

“KJV Only” Addendum

- **Second Revision and Expanded** -

written by Jonathan R. Krohnfeldt

The following is a sampling of the extra information that could not be included in Bob DeWaay’s article “KJV Only?” The majority of what is included addresses G.A. Riplinger’s book *New Age Bible Versions*. As all translations have their shortcomings, the KJV is no exception. Therefore, some general critiques of the 1611 King James Version (KJV) are also included. However, **this work should not be considered a polemic against the KJV, but against the KJV-only position.** Comments concerning the KJV are meant to help clarify some of the reasons why the KJV-only position is untenable.

Misquotations

In any research project that is to be considered credible, the accurate use of authorities and sources is crucial. Therefore, when mishandling of information or misquotation occurs, not only is the persuasiveness of the work hindered, but the credibility of the researcher is also brought into question. In a large research piece a few accidental misquotations may perhaps be excused, if the thesis does not stand or fall on those quotations. However, when an entire thesis is supported in large by numerous misquotations and mishandled information, the motive of the researcher, as well as the work’s credibility, must be addressed. It is such careless handling of information that plagues *New Age Bible Versions*. The following is only a small sample of what was uncovered in the research into Riplinger’s book. To help understand the number and seriousness of errors uncovered in *New Age Bible Versions*, it must be kept in mind that the following misquotations are derived from only a handful of the dozens of sources used by Riplinger. Regretfully, due to the number and nature of her misquotations, I constantly needed to ask myself, “Are her misquotations due to carelessness, or are they purposeful?” Also, to aid the reader, when quotation comparison is done, the specific words in Riplinger’s quotation and the original source are highlighted.

Quotes?

RIPLINGER:

“He [Edwin Palmer] also edited the *NIV Study Bible* which Zondervan says includes the **‘liberal position.’**”¹

ACTUAL:

“A unique element of its [*NIV Study Bible*] materials, besides their volume, is that they represent no single theological alignment. The notes often present more than one possible understanding and, where they differ, present both the conservative and **liberal positions** on introduction, historicity, and dating.”²

The context provides a clear understanding of the authors thought. When seen in its entirety, the quotation no longer has the sinister edge produced by lack of context.

RIPLINGER:

“Even the *NIV Concordance* editor concedes that this century’s versions are a deviation from the text type used, as Blavatsky said, ‘for nearly 1500 years.’ He acknowledges, **‘A century ago - even a half century ago...nothing seriously threatened these standards.’**”³

ACTUAL:

“**A century ago - even *half* a century ago** - these chapters would not have been necessary. The Authorized or King James Version (KJV) had reigned supreme for three centuries and was the only real choice for Protestants. The standard Catholic version was the Douay-Rheims translation of the Latin Vulgate. For Jewish readers there was the Holy Scriptures According to the Masoretic Text. True, there were other English versions at this time, many of which are still in print, but **nothing seriously threatened these standards** until the appearance of the Revised Standard Version (RSV) New Testament in 1946. With the

¹G.A. Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*.(A.V. Publications, 1994), p.231.

²John R. Kohlenberger, *Words about the Word*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan), p. 161.

³G.A. Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*.(A.V. Publications, 1994), p.28.

publication of the RSV Old Testament in 1952, the question ‘Which Bible?’ was truly born. And with each passing year the number of possible answers has increased.”⁴

In Riplinger’s quotation she would lead us to believe that the *NIV Concordance* editor is speaking about text types. However, examining the primary source reveals a number of things. She has omitted a substantial amount of information by the use of ellipses, a procedure that must be used cautiously. When done carelessly a change of meaning can easily result. The amount of information omitted in Riplinger’s quotation does just that -changes the meaning of the author. In the primary source, it is the translations (KJV, Douay-Rheims, and Jewish translations) that were the threatened standards, not text types. Riplinger has omitted crucial information to make it seem to speak of text types, and support her theory that all non-Textus-Receptus texts have been corrupted by a “New Age” conspiracy. This practice, as will be seen, pervades the entire book.

RIPLINGER:

“The pressure to change the bible to conform to this One World Religion is conceded by ‘insiders’ on new version projects....**‘[T]he question of good or bad translation is no longer a linguistic one but a doctrinal one.’** John Kohlenberger *The N.I.V. Concordance*.”⁵
(ellipses mine. A quotation of another author was omitted)

ACTUAL:

“No one denies that the LB [Living Bible] communicates. Many, however, are concerned with *what* it communicates. In fact, after noting that **‘the question of good or bad translations is no longer a linguistic question, but a Doctrinal one,’** the writer of the introduction to the Catholic Edition of 1976 comments:

Perhaps more than other translations, this translation cannot be used as a basis for Doctrinal or traditional disputes....People from various Doctrinal traditions may rejoice or be

⁴John R. Kohlenberger, *Words about the Word*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan), p. 54.

⁵Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*. p.16.

chagrined at the particular translations found within this volume, depending on whether or not the translation supports their particular Doctrinal bias.”⁶ (ellipses in original)

A number of things can be said concerning this quotation. First, Riplinger attributes the quotation to Kohlenberger. However, looking at the full context it is seen that the quotation she uses is actually Kohlenberger quoting “the writer of the introduction to the Catholic Edition” of the Living Bible. Secondly, Riplinger handles the mechanics and verbiage of the quotation carelessly. She drops the “s” on “translations,” omits the second use of the word “question,” omits the comma that follows it, and fails to capitalize “Doctrinal.” As an aside, Riplinger does not capitalize “Bible,” a practice that she engages in throughout her book. This is not only technically incorrect, but capitalizing it identifies it respectfully.

The most significant element in her manipulation of this quotation is what is done to the word “translations.” By dropping the “s” she has effectively changed it from being used as noun (this or that particular translation), to it being used as a verb (the process of translating). This is an absolute change in meaning and is the product of careless scholarship. It is clear that this needed to be done to support her theory concerning translators: that translators are looking only to promote a specific doctrine, not to give an accurate translation. This very idea preceded her above quotation: “The pressure to change the bible to conform to this One World Religion is conceded by ‘insiders’ on new version projects.”⁷

RIPLINGER:

“Their subversive and clandestine approach continued, as seen ten years later when Westcott writes to Hort, ‘...**strike blindly...much evil would result from the public discussion.**’”⁸

ACTUAL:

⁶Kohlenberger, *Words about the Word*. p. 88,89.

⁷Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*. p.16.

⁸Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*. p.408.

“To the Rev. J. F. Wickenden
Harrow, 14th November [1854].

...Have you entered into the Maurice controversy? I only hope it may pass away quietly. At first onset we always **strike blindly**; and **much evil would result from the public discussion** of the moot points just now. It is well, I believe, that they have been named; and it will be well for men to get familiarised with them. Then at length they may debate if they please. This is a strange symptom of belief or disbelief - that Mr. Maurice’s views on the Atonement seem to have called forth comparatively little criticism.”⁹ (ellipses in original)

The first thing that must be said is that the letter is addressed to Rev. J.F. Wickenden not Hort. Riplinger’s quotation is supposed to be evidence to support her theory on how Westcott and Hort dealt with their Greek text. In the original, however, it has nothing to do with Greek texts. Westcott is writing concerning the controversy over “Mr. Maurice’s views on the Atonement,” whatever they may have been. Furthermore, the quoted words of Westcott are simply stating a fact; namely, that harm can result when we jump into debates and discussions prematurely without fully understanding the issues.

RIPLINGER:

“The Greek text used to translate the NIV, NASB and others was an edition drastically altered by a Spiritualist (one who seeks contact with the dead through seances), who believed he was in the ‘**new age**.’¹⁰

ACTUAL:

“In spite of the innumerable sorrows and distresses by which we are beset, the outlook is not without encouragement. There are signs that English Churchmen - to look no further - are coming to realize the unique greatness of the spiritual charge which the Prayer Book lays

⁹Brooke Foss Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott*, ed. Arthur Westcott. (New York: MacMillan Company, 1903), vol. 1, p. 229.

¹⁰Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*. p.2.

upon them; signs that they are learning that the master-truth which is now brought home to us, that our possessions, our efficiency, our life itself, depend on others, must find active expression through the faith of Christ; signs that the co-operation of men widely different in character and place will manifest to the world the social power of the Gospel; signs that once more in the face of unbelief and non-belief the Son of Man will vindicate His sovereignty by showing that He satisfies every need and every capacity which the struggles of a **new age** have disclosed.”¹¹

Westcott words are completely benign, far from any conception of a “new age” as Riplinger would have us believe. He did not believe in *the* “new age,” with crystals, ascended masters, and the like, but simply a new time in history with its own unique struggles. Westcott even acknowledges the sovereignty of the Son of Man. This is an odd statement for someone who wants to corrupt Greek texts and hide the deity of Christ. Also, as an aside, this is the first footnoted quotation in the book. Misrepresentation is not the ideal way to begin a book.

RIPLINGER:

“Lest anyone contend that the ‘Christians’ or New Greek editors are not preaching a pantheistic philosophy, Westcott and Hort give a detailed description of their ‘one life’ philosophy.

‘To me it appears that the Spirit is teaching us now above all things the unity of life, of all things, of all beings, of the seen and of the unseen...We view...men as disconnected, but this is simply a consequence of our limited powers. To God all life that is truly life is one...’There can be no doubt that the uniform tendency of recent research is to establish in many unexpected ways the closeness of the connections by which we are bound one to another. In proportion as we know more fully, this connection is found to be more powerful and far reaching. It is the element - one element - in the idea of life which has been revealed to us this age...this little life which is now my own is part of a

¹¹Brooke Foss Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott*, ed. Arthur Westcott (New York: MacMillan Company, 1903), vol. 2, p. 252.

vaster life.”¹² (*I could not obtain the source(s) for the remainder of the quotation*)

ACTUAL:

“**To me it appears that the Spirit is teaching us now above all things the unity of life, of all life, nay, of all being, of the seen and the unseen;** and that specially for the inspiration of our action He is leading us to give reality to the fellowship of man with men and of man with God.”¹³

“Dear Miss Cordeux - On my return home I found your questions. They are indeed questions which must always haunt us, and to which we cannot find any complete answer. But all seems to me to lie implicitly in the fact to which consciousness witnesses most clearly, the coexistence of finite beings with an Infinite Being. If a finite being exists with power of self-determination, there must be the possibility of self-assertion, *i.e.* sin, and of all that must follow from this disharmony. **We view** effects dispersedly and in succession, and **men as disconnected, but this is simply a consequence of our limited powers.** To God ‘all creation is one act at once.’”¹⁴

“I naturally turned to the lines of Miss Rossetti. They are, I think, admirable in thought and form, worthy of marble. The last piece [‘Miracles’] I had read before. It seems to me to express a marked truth. We see fragments of life, and dare to pass judgement of them severally. **To God all life that is truly life is one.**”¹⁵

The rest of the Riplinger’s eclectic quotation I could not find in the sources I possessed. Of the pages listed for reference from Westcott’s “Life and Letters,” three pages (147, 148, 239) had nothing to do with the subject at hand and did not contain one piece of her quotation (a

¹²Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*. p.88.

¹³Brooke Foss Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott* , vol. 2 , p. 232.

¹⁴Brooke Foss Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott*. vol. 2, p. 242.

¹⁵Brooke Foss Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott*. vol. 2, p. 263.

phenomenon that others have discovered in her book: James White, Bob and Gretchen Passitino). The only other source listed in her footnote is Westcott's "Gospel of the Resurrection," where she says, he "refers to the Living One."¹⁶

If Westcott subscribed to a "pantheistic philosophy," it seems strange that she would need to compile fragments from letters addressed to three different persons (and possibly more if I could find the primary source to the remainder of here quotation), then combine these quotations from three completely different letters (a practice for which ellipses should not be used) to form an eclectic quotation labeled "a detailed description." Also, she attributes her quotation to Westcott and Hort when all of the letters are actually written by Westcott. They are not even addressed to Hort, let alone written by him.

One need only read the fragments in context to see that it is not pantheism being talked about. In the first quotation Westcott is writing to Canon Austen, and speaking of unity of fellowship and purpose, not of substance or being. His comments were birthed from his recent study in Ephesians. Later in that same letter Westcott says,

If we believe in the unity shown under three different aspects in Eph. ii. 14-18, hope and confidence will return, when we look on the unfathomable sadnesses of life; if we believe that for each one of us a work is prepared which we can do if we surrender ourselves of God (ii.10), we shall be saved from the restless anxiety of self-chosen plans; if we believe that all the details of ordinary life have a spiritual side and opportunities of service (v. 20 f.; comp. Col. iii.17), we shall be enabled perhaps to preach our Gospel a little more effectually in life.¹⁷

Riplinger also changes "of all life" to read "of all things," drops "nay," and adds an "s" to "being."

The second quotation is Westcott's answer to common philosophical questions: "How can an infinite being and a finite being coexist?" and "How does God perceive the universe: simultaneously or as successive events?" These questions are still addressed in almost every work on systematic theology. As to the final quotation, it is simply a comment on a poem. Again, the

¹⁶Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, footnote 53, p.656

¹⁷Brooke Foss Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott*. vol. 2, p. 232.

“oneness” is how God views reality. Also, it would be odd for Westcott to propose “the coexistence of finite beings with an Infinite Being” if he believed that all is God and God is all.

RIPLINGER:

“Liberty University’s Dean Norman Geisler adds: **‘We should be particularly wary when someone refers to Jesus Christ as ‘the Christ...’**”¹⁸

ACTUAL:

‘We should be particularly wary when someone refers to Jesus Christ as ‘the Christ spirit’ or ‘Christ-consciousness.’”¹⁹

Here again is an excellent example of Riplinger’s scholarship. To support her conspiracy theory and malign modern translations, she omits part of the original source. The meaning of the original has been changed just enough to support her theory.

RIPLINGER:

“The NIV’s chief editor vaunts his version’s heresy saying:
‘[F]ew clear and decisive texts say that Jesus is God.’”²⁰

ACTUAL:

“A striking case of where the KJV, following bad Greek copies of the original text, changed the original is John 1:18. The KJV says: ‘No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.’ John 1:18, as inspired by the Holy Spirit, is one of those **few clear and decisive texts that declare that Jesus is God**. But, without fault of its own, the KJV, following inferior manuscripts, altered what the Holy Spirit said through John, calling Jesus ‘Son.’ Using the archaic language of the KJV, the verse should read: ‘No man

¹⁸ Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 318.

¹⁹J. Yutaka Amano and Norman L. Geisler, *The Infiltration of the New Age* (Tyndale House Publishers, 1991), p.142.

²⁰ Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 2.

hath seen God at any time; the only begotten God, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.”²¹

This is another very shocking quotation by Riplinger. She has changed the entire meaning of Palmer’s words. Riplinger has made Palmer say the almost the exact opposite of his original piece.

Maligning of Character

One reoccurring theme throughout Riplinger’s book is her attack on Westcott and Hort. Of the two, Westcott seems to take the most heat. Throughout *New Age Bible Versions*, Riplinger paints a picture that Westcott was an occultist who corrupted the Greek text he and Hort compiled. How sure is she concerning her accusations? Reading the book would lead one to believe that the evidence (which is either nonexistent or based on misquotes) is rock solid. However, she betrays her theory and confidence in the back of her book. In footnote 128, Riplinger begins:

The articles on Hermetic doctrine in Blavatsky’s *Theosophical Dictionary* ‘were contributed at the special request of H.P.B. by Brother W.W. Westcott.’” She mentions B.F.

Westcott, the subject of this past chapter, several times in her other books. B.F. Westcott’s son points out that his father’s signature was almost always read as W., not B., preceding [sic] his last name. (See *Life of Westcott*, p.450.) The similar identity of these two is not a matter of historical record.²²

This is very shaky evidence to begin with (this evidence was debunked by the Passatinos in their review of *New Age Bible Versions*²³), but she uses it anyway. However, by the end of her lengthy

²¹ Edwin H. Palmer, *Isn’t the King James Version Good Enough? (The KJV and the NIV Compared)*, *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, ed. Richard P. Polcyn (Zondervan, 1986), 143.

²² Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*. footnote 128, p.666.

²³ Bob and Gretchen Passantino, *New Age Bible Versions: A Critical Review (Answers in Action, P.O. Box 2067, Costa Mesa, California 92628. (714.646.9042))*.

footnote, Riplinger discloses the validity of her evidence: “The connection between B.F. Westcott and the activities attributed to the possible allonym W.W. Westcott are speculation on my part.”²⁴ To malign and misrepresent the character of an individual with such confidence throughout an entire book, and only admit it as speculation in a footnote buried at the end of the book, is dishonest and completely unacceptable. How many readers will actually comb through every footnote in her book? The answer is obvious. Most will come away confidently thinking, based on “evidence,” that Westcott was an occultist. This is unfair to Westcott and the readers of her book.

Semantics

Another interesting point Riplinger raises has to do with the use of certain words by the translators. She claims that by using words like “teacher” instead of “master,” or using “grave” instead of the KJV’s “hell,” is obscuring the deity of Christ and changing the destination of unbelievers. As before, however, a closer look reveals something quite different. Of the numerous charts contained in her book that compare a word used in the KJV with the one used in other translations, I have chosen a few.

In chapter 18 Riplinger makes a comparison between the use of “grave” and “hades” as opposed to the KJV’s “hell.” Her basic claim is that by transliterating “sheol” or translating it as “grave,” or “hades,” the new versions are denying hell and promoting a “new age” doctrine. The following is an excerpt from the table comparing the NIV’s “grave” with the KJV’s “hell.”²⁵

NIV, NASB	VERSE	KJV
grave	Job 11:8	hell
grave	Ps. 116:3	hell
grave	Isa. 5:14	hell

²⁴Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*. footnote 128, p.667.

²⁵Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 293.

grave	Ezek 31:16	hell
grave/hades	Acts 2:27	hell

Riplinger’s book is filled with charts such as these that, upon closer examination, prove nothing. In fact, in many cases her own charts and reasoning show the KJV to be influenced by “new age” philosophies as well (a phenomenon that we will look at later). The above chart is no exception.

Before addressing the theological issue behind her objection, let us take a look at her evidence. The actual chart in the book gives approximately twenty five verse comparisons showing the supposed obscuring of Biblical truths. Also on page 294, Riplinger makes the claim that of the 67 times the Hebrew word “Sheol” appears in the Old Testament (OT), the KJV translates it “hell,” while the New American Standard Bible (NASB) transliterates it (i.e. writing it as it sounds, “Sheol”).

Contrary to her claims concerning the KJV’s translation of the Hebrew word “Sheol,” the KJV actually translates it as “grave” 28 times (e.g. Gen 37:35; 1Sam. 2:6; Job 14:13; Psa. 30:3; Psa. 89:48; Sol.8:6; Isa. 38:10; Hos 13:14). Therefore, not only is her claim concerning the KJV translation of “Sheol” completely false, but her own theory shows the KJV to be corrupted as well. This type of information filtering is the foundation of her book. All information that would paint a grim picture of other translations is included, and all the information that would make the KJV look just as grim is ignored.

As to the theological significance concerning the idea of Sheol, hades, and hell - First it should be understood that “Sheol” in the OT, was generally used to denote the state of death. Next, it should be noticed that a distinction is made between hades and hell in the New Testament (NT). As Joachim Jeremias points out, “This distinction is *a*. That Hades receives the ungodly only for the intervening period between death and resurrection, whereas Gehenna [hell] is their place of punishment in the last judgement; the judgement of the former is thus provisional but the torment of the latter eternal...”²⁶ Therefore, in the Scriptures, hades and paradise seem to be respectively, pre-resurrection states of torment for the unrighteous (Luke

²⁶Joachim Jeremias, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 1983), vol. 1, pp. 657-68.

16:22-24), and blessing for the righteous (Luke 16:22; 23:43).

There are, however indications that these places are also the final places of the righteous and unrighteous, as Paul says being absent from the body is to be present with the Lord (2Cor. 5:8; 1Phil 1:23), or the thief on the cross that would soon be in paradise (Luke 23:43). The relationship of these scriptures can be understood as Millard Erickson says, “Yet while the place of the intermediate and final states may be the same, the experiences of paradise and Hades are doubtlessly not as intense as what will ultimately be, since the person is in a somewhat incomplete condition.”²⁷

The other chart chosen for examination charges that by using “teacher” instead of “master,” the “new versions” obscure the Lordship of Jesus. The following is an excerpt from the chart in her book.²⁸

NIV, NASB, et al.	VERSE	KJV
Teacher	Matt 8:19	Master
Teacher	Mark 5:35	Master
Teacher	Luke 8:49	Master
Teacher	John 11:28	Master

The answer to her comparison chart is quite simple. The Greek word used in all of the comparisons she gives (except where she makes four comparisons between “Rabbi” and “Master”), is *didaskalos*. This word simply means “teacher.” Secondly, the word “master” in older English is used for “teacher” (e.g. schoolmaster).

“Diana vs. Artemis” or is it “Latin vs. Greek”

In *New Age Bible Versions*, Riplinger also tries to show that the “new versions” contain shoddy scholarship which obscures truth, and indoctrinates us for the “new age.” One issue is whether the name “Artemis” or the name “Diana” should be used for the Ephesian goddess in

²⁷Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1985), pp. 1183-84.

²⁸Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 323.

Acts 19:24, 27,28,34, and 35. Riplinger claims, “The use of the name ‘Diana’ [in the KJV], a dynamic equivalency (translating a word as meant and not as written), shows the breadth of scholarship of the KJV translators.”²⁹ The use of Artemis, she continues, is “transliterated directly from the Greek bible into new versions, clearly identified the goddess to the Greek, but *not* to ‘all Asia and the world’ for whom the KJV is intended.”³⁰ Does this really show greater scholarship or a lack thereof?

The first thing that Riplinger ignores is the fact of syncretism. In the ancient world, when cultures merged or mixed, their respective gods, due to similar characteristics, where many times identified with each other, a tendency that continues today in pluralism. In Roman mythology, therefore, we have the Roman god Jupiter identified with the Greek god Zeus, and Roman goddess Juno identified with the Greek goddess Hera. This fact alone should be sufficient to settle most questions concerning the use of the two names. The KJV translators simply chose to identify the goddess by the Latin name “Diana” instead of the Greek name “Artemis.” More, however, can be said.

If we first consider the title of Artemis, several things are shown. While it is true that the original Ephesian deity was distinct from the Greek goddess Artemis,³¹ this fact should be understood in its full historical context. It was the Greeks who first identified their goddess Artemis with the Asiatic deity. *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology* states, “It is a opinion almost universally adopted, that she [Artemis of the Ephesians] was an ancient Asiatic divinity whose worship the Greeks found established in Ionia, when they settled there, and that, for some resemblance they discovered, they applied to her the name of Artemis.”³² This title is even used in the 5th century B.C. by Herodotus. In his *History of the Greek and Persian War* he writes, “The Ephesians, when he [Cræsus] laid siege to the place, made an offering of their city to Artemis, by stretching a rope from the town wall to the temple of the goddess, which was distant from the ancient city, then besieged by Cræsus, a space of fifteen hundred

²⁹Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 127.

³⁰Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 127.

³¹William Smith, D.C.L, L.L.D., ed. *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology by Various Writers* (New York: AMS Press, 1967), vol. 1, p. 376.

³²William Smith, ed. *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, p.376

yards.”³³ Unfortunately, as so many times happens, the original name of the Asiatic deity has long been lost. However, to identify the goddess as Artemis of the Ephesians is completely acceptable, and shows no lack of historical accuracy. The subtle distinction made between the Greek Artemis and the Ephesian Artemis should be remembered, but for practical purposes the use of Artemis produces no problems.

The examination of the title “Diana” also turns up some interesting facts, none of which support Riplinger’s conspiracy theory. The first thing to notice is that it is a Latin name. Looking in a Latin dictionary and one will find an entry for Diana. The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* provides these definitions: “A Roman goddess, anciently identified with Artemis and other deities. *b.* the moon.”³⁴ Also, Diana was “an original Italian divinity, whom the Romans completely identified with the Greek Artemis” whose name and worship came from, and was introduced by, the Latins and Sabines.³⁵

Once this is realized, another element helps to clarify the issue. The KJV translators were more fluent in Latin than in Greek and therefore relied many times on the Latin. If a person consults Acts 19:34 in the *Latin Vulgate* they will find this reading: “*quem ut cognoverunt Iudaeum esse vox facta est una omnium quasi per horas duas clamantium magna **Diana** Ephesiorum*”³⁶ (emphasis mine). It appears that the KJV translators decided, for some reason, to use the Latin name instead of the Greek name. The appearance of Diana in the *Latin Vulgate* would have been the equivalent of the Greek Artemis.

“Lucifer” vs “The Morning Star”

This controversy is in the same vein as the “Artemis/Diana” dispute. Riplinger claims that the new versions “star of the morning” or “morning star” in Isaiah 14:12, as opposed to the KJV’s “Lucifer,” is an attempt to obscure the identity of Satan, and equate Lucifer with Jesus

³³Herodotus, *History of the Greek and Persian War*, Book I.26

³⁴*Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 536.

³⁵William Smith, ed. *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, p.1000

³⁶*Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).

who is called the “morning star” in Rev. 22:16.³⁷ As with all her claims, a closer look reveals something more benign.

It is first discovered that the word “lucifer” is a Latin word and used in the *Latin Vulgate* in Isaiah 14:12. The Vulgate reads, “*quomodo cecidisti de caelo **lucifer** qui mane oriebaris corruisiti in terram qui vulnerabas gentes*”³⁸ (emphasis mine). Now, turning to the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* for the definition of “lucifer,” one finds, “**1.** Light-bringing, light-bearing. **2.** (masc. as sb.) The morning star; (mythol.) The son of Aurora and Cephalus, and father of Ceyx. **b.** (poet. For ‘morning’ or ‘day’).”³⁹ In Latin this was an accurate translation of *belel*, the Hebrew word here. It means “shine”⁴⁰ or “shining one.”

With this in mind, recall again that the KJV translators utilized the Latin in their translating. For some reason (perhaps because they felt the passage spoke solely of Satan, and not with a double meaning of Satan and the King of Babylon) they chose to carry over the Latin word “lucifer” and capitalize it, effectively creating a proper noun were none had existed before.

As for the “equating Satan with Jesus” charge, a few words are needed. In scripture we often see contrasts between the truth and the lie. For example, we have the real “Christ” and the false “Christ,” the real “God” and the false “god” of this age. Therefore, Jesus is the true “morning star,” whereas Satan would be the counterfeit. An interesting association is made by Jesus between himself and the serpent that Moses lifted up in the desert. We do not, however, think that Jesus is associating himself with the Satan who is call the “serpent” (Gen. 3:1; Rev. 20:2). It is merely an image of looking to God’s provision for salvation.

Lastly, if such an application of the same name definitely implies equation, then Riplinger indicts the KJV in her own book. On page 123 of her book, attempting to reveal the Mother of Harlots, Riplinger quotes an inscription on a stone from Karnac: “It reads, ‘The

³⁷Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, p.40-45

³⁸*Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*.

³⁹*Oxford Latin Dictionary*, p.1045.

⁴⁰R. Laird Harris ed., *Theological Workbook of the Old Testament* (Moody Bible Institute, 1980), vol. 1, p.217.

Divine Mother and Lady, Queen of Heaven, Morning Star.” Certainly this inscription pre-dates the NT. Therefore, by her reasoning, the name “morning star” given to Jesus in Rev. 22:16 (this is done in the KJV, as well as all other translations), shows the KJV to be corrupted by a “new age” conspiracy as well.

“Which King James Version?”

This is a section heading in Jack P. Lewis’ book “The English Bible from KJV to NIV: A History and Evaluation,” which is an excellent point. He says, “Few people seem conscious of the fact that a currently circulating King James Bible differs in significant details (though not in general content) from the one issued in 1611; they assume that the King James is a fixed phenomenon like ‘the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints’ (Jude 3; ASV).” I just saw a book publisher offering a 1611 version that has the original spelling and punctuation. It would be interesting to find out how most of us would fair when confronted with “fet,” “middles,” and “creeple.” Lewis raises many excellent points and the following is summary of the most interesting.

- Due to printer errors, the original 1611 read “Then cometh Judas” (Matt. 26:36) instead of “Then cometh Jesus.”⁴¹
- The carelessness of 17th century printing is shown to produce strange and unorthodox results:

“Printers’ errors in various alter printings created oddities like the ‘Wicked Bible’ (which omitted ‘not’ from the seventh of the ten commandments), the ‘Unrighteous Bible’ (in which the unrighteous inherit the Kingdom), the ‘Vinegar Bible’ (with its ‘Parable of the Vinegar’), the ‘Ears to Ear Bible,’ and many others.”⁴²

⁴¹Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible, from KJV to NIV: A History and Evaluation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991), p.37.

⁴²Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.38

Though these were corrected, Lewis points out one error that remains. In Zechariah 4:7 a printers error ran together “head” and “stone,” the result is of course “headstone,” a very different meaning than “head stone.”⁴³

Yet the Zechariah error remains uncorrected. *“Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain: and he shall bring forth the headstone thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it”* (KJV). The question that needs to be raised is “did God inspire the errors in the printing?” Many KJV-only advocates believe in the inspiration of the 1611. Therefore they would have to hold to some type of inspired-error theory. However, some may contend that it is the original manuscript compiled by the translators of the KJV that was inspired. How do we obtain a copy of that? This would have to be published to reach the general public. They would then still have to ask if God preserved or inspired the printing. If it is not inspired or somehow God-approved, then it is not the God-delivered translation for the world.

What then do we do with the idea God of preserving the words in the published versions? Individuals in the 17th century would have obtained a copy of the “Wicked Bible,” or the “Unrighteous Bible?” Did they have to consider the errors inspired? This may seem absurd, but today’s KJV only supporters would have to hold such a position concerning Zechariah 4:7. Where does one draw the line for what errors are inspired and which are not? I raise these points only to show the issues that need to be addressed if it is claimed that the KJV is the Bible that God delivered for the world to read.

One very interesting point concerning version differences is the fact that before 1629 the KJV contained the Apocrypha. Lewis writes, “A 1629 edition was the first to omit the Apocrypha, but the omission did not become general until the nineteenth century.”⁴⁴ I say very interesting because following Riplinger’s guilt by association logic (I’m sure she would not approve of the Apocrypha) this would disqualify the KJV from acceptable translations.

Other revisions, addition of notes and tables, expanded utilization of italics, updating of the language, spelling and punctuation, et cetera are all areas of change that occurred less the 200 years after the first addition.⁴⁵ These revisions, however, even continued into the 20th century.

⁴³Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.38

⁴⁴Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.38

⁴⁵Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.39

Lewis writes, “Additional revision in punctuation, spelling, and running heads was done by the Bible Society in 1932.”⁴⁶ And he continues,

The American Bible Society in the nineteenth century, after examining six editions of the KJV then circulating and finding 24,000 variants in the text and punctuation, claimed that ‘of the great number, there is not one which mars the integrity of the text or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible’; but the Society did a revision in 1860 which was later abandoned because of protests from its supporters.⁴⁷

Some examples of spelling changes given by Lewis were, “‘Hierusalem,’ ‘Marie,’ ‘assone,’ ‘foorth,’ ‘shalbe,’ ‘fet,’ ‘creeple,’ ‘fift,’ ‘sirt,’ ‘ioy,’ ‘middles,’ ‘charet,’ and the like were no longer used.”⁴⁸

Changes in Language

This is probably one of the most important areas concerning the KJV debate. Lewis points out that for most people accustomed to reading from the KJV, many of the words and phrases that will be listed may not seem so strange.⁴⁹ However, for those not familiar with the KJV, and perhaps a few that are familiar with it, the following words and phrases will be quite strange, if not completely unintelligible.

The following selections were provided by Lewis⁵⁰ and confirmed by me, but more could be found by a general reading of the KJV version.

“And Mt. Sinai was altogether on a smoke” (Exodus 19:18)

“And all that brake his skull” (Judges 9:53)

⁴⁶Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.40

⁴⁷Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.39,40

⁴⁸Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.39

⁴⁹Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.53

⁵⁰Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.54

“Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing” (Ps. 5:6)

“Solomon loved many strange women” (I Kings 11:1)

“Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels” (II Corinthians 6:12)

“The noise thereof sheweth concerning it, the cattle also concerning the vapour”
(Job 36:33)

Concerning Job 36:23, I must thoroughly agree with Lewis, who comments in a footnote, that “This verse has no clear meaning at all.”⁵¹ Unlike some of the examples, whose meaning may be clarified by the context, the context in this case did not help. I had to consult the NASB to understand what was being said.

Obsolete words are one problem, but how about words that are still in use but convey a totally different meaning? The result can be destructive or quite humorous. The word used “peculiar,” is used in the KJV and means “possessed by a particular person.” However, to the modern reader it means “strange,” or “odd.”

Deuteronomy 14:2 For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God, and the LORD hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth.

Titus 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

1Peter 2:9 But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light

⁵¹Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, foot note 45 on p.54

The change in meaning has not only contributed to a misunderstanding of scripture, but such misunderstanding has given rise to humorous results. Many have used these verses to show that our dress needs to be odd and stand out among the populace. Therefore, we have people dressing in Mennonite or Amish fashion and using these verses to justify their clothing choice. In fact, just recently I read an E-mail, posted on a parenting group that my wife subscribes to, concerning this issue. In it a woman brought up 1 Peter 2:9 in support of her clothing choice. If a person chooses to dress in such a fashion that is one thing, but to misuse scripture (due to misunderstanding of archaic language) in support is unacceptable

That may be a humorous example, but a more serious example can be given. In his article, Bob DeWaay brought up an excellent example that needs repeating. In the KJV the word “prevent” is used. However, the word actually means “come before.

Psalm 88:13 But unto thee have I cried, O LORD; and in the morning shall my prayer prevent thee.

Psalm 119:147,148 I prevented the dawning of the morning, and cried: I hoped in thy word. Mine eyes prevent the night watches, that I might meditate in thy word.

In modern language, some serious theological statements are being made concerning man’s power and God’s power. The scriptures seem to be saying that we stop not only the rising of the sun, but God himself.

Another interesting example is the word “carriage.” In the KJV it meant “that which was carried, and nowhere in the Bible is it a vehicle.”⁵²

Judges 18:21 So they turned and departed, and put the little ones and the cattle and the carriage before them.

1 Samuel 17:22 And David left his carriage in the hand of the keeper of the carriage, and ran into the army, and came and saluted his brethren.

⁵²Jack Pearl Lewis, *The English Bible*, p.57.

Acts 21:15 And after those days we took up our carriages, and went up to Jerusalem.

Most of us, upon our initial reading, would have a horse drawn carriage in mind. Jack Lewis has several pages documenting KJV words that are still in use but have changed their meaning. They are all quite informative, especially when we consider what such changes in definitions can do to Biblical teaching.

Legerdemain With Charts

Though the following section is facetious, it should not be viewed as less informative. Distressed at the way Riplinger used charts in her book to indict the NASB, I decided to reverse the process. What follows is simple. I have printed the claims and corresponding charts used by Riplinger to malign the NASB or new versions. Next, I used her logic and constructed a claim and chart that showed the KJV to be corrupt and the NASB to be “the” word of God. The purpose of this is to show that her charts are essentially useless in proving anything. All one has to do is make a claim and dig for evidence to support it. Or else one can find discrepancies and build a claim on those. I want to make it clear that “Our Claims” are not to be taken seriously.

Riplinger’s Claim:

“The New Age Dictionary by Alex Jack, editor of the popular East-West Journal, gives New Age definitions for Christian terms. He boasts, ‘[T]his book is only the beginning in the direction of unifying...East and West.’ The left column gives some of his New Age definitions, while the column on the right gives some of his New age definitions, while the column on the right shows how new versions are changing to conform to the New Age.”⁵³

(note: the underlining of “The New Age Dictionary” is not in the original. The title was italicized in the original and would not have been distinct from my italicizing)

Here Riplinger’s basic claim is as follows: if the new versions differ from the KJV in

⁵³Gail Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions* (A.V. Publications), p. 12

not having “Jesus” in front of “Christ,” they are *de facto* new age. Why? Because the New Age uses the term “the Christ” or “Christ.” And if the new versions do not have “Jesus” with “Christ” in every place the KJV does, this is indubitable evidence for a New Age conspiracy. Of course this will only hold if you first accept the KJV a priori as the God-given translation then also accept her new-age conspiracy theory. Below is a chart she uses to show the basis of her conclusions.

NEW AGE DICTIONARY	NEW VERSIONS
Christ: any fully realized person	Drop “Jesus” from Christ

(From chart page 12 of *New Age Bible Versions*)

ANTICHRIST OR CHRIST		
KJV	NEW VERSIONS	NEW AGE / LAST DAYS
Jesus Christ	the Christ	the Christ

(From chart on page 19 of *New Age Bible Versions*)

But what would happen if we applied this reasoning in setting the NASB against the KJV? Lets find out.

Our Claim:

We will see in the following chart that the KJV was quite ahead of its time. Already in 1611, the KJV was preparing the world for the New Age. Part of this preparation involved some shocking omissions. These included dropping “Jesus” from “Christ” and even completely “Jesus Christ our Lord.” Thanks to the NASB these have been restored and the New Age thread pervading the KJV cut short.

VERSE	NASB	KJV
Acts 24:24	Christ Jesus	Christ
Romans 1:4	Jesus Christ our Lord	OMIT
Romans 8:34	Christ Jesus	Christ

Galatians 5:24	Christ Jesus	Christ
Ephesians 3:6	Christ Jesus	Christ
Colossians 4:12	Jesus Christ	Christ
Jude 1:25	Jesus Christ our Lord	OMIT

It is evident that Riplinger chose to ignore the passages and evidence that would incriminate the KJV and thus invalidate her claim. This practice of selecting evidence to support her theory is really the mainstay of many of her charts. Though our claim is concocted, the chart still says something quite significant. If the new versions were so bent on introducing New Age doctrine into the Bible, why include these? They should simply ignore the textual discoveries that allowed these corrections and go with the KJV reading (Textus Receptus).

Riplinger’s Claim:

“When the new versions do use ‘Lord’, it appears they like to use it alone, a ploy which makes their bible a more ‘International’ document.”⁵⁴

“In exclusively using the term ‘the Lord,’ new versions have created a generic religious document. Since only the title is given, anyone of any religion can ‘plug in’ the name of their lord.”⁵⁵

A similar claim as before. The new versions have “changed” the Bible to make it accommodate New Age teaching. Where it differs from the KJV in using “Lord” alone or in place of “God,” this is again is evidence for their New-Age corruptions. Here are some more charts she provides in her book.

NEW AGE DICTIONARY	NEW VERSIONS
--------------------	--------------

⁵⁴*New Age Bible Versions*, p. 332

⁵⁵*New Age Bible Versions*, p. 374

<i>Sanat</i> : [Satan scrambled] Lord of the World	Use 'Lord' alone dropping the identity of Jesus or Jehovah
--	--

(From chart on p. 13 of *New Age Bible Versions*)

VERSE	NIV, NASB, et al.	KJV
Acts 7:59	Lord	God
Acts 8:22	Lord	God
Acts 19:10	The Lord	The Lord Jesus
2 Tim. 2:19	The Lord	Christ

(From chart on p. 332 of *New Age Bible Versions*)

Shocking? Only if you acquiesce to her conspiracy theory. Personally I find nothing shocking in her chart. However, if this is her claim to show New Age infiltration then lets try it out on the KJV.

Our Claim:

In an attempt to prime future generations for the coming anti-Christ, the KJV subtly introduces a generic deity. By using "Lord" alone, the KJV effectively opens the door to deception. "The Lord" could be any being that the world would chose to worship. Even Satan himself would accept such a title. The NASB, however, has returned clarity to these verses, giving the true identity of God.

VERSE	NASB	KJV
Mark 16:19	the Lord Jesus	the Lord
Luke 2:38	God	the Lord
Acts 10:48	Jesus Christ	the Lord
Acts 17:27	God	the Lord
Acts 18:25	Jesus	the Lord
Acts 21:20	God	the Lord

Colossians 3:6	God	the Lord
2 Timothy 2:14	God	the Lord
Revelation 1:8	the Lord God	the Lord

Stunning? Not really. It simply shows the work of textual criticism. The discovery of manuscripts that prove more reliable prompts the changing of some wording. According to Riplinger’s reasoning, however, the KJV would soon find itself on the pyre. But as before, Riplinger effectively ignored all evidence that would subvert the KJV and her position. However, like the previous chart, it actually shows that there is not a conspiracy. If the translators and textual critics were really out to corrupt the Bible in the fashion Riplinger proposes, they would not have made these textual adjustments.

Riplinger’s Claim:

“Gordon Lewis, Christian apologist and cult expert, notes that the New Age ‘word game’ ‘makes the bible endorse what its writers emphatically opposed.’ The following is an overview of the New Age words and doctrines found in new versions. The words are direct quotations from each version.’⁵⁶

Here it is pronouns that signal corruption. According to Riplinger, the new versions have used pronouns to obscure who Jesus is and thereby align themselves with the New Age. Take a look below at a sample of her charts.

VERSE	NASB	KJV
Luke 24:36	he	Jesus
Matthew 2:15	He	Jesus
Revelation 21:4	He	God
Galatians 1:15	He	God

(From chart on p.18 of *New Age Bible Versions*)

⁵⁶ *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 17

ANTI CHRIST OR CHRIST?		
KJV	NEW VERSIONS	NEW AGE / LAST DAYS
Jesus	he	he
Christ	him	him
Jesus Christ	the Christ	the Christ
The name of the Lord	His name	His name

(From chart on p.19 of *New Age Bible Versions*)

What does it show? Definitely not a New Age conspiracy. Again, this is simply a product of textual criticism. Even ignoring that for the moment, it still does not say much. Somehow antecedents do not count in her analysis. If a person simply reads these verses in context, the pronouns would be fully understood. That is how pronouns work. Everyone uses them, even Gail Riplinger. So to use this as a claim of obscuring the identity of God not only devalues textual criticism but is unfair to literature everywhere. Yet, if this is the claim then we will use it.

Our Claim:

True to their form, the KJV translators were using manuscripts that were way ahead of their time. We can see that the manuscripts mask the true identity of Jesus and God the Father. Even more shocking is that the manuscripts use the phrase "his name," a very common phrase in the New Age vocabulary. And true to its form, the NASB successfully thwarts this attempt at New Age indoctrination.

VERSE	NASB	KJV
Luke 5:34	Jesus	he
Luke 7:15	Jesus	he
John 6:40	Father	him
Acts 3:16	name of Jesus	his name
1 Corinthians 1:29	God	his

There is not much more that can be said. Again it is manuscript differences that would produce these differences. But, as usual, Riplinger passes over the examples that would incriminate the KJV.

Riplinger's Claim:

“Our’ must be removed since it is a clear witness against the New Age belief in the ‘universal fatherhood’ of God. The concept that God is Father to all, without the adoption that occurs at the new birth, is a maxim of the New Age and the soapbox on which many liberal churches pose.”⁵⁷

⁵⁷ *New Age Bible Versions*, p.61

WHO IS GOD?		
KJV	NEW VERSIONS	NEW AGE/ LUCIFERIANS
The Holy Spirit	The Spirit	The Spirit
Our Father	The Father	The Father

(From chart on p.18 of *New Age Bible Versions*)

VERSE	KJV	NASB
2 Thessalonians 1:2	God our Father	God the Father
1 Timothy 1:2	God our Father	God the Father

(From chart on p. 61 of *New Age Bible Versions*)

Our Claim:

“In a world of catch-all titles, the NASB makes it clear who God really is. The KJV sides with the New Age and Luciferians on its use of the ambiguous “the Spirit.” The KJV also denies the ‘universal fatherhood’ of God by using “the Father.” However, the NASB shines true. The Spirit is clearly “the Holy Spirit” and “Spirit of Jesus.” And God is truly “our Father.”

WHO IS GOD?			
VERSE	NASB	KJV	NEW AGE/ LUCIFERIANS ⁵⁸
Acts 16:7	Spirit of Jesus	the Spirit	The Spirit
Luke 10:21	the Holy Spirit	in spirit	The Spirit
Galatians 1:3	God our Father	God the Father	God the Father

The last column of the above chart is taken directly from Riplinger’s own book. But,

⁵⁸ The heading and titles are taken right from *New Age Bible Versions*, p. 18 and 61. I used these charts on this page.

as usual, she conveniently overlooks any evidence that would incriminate the KJV and invalidate her claims.

Our Claim:

“Not only must we ask ‘who’ is God when reading the KJV but also ‘where’ is God. For the KJV has done an adequate job of removing God from the pages of Scripture. The NASB, however, stands firm and leaves God where he belongs.”

WHERE IS GOD?		
VERSE	NASB	KJV
1 Samuel 2:25	God	OMIT
Matthew 16:22	God forbid it, Lord!	OMIT
Acts 7:20	God	OMIT
2 Corinthians 7:9	God	OMIT
3 John 1:6	God	OMIT
Revelation 4:11	God	OMIT

Our Claim:

“History testifies that King James was a homosexual. When we compare the NASB with KJV, we see King James had influence over words used by translators. Homosexuality is not explicitly condemned in these verses. Instead, vague phrases like “abusers of themselves with mankind” and “them that defile themselves with mankind” are used. These could mean anything. However, the NASB, having no King to appease, leaves no doubt as to the people being addressed.”

VERSE	NASB	KJV
1 Corinthians	homosexuals	abusers of themselves with mankind
1 Timothy 1:10	homosexuals	them that defile themselves with mankind

To be honest I felt uneasy making this claim. I realized how easy it is to make claims seem quite plausible. One need only create a claim that the evidence, on the surface, supports. And This is what most of her claims are: superficial and contrary to the real evidence. Honestly though, on the surface the above claim is just as viable as any of Riplinger's. I must be very clear again that I do not believe the above claim.

Our Claim:

The consequence for blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is down-played in the KJV. Eternal damnation is only a possibility in the pages of the King James. The NASB, however, clearly prescribes the punishment of such an offense: "guilty of an eternal sin." Guilt, in the NASB, is certain.

CONCERNING BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT		
VERSE	NASB	KJV
Mark 3:29	guilty of an eternal sin	in danger of eternal damnation

There was no real counterpart in Riplinger's book for this claim. I just constructed it because it seemed as just plausible as any of her's.

Our Claim:

Not only does the KJV play down blasphemy of the Holy Spirit, it also plays down sin in general. Sin is either omitted or lessened to a simply “offense, fault,” or “error.” The NASB, as usual, speaks plainly. It calls sin what it is - sin.

VERSE	NASB	KJV
Numbers 8:21	sin	OMIT
2 Corinthians 11:7	sin	offense
2 Corinthians 11:29	sin	offended
Hebrews 9:27	sins	errors
James 5:6	sins	fault
1 Peter 2:20	sin	faults

More creativity on my part. If a person has the time, patience, and a computer Bible these types of charts are easy to construct. Simply search for a word in the version of choice (typically a word that would seem important if omitted or changed), then synchronize those verses with the version you want to deprecate. When all is done you have an instant chart supporting your conspiracy theory.

Our Claim:

Here is a brief collection of some of the other omissions found in the KJV ranging from “love” to “Lord.” You be the judge between the NASB and the KJV.

VERSE	NASB	KJV
Job 39:13	love	OMIT
Proverbs	love	OMIT
Matthew 16:22	Lord	OMIT

Mark 16:20	And they promptly reported all these instructions to Peter and his companions. And after that, Jesus Himself sent out through them from east to west the sacred and imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation.	OMIT
Acts 9:31	enjoy peace	OMIT
Acts 13:34	holy	OMIT
Romans 3:25	He passed over sins previously committed	OMIT
Hebrews 13:11	holy	OMIT
1 Peter 2:2	salvation	OMIT
Revelations 14:5	before the throne of God	OMIT
Revelation 16:5	Holy One	OMIT
Revelations 16:5	Lord	OMIT

The following is a classic example of a confused and self-defeating position.

Riplinger’s Claim:

“The NIV editor’s theory that the lost are destroyed and left to rot in their graves pops up in the NIV’s use of ‘everlasting’ destruction in II Thessalonians 1:9”⁵⁹

VERSE	NEW VERSIONS	KJV
2 Thessalonians 1:9	eternal destruction	everlasting destruction

(From chart on p. 298 of New Age Bible Versions)

⁵⁹ *New Age Bible Versions*, p.298

The purpose of this claim becomes confusing when the claim, her chart, the NIV, and the KJV are compared. First let us look at her claim. If she stands on her claim that “everlasting” is the word that incurs guilt, then the KJV is also culpable. For the NIV does indeed read “everlasting” but so does the KJV. She has effectively defeated herself on this point. Let us next consult the chart.

Here we find some discord and more incrimination of the KJV. First the discord. The NIV, which is a “new version,” actually reads “everlasting destruction” not “eternal destruction” as her chart claims. Therefore, it is already obvious that the “New Versions” category is a bit too broad. Next, if we consult the KJV, it reads (as stated above) “everlasting destruction” in 2 Thessalonians 1:9. Again, by her own claim and her own chart, the KJV is guilty. So what does she really believe? What was she really trying to prove? Did she really mean to say that the NIV’s use of “everlasting” was a tell-tale sign of apostasy? I would have to say yes. For this is a prolonged thought, not a simple slip of the pen.

Perhaps this is evidence not only of confused thinking, but also a botched attempt at fabricating a claim. It is clear that she had a theory concerning the use of ‘everlasting’ but her thinking and theory became confused when she tried to construct the chart. And honestly, what is the difference between “everlasting” and “eternal?” All the dictionaries I consulted make them essential synonymous.

The final claim I want to site appears in a video made by “The Prophecy Club.” Riplinger’s speech was based on “New Age Bible Versions” and contained extra material as well. I use this final example to give the reader a clear sense of Riplinger’s motivations. The following was transcribed by myself.

RIPLINGER’S CLAIM:

“Now, there’s something very interesting that I discovered. It says there [in Rev.13:18] ‘count the number of the beast.’ It’s telling you to count. And so what I did is I counted the number of times the Authorized King James Version has the name, the full name of God, kay. We’ll see it has seven times ‘Jehovah’ in the Old Testament. And, um, eighty-four times ‘The Lord Jesus Christ’ in the New Testament. Total, that’s 91 times.

And I thought to myself, ‘I wonder if, when I count the number of the beast in the new versions, if in

the new versions if they have 66.6% as many times?’ And I did it. And they do. When you look at the name “Jehovah” and you look at the title “the Lord Jesus Christ,” they have it 60 times or 61 times, which comes out to 66.6% as many times. And so I think that’s a very telling thing that’s happening there.”

What exactly is Riplinger’s claim? Simply this. If we total up the number of times “Jehovah” and “The Lord Jesus Christ” appears in the Old and New Testament of the KJV we arrive at 91 times. If we do the same for the new versions, which exact ones she never says, we obtain 60 or 61 (the ambiguity here will become clear). Next, if we divide the new-version number by the KJV number, this will give us a percentage. This is the percentage of times these names appear in the new versions as opposed to the KJV. Which, according to Riplinger, is “66.6% as many times.” This, of course, is supposed to be 666 the number of the beast. Hence, the new versions are shown corrupt again. Or are they.

Let me first say that 66.6 does not equal 666. It is 599.4 short. Therefore, even if her numbers worked, they really do not prove her point. With that thought let us move to the main objection.

At this point I ask the reader to get a basic calculator. We will now test Riplinger’s claims against mathematical fact. Here is where her use of ambiguity on 60 or 61 comes in. Let us deal first with 60. Take the number 60 (remember this the new version’s number) and divide it by 91. The result gives us a percentage, which she claimed would be 66.6%. However, it is not 66.6%. The actual number is .6593406 or 65.9%. How about 61? The result is the same, wrong. The quotient is .6703296 or 67%, not 66.6%. So what number gives us 66.6%?

Another possibility I thought of was an average. Perhaps those two numbers represented different totals from different sources and she obtained her answer by using their average. However, that does not work either. The two numbers give an average of 60.5 which, when divided by 91, produces .6648351 or 66.5%. So I ask again what number gives us 66.6%? If we multiply 91 by 66.6% or .666 the real number appears, 60.606.

The numbers that she gave did not work nor will they ever work. It would seem she was being deliberately ambiguous about the real number. The reason for such ambiguity is clear, it would be impossible for a word to occur 66.606 times in one document. The number would of course work as an average over several documents, but never one. What

troubles me is that she had to know what her numbers produced. A basic calculator or long division is all that is needed. What was she really trying to foist on her audience. Truthfully, I find this appalling. To make claims with such certainty, saying “I think that’s a very telling thing that’s happening there” and use those claims to defame translator’s and translations is unacceptable.

Conclusion

With that I end. My desire in this addendum was to show the reader the basis of the claims made by Riplinger and KJV advocates in general. In conjunction with Bob DeWaay’s article and the bibliography included with this work, the reader should have more than enough information to make an informed opinion