

A Response to Gail Riplinger's Claims Regarding NASB and NIV

© Aaron Blumer, 1999, all rights reserved.

Part 1: The Big Comparison

The black portion of the translation comparison chart below was created by Gail Riplinger^a (G. A. Riplinger) and posted on an Internet site. I have reproduced the chart here, added a column on the right and everything you see in green. The information in the green column is from my own research by examining and comparing the translations in question as well as the Majority Text,^b the Nestle Aland 26th Edition^c Greek text (hereafter, NA26)--the text underlying NASB^d and NIV--and the *Textus Receptus*^e (TR).

"Satan cometh immediately and taketh away the word..." Mark 4:15			
The Antichrist will use the NEW VERSIONS to set up his One World New Age Religion, with its mark and worship of the Antichrist and the dragon.			
Check NASB, NIV et al.		KJV	¹ The Facts
the Lord	Exodus 6:3 et al.	JEHOVAH	² There are 6820 references to <i>YHWH</i> in the Hebrew OT. There only 7 references to "Jehovah" in KJV. The other 6000+ occurrences of <i>YHWH</i> are translated by something else (usually LORD). NASB consistently uses LORD or GOD in small capitals for <i>YHWH</i> .
Christ	II Corinthians 5:18	Jesus Christ	³ This is a textual difference. Majority and TR text have "Jesus", the NA26 text does not (the older ⁹ MSS ^h all agree in omitting "Jesus" here). It's very clear who is meant by "Christ" and nothing is lost or gained by omitting or including "Jesus."
the Spirit	Acts 8:18 et al.	the Holy Ghost	⁴ This is a difference in the Greek text. Majority (Maj.) and TR have " <i>pneuma to hagion</i> " (spirit the holy). Again, it's clear who is meant, especially since NASB capitalizes "Spirit."
divine being	Acts 17:29	The Godhead	⁵ NASB has "Divine Nature" capitalized. That's what Godhead (<i>theion</i>) means. NIV: "divine being." RSV: "Deity." NKJV: "Divine Nature." There is no difference in the underlying Greek text here.
OMIT	Revelation 1:11	I am Alpha and Omega	⁶ This is one of the places where KJV's Greek text (TR) does not agree with the Majority Text. Majority omits this phrase but TR includes it, following some late MSS (Maj. and NA26 do have the "alpha and omega" phrase in Rev. 1:8).
One, man	John 4:42 et al.	God, Christ, the Son	⁷ This is the where the friends of the woman at the well confess their faith in Jesus. KJV actually reads " we ... know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world. " NASB reads " we ... know that this One is indeed the Savior of the world. " The difference is due to the Greek text. Maj. and TR have "this is indeed the Savior of the world, the Christ." "The Christ" doesn't really add much to "the Savior of the world" and it is very clear from the context that "this One" refers to Christ.

Only One	Matthew 19:17 et al.	God	⁸ Actual KJV reading here is “there is none good but one, that is, God.” NASB reads “there is only One who is good.” The Majority Text has the word "God" here where the NA26 does not. They concluded that the level of agreement among the best of the older MSS indicates that “God” was added later by someone who wanted to clarify the passage.
The Mighty One	Joshua 22:22	The LORD God	⁹ NASB here actually reads “The Mighty One, God, the LORD, the Mighty One, God, the LORD!” The 1901 ASV reads “The Mighty One, God, Jehovah, the Mighty One, God, Jehovah.” KJV is certainly not better. It reads “The LORD God of gods, the LORD God of gods.” The Hebrew actually reads <i>el, elohim yaweh, el elohim yaweh</i> . It's fairly clear in this case that Riplinger is distorting the truth by taking the phrase out of context.
the Lord	I Corinthians 16:22	Lord Jesus Christ	¹⁰ NASB actually reads “If anyone does not love the Lord, let him be accursed.” TR and Majority Text have "Lord Jesus Christ." In any translation, there is no doubt who "the Lord" here is.
a son of the gods	Daniel 3:25	the Son of God	¹¹ This one is a translator's decision. The <u>Hebrew supports either reading</u> . The question is which more likely represents how Nebuchadnezzar the king saw things? He is the speaker here and is referring to the fourth person in the fiery furnace. As a pagan polytheist, Neb. would have thought in those terms. He does not acknowledge the true God until Daniel 4.
Son of Man	John 9:35	Son of God	¹² KJV goes with Majority Text here. <u>Both are titles Jesus used of Himself in the Gospels</u> . The context of NASB also shows that the "the Son of Man" was someone to be worshipped. It reads as follows: “Do you believe in the Son of Man?” ³⁶ He answered and said, ‘And who is He, Lord, that I may believe in Him?’ ³⁷ Jesus said to him, ‘You have both seen Him, and He is the one who is talking with you.’ ³⁸ And he said, ‘Lord, I believe.’ And he worshiped Him.”
a God	Acts 14:15 et al.	God	¹³ This another case of misrepresenting the translation by not showing the context . NASB reads “We are also men of the same nature as you, and preach the gospel to you in order that you should turn from these vain things to a living God.” The majority text and TR have a definite article there which the NA26 text believed to be a later addition and did not include. The modern translations capitalize "God" to avoid any confusion about who is meant (context is also quite clear).
OMIT	1 John 5:7	For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost and these three are one.	¹⁴ The phrase that is actually missing in NASB and others is “in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.” Erasmus did not include the clause in the first 2 editions of his NT ⁱ because they did not exist in any Greek MS he had in his possession. The Catholic church put pressure on him to add it because it was in the Vulgate. He refused unless someone could show him a Greek MS containing it. Presto, a MS was delivered shortly thereafter. Most experts believe it was created for the occasion. ^j In any case, TR has this phrase but the Majority Text does not. ^k NASB takes the last phrase of v.6 and makes it v.7 so that there will not be a verse number missing. It also inserts a footnote containing the missing clause and acknowledges that it does exist in some late MSS.

fruit of the light	Ephesians 5:9	fruit of the Spirit	¹⁵ Here's the NASB in context: " but now you are light in the Lord; walk as children of light (for the fruit of the light <i>consists</i> in all goodness and righteousness and truth) " This is another textual issue. Majority text has Spirit here rather than light. The context does favor the "light" reading since "light" is the metaphor Paul is using in the verse.
and the nations shall walk by its light	Revelation 21:24	and the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it.	¹⁶ Here's another place where the majority of MSS do not support the KJV reading. Majority text agrees with NA26. Only TR has "of them which are saved." It is a later addition by someone who wanted to clarify the meaning of the text.
king of nations/ages	Revelation 15:3	King of saints	¹⁷ TR disagrees with Majority and has <i>hagion</i> , saints. Majority and NA26 agree that the word is <i>ethnon</i> , nations. There is also MS support for the word for "ages" here and NIV opted for that reading.
end of the age	Matthew 28:20	end of the world	¹⁸ There is no manuscript issue here. All texts have <i>aiónos</i> (Strong's 165), which usually means "a very long or unending time" and only rarely "world." Either way, the end of the age and the end of the world will arrive about the same time.
I can do everything through him who gives me strength	Philippians 4:13	I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me	¹⁹ NASB reads "through Him who strengthens me." The NA26 text omits "Christ" because it appears to be a later addition. The context and capitalization of "Him" leave no room for doubt regarding who is meant here.
He who was revealed in the flesh	I Timothy 3:16	God was manifest in the flesh	²⁰ TR & Maj. have <i>theos</i> in the text. The older MSS do not. NASB actually reads: He who was revealed in the flesh, Was vindicated in the Spirit, Beheld by angels, Proclaimed among the nations, Believed on in the world, Taken up in glory. The deity of Christ is clearly shown in other passages in NA26 such as Rom.9:5. ^m
OMIT	Acts 4:24	Thou art God	²¹ NASB reads "...they lifted their voices to God with one accord and said, "O Lord, it is Thou who DIDST MAKE..." KJV has "O Lord, thou art God, which hast made..." The KJV's Greek text differs here from that of the modern versions, but again, it's quite obvious in any version that "O Lord" refers to God !
OMIT (NASB 73, NIV 38 times.)	Matthew 8:29	Jesus	²² Actual KJV: " What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? " NASB: " What do we have to do with You, Son of God? " Context is clear that this is Jesus! ⁿ
him	Mark 2:15	Jesus	²³ NASB: "... tax-gatherers and sinners were dining with Jesus and His disciples; for there were many of them, and they were following Him. "
His kingdom	Matthew 6:33	The kingdom of God	²⁴ NASB: "our heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. ³³ " But seek first His kingdom... " It's quite obvious who "His" is. Is this really evidence that NASB is trying to remove "God" from the Bible as Riplinger alleges?
He	Revelation 21:4	God	²⁵ TR has "God" here, Majority text and NA26 text do not! KJV's translation here is not found in the majority of manuscripts.
He	Galatians 1:15	God	²⁶ NASB: " But when He who had set me apart , even from my mother's womb..." KJV: " God, who separated me from my mother's womb" Is there evidence of effort to remove "God" here? NA26 text has the pronoun instead of the noun.

He	Matthew 22:32	God	²⁷ NASB: "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob '? He is not the God of the dead but of the living" Is there any doubt here who "He" is?
his spirit	I Corinthians 14:2	the spirit	²⁸ The Greek texts here are agreed: " <i>pneumati de laei mustéria</i> " literally, "but in spirit he speaks mysteries." There is no definite article ("the") even in the TR. The translator is forced to make an interpretive decision. NASB actually has " <i>his spirit</i> " (<i>his</i> in italics) to show they are supplying a word. KJV adds the definite article, "the" without putting it in italics. KJV's rendering is certainly not a clear reference to the Holy Spirit so there is no case here for saying NASB is removing the Holy Spirit.
His name	Acts 22:16	the name of the Lord	²⁹ NASB: "... Righteous One, and to hear an utterance from His mouth. ¹⁵ 'For you will be a witness for Him to all men of what you have seen and heard. ¹⁶ 'And now why do you delay? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on His name.' " NA26 has a pronoun rather than the Majority Text's noun. Context makes the meaning unmistakable.
His name and his father's name in their foreheads	Revelation 14:1 (see Revelation 14:11!)	his father's name in their foreheads	³⁰ Majority text has "his name and" and agrees with NA26 and the modern translations. Only TR omits the phrase. Once again KJV has a reading that is not in the majority of MSS.
worship (see Revelation 9, 13, 14, 16) ^o	Philippians 3:3	worship God	³¹ NASB: " who worship in the Spirit of God " KJV: "which worship God in the spirit " KJV actually omits a reference to the Holy Spirit here. Using Riplinger's logic, this would indicate a conspiracy by the KJV translators to remove the Holy Spirit from the Bible. NASB's translation here is orthodox. One obviously cannot worship "in the Spirit of God" and be worshipping devils, dragons, beasts, etc. Therefore, Riplinger's accusations on this point are weightless.
God of the New Versions/New Age		Devil of the Bible & Christianity	³² This section is apparently intended to prove that the God of the new versions is the same as the Lucifer of the KJV. Do you see proof of this here or even any real evidence?
morning star	Isaiah 14:12 - 15	Lucifer	³³ (1) Vs.4 indicates clearly that this passage is actually addressed to the king of Babylon. (2) The original 1611 has a marginal note on the word "Lucifer" stating "or daystarre." ^p My copy of the KJV has this note as well (with spelling corrected). (3) The Hebrew there is actually <i>heylel</i> , meaning something like "light bearer," hence "star" (Strong's 1966). (4) "Lucifer" was actually taken from the Latin Vulgate: " <i>quomodo cecidisti de caelo lucifer qui mane oriebaris corruisti in terram qui vulnerabas gentes.</i> " ^q
(image worshippers are) very religious	Acts 17:22	(image worshippers are) too superstitious	³⁴ The word is <i>deisidaimonesteros</i> (Strong's 1174). Like our English word "religious" it can be meant positively or negatively. The word "superstitious" is almost always viewed negatively. Thus, "religious" is the better English equivalent, reflecting the ambiguity of the Greek.

visions he has seen	Colossians 2:18	things which he hath not seen	³⁵ NA26 has " <i>a heóroken embateuón</i> " lit. "what he has seen entering into/standing on." TR & Maj. have " <i>a mé heóroken embateuon</i> " lit. "what not he has seen entering into/standing on" NASB has " visions " in italics to show that they supplied it. In the context, it is clear that this is a reference to the activity of false teachers. There is certainly nothing new age or occultic about saying that false teachers are relying on visions they've seen.
New Version Greek Manuscripts	Manuscript <i>Aleph</i>	KJV Greek Manuscripts	³⁶ Note that the KJV was published with the Apocrypha for many years. † Although <i>Shepherd of Hermas</i> and <i>Epistle of Barnabas</i> are not in the KJV Apocrypha, they are part of the body of non-canonical religious literature of that period.
"I gave myself up to the beast"	Shepherd of Hermas	OMIT	³⁷ This phrase does not appear in any modern Bible translation. Furthermore, modern translations are not based on one MS. <i>Aleph</i> is never followed unless it agrees with other MSS. ⁵ These phrases also deserve to be examined in context before passing judgement on their message.
"Receive his name"	Shepherd of Hermas	OMIT	³⁸ This phrase does not appear in any modern Bible translation. Furthermore, modern translations are not based on one MS. <i>Aleph</i> is never followed unless it agrees with other MSS.
"Satan...is Lord"	Epistle of Barnabas	OMIT	³⁹ This phrase does not appear in any modern Bible translation. Furthermore, modern translations are not based on one MS. <i>Aleph</i> is never followed unless it agrees with other MSS.
The "New" Christianity		First Century Christianity	⁴⁰ This section is evidently supposed to show that the new versions represent or promote a "new Christianity" that makes weaker demands, promotes seeking of prosperity and wealth, etc. Is this evident when you look at the facts below?
Check NASB, NIV et al.		KJV	⁴¹
Then come, follow me	Mark 10:21	and come, take up the cross and follow me	⁴² NASB actually reads " go and sell all you possess, and give to the poor, and you shall have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me " This is definitely not descriptive of a new, weaker form of Christianity. The "cross" phrase is in the Maj. text and TR. NA26 believed it to be a later addition to harmonize with other passages that contain the cross phrase. (NA26 has the cross phrase in other passages such as Matt. 10:38, 16:24; Luke 9:23, 14:27)
men	II Peter 1:21	holy men	⁴³ NASB reads " men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God. " The older papyri and uncials do not contain the word "holy" in reference to the men. Is this supposed to imply that the NASB translators did not believe in holiness or that the older MS copyists tried to remove the idea of holiness? If that was their aim, they overlooked 184 references by my count.
heart	I Peter 1:22	pure heart	⁴⁴ The idea of purity is still very clear in the verse in NASB: "Since you have in obedience to the truth purified your souls for a sincere love of the brethren, fervently love one another from the heart " NASB does note in the margin that some MSS have "a clean heart." Majority text and TR have clean/pure. NA26 judged it to be a later addition.

adequate	II Timothy 3:17	Perfect	⁴⁵ There is no textual issue here. The word is <i>artios</i> . It appears only here in NT and literature of the period, but most scholars agree that it means "complete, capable, proficient." (BAGD lexicon)
prosperity	Proverbs 21:21	Righteousness	⁴⁶ Actual NASB: " He who pursues righteousness and loyalty finds life, righteousness and honor. " The word "prosperity" isn't there. It is worth noting, however, that even if it were, it does not constitute evidence of a prosperity gospel. There is no inherent evil in prosperity and Proverbs is full of advice about what leads to prosperity. These are evident in any translation.
prosper	Jeremiah 29:11	Peace	⁴⁷ Actual NASB: " For I know the plans that I have for you, declares the Lord, plans for welfare and not for calamity to give you a future and a hope. " <u>The word "prosper" isn't there.</u> Once again, it would not be evidence of some "new Christianity" prosperity doctrine anyway. This is God's promise that he will eventually prosper Israel. "Prosperity" is a perfect word for His plans for them! KJV: " For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the LORD, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end. " The word for "peace" is <i>shalom</i> (Strong's 7965) which means "completeness, soundness, welfare, peace."
godliness actually is a means of great gain	I Timothy 6:6	godliness with contentment is great gain	⁴⁸ This is flagrant misrepresentation. NIV: " But godliness with contentment is great gain " NASB: "But godliness actually is a means of great gain, when accompanied by contentment. "
boast	Hebrews 3:6	rejoicing	⁴⁹ NASB: " whose house we are, if we hold fast our confidence and the boast of our hope firm until the end " KJV: " whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. " The word is <i>kauchéma</i> (Strong's 2745) and means something like proud rejoicing. KJV translates the exact same word in 2Cor.9:2 as "lest our boasting of you should be in vain" and the verb form of the word in Rom. 2:17 as "and makest thy boast of God."
be proud	II Corinthians 1:14	your rejoicing	⁵⁰ Actual NASB: " we are your reason to be proud as you also are ours " KJV: " that we are your rejoicing, even as ye also are ours " This is the same word: <i>kauchéma</i> again. See above.
proud confidence	II Corinthians 1:12	rejoicing	⁵¹ This is a similar word, <i>kauchésis</i> , Strong's 2746. It has pretty much the same meaning as <i>kauchéma</i> and KJV translates it "boasting" in Rom. 3:27, 2 Cor:9:24, and several other places. Riplinger has absolutely no point here at all.

furthering the administration	I Timothy 1:4	godly edifying	⁵² Here's what the versions really say: KJV: " endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than <u>godly edifying which is in faith: so do.</u> " NASB: " genealogies, which give rise to mere speculation rather than <u>furthering the administration of God which is by faith.</u> " The difference is due to a textual issue. TR disagrees with the Majority Text here by having <i>oikodomia</i> instead of <i>oikonomia</i> . <i>Oikonomia</i> actually means "administration" or "dispensation," while TR's <i>oikodomia</i> means "building." KJV actually omits a reference to God here by making it "godly" instead, even though all Greek texts have "God" here. Should we try to claim KJV is therefore an anti-God translation?
Thou has made him a little lower than God	Psalms 8:5	thou has made him a little lower than the angels	⁵³ The Hebrew is <i>elohim</i> (Strong's 430). "Angels" is possible but <i>elohim</i> almost always means God or "gods." For example, every occurrence of "God" in the KJV of Genesis 1 is <i>elohim</i> ! If Riplinger thinks <i>elohim</i> is "angels," who is really trying to create a "New Age Bible"? Just try "in the beginning the angels created the heavens and the earth" on for size.
I retract	Job 42:6	I abhor myself	⁵⁴ The Hebrew word is <i>ma'as</i> , Strong's 3988. It means to reject or despise. <u>KJV actually has "<i>myself</i>" in italics because they supplied it.</u> More likely, it refers to rejecting the things he had been saying, hence, "I retract." It's a simple matter of translator choice. NASB actually reads as follows: " Therefore I retract, and I repent in dust and ashes. " There's nothing soft or compromising about the language here.
our humble state	Philippians 3:21	our vile body	⁵⁵ NASB: " the body of our humble state " NASB includes a footnote on the phrase stating "or our lowly body." The Greek texts are all agreed on the original wording. It literally says "the body of our humiliation." NASB is much closer to the Greek than KJV here.
man shall not live on bread alone	Luke 4:4	Than man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God	⁵⁶ The phrase is not included in the NA26 text but TR and Maj. both have it. However, NASB still has the phrase in Deut. 8:3 which Jesus is quoting from.
Salvation by works or faith in Jesus Christ?			⁵⁷ This section is intended to demonstrate that the NASB and NIV teach salvation by works. The facts show that this claim would be funny if it were not such a serious charge.
Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God	Mark 10:24	Children, how hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God	⁵⁸ This is the usual Maj. vs. older textual issue. In context, NASB reads " Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God! ²⁵ It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. " The idea of those who trust in riches is still in the context. In any case, <u>NASB still has Eph. 2:8-9 and Titus 3:5, clearly teaching that <i>salv. is by faith, not by works.</i></u>

By standing firm you will save yourself	Luke 21:19	in your patience possess ye your souls	⁶⁹ Where she found this modern translation is a mystery to me. NASB reads "By your endurance you will gain your lives." It includes a footnote on "lives" reading "or 'souls.'" NIV reads "By standing firm you will gain life." AV translates the phrase <i>"en té hupomoné humón"</i> as "in your patience" but the Greek construction is <u>dative</u> and should almost certainly read "by your patience/endurance." KJV has "possess ye" for <i>ktésasthe</i> (imperative of <i>ptaomai</i> , Strong's 2932), to get or procure, and translates it imperative (ironically, most people would not notice that "possess ye" is a command). The older papyri and uncial MSS have a future tense here (one letter difference) making it "you will get." Riplinger should be more concerned about Matt. 24:13 which reads, in the KJV "But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." No one would accuse KJV of teaching works salvation in Matt. 24:13. Why should anyone accuse NASB of teaching it in Luke 21:19?
obey	John 3:36	believeth	⁶⁰ The word <i>apeitheó</i> (Strong's 544), usually means "disobey." NASB actually has "not obey" here. <u>KJV translates the same word as "obey not" in 1 Pet. 4:17 "what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?"</u> Works salvation? I don't think so!
faithfulness	Galatians 5:22 et al.	faith	⁶¹ The word <i>pistis</i> (Strong's 4102), can mean either one, depending on the context, although KJV consistently renders it "faith." In any case, <u>the context is the fruit of the Spirit in the lives of believers.</u> It in no way indicates a translation's position on salvation, as Riplinger is attempting to demonstrate in this section.
OMIT	Romans 11:6	But if it be of works then it is no more grace	⁶² <u>I don't know who omits this. NASB and NIV both have beautifully clear translations of it (NKJV and RSV have it as well).</u> NASB: "But if it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works, otherwise grace is no longer grace." ⁶³ NIV: "And if by grace, then it is no longer by works; if it were, grace would no longer be grace."
the gospel	Romans 1:16	the gospel of Christ	⁶⁴ Majority Text has "of Christ." NA26 does not. The "gospel" is still clearly defined in NA26 (NASB, NIV) of 1Cor.15:1-4.
OMIT	Acts 8:37	I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God	⁶⁵ <u>TR disagrees with the Majority Text here (Maj. agrees with NA26).</u> There is very little MS support KJV's version.
In whom we have redemption	Colossians 1:14	In whom we have redemption through his blood	⁶⁶ The Majority Text has the blood clause in brackets, probably meaning that the MS evidence is split nearly 50/50. NA26 omits the phrase believing it to be a later addition. The older MSS do not contain it. <u>NA26 does include the phrase in Eph.1:7.</u> If there is a conspiracy to remove the blood it is certainly an ineffective one.
who believes	Mark 9:42	believe in me	⁶⁷ Context shows this to be insignificant. NASB: "whoever causes one of these little ones who believe to stumble..."
he who believes has everlasting life	John 6:47	He that believeth on me hath everlasting life	⁶⁸ TR and Majority have <i>eis eme</i> , "in me" or "on me." NA26 believed it to be a later addition. Once again, it's insignificant in context.

calling on His name	Acts 22:16	calling on the name of the Lord	⁶⁹ Context shows clearly who is meant by "His name." NASB reads "... Righteous One, and to hear an utterance from His mouth. ¹⁵ 'For you will be a witness for Him to all men of what you have seen and heard. ¹⁶ 'And now why do you delay? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling <u>on His name.</u>'"
OMIT	I John 5:13	and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God	⁷⁰ NASB in context reads: " These things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, in order that you may know that you have eternal life. " It doesn't seem to make sense to add "and that you may believe..." on the end of this sentence since John has already said he is writing to those who believe. I suspect it is a comment, a gloss, by someone who wanted to point out that the verse also had an evangelistic application. It made its way into the text and was copied extensively thereafter. TR and Maj. have it. It does not appear in any of the older MSS and was not included in NA26.
teaching	II John 9b	doctrine of Christ	⁷¹ Again, context is everything. Nothing is lost in the NASB rendering: " Anyone who goes too far and <u>does not abide in the teaching of Christ, does not have God; the one who abides in the teaching, he has both the Father and the Son.</u> " The word KJV translates "doctrine" is <i>didaché</i> which means teaching or doctrine. There is no difference.
truth	I Timothy 2:7	truth in Christ	⁷² Look at the passage in context. NASB: " for this I was appointed a preacher and an apostle (I am telling the truth, I am not lying) " There is no doctrinal issue here.
Neither is circumcision anything	Galatians 6:15	For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything	⁷³ TR and Maj. have the "in Christ" phrase here. NA26 does not. There's no doctrinal issue. We know that, because of the passing of the Mosaic Covenant, circumcision avails nothing whether you are in Christ or not.
I bow my knees before the Father	Ephesians 3:14	I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ	⁷⁴ TR and Maj. have the phrase. NA26 doesn't because it is not found in the older MSS (not just <i>Aleph</i> , and B, but also the papyri).
an heir of God	Galatians 4:7	an heir of God through Christ	⁷⁵ NASB: " ...and if a son, then an heir <u>through God.</u> " This reflects the NA26 text which does not include "through Christ." TR and Maj. have it. Is "through God" theologically weaker than "through Christ"?
God who created all things	Ephesians 3:9	God who created all things by Jesus Christ	⁷⁶ TR and Maj. have "by/through Christ Jesus." NA26 does not. There is no doctrinal issue here since the verse is only stating what Gen.1:1 clearly says. But the instrumentality of Christ is still taught in the NA26 text (NASB, NIV) elsewhere. The NASB Heb. 1:2 says " ...in His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things, through whom also He made the world. "
the Father	Colossians 1:2	our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ	⁷⁷ NASB: " Grace to you and peace from God our Father. " Again, no doctrinal issue here. If you wanted to attack the deity of Christ these are not the places you would do it! ^m NASB has the phrase in Philippians 1:2.

Summary

Riplinger's chart fails to show what she intends because of several often-repeated errors:

- (1) Words or phrases from translations are made to appear incorrect or sinister by not showing them in context.
- (2) Words or phrases are compared to the KJV even in cases where the KJV disagrees with the Majority text.
- (3) Omissions of words (such as Jesus, Christ or God) are cited to show a weakening of doctrine even though the omissions in no way change the message of the verses when read in context (usually because they are replaced by pronouns).
- (4) Places where the KJV omits references to God or the Holy Spirit or contains verses not supported by the majority of MSS are ignored.
- (5) Hiding the true weakness of the evidence by using a very large number of examples. The fallacy here is that a large number of invalid examples is somehow better than a small number. However, zero times one hundred is still zero.

When the comparisons are examined one by one, it becomes apparent that collectively they do not amount to anything. All the chart demonstrates is that **(1)** modern versions differ from the KJV in that they frequently follow earlier MSS when these MSS disagree with later ones, and **(2)** modern translators frequently make different translational decisions from the KJV translators when handling words with multiple possible meanings.

In other words, Riplinger has only proved here what everyone already knows: modern translations are different. To make her case for the error of modern versions, she has to prove **(1)** that the older MSS are not really older or **(2)** that modern versions translate the original languages incorrectly (that is, in ways that are not semantically and grammatically sound). She has failed accomplish either of these objectives.

To make her case that modern versions are not only in error but are evil, she must also prove **(3)** that the choice to favor older MSS is not only an error but a deliberate act motivated by desire to deceive or **(4)** that the translational choices that differ from KJV are not only erroneous but motivated by a desire to deceive and promote evil. Having failed to prove (1) and (2), these two are unproved as well.

The thesis of her book requires her to prove one additional premise: **(5)** that the hundreds of textual experts, translators and Bible scholars who have worked on the many modern versions now in print all deliberately worked together to orchestrate the gradual watering down of Scripture (through bad textual decisions and invalid translational choices) so that a one world version would eventually be accepted. There is no evidence of that either, especially

in light of the fact that many of these modern versions are in competition with each other, are the products of publishing companies that are in competition with each other and involve the work of scholars who do not all know each other and who in many cases have strong disagreements with those they do know.

It's very hard to get one good translation committee together and have them get along well enough to produce an entire Bible, much less to get all the various committees to agree on a sinister agenda.

One might argue that they are participants in the satanic plan unawares, but no one can either prove or disprove that theory. However, given the lack of critical judgment on the part of most Christians today, a version that *actually* obscures the great doctrines could have easily been published and widely accepted by now—if this were indeed Satan's strategy.

Part 2: Some Other Key Riplinger Claims

(1) Are the “Older Manuscripts” Older?

The famous Alexandrian Codices (*Alexandrinus*, *Sinaiticus*, *Vaticanus*) are in **uncial** text which was gradually replaced by the **miniscule** writing style beginning around the 6th century and ending around the 9th.^t In addition to these, there are several papyrus fragments of the NT which date back to the 2nd or 3rd century. There are also thousands of secular papyrus MSS from that period and older consisting of business transactions, letters, etc. Some of these include dates, providing a point of reference for dating the others. The Bodmer and Chester Beatty papyri date back to at least 3rd century and the Codices are from before the 9th at the very latest.^u The manuscripts that form the bulk of the Majority Text are minuscules from after the 9th century. These are well documented facts disputed only by persons without expertise in textual history or manuscript materials. Most KJV defenders do not dispute the age of the older MSS.

In short, yes, the older MSS really are older (and there are many of them besides *Aleph* and B).

(2) Is the KJV as Readable, Or More Readable, Than Modern Versions?

Riplinger’s assertion that the KJV is more readable than modern versions is based on the Flesch-Kincaid Algorithm. The algorithm identifies a readability grade level by calculating the average number of words per sentence, sentences per paragraph, and possibly letters per word. It is used by Microsoft Word® and other popular word processing software to rate the reading levels of documents. The KJV does score at a lower grade level than some of the modern translations (such as NASB) using this algorithm.

The problem with the Flesch-Kincaid (and most other readability algorithms) is that it ignores two key factors in actual real-world readability: **(1)** the vocabulary involved, **(2)** the sentence structure and grammar (word order, etc.). Flesch-Kincaid ignores both. Consequently, this algorithm and its variations are not valid in situations when the readability of the vocabulary or language is in question.

The paragraph below illustrates the inadequacy of Flesch-Kincaid. Microsoft Word 97® gives it a Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level of 4.2 and a Flesch Reading Ease of 80.8.^v

Hup Munker blad gregingly at the fir trots. His trist blump dittled the rej blastly. Then blub revetly riped on the rej's yonk. Toff glod the rej with a tical quenk. Woweever, the rej slod into a butical quenk. Cierfely, Hup Munker ziked the quenk with ever clipstering buttle glosh. Then Opulip the Huk tripe wundled the butical quenk to save the day.^w

The grade level score indicates that the paragraph is supposed to be readable by anyone educated at the fourth grade level. In this case, “reading” is clearly not the same as understanding.

In 1978, a readability study was conducted by experts at the Texas A & M University. Using a method then called the Fog Readability Index, they tested twelve popular translations of thirty six passages from the New Testament, assigning a grade-school-based readability level to each. Among the results were the following:

Version	Grade Level
International Children’s Bible	3.9
New International Version	7.8
New American Standard Version	11.3
King James Version	14.0

John Kohlenberger applied the same method to the New King James Version and scored it at 9.1.^x

The point is sometimes made that “understanding” Scripture requires the illumination of the Holy Spirit, anyway, so it doesn’t matter if the language of the KJV is slightly out of date. However, illumination does not refer to simple grammatical understanding of what the words and sentences are saying. Rather it refers to understanding the significance and recognizing the trustworthiness of what Scripture says *after already* understanding what the words and sentences mean. **God has not promised that the Spirit will illuminate a person who is reading Scripture in language that he does not understand in the first place. If we had such a promise, translation would not be necessary at all.** We could hand that new convert a copy of the Hebrew and Greek and turn him loose.

(3) Are There Words and Phrases in the NASB That Have No Manuscript Support?

I have yet to see what words and phrases Riplinger believes to be unsupported. However, given that she does not read Greek or Hebrew,^y and that no other KJV defenders I’ve read (and I’ve read quite a few) have made this claim, I think it is very unlikely that there is any truth to this.^z

Riplinger’s frequent misrepresentations of the modern versions and their supporters, not to mention her tendency toward the bizarre (“acrostic algebra” and the evil of the letter “s,” for example), certainly do not suggest her word is more trustworthy than that of the NASB translation committee. The committee claims, in the forward, to have represented the words of the original languages as faithfully and literally as possible without sacrificing readability.

(4) On Westcott and Hort

“The published works of a lifetime show these men to have been unjustly

accused on the basis of youthful speculations. Westcott honored and defended the deity of Christ, His virgin birth, His bodily resurrection, His miracles, the virtue of His blood, and many other doctrines in many commentaries through a long and useful life.”^{aa}

The accusation that these men were involved in the occult appears to be based solely on the fact that Westcott was a member of a society in college called the Ghostlie Guild.^{bb} It was a club dedicated to the study of unsolved mysteries involving ghosts, etc. It did not engage in occult practices, but was, in any case, abandoned long before work began on the Greek New Testament.

(5) About the Writer of the NASB Preface

Riplinger cites the writer of the preface to the NASB, Frank Logsdon, as having repudiated the translation. While this man did embrace a KJV only position later in his life, and apparently did write a preface for NASB, he is not a translator or textual scholar, and by his own testimony^{cc} had little to do with the translation other than helping draft a feasibility study and interview a couple of potential translators. Consequently, Logsdon's opinion in the matter carries no more weight than anyone else's. His close friendship with David Otis Fuller, a KJV defender for many years, influenced his views in the KJV only direction. His assertions do not in way alter what a close examination of the NASB shows: that it is a very precise translation of a very carefully constructed original-language text.

(6) Some Books Worth Reading

Probably the best book in print on the subject is James White's *The King James Only Controversy*, (Bethany House, 1995). Although James White has come under attack from Riplinger and many other KJVonliers recently—being called rude and crude, a liar, etc.—even a casual perusal of his book shows it to be a far more calm, well-reasoned, even-handed treatment of the subject than that of Riplinger and friends. Is it really necessary to rant and rave and get all spooky and mystical when you have the truth on your side?

Stewart Custer's short book *The Truth About the King James Controversy* clears up a great deal of confusion in its few pages. While he devotes a lot of attention to refuting Peter Ruckman, who is no longer a leader among KJV defenders, it is clear in the book that Gail Riplinger and other recent KJV defenders have only repackaged much of the same Ruckman-style fallacies.

End Notes

^a The chart is currently posted on the Internet at http://www.avpublications.com/3_catalogue/naby/naby_html_tract.htm.

^b *The New Testament in the original Greek : According to the Byzantine/Majority textform* / Executive editor, William David McBrayer; The text revised by Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont.—Roswell, GA : The Original Word Publishers, c1991. 510 p.

(End notes continued...)

- ^c *The Greek New Testament* [computer file] / edited by Kurt Aland...et al.—electronic ed. of the 3rd ed. (Corrected)—Federal Republic of Germany : United Bible Societies, 1997, c1982. 926 p.—(Logos Library System).
(Note: the UBS 3rd edition has the same Greek text as the Nestle Aland 26th only the textual apparatus differs. The UBS 4th edition and Nestle Aland 27th also are the same text as UBS 3 and NA26.)
- ^d New American Standard Bible, often also referred to as NASV although it has never been published under that title.
- ^e Scrivener's 1881 *Textus Receptus* [computer file].—electronic ed.—Oak Harbor : Logos Research Systems, 1995. (Logos Library System)
- ^f “Yahweh” and “Jehovah” are different ways of spelling the Hebrew **hwwhy**, letter for letter, in the English alphabet (adding vowels where needed). We do not know what the vowels originally were, so the name, as far as we know, is actually *YHWH* (or *JHVH*). Orthodox Jews have had a long-standing tradition of not pronouncing this name out loud, substituting *adonai* (Lord) in its place. Since we don't know what vowels to use, and also to respect the Jewish tradition, NASB consistently uses LORD for *YHWH*. The only exception is when *YHWH* and *adonai* appear together. In that case, they use "Lord" for *adonai* and God for *YHWH*. They are consistent in the use of the small capitals typeface, so when you see small caps, you always know it is a translation of *YHWH*.
- ^g See section in this paper: “Are the ‘Older Manuscripts’ Older?”
- ^h **MSS** is the abbreviation for “manuscripts,” plural. **MS** is the abbreviation for the singular, “manuscript.”
- ⁱ Thurman Wisdom, *Light on the Bible Text Debate* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones Univ. Press, 1984), p.3.
- ^j James R. White has documented all of this in his book, *The King James Only Controversy*, (Bethany House, 1995) pp.60-61. He cites Erika Rummel, *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament*, Univ. of Toronto, 1986, p.133. The account is also in David Ewart, *From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) p. 150.
- ^k I have verified this personally. Custer's comments, p. 14 are also interesting. (*The Truth About the King James Version Controversy*, Stewart Custer. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1981).
- ^l The word order in the TR is "all things through the one who strengthens me through Christ." It looks like a commentary or paraphrase added to the end of the verse or the margin got copied into the text there at some point. It was then copied into all copies made from it.
- ^m This might be a good place to mention that there are eight key passages that can be translated in such a way as to identify Jesus as God, but which are not consistently translated that way in various versions. Of the eight, **KJV identifies Jesus as God in four, NASB in seven, and NIV in seven.** Here's a chart:

	Jn 1:1	Jn 1:18	Jn 20:28	Rom9:5	2Th 1:12	Tit 2:13	Heb 1:8	2Pet 1:1
KJV	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
NAS	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
NIV	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

(End notes continued...)

These observations are from John R. Kholenberger III, *Words about the Word: A Guide to Choosing and Using Your Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987) p. 75.

ⁿ This is probably also the case for Riplinger's other alleged "NASB 73 times" and "NIV 38 times," if they exist at all.

^o Rev. 9 refers to worshiping devils (v.20); Rev. 13 refers to worshiping the dragon (v.4), the beast (v.12), and image of the beast (v.13). Chapters 14 and 16 have more of the same. These have nothing to do Philip. 3:3.

^p This can be seen in museum copies of the 1611 and in reprints of it which are available today.

^q In making an English translation that claims to be from the original languages, it isn't appropriate to transliterate words from another translation (Vulgate) rather than from the Hebrew or Greek.

^r David O. Beale, *A Pictorial History of Our English Bible*, (Greenville: Bob Jones University Press, 1982) p.43.

^s The NA26/UBS3 text that underlies most modern translations is eclectic, meaning all the manuscript evidence is considered. It does not follow the Westcott-Hort theory in automatically favoring *Aleph* (*Sinaiticus*) or B (*Vaticanus*) or A (*Alexandrinus*), especially if any one of them stands alone in its version of the text. This fact is documented in the following:

Stewart Custer, p.1 (see previous note).

Kurt Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. 2nd edition. Translated by Erroll R. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1989).

David Alan Black, *New Testament Textual Criticism: A Concise Guide* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), p. 37

W. Edward Glenny, "Defining the Terms." In *The Bible Version Debate: The Perspective of Central Baptist Theological Seminary* (Minneapolis: Central Baptist Seminary, 1997), pp. 45-46.

Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford, 1992), p.175.

^t Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p.9

^u For example, *The Concise Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia* (Third Edition Columbia University Press, 1994) dates *Vaticanus* as 4th century and *Alexandrinus* as 5th century. See: www.encyclopedia.com/articles/01442.html.

^v Microsoft Word 97® has a help file entry that reads as follows:

Flesch Reading Ease score

Rates text on a 100-point scale; the higher the score, the easier it is to understand the document. For most standard documents, aim for a score of approximately 60 to 70.

Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score

Rates text on a U.S. grade-school level. For example, a score of 8.0 means that an eighth grader can understand the document. For most standard documents, aim for a score of approximately 7.0 to 8.0.

^w *Butical Quenk: A Fable*. © Aric Blumer, 1999. Used by permission.

^x The Texas A & M study results, as well as Kohlenberger's are from *Words about the Word*, John Kohlenberger (Zondervan, 1987), pp. 60-61.

^y James White has written a pamphlet (*New Age Bible Versions Refuted*) responding to the claims

(End notes continued...)

of Gail Riplinger, much of which he has posted on the Internet. White did some investigating and found that Riplinger's degrees are in interior decorating and her teaching experience was also in that field. The Internet article is currently at <http://www.aomin.org/NABVR.html>.

^z There are, however, words and phrases in the KJV that are in few, if any, MSS. They were added to the TR by Erasmus, its compiler, usually from the Vulgate. The following chart details a few examples.

	TR & KJV	Majority Text
Rev. 17:8	<i>ouk esti kaiper esti</i> "and is not, and yet is"	<i>ouk estin kai parestai</i> "and is not and will come "
Rev.22:16-21 (Erasmus had no Greek MSS containing these verses)	Approximately 28 readings not found in any MS, most of which do not impact the translation. The most noticeable is in v.19 where TR has " <u>book of life</u> "	" <u>tree of life</u> "
Rev. 1:8	"saith the Lord"	"says the Lord God "
Acts 8:37	"and Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God"	omit
Acts 9:5	"it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks"	omit (the phrase is in Acts 26, however)
Eph 1:18	"eyes of your understanding"	"eyes of your heart "
Eph 3:9	"fellowship of the mystery"	" administration of the mystery"

These examples are in James White, pp.67-68. I personally verified several.

^{aa} Edward M. Panosian, *What is the Inspired Word of God? A Look at the Textual Controversy*. (Pamphlet consisting of a reprinted article from the Feb. 1979 issue of Faith for the Family. Bob Jones University), p. 5.

See also Custer, pp. 26-29, where he cites specific affirmations of nearly all the fundamental doctrines in the works of Westcott and Hort, documenting the titles and page numbers for each. He concludes on p. 29: "These are not the ideas of unsaved men, much less of abominable reprobates. . . . The real question, however, is not whether Westcott and Hort can be approved on all points. It is whether the principles on which they drew up their Greek New Testament were valid."

^{bb} Riplinger also claims B.F. Westcott is the same person as a Londong mortician with spiritist tendencies named W. W. Westcott. However, public records show that these were two different men born some twenty years apart.

^{cc} David W. Cloud, also a KJV defender, has transcribed a tape recorded testimony by Logsdon which he says he published in *O Timothy* magazine volume 9, issue 1. Details are currently at <http://www.whidbey.net/~dcloud/articles/logsdon2.htm>.