

## NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION (A Review #2)

- a. The preface states, “*they have striven for more than a word-for-word translation*” (p. viii).

### I. TYPE OF TRANSLATION:

#### A. Role of a translator:

---

**Philip Schaff** (chairman of the committee for the ASV) – “In one word, the revision is *to give*, in idiomatic English, *the nearest possible equivalent for the original Word of God* as it came from the inspired organs of the Holy Spirit” (Bible Revision, p. 16).

**R. C. Trench** (scholar & author) – “Clearly the office of the translator is *to put the reader of the translation on the same vantage-ground of the reader of the original*.

**Francis R. Steele** (one scholar associated with the NIV) – “A translation should convey as much of the original text in as few words as possible, yet preserve the original atmosphere & emphasis. The translator should strive for the nearest approximation in words, concepts, & cadence. He should scrupulously avoid adding words or ideas not demanded by the text. *His job is not to expand or to explain, but to translate & preserve the spirit & force of the original*-even, if need be, at the expense of modern colloquialisms -- so long as the resultant translation is intelligible” (The New Testament Student & Bible Translation, Vol. 4, p. 69).

---

1. The NIV is not that kind of translation & doesn't even claim to be.

#### B. Methods of translating:

1. “**Concordant or Complete Equivalence**” — seeks to preserve all the information in the text, while presenting it in good literary form (i.e., literalism).
2. “**Periphrastic**” — seeks for the gist of the text & restates it in other words.
3. “**Dynamic Equivalence**” — seeks to express the meaning of the text in today's speech patterns.

- a. The NIV falls between 1 & 3.

---

“As for the NIV its method is an eclectic [diverse] one with the emphasis for the most part on a flexible use of concordance & equivalence, but with a **minimum of literalism, paraphrase, or outright dynamic equivalence**. In other words, the NIV stands on middle ground by no means the easiest position to occupy.” (p. 13, The New York International Bible Society; financial sponsor of NIV).

---

### C. NIV was based on a faulty Greek text:

1. Some of the errors & omissions in the NIV are directly due to this fact.
2. The Westcott-Hort text was not based on the majority of Greek manuscripts (over 5000).

---

**Neil R. Lightfoot, “How We Got The Bible,” p. 63.** — “Basically, the Westcott-Hort text represented a wholesale rejection of mass authorities & an acknowledged dependence on the Sinaitic & Vatican Manuscripts, particularly the Vatican (contains NT up to Heb 9:14; no Timothy’s & Titus, Philemon or Revelation.”

**David Otis Fuller, “Which Bible?” p. 2** — These two manuscripts [Sinaitic & Vatican] are supposed to be the oldest of the extant manuscripts. It is assumed that oldest means they are the best, but “oldest & best do not necessarily go hand in hand.”

**John W. Burgon, “Revision Revised” p. 318** — “The origin of these two curiosities [Sinaitic, Vatican], it can only be divined from their contents. That

they exhibit fabricated Texts is demonstrable. No amount of honest copying, persevered in for any number of centuries, could by possibility have resulted in two such documents. Separated from one another in actual date by 50, perhaps by 100 years, they must needs have branched off from a common ancestor, & straightway become exposed continuously to fresh depraving influences.”

**Edward F. Hills, who wrote the introduction to Dean Burgon’s “The Last Twelve Verses of Mark,”** said, “Thus the fact that (the Vatican & Sinaitic manuscripts) are so old is a point against them, not something in their favor. It shows that the Church rejected them & did not read them” (p. 23).

**The Trinitarian Bible Society, London, England** (an organization of conservative Bible scholars whose efforts go back to the early 1800’s) said of the NIV “The text underlying the NIV is not the best documented text, for in many passages, it has the support of only a small minority of manuscripts.”

---

## II. ERRONEOUS REVISIONS IN THE NIV

### A. Promotes original sin

---

**Psa 51:5** – Surely I have been a **sinner from birth**, sinful from the time my mother conceived me.

---

1. The doctrine of Total Inherited Depravity is the first tenet of “Calvinism”, but it originated with Augustine of Hippo Regius (modern Annaba Algeria), a theologian 354-430 AD.

2. It is commonly taught that infants are born with a sinful nature, wholly inclined to do evil, & other false doctrines follow: *irresistible grace, perseverance of saints*.
  
3. But the word of God does NOT teach the doctrine of original sin.

---

**Psa 51:5** (KJV, ASV, NKJV, NSAU) – Behold, I was *brought forth in iniquity*, & in sin my mother conceive me.

---

- a. There is a difference in being born in sin & being born a sinner.
  
- b. A child can be born in water, but the child is not the water, the water is only *environment* in which it is born – *Likewise, David was referring to the setting into which he was born.*

---

**Psa 51:5** (AMP) – Behold, I was brought forth in [a state of] iniquity – *is this David's state or the state of his environment?* – my mother was sinful who conceived me [and I too am sinful] – *all men sin, but does this implying that she was a sinner from birth?*

---

## B. Doubts Luke's inspiration {skip}

---

**Luke 1:3** (NIV) – Since, I myself have *carefully investigated* everything

**Luke 1:3** (KJV, ASV & NKJV) – having had *perfect understanding* of all things from the very first

---

1. Weak argument – consult Strong's & Vine's definitions for "having had understanding" (*parakoloutheo*: follow near, i.e., attend, trace out, conform to) & "perfect" (*akribos*: exactly).

## C. Suggests the church built on Peter

---

**Matt 16:18** – And I tell you that *you are Peter, & on rock I will build my church...*

**NIV footnote:** "Peter means rock."

---

1. "**Peter**" is *Petros* – a detached stone or boulder.
  
2. "**Rock**" is *petra* – a mass of rock.

## D. Confuses The Prophets

---

**Mark 1:2** – It is written in *Isaiah* the prophet: "I will send my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way" (*Malachi 3:1*).

---

**Mark 1:1** – The beginning of *the gospel about Jesus Christ*, the Son of God.

1. In Mark 1:2, the prophet Isaiah is mentioned, but the quote is taken from Malachi.
2. In Mark 1:1, the **preposition** "about" replaces "of", which is found in most translations, but neither word is in the Greek, it is supplied by the translators for clarity.
3. Why wasn't the "about" used in Acts 20:28, "feed the church *of* God".
  - a. "**About**" – 1) *on every side of: around;* 2) *in the immediate neighborhood of: near;* 3) *engaged in;* 4) *with regard to: concerning* (Webster's).

- b. "**Of**" – *is a function word to indicate a point of reckoning (north of the lake); a function word to indicate origin or derivation (a man of noble birth).*
- c. Genesis 2-5 tell us "about" the family of Adam & Eve, but the gospel is "of" Jesus Christ, meaning that it points to Him exclusively; He is the origin of the gospel, it derived from Him.
- d. The church "of" Christ is to point men to Christ; we originate from Him – we're NOT the church "about" Christ.

## E. Makes conflicting statements about the Law

---

**Matt 5:17** – *Do not think that I have come to abolish the law...*

**Eph 2:15** – For he himself is our peace who has made the two one & has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments & regulations."

---

1. The translating committee for the NIV failed to acknowledge that two different Greek words are used in these passages.

a. **Matthew 5:17** – kataluo (kat-al-oo'-o); to loosen down (disintegrate), to demolish – (“destroy in KJV, ASV)

b. **Ephesians 2:15** – katargeo (kat-arg-eh'-o); to be (render) entirely idle (useless)

c. Jesus said that He did NOT come to “destroy” the Law, but He did render it powerless to save men from sins.

## F. **Detracts** from the deity of Jesus

---

**John 1:14** – The Word became flesh & made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of **the One & Only**, who came from the Father, full of grace & truth.

**John 3:16** – For God so loved the world that he gave his **one & only** Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life.

---

1. This is no scholarly justification; the Greek term “*monogenes*” means “*only begotten*” (*mono*: one or only; *genes*: begotten).

2. They give a double translation to the first syllable, & then skip over the latter syllable.

## G. **Misrepresents** immortality {skip}

---

**1 Tim 6:15-16** (NIV, NKJV, NASU) – which God will bring about in his own time — He who is the blessed & only Potentate, the King of kings & Lord of lords, 16 **who alone has immortality**, dwelling in unapproachable light, whom no man has seen or can see, to whom be honor & everlasting power.

**1 Tim 6:16** (ASV, KJV) – **who only hath immortality**, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom (be) honor & power eternal. Amen.

---

1. The phrase “alone has” implies that only God has immortality (cf. 1 Peter 3:4, man has been given an immortal spirit, one that will not decay).

2. The phrase “only hath” implies that God **ONLY HAS** qualities of immortality (cf. Jn 4:24; Lk 24:39).

## H. **Depicts** man having a sinful nature

1. We have already noticed the NIV's rendering of Psa. 51:5, which teaches inherited sin.
2. Naturally, Calvinists have a different vocabulary from the Bible.
  - a. "Inherited sin" or "inherited total depravity", "Adamic nature" or "sinful nature."
3. The NIV gives them a translation of the Bible that will enable them to use that term.

---

**Rom 8:3-13** – **3** For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the **sinful nature**, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so he condemned sin in sinful man, **4** in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the **sinful nature** but according to the Spirit.

**5** Those who live according to the **sinful nature** have their minds set on what that nature desires; but those who live in accordance with the Spirit have their minds set on what the Spirit desires. **6** The mind of sinful man is death, but the mind controlled by the Spirit is life & peace; **7** the sinful mind is hostile to God.

It does not submit to God's law, nor can it do so. **8** Those controlled by the **sinful nature** cannot please God.

**9** You, however, are controlled not by the **sinful nature** but by the Spirit, if the Spirit of God lives in you. And if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Christ. **10** But if Christ is in you, your body is dead because of sin, yet your spirit is alive because of righteousness. **11** And if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead is living in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through his Spirit, who lives in you.

**12** Therefore, brothers, we have an obligation — but it is not to the **sinful nature**, to live according to it. **13** For if you live according to the **sinful nature**, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the misdeeds of the body, you will live, **14** because those who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God.

---

1. The Greek word is "sarx", which has been translated "flesh" by the best scholars.
2. Strong's definition: **flesh** (as stripped of the skin), i.e. (strictly) the meat of an animal (as food), or (by extension) **the body** (as opposed to the soul [or spirit], or as **the symbol of what is external**, or (by implication) **human nature** (with its frailties [physically or morally] and passions), or (specifically) **a human being** (as such):

3. So the word “sarx” has nothing to do with the inborn nature of your spirit, it has to do with fulfilling the desires of your body in evil way (Jas 1:14-15).
  
4. When one does that, he is living according to the “flesh” rather than “in accordance with the Spirit” of God.
  
5. Now if we have a sinful nature from birth, then we inherited it from Adam.
  - a. So from whom did Adam inherit his nature?
  
  - b. From God! And so did every person born into this world – we are the offspring of God (Acts 17:29).
  
  - c. There is nothing inherently sinful in our bodies or spirits when we come into this world; if there were, then Jesus would have been affected by it.

---

R. L. Whiteside (Commentary on Romans) – When Adam & Eve were first created they had all that belonged to human nature. ***Sin came into their lives as a foreign element. Sin is no more a part of our nature than dust in your eyes is a part of the nature of your eye.*** Because the desires, appetites, & passions of the flesh often lead to sin, flesh is called sinful.” (p. 170.)

---

6. At least two scholars connected with the NIV spoke the truth on the correct rendering of sarx.

---

“The word for flesh in the Greek is sarx. In the NIV the word sarx is translated flesh only thirty times out of 138 Greek uses. The next most frequent translation of the word is sinful nature (twenty five times). But this rendering is more of an interpretation than a translation...The safest thing to do is to leave the word with its primary meaning (flesh) & relegate the discussion to the commentary rather than write sinful nature into the text. This is carrying free translation too far.” (Lewis Foster, *Selecting a Translation of the Bible*, p. 70, 1978 edition).

“The Greek term sarx, usually translated flesh...” (Raymond Dillard, *The New Testament Student & Bible Translation*, p. 99).

---

**Other** passages in the NIV where “sarx” is not correctly translated (Rom 7:5, 18, 25; Eph 2:3; 1 Cor 5:5; Gal 5:13, 16, 17, 19, 24; 6:8; Col 2:11, 13; 2 Pet 2:10, 18).