

# New International Perversion

## I. Introduction

The New International Version (NIV), contrary to what it claims to be, is not "a new translation of the scriptures into English." For a translation to be a translation it must stay true to the original words as much as is possible. Rather those who worked on the NIV, we shall see, took every liberty to be free with the text so as to come up with different interpretations especially of what they considered difficult passages. To quote one reviewer of the NIV: "Textual modifications in the NIV have frequently become commentary, and may be difficult for readers to determine what is paraphrase, equivalent, or literal." One sample so clearly illustrating this is Hebrews 11:11. The KJV says,

"Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised."

You will note that Abraham is not even mentioned, which is true to the Greek New Testament. Whereas in the NIV the subject has been changed from Sara to Abraham (who was not even mentioned in the Greek text of this verse). The NIV says,

"By faith {Abraham}, even though {he} was past age -- and Sarah {herself was barren} -- was enabled to become a {father} because {he} considered him faithful who had made the promise."  
[Added portions of NIV commentary that are not in the original texts appear within braces {}.]

The Greek says nothing about being barren, but rather on being able to conceive seed. Abraham is not in this verse, nor is his being past age mentioned but rather her's. The emphasis is not on him becoming a father but on her delivering a child, but all that has been lost in the NIV's loose commentary on this verse. Can we call this translation?

The NIV is in reality a paraphrase and not a translation of the scriptures. The American Heritage dictionary defines a paraphrase as a 'restatement of a text or passage in another form or other words, often to clarify meaning.' The hidden problems with paraphrases are twofold. First, they can easily reflect the doctrinal viewpoints of the translators as we shall see the NIV does. Second, the reader can never be sure what are and what aren't the very words of God -- that distinction is lost. God's promise in the scriptures is not to preserve and to protect what man says or thinks about His word. "Every word of God is pure" Pr 30:5. "The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Ps 12:6 But not so the words of men, they are corrupt! It is only the "the words of God [that] shall be fulfilled." (Rev 17:17) Our faith cannot stand on the eloquence of man, only the sure word of God.

## II. The Claims of the NIV

"It is a scholarly translation that accurately expresses the original Bible texts ... while remaining faithful to the thoughts and meaning of the Biblical writers. Its readability, accuracy, and beauty of style make it the most popular modern translation available."

None can deny the NIV's claim to present popularity (but time will tell even here), as it is probably the most widely read English Bible by new converts. But, great exception must be taken to their claims of accuracy and fidelity to the original texts. It is here that we begin to see something quite different.

# New International Perversion

## 1. Interpretation

As we shall see its popularity has nothing to do with its 'accuracy of expressing the original Bible texts', nor its 'faithfulness to the thoughts and meaning of the Biblical writers'.

First, let's deal with what they didn't say! Maybe not so obvious to the inexperienced ear, what they didn't say is that they had remained faithful to the **WORDS** of the Biblical writers, rather only to the thoughts and meaning. This is where the dangerous line is crossed from translation to interpretation. It is for the individual reader and the teacher of scripture to interpret the scriptures. The translator's job is merely to translate, but the NIV translator's have willingly crossed that line without ever alerting the reader they have become not only translators but *interpreter's* of God's truth, and it is at this very point they have greatly erred.

According to their own advertising "... they have striven for **more** than a word-for-word translation." There you have it, by their own words they have crossed the line of translation and gone into interpretation, by paraphrasing and adding their own commentary. When will we understand you can't improve on the Word of God? God has spoken exactly what he wants us to know. Let God be true (and His words), but let every man (and their words) be a liar.

## 2. Inaccuracy

As concerning accuracy of the NIV, they claim, "The first concern of the translators has been the accuracy of the translation and its fidelity to the thought of the biblical writers." They also claim "...communication of the meaning of the writers of the Bible **demands** frequent modifications in sentence structure..."

### Changing the Sentence Structure

Please know, NO other bible version required this liberty to 'frequently modify the sentence structure in order to communicate the meaning of the Bible'. As a result reading comparatively almost any other bible with the NIV it is very difficult to follow along in the NIV since they have changed the sentence structure around. In fact certain words/phrases have been moved from one verse to another, making it nearly impossible to read congregationally or to compare with Hebrew/Greek Interlinear Bibles.

Frequent modifications in sentence structure were not required by the King James translators because they knew Hebrew and Greek so well. (In fact most often overlooked amongst their abilities was their great skill in the English language. Clearly they knew the English language far better than any of our modern translators, which is why the King James above any other version is unmatched for its poetry and grandeur of language.)

### Changing the Very Words Themselves

Also in the Translator's Preface to the NIV they say, "Words in the consonantal text were divided differently from the way they appear in the Masoretic Text." In case you don't clearly understand what the above statement by the NIV translators means: the Hebrew was originally written without vowels and without spaces. By oral tradition the keepers of the Old Testament knew where the words were divided and what the consonants were. To standardize the written text the

# New International Perversion

Masoretes formalized the Hebrew text adding spaces and vowel markings. This standard Masoretic text is what the King James translators used as is -- because they unlike supposed scholars today really did believe in a preserved text. For over 1400 years the Masoretic text was the standard Hebrew text to use for the Old Testament. Proverb 22:28 says, "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

This standard Masoretic Hebrew text is what the NIV translators claimed to use, but as we see they depart from it whenever it suits them. So they clearly have not stayed true to the original texts at all, but whenever it fit their fancy they changed the standard Masoretic division so that completely different words are arrived at in the text. Is this what men have the right to do to God's word?

## Changing the Letters

So what else could the NIV translators change (other than the frequent modification of the sentence structure and the very words themselves)? Here we go, "Sometimes vowel letters and vowel signs did not, in the judgment of the translators, represent the correct vowels for the original consonantal text."

By this time, the careful hearer is probably wondering how could the NIV translators possibly have any idea of what the original texts were, if they had no diligence to stay close to it, but change it where they thought best? [But we will get to their 'original texts' in another section] And if they, in their own scholasticism thought they were so accurate in what they were doing, what made them not think that if previous Hebrew and Greek translators had been as they (and man has not changed), none of us would have any clue as to what was and what wasn't the very words of God -- for every generation would have done what the NIV committee had done. Was nothing sacred to the NIV perverters? Have they no respect for the holy text?

## Accountability

Hence, we see from their perspective the very words of God have not been preserved at all. Friend, make no doubt about it, these last two changes are the most heinous scripture twisting that you can do. We cannot make the Word of God say what we would like it to say. The Jews were meticulously scrupulous in copying the Hebrew text LETTER for LETTER. To change anything of what they preserved for us is to deny preservation of the scriptures (which God promised!). Who is to say then, that if I don't like what a scripture says that I cannot come later and change the consonantal text divisions to say yet again something else. Or if I can't quite make the scripture say what I want it to say, how about using my own judgment for what the correct vowels should be? And then the wrong emphasis is given so let's change the sentence structure around, what's wrong with that? Friends, is the Word of God fluid? Can it change from generation to generation? Or, as it claims to be, is it eternal, fixed, and unchangeable? "God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged." Rom 3:4

Though men may try to erase or change his words and his covenants, "He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations." Ps 105:8 Meditate on this friends, His sentences will not be altered, "Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever." Ps 119:160 His words shall not pass away or be changed, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Mt 24:35 Nor shall even a letter be removed from His holy writ, "Think not that I am come to destroy (to disintegrate) the law, or the prophets: I am not come

# New International Perversion

to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Mt 5:17-18

By the way in case you don't know what a jot or tittle is, they are the VOWEL markings that the Masoretes added! And Jesus promised that not one of them would in any way pass away until heaven and earth pass away. Jesus was that sure that his heavenly Father would preserve them. Sorry, NIV translators you have just violated and contradicted the very words and promise of our Lord Jesus. You ought not to have done that, for now you shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ having attempted to destroy and disintegrate the word of God!

So there we have it! The NIV by their own admission has been:

1. **unfaithful** to the original sentence structure.
2. **unfaithful** to the original word divisions.
3. **unfaithful** to the original words.
4. **unfaithful** to the original vowels.

### 3. What Original Bible texts?

Now let us go on, for unfortunately we are not done yet, to see what were 'the original texts' that they were so 'faithful' to. Is it any wonder with their unfaithfulness to the sentences, the words, and the letters of the sacred text of scripture that they felt no compunction at discarding the original texts and using almost any old document to correct the preserved scriptures! Let us look at their sources for the 'preserved' text of scripture. They claim of themselves, "It is a scholarly translation that accurately expresses the original Bible texts".

#### Old Testament Source Texts

Unfortunately, as we shall see again (and have already seen), they don't believe in an original Bible text. Hence, they are not being honest with the dear reader in the above statement. In addition to using the wrong foundational Hebrew manuscript, the NIV has used all of the 17 erroneous sources listed below to "correct" the Masoretic Hebrew text using spurious criteria. Apparently, if 17 other sources were needed to correct the Masoretic foundational text, it cannot have been preserved now can it.

Here are the 17 Old Testament sources which they have used in their 'scholarly' works and in their wisdom to correct the scriptures:

1. Septuagint, LXX, the Greek Old Testament: used to correct the Masoretic text. [Note: "The Greek Old Testament is a very deficient translation from the Hebrew into the Greek. In many books and places, it is just like the Living Version. It is a paraphrase, a perversion." Remember that the oracles of God, i.e. the very spoken words of God, in the Old Testament were given to the Jews (Rom 3.1-2) and not the Gentiles.]
2. Latin Vulgate [the Latin bible translation for the Catholic church, 382 AD]
3. Quotations from Jerome (331-420 AD) [an early church father who translated the Latin Vulgate]
4. Juxta Hebraica of Jerome for the Psalms [commentary and not scripture]

## New International Perversion

5. Aquila [a Greek Old Testament translation]
6. Samaritan Pentateuch [the first 5 books of Moses which the Samaritans used. The Samaritans were a mixed, superstitious people. Remember Jesus said to the Samaritans (as indicated by the use of the plural, "ye"), "Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews." (Jn 4.22).]
7. Symmachus [a Greek translation of the Old Testament]
8. Theodotion [a Greek translation of the Old Testament]  
[Jerome of Bethlehem, who saw these Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, makes it quite plain that these men were Judaizing heretics, and that their versions were made out of hatred to Christianity.]
9. Dead Sea Scrolls [these were preserved by the Essenes an ascetic group who left the Hebrew synagogue in Jerusalem and separated themselves from worship in Jerusalem contrary to the Law. They were an offshoot and a false, heretical cult, particularly evidenced by many weird and magical writings which have been found among their writings.]
10. Syriac Peshitta Version (3rd century) [of Syrian origin]
11. A Few Hebrew Manuscripts
12. An Ancient Hebrew Scribal Tradition [when does scribal tradition take precedence over the words of God? Jesus dealt with that clearly when he was here]
13. A Variant Hebrew Reading in the Margin [again, this is commentary]
14. Josephus [an unsaved Jewish historian who lived during the time of Jesus]
15. The Targums [an Aramaic paraphrase of the Old Testament Hebrew]
16. A different set of Hebrew vowels & Words in the consonantal text divided differently [this is nothing other than twisting the scripture]
17. Conjecture [no reason given to depart from the manuscript.]

In conclusion, they tell us, "Readings from these versions were occasionally followed where the Masoretic Text seemed **doubtful** and where accepted principles of textual criticism showed that one or more of these textual witnesses appeared to provide the correct reading." So as expected by their lack of respect for the original text (the Masoretic Text) they clearly feel they are in a position to judge what is scripture, and what is not.

### New Testament Source Texts

"The Greek text used in translating the New Testament was an eclectic one." In other words, the Greek manuscripts in their opinion have not been preserved. In case you don't remember the definition of eclectic, here it is: choosing or making use of what one considers the best ideas in various sources or systems of thought. As we have seen with the Hebrew Old Testament text already, it might as well be a smorgasbord than a preserved text in the eyes of the NIV translators. Don't like peas, get pudding. Don't like holiness, get tranquility. Don't believe me? Here again are their own words, and note especially how they really have no clear idea just what is scripture and what is not:

# New International Perversion

"No other piece of ancient literature has such an abundance of manuscript witnesses as does the New Testament. Where existing manuscripts differ, the translators made THEIR choice of readings according to accepted principles of New Testament textual criticism. Footnotes call attention to places where there was **uncertainty** about what the original text was." "As in other documents, the precise meaning of the biblical text is sometimes **uncertain**."

Just a few notes before we unfortunately have to continue with this travesty of the mocking of the scripture by the NIV translators. First, maybe they should have put more time into determining what exactly the original text was BEFORE they started juggling all the pieces together. It might have saved them a lot of time trying to mesh all these different pieces of literature. The King James translators found the preserved text and avoided all these issues, but modern scholars can't find such a text because they've discarded the real one by following in the deception and lies of Westcott and Hort.

Second, as concerns the statement: "As in other documents, the precise meaning of the biblical text is sometimes uncertain." Get the feeling these modern translators have no respect for the Holy Scriptures. Are the scriptures just another document which we use men's methods of correction and interpretation on? I pray not, dear reader. Friends, the bible is not just some other document. That has been the problem with modern scholars all along. We're talking about holy writ which God himself has promised to preserve! We're talking about the word of God upon which our eternal salvation is based. If they pass away, then the possibility of our very salvation is lost. For, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. But [thanks be to God] the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1Pe 1:23,25

Third, the uncertainty of the meaning of the biblical text (which we all may struggle with) has nothing to do with translation -- unless one is doing interpretation instead of simply translation! But then we have seen that already all along the way. That is exactly what they are doing (though they will not admit to it): Interpretation!

## 4. Unfaithfulness to the Thoughts and Meaning of the Biblical Writers

Let's now talk about one more aspect of inaccuracy before we go on to look at their mangled text which results from the use of 17 different Old Testament sources and the unnamed eclectic list of New Testament sources.

### Lost Words, Lost Meaning

The biblical Gospel writers liberally use conjunctions to begin sentences. This is why the King James as a literal translation begins many verses with [and, but, even, for] whereas the NIV ignores most. Yup, that's right, those words are just ignored -- discarded.

You read an NIV and you lose -- those words were just ignored and thrown away in their intellectual wastebuckets. Likewise, biblical writers frequently use the word 'IDOU' (behold or look here) to capture the readers mind, and the NIV once again ignores nearly all, while the KJ faithfully records them. The NIV also frequently changes questions into the most logical answer. So if they think the answer should be yes, they answer it for you. For example, in John 16:31, when the King James says of Jesus' words: "Do you now believe?" the NIV changes the form of the question (which is in the Greek) into a statement, leaping to the

## New International Perversion

answer by stating: "You believe at last!" Thus clearly the thought of the biblical writers has not been faithfully kept.

They say, "As for the traditional pronouns "thou," "thee" and "thine" in reference to the Deity, the translators judged that to use these archaisms would violate accuracy in translation. Neither Hebrew, Aramaic, nor Greek uses special pronouns for the persons of the Godhead."

This is exactly what we feared above! If the NIV committee can take such liberty with the text, how do we not know we are compounding our errors and drifting farther and farther from the true meaning of the scriptures, as the Pharisees did with their scribal traditions? This problem of the 'traditional pronouns "thou," "thee" and "thine" in reference to the Deity', for those of you who don't know, is a New American Standard Bible (NASB) perversion.

See how the modern bibles build off of one another's errors instead of going back to the standard measure of all English translations, the King James. One keeps the thees and thous only in reference to God [ie. the NASB], but another discards them (probably through ignorance of not even knowing why they were put there: to indicate the singular versus the plural). While the next seeing the inconsistency of the prior but not the original purpose takes away even more of the ACCURACY of the Word of God which has been divinely preserved for us in the King James Version alone. And all the while they all claim to be more accurate than the King James version, when in all truth, their arrogance and their error has been shown, that they are clearly less accurate.

### Changing the Meaning

Let us again deal with the NIV's translators 'first concern', as they said, "The first concern of the translators has been the accuracy of the translation and its fidelity to the thought of the biblical writers."

We have already dealt with the complete inaccuracy of the NIV with respect to translation methods, but what of their supposed fidelity to the 'thought' of the biblical writers? How did they fare in this respect? Not well, for thoughts are communicated by words. Change the words enough and the meaning is changed. Change the sentence structure around and not only is the emphasis completely altered, but even the subject can be changed (as we have already seen with Heb 11:11, where in the Greek Sara is the subject but in the NIV they have made Abraham the subject).

To be faithful to the thought of the scriptures one must be faithful to the letters, the words, the plurality of pronouns (which has now been lost completely) and the sentence structure. "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much." Lk 16:10 Be unfaithful to the words, and God says, it is impossible to be faithful to the thought.

Because the NIV translators have not used the words of the biblical writers and have changed them as they saw fit, what we have in the NIV is the thought of the NIV interpreters and not the thought of the biblical writers at all. They have made the arrogant mistake of interpreting the scripture BEFORE they translate it. One of the meanings of interpret is probably very appropriate at this point to explain why interpretation before translation is so dangerous. Interpret means (1) to explain the meaning of, (2) to conceive the significance of or to construe. Neither explanation nor construing are translation they are a form of commentary. The thought of the biblical writers has definitely not been kept.

# New International Perversion

## 5. Problems with the Translation Committee itself

"This group (of scholars) was not made up of official church representatives..." Oh, how wonderful this sounds to us in America in our enlightened era of independent ministries and para-church organizations and whatever many-headed beast may be growing outside the church. God has not ordained these things, friend. Jesus stated, "I will build my church" (Mt 16:18). He didn't say he'd build independent ministries, para-church organizations, bible colleges, or even evangelistic organizations. He would build his church. Though a group of independent scholars not made up of official church representatives may seem a good thing at first, this is actually an abomination to the Lord.

The word of God has always been the responsibility of the church to keep and to guard. God's purposes are not fulfilled by renegades who refuse to be under proper supervision, direction, and order. Or have we forgotten that God is a God of order and everything, EVERYTHING He does (and has ever done) is always in divine authority. This is why Jesus, though the Son of God, said "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." Jn 5:19 Jesus was a man under authority (Lk 7:8) and "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." 1Jn 2:6 These men if they were going to do anything for the Lord would have to be men under authority from their respective churches, but they weren't.

As for their methods of translation, we have already seen how very flawed they were. As for their review process which they boasted so highly of: "...the entire Bible under went three revisions..." "...no other translation has been made by a more thorough process of review and revision from committee to committee than this one." This my friend, is utterly false and either a deliberate lie or purposeful ignorance of the history of the greatest English bible of all time the King James, which underwent 14 separate reviews. Fourteen versus three, there's really no comparison, friends. Of course, if we exclude the King James and only concern ourselves with modern translations, then maybe they are correct, but certainly they are in grave error when compared to the diamond of all translations the King James.

## 6. The Faith of the Translators

Clear from the comparison of the NIV with the KJV with regards to only one subject matter (the acceptability of homosexuality in the eyes of God) we can clearly see that the people working on a translation and their personal faith and their respect/disrespect for the word of God as the very words of God will have a profound impact upon the work produced and its worthiness to be accepted as holy writ. We have looked individually at two people involved in the NIV, but ignoring that, but what was their corporate statement of faith they left us in their Preface,

"The translators believe that it contains the divine answer to the deepest needs of humanity, that it sheds unique Light on our path in a dark world, and that it sets forth the way to our eternal well-being."

This is truly a pathetic statement about the holy scriptures. They want to tell us they set forth the way "to our eternal well-being"? Wow, we're talking a real deep walk with our Lord Jesus, aren't we. Are they afraid to use the word

# New International Perversion

'salvation' or do they not know what it means, or worse yet, have they in their intellectualism gotten 'beyond that' to find some more important state of eternal well-being? The scriptures shed "unique light"? They shed our only true light! If we truly know the scriptures and the power of them, having experienced the faithfulness of the Lord through them, then it is no longer an issue of "believing" they contain "the divine answer to the deepest needs of humanity". If we know the Lord and we know His Word, then we should KNOW it contains God's wisdom on exactly how we should live our life and what we have need of.

## 7. Faulty Manuscripts, Faulty Translation

Because all modern translations, like the NIV, reject the foundational use of the Textus Receptus as the inerrant word of God, these translations because they are based on different foundations will produce invariable different translations and thereby different scriptures. Let's look at just one problem and how they (such as Mr. James White) try to explain them away. In reference to why the NIV omits the words 'take up the cross' in Mark 10:21, he says, contrarily (because he refuses to see the KJV as the standard by which all subsequent bibles must be measured),

Why, then, does the KJV contain the phrase at Mark 10:21? Again, we note that it is because the Greek text used by the KJV translators, later called the Textus Receptus, contains the phrase in the Greek. In point of fact, the majority of Greek texts contain the phrase. So why omit it? Here are the reasons. First, and foremost, the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament do not contain the phrase. This includes not only the two manuscripts, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, that are so often vilified by KJV Only advocates, but many others. Not only this, but entire translations into other languages lack the phrase. When Biblical scholars encounter a situation like this, they look for a reason as to why a phrase like this would be **inserted into the text**. Most often, insertions are made due to the presence of the phrase in a similar context elsewhere in Scripture, which causes a scribe to place the material in the copy he is writing due to familiarity with the other passage. Notice that Jesus says that those who would come after Him must deny themselves and "follow me." When we come to Mark 10:21, we again find that phrase "follow me." Seemingly an early scribe, familiar with the phrase-ology of Mark 8:34 and its use of "follow me," upon encountering the same thing in Mark 10:21, either mistakenly or even on purpose, inserted the phrase "take up the cross." But this is not the only fact that points to the correctness of not including "take up the cross" at Mark 10:21.

There is another good reason. Mark 10:21 is part of a story that is found in both Matthew and Luke as well, specifically, in Matthew 19:21 and Luke 18:22. Note that neither Matthew nor Luke record the phrase "take up the cross" in their gospels at this point.

How sad, so we see Dr. White tears down the Textus Receptus saying it has copyists' errors (possibly purposefully added), the only preserved standard which was used to translate the KJV, and hence made God a liar, that He has not preserved His word. So they fulfill their own prophecy that the word of God can only be discerned by looking at the whole of all manuscripts. Of course, you would think for this very reason they would have included the extra words so that they could get the fullness.

## 8. Updated so it would be easier to read? Hardly!

It is easy to claim anything, but the proof lies in the pudding, i.e. the result. Was it the purpose of the NIV to truly update the translation so it was easier to read? Or was there some other more important purpose they had which overrode their desire for simplicity? With a short, no where near exhaustive

# New International Perversion

list, Here are a few examples of the NIV's hard words compared to the Authorized Version's (AV), easy words:

Location	NIV	AV
Eze. 40:13	alcove	little chamber
Isa. 57:4	brood	children
Rev. 4:3	carnelian	sardine
1Ki. 4:22	cors	measures
Pro. 28:12	elation	glory
Pro. 23:10	encrouch	enter
Ex. 28:20	filigree	enclosings
Jer. 46:20	gadfly	destruction
Est. 1:6	porphyry	red
Mat. 27:27	Praetorium	common hall
Hos. 4:13	terebinth	elms
Isa. 1:31	tinder	tow
1Sam 14:19	tumult	noise
2K. 24:1	vassal	servant
Song 1:16	verdant	green
Num. 34:5	wadi	river
Mat. 21:41	wretches	wicked men
Heb. 11:23	edict	commandment

Here also are a few words that are difficult in the AV, but are not updated in the NIV.

Location	NIV	AV
Rev. 18:12	citron	thyine
Gal. 5:19	debauchery	lasciviousness
Isa. 28:24	harrowing	break the clods
Lev. 11:19	hoopie	lapwing
Deut. 21:20	profligate	glutton
Ecc. 9:14	seige works	bulwarks
1K. 14:24	male shrine	sodomites
	prostitute	