

The Common Spanish Bible Vindicated

By Calvin George

Revised Oct. 14, 2003

In September of 2002 Landmark Baptist Church and College of Haines City, Florida released *The Elephant in the Living Room*, a book which attacked 102 verses in the Spanish Reina-Valera 1960. The objective of this study is to show that most of those "corrupt" 1960 readings do not come solely from critical texts, and that in fact many readings that were attacked have appeared before and after the 1960 in other translations that are indisputably TR-based.

Verse maligned	Page #	Vindication	Comment
Ge. 1:14	122	TBS Portuguese	This Bible was praised in the book
Genesis 18:19	122	Bishop's Bible 1602	"him" omitted
Ex. 12:5	100	Masoretic text	See Green's Interlinear
Le. 17:14	101	KJV	KJV does not have "soul" in this verse. See Green's Interlinear.
Numbers 23:22	122	Wilson's OT Word Studies	"bufalo" instead of "unicorn"
Numbers 33:52	122	KJV	"Pictures" vs. "ídolos de piedra." See how the KJV translated the same word in Lv. 26:1, "image of stone" as well as the marginal note.
Judges 18:30	122	Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon (#1121)	See also how KJV translates same term in Ex. 4:22
1 Sa. 5:6	122	Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon	Strong's # 6076
2 Sa. 21:19	90	Italics in KJV	<i>"the brother of"</i> not in Hebrew text - added for clarification
II Samuel 22:3	122	Strong's Concordance	#5553 can be "fortaleza" #4869 can be "alto" and #4869/4499 can be "refugio"
II Samuel 23:18	122	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
2 Ki. 23:7	120	Masoretic text	See Green's Interlinear

Ezr. 2:43	122	Masoretic text	See Green's Interlinear
Job 11:12	122	Literal from Masoretic text	Words could have been added (like italics in KJV) for further clarification
Job 21:13	117	Strong's Concordance	#7281 which says it is from #7280
Ps. 2:2	102	NA	Apparently wrong reference. Typo in book?
Psalms 2:12	122	1599 Geneva Bible notes	"...a sign of homage" regarding "kiss the Son"
Ps. 128:2	90	NA	Apparently wrong reference. Typo in book?
Isa. 9:3	99 +	Masoretic text	See Green's Interlinear
Isa. 14:12	68	Masoretic text	See Green's Interlinear
Isa. 64:5	99 +	TBS Portuguese	This Bible was praised in the book
Jer. 5:17	122	Literal from Masoretic text	Words could have been added (like italics in KJV) for further clarification
Da. 3:25	20 +	Masoretic text	See Green's Interlinear

NEW TESTAMENT

Verse maligned	Page #	Vindication	Comment
M't. 2:12	89*	Scrivener 1894 TR	See Green's Interlinear
M't. 5:22	102 +	Tyndale 1534	Tyndale considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M't. 6:24	122	Scrivener 1894 TR	See Green's Interlinear "wealth"
M't. 11:23	66	Scrivener 1894 TR	"hades" transliterated. Not always translated hell in the KJV
M't. 15:8	89*	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M't 20:20	122	Stephanus TR 1550	"doing homage"
M't. 24:2	89*	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M't. 24:22	122	1999 Donate-Park-Reyes NT	"no" (not) added

M't. 26:60	89*	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M't. 28:2	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
M't. 28:9	89*	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M't. 28:19	122	Scrivener 1894 TR	See Green's Interlinear
M'r. 1:2	18 +	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M'r. 2:17	89*	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M'r. 2:27	122	Strong's Concordance	# 4521 "...day of weekly repose..."
M'k. 3:5	89*	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M'k. 9:24	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
M'k. 11:10	89*	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
M'k. 15:3	89*	Stephanus TR 1550	See Newberry's Interlinear
Lu. 2:22	101 +	Stephanus TR 1550	See Newberry's Interlinear
Lu. 2:40	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Lu. 5:17	122	context	"them" is understood clearly within context in Spanish
Lu. 9:43	89*	Geneva 1557	Geneva considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
Lu. 11:29	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Lu. 16:23	17	Scrivener 1894 TR	"hades" transliterated. Not always translated hell in KJV
Lu. 21:5	101 +	Stephanus TR 1550	See Strong's #334 in concordance and Thayers Lexicon "votive gifts"
Lu. 22:43	122	Nothing wrong	Look up "fortaleza" in any Spanish

		found	dictionary
Lu. 23:42	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Lu. 24:12	122	Stephanus TR 1550	"home" in Newberry's Interlinear
Jn. 3:36	122	Nothing wrong found	Complaint in book was not specific
Jn. 5:29	122	Nothing wrong found	Complaint in book was not specific
Jn. 6:22	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Jn. 6:65	89*	TBS Spanish 2001	See comment below table regarding this TR-based translation
Jn. 8:28	89*	TBS Spanish 2001	See comment below table regarding this TR-based translation
Jn. 8:38	89*	TBS Spanish 2001	See comment below table regarding this TR-based translation
Jn. 14:28	89*	1999 Donate-Park-Reyes NT	A contributing author of the book helped revise this translation
Jn. 16:10	89*	1999 Donate-Park-Reyes NT	A contributing author of the book helped revise this translation
Ac. 3:26	89*	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
Ac. 7:30	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Ac. 9:29	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Ac. 15:11	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
Ac. 15:23	89*	TBS Spanish 2001	"after this manner"
Ac. 19:27	122	TBS Portuguese	See comment below table regarding this TR-based translation
Ac. 22:16	122	TBS Spanish 2001	See comment below table regarding this TR-based translation
Ro. 1:16	52 +	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book

Ro. 4:8	122	Spanish grammar	"inculpar" is synonymous with "imputar"
Ro. 4:23	122	Thayer's Lexicon	Strong' # 3049
Ro. 4:24	122	Thayer's Lexicon	Strong' # 3049
Ro. 8:32	89*	Stephanus TR 1550	See Newberry's Interlinear
Ro. 10:9	101 +	Tyndale 1534	Tyndale considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
Ro. 10:15	123	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
1 Co. 2:12	89*	Stephanus TR 1550	See Newberry's Interlinear
1 Co. 7:5	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
1 Co. 9:1	89*	Valera 1862	An accepted rendering of the verse before W&H texts
2 Co. 2:10	102 +	Geneva 1557	See also original KJV 1611 note in margin
2 Co. 2:17	89*	Geneva 1557	has "counterfeit"
2 Co. 4:14	123	Stephanus TR 1550	See Newberry's Interlinear
Ga. 3:2	123	Nothing wrong found.	Complaint in book was not specific
Ga. 3:5	123	Nothing wrong found.	Complaint in book was not specific
Eph. 3:9	118	Peshitta	Peshitta considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
Eph. 3:14	123	Nothing wrong found.	Complaint in book was not specific
Eph. 6:24	123	Thayer's Lexicon	Strong's # 861
Col. 3:10	123	Nothing wrong found.	Complaint in book was not specific
1 Th. 4:4	101	Thayer's Lexicon	Strong's # 4632
Ti. 3:10	123	Thayer's	"Strong's # 141 "a schismatic"

		Lexicon	
1 Pe. 2:2	52 +	Peshitta	"unto life" - very close. See also Great Bible 1539 (italics).
1 Pe. 3:21	16 +	Matthews 1537	Matthews has "which signifieth baptism" instead of figure
2 Pe. 1:19	67	Stephanus TR 1550	See Newberry's Interlinear
1 Jn. 3:16	90	Stephanus TR 1550	See Newberry's Interlinear
Re. 14:1	123	Great Bible 1539	Has it in italics
Re. 17:5	123	Tyndale	Tyndale considered to be from "the good tree" by editor of the book
Re. 18:20	90	TBS Spanish 2001	See comment below table regarding this TR-based translation
Re. 19:8	100	Strong's Concordance #1345	"acciones justas"

* On p. 88 the 1909 was specifically mentioned as having these "problem" readings, but these readings also apply to the 1960.

Of approximately 102 verses attacked, 3 were not vindicated upon completion of the third edition of this study (October 14, 2003). I report in all fairness that the passages I count as vindicated in this study include those that were given with an apparent wrong reference in the book, and also ones in which I could find no differences between the KJV and the RV 1960, unless one was nitpicking to the point of absurdity.

Possible reasons for not being able to vindicate the remaining 3 passages in the book:

1. I was only able to look up one edition of the Masoretic text, as well as only two editions of the TR. According to the Trinitarian Bible Society, "there were approximately thirty distinct editions of the Textus Receptus made over the years. Each differs slightly from the others."¹
2. I was unable to compare OT portions of English reformation Bibles (except for Genesis, thanks to *The Genesis Octapla*), nor any portion of the Coverdale or Bishops Bible (except Genesis). Also I was not able to compare TR-based foreign Bibles in other languages (other than Portuguese).
3. It may be that some of the remaining 3 passages can only be traced back to a critical text. In my opinion, none of those 3 remaining passages properly interpreted affect

doctrine.

Due to the above facts, this remains a work in progress.

My reasoning for using a variety of TR-based translations to defend verses in the 1960 that were attacked in the book are as follows:

Spanish Trinitarian Bible Society 2001 Bible

Although not everything that was said about the Spanish TBS 2001 edition was entirely positive in the book, the invitation to Landmark's Spanish Bible conference of Sep. 22-24, 2002 indicated that there would be "Speakers from Trinitarian...projects." It is based on the TR.

Portuguese Trinitarian Bible Society 1994 Bible

This Bible was spoken of in glowing terms on pp. 114-123.

Peshitta (Murdock's English translation for the New Testament)

The Peshitta manuscripts were well spoken of by two contributing authors of the book in previous writings:

"It was available to and used by Miles Coverdale and also the translators of the King James Bible. The Peshitta is in strong agreement with the text of the King James Bible."²

"The Peshitta has long been regarded as the most ancient New Testament version, being dated around the second century...On the true "trail," the Syrian text and the Peshitta, with 350 manuscripts available, have an honest claim to being dated second century."³

1999 Donate/Park/Reyes NT

One of the contributing authors was heavily involved and printed this NT in Guatemala.

English Reformation Bibles

The editor of the book spoke well of English reformation Bibles in a book he wrote in 1993:

"The classic Geneva Bible and Matthew's Bible were fore-runners of the King James Version. Translations such as Luther's Bible and the Geneva Bible were popular 50 years before and after the King James Version, and rightly so, because they were also taken from the Textus Receptus. Critics say they differed in some places. But there were no doctrinal differences. At the same time, the Lord never put his stamp of

approval on the Matthew's or Geneva Bibles or others to the degree that he has on the King James Version, because none of those can be pointed to for having been in common usage for over 300 years as the King James Version has. That does not say God did not approve of them nor have a hand in them, but it was in the preservation of the text that came on through the King James Version. There is no quarrel with these versions."4

Also, the editor of *The Elephant in the Living Room* listed the following Bibles in a previous book under the heading "The Good Tree - Produced from the pure and strong rock" [From bottom to top]5

Original Textus Receptus
Peshitta Bible - 150
Itala Bible - 157
Wycliffe's Bible - 1382
Erasmus - 1522
Tyndale's - 1525
Luther's Bible - 1534
Coverdale's - 1535
Coverdale's 1535
Matthew's Bible - 1537
The Great Bible - 1539
Stephen's Bible - 1550
Geneva - 1560
Bishop's Bible - 1568
Beza's Bible - 1604
King James Version

My reason for comparing 1960 readings with the afore-mentioned Bibles is as follows:

Some people are being led to think that many passages in the 1960 that differ from the KJV could only come from Wescott & Hort and/or the RSV. The subtitle of the book, namely "Seeing the shadow of the RSV in Spanish" was designed to produce such an effect. Never mind that many "corrupt" readings in the 1960 can also be found in Reformation Bibles that are generally well spoken of, or various other TR Bibles or even TR Greek editions compared in this study! Most who are King James only who are not Ruckmanites believe the Word of God in English was in Reformation Bibles before 1611. The fact that numerous 1960 "departures" appear in Reformation Bibles as well as other TR-based Bibles gives the 1960 a measure of credibility that this ultra biased book refused to give it.

I am not saying that the 1960 revisers obtained readings straight from English reformation Bibles, or from the 1994 TBS Portuguese, for example (an impossibility). My point is that there is a precedent in these TR-based Bibles as to many readings in the 1960 that are being attacked. Since the editor of the book wrote that "there were no

doctrinal differences" where they differed among themselves, and "There is no quarrel with these versions," (referring to English reformation Bibles) then there isn't much left in the 1960 to quarrel about, not to mention the times the 1960 sided with a different TR edition than the KJV.

I believe this study shows that the following comment on p. 152 of *The Elephant in the Living Room* was uncalled for:

"Where there are textual differences between the KJV and the Spanish Bible, there are of necessity textual differences between the Spanish Bible and the Textus Receptus..."

There are seven verses attacked in the book in which the 1960 did not have a problem reading. The book did not state that these verses were wrong in the 1960, but by the same token, the book did not state that they were indeed all right in the 1960. Since virtually the whole book is against the 1960, readers could easily obtain the impression that the 1960 was wrong in these passages, especially those who do not know Spanish and are not able to check for themselves. To illustrate this, the person who volunteered to help me double-check how many verses from the 1960 were attacked in the book actually added the following seven verses to the list:

Verse attacked	Page #	Comment
M't. 13:40	66	1960 OK – book didn't tell you. Readers could get opposite impression
M't. 18:9	66	"
M't. 25:41	66	"
M'k 4:15	65	"
Lu. 3:17	66	"
Jn. 8:11	65	"
Ac. 9:6	65	"
Jude 7	66	"

Conclusion:

Out of respect for the heritage of the Reina-Valera and those who use it, we owe it to the Spanish Bible to be more diligent in our study before casting judgment, rather than being guided solely by first impressions upon simple comparisons between it and the KJV.

1 <http://www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/tr-art.asp>

2 Bradley, Bill. *Purified Seven Times*. Claysburg, PA: Revival Fires, 1998, pp. 56-57

3 Carter, Mickey. *Things That Are Different Are Not The Same*. Haines City, FL: Landmark Baptist Press, 1993, p. 111

4 *Ibid.*, p. 125

5 *Ibid.*, p. 112