

as compared with the earlier manuscripts. If someone wants to use Erasmus' text rather than to try to find what the earlier text is, I personally am not going to fight him or oppose him, or argue with him about it. But when someone says it is wrong to make a version, to make a translation based upon the earliest texts that we have, He is putting up an idol. He is making == taking a good thing like the serpent of brass and making an idol of it.

I know of a church in New Jersey a few years ago which almost split because half the church thought that Jesus had been crucified on Wednesday, and half thought He had been crucified on Friday. Of course we don't know which He was crucified on, but it is not a thing that Christians should divide over. God sent us into the world to preach the gospel, to win souls to Him, to teach others how they may believe in His truth. We find His truth in the textus receptus, you also find it in the original manuscripts of Scripture. But it is I believe a great sin to make an idol of the textus receptus just as it is a sin to make an idol of the KJV. I don't think there are many today who say, Well, if the KJV was good enough for St. Paul, it ought to be good enough for me, but it would be equally erroneous to say that if the textus receptus was good enough for St. Paul or because it was based upon mss most of which came from the 10th century or later, and they had many light == slight changes in them from the original, but not changes that were harmful, only changes that move an idea that is already found in one place to another place and add it there, or use a longer title where a shorter title is used. I saw book which said it is terrible to refer to Jesus simply as Jesus as some of these modern versions do; we should always call Him the Lord Jesus Christ.