

It says Holy Bible. How can it be a holy Bible which contradicts itself repeatedly? And which makes claims which on the face of it are easily shown to be false? I was criticized for making such a bitter statement! as that it is not a Holy Bible! But I fear that actually that is the case. And it is very sad, because they got a big jump ahead of evangelical scholars in preparing a translation. I'm glad the NIV took years working thoroughly in order to get something that was the best they could do. I'm glad they took the time, but I am very sorry for the big head start that the RSV got. I fear there are many churches where the RSV is read and used and I'm sure great blessing is received from many of its fine translations, many of its beautiful translations, but for the people who bother to look into it carefully and to check, it is something that will have a delayed impact that will destroy faith rather than building it up.

I found my feeling regarding it intensified by a strange thing I noticed. I had a copy of the RSV-OT after it came out and when the whole Bible came out I noticed that the first page of the NT was a little different from what it was when it was a separate book. This difference is found in the addition of a new footnote. This footnote is placed after the statement at the end of the genealogy in Mat 1:16, and Jacob the father of Joseph the husband of Mary of whom Jesus was born who is called Christ."

There is a footnote there: Other ancient authorities read: Joseph to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary was the father of Jesus who is called Christ." Now as you see that footnote flatly contradicts the virgin birth!