

Throw Away Your Strong's Concordance (Unless you only use it to find words and verses in the KJV)

I. Introductory remarks

1. I am not against the Greek and Hebrew scriptures.
 - A. They and the KJV are all equally the word of God.
 - B. It's fine for a Greek man, whose native language is Koine Greek, to read the Textus Receptus and define its Greek words with a Greek dictionary.
 - C. It's fine for a Hebrew man, whose native language is Hebrew, to read the Masoretic Text and define its Hebrew words with a Hebrew dictionary.
2. I am opposed to English-speakers, who don't speak Greek or Hebrew, attempting to define words in those languages using a lexicon.
 - A. I will give my reasons for this in the rest of this sermon.
 - B. I am only speaking to people who believe that the KJV is the inspired, preserved word of God.
 - C. I am not speaking to those who don't -- I don't care what you do.
3. An analogy: Imagine if I went to the Philippines, not knowing the Filipino language, but instead armed with a Filipino-to-English dictionary, and I started arguing with them about the meaning of a great Filipino work of literature and trying to teach them what it meant.
 - A. What do you think people in the Philippines would think of me?
 - B. What do you think American bystanders observing the situation would think of me?
 - C. What if there was a perfect translation in English of the great Filipino work?
 - i. What if I had a copy of that perfect translation, but I still decided to try to understand it by using my Filipino-to-English dictionary to define the words in the Filipino version?
 - ii. What if the man that wrote the Filipino-to-English dictionary had a vastly inferior knowledge of Filipino and English than the men that made the perfect translation of the Filipino book into English?
 - iii. What if it had been shown to me that some of the definitions in my Filipino-to-English dictionary were in conflict with the perfect translation of the book, and therefore were in error?
 - iv. What if I couldn't tell which definitions in my Filipino-to-English dictionary were in error because I couldn't read nor understand Filipino?
 - v. What if I, knowing these things, tried to explain to an American the meaning of this great Filipino work by showing him the Filipino words that neither of us could read nor understand and then proceeded to use my inferior Filipino-to-English dictionary to define them?
 - vi. What would that American think of me?
 - vii. Might he think that I was wasting my time trying to do as an amateur what had already been done by experts?
 - viii. Might he not wonder why I was not content to read the work in the language that I could actually understand, rather than trying to pretend that I could read Filipino by way of my inferior Filipino-to-English dictionary?
 - D. Remember this analogy as we go through the rest of this sermon.

II. There is no need for a KJV-reading Christian to "go to the Greek."

1. If a Christian believes that the KJV is the inspired and preserved word of God, then he has no reason to go to Greek or Hebrew versions of the word of God.

- A. If he is not an expert in Greek and Hebrew and can't read and understand them as well as he can English, he has no business using a Greek or Hebrew Bible instead of a KJV.
 - i. Why would someone use a Bible or a language that they can't read to try to interpret one that they can?
 - ii. Hypothetically, if there was a Chinese Bible that was the perfect, preserved, infallible word of God, would an English speaking Christian go to a Chinese lexicon to define the Chinese character in order to understand what the English word means in the KJV?
 - iii. Of course he wouldn't.
 - iv. Why? Because he has the preserved word of God in his native language and therefore he would not go to another language that he doesn't understand to help him understand a language that he does.
 - v. The same is true of Hebrew and Greek.
 - vi. The fact that Hebrew and Greek are the original languages of the Bible should make no difference to a Christian who believes that the KJV is the inspired, preserved word of God because he believes that the KJV is equally the word of God just as are the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Greek Textus Receptus.
 - vii. A Christian who thinks he needs to go to the Greek and Hebrew to fully understand the word of God doesn't believe that God has preserved His word in the KJV.
 - B. There are almost no Christians today that can read Greek or Hebrew proficiently.
 - i. Since they can't read Greek or Hebrew, they use a lexicon like Strong's Concordance to define the Greek and Hebrew words from which the KJV is translated.
 - ii. The definitions of the Hebrew and Greek words in Strong's Concordance are given *in English*.
 - iii. Therefore, the definitions in Strong's Concordance are *translations* of the Hebrew and Greek definitions of the Hebrew and Greek words.
 - iv. Why would a Christian choose the translation of James Strong over the translation of the KJV translators who did so by the providence of God?
 - C. Greekifiers constantly say things like "that Greek word *x* underlying the English word *y* means *z*."
 - i. Do you know what the Greek word *x* that underlies the English word *y* means?
 - ii. It means *y*! If it meant something different than *y*, the KJV translators would have translated it as such.
 - iii. If a man says that a Greek word means something different than the word used in the KJV Bible, he is changing, correcting, and corrupting the word of God (the KJV) (**Gen 3:1,4-5; Rom 1:25; 2Co 2:17**).
2. It is unnecessary for a KJV-reading Christian to "go to the Greek" to try to better understand the word of God.
 - A. At best, using Strong's concordance to define Greek words adds nothing; at worst, it corrupts the word of God.
 - i. If the definition given by Strong is equivalent to the word used by the KJV, then it adds nothing and is useless.

- ii. If the definition given by Strong is different than the word used by the KJV, then it is wrong, and using it corrupts the word of God.
 - B. It's fine for a Christian to look up Greek definitions for the sake of learning Greek, to understand why the KJV translators translated a word in a particular way, or to defend the KJV.
- 3. The vast majority of the time, people only "go to the Greek" for one reason: they can't prove their doctrine with the KJV.
 - A. If they could prove their doctrine with the KJV alone, then they wouldn't "go to the Greek."
 - B. Why go to a language you can't read and don't understand to prove a doctrine that you could prove from a KJV that you can read and understand?
 - C. Many times, these Greekifiers say that the word in the Greek means something different than the word in the KJV.
 - D. They only do this when they want to teach something that the verse doesn't teach.
 - E. Most false teachers use (alleged) Hebrew and Greek definitions to teach heresy.
 - F. Beware of the man who "goes to the Greek" to prove his doctrine!
 - G. *Any arguments from Greek or Hebrew are inadmissible in a discussion with me.*
 - H. If you can't prove it with the KJV alone, then you can't prove it.
 - I. If you can't prove it with the KJV alone, then it's false doctrine.
- 4. James Strong was one of the translators of the Revised Version and the American Standard Version, which are perversions of the Bible that were translated from the corrupt Westcott and Hort text.
 - A. "Mr. Strong was invited by Dr. Philip Schaff to join the Old Testament Company of the American committee of the English Revised Version of the Bible, and worked within that company in preparing both the English and the eventual American revision of the Bible, the American version of which became known as the American Standard Version 1901. The American Revision Committee began work in 1871 and continued to work until 1901. Notable scholars of the day who worked on these two translations with Mr. Strong include F.H.A. Scrivener (who also edited the AV to form the first Cambridge Paragraph Bible, and whose recension of the AV is considered to be the authoritative text), Princeton theologian Charles Hodge, Philip Schaff, F.J.A. Hort and B.F. Westcott (the eponymous Westcott and Hort), W.L. Alexander, A.B. Davidson, S.R. Driver, Joseph Lightfoot, Samuel Wilberforce, Henry Alford, S.P. Tregelles, J. Henry Thayer, and Ezra Abbot. In all, one hundred and one scholars on both sides of the Atlantic worked upon this historic revision." (*James Strong*, [Wikipedia](#), 8-22-17)
 - B. Why would a Christian, who believes that the KJV is the preserved word of God, go to a translator of the corrupt American Standard Version, which was translated from corrupt Hebrew and Greek texts, to get definitions of Bible words?
 - C. Strong's definitions often match the corrupt modern versions.

King James Bible	Strong's Concordance	American Standard Version
Godhead (Rom 1:20)	divinity	divinity
Master (Mat 8:19)	instructor	teacher
too superstitious (Act 17:22)	more religious	very religious
heresy (Act 24:14)	a party	a sect
hell (Luk 16:23)	Hades	Hades

devils (Mat 12:27)	demonic being	demons
Lucifer (Isa 14:12)	morning star	day-star (ASV); morning star (NIV)
corrupt (2Co 2:17)	retail	making merchandise (in the footnote of ASV); peddle (NIV)
changed (Rom 1:25)	exchange	exchanged
Son (Act 3:26)	a slave or servant	Servant
sodomite (Deu 23:17)	a sacred person, that is, a (male) devotee (by prostitution)	sodomite (ASV); shrine prostitute (NIV)
fornicators (1Co 6:9)	a (male) prostitute	fornicators (ASV); sexually immoral (NIV)
world (Mat 24:3)	age	world (ASV, footnote says "age"); age (NIV)

III. Using Strong's Concordance to define Hebrew and Greek words doesn't add any clarity to a verse and often makes it very confusing.

1. Let's interpret some verses using Strong's Concordance to translate.

A. **1Th 4:16**

- i. KJV - For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first:
- ii. Strong's - Because the supreme in authority self descend away the sky in a cry of incitement in a tone a chief angel and in a trumpet a deity and the dead in the Messiah stand up firstly:

B. **Col 2:13**

- i. KJV - And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;
- ii. Strong's - And you being dead in side slip and the prepuce of you flesh reanimate conjointly with self to grant as a favor you all side slip.

C. **Eph 1:4**

- i. KJV - According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:
- ii. Strong's - Just as to select us in self prior to founding the world us to exist sacred and unblemished directly in front of self in love.

2. As you can see, using Strong's definitions does not help to clarify the Bible whatsoever.

IV. Using a Strong's Concordance can easily lead a non-expert of Hebrew and Greek to heresy (and if you're an expert in those languages, you don't need Strong's Concordance).

1. Some of the following arguments have been made by heretics using Hebrew and Greek to pull the wool over the eyes of the ignorant.
2. Denying hell
 - A. The argument goes as follows.

- B. "Hell" (**Psa 9:17**) is translated from the Hebrew word "sheol" (H7585).
 - C. "Sheol" is also translated as "grave" (**Gen 37:35**) and "pit" (**Job 17:16**).
 - D. Therefore, hell means the grave or a pit.
3. Denying heaven
- A. The argument goes as follows.
 - B. "Heaven" (**Mat 6:1; 2Co 12:2**) is translated from the Greek word "ouranos" (G3772).
 - C. "Ouranos" is also translated as "sky" (**Heb 11:12**) and "air" (**Act 11:6**).
 - D. Therefore, heaven means the sky and the air.
4. Denying the existence of Satan
- A. The argument goes as follows.
 - B. "Satan" (**Job 1:6**) is transliterated from the Hebrew word "satan" (H7854).
 - C. "Satan" (in Hebrew) is also translated as "adversary" (**1Ki 5:4**) and withstand (**Num 22:32**).
 - i. The angel of the LORD was a "satan" (adversary - **Num 22:22**) (withstand - **Num 22:32**) to Balaam.
 - ii. David was a "satan" (adversary - **1Sa 29:4**).
 - iii. The sons of Zeruah were "satans" to David (adversaries - **2Sa 19:22**).
 - iv. Hadad the Edomite was a "satan" to Solomon (adversary - **1Ki 11:14**).
 - v. Rezon the son of Eliadah was a "satan" to Solomon (adversary - **1Ki 11:23,25**).
 - D. Therefore, "Satan" is just the name of an adversary.
5. Denying the existence of the one true God.
- A. The argument goes as follows.
 - B. "God" (**Gen 1:1**) is translated from the Hebrew word "elohiym" (H430).
 - C. "Elohiym" is also translated as "mighty" (**Exo 9:28**), "gods" (**Exo 32:31**), "judges" (**Exo 22:9**), "goddess" (**1Ki 11:5**), "angels" (**Psa 8:5**), and "godly" (**Mal 2:15**).
 - i. Abraham was "elohiym" (mighty - **Gen 23:6**).
 - ii. Rachel stole Laban's "elohiym" (gods - **Gen 31:30**).
 - iii. A master was to bring his slave to the "elohiym" for him to be made his slave forever (judges - **Exo 21:6**).
 - iv. Ashtoreth was the "elohiym" of the Zidonians (goddess - **1Ki 11:5**).
 - v. Angels are "elohiym" (angels - **Psa 8:5**).
 - vi. Righteous men are "elohiym" (godly - **Mal 2:15**).
 - D. Therefore, "God" is merely a mighty man, an idol, a judge, a goddess, an angel, or a righteous man.
- V. Christians who believe that the KJV is the preserved word of God should put away their Strong's Concordance and pick up their KJV and a good old dictionary (Oxford English Dictionary or Webster's 1828) and study the Bible the way the Bible says to by reading it distinctly and giving the sense (**Neh 8:8**).
- 1. It is unwise and unprofitable to try to study the Bible by dabbling in languages that one can't read and doesn't understand by using definitions supplied by a Bible perverter like James Strong.
 - 2. Strong's concordance is useful to find where words are used in the KJV, but not to define them.