

25) Romans 1:16 leaves out the words “of Christ” when speaking “of the gospel of Christ.”

26) Romans 10:9 says “if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is the Lord...” instead of saying “that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus...” This is a contradiction of Matthew 7:22. Biblical salvation is not just saying “Jesus is the Lord”.

27) the words “believed, unbelief, and not believed” were changed to “disobedient and disobedience” in Romans 11: 30 – 32.

28) in I Corinthians 7:3 it substitutes the word “conjugal” instead of “benevolence”.

29) in I Corinthians 7:5 it leaves out the words “to fasting” where talking about prayer and fasting.

30) the words “by Jesus Christ” were not included in Ephesians 3:9.

31) in I Thessalonians 4:4 the translators changed the word “vessel” to “wife”.

32) “But unto the Son was changed to “but of the Son” in Hebrews 1:8.

33) I Peter 2:2 is changed to read “that by it you’ll grow for\* salvation.” (\*or to be saved, or in order to be saved). This passage also makes no mention of the “word”.

34) Jude 22 has been completely changed to read: “to some that doubt, convince” instead of saying correctly “And of some have compassion, making a difference:”

35) “that had his name” was added in Revelation 14:1.

36) a comma was added between “holy apostles” creating a new group “saints” in Revelation 18:20

37) in Revelation 22:8 “the Lord God of the holy prophets...” was changed to read “the God of the spirits of the prophets...”.

38) Revelation 22:14 was changed to read “Blessed are those that wash their clothes (or robes)” instead of “Blessed are they that do his commandments”.

---

These additions, subtractions, and changes came when the Bible society decided to change from the received text to the critical text. They realized that due to the conservative nature of Spanish believers they would not be able to make a complete change to the critical text in the 1960, so they compromised and only changed certain passages. This has been well documented by the Bible society.<sup>1</sup>

I expect this from the Bible society. I don’t understand how those who defend the King James and Textus Receptus in English, can accept and even defend these changes to the critical text in Spanish.

If there were no alternative to 1960 then this would offer little more than criticism. There is a good alternative available in the revision of the 1909 Reina-Valera by Dr. Humberto Gomez. Currently in its 2<sup>nd</sup> edition printed in the late summer of 2007.

Every verse in this study, as well as thousands of other verses were carefully examined and corrected in this revision. 100’s and maybe 1000’s of brothers have been using the 1<sup>st</sup> edition of this revision and any oversights were brought to Dr. Gomez’ and his co-laborers attention and if need be, were corrected.

I hope you understand my conviction regarding this issue. My motive was not to criticize any person or ministry but solely to explain my convictions about the Word of God in Spanish.

You may contact Bro. Urling through his  
Website: [www.2EveryCreature.com](http://www.2EveryCreature.com)  
or e-mail at [Tim@2Everycreature.com](mailto:Tim@2Everycreature.com)

---

<sup>1</sup> The Bible Translator Vol 12, No.3, July 1961

# 38 SCRIPTURAL REASONS WHY I CANNOT USE THE 1960 REINA-VALERA SPANISH BIBLE

BY TIM URLING  
MISSIONARY TO MEXICO  
SINCE 1998

Although I am in the minority of Independent Baptist missionaries and Spanish ministries that do **not** use the 1960 Reina-Valera Spanish Bible, I felt it necessary to write a brief synopsis of my convictions in regards to this subject. My pastor encouraged me to clarify my beliefs, as long as I did it with a right spirit which has been my endeavor. I hope this study will be useful to you as well.

There has been a considerable amount of misleading, if not false information disseminated by those parties in favor of, as well as by those against this revision. Most of this information has been filled with emotional arguments and has little or no scriptural basis. What follows are 38 Biblical reasons why I cannot use the 1960 Reina-Valera.

I readily admit that I am no scholar in Greek, Hebrew; English or Spanish. I believe you don’t have to be a language scholar to understand this issue. The 54 men who translated the King James Bible into English were scholars in these and many other languages. Some were expert enough to write grammars and dictionaries in their known languages. It’s doubtful that any of our modern so called “experts” could hold a candle to any of those men, let alone all of them.

These men gave us a translation in English (the King James) that beyond any shadow of a doubt was

accurately translated from Textus Receptus manuscripts. They used all the editions of the Textus Receptus and also compared 1000's of existing manuscripts (including some in Spanish) to give us most exact translation that has ever been produced in the history of Bible translation.

The most unbelievable (if not miraculous) part of the King James translation is that there had to be unanimous agreement between the translators as to each text, reading, passage, and translation.

I believe any foreign language Bible can and should line up as closely as linguistically possible to the King James since there is no disagreement as to its textual base or to the accuracy of its translation.

Do I believe English is superior to Spanish? No. Do I believe the King James can correct the Greek or Hebrew? No. Were the translators inspired? No. Could they have erred? Possibly. Did God preserve his words for English in the King James. Yes.

The King James is the only translation in English that is 100% faithful to the TR. In my opinion, it would be a foolish waste of time and resources to return to the original languages to have a Bible translation (or revision) that is faithful to the TR. This work has already been done by true experts.

Some may argue that this belief makes the King James the benchmark. It does not. The bench mark is the Textus Receptus. Which Edition? The King James doesn't align 100% with any edition, so we would be sure not to err in the text if we accepted the expert opinion of the King James translators.

Some may argue that this issue didn't originate with the Spanish speaking church. This is true; however as a missionary to a Spanish speaking people, I, as well as other missionaries and pastors have the responsibility to teach this subject. It is mandated in II Tim. 2:2. Without comparison to other languages, it would be impossible to see that a discrepancy. Only Bi-linguals with knowledge of the issue can find these errors!

I have taught this for 4 years in the Bible institute and my students have always quickly seen and

appreciated learning the truth about the text.

For 12 years I have carefully studied this issue. I have come to the conclusion that I cannot endorse or use the 1960 Reina-Valera Bible. I pray that before jumping to a conclusion you will honestly and carefully consider these 38 reasons.

Lastly as you study this remember the words of Rev. 22:18-19: *"...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..."*

### **A serious issue indeed!**

#### **I cannot use the Reina-Valera 1960 because:**

- 1) it says man became a living "being" instead of a living "soul" in Gen 2:7.
- 2) it contains a false and contradictory statement about who killed Goliath in II Samuel 21:19.
- 3) it has a phrase that is the exact opposite of the King James and previous Spanish Bibles in Isaiah 9:3 where it says "...and increased the joy"
- 4) in Daniel 3:25 Nebuchadnezzar declares that the form of the fourth man he saw in the fire was like "a son of the gods."
- 5) in Matthew chapter one the word "begat" is omitted 22 times in violation of Rev. 22:19.
- 6) in Matthew 5:22 the words "without a cause" have been omitted making Christ a sinner when he became angry.
- 7) in Matthew 6:1 the word "alms" has been substituted with "Justice".
- 8) "Draweth nigh to me with their mouths" has been removed from Matthew 15:8.
- 9) "yet they found none" has been left out of Matthew 26:60.
- 10) in Mark 1:2 "in the prophets" was changed to "in Isaiah the prophet".

11) the words "to repentance" were omitted at the end of Mark 2:17.

12) in Mark 11:10 the words "in the name of our Lord" have been left out.

13) the word "the" is left out in front of the phrase where the centurion declared "Truly this man was the Son of God" in Mark 15:39.

14) Luke 2:22 says that when the days of "their" (Mary and Jesus) cleansing we accomplished. According to the Old Testament law Jesus did not need to be purified.

15) the words "in spirit" have been omitted in Luke 2:40.

16) the word "hades" has been substituted for "hell" in Luke 16:23 and in others verses. The word "hell" appears 54 times in the King James and only 13 times in the Reina-Valera 1960.

17) the repentant thief does not recognize Jesus as "Lord" in Luke 23:42.

18) in John 6:22 the words "save that one whereinto his disciples were entered" were not included.

19) the word "keep" has replaced the word "believe" in John 12:47.

20) in Acts 6:8 the word "faith" has been changed to "grace".

21) "of the Lord" was left out when Stephen was describing the angel of the burning bush incident in Acts 7:30.

22) the words "and the Lord said" were omitted in Acts 9:5

23) "Known unto God are all his works" has been completely changed to read: "Says the Lord, make known all of this" in Acts 15:18

24) in Acts 18:5 "Paul was pressed in the spirit" was changed to read "Paul was completely surrendered to the preaching of the word."