

The Mosaic Law of Rape, The KJV, and more

Question #1:

Yesterday, I came across a thread which shows Daddy Freeze attacking Pastor Kumuyi over his statement that women who wear men's wears are an abomination unto God. Such is found in the Bible...

Deuteronomy 22:5 (KJV)

The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the LORD thy God.

Reacting to the biblical sound doctrine, Daddy Freeze stated that Pastor Kumuyi is wrong because the old law has been done away by Jesus Christ who died on the cross. I ask, did Jesus die so that men can now wear makeup and skirts with brassieres like cross-dressers? Jesus didn't shed his blood for you to disobey his commandments, neither has God stopped seeing abomination as abomination. That's a whole another sermon anyway.

Daddy Freeze further stated that if Pastor Kumuyi must obey the verse against cross-dressing, then he must also tell people to obey the verse that says "women should marry their rapist".

My head sparked when I saw the statement from him which he even buttressed with a birthday verse seen below.

Deuteronomy 22:28-29 New International Version (NIV)

If a man happens to meet a virgin who is not pledged to be married and rapes her and they are discovered, he shall pay her father fifty shekels of silver. He must marry the young woman, for he has violated her. He can never divorce her as long as he lives.

An untrained Bible student will believe him and the verse above, but we that know that Satan has his own Bibles littered everywhere will not be fooled by the idea behind the above verse. The verse is clearly saying that our God who is merciful and a righteous judge will punish a lady by forcing her to marry the wicked human who raped her and took away her virginity.

First and foremost, let's remember that Satan boasted that he will be like the Most High God. Should we be surprised when we hear that he has created his own Bible too? It is from that Bible that Daddy Freeze quoted from which is the NIV. Not only is the NIV Satan's book, but also all these other new and modern versions which distort the word of God. The only true word

of God out there today is the King James Version KJV, and that's where I will be waiting from to show you that God never supports rape.

You see, that law in Deuteronomy is still the same law seen in Exodus. Let's see how the NIV puts it down in Exodus.

Exodus 22:16-17 New International Version (NIV)

“If a man seduces a virgin who is not pledged to be married and sleeps with her, he must pay the bride-price, and she shall be his wife. If her father absolutely refuses to give her to him, he must still pay the bride-price for virgins.

Compare it with how they put it down in Deuteronomy.

Deuteronomy 22:28-29 (NIV)

If a man happens to meet a virgin who is not pledged to be married and rapes her and they are discovered, he shall pay her father fifty shekels of silver. He must marry the young woman, for he has violated her. He can never divorce her as long as he lives.

As seen above, they are the same laws because they speak of a virgin, not betrothed, bride price etc. But in their intentional mistake, they put rape in one and seduce in another. Let's see how the King James puts it.

Deuteronomy 22:28-29 King James Version (KJV)

28 If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;

29 Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

Exodus 22:16-17 (KJV)

And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.

If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.

Some might quickly think the phrase 'lay hold on her' means rape. No it doesn't. Laying hold on a woman is part of the process of sex. When you have sex with your wife, don't you lay hold on

her? Or are you going to be doing it from a distance with Bluetooth? As if the Bible knew some folks will get it twisted, God repeated the same law in Exodus to show he doesn't mean rape but consensual sex. That's why in Exodus it says "if a man entice". Even the NIV uses the word seduce. Isn't it pretty clearly that the sex was consensual? The lady fell for the seduction which means she wasn't forced. How NIV and all these modern versions decided to use the word rape in another verse where the law was repeated is what baffles me. It is clearly to confuse people and make them think God was cruel in the old testament.

God never supported rape. He even ordered for rapists to be killed and the victim spared.

Deuteronomy 22:25-26 King James Version (KJV)

But if a man find a betrothed damsel in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her: then the man only that lay with her shall die.

But unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; there is in the damsel no sin worthy of death: for as when a man riseth against his neighbour, and slayeth him, even so is this matter:

The NIV says the same thing.

Deuteronomy 22:25-26 New International Version (NIV)

But if out in the country a man happens to meet a young woman pledged to be married and rapes her, only the man who has done this shall die. Do nothing to the woman; she has committed no sin deserving death. This case is like that of someone who attacks and murders a neighbor,

So, how come the NIV said the victim must marry her rapist in another verse? Isn't it confusing? This is clearly a mistranslation done by Satan so that his agents can attack the word of God and Christians.

When the Bible says a man lay hold onto a woman and laid with her, it doesn't mean rape but consensual sex. The same Bible clearly spelt out what rape is when it said the rapist should be stoned if the woman cries out. But if shoe doesn't, then it means they both consented to it.

Deuteronomy 22:23-24 King James Version (KJV)

If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her;

Then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour's wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you.

Now, where in the below verse does it say that a father should collect bride price after his daughter has cried out of rape?

Deuteronomy 22:28-29 King James Version (KJV)

28 If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;

29 Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

As seen above, the man marries the girl because it was consensual sex which she fell for after his seductive games. But below is pure rape because he forced her, that's why he's ordered to be killed and the lady is not ordered to marry him.

Deuteronomy 22:25-26 King James Version (KJV)

But if a man find a betrothed damsel in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her: then the man only that lay with her shall die.

But unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; there is in the damsel no sin worthy of death: for as when a man riseth against his neighbour, and slayeth him, even so is this matter:

This is why you need to stick with the King James Version only. Other versions have been perverted by Satan who has been attacking the word of God right from the Garden of Eden. He has not changed today.

Read link below to see more lies from all these modern Bible versions.

<https://www.nairaland.com/4957299/bible-sword-butter-knife-why>

Response #1:

I agree that the Bible does not teach that according to the Mosaic Law a raped woman must marry her rapist. It clearly teaches rather that the rapist is the one who is forced to marry the woman and treat her honorably, never divorcing her as long as he lives.

But I strongly disagree on two things here:

1. That the NIV is substantively different from the KJV here. In *Early Modern English* (the language in which the KJV was translated), "lay hold on" almost always implies force in a violent context. The exceptions would imply determination in the absence of violence.

Also there are four different situations here:

i. Man rapes unbetrothed virgin (Deuteronomy 22:28-29)

ii. Man seduces unbetrothed virgin (Exodus 22:16-17)

iii. Man rapes betrothed virgin (Deuteronomy 22:25-27)

iv. Man seduces betrothed virgin (Deuteronomy 22:23-24)

In (iii) and (iv), the man is killed because this is really adultery. In (iv), the woman is killed too because she consented despite being betrothed to another man. That is adultery.

In (i) and (ii), the woman is a free agent, so the rules are different. If it is rape, as in (i), the man is forced to marry her because he has insulted the woman and made it hard for her to find a husband (see Deuteronomy 22:13-21). If she were to marry someone else, she would be risking her life because the evidence of her virginity would be lacking on the marriage night. Note also that he cannot divorce her anymore. This law was made to protect women and guarantee marriage for them if anyone violated them. Compare 2 Samuel 13:1-22, especially verse 16. Then, as now, virginity was a great pride for the woman.

If it is seduction, as in (ii), the man must pay her dowry, also to make clear that another man has already had her. Because there was mutual consent here, the woman may not be compensated with an actual marriage: it is up to her father to decide whether to accept the seducer as his son-in-law or not. But the dowry is paid for her protection still, and the seducer has no choice but to marry her, if her father consents to the marriage. Any other man who marries her would know that she was taken by another man before him. So, he would be getting into the marriage fully aware of her past history, and therefore unable to do her any further harm because of it (see Deuteronomy 22:13-21 again).

Both translations can be different, but not so much that one would consider them different Bibles. Neither is a perfect translation either - although both are among the very best translations available - so it is wise to compare them to each other as one studies.

2. That the Mosaic Law is still in force. Nearly all of Paul's letters addressed this. Romans, Galatians, the two letters to the Corinthians (especially in their address of circumcision), Colossians and especially Hebrews were devoted to teaching vigorously that the Law is no longer in force in the Church Age. This is made more emphatic by both the total absence of the Temple in Jerusalem throughout the period of the Church Age as well as the non-existence of the

priesthood in Israel. There can be no more emphatic way to show the removal of the Law than these witnesses.

The New Testament is chock-full of its own laws that we are responsible to adhere to, not least that there should be no sexual immorality, and everyone who lacks the gift of celibacy should have their own spouse and be faithful to them. In the New Testament, the hopes and expectations of the Old Testament are brought to fruition. It is not only foolishness, but also blasphemy against the Cross of Jesus Christ to return to the Mosaic Law in any form (Galatians 5:2; Hebrews 6:4-6; 10:26). We study that Law now in order to more completely understand the New Testament, because in that Law the New Testament is found in shadows.

Question #2:

Don't you see the error in your understanding of the law? According to your understanding, what God is saying is that once a riffraff or a loser sees a beautiful girl or the daughter of an highly placed man, who is way above his league and not within his reach for marriage because he lacks the means, what he simply has to do is to find a way to rape her and she will become his.

That simply means that God is not only promoting the evil of rape but also encouraging lazy guys not to work hard to have enough to marry a beautiful girl because they have the option of making her theirs by raping her. According to your a rapist forced to marry his victim is a punishment to him, but you failed to consider when the rapists actual and main intention is for the victim to be his wife and for him to become in-laws with her well to do family. Can you now see your flaws?

Your misunderstanding is due to you reading a wrong Bible version which wrongly translates the verse to mean rape. One thing you need to know about the book of Deutoronomy is that it is a copy of the laws in the book of Exodus which precedes it (See screenshot below). So, the key to understanding the law which you have misconstrued to mean rape is to look at where it was first written which is in Exodus 22:16-17 which shows it is consensual sex.

Deuteronomy 22:28-29 King James Version (KJV)

28 If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;

29 Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

Exodus 22:16-17 (KJV)

And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.

If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.

Look at the keywords in both passages: Damsel/maid/virgin not betrothed... pay dowry, father, wife.

I'm now surprised at how the verse means rape here and means consensual sex elsewhere.

As for the law being done away with, you guys don't know what Paul and the Apostles were talking about when they made statement as such. You think they mean the law has been garbaged and over. No. They simply mean it no longer served as a basis for salvation because Jesus is now the one who gives salvation. If the law was done away with, how come the new testament orders that we do many things found in the law? Below is Jesus repeating what he said in the old testament.

Matthew 5:44 (KJV)

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

Exodus 23:4

If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again.

They are both talking about loving one's enemies. This clearly shows that the part of the old law which God wants us to continue with, he clearly states in the new testament. The ones he doesn't want us to do again, he also stated.

Now, what happens to the ones he didn't say anything about in the new testament? It means they remain valid and must be obeyed. Whatever he said back then remains until we hear otherwise from him. Changing those things is the same as ordering people to go against them when the Bible hasn't ordered such. Changing them is the same as speaking when God hasn't spoken. The above is a clear way to know which laws are to be obey and which are not to be obeyed.

You see, when the Bible is speaking about the law being done away with, it is not saying you can now disobey those laws especially the ones that have to do with serving false gods, tattoos, cross-dressing, homosexuality etc. The Bible simply means the law is no longer a prerequisite to eternal salvation. Jesus has saved us by his grace, so we no longer need to fulfill the law to be saved. We only obey the law to show obedience to God here on Earth else we get punished, but not as a ticket to heaven. The law no longer fulfills that purpose.

There isn't much new that Jesus said in the new testament that he hadn't already said in the old testament. The same Jesus who said love your neighbor as yourself is the same Jesus who said it first in the old testament.

Leviticus 19:18 (KJV)

Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the LORD .

Matthew 22:39 (KJV)

And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

If you feel, the old testament laws are done away with then go and sleep with your mother as against the law in Leviticus. Also, wear female clothes as a man which is something God said is an abomination to Him. One thing you need to know is that the laws which God doesn't want us to obey anymore, he clearly changed in the new testament e.g animal sacrifices, unclean animals, washing, not shaving, not wearing clothes with mixed materials etc. All those are carnal ordinances

Hebrews 9:10

Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.

But laws such as against homosexuality, incest, idolatry, cross-dressing, and also laws on tithing etc still stand. Yes, God repeated himself on some of these issued, but the fact that he didn't say anything concerning some in the new testament doesn't mean we can now disobey them. He doesn't always have to repeat himself. He has spoken already in the old testament and whatever he said back then remains valid until we hear otherwise. Or did you hear him say in the new testament that we can now cross-dress and sleep with our sister and mother?

Jesus made it clear that the law has been summed up into loving God and our neighbor. But can you love God and your neighbor without obeying God's commandments? Be sincere.

Matthew 22:36-40 King James Version (KJV)

Master, which is the great commandment in the law?

Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

This is the first and great commandment.

And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

How do we love God? We do by obeying his commandments.

John 14:15

If ye love me, keep my commandments.

Response #2:

I still disagree with you. I stand by what I said earlier.

Question #3:

I am always happy when I see Christians with the knowledge of what Christianity is all about. People always confuse traditions with true Christianity. When I see somebody praising the KJV to high heavens I just smh on such ignorance. God bless you bro for this writeup.

Response #3:

Thank you for your kind words.

Question #4:

You should have pointed out what you disagree with in my post.

Response #4:

I already showed you my position. You only dismissed it and repeated your claims. I didn't have to restate my arguments.

Question #5:

Your position is not biblically sound but man made. What I simply did was use the Bible to expose its flaws. If my post had flaws, you would have done the same to the rebuttal.

Response #5:

You're welcome to your opinions, my friend. I still disagree with you, and I am not going to argue with you about what you want to believe.

Question #6:

Rather, the shame is your for saying my Holy God who is a righteous judge once ordered that rapists should be rewarded with their victims.

You can all those Bible translations older than the Long James Version? You are not only ignorant concerning the scriptures but also not a student of history. They are all modern versions while the KJV was published in 1611.

Mind you, all those you claim are my fellow Christians aren't Christians at all. No Christian will say his Holy and righteous judge of a Father once supported rape. God never changes.

Do you know why an atheist like you support those so-called Christians? It's because they are operating in the flesh like you and Daddy Freeze and can never understand the scriptures.

Response #6:

1. I certainly don't hold brief for atheists, but it has been my experience in defending or answering for my faith that unapologetically agreeing with the Bible is the safest way to go. When you start making excuses for the Bible or worrying about how other people may receive what it says, I have found that it is easy to end up editing God's words, either by adding to them or by taking away from them.

It may seem as if God was rewarding rapists with their victims if we stand with what the Bible says, but that is because we are judging the past by the present. Historians call that flaw "**presentism.**" In the days in question, marriage was a different sort of business. Consider, for example, that betrothals were treated like already contracted marriages. That is not nearly common today. As far as most people today are concerned, an engagement is little more than an expression of intent.

In Israelite law as given by God through Moses, a rapist was forced to become a responsible husband if he dared to rape an Israelite virgin. Could he be a riff-raff? Not by Israelite law. By Israelite law, every adult male owned their own real estate, and thus could provide for themselves and a family. By Israelite law, irresponsible sons were to be killed upon their parents' testimony. So, there weren't supposed to be any riff-raffs at all. Therefore, any man who committed rape would have been a man of some means, and would automatically acquire the responsibilities of marriage that would be enforced too by Israelite law.

If you are confident in the Bible, you won't need to make excuses for God. Our God is well able to answer for Himself.

2. As for early Bible translations, the first complete translation into the English language is attributed to John Wycliffe in the late 14th century. Before him, there were translations of parts of the Bible into English. After him, William Tyndale did his own work in the 1500s. The King James Bible was made in 1611, as you know. John Wycliffe's Bible survives today. If age is the measure, then that translation would be superior to the KJV. But that is not the case. The KJV is superior to the Wycliffe Bible.

Modern translations, in the same vein, account for some problems in the KJV. The producers of the KJV were restricted to certain material to work with. Today, we have access to better material than those. This is what those who use that translation need to be aware of. This does not mean that any one translation is perfect. There is no perfect translation at all. All those who

believe the Bible are best served to compare translations (that is, orthodox, non-special interest translations. Special interest translations like the New World Translation, and the various Roman Catholic versions, are best avoided) in their study. Restricting oneself to one translation can cause the kinds of problems evident in your teachings. The only perfect textual preservation of God's Word was the original Scriptures written by the prophets and apostles. Those do not exist anymore. Existing copies, manuscripts, and translations can be extremely high quality, and in fact mostly are, but none of them is perfect. This is why Bible teachers need to (in addition to being spiritually mature believers who have been properly taught the Bible as a full system of truth) not only know the ancient Bible languages - Biblical Hebrew, Ancient Greek, and Aramaic, but also be skilled in textual criticism. Without these tools, the teacher will really just keep risking the spiritual health of his hearers on the flaws of otherwise excellent translations.

3. As for being fellow believers, to begin with, the Bible teaches that it is only those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ - the God-Man Who died on the Cross for all human sins so that all human beings can be saved from the Second Death - that are Christians. This is the only criterion. There are immature Christians whose behavior and theology are very bad indeed, but they are no less Christians than very mature believers who have attained a very high level of sanctification. This is exactly the same as saying that a crawling infant that cannot speak a single coherent word or act in any kind of admirable way is no less human than a full-grown, highly-accomplished adult. Both are human, although one is clearly a far more effective human than the other.

In addition to that, I don't think that anyone who has commented on your thread said that God once supported rape. I certainly did not say that. It may be a straw man on your part, a misunderstanding - perhaps deliberate, perhaps accidental.

Question #7:

2 Samuel 24:1 KJV

And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.

1 Chronicles 21:1 KJV

And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.

I don't think the error is from the version. Every version made the same mistake.

Response #7:

There is no error here.

Satan often gets special permission from God to harm believers. We see this in the example of Job and King Saul, at least (other examples abound).

In other words, Satan can be a tool in God's Hand for both testing and punishment for His Children. So, both verses are stating the same truth in two different but legitimate ways.

Question #8:

Since when did the phrase lay hold become synonymous with rape? Does that mean Paul was telling us to rape eternal life as seen below?

1 Timothy 6:12

Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses.

Response #8:

As I told you in my first post, Jacobean English was not the same as Modern English although they are very similar to each other. Early Modern English used words in a sometimes significantly different way than we do today.

"Lay hold on/upon" generally implies violence. The only exception that I know of is when it is used in a metaphorical way to indicate determination. This is why Paul's words could be translated that way. You should note that the Christian Faith is always depicted like a war. The Lord Jesus Himself put it this way: the Kingdom of Heaven has been suffering violence since the days of John the Baptist, and the violent take it by force. Paul himself called the faith "the good fight" and spoke of "weapons of warfare" and "the whole armour of God".

So, violence is a very good metaphor for our Faith. That is why "lay hold on" is a good expression to translate what he says here. The use here is not proof that the phrase does not imply force or violence. It is actually proof to the contrary.

_____, you may also consult the Collins Dictionary online. The phrase is defined there severally as to seize, to grasp, to take possession of, etc. All of these imply force or determination.

Question #9:

ONE of my many problems with Christianity. A good God giving permission to an evil spirit to commit evil on the righteous.

Response #9:

I'm sorry to hear that you have a problem with that. That is why we are all here on Earth: to demonstrate whether we trust God and His Way of doing things or whether we think we or someone else can do better than Him.

I, along with all Christians, believe that God always does the right thing. So, if He uses Satan this way, then it is the right thing to do. I have no doubts about that.

Question #10:

It is good to see refreshing honesty from a Christian.

I'm sorry but the past few weeks almost turned me into an anti-Christian hater. There were numerous falsehoods from pastors put on the front page and many nairaland Christian swallowed these falsehoods like zombies.

As I grow older, i tend to leave people to their beliefs. I am an atheist and I disagree with the bible.....however, it is another thing entirely to deny what is written in the bible.

Response #10:

I congratulate you on your new tendency. It's the right way to go. People are free to believe or disbelieve whatever they want. If they ask questions, it is good to answer to help them make their own decisions or revise them, if they please. Otherwise, better to leave well enough alone.

Question #11:

So we are all man rats in the eyes of your God.

Response #11:

He made us, so if we are, that is what we ought to be.

However, if He could also become one of us and die for our sins so that we don't have to suffer the Second Death, I don't think I could agree with you.

Question #12:

There is error there except if you want to be mischievous in your interpretation. The bible did not say God permitted satan to do it. It was plainly stated in Job what transpired between God and Satan, but in this case, you are just inferring. That is just your own extra-biblical explanation to suit yourself and get your holy book out of the hook. Are you saying everything Satan did in the bible was the work of God?

Response #12:

So the options here are only error or mischievous interpretation? How are you being an honest debater here?

Why does the Bible have to say it there when it teaches the principle everywhere else?

In the New Testament, at least two people were deliberately exposed to Satan's attack for blasphemy. There is another one in 1 Corinthians 5 who was given over to Satan too for blatant sexual immorality. Paul himself testified that God gave him a "messenger of Satan" to buffet him and keep him from becoming proud.

It is completely unreasonable to demand that a text always in each and every instance enunciate a principle that it has already established and that should be taken for granted.

Question #13:

Wait. You believe that Jesus is God? I thought protestants believe that Jesus was just a special son of God?

Response #13:

I think that there's a lot you don't know.

Question #14:

You just said too many words but nothing in them matches with the Bible. This shows that they are words of your own, and such happens when one is trying to justify an evil doctrine which can only be inspired by an evil man or an evil translation. Now let's see how you got it all wrong.

1. You claim that there were no riffraffs neither did Israel have lowlife people. According to you, every adult male had real estates and were okay enough. You speak as if you existed in those day and also as if the Bible clearly said the same thing. If everyone was okay then, how come God ordered that people should ensure they pay tithes so that poor people like widows, orphans etc could feed? Aren't there 18 year old orphans capable of rape? Also, your claim that irresponsible children didn't exist then for there to be rape because parents report them and they are stoned is quite silly. What if a responsible child commits his first after of irresponsibility and it amounts to rape? You even sound as if it was everyone in Israel then that were rich and okay and that the land had no poor men, as if the God we serve today is partial that he blessed them totally in those days unlike today. No bro, they were poor people and lazy people as well, the Bible is full of verses about them. Even Jesus confirmed it when he said we shall always have the poor among us. So your talk of everyone having a real estate is just junk from you and not the Bible.

Now if four men rape a woman, will the four of them marry her? Can you see how silly your understanding of the Bible verse is?

2. John Wycliffe's version was translated from the Latin Vulgate, not from the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, that's why it was deemed unreliable and something still inspired by the Catholic Church which as rejected.

Mind you, age matters but what matters more is correctness. I'm glad you admit that KJV is accurate than John Wycliffe's version. Do you know that most of these modern Bible versions claim to be older than the KJV? That's because they say they were translated from manuscripts older than the one KJV was translated from. Guess what? The same Satan corrupting the word of God today was also warned of during the days of Paul and has been doing it since the Garden of Eden. How do we know which version is best? We put them to the test. Read thread below to see how other versions have been corrupting God's word.

<https://www.nairaland.com/4957299/bible-sword-butter-knife-why>

You claim there's no perfect word of God in English language. This is why I say some Christians are a shame. You mean God who said he will protect his word now no longer can, that's why we don't know which is his perfect word?

Well, he has a perfect word in English and it's the king James Version. Your statement so far is why I call some Christians shame.

Response #14:

You are a quarrelsome man. You might also be a dishonest one, judging by your responses.

1. I did not claim that there were no riff-raffs. I said that there weren't supposed to be. By Israelite law, wayward sons were to be killed, and young men inherited land to farm and provide for themselves and their family. No one was supposed to be poor (Deuteronomy 15:4). That is why the law was made the way that it was.

Of course, the law was never followed by Israel for any significant length of time, so there were always "men of Belial" who could do despicable things to women, and no one in their right mind would think to make the woman marry them. This is one place where we would find the Lord warning against following the Law slavishly without understanding its purpose, like He did the Pharisees.

As for your question about four men raping a woman, the Sadducees asked the Lord Jesus a similar question about resurrection. I'll give you the same answer He gave to them: it is because you do not know the Scriptures or the power of God that you talk as you do.

2. I did not admit anything about KJV. I told you in my first post that it is one of the best translations of the Bible around. It does have problems because it was translated from poor material, but the scholars did an exceptional job for their time. Ever since the translation was made in the 17th century, better material has come to light from which better translations have been made.

As for modern versions claiming to be older, I've never heard the claim.

I did not claim that there is no perfect Word of God in English. I said that there is no perfect translation of the Word of God. No translation is inspired any more than any interpretation of the Bible is inspired.

Question #15:

grasp and taking possession doesn't mean rape but me taking a woman as mine during intercourse. I possess her and be man over her. Or do you expect me to have sex with her from a distance like with Bluetooth? I simply lay hold of her and be manly. It doesn't mean rape

Response #15:

I don't think you are right. I also notice that you didn't explain away "seize". Perhaps, you also seize a woman and "be manly" too?

Question #16:

You guys didn't have to spell it out before one can educe that you mean God once supported rape. Once you know that a lowly man can decide to become in-laws with a king or the high and mighty simply by raping their daughter, then you will see that you clearly stated that God supported rape.

Imagine a lowlife, which existed in the days of Israel, raping your daughter and you are a rich man. Today you would want him killed or jailed. But sadly, you say God said his kind must marry the victim. That means if a lowlife wants to end his misery of poverty, all he some had to do was find a way to rape King David's daughter, and viola he becomes in-laws with a king. This means people can deliberately become rapist just to escape poverty, not mainly because of sexual urge. Can you now see clearly?

Response #16:

The way I see it, you put words in other people's mouths to convince yourself that you are right. Of course, that is called lying. My position is quite clearly defined, and it does not say that God supports rape in any form.

Question #17:

What are you insinuating guy? That we should assume bible said something when it did not say so? 🙄 🙄 Just stop, so we should assume God was using Satan throughout the bible? Who authors sin God or Satan?

Response #17:

I didn't insinuate a thing. I said without mincing words that there is no error in those two verses because what was said is consistent with what the Bible teaches everywhere else.

If one version of the story says that God got angry with Israel and He instructed David to number Israel, so that Israel got punished, and another said that Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel, I will take for granted that what happened there is exactly the same as what happened when Satan stood up against Job, and with God's Permission tested him grievously. That is a natural conclusion to make. It is not forced on the text. The text itself provides a way to understand things like that that would ordinarily have been incomprehensible.

But, obviously, an atheist has a vested interest in having the Bible wrong or incomprehensible, so you will pretend as hard as you can that this is a completely unacceptable way of telling a story - even though you would never behave the same way with some other book you read.

Question #18:

Wow! Thanks for this explanation. Never thought of it that way. God bless you in Jesus Name bro.

Response #18:

Thank you for your kind words. Grace remain with you too.

Question #19:

Just cos a dictionary tells you that seize is synonymous with grasp doesn't mean. both words can be used interchangeably all the time. Try to note that. Knowing that will prevent you from using those words wrongly.

The teacher grasp hold off my book

The teacher seized my book

Both sentences carry different meanings.

Response #19:

This is too obvious a falsehood to warrant a response.

Question #20:

With one mouth, you say God never supported rape.

With another mouth, you say he said a rapist must marry his victim, which sounds like good news to a guy who will see it as an opportunity to have a beautiful girl from a well to do family. All he has to do is rape her and stand on the law which says rapists should marry their victim. Isn't it clear by now that your stance says God supports rape?

Can you now see that I didn't put words in anybody's mouth but showed them the implication of their careless utterance?

Response #20:

No, I'm afraid it is not. If it was, then I see no reason why Amnon should not have been thrilled that he succeeded at raping a virgin that he would otherwise never have had a shot at marrying since she was his half-sister.

What seems clear to me is the quarrelsome attitude and the dishonesty I mentioned earlier as coming from you.

Question #21:

 I had a good laugh reading this post. It shows how you are trying to explain your folly.

1. You stated that there weren't supposed to be any poor person in Israel, as if Israel was no longer part of this world then.

Look at how you shifted the goal post when you spoke of the sons of Belial aka sons of devil raping a woman. I thought you said God's law said a rapist must marry his victim. How come you are here saying the sons of belial aren't entitled to the same benefit of that law as rapists?



Where is it written that they are not entitled to it too? Oh, you want to apply common sense against what you say the law of God clearly stated? 

Look at how you tried to escape from answering the question on whether four men who raped a woman will be forced to marry her. Mind you, the discussion between Jesus and the Sadducees bare no correlation with this case here. Jesus and the Sadducees were talking about a woman marrying more men and who will be her husband in the kingdom of God in heaven Here we are talking about rape by four men and who will the woman's husband here on Earth. Are you beginning to see your foolishness in saying God once supported rape?

Better materials? Have you checked those materials to see their blatant errors which reflect in these modern Bibles? I can show you tonnes of errors in your modern Bibles, but I dare you to show me one in the KJV. Check the link I gave you for a few of the error packed in your modern translations inspired by so-called better materials.

There's a perfect translation of the word of God in English and it is the KJV. Prove me wrong by showing me the errors which make you think it's not the perfect translation. At least, I've shown you those of other translations.

Response #21:

1. Obviously I was just quoting a Bible verse about that, so it is the Lord Himself Whom you are mocking, not me.

As for your other comments, I don't really see much of worth to respond to in them.

Obviously, if the Law was followed, there would be no "sons of Belial" (a Bible term: see Deuteronomy 13:13 among other passages).

As for applying common sense, the Law commanded that no work was to be done on the Sabbath, but the priests and Levites still carried out their duties in the Temple without blame. The Law also said that no one but the priests was to eat the Shewbread, but David ate it and was held blameless too. The Lord used these two examples to teach the Pharisees later that they did not understand the Law that they were pretending to care so much about. The Pharisees had been complaining that his disciples were harvesting and eating grain as they walked through fields on the Sabbath. That was what our Lord was responding to. Evidently, therefore, it only makes sense to conclude that if a son of Belial raped an Israelite virgin, it would actually violate the spirit of the Law to give her to him in marriage, since he himself should not even be alive in the first place.

As for the parallel between your hypothetical and that of the Sadducees, I believe that that is about as obvious as it could possibly get. The Sadducees thought that they were being smart in attacking the doctrine of the Resurrection with a common sense application of the Law. That was foolish since they did not believe the Law in the first place, and therefore did not even understand it. You did the same thing. As I told you, if the Law had been kept in Israel, Israelite virgins would be protected by the law of rape. Because the law was not kept, they were not. If there were as many as even two men who would gang up to rape an Israelite virgin, then the land itself had a problem. In fact, this happened in a Benjaminite city when a Levite had his concubine raped to death by a gang of wicked men who had actually come to rape him at the home of his host for the night.

The result of that action was that the Lord Himself punished the eleven tribes with multiple defeats at Benjamin's hand when they went to discipline them for their wickedness. In the end, however, the whole tribe of Benjamin was nearly exterminated for that wickedness.

This is to demonstrate that if rape comes to the point you have just spoken of, then it is because the Law was not being kept by the larger community in the first place. It would then be hypocritical to give the virgin to her rapist since he clearly would not care very much to be a responsible husband to the woman in question, and the Law was designed to protect the woman, not to reward the man's wickedness as you seem to want very much for it to be.

2. As for the errors, no translation is free from them. Some have slightly more, some have slightly less, but in general, the errors are less than 1% of the material. So, you wouldn't really be proving anything by showing me errors in other translations. I know that they have them: that's why I read multiple translations including the KJV and the NKJV, which both have errors too. I compare them and try to get at the best renderings of the meanings in the original languages. More than that, since I have a pastor-teaching gift and aspire to a pastor-teaching ministry, I am also studying the original languages themselves so that I can read the manuscripts themselves and cut out the problems of translation.

3. As for proving you wrong, I'm not interested. I came to your thread because I desired a discussion about the Truth. I love to discuss the Bible especially with others who love the Lord and love His Truth above all. Of course, I knew your antecedents, and therefore did not expect much of value from discussing with you. But I embraced the exercise - albeit with hesitation - in order to give myself a spiritual work-out. You've been combative from the get-go, just like I knew that you would be. I have not answered you to prove anything. I have only used every opportunity here to exercise myself in biblical thinking. Your questions and challenges have only presented me with an opportunity to recall things I have learned, and make new connections in things I already knew. In other words, instead of mutually encouraging each other in the Truth, as two believers can and should, I have only been able to encourage myself alone, just as I do when antichristians attack my faith in the Lord and His Word.

As I said before, I won't argue with you about what you want to believe. You are free to believe it. You will answer to the Lord for it, not to me. I will also, just like you, answer to the Lord for what I believe, which is why I look to the Bible for what to believe. So if you want to be proved wrong, look elsewhere. I am not going to do that. I think your error is already obvious. I think that if you loved the Truth, you would already see it. I think that your demand to be proved wrong is nothing more than a desire to try to co-opt others into your error.

Question #22:

A long pile of nothing that addresses my post

Push over.

Response #22:

No Response

Question #23:

Stop applying deflective tactics. Address my post before coming up with fresh argument.

As for Amnon, he never loved Tamar and never had any intention of marrying her. What he had for her was lust, that's why he didn't listen to her when she said instead of forcing his way with her, he should ask for her hand from the king. If he truly loved her, he would have listened and

done what she advised. But since it was lust he had for her, he simply carried out his true desire by raping her. That's why he didn't want to see her afterwards.

Can you see how your use of Amnon's case doesn't in any way address my post?

Stop using issues that don't correlate

Response #23:

No response

Question #24:

An accusation with no evidence is similar to a false accusation.

Response #24:

No response