

Critical review of Gary La More's anti-Spanish Bible book *While Latinos Slept*

By Missionary Calvin George

December 22, 2005

There have been so many books written that attempt to correct the Spanish Bible with the English, that I've almost lost count. All of them bear a common thread, and this author's book is no exception. The common thread is that the exact principles the author utilizes to determine that the King James Version is God's Word in English is not applied consistently to the Spanish Bible.

The author of this book being reviewed has stated publicly in the recent past that the English Bible was written by God.¹ This Ruckmanite-type of thinking causes him to approach the Spanish Bible with deep prejudice.

The author boasts about his knowledge of Spanish in the preface, but when I met the author personally about three years ago, I noticed that although he had some basic knowledge of Spanish, he was not fluent. I recently received a phone call from a witness who heard him preach last year to a Spanish congregation through an interpreter! I believe the author knows just enough Spanish to be dangerous. Faulty conclusions due to his misunderstanding of Spanish grammar are sprinkled throughout the book and are covered later in this review. The author may be extremely intelligent and have an earned Ph.D., but if he is not completely fluent in Spanish or if he approaches the matter in a biased manner (such as believing the English Bible was written by God), I don't believe he is qualified to sit in judgment of our Bible.

The title *While Latinos Slept* denotes a conspiracy of sorts, to which the poor helpless Hispanics were blinded. Demeaning portrayals of Hispanics have been common among Spanish-Bible critics, although some others are less subtle about this so-called conspiracy, as is the case of Jeff McCardle, who was trained by Peter Ruckman himself: "By now the reader should be convinced that there was a conspiracy in 1960 to reinvent the Valera and make it a Roman Catholic Bible."²

This book contains some of the silliest and most ridiculous complaints against passages in the Spanish Bible that I have ever seen. Examples to follow include complaining of the Spanish word order, verse divisions, numbers, spelling of names, or even translating the Greek too closely!

¹ La More, Gary. June 7, 2003. Speech given at the 4th Annual King James Bible Conference - Toronto Baptist Church, Toronto, Ontario Canada. "You criticize the only Word of God written in the English language by God, and God's not gonna speak to you." About 10 to 11 minutes into speech.

² McCardle, Jeff. *The Bible Believer's Guide to Elephant Hunting*, Valera Bible Society, Pensacola, FL, 2003, p. 99

Author has no answer to his own question—Which one is the Holy Bible in Spanish?

Chapter Five, written in Spanish only, poses an interesting question for which the author has no answer: *¿Cuál es la Santa Biblia en Español?* (Which one is the Holy Bible in Spanish?) Since the author does not provide an answer to his own question, he leaves the Hispanic brethren hanging, as if they have no Word of God. As proof of this, he does not endorse any Spanish Bible whatsoever in his entire 418-page book.

For the record I would like to state that I have complete confidence in the King James Version, just as I have with the Reina-Valera. The only reason I refer to the KJV in this review is to demonstrate a double standard or what results if we apply the same criteria to the English Bible as is being unfairly applied to the Spanish Bible.

Don't miss the warning!

From page 149-418, which constitute Part II; the majority (60%) of complaints do not apply to the 1960 at all (which is indicated by the reference in bold lettering). I only found one warning about this in the book, buried on page 10. No similar warning could be found in Spanish. A Spanish reader who has no knowledge of English or Greek could be easily misled into believing that all passages covered from pages 149-418 are supposedly translated incorrectly in the common Spanish Bible.

The case of the missing “the’s”

Eleven of the author's complaints against the Spanish Bible in Part II are merely due to leaving out the article *the*. There are cases when Spanish grammar rules do not require it when it is already implied. The KJV did not translate Greek articles 100% of the time, such as in leaving out *the* before *Alpha* and before *Omega* in Rev. 1:11, which the Spanish Bible included. The book complains on p. 347 that the Spanish Bible follows Westcott and Hort by omitting *the* in Gal. 4:14, yet this very word does not even appear in the English Bible in the verse in dispute! If the author's own criteria were applied to the English Bible, he would have to reject it as well.

Titles of deity added or removed

The author complains of some omissions of names of deity in the 1960, and attributes it to hatred for the Lord Jesus Christ (p. 49). The fact is the revisers of the 1960 loved the name of Jesus so much, that in many places, especially at the beginning of many chapters in the Gospels, they replaced the pronoun *he* with *Jesus* if there was absolutely no question as to who the pronoun was referring to. The author complains about this as well, considering them additions without support of Greek texts. Although that is technically true, the 1960 “additions” have the support of the context. Just like when the KJV translators added “the brother of” to 2 Sam. 21:19 in italics, which is supported by the context.

At times the complaint involves replacing *God* with *Lord*, or vice-versa. I find that interesting, because the 1611 edition of the KJV has *God* in 2 Chron. 28:11, whereas the 1769 edition now in use has *Lord*. There are also times when the KJV omits a title of deity compared to the Spanish Bible. An example would be Rev. 16:5 where the Reina-Valera 1960 has *el Santo* (the Holy One), which has support in the Textus Receptus in the Stephanus 1550 Greek NT.

Word order

Just when I thought I had heard it all, along comes another excuse for those desiring to denounce the Spanish Bible. Complaints against word order abound in the book, such as faulting “faith and service” instead of “service and faith” (p. 394), or “night and day” versus “day and night” (p. 363), or Jesus Christ versus Christ Jesus (p. 363). Many more complaints about word order can be found, including three on one page alone! (p. 414). Only on rare occasions can one follow the word order of the Greek and not violate the rules of grammar of the language into which it is being translated.

Here is an example of the word order in Greek for John 3:16, taken from Green’s interlinear of Scrivener’s 1894:

So for loved God the world, so as the Son of him, the only-begotten, he gave, that everyone believing into him not may perish, but have life everlasting.

The author who has taught Greek has to know this about flexibility of word order, yet he insists on denouncing the Spanish Bible with criteria that he would never apply to his English Bible. This type of double standard in the book should be noted, and this bias on the part of the author surprises me coming from a person of his education and stature.

Italics

There are many complaints in the book about the 1960 revisers adding to the words of Scripture. One should be reminded that the KJV translators did this in thousands of places also, manifested in words in small Roman font in the 1611 edition, and in modern editions in italics. The 1960 revisers decided against placing such words in italics, because in modern literature italics represent emphatic words.³ One problem with the technique of italicizing words that had to be added is that it is not a precise science, and involves many subjective decisions. Those who speak only one language or who do not have any translation experience may find this hard to grasp. William Wonderly wrote an article in which he pointed out glaring inconsistencies in how italics were applied in older Valera Bibles,⁴ even though they were all based on the Textus Receptus. In the 1909 there are 11 chapters in Genesis that do not have any italicized words whatsoever. A comparison of those chapters with previous Valeras or Reformation Bibles in other

³ Minutes of the Translations Committee of the American Bible Society. December 15, 1950.

⁴ Wonderly, William L. “Las Letras Cursivas en la Biblia Reina-Valera.” *La Biblia en América Latina*. Octubre-Diciembre 1963, pp. 16-19.

languages that utilize italics should be sufficient to prove to the reader that it is indeed not a precise science, and the final result is of limited value. I have yet to be shown an English Bible where it clearly pointed out to the reader the reason for italicized words. I did not know the reason myself until I was in Bible college.

Tense, mood, etc.

Eighteen percent of the author's complaints against the 1960 in Part II of the book has to do with tense, mood, gender, voice, person, or case. Did the KJV translators believe they had to follow the tense of the original languages without exception? A brief look at a couple sentences from their preface gives us the answer:

Now to the latter we answer; that we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God. As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King's speech, **though it be not interpreted by every Translator with the like grace, nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere.**⁵

Verse divisions

On p. 195, the author accuses the 1960 of leaving out the phrase: "And he went and beheaded him in the prison" in Mark 6:27. The phrase that is supposedly missing is found at the very beginning of the next verse. Also a claim is made that a major portion of Mat. 28:9 is missing in the 1960. The KJV starts verse 9 at the beginning of the last sentence of verse 8 in the 1960. The author balks at some of the verse divisions in the Spanish Bible, as in page 294. Does the author believe God inspired the verse divisions as well?

From too literal, to not literal enough

On numerous occasions the author faults the Spanish Bible when a Greek word is transliterated instead of being translated literally into Spanish, yet it is common knowledge that the English Bible does this as well, as in *Raca* in Mat. 5:22.⁶ But the double standard does not end there. There is at least one case where he faults the 1960 for translating literally, instead of using the transliteration the common English Bible used. In this case it involves the popular Greek transliteration *Maranatha*, which in Spanish is translated literally and correctly as *El Señor viene* (the Lord cometh).

⁵ Emphasis added. Spelling was modernized for ease of reading.

⁶ *Raca* is not originally a Greek word, although as it appears in the KJV it is a transliteration of the Greek. It is thought to be of Aramaic origin.

Even spelling of names in the Spanish Bible is not immune to attack

The author accuses the 1960 of following Westcott & Hort by using *José* in Acts 4:36 instead of *Joses* as in the KJV (p. 284). Yet *José* was already the Spanish reading in the Valera of 1862, years before Westcott & Hort produced their Greek NT!

Don't blame the critical text

In some cases an addition in the 1960 was blamed on critical texts, when in reality the addition was needed in order to comply with Spanish grammar and avoid extremely awkward readings. The author complains about *No solo de pan vivirá el hombre* in Mat. 4:4, yet the article *el* (the) in this case is absolutely required by the rules of Spanish grammar.

Selling readers into slavery?

The author disliked the use of *esclavo* (slave) in the Spanish Bible, possibly not realizing that it is used twice in the KJV, as he states “the word *slave* was first suggested for use in the bible [*sic*] in 1890” (p. 15). The author especially did not like the use of *esclavo* in 1 Cor. 7:22, where the English Bible has *servant*. It should be noted that the underlying Greek word in 1 Cor. 7:22 (*doulos*) was translated *bondman* in Rev. 6:15 in the English Bible. The context should also be noted, where the following verse (1 Cor. 7:23) assures us: “Ye are bought with a price.” 1 Cor. 6:20 repeats this, and reminds us that we are not our own; we belong to God. In that sense of the word, we are His “slave” because we have been bought. But we are not just any slave. As a child of the King, we will have an eternal inheritance. It is a paradox of sorts. This is well illustrated in Gal. 4:7: “Wherefore thou art no more a servant [*siervo* in Spanish Bible], but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.”

More sloppy research

In Mat. 8:29, the Spanish Bible is flagged as having a departure following the critical texts consisting of omitting *Jesús*, but an examination of the verse in the 1960 demonstrates that this is not the case. As for John 1:14, the author highlights the verse, which is supposed to be an indication that it is faulty in Spanish. Yet nothing appears to be wrong, and the author does not even try to state what is wrong nor does he provide the Greek reading as in other places. Although it does not involve the same alleged omission, this is repeated with Rom. 7:25, 1 Cor. 7:13, 2 Cor. 1:15, 2 Pet. 1:21, and 2 Pet. 2:2. As for John 1:42 and John 3:16, the opposite of the complaint is true for the Spanish Bible.

And...

Nine percent of the author's complaints against the 1960 in Part II of the book merely has to do with the conjunction *and*. Many times in Spanish grammar the conjunction is not needed if it is clearly implied. Excessive use of conjunctions in Spanish can also result in awkward readings.

On p. 397, the author complains that Rev. 4:10 was missing the conjunction *and* between *twenty* and *four*! He complains of this very thing several times in the book. The Spanish word *veinticuatro* actually has a built-in conjunction, so this makes this objection all the more disturbing, and apparently reveals the author's lack of understanding of the intricacies of the Spanish language.

No problems found

Of all the verses the author complains about in the 1960 in Part II of the book, in 18% of the cases I could definitely not find anything wrong. This 18% figure is separate from matters placed in other categories, such as articles, conjunctions, or when a supposedly missing word was already implied. In some of the cases where I could find nothing wrong I may have misunderstood the point the author was trying to make, but if that is the case it wasn't clear. I suspect that many in this 18% category are cases where the author did not have a full understanding of Spanish, or where he rushed to judgment and made many mistakes in his obsession to place the Spanish Bible in as negative a light as possible. The following is a typical example that was placed in the "No problems found" category: On p. 192, there is a complaint as if there was an omission by not placing the Spanish word for "little" before *Barca*. Due to the author's lack of complete fluency in Spanish, he must not have realized that *barca* already means "little boat" in Spanish.⁷

Not missing but rather implied

Of all the verses the author complains about in the 1960 in Part II of the book, in 28% of the cases what the author stated was missing was clearly implied in the context, in my opinion. This figure of 28% is separate from the complaints against missing *the*'s and *and*'s, which also involve words that are already implied in the context. As far as what is clearly implied, I recognize that this matter is somewhat subjective, but I did give the Spanish Bible the benefit of the doubt in the process, because I believe the Spanish Bible deserves it. There were also some gray areas, where it was hard to decide whether to categorize a complaint as "nothing wrong found" or as "already implied in context." An example of this would be Luke 20:32, where the Spanish was flagged for having *finalmente* (finally) instead of *last of all* (Spanish: *al fin de todo*). The complaint was that the Spanish was missing *of all*. The Spanish word utilized clearly implies all three words.

There are cases when a short phrase in Greek can be translated into only one English or Spanish word. There is nothing missing if one English or Spanish word implies what it takes several Greek words to say. It seems that the opposite is true more often, where one Greek word requires several in English or Spanish.

What's a *doncella*?

I found it interesting that even though he dedicates eight entire pages to this matter, the author did not inform the reader what *doncella* meant. The *Vox New College Spanish &*

⁷ *Vox New College Spanish & English Dictionary* (1995 printing) defines it as *boat, small boat*.

English Dictionary (1995 printing) has *virgin* as the first word in the definition list for the Spanish word *doncella*. As far as derivatives of the term, *doncellería* is defined in this same dictionary first as *virginity*, and *doncel* as *virgin man*. The English word *virgin* is defined in Spanish as *virgen, doncella*. *Doncella* is simply a lesser-known synonym primarily meaning “female virgin.”

It should be noted that deep down the list of possible definitions for the word *doncella*, terms appear that may imply virginity, but do not guarantee it. In case any reader is still concerned about the utilization of *doncella* in the Spanish Bible, it should be noted that every time the virgin birth of Christ is involved, only the Spanish word *virgen* is used in the Reina-Valera.

Prejudice

In my opinion, the prejudice of the author towards Hispanic brethren is revealed in such statements as: “Without a doubt the RV 1960 revisers have been **patronizing** and **spoon feeding** my Latino brethren for years” (p. 106, emphasis his). Portraying Hispanic Christians as sleepy immature children who have been allowing themselves to be spoon-fed is demeaning and uncalled for to say the least.

Vindication when doctrinal changes are alleged

From pages 113-135 the author dealt with passages in the Spanish Bible where doctrinal changes are alleged. The following table contains what I consider to be a vindication for each passage, without resorting to critical texts.

Verse maligned	Vindication	Comment
M't. 5:22	Tyndale 1534	Tyndale declared to be from the Textus Receptus according to author of book ⁸
M'r. 1:2	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by many KJV defenders ⁹
M'r. 2:17	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by many KJV defenders
M'k. 9:24	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse

⁸ La More, Gary “God's Providential Preservation Of The Scriptures”

<http://www.gracembc.org/documents/ProvidentialPreservation.htm> Accessed Dec. 19, 2005

⁹ Carter, Mickey. *Things that are Different are not the Same*. Haines City, FL, Landmark Baptist Press, 1993, p. 112

		before W&H texts
Lu. 23:42	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Ac. 2:1	Dictionary	<i>Unánimes</i> is an acceptable translation of <i>accord</i> ¹⁰
Ro. 1:16	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by many KJV defenders
2 Co. 4:10	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Eph. 3:9	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by many KJV defenders
2 Th. 2:2	Valera 1602	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
1 Pe. 2:2	Peshitta	"unto life" - very close. See also Great Bible 1539 (italics).
Re. 22:14	Manuscript support	Manuscript support for either reading is fairly evenly divided ¹¹

Unreasonable

The author says the Spanish word *adulterando* (adulterating) compared to *deceitfully* is “very soft” (p. 49). To him *pecaminoso* (sinful) is not good enough in Col. 2:11 because the English Bible has *of the sins*. For 2 Cor. 4:5, the author pretends to be fair by providing justification for a 1960 reading based on a dictionary definition, but in the end for no apparent reason he still flags the verse as being wrong. What was he thinking?

OK for English, not OK for Spanish

“...yet behind the scenes will take unsuspecting believers and cause them to doubt God and His Word...”¹²

¹⁰ *Vox New College Spanish & English Dictionary* (1995 printing) has *unánimemente*, which comes from the same root word as *Unánimes*.

¹¹ For Spanish reading: A, 1006, 2020, 2053, it.ar, it.c, it.dem, it.div, it.haf, vg, cop.sa, eth, Athanasius, Fulgentius, Apringius, (Primasius), Ps-Ambrose, Haymo. For English reading: 046, 1, 94, 1611, 1854, 1859, 2042, 2065, 2073, 2138, 2432, it.gig, syr.ph, syr.h, cop.bo, Tertullian, Cyprian, Tyconius, Andrew, (Beatus), Arethas. Source: UBS Greek NT, 2nd edition, p. 894.

¹² La More, Gary “What About Scholarship?”
<http://www.gracembc.org/documents/WhatAboutScholarship.htm>
 Accessed Dec. 20, 2005

The author wrote the above in an article regarding not doubting the English Bible, yet when it comes to another language he seems to be OK with causing doubt among unsuspecting believers via his new book. This is yet another example of not applying principles consistently

The author continues: “If scholarship promotes doubt and distrust it is dangerous and will cause great harm to the cause of Christ. It becomes a schism amongst our fundamental ranks.”¹³

But is it OK to promote doubt and distrust the Bible in other languages? The author seems to think so, according to his book. Does great harm to the cause of Christ only occur if it involves doubting the English Bible? The author calls those who want to correct the English KJV Bible “intellectual perverts”¹⁴ yet why is it that the English Bible is so special that it’s OK to correct the Spanish? These words penned by the author with the English Bible in mind describe exactly what is happening in regards to the Spanish Bible (doubt, distrust, etc.). Why is it that those who warned against promoting doubt and distrust with the resulting division among fundamentalism, for some reason seem to think that the Spanish Bible is fair game?

Logic of faith need not apply

“One also knows that the King James Version is a faithful translation of the true New Testament text through the **logic of faith**.”¹⁵ The author wrote the above in an article regarding the English Bible. I couldn’t help but wonder if in the author’s mind Hispanics are not allowed to apply their “logic of faith” and therefore believe their Spanish Bible is a faithful translation?

The author talks tough when speaking of those who will mock those who place simple faith in God’s Word (regarding the English Bible):

When Scholarship infringes itself upon faith it becomes a false or pseudo-scholarship based on self-gratification. If this is not true, why does the neo-scholar mock those who, by simple faith, believe what God says in His Word? Is this not what we are supposed to do?...He does not want scholarship to be the leading factor in our lives.¹⁶

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ La More, Gary “Dean Burgon On The Textus Receptus”
<http://www.gracembc.org/documents/RECEPTUS.htm> Accessed Dec. 20, 2005

¹⁵ La More, Gary “Six Chapters In Defense Of The King James Bible”
http://www.torontobaptist.org/kjb_material/kjv_defense.htm Accessed Dec. 20, 2005

¹⁶ La More, Gary “What About Scholarship?”
<http://www.gracembc.org/documents/WhatAboutScholarship.htm>
Accessed Dec. 20, 2005

How come when the author switches languages, those who believe with simple faith are those being “spoon fed?” Is he not mocking them?

Should all preaching in Spanish cease until there is a Bible that can be “believed?”

In the past the author has questioned how one can stand up and preach and proclaim “thus saith the Lord” if one believes there are errors in his Bible: “How these neo-scholars can say there are errors in the Bible and in the next breath proclaim, ‘thus saith the Lord’ or ‘God said...’ when they really do not believe it.”¹⁷ It is obvious that the author is trying hard to convince readers in this new book that there are serious errors in the Spanish Bible. If we all agreed with the author that we should doubt the Spanish Bible, and further questioned like the author how we could preach from a book we didn’t believe in, all preaching in Spanish would cease until at some unknown time in the future God finally decided to provide Hispanics with the “true” Bible in their language he has been withholding all this time. In all fairness the author is not asking us to cease preaching from the Spanish Bible, but if we applied what he has written about both the English and Spanish Bible consistently and literally, that’s what it would lead to.

What would the KJV translators think of all this?

Would the translators of the KJV agree with the kinds of statements revealed in this book and others coming from the modern anti-Spanish Bible movement? These statements from the preface of the original 1611 sheds some light on how they would likely respond: “They that are wise, had rather have their judgments at liberty in differences of readings, then to be captivated to one, when it may be the other.” Also: “For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free, use one precisely when we may use another no less fit, as commodiously?”¹⁸

OK when English Bible translators did it, but not OK for Spanish

On page 47 the author can’t understand why the Spanish Bible has *siglo* (primarily meaning *age*) instead of *world* as in the KJV for Rom. 12:2. The *Vox New College Spanish & English Dictionary* (1995 printing) has the term *world* in the middle and also towards the end of the possible definitions for the Spanish word *siglo*. In his chapter in Spanish, the author used the plural form of *age* (p. 65), after all his lecturing on translating literally throughout the book. The author acknowledged that the KJV translated the underlying Greek word as *age* on more than one occasion, and admitted his point could be moot, but in his obsession to put the Spanish Bible in the worst light possible, based on this verse he still proceeded to question whether the 1960 is interested in “modernity” and “fashions!” In the preface the author promised he would not say anything he could not document and that he dealt only with facts. But as exemplified in the above case, many of his “facts” are merely his personal judgments.

¹⁷ La More, Gary “What About Scholarship?”
<http://www.gracembc.org/documents/WhatAboutScholarship.htm>
Accessed Dec. 20, 2005

¹⁸ Spelling was modernized for ease of reading.

Based on Textus Receptus? Let the unbiased decide!

Throughout the book the author tries to make the case that the Reina-Valera 1960 is not based on the Textus Receptus. It has been my position that although there are a few deviations that might not be vindicated by variations in Textus Receptus editions, just like some KJV deviations via the Latin Vulgate, the bottom line is that the Reina-Valera is indeed based on the Textus Receptus. Allow me to illustrate this further. The author admits on p. 24 that there are “59 places where the KJV is based on the Latin and not on any known Greek authority.” Should we then declare that the KJV is based on the Latin Vulgate? Certainly not!

In an internet article the author states something to the effect that disputes can be settled by paying attention to the research of the unbiased. I agree. He proceeds with an example of how we should rely on the unbiased to reach proper conclusions regarding Erasmus: ...he is neither an Evangelical nor a Fundamentalist. Thus he has no theological axe to grind. He is just making a statement based on the research he has done... Why cannot so-called Fundamentalists see the same things concerning Erasmus that Mr. Packard has seen? ...Have they not read? Do they not know?¹⁹

Now back to the question of whether the Reina-Valera 1960 is based on the Textus Receptus. In my book *The History of the Reina-Valera 1960*, I provide statements from no less than 12 sources that affirm that the 1960 is indeed based on the Textus Receptus. Only one of the 12 writers was a fundamentalist, so it could be said that 11 did not have a theological ax to grind. One example in my book came from a researcher (who to my knowledge was not a fundamentalist) who did a study entitled “The Textual Base of Some Spanish Versions of the New Testament.” He reached the following unbiased conclusion: “...Based upon the ‘Received Text’ in the New Testament. The revision of 1960 follows the same textual base as the earlier revisions.”²⁰ If we apply the same standard that the author had for Erasmus, as far as taking seriously what the unbiased have to say, then we would recognize that the overwhelming majority of the unbiased consider the 1960 to indeed be based on the Textus Receptus.

To the author it seems no Spanish Bible will ever be good enough

The author doesn't seem to be able to get over the fact that the KJV is in English only. No Spanish Bible will ever truly be “the KJV” in Spanish, as evidenced by the failed attempt by Missionary Bernard McVey to translate literally straight from the KJV into Spanish. Numerous new Spanish Bibles by fundamental groups have been completed or started in recent years, in which the most common complaints have been dealt with by those who believe the English Bible is the final authority. In spite of all this, in his broken Spanish he states the following: *Necesitamos una nueva traducción al español pero una*

¹⁹ La More, Gary “Erasmus Of Rotterdam [1466-1536] A Good Son Of The Roman Catholic Church?” <http://www.gracembc.org/documents/ErasmusofRotterdam.htm> Accessed Dec. 20, 2005

²⁰ Aulie, Wilbur. “The Textual Base of Some Spanish Versions of the New Testament.” *The Bible Translator*. October 1962, p. 214.

que parta de un texto griego correcto. (We need a new translation into Spanish but one that is based on a correct Greek text). There's the Versión Creyentes Bíblicos, the Reina-Valera-Gómez, the Donate/Park so-called 1602, the Enzinas restoration project, the 2001 Spanish version by the Trinitarian Bible Society, the McVey NT translated from the KJV, the Barry Smith KJV-into-Spanish project, etc. When is enough, enough? Since there is nothing that is solving the alleged problem, I believe that this contributes to my view that there was no problem to begin with in the first place.

Sometimes Spanish Bible is closer to the Greek

The author flags Acts 8:12 in the Spanish Bible on p. 289, but on closer examination with the interlinear versions of Newberry and Green of Stephanus 1150 and Scrivener 1894, the Spanish Bible actually follows the Greek more closely with *el evangelio* (the gospel) rather than *the things*. The situation repeats itself for Acts 11:20, where the author complains about the Spanish Bible using the term for Greeks, rather than Grecians. But upon closer examination, the Spanish Bible has *el evangelio* (the gospel) in this verse, with support of Scrivener 1894 and Stephanus 1550 Greek New Testaments. The KJV omits this, although as always is the case in Spanish, there is likely to be an explanation.

Differences in Textus Receptus editions

Most complaints against the 1960 are blamed on the Westcott and Hort texts, and yet upon closer examination, some can be traced to differences in TR editions. This is the case with *of God* in 1 John 3:16, which is even in italics in the KJV! Stephanus 1550 matches the 1960 reading in this point. The last *that* of 2 Cor. 12:6 is in italics in the English Bible, yet this book would have you believe that its omission in the Spanish Bible is due to the critical text! There are more cases of accusations of omissions of words in italics on pages 384, 386, and 404. The author wants you to think that leaving out "and the angel stood" in Rev. 11:1 is a case of pandering to the critical texts in the Spanish Bible, yet this phrase is also missing in the Stephanus 1550 Greek New Testament. Rom. 16:20 is flagged for omitting *amen* in the Spanish Bible, but once again it has to do with variances in Textus Receptus editions. More examples could be given, but that would be beyond the range of this book review. The author complains of those who hasten to jump to conclusions, (p. 136) but as exemplified in this paragraph and elsewhere, this book is full of examples of doing just that.

To the author the KJV is superior to the Greek

On p. 256, the author faults the Spanish Bible for translating the Greek word *de* as *entonces* (*then* in Spanish). Yet on p. 272 you can see that the KJV translated the Greek *de* as *then* in John 13:25 (not to mention other places)! At Luke 10:12, the author faults the 1960 for translating the Greek word *de* as *y* (*and* in Spanish) because the KJV at this point translated it as *but*. However, in many places the KJV translated this exact Greek word as *and* many times. Other inconsistencies in how the author will allow this Greek word to be translated can be found on pages 278, 330, and 333. As a Greek teacher, the author has to know that this Greek word can be translated both ways, so this shows once

again that he has a double standard when it comes to the Spanish Bible. From these and many more examples, such as the complaint against translating *Maranatha* literally from the Greek, you can tell that the author is treating the KJV as being superior to the Greek, which is characteristic of Ruckmanism. When will the double standards end?

Conclusion

My faith, as well as the faith of countless others in the Spanish Bible, has withstood the test of time and all the smear tactics of those who would have us abandon it. We confided in it before the anti-Reina-Valera movement reared its ugly head—and we continue undaunted, with our faith unshaken.