

The King James Bible teaches Young Earth Creation by the LORD Jesus Christ better than the NIV.

By Dan Ford

A comparison of the King James Bible with the most popular Evangelical Bible, the NIV, in passages affecting the doctrine of a recent creation of the world by the Lord Jesus Christ.

Overview

This writer agrees with ICR director Dr. Henry M. Morris, that the King James Bible is the BEST Bible to use in personal study and public teaching. 21 points below evaluate the doctrine of a recent creation of the world by the Lord Jesus Christ to demonstrate that the 'science'(1Tim.6:20) of textual criticism and modern translation theory weakens doctrine in this one area alone.

1 Tim. 6:20-21 "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: 21 Which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. Amen."

*"There are two methods of New Testament textual criticism, the consistently Christian method and the naturalistic method. These two methods deal with the same materials, the same Greek manuscripts, and the same translations and biblical quotations, but they interpret these materials differently. The consistently Christian method interprets the materials of New Testament textual criticism in accordance with the doctrines of the **divine inspiration** and **providential preservation** of the Scriptures. The naturalistic method interprets these same materials in accordance with its own doctrine that the New Testament is nothing more than a human book.*

*Sad to say, modern Bible-believing scholars have taken very little interest in the concept of **consistently** Christian New Testament textual criticism. For more than a century most of them have been quite content to follow in this area the **naturalistic** methods of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort . And the result of this equivocation has*

been truly disastrous. Just as in Pharaoh's dream the thin cows ate up the fat cows, so the principles and procedures of naturalistic New Testament textual criticism have spread into every department of Christian thought and produced a spiritual famine."

Intro "The King James Bible Version Defended" by Dr. Edward F. Hills (1912-1981)
ISBN: 0-915923-00-9 (Emphasis added)

One example of the inferiority of the NIV as documented in young earth creationist literature, occurs in

The Revised and Expanded Answers Book

Chapter 10

Was Noah's Flood global?

By Ken Ham, Jonathan Sarfati, and Carl Wieland, Ed. Don Batten

"'All flesh' (Heb. kolbasar) is used 12 times in the Flood account and nowhere else in Genesis. God said he would destroy 'all flesh,' apart from those on the Ark (Gen. 6:13,17),⁵ and He did (Gen. 7:21–22). In the context of the Flood, 'all flesh' clearly includes all nostril-breathing land animals as well as mankind—see Genesis 7:21–23. 'All flesh' could not have been confined to a Mesopotamian valley."

"[The NIV] translations wrongly render 'all flesh' in Gen. 6:13 as 'all people' (e.g., whereas KJV and NASB are correct). This is clearly not the meaning of 'all flesh,' as revealed by its use in Genesis 7:21 (where the NIV renders 'all flesh' correctly as 'every living thing')."

end of quote from Ham, et. al.

This is but one of many instances where the NIV paraphrase can feed bad doctrine. Acceptance of progressive creationism, and a limited Flood parallels the use of the NIV by the evangelical church. Note that in The NIV Study Bible, General Editor Kenneth Barker, Associate Editors Burdick, Stek, Wessel, and Youngblood actually use their own

MIS-translation noted above to buttress support for a limited flood. Their note on page 15; for Genesis 6:17 reads

"floodwaters on the earth to destroy all life under the heavens." Some believe that the deluge was worldwide, partly because of the apparently universal terms of the text—both here and elsewhere (vv.7,12-13; 7:4,19,21-23,8:21;9:11,15). Others argue that nothing in the narrative of chs. 6-9 prevents the flood from being understood as regional.....**Since the purpose of the floodwaters was to destroy sinful mankind (see v.13)...."**

This same MIS-translation and note creep into the New Testament in The NIV Study Bible note for 2 Peter 3:6. After translating the text "By these waters also the world of that time was deluged and destroyed." , the NIV authors say "This does not mean that the flood was universal."!!!! The reader is directed back to the note in Gen 6:17 to create an impression that world means only 'the world of people', based on the MIS-translation of Gen. 6:13. Thus the NIV feeds false doctrine from Old to New testaments.

1.All things created by Jesus Christ?

King James Bible Eph.3:9 "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: "	NIV Eph.3:9 "and to make plain to everyone the administration of this mystery, which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things." What's missing? ?
Ephesians 3:9 KJB Jesus is co-Creator i.e. GOD	NIV Eph.3:9 give NO testimony to Jesus as creator .

A comparison of the above verse should make it clear to even the most ardent supporter of new versions, that Henry M. Morris's admonition to 'hold on to your King James Bible', was spoken, as least in part, to retain Biblical support for the Christian Biblical Creationist. The fact that the NIV has NO footnote to flag the reader as to manuscript evidence that would give testimony to Jesus Christ as Creator in this verse is, in fact, typical of the NIV. Given that there ARE many references to manuscript differences in the NIV, the impression is given that deletions, changes and alternate readings are completely documented. However, the majority of critical text deletions go **undocumented**, causing confusion when believers compare differing Bibles.

2.The great God that formed all things?

Proverbs 26:10 " The great God that formed all things both rewardeth the fool, and rewardeth transgressors." The NIV text given for reference ABSOLUTELY destroys this reference to the GREAT <i>God</i> that FORMED ALL THINGS.	Proverbs 26:10" Like an archer who wounds at random is he who hires a fool or any passer-by." The NIV gives NO note to alert the reader that an entirely different reading exists.
God rewardeth - Will certainly give that recompence which is deserved by fools and transgressors, by such as sin either through ignorance, or wilfully. The word "great" cannot describe how great God is ;GREAT is seen as God's very NAME in this passage:impying GOD. Worship takes over where words fail. Our God formed all things. They didn't evolve after a big bang. But the NIV reading is a great example of why people say "you can make the Bible say anything".	"As a thorn is in a drunkard's hand, which he cannot manage cautiously, but employs to his own and others hurt ". The NIV Prov.26:10 is as unprofitable, and, by accident, hurtful to themselves and others. But will they change their deletion of "The great God that formed all things ?" 26:12 Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him."

Open a King James Bible, read Proverbs 26:10, close it. Open an NIV, read the same verse, close it. Which gives praise to our Creator God? Note Prov.26:9"As a thorn goeth up into the hand of a drunkard, so is a parable in the mouth of fools.

3.The earth is the Lord's

1 Cor. 10:28But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that showed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof:	1 Cor. 10: 28But if anyone says to you, "This has been offered in sacrifice," then do not eat it, both for the sake of the man who told you and for conscience' sake
--	--

For God, who is the Creator, Proprietor, and Disposer of the earth and all that is in it, has given the produce of it to the children of men, to be used without scruple except when a cause of stumbling to those weak in faith: . Psalm 24:1

The NIV misses Paul's point , shown by bracketing the discussion on scruples with quotes from Ps.24 twice in the King James Bible.Paul reminds the Corinthians that the

doctrine of Ownership includes the ownership of those whose consciences are weak. God created **them** also, and they deserve consideration.

4. The question of Origins...

Micah 5:2 But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.	Micah 5:2 "But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times."
--	--

A most serious error, is in the last part of the verse which says "whose origins are from of old, from ancient times." The KJB tells us in Micah 5:2 that Jesus Christ is from everlasting, the NIV says he had an origin in ancient times. An origin means a beginning. That is the ancient heresy of Arianism, which is held today by the Jehovah's Witnesses and other cults.

Does the Hebrew allow for the New International Version rendering of Micah 5:2? The verse could POSSIBLY be translated that way except for one thing, and that is its Messianic nature. The word translated "everlasting" is "owlam," which is the common Hebrew word for everlasting in the Old Testament. It is translated "for ever" (Gen. 3:22), "always" (Gen. 6:3), "everlasting" (Gen. 9:16), "perpetual" (Gen. 9:12), "never" (Jud.2:1), "ever more" (2 Sam. 22:51), "without end" (Is. 45:17), "eternal" (Is. 60:15), "continuance" (Is. 64:5).

"Owlam" is translated "ancient times" once in the KJB (Ps. 77:5). Why, then, did the KJB translators not translated in "ancient times" in Micah 5:2? It is **the context that defines words in the Bible**, and the context of Micah 5:2 requires "everlasting." In fact, of the 414 verses that contain "owlam," only a handful has a sense of anything other than everlasting. More than 90% of the time, the word is unequivocal in its reference to everlasting. Even more significantly, "owlam" is the Hebrew word that describes the eternity of God. For example, (Ps. 102:12) (Ps. 66:7) (Ps. 93:2) (Ps. 100:5) (Ps. 117:2) (Ps. 119:142) (Ps. 119:150) (Ps. 72:17; 135:13) (Ps. 145:13).

With this in mind, we see how false the NIV rendering of Micah 5:2 is. **Knowing that the verse refers to the Son of God**, it naturally calls forth the translation of everlasting or eternal or for ever.

Then there is the word "**origins**" in the New International Version rendering of Micah 5:2. Is that an acceptable translation? This is the Hebrew word "mowtsaah," meaning to descend or proceed from, and it could mean origin -- IF it referred to someone other than the Messiah. Knowing, though, that it is a direct reference to Jesus Christ, it is false to translate it as "origins."

5.The Word of God (John 1:1): a created work?

Prov.8:22The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old.	22 “The LORD brought me forth as the first of his works , before his deeds of old;
As the NIV implies the CREATION of the Lord Jesus Christ here, look for subsequent TNIV type revisions to follow the apostasy of the NRSV to directly say that the Lord Jesus Christ, the Wisdom of God (1 Co.1:24,30; Col.2:3) , was CREATED . This is the cross reference for John 1:1-3.	The NIV Study Bible footnotes here and in Job 40:19 that this means Wisdom was CREATED .The New Revised Standard here reads:"Prov.8:22 <i>The LORD created me</i> at the beginning of his work,"; The NIV Study Bible admits this is the "background" for John 1:1-3.

6.The foundation of acceptance of Hugh Ross' Day/Age theory: reading Genesis as POETRY!

A subtil (see Gen 3:1) change.

From John Ankerberg's website (and note that Ankerberg is <i>not</i> an enemy of the NIV) In "Gen.1-11 as Historical Narrative" by W. Gary Phillips and David M. Fouts they state " As far as we know ,	NIV DENIES THE PROSE STYLE OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE in Genesis 1 and 2 , EVEN THOUGH THEIR OWN NOTES ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THEY HAVE NO LINGUISTIC BASE FOR INFERRING
--	--

aside from the modern New International Version, Genesis One has never in translation been cast in verse form. There is one known Hebrew manuscript which does so. With the possible exception of the single verse, Gen.1:27, we lack any direct evidence that the Jews understood Gen. One as anything other than historical narrative"

THAT GEN. 1-3 IS 'POETRY' THUS, NOT SPACE-TIME HISTORY. THE SUBTLE NATURE OF THIS STYLISTIC CHANGE IS ENORMOUS, BY SETTING THIS SECTION, AND LARGE PORTIONS OF CH. 2 & 3 AS POETRY, AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE IN TRANSMITTING A NUANCE OF MYTH TO THESE FOUNDATIONAL PASSAGES.

ALL other major versions show the prose nature of Gen. 1-3, but there ARE gnostic versions which are becoming more popular, with an overt statement that this is a poem. The layout of Gen 1 is a scansion denoting poetry :

verse 3, 6, 9, 14,20, 24,27 and 2:2 are the beginning of implied poetry.

This NIV error has led many to unwittingly fall for the lie that Genesis does not portray Space/Time reality.

The Biblical Hebrew Creation Account: New Numbers Tell The Story by Steven W. Boyd, Ph.D.

The distribution of preterites to finite verbs in Hebrew narrative differs distinctly from that in Hebrew poetry. Moreover, a logistic regression model fitted to the ratio of preterites to finite verbs categorizes texts as narrative or poetry to an extraordinary level of accuracy. With its probability of virtually 1, Genesis 1:1-2:3, therefore, is a narrative, not poetry.

[see ICR article](http://www.icr.org/article/24/2/) <http://www.icr.org/article/24/2/> click above to see full ICR article the above link proves by the science of Logistic regression: the genre of texts :NARRATIVE! Using this curve the probability that Genesis 1:1-2:3 is a narrative is 0.999972604. YOU CAN'T GET MORE 'PROSE LIKE' THAN this!
Three major implications from this study are (1) it is not statistically defensible to read Genesis 1:1-2:3 as poetry;
(2) since Genesis 1:1-2:3 is a narrative, it should be read as other Hebrew narratives are intended to be read as a concise report of actual events, couched to convey an unmistakable theological message;¹³ and
(3) when this text is read as a narrative, there is only one tenable view of its plain sense: God created everything in six literal days.

The lie is put to the NIV implication of poetry by scansion layout by a comparison with a REAL creation poem: see Psalm 104.

Genesis 3:1 "*Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made.*"

There is no substantial *literary* indication in Genesis 1-2 that these early chapters are intended to be taken as allegory, legend, parable, poetry, or any other sort of “non-historical material” as indicated by: (a) lack of parallelism, (b) use of the direct object marker, and (c) use of the *waw* consecutive with verbs to describe sequential acts. (See below.)

(a) Lack of parallelism

Hebrew poetry generally uses a “parallel” structure, in which the second line either *restates* or *enhances* the first line. (This is sometimes referred to as the rhyming of thoughts rather than of word sounds.) No parallel structure is found in the first two chapters of Genesis except possibly in 1:27 and 2:23 (the NIV indents these verses differently from the areas of Genesis 1-2 that imply poetry: in these SUBSET, the NIV emphasizes that they are even more CERTAIN that THOSE areas are poetry: but...; the Hebrew Bible, on the other hand, does *not* format them as poetry).

(b) Use of the direct object marker

The “direct object” in a sentence is the person or thing receiving the action of the verb. In Hebrew narrative, the particle *eth* is often written just before the direct object in a sentence, because Hebrew word order is flexible and does not always clearly indicate the direct object. Hebrew poetry often (not always) omits this particle, but in Genesis 1-2 it is found 40 times, including those instances in which the particle is incorporated as part of a personal pronoun.

(c) Use of the *waw* consecutive with verbs to describe sequential acts

In Hebrew, the letter *waw* (pronounced “vuv” [rhymes with “love”], and transliterated as either “v” or “w”) is often prefixed to a verb. This letter carries the meaning “and,” but when prefixed to a verb, it also has the effect of changing a verb in the past tense to the future tense, or vice versa. For example, *yo’mar* means “he will say,” but *vayyo’mer*, with a prefixed *waw*, means “and he said.” This feature is often found in Hebrew prose, but is less used in poetry. The *waw* consecutive appears 75 times in Genesis 1-2.

7.ADAM :specific individual , or a generic "man"(myth)

Gen.2:19And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. 20And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him.	Now the LORD God had formed out of the ground all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air. He brought them to the man to see what he would name them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that was its name. 20So the man gave names to all the livestock, the birds of the air and all the beasts of the field. But for Adam(<i>note here that it might mean just "man"</i>)no suitable helper was found
---	--

Here we have a clear case of the individual person who has an individual counterpart in the Lord Jesus Christ. There is no excuse here for the liberal attempt to portray a 'myth', such as the Joseph Campbell school portrayed on PBS' anti-Christian Bill Moyer's special about Genesis. NIV reduces ADAM from a specific individual to a generic man in all but one instance in vs 19-20, even then adding a note casting doubt on the proper name Adam.

8. Seeds of Doubt....

Gen.3:15And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.	15 And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel."
--	--

First, note that, even though the HEBREW is the same, the NIV, as a paraphrase is wont to do, deletes the second instance of the occurrence of the word translated as "offspring". Over and again, the NIV just doesn't BOTHER to translate a word in the original, with a theory that the modern reader is overwhelmed by repetition of nouns :this creates a 'Reader's Digest bible.

Secondly, and more importantly, NIV's change from 'SEED' TO 'OFFSPRING' IS wrong. GAL 3:16 SAYS THAT GOD'S USE OF THE WORD SEED IS THE INDICATION OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY(cf GEN. 12:7), AS WESLEY SHOWS,"A gracious promise is here made of Christ as the deliverer of fallen man from the power of Satan. By faith in this promise, our first parents, and the patriarchs before the flood, were justified and saved; and to this promise, and the benefit of it, instantly serving God day and night they hoped to come.". The KJB is correct, showing that creation's fall was to be redeemed from the very instant of the first sin, where the NIV corrupts the prophecy and loses testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ as the promised SEED of Woman. This NIV error

occurs in GE 3:15 GE 12:7 GE 13:15 GE 21:12 GE 24:7 GE 26:4 GE 22:18 JN 7:42 Heb 11:18 : but the NIV is forced to correctly translate it in Gal 3:16, creating cross reference errors.

THE NIV NOTE "or seed" , SHOULD BE "**LITERALLY** `SEED'" TO BE TRUTHFUL. SEED IS SINGULAR, SEED IS MALE, Again, as in Chap. 1,&2 THE POETRY LAYOUT of Gen 3:15 in the NIV (CONTRARY TO THE STRUCTURE OF THE ORIGINAL HEBREW) implies a 'MYTH' , that is, a non-historical event.

9. Another passage laid out as poetry. Gen. 3:16-19

"16Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

17And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; 18Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; 19In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

The effects of sin were :the sentence upon the woman; she is condemned to a state of sorrow and a state of subjection: proper punishments of a sin in which she had gratified her pleasure and her pride, The ground or earth, by the sin of man, is made subject to vanity, the several parts of it being not so serviceable to man's comfort and happiness, as they were when they were made. Fruitfulness was its blessing for man's service, Ge 1:11 - 29, and now barrenness was its curse for man's punishment.

This will be **UNDONE** by the acts of the Second Man Adam: to cast this as 'myth' by a false inference of poetry denotes unbelief by the NIV authors.

10. A good example of undocumented changes that diminish testimony to Christ the Creator: Rev. 1:11

Rev.1:11Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book,	Rev.1:11which said: "Write on a scroll what you see"What is missing?
Rev. 1:11 Jesus the Alpha,and the First=Creator	Rev.1:11NIV: Jesus is NOT the Alpha,nor the First. This deletion occurs with NO reference.

The NIV New Testament has 120 variant footnotes(and **many more times than this** deletes words and passages **with no reference to the NIV's differing text** as the above text in Rev. 1:11 shows), the NASV New Testament has 133 variant footnotes, and the NKJV New Testament has 772 (Dr. Kirk D. DiVietro, Why Not the King James Bible!, Bible for Today, 1995, p. 22). Furthermore, many of the marginal notes in the modern versions question entire verses and passages, not just isolated words. .

KJV'S SUPERIORITY IN SHOWING THE DEITY OF CHRIST IN verse 11 may need a little explanation. The first time we have the phrase, "I am Alpha and Omega" (Rev. 1:8) it is the Lord God who is speaking. The second time the phrase is used (Rev. 1:11) it is Christ who is speaking according to the context of the passage (Rev. 1:12-18), thus proving that Christ is the Lord God Almighty the CREATOR. This second phrase found in verse eleven is absent from most modern versions. The deity of Christ is uprooted *seven* times in this one chapter.

PROBLEM	NIV (anemic)	REV. 1	KJB
Deity?	seven spirits	1:4	seven
Spirits			
DEITY?	his God and Father	1:6	God and
his Father			
DEITY?	OMIT	1:8	the beginning
and the ending			
DEITY?	Jesus	1:9	Jesus
Christ			
DEITY?	OMIT	1:11	I am
Alpha and Omega,			the first and
the last			
DEITY?	a son of man	1:13	the Son
of man			

The NIV misrepresents the MS evidence for Rev. 1:11. by having NO note, the implication is that NO ONE would argue with their deletion. The facts reveal that the phrase is in **57** of Hoskier's cursives; it is in **most** of the Andreas line (about 80 MSS). Note P. 1, 42, 61, 104, 336, 628, 2019, 2020, 2023, 2057, and Von Soden's Ia (181, 296, 432, 598, 743, 2026, 2031, 2033, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2060, 2064, 2067, 2068, 2069, I b2 (104, 459, 922). Andreas, Cappadocia, 614. Also including the phrase are men like Tyndale, Stephens, Beza, Elzevir, (Geneva) (Bishops)--men who had access to even *more* versions and manuscripts.

11. Mr. and Mrs. ADAM.

Gen 5:1 This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; 2 Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam , in the day when they were created.	Gen 5:1 This is the written account of Adam's line. When God created man, he made him in the likeness of God. 2 He created them male and female and blessed them. And when they were created, he called them "man."
---	---

"God blessed them. It is usual for parents to bless their children, so God the common Father blessed his; but earthly parents can only beg a blessing, it is God's prerogative to command it. He called their name Adam - He gave this name both to the man and the woman. Being at first one by nature, and afterwards one by marriage; it was fit they should both have the same name, in token of their union. " John Wesley's notes on Genesis.

NOTE THAT GOD GAVE THE COUPLE THE SAME NAME: NAMED THE WOMAN IN THE MAN: THAT IS , THE PATRONYMIC PRINCIPLE OF "MR.&MRS. ADAM" BEGAN HERE: THE NIV ELIMINATES THE PRINCIPLE OF THE WIFE TAKING THE NAME OF THE HUSBAND. THE NIV ELIMINATES THIS POSSIBILITY BY PLACING THE TERM 'MAN' IN THE TEXT, AND GIVING THE ALTERNATE 'adam' NOTE THE LITTLE `a'; A VERY SUBTLE DENIAL OF *THE FOUNDATION OF THE PATRONYMIC THAT IS NOTED HERE BY WESLEY*. This change occurred at the same time that the feminist agenda led to hyphenated names that denote a lack of obedience to the call to become 'one flesh'. The NIV helps to erode the foundation of marriage that comes from the doctrines of Genesis.

Note also in the NIV Gen.2:19 Now the LORD God had formed out of the ground all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air. He brought them to the man to see what he would name them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that was its name. 20 So the man gave names to all the livestock, the birds of the air and all the beasts of the field. But for Adam

the NIV adds a note here £Genesis 2:20 Or the man no suitable helper was found. 21 So the LORD God caused the man to fall into a deep sleep; and while he was sleeping, he took one of the man's ribs the NIV adds a note here

£NIV note Genesis 2:21 Or took part of the man's side and closed up the place with flesh. 22 Then the LORD God made a woman from the rib

£NIV note Genesis 2:22 Or part

One wonders if the NIV stylist thought that the woman was made from Adam's 'love handles': a bit of hip bone and a pound of fat? **choose to designate a softwood:** thus creating a stumbling block for those who question the **stress capacity of the Ark**. NIV notes here:" Genesis 6:14 The meaning of the Hebrew for this word is uncertain." So then, they ARE certain that it can't be called 'gopher wood' which is a transliteration ? Many young earth creationist show convincing evidence linguistically and historically that a form of plywood may be referenced here. Those using an NIV start with the FALSE impression that they know the material of the ark.

14. Just how big IS that Ark?

Gen 6:15 And this is the fashion which thou shalt make it of: The length of the ark shall be three hundred cubits, the breadth of it fifty cubits, and the height of it thirty cubits. 16 A window shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it above; and the door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof; with lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it.	15 This is how you are to build it: The ark is to be 450 feet long, 75 feet wide and 45 feet high.* 16 Make a roof for it and finish* the ark to within 18 inches* of the top. Put a door in the side of the ark and make lower, middle and upper decks.
The KJB allows the reader see that the dimension are in cubits: consistent with the rest of their work.	*Genesis 6:15 Hebrew 300 cubits long, 50 cubits wide and 30 cubits high (about 140 meters long, 23 meters wide and 13.5 meters high)*Genesis 6:16b

JN 21:8 notes in the NIV:" Greek about two hundred cubits (about 90 meters)so the cubit equals .45 meters?" but in GE 6:15 we read in 6:15 Hebrew 300 cubits long, 50 cubits wide and 30 cubits high (about 140 meters long, 23 meters wide and 13.5 meters high) if one does the math, the conversion factor for each of the three dimensions is different; we find the NIV conversion factor for cubits to be either .46666,or .46 or .45 in Gen. 6. ***This same type of precision is to be found in the NIV conversion of the original languages into English.*** If the NIV cared about consistency, we'd find the Ark say, multiplied by .45 and thus 135 meters by 22.5 meters by 13.5 meters... ..

NOTE THAT IN EXODUS 26:16,27:1,27:9 ... THE DIMENSIONS ARE LEFT by the NIV TO BE READ AS "CUBITS." THERE, THE NIV GIVES A NOTE THAT IT WAS , 'ABOUT' A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF FEET ; YET HERE, THE NIV HAS, IN V 15 PLACED DIMENSION IN FEET IN THE TEXT.

'INNUMERACY ' - the counterpart to illiteracy..

The NIV HAS AN ILLOGICAL COMBINATION OF NOTES- V 16 of the NIV has a note that TELLS US THAT A CUBIT=.5 METERS;YET THE NOTES FOR V15 ALLEGE WITH DIMENSIONS OF 300 BY 140 BY 50, THE DIMENSIONS OF THE ARK ARE 140 METERS X 23 METERS WIDE X 13.5 METERS

An example of Public school mathematics proficiency:get out your calculator and try to get these results.

THIS WOULD MEAN THAT $300 \times .5 = 140$? $50 \times .5 = 23$? AND $30 \times .5 = 13.5$? ***This same type of precision is to be found in the NIV conversion of the original languages into English.***

BESIDES THE SLOPPINESS OF NOT ADJUSTING THEIR METRIC MULTIPLIER BY ANOTHER DECIMAL PLACE,THE POSSIBILITY OF A **ROYAL CUBIT** SIZE IS COMPLETELY IGNORED.1 ROYAL CUBIT = 20.67"A ROYAL CUBIT OF 7 PALMS SURPASSES THE STANDARD 6 PALM CUBIT **BY ALMOST 3 INCHES**.THIS WOULD RESULT IN AN ARK THAT IS **600 FEET BY 100 FEET BY 60 FEET**.SEE EZ. 43:13, 40:5 FOR COMPARISON.

15.God the Creator? Yes, but only POETICALLY speaking:

Gen.14:19And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: 22And Abram said to the king of Sodom, I have lift up mine hand unto the LORD, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth,	19and he blessed Abram, saying, "Blessed be Abram by God Most High, Creator* of heaven and earth.22But Abram said to the king of Sodom, "I have raised my hand to the LORD, God Most High, Creator of heaven and earth, and have taken an oath
---	--

Gen. 14:19 KJB God: **not the Deist's Creator**, who no longer exercises the rights of current possession, but the current possessor of heaven and Earth. Blessed be Abram, of the most high God - Observe the titles he here gives to God, which are very glorious. The most high God, which speaks his absolute perfections in himself, and his sovereign dominion over all the creatures. **Possessor of heaven and earth - That is, rightful owner and sovereign Lord of all the creatures; because he made them.**

Gen. 14:19 NIV: casts this as POETRY, and thus, any supposed mention of creation can be taken as 'art': not a 'scientific' statement: this applies to Abram's subsequent quote of the poetry. Moreover, the **current possession of the earth is denied**: perhaps God did create in the past, but now leaves administration to man.

16.This ought to make the NIV `sea' RED!Skeptics deny miracles.

Ex.21:19And the LORD turned a mighty strong west wind, which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red sea;King James Bible	NIV Exodus 10:19 Hebrew Yam Suph; that is, Sea of Reeds: the first of 21 notes : EVERY time the Red Sea is mentioned in the NIV O.T.
---	--

There is an old joke about a pagan who attacks a kid who exalts over the victory at the Red Sea.The infidel scoffs "don't you know that wasn't the Red Sea, but the Reed Sea: it is only 3 inches deep. The people just waded to the other side. "The kid started praising God even more. "Praise God, He drowned all those Egyptians in only 3 inches of water."

The NIV takes the place of the scoffing infidel. EX 10:19 THE NOTE below OCCURS 21 TIMES; in the OLD testaments; e.g.19 Hebrew Yam Suph; that is, Sea of Reeds.**This attitude towards miracles directly effects the creationist. If God cannot part the Red Sea, how are we to think He could speak the universe into existence?**

EX 13:18EX 15:4 ; also in verse 22 EX 23:31NU 14:25NU 21:4NU 33:10; also in verse 11 DT 1:40DT 2:1DT 11:4JOS 2:10JOS 4:23JOS 24:6JDG 11:161Kin 9:26NE 9:9Ps 106:7; also in verses 9 and 22 Ps

136:13; also in verse 15 Jer 49:21 they CLAIM the same type of note for Acts 7:36, and Heb. 11:29 but 'forget' to give the original Greek in those places: why? They are LIARS, as the next few points show.

WHEN WE COME TO THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT, THE NOTE IS ONLY "AC 7:36; That is, Sea of Reeds"; Heb 11:29; That is, Sea of Reeds"

The NIV **transliterated** the Hebrew in the Old Testament: why not the New testament Greek??

THE REASON THE NOTE IS NOT SPECIFIC:

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT THE LITERAL GREEK IS :

"**eruthra** thalasse...." which means '**RED**' & 'SEA'

Thus, the Holy Spirit tells us that the proper translation is **RED sea.**

17. Who is the Lord Jesus Christ? adopted son? NIV, or the Only Begotten Son? (John 1:18 King James Bible)

Psalm 2:7 I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.	7I will proclaim the decree of the LORD: He said to me, "You are my Son*; today I have become your Father. With the notes: Psalm 2:7a Or son; also in verse 12 Psalm 2:7b Or have begotten you
--	--

Acts 13:33 Heb 1:5. This day - This may be understood either, Of his eternal generation. This day, from all eternity, which is well described by this day, because in eternity there is no succession, no [yesterday,] no [tomorrow,] but it is all as one continued day or moment without change or flux; or, Of the manifestation of Christ's eternal son - ship in time; which was done both in his birth and life, when his being the son of God was demonstrated by the testimony of the angel, Luke 1:32, and of God the Father, Matt 3:17 17:5, and by his own words and works; and in his resurrection, which seems to be here mainly intended, of which day this very place is expounded, Acts 13:33. When Christ was in a most solemn manner declared to be the son of God with power, Rom 1:4.

THE NIV CHANGES THIS PASSAGE TODAY I HAVE BECOME YOUR FATHER TO ALIGN WITH THE ADOPTIONIST HERESY: RELEGATING TO FOOTNOTE STATUS THE BEGOTTEN SON: Ps 2:7 OTHER PLACES THAT RELEGATE THE BEGOTTEN SON TO FOOTNOTES ARE; JN 1:14 JN 1:18 JN 1:18 JN 3:16 JN 3:18 AC 13:33

Heb 1:5 Heb 5:5 1Joh 4:9 What IS ADOPTIONISM? Separation of "Jesus" from "Christ" THIS DIVISION OF THE NAMES occurs far too often IN CORRUPT TEXTS SUCH AS THOSE USED BY THE NIV, to look for any cause other than **deliberate editing in certain N.T. manuscripts**. That there was a strong movement in the early centuries which could result in such a systematic editing, there can be no doubt! The foremost error regarding the Person of Christ, is of course, to deny His true Deity and true Humanity.

The chief means by which this was done, and which finds expression down to our own day, is technically known as "Adoptionism" or "Spirit Christology." Here: Jesus of Nazareth, an ordinary man of unusual virtue, was "adopted" by God into divine Sonship by the advent of the "Christ-Spirit" at His baptism. Therefore, Jesus became Christ at His baptism, rather than, the fact that He was always the Christ from eternity. And though united for a time, Jesus and Christ were separate personages. Many names and groups are associated with this wicked teaching, foremost of whom were the Gnostics

The liberal J. N. D. Kelly writes: There was a great variety of Gnostic systems, but a common pattern ran through them all. From the pleroma, or **spiritual world of aeons** the divine Christ descended and united Himself for a time (according to Ptolemy, between the baptism and the passion) to the historical personage ... These were tendencies on the fringe, yet Gnosticism at any rate **came within an ace of swamping the central tradition** (Early Christian Doctrines, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958, pp. 141, 142). Ponder carefully Kelly's statement about how near this came to "swamping the central tradition"!

Now we understand why the Bible closes with a fourfold warning: · "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" (1 Jn. 2:22). · "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of anti-christ" (1 Jn. 4:2, 3). · "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (1 Jn. 5:1). · "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh: This is a deceiver and an antichrist" (2 Jn. 7).

18. Subtil 'quotes' in one ref. to Gen.1:27, but NOT in the other reference to Genesis 1:1...

Mark 10:6 But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. 7 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave	6 "But at the beginning of creation God 'made them male and female.' [*] 7 'For this reason a man
---	---

to his wife	will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife,*
Why does the NIV doubt that the Lord could quote from this passage without a clause missing: having included it, what good does it do to cast doubt on the existence of ALL the words of Mk.10:7?More important:when was the beginning?	The note refers the reader to Gen 1:27, in v 6 and then says; NIV Mark 10:7 Some early manuscripts do not have "and be united to his wife."

What is interesting here is the **quote mark** designation of 'made them male and female' in the NIV, but the LACK of quote marks for "the beginning", which can ONLY refer to Genesis 1:1 "In the beginning God created the Heaven and the earth." The reason for the NIV's lack of attribution to Gen 1:1 allows doubt that Adam and Eve were created within six literal days of the creation of the universe. This inability to commit the NIV to a biblical worldview sets the stage for subsequent evolution based compromises. Big Bang cosmologist Hugh Ross a 'progressive creationist', in debating young earth creationists, states that there is no reason to suppose that the term "the beginning" refers to the beginning of creation. The King James wording "THE beginning of THE creation" emphasized the unity of the creation week, whereas the NIV's lack of a definite article for "creation" makes it easier to infer falsely that the creation of man, billions of years after "the beginning" was what Christ had in mind.

19. Firstborn of every Creature(Leader)KJB or Firstborn of every Creation (first MADE) NIV?

KJB Col 1:15Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature : 16For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: 17And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.	NIV Col 1:15He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation ; 16for in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers—all things have been created through him and for him. 17He himself is before all things, and in him all things hold together.
1:15 firstborn of every creature refers to the familial STATUS of Christ : primogeniture	NIV seems to imply that Jesus is a CREATION, who is

<p>is an integral part of the entire Bible. The King James Bible is clear by referring to US, the creatures who are related to HIM in subjection to the elder brother. : Heb. 2:11"</p> <p>for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, 12Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. 13And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me."</p>	<p>BORN: the use of the word IN in 16 and 17 infers that first Christ was created and then out of him God drew the subsequent aspects of the created universe.</p> <p>The passivity of creation IN him contrasts with the King James statement that all things were actively created BY the Lord Jesus Christ.</p>
--	--

20. God so loved the ages(NIV) or the world?

<p>Matt.24:3" and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"</p> <p>2 Pet. 3:10 But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.</p>	<p>Matt.24:3" and what will be the sign of your coming and of the end of the age?"</p> <p>2 Pet.3:10But the day of the Lord will come like a thief. The heavens will disappear with a roar; the elements will be destroyed by fire, and the earth and everything in it will be laid bare.Note that the NIV gives no notice that they delete"in the night".</p>
---	--

One pervasive change involves the translation of the word aeon/aeons as 'world' dozens of places where the context would not allow the concept, foreign to the Jewish mind, but dear to the Gnostics, of AGES. (note:new AGE).This concept of TIME being the solution for all our problems is the EXACT mechanism of evolution. Translation of the word aeon as age is New Age and pagan.Greek Scholar Herman Sasse in Gerhard Kittel's "Theological Dictionary of the New Testament" Vol.1. pg.197-209, shows that Plato and the Gnostics incorrectly defined aeon as "timeless " but: "The Biblical view... stand in antithesis to the pantheistic and astrological doctrine of recurrence."

But see the NIV's Matt. 24:3;28:20;13:39,40,49 ; Heb.9:26& Dan. 12:13, where the King James Bible refers to **the end of the world, or the end of the days**, while the NIV sounds out a new age reference to the **end of the AGE**. But the meaning of the word aeon was adjusted to the cosmology of the user, as,for example, Aeschylus in his Setum Contra Thebas used it to

mean 'world'. Jewish cosmology thought in terms of the world, while pagan greeks are the source of the evolutionary 'ages' idea.

Moreover, the physical renewing of earth is eliminated in 2 Pet.3:10, where the NIV says the earth will be 'laid bare', not "burned up", as the KJB says. The majority of the mss say burned up, thus the note in the NIV here is a lie, as it says "SOME" mss say burned up. The NASB note documents this by agreement with the KJB, while noting 'some mss say 'discovered". But this concept of TIME being the solution for all our problems is the EXACT mechanism of evolution. Thus the need to diminish the doctrine of millennial destruction of the present world. To the Gnostic, all our problems can be solved, given enough TIME. The God of the evolutionists is Father Time.. Thus the Gnostic concept of a "new Age" denoting the evolution of consciousness. **Matt. 12:32, Eph.1:21, Titus 2:12, Gal 1:4, Mk 10:30, Lk 18:30 & 20:35, and Rev.15:3 all translate with a view to convince Christians of a New AGE to come in the NIV**, in contrast with the Jewish world view of a new world to come.

21. Evolutionary Salvation? The implications of evolution corrupting the translation of Scripture.

Salvation: a current possession: King James Bible	15For we are the aroma of Christ to God among those who are being saved and among those who are perishing;
15For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish:	Process salvation: NIV. evolving to salvation?

More to the point, as much as young earth creationists tend to focus on the ontological claims of evolutionists, quite often the metaphysical implications of evolution are inadequately addressed. This is a mistake, as the **spiritual** damage from the false claims to have hard evidence to prove "goo to you by way of the zoo" evolution is found to create New Age Spiritual evolution concepts. In the **past** Plato and Aristotle claimed redemption through a process, then Christian gnostics Origen and Clement viewed salvation as an educational process, leading up to Hegelian philosophy that "History is God in process." Apostate Joseph Campell

claims in "The Power of Myth" that "The being of all beings is the serpent father...creator of everlasting becoming." These concepts pervade 21st Century philosophy, echoing Darwin's last line of the Origin of the Species: "you are being evolved".

Thus, even in the Core issue of salvation, an evolutionary mindset infiltrates the NIV, leading to a process salvation: as in Luke 13:23 "**will be saved**"NIV vs "be saved"KJB, 2 Cor. 2:15 " among those who are **being saved**" Niv vs "are saved"KJB, see other examples in:**1 Cor. 1:18, 1 John 2:8, Acts 15:19, Luke 15:32, Col. 3:10, and Acts 2:27.** It is at least plausible that a group of scholars immersed in a culture of evolutionism, could inadvertently depict a FALSE concept of process salvation , driven by an academic mindset that believes that EVERYTHING is process.

>22.gap? The implications of footnotes.

NIV Genesis 1:2 1In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. 2Now the earth was £ NIV note: doubts 'was' in Genesis 1:2	£ NIV note:Genesis 1:2 Or possibly became gap theory?
"was"agrees with King James Bible	

young earth creationists lose out on this doubting note at the onset of Genesis.

Also, note The NIV starts off in Genesis 1:1 with a contradiction. The King James Bible says: "In the beginning God created the HEAVEN (singular) and the earth."
This is also the reading of Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale 1535, Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, Webster's 1833, the Revised Version 1881, the Jewish translations of 1917 and 1936, Bible in Basic English 1960, the Italian Diodati, KJV 21st Century and the Third Millenium Bible.
The second heaven was not created until the second day as recorded in Genesis 1:6-8 when God made the firmament to divide the waters above

from the waters below the firmament.

"And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day."

However the NIV/TNIV joins such versions as the RSV, NASB, NIV, ESV and Holman Standard and the NKJV and says: "In the beginning God created the HEAVENS (plural) and the earth. And the earth was without form and void."

LEST anyone insist that the 'IM' ending MUST mean plural, remember that there are many NEW AGE 'bibles' that use this to say the first verse says "godS created" as elohIM is the Hebrew: "im" IS THE PLURAL OF MAJESTY.

>23.Syriac? WHO IS IN CHARGE?.

NIV Genesis 1:26 26Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, £NIV note: doubts 'EARTH' in Genesis 1:26	£ NIV note:Genesis 1:26 Hebrew; Syriac all the wild animals\
"EARTH"agrees with King James Bible	WHO IS IN CHARGE?

Thus in the footnote, taking man's sovereignty over 'all the earth'and diminishing it to only sovereignty over "wild animals"... also saying that animals were not under Adam's control (WILD???)

MANY GOOD CHRISTIANS WILL AFFIRM "Inspiration is affirmed ONLY of the autographs (the originals) of the Scriptures, not of any of the versions, whether ancient or modern, nor of any Hebrew or Greek manuscripts in existence, nor of any critical text known."

The logic and consistency of THIS TYPE OF argument breaks down at every point and leave us with no complete and infallible Bible TODAY. FOR EXAMPLE , SOME Calvinist Creationists quote with approval the London Confession which is derived from the Westminster Confession of 1649 which says: "The Old Testament IN HEBREW, and the New Testament IN GREEK, being immediately inspired by God AND BY HIS CARE AND PROVIDENCE KEPT PURE IN ALL AGES, ARE therefore authentical; so as in all controversies of Religion, the Church is finally to appeal to them."

If one really believes this great statement of faith, then why would one not believe the true Old Testament text has been providentially preserved in the Hebrew? As we see here in Genesis 1:26, with versions like the NIV, NASB, RSV, ESV and Holman Standard editors believe the Hebrew texts have been either corrupted or lost, and OFTEN instead supports the wildly variant readings taken from either the alleged Greek Septuagint, the Syriac, the Vulgate or just plain made up by men

All these modern versions are put out by men who believe the Hebrew Scriptures have been corrupted in numerous places, and yet they don't agree among themselves as to where nor how. You can find MANY places in the NIV where this happens, and in THIS case, it effects the doctrine of CREATION.

>24.deism?? more implications of footnotes.

<p>NIV Genesis 2 1Thus the heavens and the earth were completed in all their vast array. 2By the seventh day God had finished the work he had been doing; so on the seventh day he rested £ NIV note: doubts 'rested' in Genesis 2:2</p> <p>"rested" agrees with King James Bible</p>	<p>£ NIV note:Genesis 2:2 Or ceased; also in verse 3</p> <p>deism?</p>
---	--

young earth creationists lose out on this doubting of the word rest via a footnote at the onset of Genesis.

KJBible John 5:16And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day.

KJBible17But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. making a contradiction with their own NIV:"John 5:17Jesus said to them, "My Father is always at his work to this very day, and I, too, am working.""

Exodus 20:11 makes it clear that there were seven literal days —six for work, and one for rest. The NIV muddies the waters of the tie-in of Creation, the day of rest, and OUR creation in the Lord Jesus Christ, and our rest in Him.

The Sabbath is a day of rest, not a day of cease. Hebrews 4 says Jesus is our rest, not our cease.

Also, God stated that He 'rested' from his work of creation (not that He is resting!). The fact that He rested from his work of creation, does not preclude Him from continuing to rest from this activity. God's work now is different—it is a work of sustaining His creation, and of reconciliation and redemption because of man's sin.

>25.all dogs MIGHT go to heaven? implications of NIV Study Bible footnote.

NIV Genesis 2:7the LORD God formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being. NIV Study Bible note: tells us WHY they said 'being' in Genesis 2:7 "being" disagrees with the King James Bible's "soul"	NIV Study bible note:Genesis 2:7 "people , at least physically, have affinity with the animals" gap theory?
---	---

young earth creationists don't want people to think they are animals

Niv study Bible" "man became a living being": "The Hebrew phrase here translated "living being" is translated "living creatures" in 1:20,24. The words of 2:7 therefore imply that people , at least physically, have affinity with the animals. The great difference is that man is made " in the image of God"(1:27) and has an absolutely unique relation both to God as his(SIC) servant and to the other creatures as their divinely appointed steward.

Note the opportunity to deny a Darwinian relation to animals is LACKING here: why???

KJBible "and man became a living soul." here the word SOUL is deleted by the NIV and replaced with 'being' , which means,ANIMAL :physical ANIMAL

[according to the General Editor Kenneth L. Barker and Ronald

Youngblood(specifically Genesis' editor) and Managing Editor DORIS WYNBEEK RIKKERS and Copy Editor and Stylist JUNE GUDEN.] Thus, the KJBible here teaches man is and has a "soul" , the NIV implies, and the authoritative NIV Study Bible (Kenneth L. Barker, General Editor)explicitly confirms, that they MEAN to SAY, that man is taught to be (with provisos)an "animal" in Genesis 2:7. !!!

As an aside the KJBible teaches in Ecc.3:21Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth? But the NIV teaches that all dogs MIGHT go to heaven 21Who knows if the spirit of man rises upward and if the spirit of the animal£ goes down into the earth?"

"The NIV note £ Ecclesiastes 3:21 Or Who knows the spirit of man, which rises upward, or the spirit of the animal, which" showing that they COULD have said that animals and people were different in their destinies, but did NOT.

Conclusion:

The King James Bible is BETTER than the NIV for a fuller testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ as CREATOR, and the King James Bible gives a better testimony that there was a recent creation. The NIV is deeply flawed in this **particular** area of the doctrine of young earth creation, and should be regarded with caution by creationists, as it evidences mistakes based on science falsely so called, (textual criticism): and errors about the the person to Christ,the historical nature of Genesis 1, the size and materials of the ark, accuracy of genealogies, the ability of God to do mighty miracles(Red Sea) and others,which some professing have erred concerning the faith.

By Daniel Lee Ford.9/1/2003: revised 1/13/2008