ongoing one. Many people, probably most people, who actually read their Bible choose the King James Version of the Bible. This is because the King James, or KJV, is supposed to be the most accurate translation available. But is it? Well, yes and no. Let me try to explain."

Sargent Answers: The question "Which Bible Should I Read" is not important because I believe you should read the Book of Mormon and the NIV or the ESV to find out why you should NOT believe them. No proof like the pudding! I like getting from the horse's mouth what they teach by what they have written and compare them to the TRUTH. The question is: "Does God have more than ONE truth?" well does He? If TRUTH is absolute, then there MUST be an absolute Bible as that ONE Truth! Things that are different cannot be the same. The trouble with this author is that he believes you actually have a preference towards the King James Version of the Bible as he calls it. Then casts doubt as to the accuracy of its

translation. Typical duplicity! It is not an accurate translation at all it is superior to any Greek or Hebrew Bible. It is the Inspired words of the Living God the Lord of Hosts. Any things less than that then you MUST have two or more authorities for what God SAID and that makes YOU the final authority when you choose which one you BELIEVE.

The Prophet's Chair writes: “The first thing you need to understand about the KJV is that it was written over 500 years ago. It was translated into english but not the english that we speak today. As a matter of fact, there are several places in the KJV where the words written actually have an opposite meaning to the same words as they are used today. The last I heard, this number is about 130 words. There is even a book out now that goes over these words and tries to explain their more modern interpretation.”

Sargent Answers: His statement is inaccurate about the age of the King James Bible. 1611 to 2011 is not over 500 years; it is over 400 years. As of the date of my writing 2017 this Bible is only 406 years old. That is NOT that old really! And the language of the time over the years has been vastly updated but NOT revised. The King James Bible had linguistic things that have been updated, spellings updated, and the font used was updated. The TEXT base was NEVER altered until after 1881. This is what this author is missing. What he is saying here is that some words in the King James Bible are so old that the meanings have reversed and today we do not use the words in the same way. Then he makes this statement: “The last I heard...” Wait, you mean you have not studied this throughly before you wrote about it, you are taking someone else’s word for this? That is not a good way to make a case. Perhaps his information was bogus, misrepresenting, fraudulent, suspicious, and hearsay. The Bible says in 1 Thessalonians 5:21, “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” And this author is not proving all things at all. His word English should also be capitalized. Someone who is all about dealing with English Bibles should know to capitalize the word English. The English today is very much like the King James Bible of today. There is not much difference in the verbiage, tenses, usage or construct of English. Just because it was translated in 1611 doesn’t mean it is still Elizabethan English with Germanic type fonts and with v & u reversals. Ever wonder why the “W” is not called a double V instead of a double U? At any rate he is setting a stage here for YOUR fall into doubt.

The Prophet's Chair writes: “Here is an example of what I'm talking about:

2Th 2:5 Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?

2Th 2:6 And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.

2Th 2:7 For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now **letteth** will **let**, until he be taken out of the way.

The words written in **blue** are what I am talking about here. If you were to take these words at today's definition you would say that this word means 'to allow' and of course you would be right. But, this word, in this context, meant to 'not allow' when this translation was made. The original Greek word, pronounced 'katecho' (the 'o' is long, as in boat or hose), actually means 'to withhold, to hold in a firm grasp'. So, you can see that the original meaning is completely opposite of the meaning that we hold today. I once heard a pastor give a sermon about this verse and, since he didn't understand what I am showing you, the entire sermon was completely wrong! Now, as I said, there are several words where this is true.”

Sargent Answers: First the passage is self-interpreting: 2 Thessalonians 2:6-8a, “And now ye know what **withholdeth** that he might be **revealed** in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth **already work**: only he who now **letteth** will **let**, **until** he be **taken out** of the way. And then shall that Wicked be **revealed**...”

1. **withholdeth**
2. **revealed**
3. **already work**
4. **letteth**
5. **let**
6. **until**
7. **taken out**
8. **revealed**

His beef is with the word LET which is used to mean allow; however in the passage it is defined as withhold and revealed; which means disallow and allow both at the same time. When you let out an apartment you are allowing someone to lease your property and at the same time you are disallowing their ownership of it as you retain that ownership. Letting in allowing is always disallowing the opposite of what you are allowing. No problem here at all with the Bible, the trouble is with YOU.

He makes the remark here “The original Greek word, pronounced 'katecho'“ yet he does not have the “original Greek” to see what that word actually is in the “original Greek” He just LIED about that.

Greek does not even look like that! He is Anglicizing the Greek word to make you think he knows what he is talking about when he does not. What he did not tell you: is that the words withholdeth <2722> and the word letteth <2722> are **the same Greek word**. Why didn't he tell you that? This Greek word used in the text base for the King James Bible is κατέχω which is like kat-ekh'-o which is from <2596> κατά and <2192> ἔχω or the alternate form σκέω. So that the combined κατέχω means: “to hold down; to have, hold, keep (in memory), let, make toward, possess, retain, seize on, stay, take, withhold.” So we have in the King James Bible the interpretation of “let” in the context with the word “withhold” and yet “let” is accurate in the place where it shows up because the “withholding” is stopped and then what was withheld was then allowed in the very context. Therefore the “let” in the modern understanding to allow is what is being talked about in the context, so this is a meaningless argument against the King James Bible. Someone is trying to cast doubt on the words of God. Both “let” is in the case of disallow or withholding and “let” in the case of allowing or revealing in the context is accurate.

The Prophet's Chair writes: “Aside from these words with different meanings, the KJV is, without a doubt, one of the most accurate, if not the most accurate translations available. If you are doing an in-depth study of things like Biblical prophecy then you definitely want a copy of the KJV. However, if you are looking for a translation that you would like to use just for day to day reading, it might not be a bad idea to have a more modern version available as well. This will make it easier to understand some things since the KJV is written in a language that we no longer use. I know many people who would probably not read their Bible daily if they were not able to get a more modern translation. Let's admit it, the KJV can be just plain difficult to understand sometimes. I prefer reading the New International Version, also known as the NIV, when I am doing my daily reading. Now, I know that this version has some problems associated with it but so does every other translation including, as I have just pointed out, the KJV. But, since I know what these problems are, they don't really effect me.”

Sargent Answers: This guy thinks more highly of himself than he should: to stand in judgment on God's words? He has not proven anything at all! He casts doubt on the accuracy of the Authorized Version and then says “without a doubt”! This is

called double-speak. He that speaketh with forked tongue slices his own words like a sword cutting them into pieces. So the King James Bible is only good for studying prophecy? It is not good for daily reading according to The Prophet's Chair. Some prophet! He is a prophet of the deceit of his own wicked heart. The NIV is a Calvinistic pagan perversion of the Bible. It comes from the Alexandrian manuscript text base that has the Apocrypha in it as part of the Old Testament and has Pseudepigrapha in both Old and New Testaments as part of the Canon of Scriptures. This is not the Antiochian text base of the King James Bible. The NIV or any of the modern versions do NOT have all the words of God because they come from the Alexandrian manuscripts which match them. The culprit in Bible perversion removed his name from a rebuke in that version (see Luke 4:4 and 4:8). Removed from the NIV, ESV, RSV, NASV, etc. "...every word of God." and "get thee behind me, Satan" - that way you can study only prophecy and miss this alteration and be deceived like the writer of The Prophet's Chair. He also said, "...since I know what these problems are, they don't really effect me." He is totally deceived, and they don't bother him because he does not care about the problems or his conscience has been seared.

The Prophet's Chair writes: "I've seen videos where pastors will come out strongly against every translation that they themselves don't use. Those who read the KJV are the worst when it comes to this. They claim that these other translations aren't really a 'true' Bible. But, what they fail to keep in mind is that the KJV, under their interpretation of what a 'real' Bible is, isn't a 'real' Bible either! After all, the original New Testament books were all written in Greek. And the original Old Testament books were written in a combination of Hebrew and Aramaic!"

Sargent Answers: WOW, he has seen videos! What he is saying about all this are half-truths. He has not paid much attention to the issues presented by himself. It is not about PREFERENCES. Just because someone uses the King James Bible is meaningless. It is and always has been an issue with what you BELIEVE! Notice his issue is with "...every translation that they themselves don't use." and "Those who read the KJV are the worst..." not so! Those who BELIEVE the TRUTH know that TRUTH is absolute. So which is it? Is God now a liar because you want to play politics and get along with everyone? If the King James Bible is the absolute words of God and thereby the absolute truth; then why recommend a piece of trash like the NIV? If the NIV is the absolute words of God and thereby the absolute truth; then why recommend a piece of trash like the King James Bible? Why both? They are NOT the same! Then he makes another "original"

blunder by saying: "...the original New Testament books were all written in Greek. And the original Old Testament books were written in a combination of Hebrew and Aramaic!" Yet he has never seen ONE original Hebrew or Greek manuscript. And what difference would that make? God did not want you to have the originals or He would have allowed them to continue. Fact is, you have the King James Bible that has stood the test of time for over 400 years: the originals did not last that long! So why is there all this drive towards the originals? It is because if you cannot prove what you are saying by resorting to "the originals say" then it is your word others must take over what the Bible actually SAYS! You are trying to usurp God's authority. God's authority is the King James Bible and no other.

The Prophet's Chair writes: "The point that I'm trying to make here is that, if you are a KJV reader, for heavens sake, don't deride someone for reading an NIV! The most important thing is that they are reading their Bible! There are many, many people who have been saved reading an NIV. Heck, I was saved reading a New Revised Standard, a Bible translation with even more problems than the NIV! You see, no matter how many problems a Bible translation may have, the core idea, mainly the redemptive work of Christ on the cross, comes through clearly in ALL of the translations. Except, perhaps, one of these 'paraphrased' translations. I would stay away from any 'paraphrased' translation because it is actually the authors words that you are reading and not the words as laid out in scripture."

Sargent Answers: Oh, so he does have a point? I am a Bible Believer, not just a Bible reader. I never have derided anyone for reading the NIV; I have read it and found it to be trash. I didn't say people that read it are trash. I have not read anyone that is a King James Bible Believer do that either. The publishers, translation committees, and college professors that promote these modernist Bibles get money from their sales because of the copy right on them. They stand to gain financially by their sales and so they have a vested interest in these modern Bibles. They require deriding. But the churches that are full of people looking for the truth just need to WAKE UP and READ and COMPARE the Bibles. The NIV is just like the ESV, NRSV, NASV and all the other modernistic Reconstructionist versions out there. Don't be daft; most of the paraphrase versions tell you that they are paraphrases, so what. What you really mean to say is God lost His words and the scholars union had to attempt to reconstruct it the best way they could using the scientific methodology of textual criticism and so no translation is 100% accurate to the original autographs. That is what he means to say here.

This lie is perpetrated thousands of times in works by Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Westcott and Hort and others. It is the Alexandrian – Egyptian cult who thinks to do God a service by reconstructing His words and then altering them to suit their ulterior motives. They are without honor. For heaven’s sake: Shut up lest you look like a fool, and an idiot, and a carless moron! He says: “Heck, I was saved reading a New Revised Standard, a Bible translation with even more problems than the NIV! You see, no matter how many problems a Bible translation may have, the core idea, mainly the redemptive work of Christ on the cross, comes through clearly in ALL of the translations.” Just because you were saved reading a modern version does not make it the absolute truth. You can get saved reading a tract; but that doesn’t make it a Bible. You can find a diamond in a garbage dump, why take the dump home with you just to get the diamond? Not sure what he means by the use of the word “Heck” I guess he is being very carless with his words. The fact is these modern Bibles have removed many things including the redemptive work of Christ and they are in opposition to the King James Bible in many places. See my web site for Bible Studies about these differences: <http://www.av1611kjb.org>

The Prophet's Chair writes: “So, if you see someone reading a translation other than the one you read, it's okay to talk to them about it and point out some of the issues with it but do so in a loving manner. Make sure that you stress the point that you are not telling them not to read that particular translation but that you just want to make them aware of some of the problems that it may have. A good way to do this is to also point out some of the issues the translation that you read also has. Just remember, the important thing is that they are reading their Bible! The Holy Spirit will speak to them through one translation as well as another.”

Sargent Answers: I am not worried about someone reading a modern version; I have read the Book of Mormon. It is not even a Bible; so what! Its ok to read anything. But BELIEVE the truth. Just because someone is reading an NIV means nothing. I have studied the differences in the modern versions as they compare to the King James Bible. And they are in collusion against the King James Bible where they think they have superior knowledge than God to alter the text.

The Holy Spirit can speak through a preacher, a tract or a book about the Bible, etc. That is meaningless when dealing with Absolute Truth. If the Bible is TRUE, and if it is the words of God like it says it is. Then it must be the Absolut Truth; and as so, without error. The question is which Bible is without error. According to The Prophet's Chair “...the NIV, when I am doing my daily reading. Now, I know that this version has some problems associated with it but so does every other

translation including, as I have just pointed out, the KJV.” He just lumped the King James Bible in with all the modern versions, when the King James Bible is from the Antiochian – Syrian Text Base and the modern versions are from the Alexandrian – Egyptian Text Base. They are NOT the same; not by a long shot!

This charlatan would have you think that the translations are the same and the translators are the same and the production of all the versions are the same when they are not. Things that were done in the 1611 were done with a greater moral standard than in 1881.

This writer is misinformed, and has misunderstood the King James Bible Believing position. He has misrepresented that position to suit his agenda and ulterior motives and has lined up with the enemy of the Bible whose name was removed from the Bible he recommends: NIV in Luke 4:8. And like the Lord Jesus Christ answered Satan when Satan quoted the Bible to tempt the Lord: “Get thee behind me, Satan.” In the name of The Lord Jesus Christ.

The End



**AV1611KJB.ORG**