

# ***A Critique of Walter Veith's Presentations: "Battle of the Bibles" & "Changing the Word"***

**by Elder David W. Allen**

Walter Veith of Amazing Discoveries has made some amazing charges against what he refers to as the modern Bibles, and especially aimed at the NIV. I have thoroughly examined each of his claims and charges. My concern is that many will accept what appears to be a scholarly presentation on this topic at face value, and be led astray. . While many of his presentations may be scholarly, Dr. Veith has gone out of his area of expertise in dealing with Bible translations. The following is my critique of the DVDs named above. After you study this critique, you can come to your own conclusion.

Walter Veith said, "If you go to the middle of the book of Acts, to the end of Revelation - that is how many words are gone in the NIV – up to 60,000!" That is one half of the NT! All one has to do is to page through the KJV/NIV Parallel Bible to see how untrue is that statement.

Veith said that every single Bible in any language written before 1940 came from the same base as the KJV, the Received Text, except for the Douay. For the truth, see page 4.

Veith quotes from Aland supposedly to get support for his ideas that the manuscript base for the KJV is superior to that used in the modern translations. Alands were the editors of the 27<sup>th</sup> edition of NT Greek Bible in which all the thousands of finds since the KJV was printed are used to come up with the most accurate reading of the NT.

Veith condemns the Vulgate stating it is Arian, without giving any evidence. He then claims that Catholics are really Arians and not Trinitarian, because a pope supposedly said that the Vulgate is infallible. Tyndale's 1525 NT was translated from the Greek text compiled by Erasmus, who relied on the Latin Vulgate whenever the Greek manuscripts he was using were not clear or missing verses. 90% of Tyndale's Bible is in the KJV!

Veith speaks against the apocrypha, and gives the impression that the modern Bibles either have the apocrypha, or are influenced by them. Evidently he does not know that the Apocrypha was in KJV Bibles until in the 1800's. Veith speaks about the "lost gospels" as though they are part of the modern Bibles that he is attacking. They are not.

Veith berates Westcott and Hort because he believes they conspired to distort the Scriptures and that all modern translations are based on their Greek text. Firstly, the Greek text of Westcott and Hort is **not** the basis for **any** modern translation of the NT. Secondly, for Veith's charges to be true, not only would Westcott and Hort have to be unreliable, and evil men, but all the thousands who have poured over the manuscript evidence of the NT since them, and even before them, would also have had to have the same evil intent to distort God's word. There are 27 editions of the Greek NT that were begun by Eberhard Nestle, and continued by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland. The last of the editions were done by a group of scholars. The UBS has four editions of their own Greek text and their forth is almost exactly like the 27<sup>th</sup> edition edited by the Alands. These are the basis for all modern translations of the NT.

Veith's list of recommended books are all from those trying to support the KJV as the only right Bible, and includes G.A. Riplinger who distorts and uses deception to undermine the NIV and other modern translations. (For instance she **only quotes part** of a sentence from Dr. Edwin Palmer, NIV editor and in so doing makes it seem like he says the opposite of what he wrote. E-mail me if you want the evidence on this.)

Here are some excellent books that tell the true story about the Bible manuscripts from scholars who have looked at all the evidence; many have spent their lives studying the biblical manuscripts.

- *The Origin of the Bible* by F.F. Bruce (& others)
- *The English Bible, A history of Translations* by F.F. Bruce
- *From God to Us* by Norman L Geisler & Willaim E. Nix
- *The Text of the New Testament: It's transmission, ...* by Bruce M. Metzger
- *A User's Guide to Bible Translations* by David Dewey
- *Bible Versions, A Consumers' Guide to the Bible* by Hugh Dunton
- *Handbook for Bible Study* by Lee J. Gugliotto
- *The King James Controversy* by James R. White
- *The King James Version Debate* by D. A. Carson
- *The Accuracy of the NIV* by Kenneth L. Barker

Veith quotes from one of his sources that states there are 695 verses in the NIV that are affected by these "errors." He decries the 1200 times the NKJV departs from the Textus Receptus. Comparing the KJV with the TR, one will find hundreds of examples where the KJV departs from the TR. See page 40 where this same charge is brought against the KJV by Robert Young, author of Young's Literal Translation, also based on the TR.

Walter Veith says that the problems with the modern Bibles have to do with the doctrines. He says that the state of the dead cannot be adequately supported in them, the divinity of Christ is a problem, creationism is under attack, and the atonement is written away so Jesus doesn't fulfill that role anymore.

The real problem is such claims by those who apparently have not even read (or at least studied) the modern Bibles. If they had, they surely would have found all the doctrines he mentioned, and all of the fundamental doctrines of Scripture as well. In my 40 years of ministry, including the 35 years that I was privileged to teach Bible on the secondary level, I have been blessed by the accuracy and clarity of the modern Bibles. The NIV became my basic Bible to use in the classroom when it came out in 1978. This critique will show that all the criticism against the RSV and NIV is unfounded. Even though a few texts may read differently than one is used to, there is no doctrine lost by any of these passages in question. Note the testimony of Sir Frederic Kenyon, former director and librarian of the British Museum: "It is true (and cannot be too emphatically stated) that none of the fundamental truths of Christianity rest on passages of which the genuineness is doubtful... No fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith rests on a disputed reading... It cannot be too strongly asserted that in substance the text of the Bible is certain. Especially is this the case with the New Testament."

Amazingly, Veith refers to the treasured manuscripts that Tischendorf found at Mt. Sinai in 1844 and 1848 with these words, “Tischendorf found a piece of rubbish at Mt. Sinai.”

While discussing one text in his presentation, Veith quotes the Dublin Review, July, 1881, “By the sole authority of textual criticism these men have dared to vote away some forty verses of the inspired Word.” Then he says, “Not in other words, by the Word itself – not what it said, but by textual criticism.” There are over 5,000 manuscripts of the NT, yet no two are exactly alike.

Evidently Veith does not recognize textual criticism endeavors to find out precisely what the Word really said originally. We all need to see the significance of what Robert Young wrote in the preface to his Young’s Literal Translation (based on the TR) - “Inspiration extends only to the original text... not to any translations ever made by man, however aged, venerable, or good.”

It was not this author’s purpose to speak despairingly against any translation, including the KJV. It was only to evaluate the criticism against other translations. The following are verses where, according to Walter Veith, changes have been made in the NIV, RSV or other modern Bibles that distort the true gospel. This critique, for the most part, follows the order in which Walter Veith presents the texts. Some verses he refers to twice. His most amazing claims come toward the end of his three DVD presentations. Two of these I put at the beginning.

“**BEST GREEK**” means from the manuscripts deemed to be the most reliable by the thousands of experts who have in many cases, spent their entire lives studying and evaluating manuscripts to determine what is the closest to the original text. Unfortunately, we have no originals, and no two of the thousands of biblical manuscripts read exactly alike. Since the KJV was published, much has been discovered in both biblical and non-biblical manuscripts that help us know what was written, as well as understand the languages better.

“**GREEK**” means that the Textus Receptus (Greek text the KJV is largely based on) **and** the Standard text (Nestle-Aland and UBS) **have the same Greek word.**

**(Everything following a colon [:] is a direct quote from that source.)**

### Text by Text Analysis

#### **Matt 13:51**

KJV: Jesus saith...all these things? They say unto him, yea, Lord

NIV: “Have you understood all these things?” Jesus asked. “Yes,” they replied.

BEST GREEK: They say to him, Yes.

VEITH: By the way, that has been removed many, many times – hundreds of times in the NIV – everywhere where it says that Jesus is Lord – that’s gone in the NIV.

ALLEN: That is simply not accurate. Firstly, the KJV does not have “Jesus is Lord” hundreds of times; **it doesn’t even have *that* phrase once!** It appears in the NIV twice. Christ Jesus our Lord is in the NIV 7 times, and only 5 times in the KJV. Jesus Christ our Lord is found once in both. Thus the NIV has Jesus is Lord 8 times, and the KJV only 6 times. Secondly, “Lord

Jesus” is found 118 times in the KJV, and 102 times in the NIV. Thirdly, Lord is in the KJV 712 times from Matthew through John, and 618 times in the NIV. Fourthly, Christ Jesus and Jesus Christ are found 225 times in the NIV.

### **Matt 27:35**

RSV: And when they had crucified him, they divided his garments among them by casting lots;

NIV: When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots.

KJV: And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

VEITH: Everywhere where the Bible says that [“was to fulfill that which was spoken of by...”] the modern translations have removed it. Why do you think they have removed it in the modern translations? I’ll tell you why. Because it proves that Jesus is the fulfillment of prophecy. And so they have taken it away so He does not fulfill prophecy. Everywhere!

ALLEN: Another of Walter’s statements that is untrue. Firstly, this ‘missing’ passage is only found in Matthew in a few late manuscripts. Secondly, this ‘missing’ passage **is in the NIV** in John 19:23,24. Thirdly, the NIV has the statement that something happened regarding Jesus that was a fulfillment of OT prophecy 22 out of the 24 times it is found in the KJV. And only one of those incidents recorded in the KJV is not found in the NIV. Fourthly, it is interesting to note that John gave other information about **this specific aspect** that the **KJV does not have** in Matthew. Should we deduce then, that the KJV is not reliable, or even evil, because it did not have that important information in Matthew’s gospel? Hardly. The gospel writers give us different material, and even the same material in different ways. Scribes were good at harmonizing many of the differences that once existed in not only the gospels, but the writings of Paul as well.

### **Matt 16:3**

KJV: And in the morning, It will be foul weather to day: for the sky is red and lowring. O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?

NWT: [all the words are ‘missing’ until the word “discern”]

VEITH: Now, the Jehovah’s Witness Bible was the first one that was changed. Now this was early in the 1900’s when Westcott and Hort had produced their documents. Up until the 1900’s there was no other version except the Jesuit one... Everything that was changed in the Jehovah’s Witness Bible has also been changed in the other Bibles, or at least discredited in the margin, if nothing else.

ALLEN: To illustrate that his last statement is not true, John 1:1 in the NWT reads “the Word was a god” and all other versions say “the Word was God.” Also for the record, there were other versions of the Bible before the NWT. The English Revised Version (1885) was based on

Westcott & Hort's Greek text, along with the American Revised Version of 1901. These are not only two of the several English translations that Ellen G. White quoted from, but are the two she quoted from the most outside of the KJV.

### Mark 9:(44,)46

KJV: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

NIV/RSV and other versions do not have these two verses.

VEITH: When they came to Mark 9:46, they took it out; had to cross it out.

ALLEN: That sentence **is found** in Mark 9:48 in the NIV and RSV. The fact is that it wasn't crossed out in verses 44 and 46 because it was not there to begin with. But it was simply added by scribes to verses 44 and 46 following the same phrase that preceded that sentence in verse 48. The better scribes knew the text of the Scriptures, the more likely they were to harmonize one passage to agree with parallel ones in another Bible book. The scribe might write the added word or passage in the margin, and later scribes would add it to the text. This is called harmonization. Words and verses added by this process were accepted as Scripture. Bibles based on manuscripts prior to this harmonization are often accused of leaving material out – "it is missing!" In truth, it is not "missing" – it was added!

### Rev 22:14

KJV: **Blessed are they that do his commandments**, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

NIV: **Blessed are those who wash their robes**, that they may have the right to the tree of life and may go through the gates into the city.

VEITH: I hope they use the right soap powder. What are you washing your robes in?

ALLEN: Rev 7:14 in all translations answers that question. "Blessed are they that wash their robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb." And since that idea is found in the KJV, it will show to all that it is biblical. In the Greek language, these two phrases, wash their robes, and keep his commandments sound alike and are nearly alike.

Here are the Greek phrases written in English letters:

- HOIPOIUNTESTASENTOLASAUTOU
- HOIPLUNONTESTASSTOLASAUTOU

Both of those phrases have already been seen, heard, and written by the scribe in the following verses of Rev: wash their robes 7:14; keep the commandments 12:17 and 14:12. It is obvious in the above verses that the NIV teaches that God's people will be commandment keepers.

**Mark 16:9-20 [This passage appears in smaller print following verse 8 in the RSV.]**

VEITH: His [Christ's] post-resurrection appearances are omitted in the original RSV.

ALLEN: This claim is of course false. The RSV and all the modern Bibles have many passages like Luke 24:36-42 and John 20:10-21:24 that record Jesus appearing to Mary Magdala, to His disciples, and to Thomas after His resurrection. They also state in I Cor 15:5,6 that Jesus appeared to over 500 after His resurrection. This passage in Mark 16:9-20 is not found in the most reliable Greek manuscripts, and is not believed to have been in the original by the experts on manuscripts. No teaching of Scripture is lost without this passage. This passage in Mark does present difficult concepts about handling snakes and drinking poison .

**Acts 8:37 [not in the NIV]**

VEITH: Acts 8 verse 37 in the Jehovah Witness Bible is of course removed because there Jesus is the only way to be saved. Away with that text. You'll find it missing in the others as well. If you want to have an ecumenical Bible, you have to remove Jesus as the sole Savior and God.

ALLEN: That verse is not found in the best manuscripts of the NT, but is certainly not omitted from the teaching of the RSV and NIV. Note John 3:16; Acts 4:12; Rms 3:23; 6:23 for a few.

**I John 5:7 "The Trinity Removed," [Veith's words]**

VEITH: And this one is the bomber. Do you know how much debate there is today about the trinity, and they say, "Trinity is NOT DOCTRINE OF THE BIBLE! It has to be removed." And that's why you cannot prove it in the NIV and you cannot prove it in the RSV; you cannot prove the trinity.

KJV: For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

NIV: For there are three that testify: [Veith did not quote the rest of the text in the NIV that reads "the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement."]

ALLEN: How amazing that when the KJV here follows the late copies of the Vulgate, the translation that Veith decries as Arian, he now says the KJV is correct, and all others are wrong! No scholar supports the KJV here, and neither do most translations of the Bible including the Catholic Douay and Young's Literal Translation based on the TR. (YLT has that phrase of the trinity in brackets showing it was not in the Greek.) I have checked 41 translations on this verse. Only the KJV, NKJV and the Amplified have that added phrase. **That phrase was not even in Erasmus' first 4 editions of his Greek NT.** (See [The King James Version Debate](#) pp.34,35 by D. A. Carson.) No, the trinity is not removed from the NIV or from the RSV. Check out Matt 28:19,20; II Cor 13:13; John 14:25; 17:21.

### Matt 13:35

KJV: I will utter things which have been kept **secret** from the foundation of the world.

NIV: I will utter things **hidden** since the creation of the world.

ALLEN: The root word in Greek is *krupto* which the KJV translates as hide, keep secret, and secret. Veith somehow believes the NIV supports secrecy, and teaches that Jesus was not wanting the people to really know what He was saying. This supposedly supports those who have secret societies. The reading of the KJV sounds more secretive than the NIV.

### Matt 13:11

KJV: He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the **mysteries** of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.

NIV: He replied, “The knowledge of the **secrets** of the kingdom has been given to you, but not to them.”

ALLEN: The word in Greek is *musterion*. (Strong’s NT:3466) Quoting Strong’s “*musterion* from a derivative of *muo* (to shut the mouth); a secret or ‘mystery’ (through the idea of silence imposed by initiation into religious rites.” A secret or mystery – what is the difference? When you compare verse 11 with verse 35, the KJV would support the justification of secret societies just as much as any of the modern Bibles.

Veith then quotes **out of context** the following verses as he condemns the NIV for the way it translated Matt 13:11; Amos 3:7; Mark 4:24; Luke 8:17; John 7:4.

VEITH: Well, let’s have a look at how they changed it, these initiated ones, to keep the truth away from the rest of the world. Which verses did they change? We know they changed them. Let’s just have a few easy ones; then we’ll get deeper and deeper into the doctrines. Remember that Hort said, “We will change it very slightly, here a word, there a word, and no body will even notice. And finally when we have it all together, when we have all the little changes in one big package, if you read it all together, our doctrines and not theirs will be there.” That’s exactly what he said.

ALLEN: So, according to Veith, this is how the whole conspiracy theory fits together – Westcott and Hort had a plan, and the whole world – especially the thousands of textual scholars since them – have blindly followed their deception! An amazing conspiracy indeed! (Perhaps the real conspiracy is the endeavor to discredit the NIV and RSV.)

### II Sam 21:19

KJV: Elhanan... a Bethlehemite, slew the brother of Goliath the Gittite.

NIV: Elhanan... the Bethlehemite killed Goliath the Gittite

VEITH: Who did kill Goliath? Oh, so you prefer the KJV over the other one, the NIV?

ALLEN: The words “the brother of” **are in italics in the KJV to show they have been supplied!** They are not even in the Hebrew. And the NIV is accused of tampering with the Word?! Remember Rev 22:18 that Veith refers to when talking about the NIV.

### II Sam 23:5

KJV: Although my house be not so with God

NIV: Is not my house right with God?

VEITH: So they turn everything around. When God says that it is not right, the NIV says it is right.

ALLEN: There is no problem with the NIV as long as one **reads the context**. It is very clear that the reading of the NIV is an accurate rendering of the passage. The problem is trying to understand 1611 English. It is saying, “is not my house so with God?”

### Hos 11:12

KJV: but Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints.

NIV: And Judah is unruly against God, even against the faithful Holy One.

ALLEN: Translations that agree with the KJV include RSV, ASB, and NLT. Those that agree with the NIV include NASB/NASB update, BBE, GNB, and GW. It is obvious that the editors and translators of these various Bibles are not deliberately changing what God said. What is also obvious is that the Hebrew manuscripts must support such various readings of the text.

### Matt 5:44

KJV: But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

RSV: But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you,

VEITH: We don't have a full story anymore.

ALLEN: Only later manuscripts have what the KJV has – which was harmonized from Luke. **The RSV and NIV have this “missing” part in Luke 6:27,28** where it appears in all manuscripts.

<b>Matt 18:11</b>
-------------------

KJV: For the Son of man is come to save that which is lost.

RSV: [This verse is not in the RSV or NIV; a footnote in the NIV says that some manuscripts have this verse.]

VEITH: Don't you think this is an important text? Why is this gone in the RSV? Because Jesus is not supposed to be the only Savior. We're supposed to save ourselves. We don't need Jesus – that is a ridiculous teaching.

ALLEN: **This is taught in the RSV and NIV** in texts such as: John 3:14-18; Acts 4:12; Matt 1:18-21; John 1:29 Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away the sin...; II Pet 3:9

<b>Matt 20:16</b>
-------------------

KJV: So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called, but few chosen

RSV: So the last will be first, and the first last.

VEITH: Here [in KJV] it is important to choose, to choose right. Here [RSV] you come first or last. Who cares. So away with the choice business.

ALLEN: This 'missing' phrase **is found in the NIV** in Matt 22:14 "For many are invited, but few are chosen."

Matt 20:22,23 The NIV is 'missing' this phrase: "and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?"

ALLEN: The 'missing' phrase **is in Mark 10:38,39** where it appears in the best manuscripts. If one read the gospels in the NIV, and especially the Harmony of the Gospels, one would readily recognize that that phrase is in the NIV.

<b>Matt 25:13</b>
-------------------

KJV: Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.

NIV: Therefore keep watch, because you do not know the day or the hour.

VEITH: Is that a logical text for the God of the universe to put in the Bible? [speaking about the NIV] In this one [NIV], you know not the day or the hour of when the ice cream man will come along, or what ever! You know not the day or hour of what? Hello! Which one is even the more logical one?

ALLEN: The real question is, Which one reads like the original manuscripts? The phrase "wherein the Son of man cometh" was added. It is not found in the most reliable Greek

manuscripts. Besides, the context makes it very clear what Jesus is talking about. Hopefully we all know that we don't take one verse by itself, but we must read and study the context. The context of this text in question is Matt 24 and 25. Note Matt 24:44 "So you also must be ready, because the Son of Man will come at an hour when you do not expect him."

#### **Matt 24:36**

KJV: But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.

NIV: No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.

VEITH: If you take the text that Jesus says, I and the Father are one – then what does that make of this verse? If Jesus does not know, then it implies Jesus is not part of the Godhood. Are you with me? This is a serious change.

ALLEN: Why then does the KJV in Mark 13:32 state the exact same thing, that the Son does not know. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, **neither the Son**, but the Father." One will notice that the KJV in Matt 24:36 says, "but my Father *only*." [Emphasis added.]

#### **Mark 2:17**

KJV: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

NIV: I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners.

VEITH: [appears to be making fun of the NIV] Come sinner! Let's all have a party together. This is ecumenical. It doesn't matter whether you believe the same thing, whether you keep the same commandments, whatever you do...if you sleep around with 50 women at the same time, who cares. We don't need that [repentance]; we are the initiated ones.

ALLEN: Walter's remarks were not said kindly. His implication of what the NIV teaches and stands for is simply incorrect. **Those very words do appear in the NIV in Luke 5:32.** Matthew, Mark, and Luke record this conversation. But only Luke has the words "to repentance." (Luke 5:32) They were added by a scribe to Matt and Mark to harmonize with the same account in Luke.

#### **Luke 4:4 "but by every word of God" is not in the NIV here.**

VEITH But by **every word** of God. The Word is not important today. The Word is merely incidental. What is important is what you feel. What you feel is right – God will lead you

through His Spirit. All religions lead to the ultimate source. Trust your feelings. Forget about the word.

ALLEN: That phrase is not in Luke 4:4 in the NIV because it is not found there in the most reliable manuscripts. But the exact phrase **is in Matt 4:4 in the NIV.**

**II Tim 3:16**

KJV “all Scripture is inspired by God...”

ASV “every Scripture inspired by God...”

VEITH: The pope will tell you what to believe.

ALLEN: Paul is telling them to be discerning. The Apocrypha is believed by some to be Scripture and therefore inspired. There are many manuscripts that some believe are inspired, like the “lost gospels.” The way the ASV states this is significant, and the Greek can be correctly translated that way.

**Luke 9:55,56 NIV does not have “and He said, ‘Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.’ ”**

VEITH: Besides being strange, it is a stupid verse. It’s stupid. Which one [referring to the KJV or NIV] is more important? Which one has more power? This one [KJV] has a Savior! It [NIV translation of the verse] might as well not be in the Bible. I don’t believe God put something so ridiculous in the Bible.”

ALLEN: The right question to ask would be, Which one is the way it was written? **These exact words are in the NIV in John 3:17** where they appear in the best Greek manuscripts.

**Luke 22:43,44**

KJV: And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

RSV is ‘missing’ these verses.

VEITH: Why did they remove those verses? Remember, they don’t believe in the atonement. And if they don’t believe in the atonement, they don’t believe that Jesus shed one drop of blood for you. Away with that disgusting doctrine of the atonement.

ALLEN: What an amazing charge: “they don’t believe that Jesus shed one drop of blood for you.” **The truth is there are 28 verses in the RSV that tell of the blood of Jesus! (For the record, the ‘missing’ verses are in the NIV.)**

If Veith's criticism were true, why does the RSV have I Peter 1:18,19 that states we were redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus? Why leave in Heb 9:22 "without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins;" and tell of Jesus being our true high priest that shed His blood for us? Why have Rev 7:14 "they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb"? Once again the charges against the RSV are false.

**Rev 14:5 The NIV is 'missing' the phrase, "before the throne of God"**

VEITH: An accountability to a higher power is missing here.

ALLEN: Veith states this as if the NIV did not teach such an accountability. Yet, II Cor 5:10 in the NIV reads "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive what is due him..." Romans 2:1 NIV "...do you think you will escape God's judgment?"

**Luke 4:8 Douay, RSV, NIV 'leave out' "get thee behind me, Satan."**

ALLEN: This is in the NIV and RSV in Matt 4:10. They don't leave it out.

VEITH tries to show that the RSV and the NIV follow the Douay – the Jesuit Bible!

**Acts 13:42 NIV 'left out' "the Jews"**

ALLEN: This is in verse 43! One only has to read on to the next verse!

**Mark 6:11 NIV is 'missing' "Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment than for that city."**

VEITH: Why do you think that verse has been removed?...Because they do not believe in a judgment. See, the choice you make – who cares! Didn't they believe in reincarnation? Whatever you did wrong now – who cares! You can fix it the next time around; in purgatory you can burn it off. That's fine. So let's take the judgment right out. That'll solve the problem. So they have modified the text. See how many pieces are missing?

ALLEN: The **missing part is in the NIV in Matt 10:15** following the most reliable Greek manuscripts. Does anyone who is condemning the NIV really believe that is what the NIV Bible teaches? Does Veith believe that every gospel tells the same story, and even in the exact same way? Reading *A Harmony of the Four Gospels* by Orville E. Daniel gives insight into this reality of inspiration and revelation.

**Mark 10:21**

KJV: and come, take up the cross, and follow me.

NIV: Then come, follow me.

VEITH: This [KJV] is Christianity. The other is what? Salvation in sin. One big, happy party.

ALLEN: His charge is amazing indeed. The **‘missing’ phrase is found 5 times in the NIV** in these verses: Matt 10:38; Matt 16:24; Mark 8:34; Luke 9:23; and Luke 14:27. It is in the KJV 6 times. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all record this story. But the “missing” phrase “take up his cross” is only found in Mark 10:21, and only there in late Greek mss. Even though the **NIV has that phrase 5 times**, it is characterized as a translation that is consistent with “salvation in sin” by Dr. Veith because it doesn’t have that phrase in one place. So with the same “reasoning” would the KJV would be guilty of the same charge since it **does not** have that phrase in Matt 19:21 or in Luke 18:22 where the exact same message is given by Jesus? No. Because something is “missing” doesn’t mean that translation disavows that belief. Note Matt 16:24, one of 5 times that phrase is recorded in the NIV: “If anyone would come after me, he must deny himself and take up the cross and follow me.”

**Mark 10:24: The KJV adds “for them that trust in riches.” (Not in the NIV)**

VEITH: This one [the KJV] is the only one that makes sense. This one [NIV] is discouragement. My God is a God of encouragement, not discouragement.

ALLEN: Then what would one do about Matt 10:34-38 where Jesus says (KJV) “I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father ...” And what about the “take up the cross” command?

Note: **The KJV** in Matt 10:23 and in Luke 18:24 records this same story the way the RSV and NIV record it – **WITHOUT the words** “for them that trust in riches.” Therefore, Veith’s indictment against the NIV, that it is a dangerous and heretical Bible for not having that statement in Mark 10:24, applies to the KJV because it does not have that statement in the parallel accounts in Matt 10:23 and Luke 18:24. If one used Veith’s reasoning and response, one could speak harshly against the KJV. For then the KJV also would not make sense in Matt and Luke because those words are missing. Some scribe, sometime, added those words to Mark 10:24 to make it more tolerable, more acceptable. EG White mentions that very idea – of being shown that scribes changed the Bible thinking to make it better, but they were not making it better. “I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition.” EW220,221

**Mark 13:14 The NIV is ‘missing’ the phrase “spoken of by Daniel the prophet.”**

ALLEN: The **missing part is in** Matt 24:15 in the NIV. Note that Luke 21:20 in the KJV has this very same discourse by Jesus. But the KJV DOES NOT HAVE this ‘missing’ phrase. Thus, the same charge must be leveled against the KJV for Luke 21:20.

**Luke 2:14**

KJV: Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men.

NIV: Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men on whom his favor rests.

ALLEN: The NIV is not limiting God's desire for peace to all people. The Greek can also read, "Glory in highest to God and on earth peace among men of goodwill." The NASU reads "And on earth peace among men with whom He is pleased."

**Acts 16:7 "The Spirit vs. the Spirit of Jesus." [Veith's words]**

KJV ...but the Spirit suffered them not

NIV ...but the Spirit of Jesus would not allow them to.

VEITH: One must understand the occult mind to understand this one. This implies the Spirit is in control of Jesus.

VEITH'S SLIDE: The latter implies that the Holy Spirit had so taken possession of the Person of the Exalted Jesus that He could be spoken of as "the Spirit of Jesus." Milligan, Expository Value, p.99

ALLEN: But couldn't one argue that the KJV leaves it open to be the spirit of anything, a pig, cow, etc. (following Veith's line of criticism)? Since the early manuscripts were written in all capital letters, spirit doesn't always mean the Holy Spirit. And besides, Phil 1:19 **in the KJV** reads "For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayers, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ." Is the Spirit here controlling the supply that comes from Jesus? Romans 8:9 in the KJV not only has "Spirit of Christ," but it has that Spirit raising Christ from the grave in Romans 8:11. Is that control over Him?

**I Cor 5:7 "Doctrine of the Atonement Denied" [Veith words]**

KJV: For Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us

NIV: For Christ, our Passover Lamb, has been sacrificed.

VEITH: The occultist teach that Jesus never really died for you.

BEST GREEK: For indeed the Passover of us was sacrificed Christ

ALLEN: The sentence structure of the Greek has the "of us" going with the Passover, not the sacrificed. The NIV teaches that His sacrifice was indeed for us. That is what Heb 9 and 10 are all about. (See specifically Heb 9:23-28; 10:11-14)

**Matt 17:21**

KJV: Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.

NIV: “Missing” this verse in Matt.

ALLEN; Note Mark 9:29 in the NIV: He replied, “This kind can come out only by prayer.” A footnote reads, “Some manuscripts *prayer and fasting*.” The NIV in Acts 13:2 teaches that the early church “were worshipping the Lord and fasting.” And in the NIV in Acts 14:23 it reads, “...with prayer and fasting, committed them to the Lord.”

### I Peter 1:22

KJV: Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth **through the Spirit** unto unfeigned love of the brethren...

NIV: Now that you have purified yourselves by obeying the truth so that you have sincere love for your brothers...

VEITH: Which one would you prefer to be correct here? It is not God – it is not Christ in you that is working a change – it is your own power, and that is occult.

ALLEN: Note Romans 8:6-14 in NIV. Verse 13 reads “...but if by the Spirit you put to death the misdeeds of the body, you will live.”

### II Tim 4:1,2a

KJV: ...Lord Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom; Preach the word...

NIV: ...and of Christ Jesus who will judge the living and the dead, and in view of his appearing and his kingdom, I give you this charge: Preach the Word...

BEST GREEK: ...Christ Jesus, the [one] being about to judge living [ones] and dead, both [by] the appearing of him and [by] the kingdom of him: proclaim the word...

ALLEN: Veith states the NIV translators do not believe in a judgment taking place at the second coming. This is disproved in (NIV) Matt 25:31-46 and Rev 22:12 “I am coming soon! My reward is with me, and I will give to everyone according to what he has done.”

### Heb 7:21 Doauy, RSV, NIV are ‘missing’ the phrase “after the order of Melchizedek”

VEITH: This makes Jesus less than He is.

ALLEN: ***This ‘missing’ phrase is in Heb 6:20*** in all of these translations!! It was added in Heb 7:21 in the KJV by what is called harmonization. Thus, all the accusations about the motives for those translations without it in 7:21 are, as usual, unfounded.

<b>John 5:39</b>
------------------

KJV: Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life

NIV: You diligently study the Scriptures because you think that by them you possess eternal life.

BEST GREEK: Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think in them life eternal to have, and those are the [ones] witnessing concerning me;

ALLEN: In the 30 translations that I checked, the KJV stands alone in having this verse be a directive from Jesus to study the Bible. **Even Young’s Literal Translation that is also based on the TR does not support the KJV.** Neither does the NKJV. The NIV, and all other translations make more sense when one studies the context. Jesus is confronting the Jewish leaders for not accepting Him, when the Scriptures testify about Him. He is not telling them to search the Scriptures, but rather that they are doing this thinking that in the act of searching itself, they will gain eternal life. In actual fact, Jesus says, those very Scriptures will point you to ME! There are verses in the NIV that show we are to study the Scriptures. Matt 21:42; 22:29; Luke 24:45; Acts 17:11; Acts 18:24; Rom 15:4; II Tim 3:15. Who cares what a Catholic newspaper in 1881 said about this change. We as Protestants must make sure that we are doing what the Bible admonishes in II Tim 2:15; each of us must be one “who correctly handles the word of truth.”

<b>John 2:11 “A Deadly Blow Against Miracles” [Veith’s words]</b>
---

KJV: This beginning of miracles did Jesus...

RSV: the first of his signs, Jesus did...

NIV: the first of his miraculous signs, Jesus performed...

VEITH: No longer miracles. Just signs. Jesus was different; He was special.

ALLEN: If Veith had shown the rest of the verse from the RSV, all could easily see that these signs were indeed miracles because it reads: “...the first of his signs, Jesus did at Cana in Galilee, **and manifested his glory**; and his disciples believed in him.” (emphasis added) The word in the Greek translated in the KJV as miracles in this verse is semeion, **which the KJV translates as miracle, sign, token, and wonder.**

One could say that the ***KJV takes away that Jesus did miracles***, by only calling them “mighty works” in Matt 13:58. The NIV calls them “miracles” as they really were, which shows that Jesus was really divine. That is the way the NIV would be condemned if it was the NIV calling them only mighty works, because, after all as Veith said, “many people can do mighty works.”

<b>Matt 18:2,3 “Doctrine of Conversion Undermined” [Veith’s words]</b>
--

KJV: And Jesus ...said...except ye be converted,...

RSV: And...he...said...unless you turn and ...

NIV: And he said, unless you change...

GREEK: ...except ye turn and become as children

VEITH: Conversion is a very strong term, and means exactly what it says.

ALLEN: The Greek word “strepho” means to turn quite around, or reverse. The KJV translates this word “strepho” as convert and turn. The NIV “change” means that one turns from where they were.

<b>Heb 11:3 “No Creation: Evolution Instead” [Veith’s words]</b>
--

KJV: Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God

RSV: (marginal reading given) ...that the ages have been framed by the word of God.

NIV: By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God’s command,

VEITH: You say, “ It doesn’t look like a big deal. One is the worlds, the other the universe. What’s the big deal?” Well, let’s go and find out what professor Hort had in mind when he suggested this change. [Veith quotes Westcott, from Westcott, Some Lessons, p. 187.]

ALLEN: Would not “universe was formed at God’s command” give an even more powerful statement about believing in God’s creation than “the worlds were framed by the word of the Lord”? Besides, Westcott and Hort had nothing to do with the NIV and certainly not with its choice of English words to convey the meaning of the Greek. There are over 27 editions of the Greek text since W & H, and the NIV followed the later ones.

<b>Col 1:15,16</b>
--------------------

KJV: Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.  
For *by him* were all things created.

RSV: He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation;  
for *in him* all things were created.

VEITH: This changes the whole doctrine of creation.

ALLEN: The Greek word is en. Strongs says, “a primary preposition denoting (fixed) position (in place, time, or state) in, at, on, by, etc.”

### Heb 1:2

KJV: ...by whom also he made the worlds;

RSV: (margin)...through whom also he made the ages

NIV: ...through whom he made the universe

VEITH: It is now possible to spiritualize creation. Subtle, subtle changes.

ALLEN: So subtle they don't exist! The Greek word translated “ages” in the RSV is aion, which is “an age, by extension, perpetuity (also past); by implication, the world. [The] KJV [translates this word as] age, course, eternal, world (begun, without end),” Strong's NT:165 definition. It seems obvious that the critics of the modern Bibles are desperate when they make unsupported statements like the above.

### Eph 3:9

KJV: ...which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things *by Jesus Christ*.

NIV: ...which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things

VEITH: Eph 3:9 really irritates me. Don't you think there is a subtle attack on Jesus Christ, here? Or maybe not so subtle an attack. Maybe it's a pretty blatant attack on Jesus Christ.

ALLEN: The KJV and NKJV stand alone with the words, “by Jesus Christ.” The NIV along with the other 28 translations that I checked, including the RSV, NRSV, NASB, NASU, NEB, JB, HCSB, ESV, GW, NLT, and NCV do not have “by Jesus Christ.” Yet, all of those Bibles plainly show that Jesus Christ is the creator. See John 1:1-3 and Heb 1:1,2.

### Col 1:14 “Atonement denied” [Veith's words]

KJV: In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins

RSV: in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins

NIV: in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins

VEITH: That is the Jesuit Bible. So basically if you read the NIV you are reading the Jesuit Bible.

ALLEN: **There are 47 verses in the NIV** that teach we are saved by Jesus' blood. Two examples in the NIV: Col 1:20 “by making peace through his blood , shed on the cross.” Eph

1:7 “In him we have redemption through his blood , the forgiveness of sins,” Earlier manuscripts did not have “through his blood” in Col 1:14, but scribes added it to make it agree with Eph 1:7. This is called harmonization, making one passage agree with another. The 47 verses clearly show that once again the charges against the NIV are false.

### **Matt 24:3 “Doctrine of the Second Coming of Christ Radically Changed” [Veiths]**

KJV: ...what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?

RSV: ... what shall be the sign of Thy presence (margin) and of the consummation of the age. (Margin)

VEITH: Christ doesn't have to come in the clouds. He can just appear here or there.

ALLEN: Note that Veith is criticizing what he has labeled the marginal reading. My RSV Bibles do not have such a marginal reading. **The RSV clearly teaches Jesus' literal coming** in verses like Matt 24:42,44; 25:31 “When the Son of man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him...” Mark 13:26 “And then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory.”

### **Phil 3:21**

KJV: Who shall change our **vile** body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body...

RSV/ASV: ...who shall fashion anew the body of our **humiliation** that it may be conformed to the body of His glory.

GREEK: ...who will change the body of the humiliation of us [making it] conform to the body of the glory of him...

ALLEN: Veith has a commentary that is supposed to explain why this change in language, but he gives no source. Perhaps the best explanation is that both words are a correct translation of the Greek. **The Greek word is tapeinosis and is translated in the KJV as humiliation, be made low, low estate, and vile.**

### **II Thes 2:2**

KJV: That ye be not soon shaken in mind,...as that the day of Christ **is at hand**.

RSV ...day of the Lord **is now present**

NIV: ...saying that the day of the Lord **has already come**.

GREEK: ...as that is come the day of the Lord.

Young's Literal Translation: as that the day of Christ **hath arrived**

VEITH: So here again, subtle changes in the second coming. Is at hand means soon to come.

ALLEN: The Greek word is enistemi and is translated by the KJV as “come, be at hand, present.” Compare the RSV and NIV with the Greek, and you be the judge. Young’s Literal Translation uses the same Greek text as the KJV. It is just more literal!

### Titus 2:13

KJV: Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

RSV: ...awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ,...

NIV: ...while we wait for the blessed hope – the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ, ...

BEST GREEK: ...expecting the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of the great God and Savior of us Christ Jesus,...

VEITH: The Revisers [RSV] have removed the Second Coming of Christ from this text.

ALLEN: The NIV and RSV are supported here by the best Greek and all the major translations including the NASU. The second coming of Christ is also powerfully taught in all the modern Bibles in texts like Matt 25:31. (Note the NIV shows that Jesus is God more clearly than does the KJV.)

### Rev 1:7

KJV: because of him

RSV: over him [the verse really reads, “on account of him”]

ALLEN: For some reason Veith *does not give the correct reading* of the RSV for this verse. The Greek word is epi, which has a lot of variation in what it means. Some include: on, over, against, on account of, and because of. Again Veith quotes Westcott to explain why the RSV changed the wording of the KJV. The RSV (1952) is *not* based on the Greek of Westcott and Hort. The RSV is the third revision of the KJV, using the best manuscripts and research available at the time.

### Acts 3:19,20

KJV: Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, **when** the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.

RSV: Repent therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, **that** times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord,

GREEK: repent ye therefore and turn for the to be wiped away of you the sins, so as may come times of refreshing from [the] presence of the Lord...

ALLEN: The Greek word that is translated as “when” or “that” is *hopos*, and it is translated as “because, how, (so) that, to, and when” in the KJV. Translators must choose what word to use, and thus translators interpret. But inspiration does not rest on them!

VEITH: [Speaking about the Revisers] No we don’t want that [Jesus coming to judge the world] We’ve changed it. There is no judgment when Jesus comes.

VEITH’S SLIDE: Most of the Revisers did not believe there would be a personal return of Jesus before the restitution of all things, which the Authorized rendering of this passage teaches. So there is a whole change of doctrine here. This is very important if you believe in the advent of Christ.

ALLEN: For the Revisers’ view of the judgment when Christ returns personally, read Matt 25:31-46. If one would still doubt that the Revisers believe in the biblical view, then probably nothing would convince him. (The NIV gives the same idea that the RSV does (and the Greek), but Veith does not mention the NIV in his criticism.)

#### Mark 7:19

VEITH: [as he reads the KJV and gets to the middle of the verse] Notice this change. It is so vile, this change.

KJV: ...into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?

RSV: ...and so passes on?’ (Thus he declared all foods clean.)

NIV: ...and then out of his body.’ In saying this, Jesus declared all foods “clean.”

VEITH: [after reading the NIV] Where does it say that? It doesn’t say it anywhere. A whole new doctrine here. So for those who really love the NIV, you’ll have a hard time proving some interesting facts.

ALLEN: The Greek word translated “purging” in the KJV is *katharizo*, and it means to cleanse (literally or figuratively). The KJV translates that word in the following ways: (make) clean, cleanse, purge, and purify. The Greek \*\* word translated as “meat” in the KJV is *bro ma* which is **food**, especially (ceremonial) articles allowed or forbidden by the Jewish law. I’m not sure which “interesting facts” Walter Veith is referring to. Perhaps the only “hard time proving” would be this charge against the NIV.

#### Luke 23:44,45

KJV: And it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour. *And the sun was darkened.*

RSV: It was now about the sixth hour, and there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour, *while the sun's light failed.*

VEITH: The sun was darkened was a miracle. The RSV just says the light failed.

ALLEN: Would it not take a miracle to have the sun fail? Has it ever failed before?

#### **John 9:4**

KJV: I must work...

RSV: We must work ...

NIV: We must do the work...

BEST GREEK: Us it behoves to work...

VEITH: It's a massive difference. In the one, Jesus is the only one who can do this work. Here we can all do it. I wish say you modern-day preachers in lectures to come, that stand up on the pulpit and say they could have saved you just like Jesus could. I'll show you preachers, high ranking preachers in the world, who say that exact thing. [As always, these are Veith's exact words.]

ALLEN: Jesus sent His disciples to do even greater works than He did in John 14:12 -- "and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father." (KJV)

Most translations agree with the RSV on this verse.

#### **I Cor 11:29**

KJV: For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

RSV: For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself.

NIV: ...without recognizing the body of the Lord eats and drinks judgment on himself.

VEITH: [as he reads the NIV, the volume and pitch of his voice rises when he gets to the words "body of the Lord."] Wow! This is Roman Catholicism. This is a hoax. This is a Jesuit Bible. The NIV is a Jesuit Bible. Make no doubt.

ALLEN: Notice that Veith does not say why he states it is a Jesuit Bible based on the above verse. Nor does he read 1 Cor 11:27-29 where the NIV and RSV say the same idea as the KJV.

The context shows that Paul is talking about the exact idea expressed in the NIV and RSV. Unworthily is in the ancient Greek mss in verse 27 where the NIV translates it.

1 Cor 11:27 in the NIV reads “Therefore, whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord **in an unworthy manner** will be guilty of sinning against the body and blood of the Lord.”

(emphasis supplied) I Cor 11:27-29 says the same thing in all 3 translations! Study the whole passage in each one, and decide for yourself is there is a hoax or not. Is the hoax really the false charges being made against the RSV/NIV?

### **James 5:16 “The Change Restoring the Confessional” [Veith’s words]**

KJV: Confess your faults one to another

RSV: Therefore confess your sins to one another

NIV: Therefore confess your sins to each other

VEITH’S SLIDE: Dublin Review (Catholic), July 1881, says  
 “The Apostles have now power to ‘forgive’ sins, and not simply to ‘remit’ them. ‘Confess therefore your sins’ is the new meaning of James 5:16.”

VEITH :So was it deliberate: yes or no? It was deliberate. Very deliberate so they can get the confessional in the NIV.

ALLEN: The issue is, What does the Bible say in its original language? not what the Catholic magazine said in 1881. The word translated “faults” in this verse in the KJV is the Greek word *paraptoma* which means fall, fault, offense, sin, or trespass. **It has been translated in the KJV as sin in Eph :7**, and trespass in II Cor 5:19. To further illustrate how subjective translating can be, including the KJV, the Greek word translated as “sin” in the KJV in James 5:15, is translated in the KJV in I Pet 2:20 as “faults.” So what was the motive for the KJV translators writing faults instead of sins in James 5:16?

### **Heb 10:21**

KJV: And having an high priest over the house of God...

RSV: And since we have a great priest over the house of God...

NIV: And since we have a great priest over the house of God

GREEK:...a priest a great over the household of God

VEITH: This implies that there can be other priests, priests that are not so great also officiating.

ALLEN: The Greek word is *meGas*. It means big, high, large, loud or mighty. The language of the KJV can imply the same thing for which Veith condemns the RSV/NIV. If there is an high priest, there must be lesser priests. Also, “an” high priest doesn’t even say that it is the only high

priest. Caiaphas and Annas were both titled as the high priest at the trial of Jesus (Matt 26:57, Acts 4:6)

<b>Acts 15:23 “Church Government-Separating the Priesthood from the Laity,” Veith</b>
---

VEITH: The whole church government is changed in Acts 15:23.

KJV: The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles...

RSV: The brethren, both the apostles and the elders, to the brethren who are of the Gentiles

NIV: The apostles and elders, your brothers, To the Gentile believer

GREEK: The apostles and the elder brothers to...

VEITH: This is very important. A very subtle change. But it is a mighty, mighty, mighty, mighty change. In the one [KJV] you have three groups, apostles, elders, and brethren. And Peter says that you are all priests? Does Peter say that: yes or no? In the other you have two groups. [Then Veith angrily denounces] the practice that I have seen over and over again of stating that I have no right to preach because I am no theologian. No, I am not a theologian, I am a brethren, and so are all of you! And you have a right to preach the Word of God because you are all priests of the most high! To change it, you have no right to preach, you are not a theologian, is Jesuit teaching!! It is from the pits of hell!! ... So ignore them when they say you are not a theologian. [He goes on even more on this. His quote that follows from Fulke's Defense, p. 242, contradicts what he is trying to get across about the evil translations!] "This name then of 'priest' and 'priesthood' ... which is an order distinct from the laity and vulgar people...they wholly suppress in their translations."

ALLEN: What is amazing is Veith even uses the Catholic view of hell (taught in the KJV) to describe where he believes the NIV's teachings come from. Notice that Acts 15:6,7 state "**the apostles and elders met** to consider this question. After much discussion, Peter got up and **addressed them**: "Brothers, you know..." NIV. The KJV gives the exact same idea "And the **apostles and elders came together** for to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and **said unto them**, Men and brethren..." KJV. (Emphasis added) The ones meeting and discussing the issue are clearly the apostles and elders. Verse 22 shows it was the leading brethren, or literally "leading among the brothers" who were sent out. The context shows it was the apostles and elders that met and discussed the issues, and they are the ones who came to agreement on what should be sent out to the churches. There was no conspiracy involved; it is just that the Greek kai for "and" shows up in later manuscripts. And for this the NIV is accused of presenting Jesuit teaching from the pits of hell!

<b>Heb 9:27</b>
-----------------

KJV: And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment

RSV: And just as it is appointed for men to die once, and after that comes judgment

NIV: Just as man is destined to die once, and after that to face judgment

ALLEN: Veith declares that the RSV and NIV teach the existence of an intermediate State, because Canon F.W. Farrar, Contemporary Review, March, 1882 said so.

VEITH: So, by leaving out the little article, you got purgatory in your Bible [NIV]! You can prove purgatory, but you cannot prove that it is once to die, and then the judgment.

ALLEN: If Dr. Veith would have checked the Greek in the Textus Receptus he would have made an amazing discovery that “the little article” (namely “the”) **does not appear in the Greek**. It has been supplied by the KJV translators. Once again the NIV is condemned for following the Greek. (I will show in my discussion of the next text that the KJV can be used to show the existence of purgatory.)

### Luke 1:72

KJV: To perform the mercy promised to our fathers...

RSV/NIV: To show mercy to our fathers...

GREEK: To perform mercy with the fathers

ALLEN: The word “promised” in the KJV is in italics, which means it was supplied!

VEITH’S NOTE: To perform the mercy promised to our fathers long ago, Christ came, is the meaning of the King James. The Revised and NIV means that Christ came to shew to our dead fathers the mercy they need now.

ALLEN: How could anyone ever come up with that meaning?

VEITH’S SLIDE: “For *the text* was one which, *if rendered literally*, no one could read without *being convinced*, or at least suspecting, that the ‘fathers’ already dead needed ‘mercy’; and that ‘the Lord God of Israel’ was prepared ‘*to perform*’ it to them. But where were those fathers? Not in heaven, where mercy is swallowed up in joy. And assuredly not in hell of the damned, where mercy could not reach them. They must therefore have been in a place between both, or neither the one nor the other. What? In Limbo or *Purgatory? Why, certainly*. In one or the other.” Mullen, Canon, p. 332 (Emphasis already there)

ALLEN: Amazing that a quote that uses the language of the KJV, stating that this text is so clear on teaching purgatory, is used to condemn the RSV and NIV!

VEITH: So now we have purgatory in the Bible. If you have a modern translation, you can prove purgatory.

ALLEN: The KJV could more easily be used to teach purgatory than the NIV. I Peter 3:18,19; 4:6 “For Christ...being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;...For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh...” The phrase in I Peter 4:6 in the KJV “...was the gospel preached also to them that are dead” does say plainly that it was preached to those that are dead. The NIV reads “...the gospel was preached even to those who are now dead.” Veith says that according to the NIV it is still being preached to the dead. But “was” is past tense – “was preached to those who are now [at this time] dead.” Just like Abe Lincoln gave the Gettysburg Address to those who are now dead. Nowhere in the NIV or RSV, or even the KJV, does it say that the gospel was preached to them *while or when* they are dead.

#### Acts 24:15

KJV: that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.

RSV: that there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust

NIV: that there will be a resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked.

ALLEN: The words “of the dead” are not in the most reliable Greek, RSV or NIV. But both those translations plainly teach that it is the dead that will be resurrected. See John 5:28,29; I Thes 4:13-17 as well as others. Veith would have you believe that it could be a ghost that will be resurrected according to the RSV and NIV translations.

#### Job 26:5

KJV: Dead things are formed from under the waters, and the inhabitants thereof.

NIV: The dead are in deep anguish, those beneath the waters and all that live in them VEITH: So now we have someone burning down there in purgatory. So the NIV again teaches a totally unbiblical doctrine.

ALLEN: The Hebrew literally reads “The departed spirits or shades (referring to the dead) are made to writhe or tremble from beneath the waters.” Why didn’t the KJV translate the text the way it was written? Remember, Rev 22:18,19 warns against changing any word in the Bible! See Luke 1:72 above, where purgatory is discussed. By the way, What does the KJV mean by “dead things are formed”?

#### Jude 7

KJV: Even as Sodom and Gomorrha...are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

ALLEN: “Suffering” is present-perfect tense –it is going on now.

NIV: They serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire.

ALLEN: That doesn't say when that suffering takes place – only gives them as an example of what that is like.

### II Peter 2:9

KJV: ...and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished

NIV: ...and to hold the unrighteous for the day of judgment, while continuing their punishment

VEITH: These Bibles are disgusting, as far as I am concerned.

ALLEN: Note Jude 7 in the KJV in the discussion that preceded this text. It says Sodom and Gomorha are an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. That is present-perfect tense – going on now. However, Scriptures in all translations show conclusively that the unjust/unrighteous are asleep until Jesus comes. (Rev 20:5) They all get their reward when He comes (Matt 25:31-46).

### I Cor 15:3,4

KJV: ...and that he rose again the third day

NIV: ...and that he was raised on the third day

BEST GREEK: ...and that he has been raised on the day third

VEITH: What's the difference? The difference is in the one He has power within Himself to rise from the dead. In the other one, He gets raised because He is inferior.

ALLEN: Well, with that reasoning even the KJV shows that Jesus is inferior. I Cor 15:15 in the KJV reads "...because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ." Also note Romans 8:11 KJV "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead..." By the way, **all the major translations agree with the NIV; even Young's Literal Translation based on the TR.**

### I Cor 11:24 "Mass" [Weith's words]

KJV: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.

RSV/NIV: This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.

BEST GREEK: He took bread and having given thanks broke and said: This of me is the body on behalf of you: this do ye for my remembrance. [The words "take eat" and "is broken" are supplied.]

ALLEN: Paul is quoting from the gospel record found in Matt 26:26,27; Mark 14:22-24; and Luke 22:19-20. **None of the gospel accounts** have the word "broken," **not even in the KJV.** Only Luke records Jesus saying, "Take and eat." Are we to assume that Matt and Mark had

some evil intent by not recording those words? That is what Veith says about the RSV and NIV. In quoting the gospel account, Paul leaves off the words, “take and eat.” The KJV adds in what Paul left out, and also adds “broken” that is neither in the gospel accounts, nor in the Greek of I Cor 11:24. At some point a scribe must have inserted these words, as they do not appear in the most reliable manuscripts. I would again remind all of Rev 22:18 that is used to decry the NIV, when in fact, the NIV is faithful to the most reliable manuscripts. Veith keeps quoting from what apparently are Catholic writers, who are supposedly supporting his view of the evil changes in the Bible in departing from the KJV. The opinion of those writers is not what is important. What is important is, What does the Bible really say? Veith says he thinks that the translators of those Bible translations that he condemns were not Protestants, but Jesuits in disguise.

John 7:8 RSV does not have the word “yet” after “I am not going up” and so Veith says the RSV makes Jesus a liar. Perhaps some scribe had the same concern, as that word is not found in some of the early manuscripts.

**Matt 16:22 “Onslaught on the divinity of Christ” [Veith’s words]**

KJV: Be it far from thee, Lord:

RSV: God forbid, Lord!

GREEK: Propitious to thee = May God help thee, God be gracious

KJV: [Veith doesn’t show this part of the verse] Then Peter took him and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: Lord, this shall not be unto thee.

VEITH: Slight difference. We won’t go into the details.

ALLEN: Peter’s words were obviously strong enough for strong censure from Jesus.

**Titus 2:13 [He has already discussed this text with different criticism.]**

KJV: Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

RSV: awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of the great God and Savior Jesus Christ,

VEITH: Here (KJV) Jesus is God; here (RSV) he has only the glory that God gives him. So he is subordinate.

ALLEN: The reading in the KJV indicates two persons, God and our Saviour. Jesus is God is taught by the RSV and NIV in Jn 1:1; Titus 2:13; Heb 1:8; II Pet 1:1. **The KJV does not have Jesus being God** in Titus 2:13, or in II Pet 1:1.

**Isa 7:14**

KJV: a virgin...

RSV: a young woman...

VEITH: Please explain to me how a young woman conceiving a child can be a sign for anyone. Who could qualify? Everyone. So it is not a sign at all. It is pathetic!

ALLEN: Why does the RSV have “young woman” for Isa 7:14? First of all, because the Hebrew word is young woman, not the more specific word virgin. Secondly, from the context it is evident that the sign was given to King Ahaz to give him assurance that Judah would not be invaded by King Rezin and his allies. This sign had to be fulfilled rapidly to have done that. When under inspiration Matthew sees another fulfillment of this prophecy in the birth of Jesus, he uses the Greek word for virgin; hence, so does the RSV in Matt 1:23.

#### **Psa 45:6**

KJV: Thy throne, O God

RSV: Your divine throne O God

[Veith makes no comment about this slide in his presentation.]

#### **Heb 1:8**

KJV: But unto the Son he saith, “Thy throne, O God is forever

RSV: But of the Son he says, Thy throne, O God, is for ever

ALLEN: He admits that in Hebrews it is the same in both translations. But still note his comment that follows.

VEITH: But where did they change it? They changed it in the Psalms so that Jesus wouldn't have it applied to him.

ALLEN: But in the RSV it *is the text from Psa that is applied to Jesus*, the Son, by the writer of Hebrews. What Veith has just said makes no sense, but it is said to back up his teaching that the modern Bibles are making Jesus less than He is, God. But since the writer of Hebrews is using the Psalm's statement to refer to Jesus, doesn't the RSV speak more highly of Jesus by calling Him divine?

#### **Pro 8:22**

KJV: The LORD **possessed** me in the beginning of his way

RSV: The LORD **created** me at the beginning of his work

NIV: The LORD brought me forth as the first of his works [the margin says “works” could be “way”, and it could also read “the LORD possessed me”]

ALLEN: The primitive root of the Hebrew word qanah (translated as create in the RSV) means to erect, i.e. create; by extension, to procure, especially by purchase. It is translated in the KJV as attain, buy, get, provoke to jealousy, possess, purchase, recover, and redeem. Not every detail of a Messianic passage in the OT fits with its antitype. There are some in Psa 22 that do not apply to Jesus, even though many do. The same is true regarding statements about wisdom in Pro 8.

### Dan 3:25

KJV: and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God

RSV/NIV/ASV: and the fourth looks like a son of the gods

HEB: there is among them and the look of the fourth is like a son of (the) gods...

ALLEN: Note that the last three translations have it exactly like the Hebrew.

### Micah 5:2

KJV: ...yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, **from everlasting**.

RSV: ...from you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from **ancient days**. [The NIV has the same idea as the RSV, but Veith doesn't refer to it.]

ALLEN: The Hebrew word owlam means properly concealed, i.e. the vanishing point; generally time out of mind (past or future) i.e. (practically) eternity. The KJV translates it as: always, ancient (time) any more, continuance, eternal, forever, everlasting, lasting, long (time), old (time), at any time.

### Matt 1:25

KJV: And knew her not till she **had brought forth her firstborn son**: and he called his name Jesus

RSV: ...but knew her not until she **had borne a son**; and he called his name Jesus [NIV has the same idea, but Veith does not mention it.]

BEST GREEK: and knew not her until she **bore a son**; and he called the name Jesus

VEITH: So she was a virgin [reading KJV]. But if they [RSV] remove the virgin birth, they better remove it here too. So they removed it in the RSV.

ALLEN: Note that the RSV (and NIV) follows the best Greek. “Her firstborn” is supplied. It is a given that this is her *firstborn child*; after all, she was a virgin just like the RSV says in Matt 1:23! One could also point out that the phrase “till she had brought forth her firstborn son” doesn’t guarantee that a woman is a virgin. Many women have sex without becoming pregnant and delivering a child. The KJV says **that Joseph** “knew her not until she had borne a son.” That by itself doesn’t prove that she was a virgin. The proof that she was still a virgin is in Matt 1:23 (RSV) – the Bible says so!

### Luke 2:33

KJV: And Joseph and his mother marveled at those things which were...

RSV: And his father and his mother marveled at what was said...

NIV: The child’s father and mother marveled at what was said...

BEST GREEK: And was (were) the father of him and the mother marveling at the...

VEITH: So what happens now? Jesus no longer has a miraculous birth.

ALLEN: Once again the RSV and NIV follow the most reliable Greek manuscripts. Both clearly affirm that Joseph is not the biological father of Jesus – Matt 1:18 NIV “before they came together, she was found to be with child;” and verse 20 “...because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit.” Referring to Joseph as Jesus’ father does not deny or destroy the miracle birth described in Matt 1:18-23 (in the RSV and NIV). He was Jesus’ earthy father, and as such could be referred to in that way. Luke 2:33 was not intended to be a theological statement. Those are in Matt 1:18-23.

### Matt 19:16,17

KJV: Good Master, what good...Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God.

RSV: Teacher, what good...Why do you ask me about what is good? One there is who is good. [NIV also has this idea – Veith doesn’t mention that.]

VEITH: So Jesus is not recognized as God by this young man. That is gone.

ALLEN: The Greek word for God is not in the best Greek manuscripts in Matt 19. **But it is in the parallel accounts in Mark 10:18 AND Luke 18:19** where it is found in the RSV and NIV. Veith could have done the same thing I did for each of these texts questioned – go to the Harmony of the Gospels, to the Greek and Hebrew and see what the Bible really says in that passage. Also, READ the whole NIV Bible through – many times if necessary, before condemning it.

<b>Matt 2:15</b>
------------------

KJV: Out of Egypt have I called my son

RSV/ASV Out of Egypt did I call my son

GREEK: Out of Egypt I called the son of me

VEITH: Hosea 11:1 is now not a fulfillment of prophecy because those (the KJV) are the exact words used in Hosea applied in the NT. They changed them so that Hosea is not a fulfillment of that prophecy any more.

ALLEN: The words in the Hebrew language of Hosea 11:1 would not even translate into Greek with the exact same words, let alone be further translated exactly into English! All of the above translations are an accurate translation of the meaning of what was said.

<b>Mark 15:3</b>
------------------

KJV: And the chief priests accused him of many things: but he answered nothing.

NIV: The chief priests accused him of many things.

VEITH: Why was this left away by the RSV, ASB, NIV? I'll tell you why. Because it was a fulfillment of prophecy. Take it away. Jesus must not fulfill prophecy. He's no better than any of us.

ALLEN: Was the idea that Jesus didn't answer really "left away" by the RSV, ASB, NIV? Not at all! The next two verses in the NIV read "So again Pilate asked him, "Aren't you going to answer? ... But Jesus still made no reply." Besides, the 'missing' words are found in Matthew 27:12 where Matthew tells the same account. At some point in time, a scribe harmonized Mark 15:3 to agree with Matt 27:12. Note that **none of the gospels say *this is a fulfillment of prophecy***, even though we know it is. (See my notes on page 3 about Jesus and fulfillment of prophecy under the discussion of Matt 27:35.)

<b>Mark 15:28</b>
-------------------

KJV: And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.

NIV: missing

ALLEN: This verse is found in some manuscripts that are not considered to be the most reliable by most manuscript experts. This statement is not found in any of the other three gospels, not even in the KJV. Apparently a scribe recognized that this incident did fulfill the prophecy of the

OT, and so included it, perhaps first in the margin, and later it became part of the text. Because *this* statement about fulfilling prophecy is not in the modern Bibles, certainly does not mean that the editors did not believe that Jesus was the fulfillment of OT prophecy about the coming Messiah. **The 22 references to His fulfilling prophecy that are in the modern Bibles testify to that fact.** (See Matt 27:35)

### I John 4:3

KJV: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not from God:

RSV: and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God.

NIV: but every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God.

VEITH: Well, if they leave it out, then I must assume that the NIV and RSV was written by the spirit of the antichrist. Right or not? Yes or no? Well, what do you say? Must be. Because it is not there, so they are denying it.

NIV: [**Note the context including verse 2**] This is how you can recognize the Spirit of God: Every spirit that acknowledges *that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God*: but every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. (emphasis added)

ALLEN: How can one honestly say that the RSV or the NIV has left this test out when the test was already stated? It was too obvious to have to be redundant and say it again. The real question is: Why did Walter leave out verse 2 that shows the NIV believes in this test? The words “Christ is come in the flesh” in verse 3 in the KJV are not found in the best Greek manuscripts. These words were probably added by a well-meaning scribe.

### Luke 24:40

KJV: And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them *his* hands and *his* feet.

RSV: [missing this verse]

ALLEN: Note Luke 24:39 in the RSV: “See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have.”

**The ‘missing’ verse is found in the RSV in John 20:20.**

### Matt 6:13

KJV: And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

VEITH: Gone [referring to other Bibles]. Why did they leave it out of the RSV, Douay, and NIV? Because Jesus must no longer be exalted.

ALLEN: **Is that why Luke left it out of his gospel in Luke 11:2-4 where he records this same prayer?!** No, that would be an absurd charge. For an example of the exalting of Jesus in those translations that have been defamed, read Rev 5:9-14. Note a few majestic phrases from this passage in Rev: “Worthy is the Lamb, who was slain, to receive power ...and honor and glory and praise!” (v12) The passage in question is another of the many places where scribes added material that became scripture for many people. Almost all scholars agree this passage was not in the original manuscript, but rather added later.

### **Luke 11:2**

KJV: And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.

NIV: He said to them, “When you pray, say: Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come.”

ALLEN: Following his remarks below, Veith showed the whole Lord’s Prayer in Luke 11:2-4 in the KJV and in the other translations. If one compared the Lord’s Prayer recorded in Matt 6:9-13 with Luke 11:2-4 *even in the KJV*, it would be obvious they are not alike.

VEITH: Why remove all those verses? You see, here in the NIV and RSV you can pray to whom? You can have the pope as father. You can have the pope. But here [KJV] you can’t. The father in heaven cannot be the pope.

ALLEN: It is amazing that apparently Walter always knows why something is ‘missing’ in the NIV. However, when one investigates for himself, he finds out that Walter was wrong. **These ‘missing’ parts are of course in Matthew 6:9-13.** They were added, not missing, not anymore than Luke is ‘missing’ parts from Matthew. As has been stated, the added phrases were done by scribes harmonizing one record to agree with a similar record of the same event or message. It would, perhaps, be a revealing experience for some to read a harmony of the four gospels and see all the places where those gospels were not in perfect harmony – that is, where they are not presenting the same things in the same words. Comparing the record of the fourth commandment in Ex 20:11 with Deut 5:15 (even in the KJV) must be an embarrassment to those who struggle so when one passage is not exactly like its counterpart. Praise God, we can let each of the writers of the Bible record what God spoke to him without criticism.

### **John 3:13 “The rightful place of the Son of Man in heaven is denied” [Veith’s words]**

KJV: And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.

RSV: No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man.

ALLEN: That phrase is also not found in the NIV. But does that mean that the RSV and NIV do not teach that Jesus is in heaven? Note such references as Acts 1:2,11; 7:56 “Look, he said, I see heaven open and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God.” Also note Heb 1:3.

<b>John 6:33</b>
------------------

KJV: For the bread of God **is he** which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

RSV: For the bread of God **is that** which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world.

GREEK: for the bread of God is the coming down out of heaven...

VEITH: Jesus is systematically removed from the modern translations.

ALLEN: All Veith had to do was to keep reading for 2 more verses in John 6 in the RSV and he would have found real proof of what the RSV teaches about who is the bread from heaven. Verse 35 reads, "Jesus said to them, 'I am the bread of life; he who comes to me shall not hunger...'" The Greek word that is translated as "he" in the KJV in this verse, is translated in the following ways in the KJV: the, this, that, one, he, she, and it. That indictment by Veith is amazing, even for one who wants to show how evil the modern Bibles are. How they failed to do what Veith claims they did! Indeed, anyone who really reads and studies these "modern" Bibles *will find* all the truths that are claimed to be missing.

<b>John 6:47 "Belief in Jesus as God removed" [Veith's words]</b>
---

KJV: Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.

RSV: Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes has eternal life.

BEST GREEK: Truly, truly I say to you, the [one] believing has life eternal

VEITH: Who believes what? That frogs are God? Gone. Two little words that make a big, big difference.

ALLEN: The words "on me" are also not found in the NIV or in the most reliable Greek manuscripts. Once again if one reads the entire context, he could hardly make such a ridiculous statement. Note the following samples from the NIV where Jesus is speaking: John 6:35, "I am the bread of life. He who comes to me..." v38 "For I have come down from heaven" v51 "I am the living bread that came down from heaven. If anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever." John 14:6 NIV "Jesus answered, 'I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except by me.'" Is that enough evidence to convince one?

<b>John 16:16</b>
-------------------

KJV: A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.

RSV/NIV: In a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me.

BEST GREEK: A little while and no longer ye behold me, and again a little while and ye will see me.

VEITH: I laugh about this text. Do you know what this text means? Jesus was playing hide and seek. He was peeping behind a tree; he was standing there behind a tree, and saying, “Now you see me, now you don’t. [This is repeated as Veith sways back and forth.] It is pathetic. God wouldn’t put a stupid text like that in the Bible. [He goes on making fun of the Bible text. Then he continues] Which one do you think God spoke? Obviously this one [KJV]. This [NIV] is pathetic. This is absolutely pathetic. I get angry sometimes. I must calm down.

ALLEN: The words “because I go to the Father” are not found in the most reliable Greek manuscripts in verse 16. **They are however, recorded in verse 17 in the RSV and NIV** as part of the disciples restating Jesus’ statement.

### **John 16:23**

KJV: ...Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.

RSV: ...if you ask anything of the Father, he will give it to you in my name.

VEITH: There is a HUGE difference between that text. You just think about it. Here [KJV] the whole character and truth about God is implied. Here [RSV], anything goes.

ALLEN: The Greek can read either way: ask in my name, or give it in my name. Either way one is asking the Father and it is given because of the name of Jesus.

### **Acts 2:30**

KJV: ...that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;

RSV [NIV] ...that he would place one of his descendants on his throne.

VEITH: Why do you think “of his flesh” is out? Why do you think so? Because they deny the doctrine of the physical coming of God in the flesh. He who denies it, is what? Antichrist. Again we have the spirit of antichrist in the RSV.

ALLEN: 1 John 4:2 in the NIV (and RSV) says “Every spirit that acknowledges that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God.” I have already established that these translations teach that Jesus has come in the flesh. Note Luke 18:15; 24:39 in the RSV and NIV.

### **Acts 8:37 “Testimony to His Divine Sonship omitted,” Veith’s words.**

KJV: 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.

RSV (NIV): omitted

VEITH: Now this is a sad one. Not Jesus saves you. You get saved yourself; that's how you get saved. You save yourself.

ALLEN: That verse is not found in the best manuscripts of the NT, but it is certainly not omitted from the teaching of the RSV and NIV. Note John 3:16; Acts 4:12; Rms 3:23; 6:23.

### Acts 9:29

KJV: And he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians: but they went about to slay him.

NIV: He talked and debated with the Grecian Jews, but they tried to kill him.

ALLEN: Veith calls this an ecumenical Bible because it leaves off "in the name of Jesus." **I don't know how he could have missed those words** if he had read the passage in the NIV. In verse 27 the Greek and NIV read "in the name of Jesus."

Note the last phrase in Acts 9:28 in the NIV "and speaking boldly in the name of the Lord." The NIV has the same two phrases "in the name of the Lord" and "in the name of Jesus" that the KJV has; only the verse division is different (and they were put there in the 1500's).

### Acts 22:16

KJV: ...and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.

RSV/NIV: ...and wash away your sins, calling on his name.

VEITH: Just one of those where they have removed Him.

BEST GREEK: ...invoking the name of him

ALLEN: Whose name it is becomes plain in verse 8 where Paul quotes Jesus: "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom you are persecuting."

### Romans 1:3

KJV: ...concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord,...

RSV/NIV: ...the gospel concerning his Son,...

VEITH: Here it could be His son Lucifer.

ALLEN: Once again the RSV and NIV are true to the best Greek manuscripts that do not have “Jesus Christ our Lord” in verse 3. **But the “missing” part is in the Greek, RSV and NIV in verse 4.** “...to be the Son of God by His resurrection from the dead: Jesus Christ our Lord.”

**Romans 9:5 “The Deity of Christ eliminated” [Veith’s words]**

KJV: Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, **who is over all, God blessed** for ever. Amen.

RSV: ...to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed for ever. Amen.

NIV: ...and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ, **who is God over all**, forever praised! Amen.

BEST GREEK: ...and from whom the Christ according to flesh; the [one] being over all God blessed unto the ages.

VEITH: Here [KJV] Jesus is higher than everyone else. There [RSV], different.

ALLEN: Which translation best shows the deity of Christ? Not the KJV. But the NIV that Veith has been condemning, best exalts Jesus as God over all!

**Romans 14:10 “The Judgment Seat of Christ abolished” [Veith’s words]**

KJV: ...for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ

RSV: ...for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God;

BEST GREEK: ...for all we shall stand before the tribunal of God [Theos].

VEITH: That [KJV] makes Christ God. And not only that, it exalts Jesus as the judge. They removed this privilege from Jesus, and made it somewhat general.

ALLEN: Maybe that reasoning is why some scribe altered what was written.

That Jesus is the judge is taught in Scripture (including the RSV and NIV) in John 5:22. Jesus is God is taught by the RSV and NIV in Jn 1:1; Titus 2:13; Heb 1:8; II Pet 1:1. **The KJV does not have Jesus being God** in Titus 2:13, or in II Pet 1:1. (The NIV agrees with the RSV in Rom 14:10.)

**I Cor 15:47 “The Pre-existence of the Son as Lord in Heaven discredited” [Veith]**

KJV: The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.

RSV [NIV]: The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven.

ALLEN: The above two translations follow the most reliable Greek manuscripts that do not have “is the Lord.” The RSV and NIV teach Jesus is Lord in I Cor 15:31,57 “– just as surely as I

glory over you in Christ Jesus our Lord.” “But thanks be to our God! He gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ (NIV).” Both teach the pre-existence of Jesus in passages like John 1:1-3.

### **I Timothy 3:16**

KJV: And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh,

NIV/RSV Beyond all question, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body,

BEST GREEK: And confessedly great is the – of piety mystery: Who [Greek “os”] was manifested in the flesh,

ALLEN: John 1:18 and Romans 9:5 in the NIV state that Jesus is God, but not the KJV.

VEITH: Hello! Would you care to look at me? I am manifested in the flesh. See how they systematically reduce Jesus and how they take Him out of the gospels. It is a shame. It’s a crying shame. And this one is the bomber [referring to the next text]. Do you know how much debate there is today about the trinity, and they say, “Trinity is NOT DOCTRINE OF THE BIBLE! It has to be removed.” And that’s why you cannot prove it in the NIV and you cannot prove it in the RSV; you cannot prove the trinity.

### **I John 5:7 “The Trinity Removed” [He brought this text up already, early in his talk.]**

KJV: For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

NIV: For there are three that testify: [Veith does not quote the rest of the text.] the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.

ALLEN: How amazing that when the KJV here follows the late copies of the Vulgate, the translation that Veith condemns as Arian, he says the KJV is correct, and all others are wrong! No scholar supports the KJV here, and neither do most translations of the Bible including the Catholic Douay and Young’s Literal Translation based on the TR. (YLT has that phrase of the trinity in brackets showing it was not in the Greek.) I have checked 41 translations on this verse. Only the KJV, NKJV and the Amplified have that added phrase. **That phrase was not even in Erasmus’ first 4 editions of his Greek NT.** (See [The King James Version Debate](#) pp.34,35 by D. A. Carson.) No, the trinity is not removed from the NIV or from the RSV. Check out Matt 28:19,20; II Cor 13:13; John 14:25; 17:21.

### **I Peter 4:14**

KJV: If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you: on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified.

RSV [NIV]: If you are reproached for the name of Christ, you are blessed, because the spirit of glory and of God rests upon you.

VEITH: Gone. The glorification of Jesus removed from one piece of verse 14.

ALLEN: The question is, was it removed, or was it added at one time? The Bible translators are not deliberately removing anything. The most reliable manuscripts don't have that phrase here. **It is stated beautifully in the NIV** in II Thes 1:10,12 "...on the day he comes to be glorified in his holy people and to be marveled at among all those who have believed. We pray this so that the name of our Lord Jesus may be glorified in you, and you in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ."

#### **Rev 1:11**

KJV: Saying, **I am Alpha and Omega**, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book,...

RSV (NIV): saying, "Write what you see in a book..."

ALLEN: The phrase, "I am the Alpha and the Omega" **is found in verse 8** in the RSV and NIV and all the modern Bibles, and in the best Greek manuscripts.

#### **Rev 5:14 "His eternal Godhead removed" [Veith's words]**

KJV: And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.

NIV/RSV: The four living creatures said, "Amen", and the elders fell down and worshiped.

ALLEN: Rev 10:6 NIV "And he swore by him who lives for ever and ever, who created the heavens and all that is in them, the earth and all that is in it, and the sea and all that is in it." The eternal Godhead of Jesus is also plainly taught in the NIV and RSV in verses like John 1:1-3; 8:58; 17:5

#### **Matt 4:4 (Verse quoted)**

VEITH: How much do you know what God said if they are confused to such an extent? And just take some simple logic. Which one do you think is the most probable correct text? The one as rendered in the KJV or the one rendered in the other versions? ...It can only be the KJV because the others - some of the verses are SO PATHETIC! That's the only word for them. SO PATHETIC! That's a nice word. It rolls off the tongue. They make no sense whatsoever.

ALLEN: I will let you decide what is pathetic. May our desire be reflected in this verse, "Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures." Luke 24:45 (NIV) I pray that none of us will be like "A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still."

Veith shows pictures of Mt Sinai – tells how God gave His law there, and information to Moses for the first five books of the Bible. Then he contrasts that with Mt Carmel where there is a Bahai Temple where they teach that all religions are right. Then he takes us back to Mt Sinai, and tells us that from this place something else goes to all the world. It is the Codex Sinaiticus. “That is the text on which all of the corruptions of the [modern] Bibles are based. The devil hates Carmel. The devil hates the law of God, and he is counteracting it right here. He has taken that which God used, and made it his own. He is sneaky.”

### **Concluding Thoughts**

After all his charges, Walter Veith has failed to show that even one doctrine has been changed in the modern Bibles. I believe if Walter Veith had spent as much time and effort in the Bibles as he did in the biased sources he used to discredit the modern Bibles, he would have found the charges against them were false. There will of course be other charges leveled against the modern Bibles regarding “missing” words or phrases. The same effort put forward here to find those concepts in those translations, will demonstrate the reliability of them. Praise God, our beliefs are found in all major translations of Scripture!

### **KJV Charged with Adding and Detracting from the Word of God**

The major charge that Walter Veith makes against the modern Bibles is the same one that Robert Young, translator of Young’s Literal Translation makes against the KJV – namely that it takes liberty with the Word of God, adding and deleting from what the Greek manuscripts really said. His literal translation is based on the Textus Receptus, the same as the KJV. The following are excerpts from the preface to his revised edition of 1898, and from the 1611 KJV.

“Inspiration extends only to the original text, *as it came from the pen of the writers*, not to any translations ever made by man, however aged, venerable, or good...It is not *euphony* but *truth* that ought to be sought, and wherein such a version as the one commonly in use in this country [KJV], there are scarcely *two consecutive verses* where there is not some departure from the original such as those indicated, and where these variations may be counted by *tens of thousands*, as admitted on all hands...Modern scholarship is beginning to be alive to the inconsistency of thus gratuitously obscuring, and really changing, the meaning of the sacred writers by subjective notions of what they ought to have written, rather than what they did write...to bring out what may appear to us might, could, would, or should be the Scriptural meaning...” Robert Young then gives an example. “There are about *two thousand* instances in the New Testament where these translators [KJV] have thus omitted all notice of the definite article, not to say anything of the great number of passages where they have *inserted* it, though not in the original.” (emphasis from author) Preface to Young’s Literal Translation, revised edition of 1898 [Based on the TR].

**PURPOSE AND GOAL OF THE 1611 KJV TRANSLATORS** – (The following is taken from the preface to the original 1611 KJV, **including spelling**.)

“But how shall men meditate in that, which they cannot vnderstand? How shall they vnderstand that which is kept close in an vnknown tongue? Now what can bee more auailable therto, then to deliuer Gods booke vnto Gods people in a tongue which they vnderstand?...Indeede without translation into the vulgar tongue, the vnlearned are but like children at Iacobs well...” Preface, pages iii,iv, 1611 KJV [Original spelling.]

**The KJV translators were not making a brand new translation, but a revision of the several that went before them. Yet they were met with suspicion .**

“...to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principall good one...that hath bene our indeauour, that our marke... Our labor deserueth certainly much respect and esteeme, but yet findeth but cold intertainment in the world. It is welcommed with suspicion in stead of loue...” Preface page v, 1611 KJV [Original spelling.]

“...so, if we building vpon their foundation that went before vs, and being holpen by their labours, doe endeuour to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike vs; they, we perswade our selues, if they were aliuie, would thank us.” Preface page vi. 1611 KJV [Original spelling.]

The title page of the KJV still reads “Translated out of the original tongues; and with the former translations diligently compared and revised.”

**Ugly attacks on new translations of the Bible is not new**

“Anybody attempting to do anything for the public - specially if it pertains to religion, and to the opening and clearing of the word of God, the same setteth himself upon a stage to be glouted upon by every evil eye, yea, he castest himself headlong upon pikes to be gored by every sharp tongue.” Preface page ii, 1611 KJV. [Original spelling.]

**KJV Translators Charitable Toward Other Translations**

On page vii of the Preface they assert that we should always be willing to make new translations of the Bible. And can these be trusted? "Now to the later we answere; that... wee affirme and auow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set foorth by men of our profession... containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God." [Original spelling.]

How different from the attitude of the King James Only people today who characterize other translations as evil.

<p>If you want more information or a seminar on <i>Delight In His Word</i>, contact me at <a href="mailto:pastordaveallen@gmail.com">pastordaveallen@gmail.com</a> or 360-574-4919. By David Allen, © Revised 10/21/2009</p>
--