Dear Scripture publishing friends,

 I would like to present to you a humble petition by the signers of this letter. First, we sincerely thank you for your invaluable contribution to the publishing of God’s Word all over the world. This ministry is vital, and we share with you the genuine desire that all people everywhere receive a copy of God’s pure words in their native tongue. We ask that you read this letter carefully with an open mind and heart. We would all agree that the purity of the Word of God is of the highest importance. God puts his Word above his name. This world knows all too well the damage that can be done from even just the slightest shift from the truth of God’s word, as Satan himself stated with subtilty, “Yea, hath God said?” (Gen. 3:1). We are weakened in our efforts for sound doctrine when our only source of authority (our sword) has had its edge dulled. I write to you concerning the issue of the Spanish Bible. Unfortunately, this issue has at times, been a point of much contention. I understand that this can be a sensitive subject to many and so I ask for your patience and grace. I thank you for taking the time to read and consider some of the things written.

I want to write as briefly as possible, and I want to share primary source information. In other words, this information comes straight from the “horse’s mouth”. These are facts that cannot be disputed and should not be overlooked or ignored. These facts impact the purity of God’s Word and frequently attack the deity of Christ. We would not and do not allow such things when it comes to the King James Bible, and we should not allow such things in the Spanish Bible that we print and use.

The Reina Valera 1960 is the most widely used Spanish Bible today. Many are aware of its issues, and these issues continue to plague the Spanish Bible. The issues I am about to mention are not limited to just the 1960. Many native Spanish speakers appear to be blind on these issues because they can’t read the King James Version in English and see the differences for themselves (I speak of differences in meaning, not differences between the languages). Many who are native English speakers cannot read the Reina Valera 1960 for themselves and see some of the glaring problems. Many English-speaking fundamentalists dismiss themselves from the issue stating, “I don’t speak Spanish”. I empathize with this, but I would also like to state that we don’t choose the King James Bible because we speak English, after all there are many English Bibles available. We choose the King James Bible because of its underlying text. We care about every variant, down to the jot and tittle, because “Every word of God is pure” (Prov. 30:5). Therefore, even non-Spanish speakers must ask, “What is the underlying text?”.

Eugene Nida was the secretary for the translation committee of the Reina Valera 1960. He is known as the “*Father of dynamic equivalency*”. Many dismiss his involvement with the translation, stating he wasn’t an actual translator. They imply that he had no influence, but this couldn’t be further from the truth. We wouldn’t say a coach had nothing to do with how a ball team performed. The record shows that he had significant influence over translators and helped pave the way for modern translations. Many would even say that the Reina Valera 1960 was the gateway he used to bring about even more corrupt translations. Nida once wrote, ***“We can’t have conferences for translators in less than six weeks because of this psychological hurdle. Otherwise, within a year’s time they will be producing literal translations because it’s so much easier to do it word-for-word.”*** So, we see with his own words the type of “coaching” he desired to give to translators, steering them away from formal equivalency. He wasn’t called the “Father” of dynamic equivalency for no reason.

 Although the Textus Receptus was used as the base text of the original Reina Valera (1602) it became tainted very quickly in subsequent revisions. In the following quote, we can see from the “horse’s mouth” that Jose Flores (a consultant for the translation committee of the 1960) states that the 1909 Spanish Bible contained critical text passages and where it departed from the Textus Receptus, they did not return to the Textus Receptus or correct the 1960.

*“One principle added to the first list of the RV 1960 revision committee was that wherever the RV (1909) version has* ***departed from the Textus Receptus*** *to follow a* ***better [critical] text*** *we did not return to the Receptus.”* (*El Texto Del* *Nuevo Testamento*, 1977, pg. 232)

Some try to excuse some of the differences in the Spanish Bible by saying, “well there are a lot of different variants within the different editions of the Textus Receptus.” Or they say that it followed other Bible versions in the way that it was translated. They imply it is not a textual issue, but this couldn’t be further from the truth as you just read in the above quote. Some seek to “vindicate” the 1960 and even go as far as to imply that the Critical Text was not available until the printing of the UBS Greek New Testament in 1965, saying departures were minor. But we can read from the American Bible Society’s own History Essay #16 that the Westcott and Hort and Nestle texts were indeed available and even used as the base for their Hispano-American New Testament:

*“In December (of 1907) Committee proposed Greek* ***basis be Westcott and Hort****, with the English Revisers Text and Nestle to be consulted.” (Ibid, pg. 36)*

*“Versions Committee recommends* ***Westcott and Hort as basis*** *with liberty to use the Revisers and Nestle’s Greek NT.” (Ibid, pg. 37)*

*“While stating the fact that in its entire work the Committee has* ***taken for its basis*** *the original text in the editions placed in its hands by order of your Committee on Versions, namely, those of* ***Westcott and Hort****, of* ***Nestle****, and of the American Revisers, your Committee does not claim for its work the character of an independent version.” (Ibid, pg. 40)*

*“The Greek text as edited by* ***Nestle*** *was placed in our hands as approved by the two Bible Societies,* ***as the original*** *which we should translate.” (Ibid, pg. 47)*

So, without question, and as read above by Jose Flores, the 1909 Spanish Bible clearly contains critical text readings. There are also glaring issues in places. One example is found in Job 2:9 where the KJV reads “…curse God and die.” The 1909 reads “…bless God and die.” This is just one of many issues, but the 1960 takes the problems even further.

Eugene Nida stated: *“Nevertheless, in some instances where a critical text is so much preferred over the traditional Textus Receptus,* ***the committee did make some slight changes****, particularly if such changes were not in well-known verses…”* (“*The Bible Translator”*, Vol 12, No.3 July 1961, pg. 113)

So, we see that not only did the translators for the Reina Valera 1960 not return to the Textus Receptus where the 1909 departed, but they also made further changes departing even more so from the pure text. Notice also, that many of these changes were done in the lesser-known verses. This was a slight of hand and, in a way, the wool was pulled over the eyes of the churches.

In Nida’s own words “professors in seminaries and in many Bible schools urged the Bible societies to consider a very radical revision of the Bible.” But a radical change was not possible because he said the churches had a “very preponderate sentiment … for the retention of as much of the form and meaning as possible.” To state it simply, he couldn’t get by with the radical change he and the Bible Society desired so he did as much damage as he could get by with. He made changes in many lesser-known verses.

It doesn’t end there, unfortunately. There is another problem with the Bibles they used to consult in their translation process. They did not consult the King James Bible. Why would they leave this off the table? Consequently, the Reina Valera 1960 reads much like modern corrupt Bibles. Where the King James Bible says in 2 Sam. 21:19 that “Elhanan slew the brother of Goliath”, the Reina Valera 1960 and the American Standard Version it consulted read “Elhanan slew Goliath”. We also use this text to point out problems with modern English bibles. What good does the underlying text do when the parameters for correct translation are removed. One could say that these errors are near unmeasurable.

*“Point 12 of the working principles states: in cases where there is doubt over the correct translation of the original, we consulted* ***preferentially*** *The English Revised Version of 1885, The American Standard Version of 1901, The Revised Standard Version of 1946, and the International Critical Commentary.”* (*El Texto Del Nuevo Testamento*, 1977, pg. 232)

I must admit. As a Spanish pastor, this creates some issues. The Bible choice is an easy one for a fundamental English preacher. But if you were to pick up a Bible and preach in Spanish, what would you do? What should you do? Would you cave to popular opinion or politics among the brethren? Or would you choose purity? I think of the sacrifices made by men like Tyndale, who not only fought for the translation of the Bible, but also for its purity.

 Using the 1960 Spanish Bible would be the easy road. This is an area that I believe needs much grace, but it also needs honesty. We cannot sit around and wait on a liberal Bible Society to bring us a pure Spanish Bible. The Trinitarian Bible Society recently produced a new Spanish Bible, and although it is an improvement from the 1960, Critical Text readings remain.

I believe we now have a better option. I believe that much of the church has grown tired of waiting and has taken the reins when it comes to the purity of the Word of God. I believe this is an answer to prayers. And so, I respectfully ask you to consider printing the Reina Valera Gómez.

The Reina Valera Gómez has been scrutinized over the past 20 years; likely more than any other Spanish Bible has. It has been attacked, which is of no surprise. We are talking about the purity of the Bible. When I first began to study the issue several years ago, initially, all I heard were negative things. I still hear those same negative things, and I hear others say, “I’ve heard some bad things about it.” If you happen to be one of those people that has heard the negative, I humbly ask you to please verify it. When I began looking into it, every single negative thing I heard and read proved to be false. Some have a hard time with the name “Gómez” on the Bible and admittedly, I questioned it at first, but this is the norm for many translations. They take the name of the person who led the translation efforts. Just a few examples of such are: Reina, Valera, Coverdale, Tyndale, and the King James Bible.

The Reina Valera Gómez is a beautiful revision, and the new 2023 edition is especially good. The grammar is up to date and appropriate for the Spanish speaking world. Four hundred years ago, English was at its pinnacle. The same cannot be said for the Spanish language, so appropriate grammar is needed.

It was revised using the 1909 Spanish Bible as its base. No, it was not translated from the King James Version like many try to say. It did however consult the King James Version. What better Bible is there to use as a guide? The revisions were based on the correct underlying Greek and Hebrew texts.

Bro Humberto Gómez, a humble man, has led the effort to revise the Spanish Bible. This was not the work of one man like some try to say. The main collaborators were about 25 in number. Men like Dr. D. A. Waite, Dr. Rex Cobb, and Dr. Louis Tyler were involved in this revision. Altogether there were more than 300 men involved from over 14 different countries. The process of revision has been an open and honest one. This was not a thing done behind closed doors. There have been over 3 million RVG Bibles printed! It is FREE to print, and it is exclusively endorsed by the *King James Bible Research Council* and used by well-known ministries such as *Chick Publications*.

I recently had the privilege to attend a Reina Valera Gómez Bible conference. I was convinced that the Reina Valera Gómez is the pure Word of God in Spanish, but I was also encouraged to get to know some of the men involved. These men are men of strength and conviction, but they are also humble and apt to teach. They preach sound doctrine and are soul winners. The week I attended the conference we saw 7 people trust in Christ as their Savior. They have the right direction, but also the right disposition. The demand for the Reina Valera Gómez Spanish Bible is growing. The demand cannot be met. The printing is done domestically and even outsourced to foreign countries. But we can do better! I humbly ask again that you would consider printing the RVG. Attached is a list of names (not exhaustive) of Pastors, missionaries, and evangelists, and supporters that have chosen the RVG as their Spanish Bible and would be forever grateful for any assistance in getting the PURE Word of God out to the Spanish speaking world.

God bless you,

Pastor Jonathan Everhart

***“The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it.” Psalm 68:11***