

**General Topics :: WHAT ABOUT THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE?****WHAT ABOUT THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE?, on: 2005/6/22 11:02****WHAT ABOUT THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE?**

The Holman Christian Standard Bible (CSB), which was published in April 2004, has soared to No. 5 in the General Versions & Translations category in Christian retail stores in the USA and Canada. (#1 New King James, #2 New International, #3 King James, #4 New Living) Roughly 1.5 million copies have been printed of the entire Bible.

It is published by Broadman & Holman, a division of LifeWay Christian Resources of the Southern Baptist Convention. The CSB was produced by a team of "100 scholars and English stylists representing more than 20 different denominations."

Though it is a more literal version than the New International and therefore is more to be recommended in that regard, the CSB is based upon the Alexandrian Greek Text so it can never be purer than its polluted Egyptian exemplar. The Alexandrian Text is so-named because it is derived from a tiny minority of manuscripts (e.g., Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and a few others of similar character) dating to the early post-apostolic centuries and originating in the region of Alexandria, Egypt. This was a hotbed of theological heresy, which teaches us the "oldest" is not necessarily "best" in the field of New Testament manuscripts. After examining a number of heretical readings in the early Egyptian manuscripts favored by modern textual critics, Edward F. Hills, who had a doctorate in textual criticism from Harvard and began writing in defense of the King James Bible in the 1950s, concluded: "Thus we see that it is unwise in present-day translators to base the texts of their modern versions on recent papyrus discoveries or on B and Aleph. For all these documents come from Egypt, and Egypt during the early Christian centuries was a land in which heresies were rampant. So much was this so that, as Bauer (1934) and van Unnik (1958) have pointed out, later Egyptian Christians seem to have been ashamed of the heretical past of their country and to have drawn a veil of silence across it. This seems to be why so little is known of the history of early Egyptian Christianity. In view, therefore, of the heretical character of the early Egyptian Church, it is not surprising that the papyri, B, Aleph, and other manuscripts which hail from Egypt are liberally sprinkled with heretical readings" (Edward Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, p. 134).

The Egyptian manuscripts given such strange preference by modern textual critics, such as the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus, bear evidence of being corrupt above all other Greek uncials or minuscules. Consider this important testimony by John William Burgon, one of the greatest textual scholars of the last 200 years, who dedicated much of his life to the study of Greek manuscripts and who personally analyzed the Vaticanus in Rome: "When we study the New Testament by the light of such Codexes as B Aleph D L, we find ourselves in an entirely new region of experience; confronted by phenomena not only unique but even portentous. The text has undergone apparently AN HABITUAL, IF NOT SYSTEMATIC, DEPRAVATION; has been manipulated throughout in a wild way. Influences have been demonstrably at work which altogether perplex the judgment. The result is simply calamitous. There are evidences of persistent mutilation, not only of words and clauses, but of entire sentences. The substitution of one expression for another, and the arbitrary transposition of words, are phenomena of such perpetual occurrence, that it becomes evident at last that which lies before us is not so much an ancient copy, as an ancient recension of the Sacred Text. And yet not by any means a recension in the usual sense of the word as an authoritative revision; but only as the name may be applied to the product of individual inaccuracy or caprice, or tasteless assiduity on the part of one or many, at a particular time or in a long series of years. There are reasons for inferring, that we have alighted on five specimens of what the misguided piety of a primitive age is known to have been fruitful in producing. ... THESE CODEXES ABOUND WITH SO MUCH LICENTIOUSNESS OR CARELESSNESS AS TO SUGGEST THE INFERENCE, THAT THEY ARE IN FACT INDEBTED FOR THEIR PRESERVATION TO THEIR HOPELESS CHARACTER. Thus it would appear that an evil reputation ensured their neglect in ancient times; and has procured that they should survive to our own, long after multitudes which were much better had perished in the Master's service" (John Burgon and Edward Miller, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated*, 1896, pp. 32, 33).

It is admitted by all sides of this debate that the Alexandrian text was rejected wholesale by the churches from the 5th to the 19th centuries and was only "recovered" by modern textual critics in these last days. Most influential textual critics of the past 200 years have been skeptics and the fact that their theories fly in the face of divine preservation is none of their concern. The few evangelicals who have been authorities in this field have tried to shoehorn the theories of modern textual criticism into their biblical faith, but the only product is confusion. If the purest apostolic text was "buried in the sands

of Egypt," so to speak, for 1500 years of church history, including the entire Protestant Reformation era and the great missionary era of the 16th to the 19th centuries, what does that tell us about biblical preservation? Scholarly fundamentalists who have adopted modern textual criticism try to solve this problem by saying that the Bible does not teach an explicit doctrine of preservation, that preservation is only hinted at in an implicit manner, and that since God has not told us (they allege) how He would preserve the Scriptures it is possible that He did it by burying them in Egypt. I am thankful that I have the Spirit of God as my Teacher (1 Jn. 2:27) and the Word of God as my sole authority (Acts 17:11) and that I don't have to buy such a ridiculous theory!

In a few instances the CSB uses brackets to question verses that are omitted outright in the United Bible Societies critical Greek New Testament. For example, it brackets Matthew 17:21 and Acts 8:37 instead of omitting them entirely. Lest we think that the CSB is more textually conservative than the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament, the Introduction to the CSB explains the significance of the brackets: "In a few places in the N.T., large square brackets indicate texts that the HCSB translation team and most biblical scholars today believe WERE NOT PART OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT." Why did they not remove the verses entirely, then? They tell us that they left them in with brackets because of their "value for tradition." The verses are not inspired Scripture and yet they are left in the Bible because of tradition? What kind of nonsense is this?

#### 1. THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE HAS AN ABBREVIATED NEW TESTAMENT.

The Introduction to the CSB says it is based on the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament (which is the same as the 4th edition of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament). Jack Moorman also did a firsthand study of the differences between the Nestle-Aland Greek text and the Received Greek text underlying the Reformation Bibles. He published this in "Missing in Modern Bibles: Is the full Story Being Told" (Bible for Today, 1981), concluding that the Nestle-Aland is shorter than the Received Text by 2,886 words (934 MORE words than were omitted in the Westcott-Hort of 1881). This is equivalent to dropping the entire books of 1 Peter and 2 Peter out of the New Testament.

#### 2. THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE OMITTS OR QUESTIONS ROUGHLY 45 ENTIRE VERSES AND 147 MAJOR PORTIONS OF VERSES THAT WERE INTACT IN THE REFORMATION BIBLES.

Consider some examples:

##### Matthew

- 5:22 -- "without a cause" omitted
- 5:44 -- "... bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and ... which despitefully use you, and" omitted
- 6:13 -- "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen" bracketed
- 9:13 -- "to repentance" omitted
- 12:47 -- "Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee" omitted
- 18:11 -- "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost" bracketed
- 19:9 -- "and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery" omitted
- 23:14 -- "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation" bracketed
- 25:13 -- "wherein the Son of Man cometh" omitted

##### Mark

- 1:2 -- "the prophets" is changed to "Isaiah the prophet," thus creating an error because the quotation is from both Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3-5
- 2:17 -- "to repentance" omitted
- 6:11 -- "Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city" omitted
- 9:44 -- "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" bracketed
- 9:45 -- "into the fire that never shall be quenched" omitted
- 9:46 -- "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" bracketed
- 10:21 -- "'take up the cross" omitted
- 11:10 -- "in the name of the Lord" omitted
- 11:26 -- "But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses" bracketed
- 13:14 -- "spoken by Daniel the prophet" omitted
- 15:28 -- "And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors." bracketed

---- 16:9-20 -- entire last 12 verses of Mark's Gospel bracketed

Luke

---- 1:28 -- "blessed art thou among women" omitted

---- 2:14 -- "peace, good will toward men" is changed to "peace among men in whom he is well pleased"

---- 4:4 -- "every word of God" omitted

---- 4:8 -- "and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan" omitted

---- 4:18 -- "to heal the brokenhearted" omitted

---- 9:55, 56 -- "and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them" omitted

---- 11:2 -- "Our ... which art in heaven" omitted

---- 11:2 -- "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth" omitted

---- 11:4 -- "deliver us from evil" omitted

---- 11:11 -- "bread of any of you ... will he give him a stone? or if he ask" omitted

---- 22:43-44 -- "And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground" bracketed

---- 23:17 -- "(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)" verse bracketed

---- 23:34 -- "Then said Jesus, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do" bracketed

---- 24:12 -- "laid by themselves" omitted

John

---- 3:15 -- "should not perish, but" omitted

---- 4:42 -- "the Christ" omitted

---- 5:3-4 -- "waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had" bracketed

---- 5:16 -- "and sought to slay him" omitted

---- 6:47 -- "on me" omitted

---- 7:8 -- "yet" questioned with a footnote, thus causing Jesus to tell a lie

---- 7:53 - 8:11 -- These 12 verses bracketed

---- 8:59 -- "going through the midst of them" omitted

---- 16:16 -- "because I go to the Father" omitted

Acts

---- 2:30 -- "according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ" omitted

---- 8:37 -- entire verse bracketed

---- 24:6-8 -- "...and would have judged according to our law. But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands, Commanding his accusers to come unto thee..." bracketed

---- 24:15 -- "of the dead" omitted

---- 28:29 -- "And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves." verse bracketed

Romans

---- 1:16 -- "of Christ" omitted

---- 1:29 -- "fornication" omitted

---- 8:1 -- "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" omitted

---- 9:28 -- "in righteousness: because a short work" omitted

---- 9:32 -- "of the law" omitted

---- 10:15 -- "preach the gospel of peace" omitted

---- 11:6 -- "But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work" omitted

---- 13:9 -- "Thou shalt not bear false witness" omitted

---- 14:6 -- "and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it" omitted

---- 14:21 -- "or is offended, or is made weak" omitted

1 Corinthians

---- 5:7 -- "for us" omitted

---- 6:20 -- "and in your spirit, which are God's" omitted

---- 7:39 -- "by the law" omitted

---- 10:28 -- "for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof" omitted

---- 11:24 -- "Take, eat ... broken" omitted

---- 11:29 -- "unworthily" omitted

---- 11:29 -- "the Lord" omitted

Ephesians

---- 5:30 -- "of his flesh, and of his bones" omitted  
Philippians  
---- 3:16 -- "by the same rule, let us mind the same thing" omitted  
Colossians  
---- 1:14 -- "through his blood" omitted  
Hebrews  
---- 1:3 -- "by himself" omitted  
---- 2:7 -- "and didst set him over the works of thy hands" omitted  
---- 3:1 -- "Christ" omitted  
---- 3:6 -- "firm unto the end" omitted  
---- 7:21 -- "after the order of Melchisedec" omitted  
---- 8:12 -- "and their iniquities" omitted  
---- 10:9 -- "O God" omitted  
---- 10:30 -- "saith the Lord" omitted  
---- 10:34 -- "in heaven" omitted  
James  
---- 5:16 -- "faults" changed to "sins"  
1 Peter  
---- 1:22 -- "through the Spirit" omitted  
---- 4:1 -- "for us" omitted  
---- 4:3 -- "of our life" omitted  
---- 4:14 -- "on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified" omitted  
2 Peter  
---- 2:17 -- "for ever" omitted  
---- 3:10 -- "in the night" omitted  
Jude  
---- 1:4 -- "Lord God" changed to "Master and Lord"  
---- 1:25 -- "wise" omitted

### 3. THERE ARE NUMEROUS PLACES WHERE THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY IS WEAKENED IN THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE BECAUSE IT IS BASED UPON THE CORRUPT EGYPTIAN TEXT.

The following are examples:

Matthew 8:2; 9:18; 15:25; 20:20; Mark 5:6 -- In these verses "worship" is changed to "kneel before" in the New International Version, the Holman Christian Standard Version (CSV) and other modern versions. It is not done on the basis of the Greek text but is a decision that was made by the translators. Eleven times in the Greek Received Text and the King James Bible the Gospels tell us that Christ was worshipped (Mt. 2:11; 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 20:20; 28:9,17; Mk. 5:6; Lk. 24:52; Jn. 9:38). It is the same Greek word in every passage -- proskuneo. This is indisputable evidence that Jesus Christ is Almighty God, because only God can be worshipped (Ex. 34:14; Is. 42:8; Mt. 4:10; Acts 14:11-15; Rev. 19:10). The NIV, CSV, and other modern versions remove almost one-half of this unique witness to Christ's deity, changing "worship" to "kneel before" in Mt. 8:2; 9:18; 15:25; 20:20; Mk. 5:6. Why did the translators make this decision? I don't know, but I don't agree with it and it weakens the doctrine of Christ's deity.

Mark 9:24 -- The father's testimony that Jesus is "Lord" is omitted.

Mark 16:9-20 -- This glorious passage is bracketed, signifying that it is not considered apostolic Scripture. This ends the Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Mark with no resurrection and ascension and with the disciples fearful and confused.

Luke 23:42 -- The thief's wonderful testimony that Jesus is "Lord" is omitted.

John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18 -- "only begotten Son" changed to "one and only"

John 1:27 -- "is preferred before me" is omitted, thus removing this witness to Christ's deity.

John 3:13 -- "which is in heaven" is omitted, thus removing this powerful witness to Christ's omnipresence.

John 6:69 -- "thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God" is changed to "you are the Holy One of God," thus destroying this powerful witness that Jesus is the very Christ, the Son of God, a doctrine that was under fierce assault in the early centuries.

John 8:59 -- "but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by" is replaced with "But Jesus was hidden and went out of the temple complex," thus destroying the miracle of this scene. Whereas the Received Text and the King James Bible teaches here that Jesus supernaturally went out right through the midst of the angry crowd that was trying to kill Him, the modern versions have Jesus merely hiding Himself.

Acts 8:37 -- The eunuch's glorious testimony that Jesus Christ is the Son of God is bracketed, signifying that it is not apostolic Scripture.

Romans 14:10 -- "Christ" changed to "God"; the "judgment seat of Christ" identifies Jesus Christ directly with Jehovah God (Isaiah 45:23), whereas the "judgment seat of God" does not.

1 Cor. 15:47 -- "the Lord" is omitted

Eph. 3:9 -- "by Jesus Christ" is omitted

1 Tim. 3:16 -- "God" is omitted, thus removing one of the clearest references to Jesus Christ as God in the New Testament

1 John 5:7 -- The glorious Trinitarian confession is omitted, even though it has more manuscript and versional evidence than most of the Alexandrian readings preferred by modern textual critics.

Revelation 1:8, 11 -- In the CSV verse 8 omits "the beginning and the ending" and verse 11 omits "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." As it stands in the Greek Received Text and in the KJV and other faithful TR translations, the "Almighty" of verse 8 is clearly the Lord Jesus Christ of verse 11, but this connection is destroyed by the omissions in the CSV, following the critical Greek text.

#### 4. NOT ONLY DO THE MODERN VERSIONS SUCH AS THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE WEAKEN IMPORTANT DOCTRINES, THEY ALSO CONTAIN GROSS ERROR, THUS UNDERMINING THE BIBLE'S AUTHORITY.

Psalm 12:6 says, "The words of the Lord are PURE words," but the new versions are not pure. Consider the following examples of the errors in modern versions:

Matthew 1:25

KJV: "And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS."

CSB: "but did not know her intimately until she gave birth to a son."

By changing "firstborn son" to "a son," following Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, the modern versions make allowance for Rome's heresy that Mary is a "perpetual virgin."

Matthew 5:22

KJV: "But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire."

CSB: "But I tell you, everyone who is angry with his brother will be subject to judgment. And whoever says to his brother, 'Fool!' will be subject to the Sanhedrin. But whoever says, 'You moron!' will be subject to hellfire."

The omission of "without a cause" creates a serious error, because the Lord Jesus Himself was angry at times. Mark 3:5 says, "And when he had looked round about on them WITH ANGER..." To be angry is not necessarily a sin, but to be angry "without a cause" is. The modern version omission in this verse makes Jesus Christ subject to judgment.

Matthew 27:34

KJV: "They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink."

CSB: "they gave Him wine to drink. But when He tasted it, He would not drink it."

To replace the word "vinegar" with "wine" creates a contradiction with the prophecy in Ps. 69:21, which says Christ was

given vinegar to drink. The Greek word translated "vinegar" in the KJV is "oxos," which appears six times in the New Testament, always in the context of Christ's crucifixion, and always translated vinegar. The Greek word for wine is a different word, "oinos." In this case, the critical Greek text, following some corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts, replaces oinos with oxos.

Mark 1:2-3

KJV: "As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

CSB: "As it is written in Isaiah the prophet..."

The KJV says Mark is quoting the "prophets" plural, but the modern versions say he is quoting "Isaiah the prophet." This creates an error, because it is plain that Mark was not quoting Isaiah only but was quoting Malachi 1:3 as well as Isaiah 40:3.

#### 5. THE DOCTRINE OF FASTING AS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF SPIRITUAL WARFARE COMES UNDER ATTACK IN THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE.

The word fasting is not removed entirely from the modern versions but its significance as an element of spiritual warfare is weakened or removed entirely.

Matthew 17:21 - entire verse bracketed, signifying it is not apostolic Scripture

Mark 9:29 - "and fasting" bracketed, signifying it is not apostolic Scripture

Acts 10:30 - "fasting" omitted

1 Cor. 7:5 - "fasting" omitted

2 Cor. 6:5 - "fasting" changed to "hunger" (even though it is the Greek word "nesteia," which always means fasting and not the Greek word "limos," which means hunger or lack)

2 Cor. 11:27 - "fasting" changed to "hunger" (even though it is the Greek word "nesteia," which means fasting and not the Greek word "limos," which means hunger or lack)

#### CONCLUSION

There is a serious doctrinal issue pertaining to Bible texts and versions, and we must be careful not to accept commonly held myths, first that the differences between the texts and versions are not large nor significant, second that the differences do not affect any doctrine.

While we can thank the Lord that sound doctrine in general can be taught from most Bible texts and versions, this does not mean that one version is as theologically sound as another. We must remember the principal of the sword. The Bible is likened to a sword (Heb. 4:12). This sword is a part of our spiritual weaponry against the devil (Eph. 6:17). To be effective, a sword must be sharp. While any Bible text or translation, even a Roman Catholic one, contains the doctrine of the Christian faith in a general sense, this does not mean that any one text or version is as effective and sharp as another. Who would think highly of a soldier who does not care if his sword is sharp just so long as he has a sword? I am convinced that the Hebrew Masoretic and the Greek Received Text is the very sharpest sword. To say that a text that omits more than 200 verses and significant portions of verses and thousands of words in other places just in the New Testament alone is as effective as one that has all of these words is ridiculous.

This is not a light matter. A battle is raging. There are spiritual enemies in high places. Truth is being cast to the ground. It is difficult enough to win the battle when we have the sharpest sword and the most complete armor. Woe unto that Christian whose sword is dull! And yet, I contend that we have come upon an entire generation of Christians who are slashing away at their spiritual enemies with dull swords, and if a bystander tries to warn them of the folly of this, they rail upon him as divisive and mean-spirited!

**Re: WHAT ABOUT THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE? - posted by dann (), on: 2005/6/22 11:54**

Wow!

I don't have an HCSB yet, but after reading this I plan to get one! To be fair, I was planning to get one before reading this, but this reminded me that I haven't got one yet.

I have read through quite a few translations, the KJV, NKJV (TR) and the NASB, ESV, NET (NA27/UBS4). I prefer more literal translations of the underlying text.

I notice you have a (slight?) bias favoring the Textus Receptus? ;-) Gamaliel had great advice that you might do well to heed. If the critical text (NA27/UBS4) is not from God, it will come to nothing. If however the text is blessed of God, your zeal for the TR (and more importantly against the critical text) may be, for all your good intentions, misplaced. If your bias is the correct one, you will not need to promote or preserve it, God will do that.

Dan  
/\  
\<

**Re:, on: 2005/6/22 13:24**

Quote:  
-----I notice you have a (slight?) bias favoring the Textus Receptus? Gamaliel had great advice that you might do well to heed. If the critical text (NA27/UBS4) is not from God, it will come to nothing. If however the text is blessed of God, your zeal for the TR (and more importantly against the critical text) may be, for all your good intentions, misplaced. If your bias is the correct one, you will not need to promote or preserve it, God will do that.  
-----

Gnosticism, I am sure you will agree, is not of God... and it's still around, and becoming more popular than it was in the early days of Christianity. Therefore your argument holds about as much water as a bucket with no bottom.

I did not post this in order to promote anything... but to warn of yet another deceptive "version" of the Bible.

You got one thing right tho... it all comes down to the underlying greek text. As stated, the HCSB is a better literal interpretation of it's underlying greek text. HOWEVER, it is a corrupted greek text. Therefore, what good is it? Or did you not read the first half of my post?

Anyway Dann... good to hear from you again, brother.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/6/22 13:30**

Krispy K? Is that you?

Good to see you. (Or read you...)

**Re:, on: 2005/6/22 14:01**

yep... this is me. Hope everyone else shares your sentiment.

Krispy

**Re: Praise the Lord - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/22 14:06**

Quote:

-----yep... this is me. Hope everyone else shares your sentiment.

Krispy

Krispy!!! Praise the Lord you are back.

I've been thinking a lot about you lately. I pray you and your family are doing well.

Great to have you back!

RT

**Re:, on: 2005/6/22 14:19**

RT,

We're doing great... gearing up for football season to begin on Aug 1st. Cant wait to get back out there and start yelling at the kids again! "You dropped my ball?? Drop and give me 20!"

Krispy

**Re: - posted by DezCall (), on: 2005/6/22 14:59**

Hey Krispy,

Welcome back, brother. Stand firm in the Lord and please share with us all that you've learned from Him (and still learning!) by being in His presence.

Rise up, o men of God...

In Him,  
Paul

**Re: WHAT ABOUT THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/6/22 16:15**

Quote:

-----  
Why did they not remove the verses entirely, then? They tell us that they left them in with brackets because of their "value for tradition." The verses are not inspired Scripture and yet they are left in the Bible because of tradition? What kind of nonsense is this?  
-----

When verses are put in brackets, that doesn't mean that the scholars don't think they were not inspired. It simply means they don't think they were part of the original manuscripts. Some of these "additions" simply could have been later inspired revisions, a second edition of that writing, for example. Consider the woman caught in adultery story of John 8. Many different ancient manuscripts include this passage (though some don't contain it at all), but where they do contain it varies in actual location. Some manuscripts have it placed in entirely different places.

I'm far from being a textual scholar, but I have read a bit about this matter enough to say I'd encourage you to actually study this matter out before making such inflammatory comments. You cannot simply dismiss a manuscript because it was in a region of the world where heresy was big. Just because there were many heretics doesn't mean all were. Also for that matter, consider the letters of Paul and whose hands they were in. I mean, my gosh, the Corinthians were denying the resurrection, the churches at Ephesus and Colosse were having serious problems with their cosmology that was highly gnostic, and John seemed to face the same problem. Should we discount all these letters on the same basis that some

e stupid people had them in their hands? Hardly.

Also for that matter, the scholars you quote are hardly modern. There has been many many significant discoveries and advances in textual criticism in the last 50 years. If you want something modern, try scholars from the last 20-30 years or so.

If you want some real textual scholars, try F.F. Bruce, Gordon Fee, Bruce Metzger and some others who actually are of great repute. They are extremely conservative and evangelical, and recognized highly by many.

Like I said, I'm no textual scholar, but I humbly submit to you that we both need to study a lot more on this issue. If we've not been able to actually read the different manuscripts in their original languages, and compare them side by side, we really have very little room to come down so hard on people who are far more studied than us in these matters. That is not to say there are not perhaps some poor theories in modern textual criticism, but don't throw the baby out with the bath water.

**Re:, on: 2005/6/22 16:36**

Quote:  
-----When verses are put in brackets, that doesn't mean that the scholars don't think they were not inspired. It simply means they don't think they were part of the original manuscripts.  
-----

That doesn't really even make sense, and I have not read where any reputable scholars OR theologians have ever subscribed to that theory.

Quote:  
-----I'd encourage you to actually go study this matter out before making such inflammatory comments.  
-----

Actually I've been studying this whole topic for several years now... not an expert, but pretty well versed on the topic. Inflammatory? Where has anything in my post been inflammatory? Is it inflammatory because I actually take issue with something that has become so incredibly popular in the church? Easy now... I thought the post was thoughtful and informative. Just because you draw different conclusions doesn't make it inflammatory. Implying I haven't studied this issue... that could be considered inflammatory.

Quote:  
-----If you want some real textual scholars, try F.F. Bruce, Gordon Fee, Bruce Metzger and some others who actually are of great repute. They are extremely conservative and evangelical, and recognized highly by many.  
-----

Really? These guys are all modernists. Bruce Metzger especially. He denies large portions of the Bible. Do you realize he wrote an autobiography and not once ever mentions any kind of a salvation experience? How is that possible? If he is saved... how is that not the cornerstone and turning point of his life... important enough to be mentioned in his autobiography?

Krispy

**Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/6/22 16:50**

Krispy, it is great to have you back!

I agree heartily with you that Gnosticism is -not- of God, is still around, and is becoming more popular - yet I am not aware of any (credible) link between Gnosticism and the NA27/UBS4.

If the NA27/USB4 texts -are- inferior to the Textus Receptus, the arguments you are presenting in no way demonstrate it.

No verse in scripture tells us how God is going to preserve His word. Therefore I believe it wise to make no presumptions regarding which texts are being preserved - the TR or the NA27/USB4.

Perhaps I am alone in this, but I have yet to be edified by someone slinging mud at the bible.

The Textus Receptus is a good rendering of the six manuscripts it represents. The NA27/USB4 is a good rendering of the 5300+ manuscripts (including the six used by Erasmus to create the TR) it represents.

You may want to note, since you included the following in your post:

Quote:  
-----  
1 John 5:7 -- The glorious Trinitarian confession is omitted, even though it has more manuscript and versional evidence than most of the Alexandrian readings preferred by modern textual critics.  
-----

That Erasmus originally followed the majority of MSS in reading "there are three witnesses in heaven, the Spirit and the water and the blood!" However, there was an uproar in some Roman Catholic circles (recall that Erasmus, the original compiler of the TR, was both a 16th century humanist as well as a Catholic Priest). The uproar came about because the original TR did include "there are three witnesses in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit."

Erasmus explained why that was - because he could find no Greek MSS which had that reading! This implicit challenge—viz., that if he found such a reading in any Greek MS, he would put it in his text—did not go unnoticed. In 1520, a scribe at Oxford named Roy manufactured just such a Greek MS (codex 61, now in Dublin). Erasmus' -third- edition included the superfluous verse because now there was a Greek MS ('made to order' in this case) to fill his challenge!

To date, only a handful of Greek MSS have been discovered which have this rendering in 1 John 5:7-8, though --none-- of them is demonstrably earlier than the sixteenth century.

This is a matter of history and not debate.

Really, I guess I wonder why you bother attacking the translation, when in reality you have issue with the underlying texts?

Dan  
/V  
V\

**Re:, on: 2005/6/22 17:12**

Quote:  
-----No verse in scripture tells us how God is going to preserve His word. Therefore I believe it wise to make no presumptions regarding which texts are being preserved - the TR or the NA27/USB4.  
-----

No verse in the Bible explains to me how God created all the zillions of different plants in one day... yet I believe He did.

No verse in the Bible explains to me how God raised Lazarus from the dead... yet I believe He did.

God doesn't need to explain to us why or how... He just does. Who are we to say we need to know how? Are you relying on faith... or your own intellect?

Quote:

-----Perhaps I am alone in this, but I have yet to be edified by someone slinging mud at the bible.  
-----

I'm not slinging mud at anything... merely presenting the facts as I understand them to be. Also, I'm not arguing against the Bible... I'm arguing against a fake bible. The real Bible I don't have an issue with. :-)

Hey... I present what I understand about an issue... if you disagree, fine. You can disagree, and I am not offended. Nor am I always right about everything. Altho, on this topic I am quite confident that I am on solid ground.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/22 17:21**

Quote:

-----If you want some real textual scholars, try F.F. Bruce, Gordon Fee, Bruce Metzger and some others who actually are of great reputation. They are extremely conservative and evangelical, and recognized highly by many.  
-----

Bruce Metzger..."extremely conservative"... :-P ha ha...that's a gas! You should be a comedian. Read this:

(One) "of the editors of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament is Bruce Manning Metzger (1914- ). Metzger is George L. Collord Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Princeton Theological Seminary, and he serves on the board of the American Bible Society. Metzger is the head of the continuing RSV translation committee of the post-state National Council of Churches in the U.S.A. The Revised Standard Version was soundly condemned for its modernism when it first appeared in 1952. Today its chief editor sometimes is invited to speak at Evangelical forums. The RSV hasn't changed, but Evangelicalism certainly has!

Metzger was the chairman for the Reader's Digest Condensed Bible and wrote the introductions to each book in this butchered version of the Scriptures. The Preface claims that "Dr. Metzger was actively involved at every stage of the work, from the initial studies on each of the sixty-six books through all the subsequent editorial reviews. The finished condensation has received his full approval." The Condensed Bible removed 40% of the Bible text, including the warning of Revelation 22:18-19! In the introductions to the books of the Reader's Digest Bible, Metzger questions the authorship, traditional date, and supernatural inspiration of books penned by Moses, Daniel, and Peter, and in many other ways reveals his liberal, unbelieving heart. Consider some examples:

Genesis: "Nearly all modern scholars agree that, like the other books of the Pentateuch, is a composite of several sources, embodying traditions that go back in some cases to Moses."

Exodus: "As with Genesis, several strands of literary tradition, some very ancient, some as late as the sixth century B.C., were combined in the makeup of the books" (Introduction to Exodus).

Deuteronomy: "It's compilation is generally assigned to the seventh century B.C., though it rests upon much older tradition, some of it from Moses' time."

Daniel: "Most scholars hold that the book was compiled during the persecutions (168-165 B.C.) of the Jewish people by Antiochus Epiphanes."

John: "Whether the book was written directly by John, or indirectly (his teachings may have been edited by another), the church has accepted it as an authoritative supplement to the story of Jesus' ministry given by the other evangelists."

1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus: "Judging by differences in style and vocabulary from Paul's other letters, many modern sc

holars think that the Pastorals were not written by Paul."

James: "Tradition ascribes the letter to James, the Lord's brother, writing about A.D. 45, but modern opinion is uncertain, and differs widely on both origin and date."

2 Peter: "Because the author refers to the letters of Paul as 'scripture,' a term apparently not applied to them until long after Paul's death, most modern scholars think that this letter was drawn up in Peter's name sometime between A.D. 100 and 150."

Metzger's modernism was also made plain in the notes to the New Oxford Annotated Bible RSV (1973). Metzger co-edited this volume with Herbert May. It first appeared in 1962 as the Oxford Annotated Bible and was the first Protestant annotated edition of the Bible to be approved by a Roman authority. It was given an imprimatur in 1966 by Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, Massachusetts. Metzger wrote many of the rationalistic notes in this volume and put his editorial stamp of approval on the rest. Consider some excerpts from the notes:

INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT: "The Old Testament may be described as the literary expression of the religious life of ancient Israel. ... The Israelites were more history-conscious than any other people in the ancient world. Probably as early as the time of David and Solomon, out of a matrix of myth, legend, and history, there had appeared the earliest written form of the story of the saving acts of God from Creation to the conquest of the Promised Land, an account which later in modified form became a part of Scripture. But it was to be a long time before the idea of Scripture arose and the Old Testament took its present form. ... The process by which the Jews became 'the people of the Book' was gradual, and the development is shrouded in the mists of history and tradition. ... The date of the final compilation of the Pentateuch or Law, which was the first corpus or larger body of literature that came to be regarded by the Jews as authoritative Scripture, is uncertain, although some have conservatively dated it at the time of the Exile in the sixth century. ... Before the adoption of the Pentateuch as the Law of Moses, there had been compiled and edited in the spirit and diction of the Deuteronomic 'school' the group of books consisting of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, in much their present form. ... Thus the Pentateuch took shape over a long period of time."

NOTES ON GENESIS: " 2.4b-3.24 ... is a different tradition from that in 1.1-2.4a, as evidenced by the flowing style and the different order of events, e.g. man is created before vegetation, animals, and woman. ... 7:16b: The Lord shut him in, a note from the early tradition, which delights in anthropomorphic touches. 7:18-20: The waters covered all the high mountains, thus threatening a confluence of the upper and lower waters (1.6). Archaeological evidence suggests that traditions of a prehistoric flood covering the whole earth are heightened versions of local inundations, e.g. in the Tigris-Euphrates basin."

NOTES ON JOB: "The ancient folktale of a patient Job (1.1-2.13; 42.7-17; Jas. 5.11) circulated orally among oriental sages in the second millennium B.C. and was probably written down in Hebrew at the time of David and Solomon or a century later (about 1000-800 B.C.)."

NOTES ON PSALM 22: "22:12-13: ... the meaning of the third line is obscure."

NOTES ON ISAIAH: "Only chs. 1-39 can be assigned to Isaiah's time; it is generally accepted that chs. 40-66 come from the time of Cyrus of Persia (539 B.C.) and later, as shown by the differences in historical background, literary style, and theological emphases. ... The contents of this section (sometimes called Third Isaiah) suggest a date between 530 and 510 B.C., perhaps contemporary with Haggai and Zechariah (520-518); chapters 60-62 may be later."

NOTES ON JONAH: "The book is didactic narrative which has taken older material from the realm of popular legend and put it to a new, more consequential use."

INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT: "Jesus himself left no literary remains; information regarding his words and works comes from his immediate followers (the apostles) and their disciples. At first this information was circulated orally. As far as we know today, the first attempt to produce a written Gospel was made by John Mark, who according to tradition was a disciple of the Apostle Peter. This Gospel, along with a collection of sayings of Jesus and several other special sources, formed the basis of the Gospels attributed to Matthew and Luke."

NOTES ON 2 PETER: "The tradition that this letter is the work of the apostle Peter was questioned in early times, and internal indications are almost decisive against it. ... Most scholars therefore regard the letter as the work of one who was deeply indebted to Peter and who published it under his master's name early in the second century."

NOTES FROM "HOW TO READ THE BIBLE WITH UNDERSTANDING": "The opening chapters of the Old Testament d

deal with human origins. They are not to be read as history ... These chapters are followed by the stories of the patriarchs, which preserve ancient traditions now known to reflect the conditions of the times of which they tell, though they cannot be treated as strictly historical. ... it is not for history but for religion that they are preserved ... When we come to the books of Samuel and Kings ... Not all in these books is of the same historical value, and especially in the stories of Elijah and Elisha there are legendary elements. ... We should always remember the variety of literary forms found in the Bible, and should read a passage in the light of its own particular literary character. Legend should be read as legend, and poetry as poetry, and not with a dull prosaic and literalistic mind."

This is the same type of rationalistic wickedness that appears in Metzger's notes in the Reader's Digest Condensed Bible. This modernistic foolishness, of course, is a lie. The Pentateuch was written by the hand of God and Moses and completed during the 40 years of wilderness wandering hundreds of years before Samuel and the kings. The Old Testament did not arise gradually from a matrix of myth and history, but is inspired revelation delivered to holy men of old by Almighty God. The Jews were a "people of the book" from the beginning. The Jewish nation did not form the Bible; the Bible formed the Jewish nation! In Metzger's "Introduction to the New Testament" in the New Oxford Annotated Bible, he completely ignores the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and claims that the Gospels are composed of material gathered from oral tradition. The Bible says nothing about this, but Jesus Christ plainly tells us that the Holy Spirit would guide the Apostles into all truth (John 16:7-15). The Gospels are the product of divine revelation, not some happenstance editing of oral tradition.

Bruce Metzger is a Liberal. He piously claims on one hand that the Bible is the inspired Word of God; but out of the other side of the mouth he claims the Bible is filled with myth and lies. He denies the Bible's history, its miracles, and its authorship, while, in true liberal style, declaring that this denial does not do injustice to the Word of God, for the Bible is not "written for history but for religion" and is not to be read "with a dull prosaic and literalistic mind"!

Metzger has been called an Evangelical by some who should know better, but upon the authority of the man's own writings, I declare that Bruce Metzger is an unbeliever. He is a false teacher. He is apostate. He is a heretic. Those are all Bible terms. Having studied many of the man's works, I am convinced those are the terms which must be applied to him. One Baptist writer partially defended Metzger to me with these words—"he did write a superb pamphlet in 1953 refuting the Jehovah's Witnesses and defending the full and absolute deity of Christ." Even the Pope of Rome defends the full and absolute deity of Christ. A man can defend the deity of Christ and still be a false teacher. A man who denies the written Word also denies the Living Word. They stand or fall together. If the Bible contains error, Christ was a liar. If Christ is perfect Truth, so is the Bible.

In *The New Testament, Its Background, Growth, and Content*, which appeared in 1965, Metzger claims that "the discipline of form criticism has enlarged our understanding of the conditions which prevailed during the years when the gospel materials circulated by word of mouth" (p. 86). Not so. Form criticism is that unbelieving discipline which claims that the Gospels were gradually formed out a matrix of tradition and myth. Form critics hold a wide variety of views (reflecting the unsettled and relativistic nature of the rationalism upon which they stand), but all of them deny that the Gospels are the perfect, verbally inspired, divinely-given, absolutely infallible Word of God. Metzger says, "What each evangelist has preserved, therefore, is not a photographic reproduction of the words and deeds of Jesus, but an interpretative portrait delineated in accord with the special needs of the early church" (Ibid.). Metzger is wrong. The Gospel writers have indeed given us, by divine revelation, a photographic reproduction of the words and deeds of Jesus Christ. Praise God for it!"

RT

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/6/22 17:26**

Quote:

-----  
That doesn't really even make sense, and I have not read where any reputable scholars OR theologians have ever subscribed to that theory.  
-----

This was one of the first ideas I learned in Bible school, and it actually makes a ton of sense. If you've not come across this idea after several years of study, I fear you are hardly scratching the surface. What is hard to understand about later revisions and editions by the author being inspired? I suggest you go read. Try the Intro to Pentateuch by Herbert Wolf on for size.

**General Topics :: WHAT ABOUT THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE?**

The OT is especially full of these revisions, especially the Pentateuch and Historical Books, as sometimes cities and locations were updated by later ancient scribes to make the locations more understandable. This comes across even in our English editions! For example, a lot of what you see in the OT that is in parentheses is actually such. For example, 1 Sam 9:9 is a great example of a later inspired scribe making a comment to help clarify something to his reader.

Quote:  
-----  
Really? These guys are all modernists. Bruce Metzger especially. He denies large portions of the Bible. Do you realize he wrote an autobiography and not once ever mentions any kind of a salvation experience? How is that possible? If he is saved... how is that not the cornerstone and turning point of his life... important enough to be mentioned in his autobiography?  
-----

Just because they are modern doesn't mean they aren't conservative and evangelical. Just because they are modern in scholarship doesn't mean they are automatically therefore wrong either.

F.F. Bruce was very much Plymouth Brethren, Fee is very much Pentecostal (Assemblies of God ordained in fact, pastored for a short while as well). I will have to retract on Metzger, as I don't actually know his Christian background. I think I heard he is more mainline, but I cannot be for sure. However, he is conservative, and has written extensively on the reliability of Scripture and even of its preservation. I know he was a guest lecturer once at the Church of God Theological Seminary, which is Pentecostal, and very conservative in scholarship.

Please, go read some more before you come out with an all out assault on a translation... one since it is so new I take you have not even read. Have you read it? Have you not only read it, but studied it? Or, did you simply hear it was based on an ancient text you don't really care for, thus, you decided to attack it and denounce it? Such is what makes your comments inflammatory if so.

**Re: - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/22 17:36**

Quote:  
-----No verse in scripture tells us how God is going to preserve His word.  
-----

How? Maybe not. I'll have to look again. But for sure Ps. 12:6,7 tell us that it will be preserved and kept in every generation. Your critical text doesn't fit this description.

Besides, if you include the 45 Alexandrian MSS that differ with the rest and each other so often, WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO FIND THE PURE WORDS OF GOD??? The answer is, you will have to pick and choose and guess like the rest of the so-called scholars like Metzger. Well you can put up with his doubt, but not me.

Quote:  
-----Perhaps I am alone in this, but I have yet to be edified by someone slinging mud at the bible.  
-----

No, I think you have quite a large company who will join you there. I doubt anyone here wants mud slung at God's word.

**But will we ever find a bunch who will defend it, contend for it, and stand squarely upon it? That is the question**

Quote:  
-----The NA27/USB4 is a good rendering of the 5300+ manuscripts (including the six used by Erasmus to create the TR) it represents.  
-----

This is false. If your beloved NA27/USB4 would have gone with the majority of those 5,300 MSS, you would have a Kin

g James Bible. But since they extracted 45 corrupt ones for their base and made reference to the rest, they ended up with what they have.

It's a shame you would make such a deceptive misrepresentation of the facts.

Quote:

-----Erasmus explained why that was - because he could find no Greek MSS which had that reading!  
-----

It is amazing how you take a few sentences to describe books worth of information and history about something so controversial. If you are a Greek only guy, you can do that. I prefer being an Acts 2 person. Vernacular Bibles are essential for translation. Old Latin is one of them.

BTW, the Greek grammar doesn't fit the omission of the Johannine comma.

Quote:

-----Really, I guess I wonder why you bother attacking the translation, when in reality you have issue with the underlying texts?  
-----

Because the translation ALWAYS represents the underlying texts. Go look up the word "translation" and you won't ask such silly questions.

RT

**Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/6/22 18:03**

Quote:

-----

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Are you relying on faith... or your own intellect?  
-----

I, like all born again believers, do not rely on my faith or my intellect - but instead I rely solely on Jesus Christ, my God, my King, and my Savior. :-)

When I remarked that no verse in scripture teaches how God preserves His word, I wasn't suggesting that we need to know how God preserves his word. I was saying that because we do not know, saying one text is the bible, and the other a fake might be a little presumptuous on our part - no matter how convinced we happened to be.

Dan

/\

\

**Re: - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/22 18:09**

Quote:

-----I was saying that because we do not know, saying one text is the bible, and the other a fake might be a little presumptuous on our part - no matter how convinced we happened to be.  
-----

Well, one thing is for sure. The two text streams are SO different that if we CAN'T know then we have no sure foundation to stand on.

By your own admission there COULD be an innerrant Bible, but you wouldn't know how to find it. And if you did find it, you definitely wouldn't say so with faith and assurance.

You are a Bible agnostic by your own admission. Pity.

RT

**Re: - posted by drifter (), on: 2005/6/22 18:17**

As I remarked in an earlier post, why have hamburger(NIV) when you can have steak(KJV)? I personally don't trust any Bible version that was translated by occultists(Westcott and Hort) and lesbian goddess worshipers(Virginia Mollenkott).

**Re: - posted by drifter (), on: 2005/6/22 18:21**

Also, instead of relying on our own wisdom, why not ask the Lord which version is the best?(Or which version we person ally should use?) He can't have two opinions.

**Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/6/22 18:29**

Thank you for your opinions brother Received Text.

Dan

/\

\

**Re:, on: 2005/6/23 6:45**

Dann... I love ya, my brother.

It's interesting to me that when debates like this happen, people start throwing around the old "Well.... when I was in BIBLE SCHOOL..." line. Thats great if you went to Bible school, and I'm not knocking anyone who has. But I believe the professors at some of these Bible schools have done more harm to the cause of Christ than anything else.

Going to Bible school doesnt impress me, and it doesnt matter if someone is on my side of an argument or not.

Fact is.... the information is out there for anyone with enough gumption to go find it. I dont need some high-brow professor to tell me what to think. I can examine the evidence for myself.

By the way... I have a bachelors degree in engineering... I'm NOT against education.

Anyway... Faith does play into this when it comes to the doctrine of preservation. I believe the TR is the preserved Word of God. I believe the other stream is Satan's counterfeit. Period. I do not read from Bibles from that stream... altho I used to be a staunch supporter of the NIV and the NASB.

I do have a Tyndale NT that I love, and I have a Greens Modern KJV that I sometimes refer to in personal study.

I will not sit under someone who is preaching/teaching from a version of the Alexandrian stream.

These are convictions that the Holy Spirit has brought me to.

Everyone is free to disagree with me. I have no problem with that. I dont really care. I will still call you brother... and our salvation is not based on what version we read.

But thats not to say this issue isnt important.. it is extremely important... and is problem one of the most important issues facing the church today.

Krispy

**Re: Your conviction is not my conviction - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/6/23 7:24**

First off welcome back, you certainly left a mark in the brief time that you with us last time, so having you not around was... well I'll leave you hanging. :-P

Quote:

-----  
Everyone is free to disagree with me.  
-----

I do not get that feeling.

Quote:

-----  
I have no problem with that. I dont really care...  
But thats not to say this issue isnt important.. it is extremely important... and is problem one of the most important issues facing the church today.  
-----

Says who? It seems like it is only Krispsy's conviction. The thing is you are trying to make your conviction an important issue, and quite honestly, for me, it is not. I will not post thirty odd rebutals and refutals trying to convince you of that fact either, even with all the evidence in the world. This, of course is my conviction. ;-)

Hoping that the goal of the thread is being achieved,

**Re:, on: 2005/6/23 8:18**

Hey Zeke...

It is important. Contending for the Word of God is important.

Look at it this way... either the TR is correct, and the other is corrupt, or the other is correct and the TR is corrupt... but they cant both be correct, therefore they both must be corrupt.

If they are both corrupt, then how do we know what God's Word is? If we dont have the true Word of God... then how do we know God?

Therefore, one must be correct, or God did not keep His promise to preserve His Word unto every generation. If God doesnt keep His promises, how can we be assured of salvation?

It's worth contending for. It is important to know what is God's Word, and what isnt.

And this isnt some crusade that I and I alone am on... there are many who realize the importance of this issue in these last days when confusion and deception runs rampant.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/6/23 12:09**

I am so agast at how many translations come out I cannot keep up with them all !!!  
i think I stick with what is trustworthy and right!!! and not worry about the rest

**Re:, on: 2005/6/23 13:20**

Quote:  
-----I am so agast at how many translations come out I cannot keep up with them all !!!i think I stick with what is trustworthy and right!!! and not worry about the rest  
-----

You're right... it is alarming. Each of the over 100 modern English versions available today claims that they make the Bible easier to read and understand. How many versions do we need that are easier to read and understand? It doesnt even make sense. Is the English language changing so rapidly that we need a new version every 6 months?

I'm not against a Bible that is easier to read... but when it comes at the expense of doctrine, or watering down the gospel

... what's the point?

The issue isn't the English language. If you use the same corrupt Greek manuscripts used to translate the NIV to make a Spanish version... you will have a corrupted Spanish Bible.

As far as not worrying about it... it doesn't worry me as far as my walk with Christ is concerned. What worries me is how the church has become so diluted by the influence of these Bibles. The deception is wide and deep. My concern is for others who don't take the time to look into this issue... and just accept what their pastor or the publishing company says.

Why are there so many modern versions? MONEY. Notice the big publicity campaigns the publishing companies do when a new version comes out. HCSB was the latest mass marketing escapade. It's all about MONEY. Interesting to note that there is no copyright on the KJV. You can quote from it all day long in writing or recording. Just ask of Rick Warren what he had to pay the publishing companies when he quoted from over 30 different versions in his Purpose books and materials.

Money Money Money....

Krispy

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/6/23 13:40**

Quote:

-----  
Therefore, one must be correct, or God did not keep His promise to preserve His Word unto every generation. If God doesn't keep His promises, how can we be assured of salvation?  
-----

Both can have errors, and God still have His word preserved. Let us not be ignorant. There was one time when the entirety of Scripture was lost, yet God still had it preserved. We read about this in the Bible of all places:

You can read this account in 2 Kings 22. At one point in history the Scriptures were lost. When Josiah commissioned the temple to be repaired, this chapter records them finding the long-lost Law of God. When it was found, the priest of the Lord, Hilkiah brought it to King Josiah, who instituted a national religious reform. One of the greatest revival's of history occurred with the losing and rediscovery of God's word!!!

SO, if we are going to talk about the preservation of God's word, let's be Biblical about it. God's word could be hidden in a cave for 1500 years or even the rest of this age and His word still be preserved.

You've cited things such as the reformation being based on things such as your preferred ancient text. All fine and good, but had the generally preferred texts scholars believe to be the best today would have suited folks like Luther and Calvin just as well, as that text likewise holds all the same doctrines.

Or consider this: the Church in China. Many Christians in China do not have a copy of the Bible, or if they do, they have only a small portion of it. Yet China is seeing a revival that dwarfs anything ever seen in history since the days of the 12 apostles. Some of them simply have hand copied pages of the Bible at best.

Consider a story the famous Chinese missionary Watchman Nee told once. He mentioned a Chinese Christian who only had one page of the Bible, which constituted of only Mark 16, with the "long ending." He said this Christian was only able to obtain this page, and quite by accident. Yet he read it, believed it, and then went about casting out devils, speaking in new tongues, and performing miracles in the name of Christ... based on just this one page of Scripture.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/6/23 13:42

Quote:

-----  
I will not sit under someone who is preaching/teaching from a version of the Alexandrian stream.

These are convictions that the Holy Spirit has brought me to.

-----  
I bet most the time you could not even recognize if somebody actually was.

It is so sad that you'd blame the Holy Spirit for such a delusion.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/6/23 13:52

Quote:

-----  
It's interesting to me that when debates like this happen, people start throwing around the old "Well.... when I was in BIBLE SCHOOL..." line. That's great if you went to Bible school, and I'm not knocking anyone who has. But I believe the professors at some of these Bible schools have done more harm to the cause of Christ than anything else.

Going to Bible school doesn't impress me, and it doesn't matter if someone is on my side of an argument or not.

Fact is.... the information is out there for anyone with enough gumption to go find it. I don't need some high-brow professor to tell me what to think. I can examine the evidence for myself.

-----  
I only quoted the fact that I learned something in Bible school to show that this is not an unlearned opinion. Much as you quoted stuff from all sorts of "great textual scholars" to show yours is not based on men who have entirely unlearned opinions.

You should not attempt to shrug it off with "I believe the professors at some of these Bible schools have done more harm to the cause of Christ than anything else," especially when your stance is based on "scholars and theologians" who work at these same institutes.

My school I went to was a satellite school, so I only had a small handful of professors who I had class after class with, men with whom I have labored in the gospel and gotten to know intimately over the last 2 years. We have prayed together and cried together and ate together, and have had great fellowship. These men have been men who greatly feared God, and strove to walk in integrity in all their profession. They have done more for the cause of Christ to promote the gospel than you ever will. You should not attempt to blow something of with such a vague generality in order to defend your position, especially with an attack on their character, men you have never met. These were far from "high-brow" professors. Why is it that you quote from Bible scholars one minute then trash them the next?

Informed opinions is what makes one scholarly.

Re: - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/23 17:58

Quote:

-----  
-----These men have been men who greatly feared God, and strove to walk in integrity in all their profession. They have done more for the cause of Christ to promote the gospel than you ever will.

-----  
I know this wasn't directed at me, but, KingJimmy, this is WWAAAYY over the line!! Not only is this below the belt, but it is something you could never know. Not to mention it is not yours to judge such a thing as this.

Who are you to say who will end up doing more or less in the Kingdom of God???

If you do not immediately repent of this, it will greatly lessen my respect for you, sir. Not that it matters what I think. But just want to let you know how ugly this looks.

RT

**as the Dutch said, "there ya go again", on: 2005/6/23 18:10**

Quote:  
-----I believe the other stream is Satan's counterfeit.  
-----

when I see 'opinions' like that just bandied about, not only does it grieve me, but I do believe that it grieves the Holy Spirit most intensely.

we become the laughing stock of devils by this continued inane argument, and the inevitable divisive ungodly arguments that emit from the bowels of our flesh.

inane.

without profit,

and surely not edifying.

please stop, for Jesus' sake,

your NOT contending for the Word, you're not even contending for the Faith, you're only contending for your opinion.

**Re: as the Dutch said, "there ya go again" - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/23 18:20**

Quote:  
-----your NOT contending for the Word, you're not even contending for the Faith, you're only contending for your opinion.  
-----

Hey Neil,

If they don't contend for this, how can they know what the word of God is?

I want to give you a suggestion as a friend. If this subject bothers you so much, why not just post about other things and refrain from this discussion.

These men want to find the truth. Many are confused about omissions in the vernacular Biblical text that SHOULD not exist.

Instead of asking them to stop their discussion and quest for truth, why not abstain from comment and let the Lord work it his out.

I fear you don't know these men's hearts as well as you may think.

Be blessed, my friend,

RT

re:, on: 2005/6/23 18:28

to call, for instance, the NIV Bible I hold in my hand, "satan's counterfeit" is just wrong, it stinks of fleshly pride and like I have said before, hews perilously close to committing the unpardonable sin.

I've said what I've been led to say, receive it or not.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/6/23 22:50

Quote:

Who are you to say who will end up doing more or less in the Kingdom of God???

Indeed, I thought of this after the fact on my way home this evening. It is indeed possible he might, and I pray to God he can.

Just to boast of what God has accomplished through one of the pros, he started an inner city ministry in North Carolina called providence house, it is geared towards teenagers. It is a sort of "parachurch" ministry, and is currently reaching hundreds of urban teens with the gospel, bringing up some pretty radical disciples for Christ.

I pray Krispy can do such with whatever ministry God has or will give him. That's a pretty tall order.

Re:, on: 2005/6/24 5:45

Quote:

I pray Krispy can do such with whatever ministry God has or will give him. That's a pretty tall order.

KingJimmy....

I praise God for anyone who does anything to reach even one soul. One thing I won't do is compare what God has called ME to do in this life with what He has called someone else to do. The disciples got into an argument once about who was the greatest among them... one of their mothers even got involved.

All I can do is be in His will every single day. I might reach 2 people in this lifetime, I might reach 2 million... but as long as I've fulfilled His will for my life... then that's all that matters.

And that's all that matters for you as well.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/6/24 6:03

Quote:

to call, for instance, the NIV Bible I hold in my hand, "satan's counterfeit" is just wrong

Sorry you feel that way, Neil. It's nice to see you're still in touch with your emotions. :-)

That is my conviction, and I'll stand by it. You and I have gone around this apple tree a number of times, and as of yet you have offered no evidence that you have ever even studied this issue... so I ask you, as RT did... why can't you resist jumping into this discussion?

As for being "satan's counterfeit", let me ask you this... according to scripture, who is it that goes by the name "Morning Star"?

Quote:  
-----it's divisive  
-----

This is lame... sorry. People who can not debate an issue, or want to shut people up throw out the "this is divisive, therefore you're wrong" statement. It's a lot like Benny Hinn saying "touch not the Lord's anointed". You consider it divisive because you don't agree with it. I don't consider standing for the Received Text to be divisive at all. In fact, there was a whole lot of unity about what was the true Word of God up until 1881. When the RSV came out (the first modern version based on the Alexandrian Text, and not the RT) that's when all the divisiveness started.

Study history, Neil.

Quote:  
-----it stinks of fleshly pride  
-----

So now you're judging my motives? C'mon Neil... how can you possibly do that?

Quote:  
-----like I have said before, hews perilously close to committing the unpardonable sin.  
-----

Actually what you said several months ago was that I DID commit the unpardonable sin by calling into question the validity of the NIV.

Quote:  
-----I've said what I've been led to say, receive it or not.  
-----

Hmmm... so phrasing it that way (saying you were led) we're not to question what you're saying? That's a bit manipulative, don't you think?

Neil... I love you brother. I wish you could reign in your emotions just a tad and discuss the facts and issues instead of making grand statements and proclamations about who's sinning and who's committing unpardonable sins.

It's interesting, this is my first real response toward how someone is treating me on this thread. I've responded to others' statements, yet I have not turned this into a personal attack on anyone. I believe I've been very gracious, and have told several on here that I love them. ALL WORDS OF TRUTH.

Yet, I get attacked for taking a stand. I get called divisive, and a slew of other things...

Have y'all not changed around here? I read thru some of the hostile posts on this thread... and I begin to regret showing my face around here again. There are a few on here that will discuss the merits of the issue... but for the most part people are too hostile to really just talk about it.

How sad.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/6/24 6:11

Quote:

-----I bet most the time you could not even recognize if somebody actually was.  
-----

(This is in reference to me saying I wont sit under someone who preaches out of a modern versions.)

To answer KingJimmy... uh, yea I can. I recognize the KJV when I hear it.

Quote:

-----It is so sad that you'd blame the Holy Spirit for such a delusion.  
-----

I blame the Holy Spirit for one thing... leading me into the truth. Not all truth, yet, but I'm making progress. :-)

Krispy