



**"You have made known to me the path of life; you will fill me with joy in your presence, with eternal pleasures at your right hand."
Psalm 16:11**

"Not all dragons are evil, but all dragons are dire. And the last is more to be feared than the first." – D.



Taken from "A Dragon Comments - The Human Propensity to Sacrifice Virgins, and Other Oddities."

Ah, I wondered when you might ask this one, especially as you reside within cannon shot of the site where the nobles on that fine June day buttonholed King James. That you were actually there is incidental, though, had they noticed your presence, history may have recorded a much different outcome.

Why humans insist on deifying objects is rather a bit of a mystery. You would think that the obvious signs in nature itself would tend to lead them into worshipping the Creator, and not the created. Maybe it is their constant need to be able to control their relationship with God, or with their gods, as the case may be, that leads them so easily down the path to idols and other abominations.

It isn't unusual to find that some sects of Christianity have deified various objects and focused their adoration and worship on those earthly representations of God, rather than focusing their adoration and worship on the One who by His very nature commands their worship and obedience.

To answer your specific question in reference to the human worship of the King James version of the Bible, especially as it concerns the original 1611 edition (ref. the abbr. "KJV"), there may not be another case related to modern day Christianity that illustrates this issue of object worship better.

What makes this seem rather odd (though, admittedly, humans do excel at oddities), is that this worship focuses on a translation of the original Scriptures and not on the original Scriptures themselves. There have been many other translations since 1611 and all of them have some merit, though a few are better suited to holding up the odd table leg than for serious Bible study.

One thing that helps to encourage this worship of a book, rather than the book's Author, is the beauty and cadence of the English language in the time period that the KJV was written. Also, the fact that it was the first layman's Bible, the catalyst for opening up Christianity for the common human.

Unfortunately, what started out as a catalyst has been transformed into an object of worship, and this has happened at the hands of the very men who are expected to teach and protect human believers from this sort of object worship.

I reside in a portion of the North American continent known as the "Bible Belt". It is very common here to find pastors who so stress the worship of the KJV that they turn on, and sometimes spiritually devour believers who oppose their worship *of a book!* Instead of encouraging their flocks to study the actual Scriptures, i.e. the original writings, in conjunction with using a common language translation, these men browbeat their followers into focusing their love and adoration for God, onto the KJV.

I've seen how their followers stiffen their backbones and fall into a sort of trance when the validity of the KJV is questioned. Their eyes flash, and they launch into their stanch defense of the KJV. To the very point of driving other humans away from the Gospel of Christ and salvation!

I personally believe that this also involves the issue of "Master, or Pastor?" that I discussed with James some time back. Many human believers tend to follow their church leadership blindly and without question. Especially when the pastors of these folk tend to not encourage spiritual growth beyond the infant stage. It's much easier for these men to lead their followers when they exercise absolute power over them.

This in turn can lead to all sorts of aberrant behavior and worship in the congregations that follow this sort of church leadership. And one of the more common things that this leads to is the worship of objects, like the KJV, rather than the worship of God.

Practically speaking, like every other translation of the original Scriptures, the KJV is not the Word of God. The KJV, like every other copy of the original Scriptures, is a *translation* of the Word of God and should be trusted only in so far as one studies it in the light of the original Scriptures. The example of Hebrews 13:17 is a case in point:

"Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves:"

In the light of the original Scriptures, and the context of Hebrews 13, the verse is better rendered:

"Rely upon them that rule over you, being convinced by your earnest inspection and review of your memories of their testimonies that they are faithful, their testimonies consistently reflecting Jesus Christ's own character. In your own lives, imitate their consistent testimonies and being convinced of their continued faithfulness, voluntarily yield yourselves to their leadership:"

The first tends to lead to unquestioned obedience to one's religious leadership; the latter properly encourages careful examination of one's leadership on a constant basis before submitting to their authority. A decidedly critical point that can be missed if one doesn't discover the actual intent of the author through careful study of the original Scriptures.

There will always be misinterpretations in any translation of the Scriptures into any language other than the ones that were the basis for the original writings. Even in English, time and use changes the meaning and import of words. Social mores of a particular time period may sometimes influence translators into interpreting a particular passage of Scripture according to their society's lifestyle. A case in point, Genesis 3:16-17. In the KJV the passage reads:

"(16)Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. (17)And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; (18)Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; (19)In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

We see multiplied sorrow and pain in childbirth for Eve, and sorrow and increased physical labor for Adam. Human childbirth in the 1600's was a terrible experience, whether one sees it from a medical standpoint or from the standpoint of the woman giving birth. So, one could naturally question whether this affected the translation of this particular passage.

If one goes back to the original Scriptures, one finds the possibility of a much different translation.

The word "sorrow" is used three times in the above passage. Twice for Eve, and once for Adam. The first time for Eve, and the time for Adam, it is the Hebrew word *'itstsâbône*, worrisome labor or pain, sorrow or toil. The second time for Eve, it is the word *'etseb*, toil, physical or mental anguish, labor or sorrow. Both of these words share the same root word, *'âtsab*, to carve, to fabricate or to fashion.

The surprising thing is that either Adam is supposed to experience the same pain as Eve's childbirth will bring, when he labors in the field, or that Eve will find childbirth as labor intensive as Adam's labors in the field. Which is correct?

Take the weight of the longer passage dealing with Adam's curse into account, along with the testimonies of human women who, through proper preparation, have found childbirth to be an intense labor, but not a *painful* experience in and of itself. These women have found that childbirth does not have to be the painful experience described by other women, this KJV passage, or even the horrors possibly described by their own mothers (no offense intended to human motherhood). One's conclusion could be that the KJV translators allowed their own society's perception of childbirth to color their interpretation of this passage in Genesis.

In Galatians 6:2-5, we find the following in the KJV:

"(2)Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ. (3)For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself. (4)But let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another. (5)For every man shall bear his own burden."

Yet in the New international Version (yes, my favorite human translation. Though I find our own translation into the Dragonish much clearer all around), we find this:

"(2)Carry each other's burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ. (3)If anyone thinks he is something when he is nothing, he deceives himself. (4)Each one should test his own actions. Then he can take pride in himself, without comparing himself to somebody else, (5)for each one should carry his own load."

Why the difference? Because the word "burdens" in the second verse in the KJV and the word "burden" in verse 5 are two completely different words in the original Scripture passage. The first "burden" is from the Greek word baros which means "loads" or "weights", as in burdensome, by implication from the context, I would see this as life's difficulties. The second "burden" is from the Greek word phortion, which means "task" or "service", as in an assignment or a responsibility.

If the KJV translators knew this, why did they not use words that would have made the meaning of this passage so much clearer for the reader? Was it simply an assumption that the reader would understand the distinction, or an unintentional error on the part of the translators? As they are all dead and presumably in the presence of God, this question will have to wait for a Brighter and More Glorious Time for revelation.

And let us hope that today's human believers are not too confused by some of the word meaning changes that have crept through the English language over the years. The modern meaning of the word "gay" completely changes the intent of James 2:1-4, if one does not read and understand the entire passage through verse 13!

As you can see, Dear Cornelius, humans have difficulty separating their preferences from their principles. Especially when they blindly follow their leadership, and even more so when their religion is in question.

The problems that arise from this human mindset do not restrict themselves to a particular version of the Scriptures. There are many religious preferences that can easily become a fetish through inordinate preoccupation, from a particular interpretation of the Scriptures, to the leadership of a particular individual, to clothing, food or lifestyle, for some known examples.

One wonders at the grace and mercy of God, that He would care so much for creatures that tend so easily to wander away from Him and wallow in the mires of pride and self-sufficiency.

May His grace and mercy continue to bless your weyr, and all of "Camelot's" weyrs, now and until the End of the Shadowlands.

Truly Yours in Friendship,

Theophilus Braesbaec, D.D.W., M.H.R.