

Do Modern English Bible Versions Remove the Ascension of Jesus Christ?

“He that speaketh truth sheweth forth righteousness: but a false witness deceit.” (Proverbs 12:17)

On p. 360 of *New Age Bible Versions*, Gail Riplinger makes a serious claim against every accurate modern English Bible version:

The Absent Ascension

As the new versions accelerate into the arms of the Antichrist, they bypass the ascension of Christ, *omitting* almost every mention of it.
[Emphasis added]

Is this true? Do the “new versions” omit almost every mention of the Lord’s ascension? She features a chart, which spans pp. 360-61, comparing what the KJV says to what she says the “new versions” say.

To find out whether or not the “new versions” do as Riplinger reports we checked each Scripture she lists on pp. 360-61 and the “new versions” that she most often accuses in her books, and here is what we found:

What Riplinger Says	NKJV	NASB	NIV	ESV	NCV
In John 16:16 the “new versions” omit the phrase “because I go to the Father.” P. 360	John 16:16 reads: “because I go to the Father.” Not omitted	John 16:17 reads: “because I go to the Father.” Not omitted	John 16:17 reads: “because I am going to the Father.” Not omitted	John 16:17 reads: “because I am going to the Father.” Not omitted	John 16:17 reads: “because I am going to the Father.” Not omitted
In Luke 24:51, 52 the “new versions” say “He parted from them” and omits rest of the section. P. 361	Vs. 51 reads: ...He was parted from them and carried up into heaven. Vss. 52-53 have not been omitted.	Vs. 51 reads: ...He parted from them and was carried up into heaven. Vss. 52-53 have not been omitted.	Vs. 51 reads: ...he left them and was taken up into heaven. Vss. 52-53 have not been omitted	Vs. 51 reads: ...he parted from them and was carried up into heaven. Vss. 52-53 have not been omitted.	Vs. 51 reads: ...He was parted from them and carried up into heaven. Vss. 52-53 have not been omitted.
In Mark 16:9-20 the “new versions” read ‘[[double brackets]] “are known not to be part of the original text.” P. 361	No brackets and no omission of vss. 9-20. Same as KJV.	It is historical knowledge that some manuscripts, including <i>Aleph</i> and <i>B</i> , lack vss. 9-20. The NASB does not omit vss. 9-20, but adds to vs. 20 (in brackets): “And they promptly	No brackets and no omission of vss. 9-20. Same as KJV.	No omission of vss. 9-20. See note for NASB.	No omission of vss. 9-20. See note for NASB.

		<p>reported all these instructions to Peter and his companions. And after that, Jesus Himself sent out through them from east to west the sacred and imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation.” Many MSS also add “amen” to the end. Historically, it is not known whether Mark wrote the text of the last 12 vss., left it off, or if it was lost during early MS copying and a copyist later added it to synchronize it with the other 3 gospels.</p>			
What Riplinger Says	NKJV	NASB	NIV	ESV	NCV
<p>In 1 Timothy 3:16 the “new versions” read “He was... taken...in glory.” P. 361</p>	<p>Reads: ...Received up in glory.</p> <p>The text is clear that he was received UP, meaning INTO heaven. It makes no difference whether the KJV reads “up into glory” or the “new versions” read “up in glory.” Both apply to Christ ascending to heaven. He was glorified at his resurrection, before his ascension.</p>	<p>Reads: Taken up in glory.</p> <p>See note for NKJV.</p>	<p>Reads: taken up in glory.</p> <p>See note for NKJV.</p>	<p>Reads: taken up in glory.</p> <p>See note for NKJV.</p>	<p>Reads: taken up in glory.</p> <p>See note for NKJV.</p>
<p>In John 3:13 the “new versions” omit “the Son of man which is in heaven.” P. 361</p>	<p>Reads: ...the Son of Man who is in heaven.</p> <p>Same as KJV.</p>	<p>Later MSS contain: “who is in heaven.” The NASB used earlier MSS that were closer to the time of the original autographs. The KJV</p>	<p>Later MSS contain: “who is in heaven.” The NIV used earlier MSS that were closer to the time of the original auto-</p>	<p>Later MSS contain: “who is in heaven.” The ESV used earlier MSS that were closer to the time of the original</p>	<p>Later MSS contain: “who is in heaven.” The NCV used earlier MSS that were closer to the time of the original auto-</p>

		translators did not have these MSS. If they had, no one knows for certain that they would <i>not</i> have utilized them.	graphs. The KJV translators did not have these MSS. If they had, no one knows for certain that they would <i>not</i> have utilized them.	autographs. The KJV translators did not have these MSS. If they had, no one knows for certain that they would <i>not</i> have utilized them.	graphs. The KJV translators did not have these MSS. If they had, no one knows for certain that they would <i>not</i> have utilized them.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Riplinger accuses “new versions” of omitting Luke 16:9-20 but she fails to tell her readers that the NASB (due to the MSS that were used in translating it) adds the words (in brackets): “And they promptly reported all these instructions to Peter and his companions. And after that, Jesus Himself sent out through them from east to west the **sacred and imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation.**” [Emphasis added.] There is nothing doctrinally unsound here. Moreover, it agrees with the previous verses, as well as with the other three gospels in the KJV, NKJV, etc. Some later MSS and versions contain this last part, usually placed after verse 8, while a few versions place it at the end, as the NASB has. This part is not found in the KJV in Luke 9-20, even though its translators utilized later MSS. Should this cast doubt or guilt upon the KJV? Of course not. Yet, if we were to use Riplinger’s logic here, the KJV becomes guilty of omitting Scripture and the NASB is correct for having a complete reading. The truth is, the KJV is no guiltier than the “new versions” for omission or addition. It just depends on which MSS have been used during translation. One is not necessarily better or worse than the other, which is why it is a good idea to utilize several good translations of Scripture (KJV, NKJV, NASB, NIV, et al.) when studying God’s word. That way, one can view the many doctrinally sound readings of various manuscripts, which have been preserved through time, since the originals no longer exist to tell us what the exact readings were.

On p. 361 Riplinger writes,

Such New Age fiction is fostered by the NASB’s rendition, “He parted from them,” which omits the remaining, “and was carried up into heaven.” It lends a hand to such legends as a visit by Jesus to India as Krishna or Saint Issa...or even the Mormon myth of his visit to the American Indians.

Is that what the NASB does to Jesus? No. Here, Riplinger lies to her readers about the NASB, blaming it for New Age teachings that deny the ascension of Jesus Christ. As the chart above clearly illustrates, neither the NASB nor any other accurate Modern English version omits “and was carried up into heaven.” The ascension is intact. Anyone can verify this by checking the NASB and other accurate “new versions.” Whatever the New Age makes claim to regarding the Lord Jesus Christ, they have not taken such from the NASB, NKJV, NIV, ESV,

nor the NCV, et al. New Age denial of the Lord's ascension has nothing to do with accurate "new versions."

Continuing to foster this lie against the "new versions", Riplinger compares them to "the frail fantasy of New Age books like *The Mystical Life of Jesus...*"¹ from which she quotes, needlessly exposing her readers to New Age teaching.

It is simply untrue that the accurate "new versions" omit the ascension of Christ or that they have inspired the New Age Movement's belief that Jesus never ascended to heaven but instead went off to the mountains of India to live out the rest of his days as a guru. New Age thinking includes a belief, held by many practitioners, that Jesus Christ is only one in a succession of other "Ascended Masters."² Since the Garden of Eden Satan has attempted to counterfeit God's truth by creating his own clever copy, playing out his own scenario through the world's religions. New Age confusion is one of Satan's counterfeits and an attack on God's only way to heaven. He has found men and women who are willing to take what Scripture says and then twist it in their own books so that it fits their dogma. Satan has rewritten the important messages of Scripture through New Age doctrine in an attempt to make Jesus just a man who ascended to a "higher level of consciousness", and Riplinger has allowed him to get away with it by falsely accusing "new versions" of being the cause. She had the perfect opportunity in her book to defend God's word in all accurate Bible versions, while exposing what the New Age is teaching through their own books and seminars. But she didn't take that opportunity and instead told a lie about them. Why? It is not any of the accurate "new versions" that say Jesus became a mystic instead of ascending to heaven, it is Riplinger who says they do.

The question needs to be asked: On which side is Gail Riplinger?

Instead of bearing false witness against these "new versions", why has Riplinger not *outed* the teachings which the New Age has twisted from the Bible? In other words, why did she quote from the New Age and then falsely compare the "new versions" to it? These are the kind of questions Gail Riplinger's readers need to be asking. It's time to stop attacking God's word in the good English Bible versions and start seeing the devil hiding behind all the false accusations.

¹ *New Age Bible Versions*, fourth printing, 1994, p. 361.

² See <http://www.greatdreams.com/masters/ascended-masters.htm>