

You can now listen to our teaching video on You tube about this topic - Thy Footnotes Have I Hid in Mine Heart

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9DkpLUFtJQo>

Every Man for Himself Bible Versions - the HCSB, NET, ESV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV

"In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes."
Judges 21:25

For those who have ears to hear and can see through the Double-Speak, inconsistency and logical fallacies of modern version scholars, the 2001 Holman Christian Standard Bible provides us with several quotes that exemplify the typical, pious sounding BALONEY promoted by those who do not believe IN FACT that any Bible is now the complete, inerrant and 100% true words of God. In the Introduction to the HCSB, the translators describe themselves as "a team of 100 scholars, editors, stylists, and proofreaders, ALL OF WHOM WERE COMMITTED TO BIBLICAL INERRANCY". They tell us: "The Bible IS God's inspired Word, inerrant IN THE ORIGINALS." They then tell us their goal is "to affirm the authority of Scripture as God's Word and to champion ITS ABSOLUTE TRUTH against social or cultural agendas that would compromise its accuracy", and that the HCSB "will be a standard in Bible translations FOR YEARS TO COME."

Then they tell us: "Each generation NEEDS a fresh translation of the Bible in its own language" and that "each new generation must be introduced to God's Word in its own language...Translations made as recently as 10 or 20 years ago do not reflect many of these advances in biblical research."

They inform us that their textual base for the New Testament is the Nestle-Aland 27th edition, and the United Bible Societies' 4th corrected edition, but then they say: "At times, however, the translators have followed an alternative manuscript tradition, DISAGREEING with the editors of these texts ABOUT THE ORIGINAL READING."

They go on to tell us: "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." They say they include them for "their undeniable antiquity" and their "value for tradition".

These "few places in the N.T." include at least 39 entire verses that, by their own admission, "were not part of the original text"!!! Among these are Matthew 17:21; 18:11; 21:44; 23:14; Mark 7:16; 15:28; 16:9-20; Luke 17:36; 22:43-44; 23:17; John 5:3-4; 7:53-8:11; Acts 8:37; 24:6-7, 28:29, and Romans 16:24. Would you characterize 39 entire verses in the New Testament as "a few places"?

First of all, it should be obvious that if only the originals were inspired and inerrant, and they no longer exist, and have never been seen by any of the HCSB translators, then how can they logically say The Bible IS inspired? Don't they really mean "Once upon a time, and far, far away,

the Bible WAS inspired"?

Secondly, if they are so committed to inerrancy and are "champions for absolute truth against any compromise with inaccuracy", then why do they include in their new version at least 39 entire verses that they don't think were "part of the original text"? These Scriptures are either inspired of God and belong in the Holy Bible, or they are spurious additions that have no place in any bible version at all.

Thirdly, they reveal their "Every man for himself" X Files Bible mentality (the truth is out there somewhere) by telling us that they themselves disagree about the original reading with the scholars who put together the ever-changing UBS, Nestle-Aland critical texts. Those UBS scholars think certain readings are original, but the HSCB guys think that others are. And you can bet the next bible version to come down the pike will promote yet different readings as original; in fact, it is already happening in the TNIV and ISV.

Fourthly, if the Holman Christian Standard Bible is "a standard for YEARS TO COME", then why do they also claim that EACH GENERATION NEEDS a new translation, or even one every 10 or 20 years "to reflect biblical research"? The shelf life of the modern bible versions isn't very long, is it? If the "scholars committed to inerrancy" finally produced an inerrant Bible, then they wouldn't need to keep churning out one new version after another, and they would be out of a job, wouldn't they?

For further documented information about the Holman Standard, please see my article here:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/holmancsb.htm>

This same mentality of "every man for himself Bible Versions" is seen in Daniel Wallace's NET bible, the 2001 ESV (English Standard Version), the TNIV (Today's NIV) and in the New KJV as well.

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

The hypocrisy of the modern versions is shown by how they deal with these two verses. They are found in the Majority of all texts including D, the Old Latin copies, Syriac Peshitta, Curetonian, Harkelian, Palestinian, Armenian and Ethiopic ancient versions. Vaticanus omits all these words. Sinaiticus original contained all these words; then a scribe omitted them, and then another scribe put them back in again!

Even though Vaticanus omits all these words, and the modern versions like the NASB, NIV, ESV omit thousands of words from the New Testament primarily because of the Vaticanus readings, yet the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV, ISV and Holman (in brackets) include these two verses in their versions.

Daniel Wallace's NET version also includes them, but in brackets, like the Holman Standard. He then reveals the mindset of many scholars today in his footnote. Mr. Wallace tells us:

"Arguments can be given on both sides about whether scribes would tend to include or omit such

comments about Jesus' humanity and an angel's help. But even if the verses are NOT LITERALLY AUTHENTIC, they are PROBABLY HISTORICALLY AUTHENTIC... Nevertheless, because of the SERIOUS DOUBTS as to these verses' authenticity, they have been put in brackets."

So, in other words, even though God may not have inspired them, and they were later added by mere human hands, it may be OK to keep them in our bibles, but we should continue to call them into question!!!

The 2001 ESV

This revision of the revision of the Revised Standard Version refers in its Preface some 12 times to "the original text" as though it were something they actually had before them when making their new translation. They go on to tell us of "the currently renewed respect among Old Testament scholars for the Masoretic text". You see, the ESV has not rejected the Hebrew Scriptures QUITE AS MUCH as the older RSV and NRSV, BUT they still reject it dozens upon dozens of times, and not always in the same places as do the NASB and NIV.

The ESV translators further tell us: "In exceptional, difficult cases (not true at all) the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Syriac Peshitta, the Latin Vulgate, and other sources were consulted...to support a divergence from the Masoretic text. Similarly, in a few difficult cases (again, not true at all) in the New Testament, the ESV has followed A GREEK TEXT DIFFERENT FROM the text given by preference in the UBS/Nestle-Aland 27th edition."

Actually, the ESV omits even more whole verses than the 17 the NIV omits, while the NASB omits fewer than the NIV, and none of these modern versions always follows the same Greek texts as the others all the way through any single book in the New Testament. Then the ESV editors conclude by telling us: "We know that NO Bible translation is perfect or final."

For further documented information on the ESV, please see my article here: <http://brandplucked.webs.com/theesv.htm>

The ESV, just as all the modern versions like the NKJV, NASB, RSV, and the NIV keep on changing their English text, and sometimes even the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts, from one edition to the next, and they do not let the reader know what changes they have made from one to the other. These "Now you see it, and now you don't" fake bibles keep on changing all the time, and they have no settled text.

Here are a few clear examples of the textual changes made in the ESV 2007 edition from what it read in the ESV 2001 edition. You can see a more complete list at this site here. They have changed over 350 verses that were found in the 2001 ESV edition.

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/esv2007.html>

For clear and numerous examples of how the NASB continues to change its Hebrew, Greek, and English texts from one edition to the next, please see my article The Ever-Changing 'literal' NASB here:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/everchangingnasbs.htm>

The TNIV - an NIV revision and the NIV itself revised again in 2010

The 2005 Today's NIV has now come on the scene and it differs both in texts and translation from the "old" NIV in many places. The TNIV editors tell us: "Today's New International Version (TNIV) is a revision of the NIV... There is a sense in which the work of translating the Bible is never finished... The chief goal of this review has always been to bring the text of the NIV ABREAST OF CONTEMPORARY BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP." So, I guess the old NIV is no longer "abreast of contemporary scholarship", right?

The TNIV editors further inform us: "Already in 1978 and again in 1984 various CORRECTIONS AND REVISIONS TO THE NIV TEXT WERE MADE. And now in 2010 the NIV has once again been revised and they have changed about 10% of the verses from the way they read in the old NIV of 1984. In the TNIV the Committee offers to the reading public THE LATEST FRUITS of its review." Then the TNIV guys go through the now familiar spiel about "occasionally following the Dead Sea Scrolls, scribal traditions (whatever that means), emending (changing) the Hebrew text where it appears to have been corrupted" yada, yada, yada.

The TNIV does not always follow even the same Greek or Hebrew texts used in the old NIV, but as they tell us: "The translators HAVE MADE THEIR CHOICES AMONG THE VARIANT READINGS." Some of their choices differ not only from the UBS/Nestle-Aland critical texts, but also from the previous NIVs in both the Old and New Testaments.

Here is just one example of many that can be given of the ever changing nature of this so called "science of textual criticism" .

Mark 1:41 "Jesus moved with compassion" or "Jesus was indignant"?

In Mark 1:40 - 41 we read: "And there came a leper to him, beseeching him, and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And Jesus, MOVED WITH COMPASSION, put forth his hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean."

"moved with compassion" is the reading found in the Majority of all Greek texts including Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, C, the Greek Lectionaries, the Old Latin Italic a, c, e, f, l and q, the Vulgate, the Syriac Peshitta, Sinaitic, Harkelian, the Coptic Sahidic, Boharic, the Armenian, Ethiopian, Georgian and Slavonic ancient versions. It is even the reading found in the UBS IV critical Greek text.

"moved with compassion" is the reading found in Wycliffe 1390, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale

1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1587, the Revised Version 1885, the ASV 1901, Douay, Darby, Young's, Lamsa's translation of the Syriac, the RSV, NRSV, 1989, ESV 2001, NASB 1963 - 1995, Holman Standard 2003 and the ISV to name but a few.

The NIV 1973, 1978 and 1984 all read: “ **Filled with compassion**, Jesus reached out his hand and touched the man. “I am willing,” he said. “Be clean!”

And even the Spanish version of the NIV reads the same. **Marcos 1:41 (Nueva Versión Internacional)** “Movido a compasión, Jesús extendió la mano y tocó al hombre, diciéndole: — Sí quiero. ¡Queda limpio! “

Well, the 2010 NIV finally did it! Here it is -

Mark 1:41 (New International Version, 2011) "**Jesus was indignant.**[a] He reached out his hand and touched the man. “I am willing,” he said. “Be clean!” Footnotes: Mark 1:41 Many manuscripts Jesus was filled with compassion.

Well, this totally bogus reading comes basically from one very corrupt manuscript called manuscript D, which scholars have known about for centuries and rejected. But now the “late\$st, greate\$st and be\$st \$cholarly re\$earch” has once again changed their minds and so we have this absurd reading in the latest NIV 2011.

Daniel “Anything but the KJB” Wallace’s NET version still reads “moved with compassion” but he reveals the “No reading is sure” and “every man for himself” mentality in his footnote on this verse when he says: The reading found in almost the entire NT ms tradition is *σπλαγγισθείς* (*splancnisqei*”, “moved with compassion”). Codex Bezae (D), and a few Latin mss (a ff2 r1*) here read *ὀργισθείς* (*ojrgisqei*”, “moved with anger”). It is more difficult to account for a change from “moved with compassion” to “moved with anger” than it is for a copyist to soften “moved with anger” to “moved with compassion,” making the decision quite difficult. B. M. Metzger (*TCGNT* 65) suggests that “moved with anger” could have been prompted by 1:43, “Jesus sent the man away with a very strong warning.” It also could have been prompted by the man’s seeming doubt about Jesus’ desire to heal him (v. 40). As well, it is difficult to explain why scribes would be prone to soften the text here but not in Mark 3:5 or 10:14 (where Jesus is also said to be angry or indignant). Thus, in light of diverse mss supporting “moved with compassion,” and at least a plausible explanation for *ὀργισθείς* as arising from the other reading, it is perhaps best to adopt *σπλαγγισθείς* as the original reading. Nevertheless, a decision in this case is not easy. For the best arguments for *ὀργισθείς*, however, see M. A.

Proctor, "The 'Western' Text of Mark 1:41: A Case for the Angry Jesus" (Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 1999)."

So the modern day "scholarship mindset" seems to be that if, in spite of tons of manuscript evidence to the contrary, and the examples of Jesus being angry are in an entirely different context, if a reading is unaccountably ridiculous, it just might be the correct reading." Things just keep getting better and better, right? ;-)

The New KJV "Every man for himself" mentality

Notice these words from the NEW KJV 1982 on page 1235: "It was the editors' conviction that the use of footnotes would encourage further inquiry by readers. **THEY ALSO RECOGNIZED THAT IT WAS EASIER FOR THE AVERAGE READER TO DELETE SOMETHING HE OR SHE FELT WAS NOT PROPERLY A PART OF THE TEXT**, than to insert a word or phrase which had been left out by the revisers."

These footnotes in the NKJV generally have to do with the 3000 - 5000 words that have been omitted from the New Testament in such versions as the NIV, NASB, ESV. The NKJV editors are of the opinion that **THE AVERAGE READER** can **DELETE** something he **FEELS** is not part of the text.

In contrast to the divergent, ever-changing, "Let's include verses even we don't think are authentic", every man for himself mindset of ALL modern versionists, the King James Bible believer actually believes God has providentially kept His promises to preserve His inerrant, complete and 100% true words in the **BOOK OF THE LORD**.

"Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein." Jeremiah 6:16

Will Kinney

Notes from a Christian forum where we were discussing the Bible version issue;

Donald writes: "I guess I am pretty insistent on **DOCTRINE**, because doctrine is what the modern day church has neglected. It seems to me that the average Christian these days is more into "feelings," and "experiences," than into doctrinal understanding based on propositional language."

Brother, I agree. Absolute Truth is what characterizes the true God. He cannot lie. Satan, on the other hand, is a liar and the father of it. He mixes lies and truth together and he raises doubt, sows unbelief and takes away the word of God sown in the heart. These are his characteristics.

The very first question recorded in the whole Bible is "Yea, hath God said...?"

Because of the multitude of conflicting bible versions on the market today most Christians are now asking themselves this same question - "Has God said....?"

The Bible itself tells us that there will be a falling away from the faith in the last days before the return of Christ, and it is happening now.

God Himself will send a famine of hearing the words of God. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the LORD. And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the LORD, and shall not find it." Amos 8:11-12.

With the multitude of conflicting bible versions more and more Christians do not believe in the infallibility of any real and tangible Bible in any language, and they read their inferior versions less and less and believe them less and less.

No one is going to stop this downward tailspin into full blown apostasy. God has appointed it. However He will always have a believing remnant. This is not to say that people who use and ignorantly embrace the modern versions are lost or not redeemed by the blood of the Lamb. But their faith in God's pure and 100% true words will be weakened and their spiritual sword of the Spirit will be replaced with something akin to a butter knife.

It is the lies found in all modern versions that prove them to be false witnesses to the Truth of God.

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nodoctrinechanged.htm>

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matthew 11:15

All of grace,

Will Kinney

More notes from the internet forums:

Hi "Rev" Jim. You post: "Over and over come the posts with one perspective: We KNOW the KJV is perfect, therefore everything different is wrong, and if you don't agree with us, you are wrong."

Stop.

Jim Harris

Hi Jim. Somehow I sense you are getting frustrated with your stated position of "only in the originals" and it is slowly dawning on you that you really do not have a complete, inspired and infallible bible to give to anyone. You cannot logically defend your position and so the frustration turns into anger.

I believe this is your statement of faith from your church website, right?

The Holy Scriptures

We teach that the Bible is God's written revelation to man, and thus the 66 books of the Bible given to us by the Holy Spirit constitute the plenary (inspired equally in all parts) Word of God (1Corinthians 2:7-14; 2 Peter 1:20-21).

We teach that the Word of God is an objective, propositional revelation (1 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Corinthians 2:13), verbally inspired in every word (2 Timothy 3:16), absolutely INERRANT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS, INFALLIBLE, and God breathed."

Again, you have nothing more than empty air as the foundation of your "holy Scriptures". Why do you mix up present tense verbs like "IS", "constitute" and "IS" again, as though the Scriptures are something that EXIST now, and then take it all away in one fell swoop with four betraying words - "in the original documents"?

Again, isn't this placing your faith in something that you know does not exist? If you were to be honest with yourself and others about your present belief system, you would have to adjust your confession of faith in the inerrancy of Scripture to read more like this:

The Holy Scriptures: "IF the originals HAD BEEN (but they never were) preserved and gathered into a single book making up the 66 book canon, then THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN the inerrant words of God. We therefore affirm that this hypothetical Bible would have been the inspired and inerrant words of God if the originals hadn't been lost to the ravages of time and in the shuffle of bungling scribes, and you COULD HAVE believed in every word IF it had ever existed, Amen."

Now, THAT would be more in keeping with what most present day Christians REALLY believe about "the bible", isn't it.

What happened to the sovereignty of God in this whole process? Did He or did He not promise to preserve His words in "the book of the LORD"? Did God lie to us? Was He using hyperbole or exaggerating?

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." The stated pratfall position of "only in the originals" makes God a liar and man an unbeliever, or at least an agnostic regarding his belief in "the Scriptures (that) cannot be broken." John 10:35

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matthew 11:15

Hi "Rev" Jim. You post: "Over and over come the posts with one perspective: We KNOW the KJV is perfect, therefore everything different is wrong, and if you don't agree with us, you are wrong. Stop.

Jim Harris

Hi Jim. Somehow I sense you are getting frustrated with your stated position of "only in the originals" and it is slowing dawning on you that you really do not have a complete, inspired and infallible bible to give to anyone. You cannot logically defend your position and so the frustration turns into anger.

I believe this is your statement of faith from your church website, right?

"The Holy Scriptures We teach that the Bible is God's written revelation to man, and thus the 66 books of the Bible given to us by the Holy Spirit constitute the plenary (inspired equally in all parts) Word of God (1Corinthians 2:7-14; 2 Peter 1:20-21).

We teach that the Word of God is an objective, propositional revelation (1 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Corinthians 2:13), verbally inspired in every word (2 Timothy 3:16), absolutely INERRANT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS, INFALLIBLE, and God breathed."

Again, you have nothing more than empty air as the foundation of your "holy Scriptures". Why do you mix up present tense verbs like "IS", "constitute" and "IS" again, as though the Scriptures are something that EXIST now, and then take it all away in one fell swoop with four betraying words - "in the original documents"?

Again, isn't this placing your faith in something that you know does not exist? If you were to be honest with yourself and others about your present belief system, you would have to adjust your

confession of faith in the inerrancy of Scripture to read more like this:

The Holy Scriptures: "IF the originals HAD BEEN (but they never were) preserved and gathered into a single book making up the 66 book canon, then THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN the inerrant words of God. We therefore affirm that this hypothetical Bible would have been the inspired and inerrant words of God if the originals hadn't been lost to the ravages of time and in the shuffle of bungling scribes, and you COULD HAVE believed in every word IF it had ever existed, Amen."

Now, THAT would be more in keeping with what most present day Christians REALLY believe about "the bible", isn't it.

What happened to the sovereignty of God in this whole process? Did He or did He not promise to preserve His words in "the book of the LORD"? Did God lie to us? Was He using hyperbole or exaggerating?

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." The stated pratfall position of "only in the originals" makes God a liar and man an unbeliever, or at least an agnostic regarding his belief in "the Scriptures (that) cannot be broken." John 10:35

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matthew 11:15

Will Kinney

Return to Articles - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>