

“The Paradox of Good & Evil ” – Pastor Stephen Bohr was posted on YouTube by Daily Hymns on September 21, 2020. Pastor Bohr apparently doesn’t understand what his fake bible, the New King James Version (NKJV) says in English.

Around 4:18 Pastor Bohr expresses some dissatisfaction with what his fake bible, the New King James Version (NKJV) says in Revelation 12:9. It says “serpent of old” but Stephen wishes it said “ancient serpent” like “the Old King James Version.” There are some problems with that. Firstly, the King James Version (KJV) says “old serpent” which is similar to what the NKJV says. Secondly, Stephen is the first person I’ve heard refer to the KJV as “the Old King James Version.” I believe that means he is under the delusion that the NKJV is just some improvement over the “Old King James Version. “New” has to be better. Right? Finally, if Stephen wants his bible to say “ancient serpent” he will have to go to bibles that are worse than the NKJV like the English Standard Version (ESV), the New International Version (NIV), the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), the Revised Standard Version (RSV), the Holy Trinity Edition of the Catholic Bible, etc. which say “ancient serpent” like he wants it to say.

Around 7:06 Stephen says the name of the “glorious being” was Lucifer and says Isaiah tells us that Lucifer was a created being. He also says Lucifer was “the star of the morning.” Isaiah 14:12 is the ONLY verse in the Bible that names Lucifer and, guess what, that name doesn’t appear in any of the above-mentioned bibles he must have liked because they said “ancient serpent” except for the Holy Trinity Edition of the Catholic Bible. Here is that verse from the Protestant Bible.

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! Isaiah 14:12 from the KJV.

If you look in some of the bibles that have “ancient serpent” like the ESV, NIV, NRSV and RSV you will find that “Lucifer” has been replaced with a title for Jesus Christ. Oh, and neither the KJV or the NKJV call Lucifer “the star of the morning” but rather the “son of the morning.” To get “star of the morning” go to the New American Standard Bible (NASB). To say Lucifer is the “star of the morning” is a serious error because of the following verse:

“I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.” Revelation 22:16 from the KJV.

The NKJV, ESV, NIV, NRSV, RSV and NASB ALL say Jesus is the “morning star” in this verse. “Star of the morning” is the same as “morning star.” A “son” is not a “star.”

Around 9:51 Stephen starts to explain Ezekiel 28:14. He notes that this being is an angel; a cherub. So far so good. He then says that where it says “fiery stones” in his fake bible it actually means “stars” or “angels.” I know of no place else in the Bible where “stones” mean “angels” or even “stars.” Why can’t it just mean “fiery stones?” Hebrews 12:29 says “our God is a consuming fire.” Couldn’t “fiery stones” mean very hot rock like lava?

Around 17:34 Stephen says “Now we need to take a look at what happened with this being; Lucifer.” Please notice that he said “happened” which is past tense. He then goes to Ezekiel 28:16 in his fake bible and posts it in its entirety.

“By the abundance of your trading you became filled with violence within, And you sinned; Therefore I cast you as a profane thing Out of the mountain of God; And I destroyed you, O covering cherub, From the midst of the fiery stones.”
Ezekiel 28:16 from the NKJV.

Notice that the NKJV has what happened to Lucifer in past tense; it says he was “destroyed.” Remember this; we’ll come back to it later. For comparison, we’ll look at what the Protestant Bible says.

“By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub; from the midst of the stones of fire.” Ezekiel 28:16 from the KJV.

Notice that the KJV has this verse in future tense and is describing what will happen to Lucifer. This is more important to understand than Hebrew or Greek.

Around 18:30 Stephen says, “The question is, what is sin.” To define sin he refers to 1 John 3:8, 4. The problem is not verse 8 but in verse 4 in the fake bible.

“Whoever commits sin also commits lawlessness and sin is lawlessness.” 1 John 3:4 from the NKJV.

Most Seventh-day Adventist ministers I’ve been acquainted with aren’t so bold as to even attempt to define sin with the NKJV. The first definition of “lawless” in Webster’s Third New International Dictionary (unabridged) is “being without law : having no laws : not regulated by law.” Someone who only broke a few laws wouldn’t be considered lawless. You could even steal a little occasionally and not be considered lawless. This goes along with the Roman Catholic teaching wherein a venial sin, like stealing a little something, doesn’t even need to be confessed.

He starts reading 1 John 3:8 and says, “he who sins, is of the devil for the devil has sinned from Mount Sinai on.” He deliberately misread the verse and got a round of laughter from his audience because they knew it said “the devil has sinned from the beginning” and not “from Mount Sinai on.” Ha, ha. They probably wouldn’t be laughing if they understood what the fake bible Stephen uses says in ENGLISH.

Stephen does read the entirety of 1 John 3:4 from his fake bible but then does when he should have done in the first place. He says, “I like the way the King James translates it. It says sin is the transgression of the law. In other words sin is breaking God’s holy law according to first John chapter three.” It begs the question; can anyone pick any bible verse from any bible; mix and match or pick and choose as it were; just because they like how that bible translates it?

Stephen likes what the KJV says because it's the only way he can link that verse effectively to the Law of God; i.e., the Ten Commandments.

Here is 1 John 3:4 as it reads in the real Bible.

“Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4 from the KJV.

Remember where I said to remember Ezekiel 28:16 and that we'd come back to it later? Around 21:11 speaking of Lucifer he says, “He's gonna have an end according to Scripture because he was created by God.” So sorry. The fake bible he used to show this was the NKJV that said Lucifer had been “destroyed.” If Lucifer has been “destroyed” he has already met his end. Don't worry. It gets worse.

Around 22:38 he asks, “What did the serpent say to Eve?” and then answers the question using the wording of the NKJV in Genesis 3:5; “You shall be like God.” Remember that Eve sinned. Matthew 5:48 says, “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” It was NOT sin to wish to be like God. I like the way the KJV says it; according to the KJV Eve's motivation was that she wanted to be “as gods.” Wanting to be “as gods” means you yourself want to be a god. A lot of people wish to be “as gods.” That way they can edit the Bible to make it say what they want it to say.

Regarding Eve Stephen says, “Do you know in fact that she attributed to God words that God had not spoken? Bringing dishonor upon the name of God. Because she told the serpent, ‘God has told us that we should not eat of the tree or even touch it.’ The fact is God didn't tell them that they couldn't touch it. God told them that they couldn't eat.”

Carefully think this over. At the time Eve spoke to the serpent, she was sinless and had a perfect brain. Do you think Eve forgot what God said? Did Eve sin by telling the serpent what God had told her? That should be enough to go on to tell you Eve had NOT sinned when she told the serpent they weren't to touch the fruit but there is more.

“In the midst of the garden, near the tree of life, stood the tree of knowledge of good and evil. This tree was especially designed of God to be the pledge of their obedience, faith and love to him. Of this tree the Lord commanded our first parents not to eat, neither to touch it, lest they die.” *The Spirit of Prophecy* volume 1 page 27.

There are several possibilities. Stephen may never have read that or he may have read it and forgotten it. He could also believe Ellen G. White was mistaken.

Around 31:07 Stephen wishes the audience to say the antonym of the word “love.” When they say “hate” he tells them that is wrong. Allegedly the opposite of love isn't hate. Webster disagrees. Isn't it interesting that Stephen thinks he knows more than Webster and apparently doesn't know the difference between past tense and future tense?

Around 41:02 Stephen goes back to Ezekiel 28:16 and wants his audience to notice “a very important word.” I had thought the important words he should discuss from his fake bible were “I cast” and “destroyed” but no, he is of the opinion that “trading” is the important word. He goes into an extended discussion about what the Hebrew root of the word translated thus is. I don’t know Hebrew, I will probably never know Hebrew in this life, and probably none in his audience know Hebrew. It’s a ridiculous exercise whose only function is to show that since he knows what the Hebrew root of the word is you must believe him. The real Bible has “merchandise” there and I believe that word is easily understood without any reference to a language probably none in his audience know. If he has to explain what “merchandise” means he should get an ENGLISH dictionary. An ENGLISH dictionary might also help him understand the difference between such words as “destroyed” and “will destroy.”

Stephen says a “Strong’s Concordance” will show one that the Hebrew root word for “trading” will prove his bible will say what he thinks it should say. He probably didn’t think any but a fellow peddler of theological theories would have a Strong’s Concordance and actually see if what he says it true. The Hebrew word *rekullah* can be translated merchandise or traffic. That word is 7404 in my Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. It refers one to 7402 which is *rakal*; “a prim root; to travel for trading.” Stephen wants “trading” to mean “talebearer.” Strong’s 7400 is *rakiyl* which it says is “from 7402 and means “slander, carry tales, talebearer.” Stephen may have left you with the impression that because one word had a root in another word they were the same word. No, they aren’t the same. Just because two words have the same root doesn’t mean they mean the same thing. Really, what Stephen, also known as Esteban, should be explaining is why what happened to Lucifer is all in past tense in his NKJV “Bible.” There is a reason for it but I doubt he knows what it is.

Around 50:09 Stephen says, “Now the question is, is the devil ever gonna have an end?” His question is in spite of the fact that his NKJV says the devil has met his end. Around 51:41 he says, “Praise the Lord that he’s gonna come to an end.”

Around 51:39 Stephen goes back to Ezekiel and tells his audience to notice what it says in Ezekiel 28:18-19.

“You defiled your sanctuaries By the multitude of your iniquities, By the iniquity of your trading; Therefore I brought fire from your midst; It devoured you, And I turned you to ashes upon the earth In the sight of all who saw you. All who knew you among the peoples are astonished at you; You have become a horror, and shall be no more forever.”

Then he says, “Notice he’s gonna be reduced to ashes.” He also asks, “Is that good news?” and he says, “It’s coming soon.” No Stephen, if your “Bible” is to be believed, Satan is already dead.

SatanIsDead.com
InfallibleBible.com
AdventistsToday.com
SabbathSchoolGuide.com