

Comments



[Chris Centola](#) Well, I can tell you for #55, just read the passages in question. There is nothing stating that Benjamin was a little child that couldn't leave his fathers side. Rather, that if he were to leave, it would kill his father. [#datcontext](#)

[March 19, 2015 at 1:46pm](#) · [Unlike](#) · [15](#)



[Luther Stapleton](#) 10 She went and told those who had been with him, as they mourned and wept.
11 But when they heard that he was alive and had been seen by her, they would not believe it.
Mark 16:10-11

No time frame is given and no contradiction.

[March 19, 2015 at 1:53pm](#) · [Like](#) · [10](#)



[Josh Hoffman](#) The left one is really funny, because both texts say they ran away in fear, and mark 16:8 does not imply they remained silent, merely that they did not immediately say anything. (and if the rest of Mark is actually original, then it proceeds to give account of Mary Magdalene telling the disciples, so there's that). Yay context!

[March 19, 2015 at 1:54pm](#) · [Like](#) · [6](#)



[John L. Sherk](#) For the second frame, whoever made that has no idea how to read poetry or figurative language. I recommend he read "How to Read a Book."

[March 19, 2015 at 2:03pm](#) · [Like](#) · [5](#)



[Josh Jeremiah](#) Neither of these are arguments for atheism...

[March 19, 2015 at 2:06pm](#) · [Like](#) · [3](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) The rest of Mark is original. Dean Burgon and Herman C. Hoskier proved this over 100 yrs ago. And the Reformers reject the reading from the 15th century manuscript Vaticanus as a corruption. I'll trust them over practical atheists and outright atheists.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:13pm](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#)



[Josh Jeremiah](#) I haven't read Burgon or Hoskier, but the fact that they wrote over 100 years ago is a strike against them when it comes to textual criticism.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:17pm](#) · [Like](#) · [2](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) Only if you by into the impiety of the modern school which no longer believes the text can be recovered and rejects scripture as authoritative. Though to be consistent you should also reject the writings of the Reformers on theology.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:19pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Josh Jeremiah](#) I think your argument is backward. I believe we have a better idea what the original text said now than 100 years ago.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:21pm](#) · [Like](#) · [3](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) Then you'd be wrong. Read the modern New Testament textual critics. They believe the text was irretrievably corrupted in the 2nd century and that the furthest we can go back using the rationalistic means of tc is some variation of a 4th century text.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:40pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Josh Jeremiah](#) I'm not talking about the liberal textual critics. There are many textual critics today who believe we have texts way older than 4th century. And almost all living textual critics, regardless of their view on the Bible, believe the second half of Mark 16 is not original.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:47pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) It's not a matter of how old they believe a text to be. If you reread, you'll see I didn't state that. They believe the original text is irretrievably lost. Full stop. It is immaterial what all living textual critics believe concerning the last 12 verses of Mark. That is a logical fallacy. Since all textual critics today approach the text of Scripture assuming it to be just like any other book of the ancient world, all textual critics today start out with the wrong presupposition. Rationalism has no place in a Christian's thought life. The Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, not the Rationalists who reject the authority of Scripture as their ultimate presupposition.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:56pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Daniel A. Stippinger](#) The reformers rejected Vaticanus? Wasnt it discovered way after their lifetime?

[March 19, 2015 at 2:57pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) No. It was "discovered" in the 15th century. You're thinking of Sinaiticus.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:58pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Josh Jeremiah](#) It is simply false to say all textual critics today believe the original text was irretrievably lost.

[March 19, 2015 at 2:59pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) I didn't say "all", I said they. Referencing the previous post of mine. The modern textual critics out there do believe the original was irretrievably lost. Those who hold to the late 19th century early 20th century view do not. But those who hold to that view are a miniscule minority and you should reject their view as it is 100 yrs old. If you wish to be consistent concerning Burgon and Hoskier.

[March 19, 2015 at 3:04pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Paul Barth](#) pagans gonna pag

[March 19, 2015 at 3:09pm](#) · [Like](#) · 4



[Josh Jeremiah](#) Let me back up. I'm saying we know more about the original text of the Bible than we did 100 years ago. The evidence we have gained in that 100 years says the second half of Mark 16 is not original. Almost every reformed textual critic alive today agrees with that evidence about Mark 16, and not with Burgon and Hoskier. Why should I trust Burgon and Hoskier about Mark 16 over modern reformed textual critics?

[March 19, 2015 at 3:11pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) [Josh Jeremiah](#), that is simply not the case. Furthermore there are no Reformed textual critics. To make it worse the Reformers rejected your position and the view of these non-existent reformed text critics as spurious and corruptive.

[March 19, 2015 at 3:14pm](#) · [Edited](#) · [Like](#)



[Josh Jeremiah](#) Wow, that's crazy that no one in the entire reformed camp is trying to study the Bible. So is D.A. Carson like a fictional character or something?

[March 19, 2015 at 3:28pm](#) · [Like](#) · 2



[Chris Thomas](#) He's not a textual critic. There are no Reformed textual critics.

[March 19, 2015 at 3:37pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Rob Ename](#) Here's a little document I threw together a few years ago.
<https://docs.google.com/.../OB0.../edit...>

All of the apparent contradictions in the resurrection accounts are reconcilable, as any honest

person (who takes the time to look) would say.

[Event Alignment - Shifted Harmony.doc](#)

docs.google.com

[March 19, 2015 at 5:17pm](#) · [Edited](#) · [Like](#) · [4](#)



[David Seip](#) Chris, are you a King James Onlyist?

[March 19, 2015 at 8:22pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) [David Seip](#), are you an atheist like Dr. Bart Ehrman?

[March 19, 2015 at 8:26pm](#) · [Like](#)



[David Seip](#) Of course not. Given your arguments my question is reasonable. Yours is simply argumentative.

[March 19, 2015 at 8:27pm](#) · [Like](#) · [2](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) No your question is not reasonable, unless you're affirming that the Reformers, Puritans, Westminster Divines etc. were KJVOs. My question isn't argumentative. It's a demonstration of the fallacious nature of your question.

[March 19, 2015 at 8:32pm](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#)



[David Seip](#) My question was an honest one based on wanting to understand where your

arguments are coming from. Calling the reformers King James Onlyists would be absurd. If you have a problem with the identification I'm sorry, but as Josh has mentioned above, the idea that all textual scholars are liberal Bible-haters is simply untrue. And if that's not what you're saying then you need to clarify your position, because that's certainly how it comes across.

[March 19, 2015 at 8:36pm](#) · [Like](#)



[James R. White](#) [Chris Thomas](#) : your presentation of "modern critics" is horrifically imbalanced and inaccurate. Furthermore, asking the Reformers to be textual critics is fallacious in the extreme. In fact, asking anyone, prior to the discovery and publication of the papyri, to comment on the state of the early NT text is just a waste of time and space (which is why relying on someone like Burgon is so fallacious).

[March 19, 2015 at 8:42pm](#) · [Like](#) · [11](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) [David Seip](#), your question was an example of the loaded question fallacy. I answer those with the same. In order for your question to be reasonable you would need to assume the Reformers et al are also KJVOS as my position is their position. Furthermore I did not say ALL textual scholars are liberal Bible-haters. You are allowing your personal biases against the facts to cloud what I have written. I have stated what modern textual critics believe. I have also pointed out the simple truth that D.A. Carson is not a textual critic nor are there any Reformed textual critics. You may claim there is at least one current evangelical textual critic in Daniel Wallace. But as he believes theological presuppositions have no place in textual criticism he cannot be called a Reformed textual critic.

[March 19, 2015 at 8:42pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) [James R. White](#), Rev. Jeff Riddle dealt with your papyri claim in his World Magazine and refuted it.

[March 19, 2015 at 8:44pm](#) · [Like](#)



[James R. White](#) < chuckle > OK, well---that's pretty hard to do, given the nature of the evidence, but if you want to believe that, I can only ask....just what color IS the sky in your world? smile emoticon

[March 19, 2015 at 8:45pm](#) · [Like](#) · [16](#)



[James R. White](#) If I could expand a bit for the edification of others...beginning generally around the 1930s a huge cache of papyri manuscripts came to light, primarily due to the examination of materials taken from Egypt during the English colonial period there. In these materials a number of fragmentary (mainly) manuscripts were discovered that moved the testimony to the NT back by centuries from the great uncial texts such as Aleph, B and A. Indeed, those discoveries placed the NT into a unique category, making it not only the earliest attested book from antiquity, but the widest and best attested as well. But what is directly relevant here is that the readings that marked off the so-called "Alexandrian" text were found to have precedent in the papyri, demonstrating a consistent lineage going back to the most primitive time of transmission of the NT text.

What makes this important is that this is the very foundation of a meaningful defense of the reliability of the NT manuscript tradition today. If we are going to take on the legions of Bart Ehrman fans, we cannot do so by retreating to the traditions of five hundred years ago. We have been given the single best preserved body of manuscripts of any work of antiquity---to abandon that in favor of Erasmus' text is not only irrational, it is deadly to apologetics as well.

[March 19, 2015 at 8:59pm](#) · [Like](#) · [22](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) For those who actually want to hear the opposing view on the last 12 verses of Mark:

<http://confessingbaptist.com/macarthur-and-marks-ending.../>

For those who wish to know why James is wrong concerning the papyri:

<http://www.jeffriddle.net/.../word-magazine-33-recent...>

The audio covers more detail.



[MacArthur and Mark's Ending, \[Jeff Riddle\] | The Confessing Baptist](#)
confessingbaptist.com

[March 20, 2015 at 9:07am](#) · [Like](#) · [Remove Preview](#)



[James R. White](#) Riddle's article is a study in obfuscation and tradition mongering and it most

assuredly did not "refute" me or anyone else for that matter. It is however an excellent example of Christian retreatism. I will say more but I am about to take off and have three dialogues and debates over the next 72 hours on other topics.

[March 20, 2015 at 10:42am](#) · [Like](#) · [7](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) When you have no argument I guess ad hominems will do. For anyone who reads or listen to the audio, he quotes from textual critics. It is their opinions concerning the papyri he is relating. As to the last 12 verses of Mark, tread carefully James. To claim Scripture is not Scripture is sin.

[March 20, 2015 at 11:25am](#) · [Like](#)



[Josh Jeremiah](#) More a sin than calling what isn't scripture, scripture?

Just checking what standard we are using.

[March 20, 2015 at 11:55am](#) · [Edited](#) · [Like](#) · [2](#)



[Matthew Hagen](#) If the view is that the last 12 verses of Mark are not canonical, then would it not be sinful to exposit the last 12 verses from the pulpit? And, in the view that the last 12 are not canonical, since all popular translations that I'm aware of include the last 12 verses, wouldn't that place responsibility on preachers to explain that to their congregation?

This, of course would also include any and all other passages and verses that preachers are convicted are not canonical.

[March 20, 2015 at 11:55am](#) · [Like](#)



[James R. White](#) [Chris Thomas](#) Believe me, friend, I have heard the arguments for decades now. The TR group has not managed to update much in that time period. Sturz, for example, is old news, reviewed, and refuted. Newer than Burgon, anyway, but you can tell immediately that someone does not do any work in the field when they repeat these names and arguments.

I find it very troubling when someone such as yourself dares to start accusing people of sin based upon their traditionalism and their defense of the simply indefensible. Let's assume you are a TR guy---of some sort---who knows which, since, of course, there is no one TR and I have yet to

meet a single person in your camp who can provide a meaningful answer to "OK, what IS the final authoritative text to which you wish to bind us?" There is no single TR, as you know, and if you wish to dismiss the variations between Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza, well---wouldn't THAT be "sinful" as well? In any case, wouldn't it be "sinful" to ADD to the Scriptures, Chris? How about that conjectural emendation Beza made at Revelation 16:5 that is in the KJV and the Trinitarian Bible Society TR till this day? Is it "sinful" to allow that, Chris? Let's see some consistency here.

I am convinced, for example, that the Pericope Adulterae is not original---the fact that it appears in LUKE in f1 and f13 is more than sufficient evidence of that for me (let alone that it first appears in the manuscript tradition in Bezae Cantabrigiensis---the LB of the ancient world). So, if you think it is original, is one of us of necessity in SIN and the other correct? Let's see you flesh that out. I have LOTS of example in the TR where I could show you are defending an indefensible reading---so you better be ready to do some repenting on the basis of your own standards!

What really, really bothers me about the TR movement, especially amongst Reformed folks, is the head-in-the-sand mentality it breeds. Please, whatever you do, Chris, don't take this kind of argumentation out into the REAL world of Christian apologetics. Don't take it up against Ehrman or even a sharp Muslim apologist. It is like taking one a tank with a plastic gun. The problem with the article you linked to (which, unless I missed it, as I was reading quickly before they asked us to turn off our phones, didn't even mention me, so how it could "refute" me is a bit of a mystery) is that it throws under the bus the very *BEST* evidence we have of the accuracy and supremacy of the NT text over all other works of antiquity. It minimizes the impact, and importance, of the papyri (errantly, I note, as it is well known Sturz was wrong to confuse Byzantine *readings* with the Byzantine *text*), in ways frighteningly similar to my Muslim opponents in debate around the world. This is not the first time I have seen KJVO/TR proponents willing to join "the other side" just to promote their tradition. I realize most in your camp prey only upon folks within the church and in fact within a very narrow spectrum close to your own tradition. Some of us, however, do not live in that safe little cocoon. We actually take the message to the entire world, and defend it there! And when I see folks who are allegedly my friends trying out the enemies best weapons just for the fun of it---it is troubling indeed!

[March 20, 2015 at 12:22pm](#) · [Like](#) · [12](#)



[Brandon Solberg](#) [Chris Centola](#)

[March 20, 2015 at 12:29pm](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) Ironically Rev. Riddle dealt with your apologetics claims in WM#25-29 and your debate with Dr. Ehrman demonstrates the futility of holding to the modern position. Considering

that the modern textual criticism position is inherently atheistic I'll stick with the historic Reformed view of Scripture and not the modern view.

[March 20, 2015 at 12:52pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Elise Schafer](#) Scenario: there was a robbery at a store. Eye witness 1 said she saw 1 man run out of the store. Eye witness 2 said he saw 2 men run out of the store. Who is telling the truth? Both.

Not all "contradictions" are actually contradicting

[March 20, 2015 at 12:59pm](#) · [Like](#)



[James R. White](#) Oh please---you are retreating so fast I can't see through the dust, [Chris Thomas](#), and properly so. Do forgive me for not accepting your simplistic brush-offs. Ehrman is steaming to this day, as I was reminded this past week when someone else raised my name to him and he once again expressed his unhappiness. He knows a Christian stood up to him without compromise and he likewise knows he cannot defend his theological conclusions in debate (despite his constant assertion he makes no theological conclusions).

It is simply ABSURD (I call it like I see it) to say "modern textual criticism" is "inherently atheistic." That's just ridiculous to anyone with the slightest knowledge of the field. Are there atheists in the field? Of course. There are atheist historians too. Is ALL study of history therefore atheistic? Yeah, absurd is a very good term. You can pretend believing textual critics do not exist if you wish to, Chris, if that makes you feel warm and fuzzy and makes that TR look better to you, but it is sheer FANTASY to say it anyway, and a *Christian* does not live in a fantasy world.

And please, I will not allow you to wrap yourself up with the mantle of "the historic Reformed view of Scripture." That is so outrageously offensive and shallow on so many levels. I am having to pray for patience here, to be sure. You dodged every challenge I made to you in the last post--- you won't talk about specific texts because, as we all know, you can't. How come you ignored Rev. 16:5? How come you did not identify SPECIFICALLY the text to which you wish to bind us lest we SIN by disagreeing with you? But, having dodged all of that factual stuff, you dare piously wrap yourself in the robe of THE "historic Reformed view of Scripture"? I am deeply offended! I thought Reformed folks had a living, vital, robust view of God's sovereignty and providence! I thought Reformed folks chanted "semper reformanda!" and tested their traditions regularly! Wasn't it the Romanists who were chanting all about the traditional text back in the day, Chris---you know, the infallible Vulgate edition of Sixtus? Attacking the Reformers for daring to dally with that rascal Erasmus and all the new fangled Greek manuscripts and the like? Ah, the conundrums one gets into when pretending you are not promoting tradition when you

are.

OK, Chris...either this thread is going to come to a conclusion, or you are going to have to start manning up. Name your text so we can examine it on the same basis, shall we? I want specifics. And let's talk Revelation 16:5, and I want to throw in Luke 2:22 as well, OK? Let's see if you can unwrap yourself from your traditions long enough to examine them fairly?

[March 20, 2015 at 1:08pm](#) · [Like](#) · [8](#)



[Jodi Ferrante](#) [Matthew Hagen](#). You asked about a pastor's addressing this in Mark. <http://www.gty.org/.../the-fitting-end-to-marks-gospel...>



[The Fitting End to Mark's Gospel](#)

Grace to You... John MacArthur's in-depth Bible teaching brings the life-transforming truth of God's Word to...

www.gty.org By Grace to You

[March 20, 2015 at 1:13pm](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#)



[Anthony Ray](#) [Josiah Richardson](#) [G Caleb Adams](#)

[March 20, 2015 at 1:15pm](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#)



[Lucas Procee](#) [Chris](#), for you to accuse [James](#) of "ad hominem" is entirely ridiculous. It seems popular among us fellows who know a little about the rules of logic to start painting every argument we see into a little "fallacy" box. Because, of course, when you only have a hammer, everything looks like a nail.

If i may say, wrongly accusing someone of a logical fallacy should itself be considered a fallacy. Perhaps the "throwing sand" error.

By accusing James of making an ad hominem, you yourself commit the same. Because one of you has to be right. And it obviously isn't you.

To anyone who is paying attention, the hole you are digging yourself into right now is brutally obvious.

[March 20, 2015 at 1:56pm](#) · [Edited](#) · [Like](#)



[Brandon Solberg](#) [Chris Schinbein](#)

[March 20, 2015 at 1:57pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Charles Wade Baker](#) This is the best thing I have watched in the Pub in the year I have been here. Thank you, James White

[March 20, 2015 at 2:30pm](#) · [Like](#) · [4](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) James, yes modern textual criticism is inherently atheistic. It may seem absurd to you, but the fact remains that it assumes the Bible is just like any other book of the ancient world and can be treated as such. That is a rejection of Scripture's own testimony. Furthermore you continuously put the cart before the horse. Your questions show that you have failed to deal with the presuppositions of modern textual criticism . It is even worse. To be able to even get to the CT you must first hold as authoritative the same apographs the Reformers considered authoritative. And from these apographs you would then need to exegetically derive the principles of textual criticism and how and when to apply said principles. And in the application of them you would then reject the final authority of those apographs for the critical text. And at that moment you undermine your entire position by showing that your final authority is not Scripture.

The burden of proof to replace those apographs the Reformers considered authoritative with the critical text rests upon you and all CT advocates. Neither yourself, nor any modern textual critic has provided the exegetical foundation for textual criticism and without that all your previous posts on this subject are meaningless. Not only is modern textual criticism inherently atheistic for rejecting the testimony of Scripture about Scripture; it is inherently arbitrary. You have no objective foundation for the development of the principles nor for the practice of it. Without that foundation you cannot escape from the charge of arbitrariness. And until you deal with this issue your arguments are vain.

[March 21, 2015 at 3:20am](#) · [Edited](#) · [Like](#)



[James R. White](#) I see you want to have the freedom to accuse others of sin, criticize their position, and yet you refuse to man up and answer direct questions of your position. I fully understand: when someone is arguing in circles, this is the inevitable result.

You have refused to even identify the text you wish to bind us to lest we be sinners, or worse, atheists. The reason you refuse to do so is simple: once you have done so, the circularity and indefensibility of your claims can be easily demonstrated. If you pick any one of the seven sub-texts for the TR you will then have to deal with the reality that the compiler of said text had to engage in... [drum roll please]... textual criticism! Oh no! Yes, Erasmus examined variants (as a good Roman Catholic priest) and made decisions. He even changed his mind on some over the course of his life, and this is reflected in the variations between his five editions. But he weighed evidence, even though he had little material from which to draw, compared the Greek and Latin traditions, and, as is well known, made some big mistakes as a result. But he engaged in textual criticism. He did so not as an atheist, but as a self-professing son of Mother Church. He would have laughed at the accusation of being an atheist—he would have pointed out that what he was doing was not only necessary, but had been done throughout the history of the church before him, going back to the earliest days, when “atheism” (as you are using the term) was pretty rare.

I also fully understand why you will not engage specific texts. Your position is meant to be preached to a narrow group so as to gather disciples. It is impossible to bring into the glaring light of day. Its circularity again becomes painfully obvious when that happens. All its pomp and piety becomes just that much more verbiage when it actually has to answer the real questions that face us regarding the history of the NT text. Theories are nice and they preach well. But they rarely are helpful in the nitty-gritty of reality itself. We have a task before us: establishing the NT text. You can go the Romanist way—let religious authorities tell you. Or you can honestly face the facts and deal with the data as it stands. If actually engaging the issue makes you an atheist—well, the absurdity of that is too obvious for further comment.

I would ask you to explain how treating the individual manuscripts of the NT as distinct, identifiable artifacts of history and then utilizing them to identify manuscript families, etc., *demands* that you think as an atheist (the massive leap you are making is again almost too obvious for comment), but I will not bore everyone with verbiage that will be ignored anyway. It is clear you have no intention of engaging this topic meaningfully here in this thread. You chatter away about establishing principles of textual criticism from Scripture itself—as if the specifics of manuscript examination are the actual subject of didactic teaching in the Bible! Tell me—did you derive principles of computer operation from the exegesis of the biblical text? How about genome mapping? I could go on and on. It has become obvious that your arguments are all theoretical and cannot engage specific texts and the reality of the NT manuscripts. Yet, you will accuse others of sinning, engaging in atheistic thought, etc.—all without “manning up” and taking a positive stand and letting your own position experience thorough examination. It’s a shame, but clearly, it’s all you’ve got.

[March 21, 2015 at 5:44am](#) · [Like](#) · [7](#)



[Eric Bryant](#) As I've said before Dr. [White](#), thank you for clear arguments, plainly stated.

[March 21, 2015 at 8:02am](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) James, ignoring your childish snark about manning up, you haven't dealt with the inherent atheism and arbitrariness of modern textual criticism. Until you do so, your just posting so much hot air. I understand you have no objective foundation for it, but that's no reason to be snide.

[March 21, 2015 at 9:32am](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) A few other points, computer programming and genome mapping? Apples and oranges. One deals with Scripture and whether or not its self-attestation is true, the others 2 subjects do not. You have made the fallacy of equivocation. Historical science is not the same as observational science.

Claiming that Scripture is not Scripture is sin. Deal with it. I did not call anyone an atheist, stop implying that I have. I stated that modern textual criticism is inherently atheistic because of its starting presupposition that Scripture is not unique and is instead like any other book of the ancient world. As to the texts, same ones the Reformers considered authoritative. Now tell us something you've been asked for years and never answered, which texts do you consider authoritative?

[March 22, 2015 at 8:50pm](#) · [Edited](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) A friend's comments on this subject:

Circularity of your claim? All claims of ultimate authority are circular...if they weren't then there would be a greater authority by which to judge the ultimate authority.

Conflating the traditional (ecclesiastical) textual criticism with modern (academic) textual criticism....if there is no sense to the fundamental difference between the two then there is much misunderstanding in his presuppositions from the very start.

Any kind of proper textual criticism must start with the biblical presuppositions of:

- 1 - Scripture has been providentially preserved by God (Isa 59:21; Psa 12:6-7).
- 2 - God preserves His Word through the Church (Rom 3:1-2; 1Ti 3:15).
- 3 - What constitutes God's Word is not to be determined autonomously apart from the history of the Church (2 Pet 1:20).

Textual criticism has its place, but that place is not to supplant the Scripture of the Church. Rather the purpose is to gain a better understanding of the Church's Scripture. Proper criticism doesn't look at textual history with the goal of reconstruction or restoration, but rather with the goal of understanding the preserved text better.

It is so strange to think that a Christian can't recognize the sin in saying, "Yea, hath God said?" (Gen 3:1) - the very words of Satan, conveying the very mindset of Satan.

I've also seen some strange inconsistencies when those against the Received Text argue that no doctrine is affected....but then when considering the presuppositions above will change the historic interpretation of the passages so that they no longer relate to the preservation of Scripture.

And whatever passages or verses they argue are wrong in the Received Text, they can't show them to be factually wrong but rather only perceived to not be "original" (something they are altogether unable to truly determine). Yet the modern text that they cling to has factual errors that they are fine with (e.g. Mat 1:7,10).

[March 21, 2015 at 11:28am](#) · [Like](#)



[Chris Thomas](#) For those who wish to know why James' mention of Luke and Revelation are not the boogeymen he makes them out to be, Rev. Jeff Riddle refutes him yet again and demonstrate James' errors start here: <http://confessingbaptist.com/jeff-riddle-interacts-with.../>

Word-magazine

issues 25 to 29 and 31 to 33 demonstrate the errors in his above arguments.



[Jeff Riddle interacts with James White's answers to issues related to Textual...](#)
[confessingbaptist.com](#)

[March 21, 2015 at 2:29pm](#) · [Like](#) · [Remove Preview](#)



