

“The Biblical Worldview” was published on YouTube by Sabbath School Daily around midnight on 10/19/20. One of the speakers was Pastor Luccas Rodor and the other was Bradley Burnham. John T referred to them as “prs” which I take to mean pastors; perhaps John T knows them. I don’t know if Bradley Burnham is a pastor as he isn’t identified as such on the video.



[Martin Lohne](#) 13 hours ago

Around [5:28](#) you note that any teaching contrary to the "Word of God" must be rejected. Using "Scripture references" from this Sabbath School Bible Study Guide, would you please say which of the following should be rejected?

1. "Because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats." Mark [7:19](#).
2. "because it does not enter his heart but his stomach, and is eliminated, thus purifying all foods?" Mark [7:19](#) from another "Word of God."
3. "For it doesn't go into their heart but into their stomach, and then out of the body.' (In saying this, Jesus declared all foods clean.)". Mark [7:19](#) from yet another "Word of God."

This verse records what Jesus said after His disciples were maligned for eating without washing their hands. Carefully follow the path of the food.

The first "Word of God" says the food goes into the "belly" (digestive tract), then goes into the "draught" (sewer) thus "purging" (getting rid of) all "meats" (foods).

The next "Word of God" says the food enters the "stomach" and is eliminated. Food that has been eliminated after traversing the digestive tract has become feces. This "Word of God" says food thus turned to feces has been purified; i.e., made clean.

The final "Word of God" says Jesus "declared all foods clean." That would include pig. So which "Word of God" should we go with?

[SatanIsDead.com](#)

Show less

REPLY



Highlighted reply

[Sabbath School Daily](#)
[6 hours ago](#)

Hi Martin, Thanks for your question!

This is why it is very important to choose your Bible version wisely. Although the King James Version (KJV) is difficult to read, and not without translation error, it is probably one of the closest to unbiased accuracy since it was not created by a specific church or to prove any points. For instance, Mark [7:19](#) says "Because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?" If you look in the original language, the part in parenthesis is not in there. Have a look:
<http://www.textusreceptusbibles.com/Strong/41007019/G2588>

Remember Jesus was a Jew and was speaking to Jews. Therefore, when he was speaking of food, he was talking about what was food to a Jew not what is food to a western mind. Food to the Jew was not unclean meat.

If you would like to discuss further, please private message us on facebook
<http://facebook.com/SabbathSchoolDaily>
Show less

REPLY

I agree, "it is very important to choose a Bible version wisely." You also say the KJV "is probably one of the closest to unbiased accuracy." I take that to mean you prefer reading number 1 above and you reject readings number 2 and 3 which are the New King James Version (NKJV) and the New International Version (NIV) respectively.

You say the KJV is "not without translation error." I have been looking for translation errors in the KJV for some time and haven't found any. If you could provide one clear cut example of one translation error in the KJV I would be grateful. There are things in the KJV I don't always understand but that doesn't make them a translation error. So the example needs to be clearly an error. If you have the time and inclination, examples of two translation errors would be better yet.

There are a couple of points on which we disagree. Mark 7:19 wasn't even referring to what was clean food and what was unclean food; it was about washing hands before eating. Without referring to the original language I can tell the thing about all foods being clean in the NIV was an invention of the translator(s). Though Jesus was probably speaking to Jews, the Jews would have known that some cultures considered pig, etc. food. In fact, in Isaiah 66:17 some of the children of Israel were noted to eat swine's flesh so it's clear that some of them considered it food.

In addition, the book of Mark was written for both Jews and Gentiles. Even though I don't eat pig and have been an ovo-lacto vegetarian for about five decades, if I were speaking to anyone about pronouncing foods clean, I would have to specifically exclude unclean foods in my pronouncement if I didn't want them included on the clean list. You cannot take the just the

New Testament in any bible without also taking the Old Testament and the Spirit of Prophecy to show we shouldn't be eating unclean flesh food.

You say the KJV is difficult to read but I haven't found it so; even the first edition with the Germanic type face. I find it ironic that children study French, Spanish, algebra, etc. in grade school and yet it is claimed the KJV is too hard to read. It brings to mind 1 Kings 12:28 where it says:

“Whereupon the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold, and said unto them, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem: behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.

I appreciate the invitation to connect with you on Facebook but I don't do Facebook.

There was a reply from a guy who apparently is offended that I have the gall to claim any bible is infallible.



Highlighted reply

[John](#) [T9 hours ago](#)

Don't waste your time with this guy, it's like talking to a door. Just another KJV only maxi. Ignorance + arrogance = incurable.

REPLY

Hello John. Nice to hear from you again. I understand I am one of the rare ones who believes there is a Bible in this world that has no error at all; i.e., it's infallible. I have never met someone face to face who believed that even though many are willing to say "the Bible says." I understand it's considered very arrogant to maintain that God preserved his Holy Word as he promised in an infallible condition.

During our last internet discussion you seemed to think "strain at a gnat" versus "strain out a gnat" was a serious issue. You also seemed to think 1 John 5:7 didn't belong in the Bible even though it's needed to align with the gender of Greek nouns in 1 John 5:8. Not only that, in addition to the translators of the King James Version, the translators of the 1380 Wiclif Bible, the 1534 Tyndale Bible, the 1539 Cranmer Bible, the 1557 Geneva Bible and the 1582 Rheims Bible all thought it should be there.

You implied you had a favorite bible version but neglected your opportunity to sing its praises. I once again humbly invite you to disclose your favorite bible so we can discuss its errors if it has any. There shouldn't be any need to be embarrassed about your choice.



Highlighted reply

[John T5 hours ago](#)

[@Martin Lohne](#) I invite you to refer me to where I "implied" I had a favorite bible version. This has nothing to do with embarrassment, but with my unwillingness of wasting my time. It has already become clear that real dialogue with you is impossible. First, because you have no idea what you're talking about. Second, because you think you have idea about what you're taking about. I can substantiate these claims:

1. You make no differentiation between a Bible VERSION and a Bible TRANSLATION. This miss definition already sets up the basis of your fallacious convictions.
2. You limit the power of God by thinking Satan will lead people astray with one wrong word here and another omitted sentence there. I CAN refer you to where I have previously stated that ALL biblical doctrine can be studied, proved and taught using ANY version.
3. You are theologically near sighted, because every single comment you make always comes back to this one issue. It is all you can see. These prs are sharing great biblical truth, using whichever version they are using, and all you can see is exactly that...the version.
4. You are arrogant in thinking God provided an inerrant translation to english, while ignoring the rest of the world (or at least presuming they need to learn english to have "an inerrant bible"), with all it's languages and peoples, something quite typical of many americans that live within their own small self-made bubble.
5. You are theologically lazy, making it your passion to splurt out nonsensical textual criticism, while not even taking the time to learn the bare minimum, instrumental knowledge of the original biblical languages (and no, I don't believe you need to know Hebrew or Greek to know God through the Bible. But if you want to discuss this topic with authority, then yes, you should know the minimum).

For all these reasons, getting into a KJV maxi argument with you would be a waste of time and energy. I know I come off "salty" or however one would like to describe me, but I have a lack of patience for this subject and people that insist on it. I love you in the Lord, and hope He blesses you. I probably won't be answering these any more. God bless!

Show less

REPLY

Perhaps I misunderstood you but you said the KJV wasn't your favorite Bible. To me that implies you do have a favorite bible. If you don't have a favorite bible, I can understand that as many people don't have a favorite bible.

1. It's true that I make no difference between a bible version and a bible translation. If you prefer, let me know what your favorite translation is (if you have one) and let me know what bible version is based on that translation.
2. I thought limiting the power of God was the idea that He couldn't preserve His words in a pure condition as He promised. "The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." Psalms 12:6-7. Your allegation that "ALL biblical doctrine can be studied, proved and taught using ANY version" are brave words considering the fact that prominent Seventh-day Adventist ministers using fake bibles frequently fall back on the KJV when attempting to prove doctrine like the state of the dead, the heavenly sanctuary, etc. They also frequently just read verses from their favorite bible (if they have one) and have no idea of what their favorite bible (if they have one) says in English. And there is another problem; I can teach false doctrine using one of the fake bibles. If I'm allowed to mix and match using whatever bibles I like, my opportunity to teach false doctrine is enhanced considerably.
3. If you believe that using a pure Bible is "near sighted" so be it. One of the pastors sharing "great biblical truth" in this video said the version was important. You should believe him.

4. I'm arrogant to think God provided an inerrant translation to English when He promised to do so? See number 2 above. Unfortunately, Satan's helpers have been much more industrious in making fake "Bible" translations than have those who are supposed to be on God's side. It's true that the majority of bible translations in languages other than English have defects. That's why it's important to have at least one pure Bible translation in English to test them with. I don't know where you live or have lived. For what it's worth and if it's important, I have lived in a foreign country longer than the majority of Americans.

5. Actually, textual criticism is directed at proving there is no bible version without error and I haven't done that. As far as being "theologically lazy" goes, if that means I don't believe everything the textual critics have said, I would agree with that assessment. I go with William Tyndale; the boy "that driveth the plow" can know more of Scripture than the textual critics (see *The Great Controversy* page 246).

It's OK with me if you're salty. I prefer that to vague words and beating around the bush. I understand that it's frustrating when you can't depend on your favorite bible translation (if you have one).

Cordially, Martin Lohne

And that was the end of the discussion. When someone is asked to disclose what "Bible" they would like to put up against the KJV there haven't any takers among Seventh-day Adventists.

Also notice that no example of a translation error was given by the pastor who responded to my post. That also happens; when asked to provide an example of a KJV translation error there usually is sudden silence. For those who are so bold to attempt to proffer an example of a KJV translation error, it doesn't go well.

SatanIsDead.com

InfallibleBible.com

AdventistsToday.com

SabbathSchoolGuide.com