

The NIV, NASB, ESV and other Vatican Versions reject the Hebrew Texts

Part One - Genesis through Psalms

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you." Deuteronomy 4:2.

"Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Proverbs 30:5,6.

"If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Revelation 22:18, 19.

The Old Testament scriptures, except for a few chapters of Aramaic, were written in Hebrew - not Greek or Syriac or Latin. The Lord Jesus Christ said in Matthew 5:18 "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Jots and tittles refer to the Hebrew scriptures.

Likewise the apostle Paul states: "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." Romans 3:1,2.

The Hebrew Masoretic scribes were used of God to preserve His inspired words in the Old Testament. Of the Bible versions widely used today in the English language, only the King James Bible consistently sticks to the Hebrew text. The NKJV departs at least 10 times I have found so far, the NASB over 40 times and the NIV, ESV reject the Hebrew Masoretic text well over 80 times, and most of these are openly admitted to in the footnotes of the NIV and ESV. The NASB departs from the Hebrew but they don't tell you when they do this in their footnotes. The modern Catholic bible versions like the St. Joseph New American Bible 1970 and the Catholic New Jerusalem Bible of 1985 often reject the same Hebrew texts in the same places and ALL these versions have virtually the SAME New Testament "interconfessional" text created by a joint effort of the Vatican and the infallibility denying, apostate 'Evangelicals' called the UBS (United Bible Society) or Nestle-Aland critical Greek text. See Undeniable Proof the ESV, NIV, NASBs are the new "Catholic" bible versions here -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/realcatholicbibles.htm>

This article will not list all the examples from the NIV, ESV, NASB, but enough to allow you to see what is happening to the Book we should all hold in reverence and treasure above any earthly possession.

Most Evangelical Christians today do not believe that any Bible in any language IS the inerrant words of God. In spite of the lame, signifying nothing, recent Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, they did get one thing right. It's found in Article XII - "We deny that Biblical infallibility and inerrancy are limited to spiritual, religious, or redemptive themes, exclusive of **assertions in the fields of history and science.**" Every true Bible believer should agree with this statement. **IF the Bible is not 100% historically true, then at what point does God start to tell us the truth?** If we cannot trust God's Book when it comes to specific numbers and names when it comes to past history, then how can we be sure He got the other parts right?

It is devastating for the modern version promoter to see where the New Jerusalem Catholic bible lands on these verses. Also notice how the previous Catholic Douay-Rheims read. It was a whole lot closer to the historical truth than are these more modern translations.

The following short list is just a sampling of the divergent and confusing readings found among the contradictory modern bible versions. There are numerous other examples, but these are just a few to make you aware of what is going on here with "the late\$ in \$cholar\$hip Finding\$".

Among these "historic details" are whether Jeremiah 27:1 reads Jehoiakim (Hebrew texts, RV, ASV, NKJV, KJB, ISV, Douay-Rheims) or Zedekiah (RSV, NIV, NASB, ESV, NET, Holman, Catholic New Jerusalem 1985)

whether 2 Samuel 21:8 reads Michal (Hebrew texts, KJB, NKJV, RV, ASV, Douay-Rheims) or Merab (RSV, NIV, NASB, ESV, NET, Holman, ISV, Catholic New Jerusalem)

or 70 (NASB, NKJV, RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, Holman, ISV, KJB) being sent out by the Lord Jesus in Luke 10:1 and 17 or 72 (NIV, ESV, NET, Catholic New Jerusalem)

or in Matthew 18:22 does the Lord say to forgive your brother not "until 7 times, but unto 70 times 7 times" (= 490 times - KJB, RV, ASV, NASB, NKJV, RSV, ESV, ISV, Douay-Rheims, ALL Greek texts) or 77 times (NRSV, NIV, Catholic New Jerusalem)

or the 7th day in Judges 14:15 (KJB, NKJV, RV, ASV, Douay-Rheims) or the 4th day (RSV, ESV, NASB, NIV, NET, Catholic New Jerusalem) or "the NEXT day" ISV (they just made this up!)

Or Hannah taking young Samuel to the house of the LORD with THREE bullocks in 1 Samuel 1:24 (KJB, Hebrew texts, RV, ASV, JPS 1917, NKJV, Youngs, NET, Douay-Rheims) or "A THREE YEAR OLD BULL: (LXX, Syriac RSV, ESV, NIV, NASB, ISV, Holman, Catholic New Jerusalem)

or God smiting 50,070 men in 1 Samuel 6:19 (KJB, RV, ASV, NASB, NET, ISV, Douay-Rheims) or 70 men slain (RSV, NIV, NRSV, ESV, Catholic New Jerusalem), or "70 men- 50 chief men" (Young's), or "70 MEN OUT OF 50,000 Holman Standard

or there being 30,000 chariots in 1 Samuel 13:5 (KJB, NKJV, RV, ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, ISV, Douay-Rheims) or only 3000 (NIV, NET, Holman, Catholic New Jerusalem)

or 1 Samuel 13:1 Here we read: "Saul reigned ONE year; and when he had reigned TWO years over Israel, Saul chose him three thousand men of Israel." reading - ONE/TWO years (NKJV, KJB, Geneva, Judaica Press Tanach), or 40/32 (NASB 1972-77) or 30/42 (NASB 1995, NIV), OR 30 years/ 40 years (NET) or _____years and._____and two years (RSV, NRSV, ESV, St. Joseph New American Bible 1970, Catholic New Jerusalem 1985), or "was 30 years old...ruled for 42 years" ISV, or even "32 years old...reigned for 22 years" in the 1989 Revised English Bible!

2 Samuel 15:7 "forty years" (KJB, Hebrew, Geneva, NKJV, NASB, RV, Douay-Rheims) OR "four years" (NIV, RSV, ESV, NET, Catholic New Jerusalem). The ISV ADDS words to the Hebrew text to make it say what they *think* it means, saying: "And so it was that forty years **after Israel had demanded a king**, Absalom asked the king..."

or whether both 2 Samuel 23:18 and 1 Chronicles 11:20 read "chief of the THREE" (KJB, Hebrew texts, RV, ASV, NKJV, NRSV, Holman, NIV, NET, Holman, NET, Douay-Rheims) or THIRTY from the Syriac (NASB, RSV, ESV, Catholic New Jerusalem) The ISV completely omits any number and just makes up their own text saying: "in charge **of the platoons**"

or 2 Samuel 24:13 reading SEVEN years (KJB, Hebrew, ASV, NASB, NKJV, NET, ISV, Douay-Rheims) or THREE years (LXX, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, Holman, Catholic New Jerusalem)

or whether 1 Kings 4:26 reads 40,000 stalls of horses (Hebrew, KJB, RV, ASV, NASB, ESV, NKJV, ISV, Douay-Rheims) or 4,000 stalls (NIV, NET, Catholic New Jerusalem)

or whether 1 Kings 5:11 reads 20 measures of pure oil (Hebrew texts, Geneva, KJB, ASV, RV, NASB, NRSV, ISV, Douay-Rheims) or 20,000 (RSV, NIV, ESV, NET, LXX and Syriac, Catholic New Jerusalem)

or in 2 Chronicles 31:16 we read "males from THREE years old" (Hebrew texts, KJB, Geneva Bible, Wycliffe, LXX, Syriac, RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, NKJV, Holman, NET, Douay-Rheims) or "males from THIRTY years old" (NASB - ft. Hebrew "three", ISV - "every male 30 years old and older", Catholic New Jerusalem)

or where 2 Chronicles 36:9 reads that Jehoiachin was 8 years old when he began to reign (Hebrew texts, KJB, NASB, NKJV, RV, ASV, KJB, RSV, NRSV, ESV 2001 edition, ISV, Douay-Rheims) or he was 18 years old (NIV, Holman, NET, ESV 2007 edition!!! and once again the Catholic New Jerusalem)

or that when God raised the Lord Jesus from the dead it is stated in Acts 13:33 "this day have I begotten thee" (KJB, NASB, NKJV, RV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, Douay-Rheims) or "today I have become your Father" (NIV, Holman, NET, ISV, Catholic New Jerusalem).

If you go back and read through this list of just some of the numerous very real differences that exist among these Bible of the Month Club versions, ask yourself which (if any) are the 100% historically true words of God. IF "the Bible" is not 100% historically true in the events it narrates, then when does God start to tell us the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

As for the ESV, you can see a lot more examples of how this revamped RSV version often rejects the clear Hebrew readings and has changed over 300 verses from the 2001 to the 2007 editions - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/theesv.htm>

Remember, God said that no man should add to or take away from His words.

Genesis 4:8 KJB "And Cain talked with Abel his brother: AND IT CAME TO PASS, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him."

NIV - "Now Cain said to his brother Abel, LET'S GO OUT TO THE FIELD. And while they were in the field, Cain attacked his brother Abel and killed him."

The NIV omits the verb "and it came to pass". In fact, the NIV complete concordance will tell you that they have "not translated" this verb a whopping 887 times. Not only does the NIV not translate this verb here but they also added "Let's go out to the field." The Holman Christian Standard also adds "Let's go out to the field" as does Dan Wallace's NET version. Wallace footnotes - "The MT has simply "and Cain said to Abel his brother," omitting Cain's words to Abel. It is possible that the elliptical text is original. " Their own footnotes say this reading comes from the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint (LXX - Greek), the Vulgate (Latin) and the Syriac but that the phrase is not found in the Hebrew Masoretic text. Guess which other bible versions also include these added words. That's right, the Catholic Douay, St. Joseph NAB and the New Jerusalem bible all have these extra words in them that are not found in the Hebrew Scriptures.

This additional phrase is not found in the NASB, NKJV, RV, ASV, ESV or any Hebrew translation.

Other places in Genesis where the NIV departs from the Hebrew are Genesis 4:15; 10:23; 36:24; and 47:31 where instead of "bowed himself upon the bed's head" (KJB, NASB, NKJV, Holman), the NIV says "he leaned on the top of his staff." This reading comes from the LXX and not the Hebrew, and Jacob didn't lean on the top of his staff until after the events of the next chapter. See Hebrews 11:21.

Genesis 47:21 KJB "And as for the people, HE REMOVED THEM TO CITIES from one end of the borders of Egypt even to the other end thereof." This is also the reading of the Geneva Bible, Youngs, Darby, the NKJV, RV, ASV, Holman Standard, Hebrew Names Version, the Jewish JPS 1917, the NASB 1995 and the Spanish Reina Valera 1995, to name just a few.

NIV - "And JOSEPH REDUCED THE PEOPLE TO SERVITUDE from one end of Egypt..." The NIV footnote says this comes from the Samaritan and the LXX, but that the Hebrew says: "he removed them to the cities". This false reading taken from the so called LXX is also that of the liberal RSV, the NRSV, ESV, Message and the NET version put out by Daniel Wallace and company. It is also the reading found in the modern Catholic versions like the St. Joseph and the New Jerusalem, though the earlier Catholic bibles like the Douay-Rheims and the Douay of 1950 read like the KJB and followed the Hebrew texts. Wallace footnotes that the Hebrew reading of "he removed them to cities" makes no sense in the context. Well, bible agnostics like Daniel Wallace are entitled to their humble opinions, but I and millions of other Bible believers maintain that God did not make a mistake and the Hebrew Scriptures are right.

John Gill comments on this verse: "*And as for the people, he removed them...* From the places where they dwelt, that it might appear they had no more property there, and might forget it, and be more willing to pay rent elsewhere; and their posterity hereafter could have no notion of its being theirs, or plead prescription; and besides, by such a removal and separation of the inhabitants of cities, some to one place, and some to another, sedition and mutiny might be prevented: he had them *to cities, from one end of the borders of Egypt, even unto the other end thereof*; according to the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem, those that dwelt in provinces, or in country towns and villages, he removed to cities, and those that dwelt in cities he removed into provinces, and placed them at the utmost distance from their former habitations, for the reasons before given."

Adam Clarke also agrees with the Hebrew and KJB reading and says it would be easier to feed the people where the corn was being stored, that is, in the cities, and to then have some others out working the fields. The KJB is right and the fake bible versions are wrong for rejecting the Hebrew texts and following some fanciful Samaritan Pentateuch or the alleged Septuagint.

The NIV also departs from the Hebrew in the following verses, though the NASB does not. Lev. 14:31; Numbers 24:17; 26:40; Deut. 23:18; 28:20; Joshua 15:4; 16:2; 18:18; 19:28, 34; Judges 8:8; and 9:29.

Exodus 3:19 "no, not by a mighty hand."

NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV all depart from the Hebrew and change the meaning of Exodus 3:19.

In Exodus chapter three the LORD tells Moses what He is going to do to Pharaoh and his land. In 3:19-20 we read in the King James Bible: "And I am sure that the king of Egypt will not let you go, NO, NOT BY A MIGHTY HAND. And I will stretch out MY HAND, and smite Egypt with ALL MY WONDERS which I will do in the midst thereof: AND AFTER THAT he will let you go."

The meaning is quite clear in the King James Bible for those who believe the Book and have eyes to see. God Himself is going to stretch out His mighty hand over Egypt and bring a

series of 10 plagues upon the land, yet, in spite of the first nine plagues, God will harden the heart of Pharaoh and he will refuse to let the people go. Only after the 10th and final plague of the death of the firstborn will God move upon Pharaoh to let the people go. Even after that, God will again harden Pharaoh's heart that he pursues after the children to Israel to bring them back, but they will be drowned in the Red sea.

In Exodus 7:4 and again in 9:3 and 15 we read concerning the series of plagues: "But Pharaoh shall not hearken unto you, THAT I MAY LAY MY HAND UPON EGYPT, and bring forth mine armies, and my people the children of Israel, out of the land of Egypt BY GREAT JUDGMENTS."

Exodus 9:3 "Behold, THE HAND OF THE LORD is upon thy cattle which is in the field, upon the horses, upon the asses, upon the camels...there shall be a very grievous murrain."

Exodus 9:15 "For now I will stretch out MY HAND, that I may smite thee and thy people with pestilence"

The "mighty hand" spoken of in Exodus 3:19 is the hand of God Himself in the first nine plagues. God had raised up Pharaoh "for to show in thee my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth." (Exodus 9:16)

The Hebrew texts clearly say exactly what is written in the King James Bible. Not only does the KJB say: "And I am sure that the king of Egypt will not let you go, NO, NOT BY A MIGHTY HAND", but so also do the Bishop's Bible 1568, Webster's 1833 translation, the Revised Version, American Standard Version, NKJV, Darby, 1936 Hebrew Publishing Company's translation, Green's interlinear, KJV 21, and the Third Millennium Bible.

However we find that the NIV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, Holman Standard, the Catholic St. Joseph NAB, the New Jerusalem bible and an host of other versions reject the Hebrew reading and follow the Greek LXX and the Vulgate. You won't see this by consulting the NASB, NIV, but the RSV, NRSV, and ESV let us in on this little secret by saying so in their footnotes.

In the RSV, NRSV, New Jerusalem bible and ESV we read: "I know that the king of Egypt will not let you go UNLESS COMPELLED by a MIGHTY HAND"; then is a footnote these three versions tell us their reading comes from the LXX and the Vulgate, but that the Hebrew says "no, not by a mighty hand" - just as found in the King James Bible.

The NIV has no footnotes here but it says: "UNLESS a mighty hand COMPELS HIM" - at least they kept the "mighty hand" part.

But the NASB, vaunted so much for being so literal (what a joke), says: "will not let you go EXCEPT UNDER COMPULSION." - thus rejecting the Hebrew reading, following the Vulgate, and even paraphrasing this by omitting "mighty hand". It is much like the St. Joseph New American bible of 1970 that says: "unless he is forced."

The translators of these versions apparently could not make sense of the passage, thought the Hebrew text was in error, and so followed something else according to their own understanding. As a result, they have changed the meaning of the passage.

The King James Bible is ALWAYS right.

Exodus 14:25 the LORD TOOK OFF their chariot wheels

Exodus chapter 14 relates the event of the children of Israel crossing the Red Sea when God divided the waters. The Egyptians pursued after them and were drowned in the sea.

In Exodus 14: 24-25 we read: "And it came to pass, that in the morning watch the LORD looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians, And **TOOK OFF** their chariot wheels, that they drave them heavily."

"**TOOK OFF** their chariot wheels" is the reading of Tyndale 1530, Coverdale 1535 (smote the wheels from their chariots), Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, the King James Holy Bible 1611, Rotherham's Emphasized bible 1902, the NKJV 1982, the Revised Version 1881, the ASV of 1901 (the predecessor of the NASB), the KJV 21, Third Millennium Bible, Hebrew Names Bible, World English Bible, the two Jewish translations of 1917 and 1936, Darby, the Living Bible and 1998 New Living Bible, Green's interlinear, MKJV, the NIV 1978 and 1984 editions - "He made the wheels of the chariots **COME OFF** so that they had difficulty driving." (NIV 1984) and the Spanish versions - *quitó las ruedas*.

However the "scholarly" NASB tells us : "He caused their chariot wheels **TO SWERVE**". This is also the reading of the brand new 2004 Holman Christian Standard version.

Now I've had the unpleasant experience of having my car wheels swerve on ice or snow, but thankfully I have never had them come off yet. You have to admit there is a difference between the Lord taking off their wheels and the Lord causing them to swerve.

The word used here is # 5493 *soor* and it means **to remove or take away**. It is used in Exodus 8:8 "take away the frogs"; in 8:31 "he removed the swarms of flies", in 34:34 Moses took off the vail", Genesis 41:42 "Pharoah took off his ring" and in Genesis 8:13 "Noah removed the covering of the ark".

Besides the confusion of the NASB and Holman Standard, let's see how some other modern versions clarify this passage for us.

The 1950 Catholic Douay version says God **OVERTHREW** the wheels; but the more recent Catholic versions like the St. Joseph NAB and New Jerusalem bible say God was "clogging" the wheels.

The RSV 1952, NRSV, ESV 2002, New English Bible 1970, Daniel Wallace and company's NET version, The Message **AND NOW THE "new" NIV of 2011** all say God "**CLOGGED** the wheels", (NIV 2011 - "He **JAMMED** the wheels of their chariots") with a footnote that tells us this reading (clogging, jamming) comes from the Septuagint, Samaritan Pentateuch and Syriac; but that the Hebrew text reads "took off" or "removed". Actually, the Greek version called the Septuagint doesn't say "clogging", as we shall soon see.

The Bible in Basic English of 1965 says God "made the wheels **STIFF**"

The New Century Version tells us God "kept the wheels from turning".

Young's "literal" (hah) says: "and turneth aside the wheels of their chariots." This would mean they swerved, but not that they actually came off.

Lamsa's 1936 translation of the Syriac Peshitta reads: "clogging the wheels" (from the Syriac we get the reading found in the Message, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NET, the "new" NIV 2011 and the other recent Catholic versions like the St. Joseph New American bible 1970 and the New Jerusalem bible 1985. The Catholic Jerusalem bible reads "He so **CLOGGED** their chariot

wheels.." then it footnotes that the "versions" read 'clogged' but the Hebrew reads "TOOK OFF")

Today's English Version 1992 "He made the wheels get stuck"

And the famed Greek Septuagint says God "bound the axel-trees of their chariots"; it doesn't say "clogging the wheels" as the false footnotes of the RSV, ESV, NIV 2011 tell us.

So when you read glowing recommendations about the next Bible of the Month Club version coming out that is based on better manuscripts and greater advances in scholarship, just realize it is a lot of pious sounding baloney. None of these people believe any Bible or any text is the inspired words of God, and all their efforts are designed to overthrow the time tested, inerrant, God approved King James Holy Bible.

In Deuteronomy 11:14, and 15 the Hebrew texts have Moses speaking for God who says: "That "I" will give you the rain of your land in his due season...And "I" will send grass in thy fields..." This is the reading of even the NIV, TNIV, New English Bible 1970, as well as the Holman Standard, the NKJV, RV, ASV, and the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, the Judaica Press Complete Tanach and the Complete Jewish Bible. It is also the reading found in the Geneva Bible, Bishops' Bible, Coverdale, the Hebrew Names Version, World English Bible, New English Bible, the Spanish Reina Valera, French Louis Segond, the Portuguese Almeida, and the Modern Greek O.T. (not to be confused with the so called LXX). The NASB at least up until the 1972 edition also read "I" will give rain.."I" will send grass...But in the 1977, and again in the 1995 edition the NASB editors decided to reject the clear Hebrew reading and they now follow the RSV, NRSV, and the 2003 ESV which read: "HE will give rain...HE will send grass..." The RSV, ESV tell us that the reading of "He" comes from the Samaritan Pentateuch, LXX, and the Vulgate, but that the Hebrew reads "I", and not "he".

Deuteronomy 26:3 - "...I profess this day unto the LORD THY God, that I am come unto the country, which the LORD swore unto our fathers for to give us." Here all Hebrew texts as well as the RV, ASV, NKJV, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV and Holman read either THY God, or YOUR God (which mean the same thing), but only the NASB follows the Greek Septuagint version and says: "unto the Lord MY God..." The footnotes in versions like Holman, ESV tell us this. Even the online NASB footnotes that the reading of "MY God" comes from the LXX, but that the Hebrew reads "your God". Daniel Wallace's ridiculous NET version goes with "your" God in his text, but then he gives us this silly footnote saying: "For the MT reading "your God," certain LXX mss have "my God," a contextually superior rendition followed by some English versions (e.g., NAB, NASB, TEV)." How can this be a "contextually superior rendition" when clearly the context of the verse itself is what the man bringing the offering says unto the priest? "...go unto the priest...and say unto him, I profess unto the LORD THY God..." And if it is a "contextually superior rendition" according to Dr. Wallace, then why didn't he himself follow it? Scholars are a funny bunch, No? Wait till you see what Dr. Wallace says about the next one.

In Deuteronomy 28:20 we read: "The LORD shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke ...because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken ME." The word "me" is the reading of the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, Holman and the Jewish translations. However the NIV and the TNIV say: "...because of the evil you have done in forsaking HIM." Then in a footnote the NIV and TNIV tell us the Hebrew reads ME. Daniel Wallace's NET version reads HIM but he footnotes: "For the MT first person common singular suffix ("me"), the LXX reads either "Lord" (Lucian) or third person masculine

singular suffix ("him"; various codices). The MT's more difficult reading probably represents the original text." However the copy of the LXX I have in front of me actually says ME, just like the Hebrew. Apparently there are at least THREE different LXX readings, and the NIV editors went with one of the three LXX readings and rejected the Hebrew text.

The NIV, Holman CSB, ESV and NASB change the Hebrew in Judges 14:15 where the KJB, RV, ASV, Youngs, the Jewish translations and many others correctly say "ON THE SEVENTH DAY". Here the NIV, NASB, ESV, Holman CSB all say "ON THE FOURTH DAY", which the NIV tells us comes from SOME LXX and the Syriac, but the Hebrew says "on the 7th day". The older Catholic Douay version followed the Hebrew reading of "the SEVENTH day" but the more modern Catholic versions like the St. Joseph NAB and the New Jerusalem read like the other Vatican Versions like the ESV, NIV, NASB and now have "the FOURTH day". There is a riddle within a riddle here and the NASB, NIV Bible Correctors couldn't solve it and they still end up with a contradiction. For a complete study on this apparent contradiction, see my article at: <http://brandplucked.webs.com/jud1415samsonsriddle.htm>

Judges 16:13 Here the NASB, ESV, NET, the Catholic versions like the Douay, St. Joseph and New Jerusalem and NIV add an additional 35 words to the Hebrew text. Agreeing with the KJB are the Jewish translations, the RV, ASV, NKJV, Darby, Young's and many others. There is no Hebrew text that contains these extra words. The NASB, NIV, Holman, ESV all add "and tighten it with the pin, I'll become as weak as any other man. So while he was sleeping, Delilah took the seven braids of his head, wove them into the fabric". The NIV footnote tells us these 35 extra words come from SOME Septuagint manuscripts.

For a much fuller examination and explanation of this passage where versions like the NASB, NIV, ESV, and Daniel Wallace's goofy NET version add these extra words to the Hebrew Scriptures, see my article on the book of Judges here:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/bookofjudges.htm>

Judges 18:30 "and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of MANASSEH, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of Dan until the day of the captivity of the land." MANASSEH is the reading found in the Hebrew texts as well as my copy of the LXX. So too read even the NASB, Complete Jewish Bible, Young's, the Geneva Bible and NKJV to name but a few. However versions like the NIV, ESV, Holman Standard, Catholic Douay, St. Joseph NAB and New Jerusalem bible reject the Hebrew reading Manasseh and say MOSES instead of Manasseh. Again, you can see my article on Judges for further information on this verse -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/bookofjudges.htm>

1 Samuel 1:24 "with three bullocks" KJB, RV, ASV, NKJV, and the Hebrew texts, is changed in the NIV, Holman, ESV, NASB to "a three year old bull" from the LXX and Syriac. The more modern Catholic versions like the St. Joseph and New Jerusalem bible also read like the NIV, ESV, NASB though the earlier Douay-Rheims followed the Hebrew text and read "with three bullocks".

1 Samuel 6:19 "he smote of the people 50,070 men." This is the Hebrew reading and also the RV, ASV, NASB and even the NET version. However the NIV, ESV say "putting 70 of them to death." The NIV is only off by 50,000. Is that close enough? By the way, the modern Catholic versions like the St. Joseph NAB and New Jerusalem also read "struck down 70 of

them" just like the NIV, ESVs. The earlier Douay-Rheims had: "he slew of the people seventy men, and fifty thousand of the common people."

The Holman CSB is different from them all in that it says: "He struck down 70 men out of 50,000 men."

The NIV also changes the Hebrew in 1 Samuel 12:11; 13:5; 20:24; 25:1, 22; 2 Samuel 5:25; 6:5; 7: 16 "before thee" to "before me" (NASB too); 7: 23; 8:4, 8, 13; 9:11 (NASB too); 13:39; 14:4; 15:7, 8; 17:28; 23:8, 36; 24:2, 13. The NASB agrees with the Hebrew and the KJB in all of these verses except the two mentioned.

1 Sam 8:16 KJB - "And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest YOUNG MEN, and your asses, and put them to his work."

YOUNG MEN is the reading of the Hebrew, the NASB, RV, ASV, NKJV, Holman CSB, and the new revision of the RSV called the English Standard Version of 2001.

1 Sam 8:16 NIV - "Your menservants and maidservants and the best of your CATTLE and donkeys he will take for his own use." Then in a footnote they tell us "cattle" comes from the LXX, but that the Hebrew says "young men". Guess who else does this same thing. You got it. The older Douay Version followed the Hebrew text and says "young men", but the more modern Catholic versions like the St. Joseph NAB and the New Jerusalem both say "your OXEN". Then in a footnote the New Jerusalem informs us that the word "cattle, oxen" comes from the Greek but the Hebrew text reads "young men".

1 Samuel 13:1 Here we read: "Saul reigned ONE year; and when he had reigned TWO years over Israel, Saul chose him three thousand men of Israel." reading - ONE/TWO years (NKJV, KJB, Geneva, Judaica Press Tanach, Spanish Reina Valera, Italian Diodati), or 40/32 (NASB 1972-77) or 30/42 (NASB 1995, NIV), OR 30 years/ 40 years (NET) or _____years and._____and two years (RSV, NRSV, ESV, St. Joseph New American Bible 1970, Catholic New Jerusalem 1985), or "was 30 years old...ruled for 42 years" ISV, or even "32 years old...reigned for 22 years" in the 1989 Revised English Bible!

In 2 Samuel 7:16 the NIV, Holman CSB and NASB change the Hebrew "before THEE" (RV, ASV, NKJV) to "before ME", according to the LXX, but the Hebrew says "thee". So too do the modern Catholic bible versions, though the older Douay-Rheims followed the Hebrew text like the KJB does.

2 Samuel 13:34 again the NIV, RSV, NRSV add 21 extra words to the text which come from the so called Greek LXX. These are not included in the 2003 Holman nor the NASB, nor even in the revision of the old RSV, NRSV called the ESV (English Standard Version 2001). You see, these modern scholars can't even agree among themselves as to what God wrote or didn't. The NIV adds this sentence which is not found in any Hebrew manuscript. "The watchman went and told the king, I see men in the direction of Horonaim, on the side of the hill." Likewise the newer Catholic versions like St. Joseph and New Jerusalem also add these extra words, but the previous Douay version did not. So, is it inspired Scripture or not?

In 2 Samuel 21:8 the NIV, Holman, ESV and NASB change "MICHAL the daughter of Saul", which is the Hebrew reading, to MERAB, which comes from 2 manuscripts and SOME LXX. My copy of the LXX, as well as the Jewish translations, the RV, ASV, Spanish, Geneva and NKJV all correctly read "Michal". Likewise the previous Catholic Douay version had MICHAL but the newer Catholic versions like St. Joseph and New Jerusalem have

changed this to MERAB, and the New Jerusalem even footnotes that the Hebrew reads MICHAL!

In 2 Samuel 23:18 and 19 the NASB follows the RSV and the Syriac in changing "Adriel...was chief among THREE" to "chief among THIRTY", but here even the NIV and Holman stick with the Hebrew and the RV, ASV and NKJV. Here again, the previous Catholic Douay-Rheims had "THREE" but the more modern Catholic versions like St. Joseph NAB and the New Jerusalem go with "the THIRTY".

In 2 Samuel 24:2 we read: "For the king said to Joab THE CAPTAIN OF THE HOST, which was with him, Go now through all the tribes of Israel, from Dan even to Beersheba, and number ye the people, that I may know the number of the people."

So read the Hebrew texts, the RV, ASV, NASB, NKJV, NET, Darby, Youngs, the Holman Standard, Lamsa and even the ESV. However the NIV adds words taken from the LXX and rejects the Hebrew reading. The NIV, along with the RSV, NRSV and the Message, says: "So the king said to Joab AND THE ARMY COMMANDERS WITH HIM (F89), "Go throughout the tribes of Israel from Dan to Beersheba and enroll the fighting men, so that I may know how many there are." Then it footnotes: "Septuagint; Hebrew - Joab the army commander". Once again, the previous Catholic Douay followed the Hebrew like the KJB, but the St. Joseph and New Jerusalem go with the LXX reading and read "and the senior officers who were with him".

Notice that the RSV and NRSV added these extra words from the LXX, but then the latest revision of these three - the 2001 ESV - went back to the original Hebrew reading. Such are the ever changing ways of the "science" of textual criticism.

Again, in 2 Samuel 24:13 we read: "So Gad came to David, and told him, and said unto him, Shall SEVEN years of famine come unto thee in thy land?"... So read the Hebrew texts as well as the Geneva Bible, the RV, ASV, NASB, NKJV, Darby, Youngs, the Jewish translations, Douay, the Spanish Reina Valera and the Italian Diodati. However, versions like the NIV, RSV, NRSV and the ESV read: "THREE years of famine" and then tell us in a footnote that "three years" comes from the Greek Septuagint, but that the Hebrew texts read "seven years". Again, the previous Douay-Rheims followed the Hebrew text and reads "SEVEN years" but the more modern St. Joseph and New Jerusalem reject the Hebrew and go with the so called Greek Septuagint and read "THREE years".

There is a very reasonable and biblical way of explaining this apparent contradiction once we read all that the true Bible says regarding the events recorded in Scripture. You can see it here: <http://brandplucked.webs.com/7or3yearsoffamine.htm>

In 1 Kings the NIV changes the Hebrew text in 5:11 from "20 measures of pure oil" to 20,000; and changes 6:8;(NASB too); 7:18 twice, though the NASB equals the KJB, and in 12:18. Likewise the previous Catholic Douay-Rheims read "20 measures of pure oil", following the Hebrew text, but the more modern St. Joseph and New Jerusalem say "20,000 kor of pure oil" and then footnote that this reading comes from the Greek but that the Hebrew reads 20.

1 Kings 9:8 King James Holy Bible and the Hebrew texts say: "And at this house, WHICH IS HIGH, every one that passeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss; and they shall say, Why hath the LORD done thus unto this land, and to this house?"

In 1 Kings 9:8 the NASB goes along with the NET, RSV, NRSV and ESV and follows the Syriac and Old Latin, while rejecting the Hebrew reading. In the Hebrew we read: "And this house WHICH IS HIGH, every one that passeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss..."

This is the reading of Coverdale 1535, Matthew's Bible 1549 - "And hys house which is so hie", the Geneva Bible 1599, KJB 1611, Darby, Young's, Holman CSB, NKJV 1982, Revised Version 1885 "is high", ASV 1901 - "And though this house is so high, yet shall every one that passeth by it be astonished, and shall hiss", 1917 and 1936 Jewish translations, Green's literal translation 2000, the KJV 21st Century 1994 and the Third Millennium Bible 1998. It is also the reading found in the so called Greek Septuagint.

The NASB doesn't tell you when they reject the Hebrew, but the RSV, which reads as the NASB, tells us "this house WILL BECOME A HEAP OF RUINS" comes from the Syriac and Old Latin, but the Hebrew reads "high". The 1973 NASB I have also reads "will become a heap of ruins" but then in the marginal notes says: "Hebrew - high", though they do not tell you that they got this perverted reading from the Syriac.

Even the NIVs of 1973 and 1984 basically followed the Hebrew text reading "AND THOUGH THIS TEMPLE IS NOW IMPOSING" but in the NIV 2010 they have now rejected the Hebrew reading and chose to follow the Syriac instead. The NIV 2010 now reads: "This temple WILL BECOME A HEAP OF RUBBLE. All who pass by will be appalled and will scoff and say, 'Why has the LORD done such a thing to this land and to this temple?'" Then it footnotes: "See some Septuagint manuscripts, Old Latin, Syriac, Arabic and Targum; Hebrew *And though this temple is now imposing.*" Well, my copy of the Septuagint clearly says "and this house which is high".

Daniel Wallace and company's "anything but the KJB" NET version also says: "This temple will become a heap of ruins;¹⁴ " and then footnotes: *Heb* "and this house will be high [or elevated]." The statement makes little sense in this context, which predicts the desolation that judgment will bring. Some treat the clause as concessive, "Even though this temple is lofty [now]." Others, following the lead of several ancient versions, emend the text to, "this temple will become a heap of ruins."

Uh, Daniel, "and this house WHICH IS HIGH" makes perfect sense. Before it was destroyed it was exalted among the people and held in very high esteem, and it was also very high physically. God did not make a mistake when He inspired His words in the Hebrew language. Jamieson, Fausset and Brown (as well as John Gill) comment: "**this house, which is high--**"high," either in point of situation, for it was built on a hill, and therefore conspicuous to every beholder; or "high" in respect to privilege, honor, and renown."

Matthew Henry likewise comments: "*This house which is high.* Those that *now pass by it are astonished* at the bulk and beauty of it; the richness, contrivance, and workmanship, are admired by all spectators, and it is called a stupendous fabric; but, if you forsake God, its height will make its fall the more amazing, and those that pass by will be as much astonished at its ruins."

Among foreign language Bibles that follow the Hebrew text and read like the King James Bible are the following: The Portuguese Almeida - "E desta casa, que é tão exaltada", the Spanish Sagradas Escrituras 1569, the Spanish Reina Valera's 1909, 1960, 1995, the Spanish Nueva Traducción Viviente of 2010, the Italian Diodati 1649, the Riveduta 1927 and the La Nuova Diodati 1991 - "E questa casa, per quanto sia così in alto ", the Modern Greek translation, and the French Martin 1744 and French Ostervald 1996.

2 Kings 17:27 - Here is an interesting verse in that so many Bible versions actually depart from the Hebrew text and yet I have seen some modern version promoters actually trying to tell us on the forums that the King James Bible is wrong and their modern versions that reject the Hebrew text are right! If they would just think things through, they would realize that the KJB and the Hebrew text are right. But NO. Rather than accepting a very reasonable explanation as to why the KJB and Hebrew are correct, they prefer to accuse them of error. Such are the ways of those who have no Final Written Authority -The Inspired Holy Bible - and instead place their own minds and understanding as their final authority.

In 2 Kings the Lord Himself sent lions among the people who now lived in Samaria because they continued to worship idols and feared not the Lord God of Israel. So the king of Assyria came up with a plan to teach the people about the God of Israel. In 2 Kings 17:27 we read: "Then the king of Assyria commanded, saying, Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence; and let THEM go and dwell there, and let HIM teach them the manner of the God of the land."

Agreeing with the Hebrew text in reading the plural as "let THEM go and dwell there" are the Jewish translations of JPS 1917, the 1936 Hebrew Publishing Company version, the Judaica Press Tanach, the Revised Version 1881, American Standard Version 1901, Darby, Young's, the Spanish Reina Valera 1909, Rotherham's Emphasized Bible 1902, World English Bible, Hebrew Names Version, and the KJV 21st Century version 1994.

There are many versions like the RSV, NRSV, ESV which change the Hebrew text here and tell us so in their own footnotes. These versions read: "Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence; and let HIM go and dwell there..." Then in a footnote they all tell us that the reading of HIM comes from the Syriac and the Vulgate, but the Hebrew reads THEM.

Not surprisingly, Daniel "scribal error" Wallace's NET version also adopts this bogus reading and he defends it by telling us in his footnote: "Hebrew "and let THEM go and let THEM live there, and let HIM teach them the requirements of the God of the land." The two plural verbs seem inconsistent with the preceding and following contexts, where only one priest is sent back to Samaria. The singular has the support of Greek, Syriac, and Latin witnesses."

Did it ever occur to "scholars" like Daniel Wallace et.al. that the priests themselves were married men with wives and children and that they would take their family members with them when they went to live in another country, and so the priest and his family went to Samaria and he would teach the people about the God of the land, and thus we have "let THEM go and dwell there, and let HIM teach them..."???

Not only do the RSV, NRSV and ESV wrongly read HIM instead of THEM, but so do the NKJV, NASB, the Geneva Bible, Bishops', Coverdale, and the Holman Standard. And not surprisingly, so too do the Catholic versions like the Douay and the New Jerusalem bibles. St. Joseph just omits the word altogether.

The NIV gets around the "problem" by just omitting the Hebrew word altogether and says: "Have one of the priests you took captive from Samaria go back to live there and teach the people what the god of the land requires." The Catholic St. Joseph NAB also does it this way.

The King James Bible is right, as always.

In 1 Chronicles the NIV rejects the Hebrew in 1:4, 17; 4:3 changes "father" to "son" along with the NKJV, NASB though the Hebrew translations, RV, ASV, Young, Darby and others read as does the KJB with "were of the father of Etam". 4:33; 6:25, 27, 28, 59, 77; 8:29, 30; 16:15; 25:9; 26:20 (NASB too), 2 Chronicles 15:8 both NIV and NASB add "Azariah son of" from the Syriac and the Vulgate; 20: 1,2, and in 20:25 both the NIV, NASB change "dead bodies" to "clothing"; 22:2 both NIV, NASB change 42 to 22 on basis of some LXX, but the Hebrew says 42; and in 36:9 the NIV changes 8 to 18 but the NASB retains "eight" years old, according to the Hebrew.

One example of many:

1 Chronicles 16:15 and 19. "BE YE MINDFUL always of his covenant; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations (v. 15)...when YE were but a few, even a few, and strangers in it."

The modern versions present us with their typical array of confusion and mutual disagreement in these two places - "BE YE MINDFUL" (v. 15) and "when YE were but a few" (v. 19.)

The Hebrew texts clearly read as does the King James Bible, but the NIV has chosen to reject the Hebrew texts and instead follow SOME Greek Septuagint versions in these two places.

Agreeing with "BE YE MINDFUL" or, as some modern versions have it "Remember" (which means the same thing) and "when YE were but a few" are the Hebrew versions of JPS 1917, the 1936 Hebrew Publishing Company version, the Judaica Press Tanach, the Complete Jewish Bible and the Hebrew Names Version.

Also agreeing with both Hebrew texts - "Be ye mindful" and "when YE were but a few" are the Geneva Bible 1599, the Revised Version 1881, the ASV 1901, Youngs, Darby, Webster's, Rotherham's Emphasized Bible 1902, Lamsa's 1936 translation of the Syriac Peshitta, the NKJV 1982, Green's interlinear, the KJV 21st Century Version 1994, Third Millennium Bible 1998, and the 2001 revision of the revision of the revision called the ESV (English Standard Version.) The RSV has it one way, the NRSV another and the ESV yet another. These guys are nothing if not consistently inconsistent.

Also agreeing with the Hebrew reading of "BE YE MINDFUL" (or Remember) are the NRSV 1989, NASB 1963-1995, Douay, Wycliffe, Coverdale, Bishops' Bible, Holman Standard 2003 and Daniel Wallace's NET version.

However all of these versions, both old and new - Wycliffe, Coverdale, Bishops' bible, the NASB, Holman, NRSV and Wallace's NET version - then proceed to reject the Hebrew text in verse 19, where instead of reading "When YE were but few", all these versions incorrectly read "when THEY were but few in number."

The NIV, RSV and TNIV reject both Hebrew readings and in verse 15 instead of saying "Be ye mindful always of his covenant" they say: "HE REMEMBERS his covenant forever". Then they tell us in their footnotes that these readings comes from "SOME Septuagint manuscripts, but the Hebrew reads 'Remember'." and "when you were few". Not all 'Septuagint' versions are the same. The copy of the Septuagint that is the most common says "LET US REMEMBER forever his covenant" and not "He remembers his covenant".

Likewise the foreign language bible versions are a hodgepodge of conflicting readings. Agreeing with the Hebrew texts and the King James Bible are the Spanish Reina Valera of

1902 and the Sagradas Escrituras 1569 - "Haced memoria de su alianza perpetuamente" and "Cuando erais pocos en número, Pocos y peregrinos en ella." However the newer Reina Valera versions have rejected the Hebrew texts, and both the 1960 and 1995 versions read like the NIV with: "El hace memoria de su pacto perpetuamente" and "Cuando ellos eran pocos en número".

The Italian Diodati 1649 and the Italian Nuova Diodate 1991 agree with the Hebrew and the KJB saying - "Ricordatevi sempre del suo patto" and "quando non eravate che un piccolo numero"

The French Martin 1744 and the 1996 French Ostervald both read the same as the Hebrew and the King James Bible. The 1999 French version called La Bible du Semeur, put of by the same people who gave us the NIV, the International Bible Society, does follow the Hebrew texts and agrees with the King James Bible. It says "Souvenez-vous pour toujours de son alliance" and "Vous n'étiez alors qu'un très petit..." So the French NIV differs from the English NIV.

The Modern Greek translation (not to be confused with the so called Greek Septuagints) also reads "Remember his covenant always" and "when you were but a few".

The King James Bible is right - as always.

2 Chronicles 15:8 "And when Asa heard these words, AND the prophecy OF OBED the prophet, he took courage and put away the abominable idols..."

So read the Hebrew texts and the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, modern Complete Jewish Bible, the Judaica Press Tanach, Hebrew Names Bible, the Geneva Bible 1599, Revised Version 1881, American Standard Version 1901, Darby, Young's, Rotherham's Emphasized Bible 1902, the NKJV and even Wallace's NET version.

However in modern times beginning with the liberal RSV, many bible versions add words to the Hebrew text on the belief that the Hebrew text has been corrupted. These include the NRSV, ESV, NASB, NIV, TNIV and the Message. These versions add the words "Azariah the son" to the inspired text.

Jamieson, Faucett and Brown give this faith destroying comment: "when Asa heard . . . the prophecy of Oded the prophet--The insertion of these words, "of Oded the prophet," is generally regarded as a corruption of the text. "The sole remedy is to erase them. They are, probably, the remains of a note, which crept in from the margin into the text" [BERTHEAU]."

This is an interesting comment from these men who do not believe that any Bible or any text is free from corruption. They suggest that we merely "erase" these words from the divine text, but yet none of the other multiple bible version translators have followed their advice. Instead the versions like the NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV and Holman have ADDED the words "which Azariah the son" of Obed to the text, allegedly from the Syriac and Latin Vulgate.

The NIV says "the prophecy of AZARIAH SON of Obed the prophet" and then tells us in a footnote: "Vulgate and Syriac; Hebrew does not have 'Azariah son of'.

Furthermore, the Syriac translation done by Lamsa reads: "the prophecy of Azariah the son of Azor" and not Obed. Then the conflicting Septuagint versions are again in disarray. The LXX copy I have does not add the name of Azariah to the text but says: "the prophecy of AZOR",

but then footnotes that the Alexandrian Septuagint reads: "the prophecy of Azariah" and both omit the name Obed altogether. So we see that these other "ancient versions" are in complete disagreement among themselves and the footnotes in versions like the NIV are a misleading lie.

Another note of interest as to why it is the King James Bible and not the previous English versions that is the perfect words of God is that Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale 1535 and the Bishops's Bible of 1568 all contain this added false reading of "the prophecy OF AZARIAH THE SON of Obed" to the Hebrew text.

There are two possible explanations I am aware of for believing that God got it right after all, and that His words have not been corrupted or lost over time, but have been faithfully preserved in the Hebrew texts and more specifically in the King James Bible. One explanation is that the prophet Azariah is called by the name of his father Obed. This is possible. However I personally lean towards the other explanation that not only did king Asa hear the words of Azariah but that he ALSO was told at this time about a previous prophecy given by Azariah's father Obed.

Notice carefully the words recorded in the King James Bible in 2 Chronicles 15:8: "And when Asa heard these words, AND the prophecy OF OBED the prophet, he took courage and put away the abominable idols..."

The King James Bible is correct and translators who put together versions like the NASB, NIV, ESV, and Holman are guilty of adding to the words of God and not believing in an infallible Bible.

Modern Bible translators do not believe in the preservation of the inspired Scriptures. There are many examples of where modern versions like the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV and Holman often reject the clear Hebrew readings and either follow some other source, or just INVENT or make up a reading on a whim. Yet they continually disagree among themselves as to when they do this.

2 Chronicles 20:1 KJB - "It came to pass after this also, that the children of Moab, and the children of Ammon, and with them other BESIDE THE AMMONITES, came against Jehoshaphat to battle."

These "other beside the Ammonites" would include "those of mount Seir" later mentioned in verses 10 and 22.

THE AMMONITES is the reading found in the KJB, the Jewish translations of the JPS 1917, Judaica Press Tanach, the Complete Jewish Bible, the RV, ASV, NKJV, the Geneva bible, the Bishops' Bible and the Spanish Reina Valera.

However the NIV says: "After this, the Moabites and Ammonites with SOME OF THE MEUNITES came to make war on Jehoshaphat." Then it footnotes that this reading comes from "SOME Septuagint copies, but the Hebrew reads Ammonites". Not only does the NIV reject the Hebrew text in this place but so do the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NET, NASB and the Holman Standard. Wallace's NET version also follows the non-Hebrew reading "Meunites" but then he footnotes: "The Hebrew text has "Ammonites,"...Most translations, following some mss of the LXX, read "Meunites" so NASB, NIV, NRSV." Likewise the older Catholic Douay followed the Hebrew text and reads like the KJB, but the more modern Catholic versions like the St. Joseph and the New Jerusalem add "and with them the Meunites" and then footnote that these extra words come from "the Greek; Hebrew corrupt"!!!

By the way, Lamsa's translation of the Syriac has a completely different reading than either the Hebrew texts or "some" LXXs. In stead of "and with them beside the Ammonites" it reads "with the mighty men of war".

In the very next verse, 2 Chronicles 20:2 we read in the KJB - "There cometh a great multitude against thee from beyond the sea on this side SYRIA ; and behold, they be in Hazazontamar, which is Engedi."

SYRIA (or Aram, which is the same) is the reading found in the Jewish translations of JPS 1917, 1936 Hebrew Pub. Com., the Judaica Press Tanach, Wycliffe 1395, Bishops' Bible, Rotherham's Emphasized bible 1902, the Douay-Rheims, the Revised Version, the American Standard Version, the NKJV, Third Millenium Bible, Green's literal, Darby, and even the Greek Septuagint - Siria.

However beginning with the liberal RSV and followed by the NRSV, ESV, NIV, NASB, NET, Holman Standard and the Message, these modern versions have rejected the Hebrew reading of Syria (or Aram) and read EDOM instead. Again, the older Catholic Douay version read "SYRIA" but the more modern Catholic versions like St. Joesph and New Jerusalem have "EDOM". Then versions like the NIV, NRSV, New Jerusalem and NET footnote that EDOM comes from ONE Hebrew manuscript, but that the Hebrew Masoretic texts read Syria or Aram. Even the LXX agrees with the KJB here. Once again the Syriac is corrupt and has a completely different reading than either the Hebrew or the LXX. Instead of "on this side Syria" it actually says: "and behold, they are encamping in Jericho"!!!

Then again in 2 Chronicles 20:25 we read: "And when Jehoshaphat and his people came to take away the spoil of them, they found among them in abundance both riches WITH THE DEAD BODIES, and precious jewels, which they stripped off for themselves, more than they could carry away: and they were three days in gathering of the spoil, it was so much. "

The context is really quite simple. When the children of Israel cried out to the Lord, God Himself set these enemies against one another and they killed each other. Verse 24 reads: "And when Judah came toward the watch tower in the wilderness, they looked unto the multitude, and, behold, THEY WERE DEAD BODIES FALLEN TO THE EARTH, and none escaped."

Not only does the King James Bible read "with the DEAD BODIES" (or corpses) but so also do the Jewish Scriptures (JPS 1917, 1936 Hebrew Publishing Company, New York, Judaica Press Tanach 2004, the Complete Jewish Bible) the RV 1885, ASV 1901, NKJV 1982, Green's, Spanish Reina Valera, Darby, Youngs, the Geneva bible 1587, the Lesser Bible 1853, Rotherham's Emphasized Bible 1902, the Third Millenium Bible 1998, and this time even the Holman Standard version of 2003. The Geneva Bible says: "they founde among them in abundance both of substance and also of bodies laden with precious iewels, which they tooke for themselues." Even Lamsa's translation of the Syriac agrees with the Hebrew texts and the KJB saying "and behold they were DEAD BODIES fallen to the earth".

The Hebrew word is found over 20 times in the Masoretic text. It is # 6296 peh-ger and is variously translated as "dead bodies" in the previous verse of 2 Chron. 20:24, Jeremiah 31:40; 33:5; 41:6, and as "carcasses" in Genesis 15:11; Lev. 26:30; Eze. 43:7 and as "corpses" in Isaiah 37:36.

(As a side note, earlier English versions were still influenced by some Latin Vulgate readings and the earlier English translations from Wycliffe 1395 to Coverdale 1535, Matthew's Bible 1549 and the Bishops' Bible of 1568 contained the reading of "clothing" instead of the Hebrew text of "dead bodies". The 1568 Bishops' Bible read: "And when Iehosaphat and his people came to take away the spoyle of them, they founde among them aboundaunce of goods, rayment, & pleasaunt iewels, which they toke for them selues, more then they could cary away." It wasn't till the Geneva Bible that the Hebrew reading was followed instead of

the Latin in this place. This shows the purification process that was taking place, which finally was perfected in the King James Bible.)

The NKJV also reads “dead bodies” but then it casts doubt on the Hebrew reading by footnoting “A few Hebrew manuscripts, Old Latin, and Vulgate read garments; Septuagint reads armor.” Well, for one thing they are lying about what the Septuagint reads. Instead of “dead bodies” or even “armor”, my copy of the so called LXX reads: “they found much CATTLE and FURNITURE, and spoils and precious things.”

The NIV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV and NET versions all reject this Hebrew reading of “dead bodies” and instead say: “his people came to take their spoil, they found much among them, including goods, GARMENTS (NASB) CLOTHING (NIV) and valuable things.” Then the NIV tells us that this reading comes from “Some Hebrew manuscripts and Vulgate; most Hebrew manuscripts corpses.” The newer Catholic bibles (St. Joseph, New Jerusalem) also read “clothes” and then footnote that the Hebrew reads “dead bodies”.

Another Bible corrector, Daniel Wallace, also reads in his NET version “clothing” instead of “dead bodies”, and he footnotes: “The MT reads “corpses”, but this seems odd among a list of plunder. A few medieval Hebrew mss and the Vulgate read “clothing”, which fits the context much better.”

Sorry Dan, but the context is just fine as it stands in the traditional Hebrew texts and the KJB. The JPS (Jewish Publication Society) translation of 1917 reads just like the King James Bible with - “And when Jehoshaphat and his people came to take the spoil of them, they found among them in abundance both riches and dead bodies, and precious jewels, which they stripped off for themselves, more than they could carry away”

Likewise the 2004 Jewish translation called The Complete Tanach follows the Hebrew Masoretic text (as does the KJB) and says: “And Jehoshaphat and his people came to plunder the spoils, and they found among them plenty, and belongings and corpses and precious vessels, which they emptied out for themselves to the extent that they could not carry them away, and for three days they were plundering the spoil, because it was so much.”

Wycliffe 1395, which was translated from the Latin includes BOTH the words “dead bodies” and “clothes”. It reads: “Therfor Josaphat cam, and al the puple with hym, to drawe away the spuylis of deed men, and thei founden among the deed bodies dyuerse purtenaunce of houshold, and clothis, and ful precieuse vessels”

The Latin Vulgate - "spolia mortuorum inveneruntque inter cadavera variam supellectilem vestes "

Catholic Douay-Rheims, like the Latin Vulgate and Wycliffe (which was translated from the Latin) also includes both the “dead bodies” and the garments - “and they found among **the dead bodies**, stuff of various kinds, and **garments**, and most precious vessels”. So, even the footnotes found in the NIV are false and misleading.

The NIV reads: “So Jehoshaphat and his men went to carry off their plunder, and they found among them a great amount of equipment and **clothing** [1] and also articles of value—more than they could take away. There was so much plunder that it took three days to collect it.”

Footnotes: Some Hebrew manuscripts and Vulgate; most Hebrew manuscripts corpses

2 Chronicles 26:5 - “And he sought God in the days of Zechariah, who had understanding in THE VISIONS of God: and as long as he sought the LORD, God made him to prosper.”

The VISIONS of God is the reading found in the vast majority of Hebrew texts and is the reading of every Jewish translation I am aware of, including the 1917 Jewish Publication Society, the 1936 Hebrew Publishing Company, the modern Complete Jewish Bible, the Hebrew Names Version and the Judaica Press Tanach.

It is also the reading found in the King James Bible, Latin Vulgate 425, Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale 1535, Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, the Revised Version 1881, American Standard Version 1901, Darby, Youngs, the Spanish Reina Valera, French Martin 1744, Louis Segond 1910, Ostervald 1996, Italian Diodati and the Rivudeta 1927, the NKJV, Modern Greek, and the NASB 1972-1995,

However the NIV has chosen a different text and reads: "He sought God during the days of Zechariah, who instructed him in THE FEAR of God. As long as he sought the LORD, God gave him success." Likewise the newer Catholic versions like St. Joseph and New Jerusalem say "THE FEAR of God" and then the New Jerusalem footnotes that "fear" comes from the Greek, but that the Hebrew reads "vision of God".

Then the NIV footnotes that the reading "fear" comes from 'Many Hebrew manuscripts, Septuagint and Syriac; other Hebrew manuscripts vision'. This variant reading was first adopted by the liberal RSV in 1954 and now it is found in the NRSV, ESV, NIV, NEB and the Holman Standard Version. The LXX does read "fear of God" rather than "visions of God", but Lamsa's translation of the Syriac has "worship of God" rather than either 'fear' or 'visions', but with the modern versionists' Bible Agnostic mentality, I guess we can never be sure what God inspired in His precious words of truth and grace.

NET version- Daniel Wallace's fickle NET version has an incredible 4 footnotes in this single verse and yet for the word in question he has nothing. He seems to have made up his own text which more or less leans towards the NIV reading. The NET says: "He followed God during the lifetime of Zechariah, who TAUGHT HIM HOW TO HONOR GOD. As long as he followed the Lord, God caused him to succeed."

Both readings obviously cannot be what God originally inspired. Who wants you to be unsure about what God has said? As the Rolling Stones say: "Won't you guess my name?"

2 Chronicles 31:16 - "from THREE years old and upward" or "from THIRTY years old and upward"?

In the King James Bible and in all Hebrew texts we read: "Beside their genealogy of males, from **THREE YEARS OLD** and upward, even unto every one that entereth into the house of the LORD, his daily portion for their service in their charges according to their courses."

Not only does the King James Bible correctly read "from three years old and upward" but so do the following Bible translations: Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1587, the RV 1885, ASV 1901, RSV, NRSV 1989, ESV 2001, NIV 1984 and 2011, NKJV 1982, Holman Standard 2003, the Berkeley Version 1969, Lamsa's translation of the Syriac, the Greek LXX, the New English Bible 1970, Daniel Wallace's NET version and the Revised English Version of 1989.

Yet the NASBs read: "without regard to their genealogical enrollment, to the males from **THIRTY YEARS OLD** and upward--everyone who entered the house of the LORD for his daily obligations--for their work in their duties according to their divisions." Then in a footnote they tell us "the Hebrew reads *three years old*." In other words, they just made this

number up out of thin air. The only other version I could find that also reads "thirty years old" is Eugene Peterson's The Message. In like manner, the previous Douay-Rheims read "THREE" but the newer Catholic versions (St. Joseph, New Jerusalem) say "THIRTY years and upwards" and then the New Jerusalem footnotes that the Hebrew reads THREE, just like the KJB has it.

There is NO Hebrew text that reads this way; nor the so called Greek Septuagint nor the Syriac; they all read "from three years old and upward". The NASB seems to attempt some justification for this whimsical change in the text by cross referencing 1 Chron. 23:3 where it talks about the age of the priests, but that passage is talking about the age of the Levites and not the Aaronic priesthood, which originally was 30 years old and upward, but was later changed to 20 years old and upward as can be seen from looking at the very next verse in 2 Chronicles 31:17 "...and the Levites from twenty years old and upward, in their charges by their courses."

John Gill comments: "*Beside their genealogy of males, from three years old and upwards...* Their office was not only to give to the priests, but to those of their males in their genealogy, who were three years old and upwards; for under that age, according to Kimchi, they were not fit to come into the temple; nor have they knowledge to keep what is put into their hands; nor fit to handle offerings, lest they should defile them; but at that age they might be taught how to hold them, and be used to it; but as for females, he says, they were not admitted at any age."

Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown - "With the exception of children under three years of age--an exception made probably from their being considered too young to receive solid food--lists were kept of the number and age of every male; of priests according to their fathers' house, and Levites from twenty years (see Nu 4:3; 28:24; 1Ch 23:24)."

The King James Bible is right, as always, and the NASB is clearly wrong.

Ezra 8:5 and 8:10 NASB 95, NIV, ESV, RSV, Holman all add to the Hebrew Scriptures.

In Ezra chapter eight we read of the genealogy of those who went up with Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem to rebuild the temple. In Ezra 8:5 we read: "Of the sons of Shechaniah; the son of Jahaziel, and with him three hundred males."

This is the reading of the Hebrew text, as well as the Geneva Bible, the RV, ASV, NKJV, Young's, Darby, Douay, the Spanish Reina Valera, and the Jewish translations of 1917 JPS, 1936 Hebrew Publishing Company, 1998 JPS updated and the 2004 Complete Jewish Tanach. It WAS also the reading of the NASB in their 1972, 1973 and 1977 editions.

However, the new NASB of 1995 now reads as do the RSV, ESV, NIV, the newer Catholic versions like the Jerusalem Bible and the St. Joseph NAB (BUT the latest 2009 Catholic Public Domain Bible has now gone back to the Hebrew text and omits these two added names!) and the Holman Standard. These versions say: "Of the descendants OF ZATTU, Shechaniah son of Jahaziel.." Then in a footnote the NIV, ESV and Holman tell us that the name ZATTU comes from SOME LXX copies, but that the Hebrew does not have this added name.

The same thing occurs in Ezra 8:10. Here the King James Bible as well as the Hebrew text and Jewish translations (1917 -1998), the 2004 Complete Jewish Tanach, and the RV, ASV,

NKJV, Young's, Darby, Douay of 1950, and Spanish versions all read: "And of the sons of Shelomith; the son of Josiphiah, and with him 160 males." This WAS the reading too of the NASB of 1972, 1973 and 1977.

But once again, the 1995 NASB has changed its Old Testament text and it now reads along with the RSV, ESV, NIV, the newer Catholic versions (except the latest 2009 version), and the Holman Standard: "Of the descendants of BANI, Shelomith son of Josiphiah..." Then in the NIV, ESV and Holman footnote (the NASB doesn't tell us that they changed the text), we read that the name of BANI comes from SOME LXX copies (they do not all read the same), but that the Hebrew does not have the name BANI in the text. Not surprisingly, Daniel Wallace and company's NET version does the same thing - adding these two names to the Hebrew texts - and then footnotes:

The MT lacks "of Zattu." The translation adopted above follows the LXX in including the words. The MT lacks "Bani." It is restored on the basis of certain LXX MSS.

Ezra 10:6 and 10:16

In Ezra 10:6 we read: "Then Ezra rose up from before the house of God, and went into the chamber of Johanan the son of Eliashib; AND WHEN HE WAS COME THITHER, he did eat no bread, nor drink water: for he mourned because of the transgression of them that had been carried away."

"And when he was come thither" is the reading of the Hebrew translations of the Jewish Publication Society 1917, the Hebrew Publishing Company version 1936, the Revised Version 1881, the American Standard Version of 1901, Young's, the Spanish Reina Valera, Green's MKJV 1998 and the NKJV. Even the LXX reads this way.

The NASB is a bit different with: "Although he went there, he did not eat bread..." The NIV is basically the same with: "While he was there, he did not eat bread..."

However the Holman Standard, the RSV and the ESV say: "Then Ezra went from the house of God, walked to the chamber of Jehohanan son of Eliashib, WHERE HE SPENT THE NIGHT. He did not eat food or drink water." Likewise the older Douay Rheims followed the Hebrew reading, but the more modern Catholic versions (St. Joseph, New Jerusalem) go with the reading "WHERE HE SPENT THE NIGHT".

Then in a footnote the Holman tells us "where he spent the night" comes from the Syriac but that the Hebrew reads as does the KJB and many others. Actually, this is a false footnote. Lamsa's translation of the Syriac says "And HE SAT THERE" instead of "where he spent the night".

The RSV and the ESV also say "where he spent the night", but they say nothing about any Syriac reading. Instead the ESV footnotes this reading in this manner: "PROBABLE reading"; Hebrew - he went there". In other words, the Holman and the RSV, ESV and modern Catholic versions just made this reading up out of thin air.

Daniel Wallace's NET bible says: "Then Ezra got up from before the temple of God and went to the room of Jehohanan son of Eliashib. WHILE HE STAYED THERE (footnote # 10) there, he did not eat food, nor did he drink water, for he was in mourning over the infidelity of the exiles."

Then in his footnote he tells us: "The translation reads wayyalen ("and he stayed") rather than the reading wayyelek ("and he went") of the MT. Cf. the LXX."

So Daniel Wallace has made up his own reading, and it doesn't even agree with ANY of the other versions. And why does he refer us to the LXX? Who knows? The LXX reads the same way here as do the Hebrew texts and the King James Bible.

A similar example of confusion exists in Ezra 10:16. There we read: "And Ezra the priest, with certain chief of the fathers, after the house of their fathers, and all of them by their names, WERE SEPARATED, and sat down in the first day of the tenth month to examine the matter."

"And Ezra the priest, with certain chief of the fathers...WERE SEPARATED" is the reading of the KJB, the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, the RV, ASV, NKJV, Young's, the Spanish Reina Valera, Green's MKJV, and even the Greek Septuagint.

However this time the RSV, NRSV, ESV and Holman all say: "Ezra the priest SELECTED MEN who were family leaders..." Then in a footnote the RSV, ESV and Holman all tell us this reading comes from the Syiac. The NASB, NIV and the TNIV also read "Ezra the priest SELECTED MEN" but they don't tell us that this reading is not what the Hebrew texts say; they just change the text with no footnotes telling us they have done so. The New Jerusalem also says "SELECTED"

Daniel Wallace's NET bible says: "10:16 So the exiles proceeded accordingly. Ezra the priest SEPARATED OUT (ft. # 19) by name men who were leaders in their family groups."

Then Mr. Wallace tells us in his footnote: "The translation reads the Hiphil singular wayyabdel lo ("separated for himself") rather than the Niphal plural wayyibbadelu ("were separated") of the MT."

Again, Doktor Wallace has simply changed the text, (and he even put in his own Hebrew rendering!), but admitted that the Masoretic text reads as does the King James Bible.

Even those versions that tell us the reading "selected men" comes from the Syriac are not being totally honest. Lamsa's translation of the Syriac actually says: "Ezra the priest selected TEN men". So, in other words, the NASB, NIV, ESV and Holman have all rejected the Hebrew text and substituted instead PART OF the Syriac reading. Nice scholarly work, huh? These are the guys who are writing your modern bible versions.

Nehemiah 11:8 - Here the KJB as well as the Hebrew texts read: "AND AFTER HIM GABBAI, SALLAI nine hundred twenty and eight." So too do Wycliffe, Bishops's bible, the Geneva Bible, the RV, ASV, NASB, RSV, NIV, NKJV, Rotherham's Emphasized bible, Green, Darby, Youngs, and the Jewish translations.

However the ESV omits the names here, and changes "and after him" to "brothers" saying: "and his brothers, men of valor, 928." They not only changed "and after him" to "HIS BROTHERS" but they omit the two names. Then the ESV footnotes: "Compare Septuagint; Hebrew And after him Gabbai, Sallai, 928". Well, I compared the LXX and it reads "and after him Gebe, Seli nine hundred and twenty eight." (kai opisoo autou Gebe, Seli)

The previous RSV read exactly like the KJB - "And after him Gabba'i, Salla'i, nine hundred and twenty-eight.", then the NRSV changed it a bit with - "And his brothers F36 Gabbai, Sallai: nine hundred twenty-eight." with a footnote that "brothers" comes from "F36 Gk Mss:

Heb [And after him]" They are lying. The LXX I have says "and after him" not "his brothers", AND it has two names listed. So much for the ESV and its accuracy.

Nehemiah 11:14 - Here the KJB as well as the Hebrew texts read: "And THEIR BRETHREN, mighty men of valour, an hundred twenty and eight..." Agreeing with the reading of THEIR BRETHREN are Coverdale, Bishops' bible, the Geneva Bible, the 1917 Jewish translation, the RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, NASB, Young's and Lamsa's translation of the Syriac. However the NIV, TNIV, Message and Daniel Wallace & company's NET version read: "And HIS ASSOCIATES". Then the NIV footnotes that HIS comes from "Most Septuagint manuscripts" but that the Hebrew reads "their". It should also be pointed out that "associates" is not the same thing as "brethren". The copy of the LXX I have reads "adelphoi autou" or "HIS brothers". Wallace's NET version also reads like the NIV- HIS COLLEAGUES" - and then he footnotes - "The translation reads with the LXX "and his brothers" rather than the MT reading "and their brothers".

Among the Catholic versions the older Douay read "THEIR BRETHREN", but the New Jerusalem has "HIS kinsfolk" while the St. Joseph NAB has "HIS brethren"

In the Book of Job the NIV changes Job 7:20, and in 9:19 both the NASB, NIV change "me" to "him". Here the NIV footnote says to see the LXX, though the Hebrew says "ME", but even the LXX doesn't read "him" - I checked it out. The Hebrew translations as well as the RV, ASV read "who shall set ME a time to plead?" as does the KJB.

Job 14:3 - "And doth thou open thine eyes upon such an one, and bringeth ME into judgment with thee?" So read the Hebrew texts as well as the 1917, 1936 Jewish translations, the Judaica Press Tanach, the Geneva Bible, Bishops's bible, Coverdale, the RV, ASV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, and the Holman Standard.

But the NASB, NIV 1984 edition, and RSV change the "me" to "him". The NASB does not tell us where they got this reading from, but the NIV footnotes tell us it comes from the alleged LXX, the Vulgate and Syriac, but that the Hebrew says ME. Even Daniel Wallace, of the goofy NET version fame which often rejects the Hebrew readings, says in his footnotes: "The text clearly has "me" as the accusative; but many wish to emend it to say "him". Likewise the Catholic Douay and St. Joseph change the Hebrew "me" to "him", just like the NASB, NIV, RSV.

Now the new TNIV has come down the pike and it has even changed from the old NIV. The TNIV now reads: "will you bring THEM..." Then in a footnote it tells us this reading supposedly comes from the LXX, Syriac and the Vulgate, but the Hebrew reads ME. By the way, the TNIV footnote is false. The LXX and Syriac do not read "them" but "him". Oh, but wait! Now the New New International Version of 2011 is here, and guess what. They have once again changed their text. The NIV 1984 read: "Do you fix your eye on SUCH A ONE? Will you bring HIM before you for judgment?" BUT the new NIV 2011 now says: "Do you fix your eye on THEM? Will you bring THEM before you for judgment?" Then it footnotes that this reading comes from the Septuagint, Vulgate and Syriac, but the Hebrew reads ME.

Job 15:23 "He wandereth abroad FOR BREAD, SAYING WHERE IS IT? he knoweth that the day of darkness is ready at his hand."

This verse reads the same in the Jewish translations, based of course on the Hebrew texts. It is also the reading of the RV, ASV, NASB, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. The NIV, however, goes totally off the wall here and doesn't even tell you in their footnotes how they

came up with their unique reading. The NIV 1982 edition says: "He wanders about - FOOD FOR VULTURES." You have to do a bit of research, but this corrupt reading comes from the Greek Septuagint; not the Hebrew texts. Oh, but wait! It's happened again! Now the new NIV of 2011 is here and it now reads: "He wanders about FOR FOOD LIKE A VULTURE." Tricky fellows, these NIV translators, huh?

Job 22:17 Again the NIV, RSV, and ESV depart from the Hebrew texts. The KJB, as well as the NKJV, NASB say: "Which said unto God, Depart from us: and what can the Almighty do for THEM." The NKJV footnote says the Hebrew reads "them", but the Syriac and LXX read "us", and so read the NIV, ESV saying: "what can the Almighty do for (or, to) US?" The Catholic St. Joseph and New Jerusalem likewise read "do to US?" with a footnote that says the Hebrew reads "do to THEM".

Job 27:18 Here we have another blunder found in the NASB. All Hebrew texts as well as the RV, ASV, NKJV, 1917, 1936 Jewish translations, Young's, Geneva, and the ESV (2001 English Standard Version) read: "He buildeth his house as a MOTH, and as a booth that the keeper maketh."

The word is clearly "moth" (# 6211 gahsh) and is found 7 times in the Hebrew texts, as in Job 4:19 "are crushed before the moth", and 13:28 "as a garment that is moth eaten". However the RSV and the NASB read: "He has built his house like A SPIDER'S WEB." If you look in the NASB concordance you will see there is no number by their entry of "spider's web". That is because there is no such word in the Hebrew texts. The NASB does not tell you when they depart from the Hebrew texts, but the RSV has a footnote telling us to compare the Greek Septuagint and the Syriac, but the Hebrew reads "moth".

Well, the LXX and the Syriac are interesting. The Greek LXX reads: "And his house is gone like moths, and like a spider's web", while Lamsa's translation of the Syriac has: "The wicked has built his house upon a spider's web."

It is also of interest that the RSV has "spider's web", while the NRSV says: "he builds his house LIKE A NEST", and then the ESV, which is a revision of the previous two, goes back to "moth". The NIV adds a word not found in any text but it still is similar to the KJB reading with: "The house he builds is like a moth's cocoon." The Catholic New Jerusalem is like the NASB saying: "All he has built himself is A SPIDER'S WEB". Then it footnotes that "SPIDER" comes from the Greek and Syriac, but that the Hebrew reads "MOTH"! - just like the KJB has it.

Psalms 18:13 "The LORD also thundered in the heavens, and the Highest gave his voice; HAIL STONES AND COALS OF FIRE." Bible versions that include the phrase "hail stones and coals of fire" are the Wycliffe, Coverdale, Bishops', the Geneva Bible, Young's, Darby, the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, the 2004 Judaica Press Tanach, the Complete Jewish Bible, the RV, ASV, RSV 1954, the NASB 1995, the 2001 ESV, the Spanish Reina Valera 1602 - 1995, Lamsa's 1936 translation of the Syriac Peshitta, the Modern Greek (not to be confused with the so called LXX) the KJV 21st Century version 1994, and the NKJV 1982.

However the NIV, NRSV 1989, NET version, and the 2003 Holman Standard omit these words, and then in a footnote tell us that some Hebrew mss. and the LXX omit these words, but they are found in most Hebrew manuscripts. Well, they are also found in the ancient Syriac versions too. The previous Douay version included these words, but the more modern Catholic versions (St. Joseph and New Jerusalem) omit them like the NIV and NET versions.

As for the NIV, what is of interest is that the NIV Spanish edition, called Nueva Versión Internacional 1999, put out by the same people who give us the NIV English version (International Bible Society) has included the Hebrew words left out by the NIV English version. It reads: "En el cielo, ENTRE GRANIZOS Y CARBONES ENCENDIDOS, se oyó el trueno del Señor, resonó la voz del Altísimo." Likewise the NIV French edition, called La Bible du Semeur 1999 (IBS) also includes the Hebrew words omitted by the American NIV.

Notice also that the previous 1954 RSV included the words; then the NRSV 1989 omitted them, but then the revision of the revision of the revision "scientifically" put them back in again! This typifies what modern scholars call the "art and science of textual criticism" - mere guesswork and fickle change for change's sake.

Though I certainly do not trust the Dead Sea Scrolls, since they have been found to contain conflicting texts of radically different readings, plus an additional "15 apocryphal Psalms or similar compositions distributed among four manuscripts", yet the DSS copy of Psalm 18 does include these Hebrew words that the NIV omits.

Psalm 20:9 "Save, LORD: LET THE KING HEAR US when we call." This verse reads the same in the NASB, NKJV, RV, ASV, Darby, Spanish, 1936 and 1917 Hebrew-English and other translations. The king can easily be seen as the anointed, or the Christ, who is the true king, whom God will hear, referred to in verse 6. Christ makes intercession for us, and God hears Him. Or it could be referring to the earthly king, who if he is a godly and compassionate ruler, will attend to the needs of the people when they come before him with their needs. In any case the Hebrew clearly reads this way. The NIV, and the ESV however, without a footnote, have this reading. "O LORD, SAVE THE KING! Answer us when we call!" It is of interest to note that the RSV also reads as does the NIV, but the RSV has a footnote telling us that the Greek LXX reads this way. I looked it up and it's true. But the RSV also states that the Hebrew reads as does the KJB, and also the others like the NASB and NKJV. So again, the NIV editors have forsaken the Hebrew masoretic text and followed the Greek LXX. The "old" NIV read: "O LORD, save the king", but the "new" NIV now has "LORD, give victory to the king!", but both readings are from the LXX, and not the Hebrew text. Likewise the Catholic Douay and New Jerusalem have "save the king", while the St. Joseph has "Lord, grant victory to the king", thus following the LXX and not the Hebrew, as do the NIVs here.

Likewise the NIV has used the LXX, Syriac or Vulgate to alter Psalms 19:4; 22:31; 42:5; 44:4; 49:11; 109:10; 119:37; 145:5; but all of these verses read the same in the NASB and NKJV.

In Psalm 22:31 along with the Hebrew texts we read: "THEY SHALL COME, and shall declare his righteousness...". So read the RV, ASV, NASB, NKJV, ESV, NET, and Holman. However the previous RSV, NRSV and now the NIV and TNIV omit the words "they shall come". The NRSV informs us in their footnote to consult the LXX for this omission, but also tells us that the Hebrew reads: "They shall come". Of course the NRSV also changes the Hebrew text in verse 29 where it says: "and none can keep alive his own soul" (RV, ASV, NASB, NIV, ESV, NKJV and Holman) for "AND I SHALL LIVE FOR HIM". The NRSV then tells us to consult the LXX, Vulgate, and Syriac for this completely different reading, but that the Hebrew reads as the KJB and others, including the revised ESV, now have it. So, at present, the NIV is the only newest version that continues to omit the words "THEY SHALL COME" from the Hebrew texts and follows the omission of the LXX here.

Psalm 60:4 "Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, THAT IT MAY BE DISPLAYED BECAUSE OF THE TRUTH. Selah."

So read the Hebrew texts as well as the following Bible translations: Coverdale 1535, Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, KJB , Youngs', Darby, the Revised Version, American Standard Version, NASB, NKJV, the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, and the Complete Jewish Bible.

The Spanish Reina Valera 1995 is the same as the KJB with "Has dado a los que te temen bandera que alcen por causa de la verdad. Selah".

However, the NIV reads: - "But for those who fear you, you have raised a banner TO BE UNFURLED AGAINST THE BOW." The RSV, NRSV, ESV read much the same with: "Thou hast set up a banner for those who fear thee, TO RALLY TO IT FROM THE BOW.", but then in the RSV, NRSV footnotes tell us this totally different reading comes from "the Greek LXX, the Syriac and Jerome, but the Hebrew says 'Truth'."

Well, not even their footnote is totally accurate. The copy of the Greek LXX I have says "given a TOKEN...that they might FLEE FROM THE BOW", while Lamsa's translation of the Syriac says the opposite with: "Thou hast wrought a miracle to them that reverence thee, so that they need NOT FLEE FROM THE BOW."

The Holman Standard basically keeps with this NIV perversion and says: "You have given a signal flag to those who fear You, so that THEY CAN FLEE BEFORE THE ARCHERS." These new bogus bibles are significant in that TRUTH has disappeared, and God's people are now fleeing before the enemy!! Guess which other "bibles" also read like the NIV here... You got it. The Catholic Douay, St. Joseph and New Jerusalem all reject the Hebrew and read "let them escape out of the range of the BOW."

In Psalms 145:13 the NIV adds 15 words to the standard Hebrew text. These additional words are not found in the RV, ASV, NKJV, NASB, Hebrew Names Version or any Jewish translation. The NIV adds "The LORD is faithful to all his promises and loving toward all he has made." See my article on this verse here -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/psalm145versemissing.htm>

Here are two examples from the Psalms that illustrate what the NIV is doing.

In Psalm 72:5 we read: "THEY SHALL FEAR THEE as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations."

. This is the reading of the KJB, Revised Version, ASV, NASB, NKJV, the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, the Spanish, Young's, Darby's, Geneva, and the 2001 revision of the RSV called the English Standard Version.

The NIV 1982 edition, however reads: "HE WILL ENDURE as long as the sun..." The new 2011 NIV changed this slightly and now says "MAY HE ENDURE as long as the sun". This is also the reading of the liberal RSV and NRSV, though the new ESV has again gone back to the KJB and Hebrew reading. But the footnotes found in the NIV, RSV, and NRSV all tell us that the reading of HE WILL ENDURE comes from the Greek Septuagint, but that the Hebrew reads "they shall fear thee". Likewise the Catholic Douay, St. Joseph NAB and the New Jerusalem all read: "HE WILL ENDURE" (New Jerusalem) OR "MAY HE ENDURE" (St. Joseph). Then the New Jerusalem footnotes that this reading comes from the Greek - "he

will endure", whereas the Hebrew reads "they will fear you". It's right there in black and white.

So why did the NIV change the clear Hebrew reading? Doesn't the Hebrew make sense? Didn't God inspire the words of the Old Testament in Hebrew and not in Greek, Syriac or Latin?

The second example is found in Psalm 73:7. There the Psalmist is speaking of the foolish and wicked who prosper in this world. He says of them: "THEIR EYES STAND OUT WITH FATNESS: they have more than heart could wish."

This is the reading of not only the KJV, NKJV, NASB, RV, ASV, but also of the RSV, NRSV and the ESV versions. However the NIV says: "FROM THEIR CALLOUS HEARTS COMES INIQUITY". Then in a footnote the NIV tells us this reading comes from the SYRIAC, but that the Hebrew says "their eyes bulge with fat." Likewise the Catholic St. Joseph says: "OUT OF THEIR CRASSNESS COMES INIQUITY".

Again, why would the "good, godly, evangelical scholars" who worked on the NIV change the text, if the Hebrew clearly makes sense and there is no doubt about what it says?

Also of note is the totally changed meaning of verse 9 where we read: "THEY SET THEIR MOUTH AGAINST THE HEAVENS, and their tongue walketh through the earth."

These wicked people speak against God, blaspheme heavenly truths and talk only of earthly interests. "They set their mouth against the heavens" is the reading or meaning of even the NASB, RSV, ASV, NRSV, RV, ESV, and NKJV. Yet the NIV actually says: "Their mouths LAY CLAIM TO HEAVEN, and their tongues take possession of the earth." Likewise the New Jerusalem says: "THEIR MOUTH CLAIMS HEAVEN FOR THEMSELVES."

Psalm 105:21-22 "He made him lord of his house, and ruler of all his substance: TO BIND his princes at his pleasure; and to teach his senators wisdom."

"to bind his princes" -So read the Hebrew texts, as well as the RV, ASV, the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, the Geneva Bible, NKJV, ESV, Darby, Green's MKJV, Holman Standard, and Young's. The NASB says: "to imprison", and even Wallace's NET version reads: "giving him authority to IMPRISON his officials." Then he footnotes: "Heb "to BIND his officials."

However the NIV joins the liberal RSV, NRSV and says: "TO INSTRUCT his princes as he pleased." This time the NIV doesn't tell us in their footnotes why they changed the text, but the RSV, NRSV and ESV tell us that "to instruct" comes from the so called LXX, the Syriac, and Jerome, but that the Hebrew reads "to bind". Again notice that the 2001 ESV has gone back to the Hebrew reading instead of the previous RSV rejection of the Hebrew text. However the Catholic versions (Douay, St. Joseph NAB, New Jerusalem all unite in saying: "TO INSTRUCT HIS PRINCES AS HE SAW FIT", and then the New Jerusalem footnotes that the Hebrew reads "to bind"!!!

There is a distinct pattern easily seen if one studies the different bible versions. The King James Old Testament is based on the Hebrew Masoretic text and the New Testament on the traditional Greek text. When the RV and ASV came out, they significantly changed the Greek text of the New Testament but kept the Masoretic text intact. Then the liberal RSV appeared with the same corrupted Greek text of the apostates Westcott and Hort, but also with many of

the same changes in the Hebrew text that now appear in the NASB, ESV, modern Catholic Versions and the ever worsening NIV.

118:13 "THOU HAST THRUST SORE AT ME that I might fall: but the LORD helped me."

The Hebrew reading here is clearly THOU, or "you" as some modern versions have it. THOU is the reading of the Geneva Bible, Bishops' bible, the KJB, RV, ASV, Young's, the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, and Hebrew Names Bible. The "thou hast thrust sore at me" is addressed to each of the many enemies who compassed Israel about like bees.

The NKJV, NASB, and Holman Standard read: "YOU pushed me violently..."

However the NIV, RSV and ESV all reject the Hebrew reading and follow the LXX and Syriac. The NIV reads: "I WAS PUSHED BACK..." Though the ESV also follows the LXX and Syriac, yet in their footnote the ESV informs us: "Hebrew You (that is, the enemy) pushed me hard."

The NIV departs from the Hebrew Scriptures well over 100 times and follows the Syriac, LXX, Vulgate or some other source. They usually tell you this in their footnotes, but not this time. However if you consult either the RSV or the ESV, they tell you in a footnote that the Hebrew reads "You" but the reading of "I" comes from the LXX and the Syriac.

Psalms 119:37 KJB - "Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity; and quicken thou me IN THY WAY."

So read the Majority of all Hebrew manuscripts as well as Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale 1535, Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, the RV 1985, ASV 1901, Darby, Youngs, the NASB 1995, ESV 2001, Holman Standard 2003, NKJV, the so called Greek Septuagint, Lamsa's translation of the Syriac Peshitta, Luther's German 1545, the Spanish Reina Valera 1909, 1960, 1995, the Italian Diodati 1602, 1991, the French Martin 1744, Louis Segond 1910, Ostervald 1996 and the Portuguese Almeida.

However the NIV has: "Turn my eyes away from worthless things; preserve my life ACCORDING TO YOUR WORD." Then in a footnote it tells us that this variant reading comes from "Two manuscripts of the Masoretic Text and Dead Sea Scrolls; most manuscripts of the Masoretic Text *life in your way*". Here the previous Catholic versions like the Douay and even the St. Joseph have "quicken me IN THY WAY" (Douay) but the 1985 New Jerusalem says: "BY YOUR WORD give me life", and then footnotes that the Masoretic text reads "in your WAY".

Likewise Daniel Wallace and company's NET version has rejected the Traditional Hebrew Masoretic texts and says: "Turn my eyes away from what is worthless! Revive me WITH YOUR WORD." Then the NET version footnote is completely misleading in that it now says "Hebrew - by your word", without informing us that the vast majority of the Hebrew texts do not say "by your word" but "in thy WAY".

However IF the NIV, NET editors put so much reliance on the Dead Sea Scrolls, why didn't they follow the DSS in this exact same verse where instead of "quicken thou me" (preserve my life - NIV; revive me - NET), the DSS reads "BE GRACIOUS TO ME"? [See The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible - Abegg, Flint & Ulrich] Why pick the DSS reading for part of the verse but not for the other part? And why don't all the other modern day "scholars" (read:Bible

Agnostics) see it the same way? Hey, it's every man for himself bible versionism. *Nothing* is sure!

Psalm 145:5 - "I WILL speak of the glorious honour of thy majesty, and of thy wondrous works."

The Hebrew Masoretic text clearly says "I" will speak, or it can be translated as "I" will meditate, and so read all the Jewish translations like the JPS 1917 version, the Complete Jewish Bible and the Hebrew Names Bible, as well as Coverdale, Bishops' bible, the Geneva Bible, the RV, ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV and Holman Standard.

However the NIV rejects the Hebrew reading of "I" and says: "THEY WILL SPEAK of the glorious splendor of your majesty, AND I WILL MEDITATE on your wonderful works." Thus adding another subject and verb and changing the "I" will speak to "THEY will speak". The Catholic St. Joseph and the New Jerusalem also follow the reading found in the NIV. Then they tell us in their footnotes that these changes come from the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Syriac. However I have a copy of Lamsa's translation of the Syriac and it says: "I will speak" just like the King James Bible and the Hebrew texts.

Then in Psalm 145:12 the Hebrew and the King James Bible read: "To make known to the sons of men HIS mighty acts, and the glorious majesty of HIS kingdom."

So read the Hebrew texts as well as Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Bible, the Jewish translations of JPS 1917, Hebrew Names Bible, the Revised Version, American Standard Version, NKJV, Youngs and Darby.

However the NASB, NIV change the Hebrew texts, which read HIS mighty acts and HIS kingdom, to THY mighty acts and THY kingdom (NASB 1977) or YOUR mighty acts and YOUR kingdom (NIV). Other versions that reject these two Hebrew readings of "HIS" and substitute either THY or YOUR are the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and the Holman Standard. Most of these versions, like the NASB, just footnote that the literal Hebrew is HIS. This time neither the NIV nor the NASB tell us why they made this change in the text, but we learn it from the NRSV. The NRSV footnotes that the literal Hebrew reads HIS, but the LXX and the Syriac read YOUR. That is where the NASB, RSV, ESV and NIV got it from. The Catholic versions also read this way saying "YOUR kingship and YOUR might" instead of the Hebrew and KJBs "HIS mighty acts...HIS kingdom"

NIV - "so that all men may know of YOUR mighty acts and the glorious splendor of YOUR kingdom."

May I suggest you take a serious look at this article that shows numerous examples proving the modern versions like the ESV, NIV, NASB, NET etc are the new Vatican Versions.

It is called - Undeniable Proof the ESV, NIV, NASB, NET etc. are the new "Catholic" bibles

"Mystery, Babylon the Great, The Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth..is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit...Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins" Revelation 17:5; 18:2-4

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/realcatholicbibles.htm>

Will Kinney