

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

AN OPEN MIND AND LOVE FOR THE TRUTH ARE MOST VITAL IN ANY STUDY OF GOD'S WORD.

Jeremiah, the prophet, said: "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land. The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?" (**Jeremiah 5:30,31**)

Today, "translators" (?) translate falsely; preachers preach from these corrupt versions; elders "bear rule by their means", and (many) "people love to have it so." However, there are still many who love the truth and want it uncorrupted; and are "sick and tired" of having the modern versions thrust upon them.

Jeremiah revealed further the attitude of many in his day toward the word of God when he said: "Behold, the word of the Lord is unto them a reproach; they have no delight in it." (**Jeremiah 6:10b**)

In Isaiah's time, some were saying "to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits. (**Isaiah 30:10**)

History is repeating itself. It is appalling (almost unbelievable) to see the same spirit of rebellion against God's word today. Many are honestly ignorant; others are "willingly ignorant" (**II Peter 3:5**), refusing to face up to the truth on the subject. For 371 years the King James Version has been read, loved and recognized as the word of God just as written by holy men of God as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. (**II Peter 1:21**).

Satan began "revising" the word of God in Eden as he deceived Eve, adding one little word "not." In recent years, he has launched a campaign against the word of God in making an attack against the KJV in the colleges and in many pulpits. In spite of a few words that admittedly need updating, the KJV remains the most accurate, the most reliable, and the closest to the original autographs of the inspired men. (There is ample proof for this point for those who wish to send for and examine it.) In spite of this fact, to many the KJV is "unto them a reproach; they have no delight in it."

In buying a Bible, some walk into a book store, and scornfully remark, "Any version but that old KJV." To reject the KJV for an inferior translation is like throwing the baby out with the bath water. It is a sad day for the church when men (as in the time of Isaiah) reject the right and choose something "smooth" and deceitful. After learning that the modern versions are not reliable and teach false doctrine, many go ahead buying them; and some elders permit them to be purchased and placed in the church pews and let the people be deceived.

Page Two:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

"And what will ye do in the end thereof?"

What will be the consequences of going after the modern versions? Men will eventually cease to walk in the Old Paths. (**Jeremiah 6:16**)

1) The first result is confusion. This prevails already in the class rooms and in the pews. How can "all speak the same thing" using conflicting versions? Remember, "God is not the author of confusion." (**I Corinthians 14:33**)

2) Doubt and destruction of faith. This will happen just as sure as men reap what they sow.

Doubt about the inspiration of passage after passage is sown in the footnotes and marginal readings on nearly every page. The translators do not know WHERE the word of God is, and consequently cannot tell us WHAT it is. No conclusion can be any more certain than the premises upon which it is based. How can a preacher or teacher use the NIV as authority when it challenges the truth and accuracy of the scriptures throughout? We cannot sow doubt and uncertainty and build faith, hope and blessed assurance.

3) The primary issue is truth and error. No one would object to an accurate and scholarly translation. But the NIV is neither.

Altering the word of God is not making it plain but perverting it. The translators left their role and have tried to become commentators. They have rewritten nearly every verse. The NIV is filled with unnecessary changes, many that weaken or change the truth; and it also teaches many false doctrines.

4) The threat of division is real. How can faithful brethren sit back in silence and hear the word of God mutilated, and see the faith of our young people and young members destroyed? Let us note well where the blame will rest. Who is guilty of splitting a log? the one who drives the wedge? or the one who pleads for it not to be driven? **THE ONE WHO DRIVES THE WEDGE.** Who was guilty of dividing the church over Instrumental Music? Those who inject it into the worship! The blame will not only rest on preachers who use the corrupt versions but also on elders who are to protect and to guard the flock. I plead for all elders to wake up, study up and to speak up!

Page Three:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

PART TWO

CONSCIENCE IS NOT A SAFE GUIDE

, and one may be honestly mistaken. Much prejudice prevails on this subject; hence, I plead that each point of this Review be carefully considered.

God warned Ezekiel that when one came to the prophet seeking His will with idols in his heart "I the Lord will answer him that cometh according to the multitude of his idols." (**Ezekiel 14:4**)

In the review of any version, we should consider 1) The Text, 2) The Translators, and 3) The Translation. When we do this, we find that THE NIV IS NOT BASED ON THE BEST TEXT.

The first witness we call to the stand is:

1. The Trinitarian Bible Society (217 Kingston Road, London SW19 3NN, England). This organization of conservative Bible scholars founded in 1831 with the aim "to give the widest possible circulation of the inspired Word of God, that as far as in them lies, the Gospel may be proclaimed to every creature, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

On the NIV, they testify as follows: "The text underlying the N.I.V. is **not** the best documented text, for in many passages it has the support of only a small minority of the manuscripts. The translation is **not** the most accurate, for many passages are **paraphrased** rather than translated. The version is **not** in the best style for communication, for in many instances the simple vocabulary of the K.J.V. has been replaced by more difficult words, and there are other literary deficiencies."

2. Next, we call to the witness stand the 199 scholars and editors of the New KJV. These men did not follow the liberal critical Westcott-Hort type text; but went back to the Traditional Text. In the introduction, they state the following: "It is commonly known that nearly all modern translations of the New Testament are derived from a type of Greek text advocated by Brooke F. Westcott, Fenton J. Hort, and others of the nineteenth century. The Westcott and Hort theory has been a leading view of textual critics and translators since that time. Although there are now massive differences between the two textual foundations of the New Testament, the net effect of the Westcott-Hort type of text is to delete many words, phrases, and verses that are found in the Authorized Version.

Page Four:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

"The publishers are familiar with the issues of the continuing discussion between textual critics. Recently there has been growing concern among reputable New Testament scholars that the nineteenth century text suffers from over-revision, and that the traditional Greek text is much more reliable than previously supposed. We have confidence, therefore, in presenting the New King James Bible, New Testament, without subjecting it to the strictures of the newer critical text."

Please note these observations:

1) "The net effect of the Westcott-Hort type of text is to delete many words, phrases, and verses that are found in the Authorized Version"

The NIV translators followed this type text. In the Introduction, it is stated that they used an "eclectic" text. This means that they take a little here and there and do not follow any one Greek text. In reply to a letter submitted by brother Tommy J. Hicks, the New York International Bible Society replied: "If you have a copy of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament or the Nestle Greek New Testament, then you have the 'eclectic' text that we followed probably at least 98% of the time."

Now we can see why the NIV omits so many precious truths (as will be pointed out in future articles). Everett W. Fowler, in his book, "Evaluating Versions of the New Testament", points out that the Nestle Greek text omits 31 whole verses, and 191 portions of verses; and that the Bible Societies text omits 17 entire verses and 185 parts of verses.

2) It is admitted that there is "growing concern among reputable New Testament scholars that the nineteenth-century text suffers from over-revision." Yea verily! That can be said again. It has been so "over-revised" that truth is being supplanted with error.

3) Note well this admission among reputable New Testament scholars, "that the traditional Greek text is much more reliable than previously supposed." This is the text, of course, underlying the AV.

3. My third witness is Dr. Frank Logsdon. This man wrote the Introduction or Preface to the New American Standard Version. It is based primarily on the same type text as the NIV. He has seen the errors and blunders of the NASV, has repented and renounced all connections with the Lockman Foundation, and has gone back to defending the traditional Greek text.

The NIV is not now the true word of God, and it will never be regardless of the revisions it undergoes as long as it is based on faulty and inaccurate manuscripts.

Page Five:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

PART THREE

Tampering with the word of God is both serious and sinful. "Every word of God is pure", and men have ever been admonished neither to add to nor diminish from it. (**Deuteronomy 4:2; Revelation 22:18,19**).

Translators of the NIV have dared to add to the word, diminish from it, and mistranslate it and paraphrase.

In the Preface, we read: "...they have endeavored to avoid a sameness of style in order to reflect the varied styles and moods of the New Testament writers." They should not try to change the "style" used by the Holy Spirit; and how can the "moods" of the New Testament writers be ascertained except through their words? The readers want to know WHAT the inspired men said.

No italics are used. This fact, plus the approach of the translators, make the NIV a commentary. One cannot know which words were inspired. Teachers should not ask: "Did you bring your Bibles"? but "did you bring your commentaries"? Preachers and elders should level with the congregation and cease calling the NIV the Bible. It has false doctrine and perversions of the truth throughout. It is not reliable even to use as a commentary. It is definitely a purveyor of FALSE DOCTRINE.

Note The Following:

1) Original or Inherited Sin. The NIV says: "Surely I have been a sinner from birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me." (**Psalms 51:5**). This is a perverted interpretation to fit the false doctrine that infants are born in sin, whereas sin is transgression of the law. (**I John 3:4**). In **Ezekiel 18:20**, we read: "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father..." Jesus said: "Except ye be converted; and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (**Matthew 18:3**).

In as effort to further the idea of "Adamic" or "inherited" sin, the NIV renders "flesh" as "sinful nature" in **Romans 7:18, 25; 8:2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 12; 13:14; I Corinthians 5:5; Galatians 5:13, 16, 19, 24, 6:8; Ephesians 2:3; and Colossians 2:11, 13**.

Man is made in the image of God, and God is the Father of our spirits. (**Hebrews 12:9**). Human nature is not sinful. Men go astray. (**Psalms 58:3**). We are not born astray. Those studying the NIV are missing the truth and following error.

Page Six:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

2) Direct operation of the Spirit. the NIV says (in reference to the new birth), "So it is with every one born of the Spirit." (**John 3:8**). Jesus was teaching that the inner man, the part of man that is changed in the new birth is invisible. This is not an example of the new birth; but rather it is an illustration that we cannot see the inward man. The NIV makes the entire new birth accomplished by the Spirit, as the wind comes and goes. (Terms of the new birth are set forth in **Matthew 28:18-30; Mark 16:15-16; and Luke 24:46-47**. EXAMPLES of the new birth are in the Book of Acts.)

The NIV interprets **I Corinthians 2:14**: "The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned." The sinner cannot have the Spirit in any sense before he is converted; hence, it would be a waste of time to preach to a man before he has the Spirit -- but how is he going to get the Spirit? by direct operation theory!!

3) Salvation by faith only. In **Romans 1:17**, the NIV says, "a righteousness that is by faith from the first to last." The NIV renders **Romans 10:10** thus: "For it is with your heart that you believe and are justified, and it is with your mouth that you confess and are saved." This is false since it teaches that man is saved before he puts Christ on in baptism. Redemption is by the blood of Christ (**Ephesians 1:7**); and one is baptized into the death of Christ, (**Romans 6:3-4**). It is at this point that one received the benefits of Christ's shed blood, and is then made free from sin (**Romans 6:17-18**).

Faith only also is taught in **Ephesians 1:13**.

Another passage perverted to teach salvation by faith only is **Galatians 2:16**. This verse reads: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Jesus Christ, and not by the works of the laws: for by works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

We are justified "by the faith of Jesus Christ", which is the "gospel of Christ." (**Romans 1:16**). This is not the personal faith of Christ, but "the faith", the system of faith for which we are to contend. (**Jude 3**).

The NIV omits "the" and changes "of" to "in". The NIV erroneously has the sinner saved just by believing in Christ.

Page Seven:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

PART FOUR

A Purveyor of False Doctrine (No. II)

THE WORD OF GOD IS SHARPER THAN ANY TWO-EDGED SWORD. (**Hebrews 4:12**). We are warned that to those who do not love the truth God will send a strong delusion and that they should believe a lie and be damned. (**II Thessalonians 2:10-12**).

The proper attitude toward the word of God, and the proper handling of the word are two most vital factors. We must love and obey the truth to be saved. (**I Peter 1:22-23; Hebrews 5:8-9**). And we may "wrest the scriptures" unto our own destruction. (**II Peter 3:16**).

I plead with my readers to keep an open mind as we pursue this review. We all must give an account as to how we handle the word of God. Consider carefully these additional shocking errors:

4). NIV says that Jesus "made himself nothing" (**Philippians 2:7**). What is "nothing"? Webster's Dictionary says: "1. Not anything; naught. 2. That which does not exist; a nonentity." How absurd! How could a self-existing Being cease to exist? This a mistranslation, sign of inefficient scholarship. Certainly Jesus our Lord did not become a nonentity and cease to exist!

5). The NIV equates epilepsy with demon possession. A man said to Jesus: "Lord, have mercy on my son for he is a lunatic, and sore vexed: for oftentimes he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water. And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him. Then Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him hither to me. And Jesus rebuked the devil; and he departed out of him: and the child was cured from that very hour." (**Matthew 17:15-18**).

The NIV does not translate but interprets the man as saying, "He is an epileptic." And, "Jesus rebuked the demon, and it came out of the boy, and he was healed from that moment." Epilepsy is not demon possession. The NIV paraphrase is a reflection against, if not an insult to all epileptics -- some of whom are Christians and faithful members of the Lord's church.

6) The NIV teaches that Jesus causes men to stumble, and makes them fall. Again this is a paraphrase and not translation. Jesus does not cause men to stumble, or make men fall. Peter explains, "they stumble at the word being disobedient." (**I Peter 2:8**). Man is a responsible being. Personal obedience is the responsibility of men. Men may obey Christ and be saved; or men may disobey and be lost. (**Hebrews 5:8-9**).

Page Eight:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

7) The NIV teaches that the church was built on Peter. The NIV says "And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it." (**Matthew 16:18**). A footnote adds, "Peter means rock", thus implying that the church was built on Peter. That is what the Catholics teach. They will be pleased with the NIV here.

However, reason, revelation and history all testify that the church was not built on Peter. (1) The Greek word for Peter is Petros, a small detached stone that can be thrown. (2) Another Greek word for rock is Petra, a mass of stone, a ledge of rock. Jesus told Peter that he was a rolling stone, just a pebble on the beach, so to speak; but you have just confessed a great truth that I am the Son of the Living God, and upon this rock, Petra, building stone, I will build my church. Observe also that Petra is feminine gender agreeing with the word church. Petros is masculine gender and cannot grammatically modify church.

Some say that Jesus spoke here in Aramaic, and that in Aramaic there is only one word for rock. But note: (1) This is an assumption. (2) Matthew was an inspired Apostle and wrote in Greek (regardless of whether or not he wrote in Aramaic). (3) Authentic copies of his Gospel in Greek have been preserved and handed down to us. (4) To reject the Greek and to argue from Aramaic is to challenge the providence of God, and to deny the divine inspiration of Matthew.

Please do not resent my calling attention to these errors. Those who honestly love the truth, of course, will not. There are other doctrinal errors; many deletions, additions and paraphrases that change the truth. The many valid objections to the NIV cannot be wisely ignored.

PART FIVE

A Purveyor of False Doctrine (No. III)

THE QUESTION OF FALSE DOCTRINE IS A MOST SERIOUS MATTER, and cannot be brushed aside as something trivial. Believing and following false doctrine will damn one's soul in hell. We have many warnings in the Bible of this danger.

"Be not carried away with divers and strange doctrines." (**Hebrews 13:9**).

"Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son."

Page Nine:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed:" "For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (**II John 9-11**).

THE ISSUE IS CLEAR: We must not lend our support to or encourage false teachers in any way. To do so incurs the same guilt as the false teacher. What about upholding, defending, and endorsing a book that teaches false doctrine, such as the NIV? For one to do so puts him in the same class as the one who stands in the pulpit or before a class and teaches false doctrine. One this becomes a "partaker of his evil deeds." (NOTE: Teaching false doctrine is an "evil deed.")

He who does not abide in the true, sound doctrine of Christ, "hath not God." If one "hath not God" he is godless and without hope in the world. (**Ephesians 2:12**).

The NIV teaches many false doctrines. This cannot be denied. Several have already been pointed out; and there are many more as we shall see. Are you going to have the courage to renounce it and cease using it? Or will you say "Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits" (**Isaiah 30:19**)?

Lest one think that I am "nit-picking", may I remind you that "Every word of God is pure"? We dare not change one jot or tittle.

1) Jesus made an argument on the tense of a verb in defending the resurrection with the Saducees. (**Matthew 22:31-32; Luke 20:37-38**). And in arguing with the Jews, He said. "Before Abraham was, I am." (**John 8:58**).

2) Paul made an argument on the letter "s" in Galatians 3:16.

Let us note another false doctrine taught in the NIV.

8. Premillennialism. This is the false doctrine that Christ will come back to earth, set up an earthly kingdom, and reign 1,000 years in Jerusalem on the literal throne of David.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. Let us note a few passages that are twisted so as to accommodate this theory.

1) **Matthew 18:28**: "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Page Ten:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

All well-informed Bible students know that "in the regeneration" refers to the Christian Age. The apostles were given the keys to the kingdom, and ascended their thrones of authority on the day of Pentecost and began to bind and to loose when the Holy Spirit, through them, revealed that men must repent and be baptized for the remissions of sins. (Acts 2:36-38).

The NIV projects this expression into the future so as to accommodate the 1,000 year reign theory and renders it "at the renewal of all things."

2) **Acts 3:21**: Here we have the expression, "the times of restitution." The context shows that this refers to the Christian Age, a time as Peter proclaimed, "Unto you first God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

Here, again, the NIV projects this into another age, stating, "until the time comes for God to restore everything, as he promised long ago through his holy prophets." There is a difference in "times of restitution" (plural), and "the time comes" -- a period in future.

We dare not change one letter which was given by the Holy Spirit. But the NIV translators are bold to do so to make a passage fit their biased theory.

Keep in mind these facts about the kingdom: (1) It was set up in 33 A.D. (2) Jesus is NOW both king and priest on His throne. (**Zechariah 6:12-13**; **Hebrews 7:17-21**). (3) All early Christians were translated into the kingdom. (**Colossians 1:13**).

Jesus is reigning NOW. (**I Corinthians 15:25-26**). At his second coming, he will DELIVER UP the kingdom to God -- NOT SET IT UP.

PART SIX

A Purveyor of False Doctrine (No. IV)

As we pursue this review, I want it clearly understood that I am not impugning the motives of anyone.

Most of those using the NIV are doing so ignorantly -- just not knowing how wrong it is. Please consider carefully what I am pointing out. The prophet Isaiah warned, saying, "WOE UNTO THEM THAT CALL EVIL GOOD, AND GOOD EVIL..." (**Isaiah 5:20**). How can anyone call the NIV a good translation when it teaches false doctrine outright, omits many words, verses and phrases; when it casts doubt on so many passages; when it perverts and paraphrases so many other passages?

Page Eleven:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

Some seem to think that it makes no difference which version one uses, just so he lives a good Christian life. It is contended by some that the Bible most people read is our lives. It is true that Paul said to the church at Corinth, "Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men." (**II Corinthians 3:2**).

However, the kind of life one lives for the world to read depends upon WHAT one believes and what one does -- in private life and in public worship. What one believes is going to influence what one does. Our deeds and words (conversation and teaching) make up our influence.

Jesus said, "Take heed therefore HOW ye hear..." (**Luke 8:18**). He also said, "Take heed WHAT ye hear..." (**Mark 4:24**).

Faith comes by hearing the word of God. (**Romans 10:17**). False belief comes by hearing and reading false doctrine. If one wants the young people, and others, to believe that infants are born in sin, the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, salvation by faith only (and the many other false teachings that I am pointing out), then give them the NIV. Giving the young people the NIV as a gift is no favor. Even though done with good intentions, it is actually a disservice and a deception.

With all due respects toward all, and with no offense intended toward any: LET US FACT THE FACT -- THE NIV IS NOT THE TRUE WORD OF GOD. It is a paraphrased perversion!! This will be more fully sustained as we proceed with this review.

If one does not believe that the NIV is a dangerous version, teaching false doctrine and leading people from the truth, note this: In another state, the teacher asked, "At what point does one receive remission of sins?" One (who was visiting from another congregation) answered, "When one confesses." This is what the NIV teaches. (**Romans 10:10**). This same person then began talking about "our sinful nature", which is another false doctrine taught by the NIV. But man's nature is not sinful. We are made in the image of God.

NOTE THIS POINT CAREFULLY: One's life is a rather blurred epistle for the world to read if one believes and teaches what the NIV teaches. Yes, the translation one uses really is important. It is a serious matter as to how we handle the word of God. For this we must give an account on the day of judgment. This responsibility cannot be passed off as a joke.

Page Twelve:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

We continue pointing out more false teaching.

Premillennialism continued. Some half of the religious world espouses this doctrine; and a few years ago the church of our Lord was divided over it. Therefore, it poses a real danger and should not be ignored. I have called attention to two scriptures (**Matthew 19:28; Acts 3:21**) that are rendered so as to accommodate this theory. Let us note another.

3) **Ephesians 1:10**. The NIV translators think this verse refers to a future period of time. However, we are not in the dispensation of the fullness of time. We are assured that it was in the fullness of time when God sent his Son. (**Galatians 4:4**).

9. The NIV teaches that Simon Peter had TWO fathers. In **Matthew 16:17**, the NIV says: "Jesus replied, Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah..."

In **John 21:15-17**, three time Jesus addresses Simon Peter, son of John. I know that this is absurd and impossible. This is just some of the bungling of inefficient translators. Now do you want to know the truth? Was Simon Peter's father Jonah, or John? His father was Jonah, NOT John. The KJV has Jonah in all three passages. For further verification of this see The Revision Revised, by John W. Burgon, p. 181.

10. The NIV teaches the spotless Son of God had to be purified. **Luke 2:22** says, "And when the days of HER purification according to the law of Moses..." The NIV says, "When the time of THEIR purification..." Under the law of Moses (Leviticus), only the mother had to submit to the rite of purification -- not the child.

PART SEVEN

A Purveyor of False Doctrine (No. V)

I feel quite sure that the majority of my readers were unaware of so much false teaching in the NIV.

In dealing with the word of God, we are dealing with something sacred. God never has allowed men to tamper with His word, or to change the least iota. This truth is set forth in many passages. For instance, we read: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you. Neither shall ye diminish ought from it..." (**Deuteronomy 4:2**).

This warning is sounded throughout the New Testament. (**Revelation 22:18-19; Galatians 1:8, and II John 9-11**).

Page Thirteen:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

The translators of the NIV violate this principle throughout. Currently we are pointing out some specific false teachings. Thus far, we have noted ten.

11. The NIV teaches that Christ did not come to abolish the law. In **Matthew 5:17** the NIV reads: "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them."

Jesus, however, did abolish the law. It was the will of God that He do so. **Hebrews 10:9** reads as follows: "Then said he, lo, I come to do thy will, O God, He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second."

In **Ephesians 2:15**, we read, "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace."

Further evidence is found in **II Corinthians 3:3-14**. This was accomplished when Jesus was nailed to the cross. (**Colossians 2:14**).

Jesus did not come to destroy but to fulfill the law. Had he destroyed the law, he could not have fulfilled it. The first Testament had to be taken away before the New Testament could be established.

12. The NIV virtually denies that Luke was inspired.

Luke said that he "had perfect understanding of all things from the very first." Only a man with divine inspiration could make such a statement. No man without divine inspiration could have had "perfect" understanding of "all things from the very first." However, the NIV has Luke saying that he had "carefully investigated everything from the beginning" this making Luke merely an investigative reporter with the truth of his message hinging on his investigation. Luke was an inspired penman, and inspired men did not have to investigate.

13. The NIV teaches that the kindness of God leads to repentance.

However, the Bible teaches that "the goodness of God" leads to repentance. Criminals and drunkards may be kind, God is kind, but he is also good, and it takes more than kindness to lead one to repentance. This is truly a sad mistake to render this word kindness rather than goodness.

14. The NIV teaches that Cornelius and his house received the same gift as the apostles.

Peter told the other apostles that God gave Cornelius and his house a "like gift" as the apostles received on the day of Pentecost. It, however, was not the same gift. If it had been the same gift, then Cornelius and his house could have performed all miraculous powers that the apostles could perform. This would include raising the dead, and imparting miraculous power to others by laying on of hands, whereas this power was possessed only by the apostles. (**Acts 8:17-18**).

Page Fourteen:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

Peter said, "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning." (**Acts 11:15**). It was a direct, miraculous outpouring on Cornelius and his house, like what occurred on Pentecost. There is no record that Cornelius ever spoke in tongues again or ever did anything miraculous.

Please hear me patiently. Consider what I am saying. The defense of the Bible is the one most important questions before us today.

If the Bible is not the inspired word of God, and if we do not have a translation that is based accurately and faithfully on copies of the manuscripts of the inspired men, one we can trust, then we have no standard authority by which to settle any of the other questions that confront us.

Satan's approach to Eve was to create doubt in what God had said. He said to her, "Yea, hath God said...?" Doubt, distrust, and then disobedience followed.

Throughout the brotherhood, doubt is being sown via the modern versions which are challenging the inspiration of passage after passage -- many of which question truths that we have long held as sacred and certain.

We need to build faith in the word of God so we can build and strengthen faith in the hearts of men.

PART EIGHT

A Purveyor of False Doctrine (No. VI)

GOD COMMUNICATES HIS WILL UNTO MAN THROUGH WORDS. He spoke in times past unto the fathers by the prophets; and "hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son..." (**Hebrews 1:1-2**) God commands that we hear him. (**Matthew 17:5**). Jesus selected and appointed the apostles and assured them that they would be guided unto all truth by the Spirit. (**John 16:13**). The apostle Paul said that the Holy Spirit gave them the very words to speak. (**I Corinthians 2:13**).

GOD'S MESSAGE IS IN HIS WORD. In studying, teaching, or preaching, we must deal with words. The translators of the NIV, we are told, "have striven for more than a word-for-word translation." We are further told (in the introduction) that "they have endeavored to avoid a sameness of style in order to reflect the varied styles and moods of the New Testament writers."

This is one reason that the translators made so many errors. They should not try to improve on either style or the words of inspired men. Let us note more false teaching in the NIV. We have called attention this far to fourteen.

Page Fifteen:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

15. The NIV perverts the truth and teaching of **Luke 10:1**.

Here Luke tells us that the Lord appointed and sent seventy workers, "two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself would come." The NIV denies and contradicts what Luke the inspired penman revealed, and says that Jesus sent "seventy-two." A footnote should say that MOST of the manuscripts have seventy.

The number seventy was one of the favorite numbers among the Jews. God punished the southern kingdom seventy years in Babylonian captivity. God had Moses to select seventy elders to assist him. (**Numbers 11:24-26**).

The following translations have seventy: KJV, NKJV, ASV, NASV, RSV -- even the Living Bible Paraphrased has seventy. Thus, we have the testimony of some 400 translators saying that seventy is the correct rendition here.

The Pulpit Commentary says, "The preponderance of authority is in favor of seventy."

Not only here, but in many other places, the NIV translators ignore an avalanche of evidence and follow a minority and questionable evidence. They seem all too eager to put the "ark of God" on a "new cart" and those who use the NIV seem all too eager to pull it.

16. The NIV perverts the truth of **Acts 26:28**.

Here we have the well known and familiar statement of King Agrippa in response to Paul's preaching; "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." This is an affirmative statement of the king. There is no reason to doubt the honest, sincere conviction of Agrippa. However, the NIV has the audacity to turn this into a cynical question. Thus, "Do you think that in such a short time you can persuade me to be a Christian?"

This is a complete reversal of what the king said.

1) The context shows that Agrippa was willing to listen to Paul. He indicated this to Festus. "Then Agrippa said unto Festus, I would also hear the man myself. Tomorrow, said he, thou shalt hear him." (**Acts 24:2**).

The next day, Paul preached a powerful and persuasive sermon. In conclusion, Paul said: "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest."

"The Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."

2) Let us take special note that Paul was inspired. When he said to Agrippa, "I know that thou believest", he was speaking by inspiration. Agrippa was not scornfully rejecting the gospel. He was almost persuaded to obey.

Page Sixteen:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

The apostles could see into the hearts of men. Peter knew that Ananias and Sapphira had kept back part of the price. (**Acts 5:1-11**).

Jesus said to the Jews, "For had you believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me." (**John 5:46**).

To deny that Agrippa believed the prophets and was almost persuaded to obey the gospel is to deny the inspired word of God.

Thus the NIV is wrong again!!

A MOST STRANGE THING: We have always demanded Bible proof -- book, chapter and verse -- for what we teach and practice religiously. However, in Biblical criticism we have walked by assumption, minority, and questionable evidence. (This will be discussed later.)

Many are using translations that are based on textual evidence that is questionable, and in some cases absolutely false. The passages discussed in this article are classic examples.

PART NINE Some Glaring Contradictions

All who handle the word of God are under certain restrictions.

"Every word of God is pure: He is a shield unto them that put their trust in Him."

"Add thou not unto His words, let He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (**Proverbs 30:5,6**).

Neither are we to "diminish ought from it."

Peter warned that some wrested the scriptures unto their own destruction. (**II Peter 3:16**).

I am appalled at the way the translators of the NIV have added to the word, taken from, and have perverted it throughout. However, it is more appalling to see preachers and elders defending and using it. Of course, we all must give to the Lord an account personally at the judgment.

When asked, "Why are you using this or some other version?", the stock reply is: "Well, somebody told me that it was a pretty good translation." Who is that "somebody"?

Some will casually thumb through the NIV, and then remark, "It looks pretty good to me," Be careful now! Remember that when Eve looked upon the forbidden fruit she saw that "it was pleasant to the eyes." Remember the Divine injunction, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (**I Thessalonians 5:21**).

Page Seventeen:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

There are other false teachings, and many blunders that need attention. However, at the moment, let us note some contradictions:

I. Contradictions and blunders in **Mark 1:1,2**.

Let us note this great verse: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee."

Note the NIV:

"The beginning of the gospel about Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

"As it is written in Isaiah the prophet:..."

The NIV changes "gospel of Jesus Christ" to "the gospel about Jesus Christ." There is quite a difference in the expressions "of" Jesus Christ and "about" Jesus Christ. The first expression involves the gospel that Jesus preached. The latter expression is what one believes about Jesus Christ, and the two could be miles apart. In **Mark 1:2**, we have the expression, "As it is written in the prophets (plural)." Then there is a prophecy from Malachi, and a quotation; from Isaiah -- perfect harmony in the KJV. But the NIV contradicts itself by saying, Isaiah the prophet, and then quoting from Malachi!

II. Another Contradiction: In **Hebrews 11:17**, the NIV says that Abraham "was about to sacrifice his one and only son..." However, in **Galatians 4:22**, we read that "Abraham had TWO sons." Was this due to ignorance or incompetent scholarship? Do able scholars paint themselves into a corner like this?

III. In the NIV Jesus is called God's "one and only son" in several references, as in **John 1:14** and **John 3:16**.

This contradicts several other passages that refer to Christians as sons of God. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." (**I John 3:2**). Since we are now the sons of God, how can Christ be called God's "one and only Son"?

Evidently the translators would rather be contradictory than to use "only begotten Son."

The Greek word for "only begotten" is "monogene" and is found nine times in the New Testament. Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon says "monogene" means "only begotten in respect of peculiar generation." (p 77). "Monogene" is translated six times "only begotten" in the AV and three times "only." When it is rendered "only", the context shows peculiar generation. In **Luke 7:12**, we find "only son of his mother." In **Luke 8:42**, we have "for he had an only daughter." In **Luke 9:38**, we read, "For he is mine only child." The virgin birth does not always inhere in "monogene". Isaac was Abraham's "only begotten son." (**Hebrews 11:17**). He was not virgin-born, but his birth was indeed unique.

Page Eighteen:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

How was the birth of Jesus peculiar? It was his virgin birth. The conception of Jesus was miraculous, thus making his birth indeed unique and peculiar.

If the translators are allergic to or choke on the words "only begotten", why not say that Jesus is God's only virgin-born Son, for so he is.

PART TEN

The Great Conspiracy of 1881 (No. 1)

As previously noted, in a review of a version, three factors should be considered: 1) The Text, 2) The Translators, and 3) The Translation.

In order to understand the puzzling maze of confusion that prevails in the translation field, we need to know about the great conspiracy that was perpetrated by the English Revision Committee (1870-1881). What occurred is almost unbelievable until we know something about the men on the committee and the procedure they followed.

The truth must be told, even though it be shocking and unpleasant. This information has been available for years. Many have not known about it; others have refused to consider it due to prejudice, and accepting assumptions as evidence for proof. Prejudice is to prejudge a matter without weighing all the facts.

If one should wonder why, in reviewing the NIV, that I am going back to the committee of 1870-81 of the English Revision, may I hasten to explain what happened then has cast a long and baneful shadow over Bible translating even till today.

First I mention G. Vance Smith who was on the committee and wielded a powerful influence. This man was a Unitarian and did not believe in the Deity of Christ. A letter of protest signed by 1,000 clergymen was submitted, and still he was permitted to serve on the committee.

Next, I mention Westcott and Hort. In a review of the New International Version, the Trinitarian Bible Society says: "...the most disappointing feature of this translation is that it shows in hundreds of places the extent to which Biblical scholars today are still held in bondage by the misguided textual theories of Westcott and Hort and their successors."

Page Nineteen:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

Thus, the importance of going back to the ERV committee is apparent. The many changes, and omissions in the NIV are due to the influence of the "misguided textual theories of Westcott and Hort and their successors." I may add that these "misguided textual theories" have long since been proved to be fallacious, unsound and unsafe.

The Trinitarian Bible Society states what this theory is, briefly, as follows:

"The theory is that a small group of ancient manuscripts headed by the Vatican copy known as 'B', and the copy found by Tischendorf at Sinai known as 'Aleph', represent the original text with a high degree of accuracy and outweigh the testimony of the great multitude of manuscripts which preserve the traditional or majority text underlying the Authorized Version (the King James Version)."

Who were Westcott and Hort? What did they believe? What was their unscrupulous policy?

Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. Hort were liberal professors of Cambridge University of England. Before the work of translation began, they engaged in a communion service with infidel G. Vance Smith. Hort thought that this would be a great help in getting their translation accepted by the public. In spite of the protest of 1,000 English ministers to remove Smith from the committee. Westcott and Hort said that they would not serve unless Smith was retained.

Let us note other beliefs of Westcott and Hort. They were believers in HIGHER CRITICISM.

In 1847, Hort wrote: "All stigmatize him (Dr. Hampden) as a HERETIC...If he be condemned, what will become of ME!" (Which Bible? p. 278).

Westcott and Hort were both Mariolaters. In 1847, Westcott wrote: "After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill...Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling-place; and behind a screen was a 'Pieta' the size of life (i.e. a Virgin and dead Christ)...Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours." (Life of Westcott, Vol. I, p. 81, W-B, p. 278).

Let us note Hort's "Mary-worship." He wrote to Westcott, October 17, 1865: "I have been persuaded for many years that MARY-worship and Jesus-worship have very much in common in their causes and their results." (Life of Hort. Vol. II p. 50. W-B, p. 279).

Page Twenty:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

PART ELEVEN

The Great Conspiracy of 1881 (No. II)

World history turns upon certain events, which, in turn become historical events. What transpired in the Revision Committees that produced the English Revised Version (ERV) has had a bad effect on the entire religious world, from that day until now, including the church of Christ.

The northern half of the Church of England would not consent to revising the Authorized Version; but the southern part agreed to a revision, providing certain rules be followed.

1) The terms "of the original Resolution of February 10, 1870, being, that the removal of PLAIN AND CLEAR ERRORS was alone contemplated." The first Rule of the committee was "To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorized Version, consistently with faithfulness." This rule was ignored.

2) Whenever "decidedly prepondering evidence constrained their adoption of some changes in the Text from which the Authorized Version was made, they should indicate such alteration in the margin. Will it be believed that, this notwithstanding, not one of the many alterations which have been introduced into the original Text is so commiserated? (The Revision Revised, John W. Burgon, p. 3). (Note: This a "brief" critical review. No one has "done his homework" or completed his research on this question unless he has read this masterpiece by John W. Burgon -- one of the greatest scholars of all time.)

Before making a decision, one should read and consider all the evidence. Many are speaking out on this question when they have not considered much of the evidence. Let us note: "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it; it is a folly and shame to him." (**Proverbs 18:13**).

Hort, when he was only 23 years old (evidently he had more arrogance than information), called The Received Text "vile" and "villainous." Benjamin C. Wilkinson asked: "On what meat had Dr. Hort fed, when he dared, being only 23 years old, to call the Received Text "villainous and vile"? By his own confession he had at that time read little of the Greek New Testament, and knew nothing of texts and certainly nothing of Hebrew." (Which Bible? --David Otis Fuller, p. 302). (Is history repeating itself when so many young preachers with only two years of Greek think they are scholars and able to be translators of the Bible?)

Page Twenty One:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

The Revision Committee, besides Vance Smith, The Unitarian who denied the Deity of Christ, Drs. Westcott and Hort, liberal higher critics who favored Romish views about the evangelical, denied the historicity of Genesis chapters 1-2, and several other heresies; there were others who held liberal views and favored destructive criticism of the Bible.

We need not be surprised, therefore, when we read the following:

"When the English New Testament Committee met, it was immediately apparent what was going to happen. Though for ten years the iron rule of silence kept the public ignorant of what was going on behind closed doors, the story is now known. The first meeting of the Committee found itself a divided body, the majority being determined to incorporate into the proposed revision the latest and most extreme higher criticism. The majority was dominated and carried along by a triumvirate consisting of Hort, Westcott, and Lightfoot. The dominating mentality of this triumvirate was Dr. Hort. Before the Committee met, Westcott had written to Hort, 'The rules though liberal are vague, and the interpretation of them will depend upon decided action at first.' They were determined at the outset to be greater than the rules, and to manipulate them.

"The new members who had been elected into the body, and who had taken no part in drawing up the rules, threw these rules completely aside by interpreting them with the widest attitude. Moreover, Westcott and Hort, who had worked together before this for 20 years in bringing out a Greek New Testament constructed on principles which deviated the furthest ever yet known from the Received Text, came prepared to effect a systematic change in the Protestant Bible.

On this point Westcott wrote to Hort concerning Dr. Ellicott, the chairman: 'The Bishop of Gloucester seems to me to be quite capable of accepting heartily and adopting personally a thorough scheme'." (Which Bible?, p. 290).

Thus we see briefly how the Satanic conspiracy poisoned the stream of truth with the higher, destructive criticism that prevailed in the English Revision Committee of 1870-1881.

PART TWELVE The Deity of Christ Downgraded

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of God shall stand forever." (**Isaiah 40:8**).

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."
(**Matthew 24:35**).

Page Twenty Two:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

Belief in verbal inspiration and Divine preservation of the word of God go hand in hand. To believe in one and to deny the other is most inconsistent. Would God inspire his word, every jot and tittle, make one's soul's salvation dependent upon believing and obeying the word -- and then cease to watch over it?

With the assurance in the above two scriptures we may rest assured that the word of God is somewhere. But where? The word was passed on from the faithful members of the church from one generation to the next. Note **II Timothy 2:2**:

"And the things that thou has heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."

The truth, the words of salvation, have been preserved through the Textus Receptus, also called the Majority Text, and Traditional Text. This was the culmination of years of work, research and other translations preparing the way. The KJV translators built on a foundation well laid by others -- some giving their lives for translating the word of God.

Let us pursue our critique of the NIV which is tintured throughout with false doctrine. I now call attention to several ways the Deity of Christ is downgraded.

1. **Matthew 1:25**: "And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son; and he called his name Jesus."

The NIV omits "her firstborn." These words are in the Received Text; but were "revised" out by the Satanic conspiracy that prevailed in the Revision Committee of 1870-1881. G. Vance Smith did not believe in the Deity of Christ. Pressure was brought to bear to get him off the committee; but Westcott and Hort and Bishop Thirlwall would not serve if Smith was dismissed.

Christianity stands or fails on the Deity of Christ; and the Deity of Christ stands or falls on the virgin birth. This Satan knows so he makes every subtle attack at this truth.

2. **Luke 2:33**: "And Joseph and his mother marveled at those things which were spoken of him."

Here "Joseph and his mother" is changed to "the child's father and mother." In verse 43, "Joseph and his mother" is rendered "his parents."

It is obvious from both these passages that the NIV translators were following a corrupt text (or else they were paraphrasing).

Page Twenty Three:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

3. **I Timothy 3:16**: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up onto glory."

The NIV says, "He" instead of god. A footnote says that "Some manuscripts" have "God." This is incorrect and misleading. There is overwhelming evidence that "God" is the word put here by inspiration. The magnificent John W. Burgon in his noble work *The Revision Revised* devotes 96 pages giving incontrovertible evidence and proof beyond cavil that "God" is the word inspired by the Spirit of God.

Burgon spent six months of research on this one word. When men make a translation and do not retain "God" here it is evident that they just have not "done their homework" -- or else they are like those in Isaiah's day who said: "Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits." (**Isaiah 30:10**).

4. **Acts 8:37** is omitted by the NIV.

It is in the Textus Receptus and the KJV. It was deleted by the Revision Committee of 1870-1881. There is ample evidence that this verse was given by inspiration and should be left in. Westcott and Hort ignored 95% of the evidence and followed, in the main, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus Manuscripts. Both of these are corrupt and unreliable.

By omitting verse 37, the question asked by the Ethiopian is left unanswered. It should be in. Are you going to follow the liberal higher destructive critics, or the dedicated conservative scholars?

"And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

"Every word of God is pure..."

"Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (**Proverbs 30:5,6**).

PART THIRTEEN

Doubt and Deception in the Footnotes (No. 1)

In reading the NIV, we find footnotes on virtually every page which raise doubt as to the inspiration of verse after verse. If the "best and most reliable" manuscripts omit a certain verse or verses, then maybe it is not the word of God. If we cannot be sure, then we have to doubt its inspiration. Thus the NIV makes an attack on the Divine inspiration of the Bible.

Page Twenty Four:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

"If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (**Psalms 11:3**).

"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (**Romans 10:17**).

"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." (**Hebrews 11:1**).

We are dealing with a most crucial issue. If we cannot be sure of the word by which faith comes, we cannot be sure of our faith. If we cannot be sure of our faith, then the substance of our hope is gone. If we cannot be sure that we have the truth, we cannot be sure there is a heaven, or a hell, or a resurrection. If this be the case, we might as well burn down the church building and all go fishing.

The faith of any congregation using the NIV will grow weaker and weaker. Will God not hold elders accountable if they permit the faith of the souls entrusted to them to be shipwrecked?

In order to make way for their New World translation, Jehovah's Witnesses attacked the King James Version. The Mormons do likewise in an effort to justify their so-called inspired books. In an effort to justify the modern versions, even though they are filled with false doctrine, and contradictions, many make an attack on the KJV. Bear in mind that we cannot help the poor by tearing down the rich; we cannot help the wage earner by tearing down the wage payer; one cannot build himself up by tearing down another. Please note, I wish to make this loud and clear.

One cannot build up the NIV, or excuse the false doctrines, contradictions and deceptions therein by trying to tear down the KJV, and building a bitterness and hatred toward it.

Many take great delight in heaping scorn upon this Grand Old Book that has been a guiding light to millions for nearly four centuries.

In the NIV, following **Mark 16:8**, a line is drawn, followed by this note: "(The two most reliable early manuscripts do not have **Mark 16:9-20**.)"

The two manuscripts referred to here are Vaticanus, also known as B; and Sinaiticus, also known as Aleph (first letter of the Hebrew alphabet). Those two manuscripts were, by and large, the basis of the Westcott and Hort Greek text. Were these manuscripts the most reliable? Far from it. "Both these documents are of uncertain ancestry, of questionable history, and of suspicious character." (Which Bible?, p. 301). They both were in the hands of the Catholic Church.

Page Twenty Five:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A.G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

Vaticanus B was found on a shelf in the Vatican Library. How it got there, no one knows for certain. Sinaiticus was found in a waste paper basket in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai in 1859 by Dr. Tischendorf.

As pointed out by Herman Koskier, in "Codex B and Its Allies", p. 1, Vol. II, these two manuscripts differ from each other 3,036 times in the gospels alone; and more than 7,000 times throughout the New Testament. When two witnesses do not agree, it is evident that they are not witnessing to truth. (**Mark 14:55,56**).

These are the only two manuscripts of note that omit this passage, and there is a blank page of Vaticanus large enough for these verses.

"In the Sinai copy the double page containing the end of Mark and the beginning of Luke was removed at an early date and replaced with the four sides rewritten to exclude **Mark 16:9-20**. By slightly increasing the size of the letters and spaces the writer was able to extend his shortened version to the top of the column preceding Luke 1. He filled in the remainder of his last line with an ornamental flourish to make sure that no addition could be made without being immediately evident. ***These two manuscripts are shown to be false witnesses. ***The majority of ancient copies, the majority of ancient writers and the majority of ancient translations all testify to the genuineness of these verses." (The Authenticity of the Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to Mark, Trinitarian Bible Society, 217 Kingston Road SW19 3NN, England, pp. 4,10).

The evidence for Divine inspiration of these verses is overwhelming. All critics in the world cannot prove other-wise. They should be received with all reverence and respect as part of the inspired word of God.

Page Twenty Six:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

PART FOURTEEN

Doubt and Deception in the Footnotes (No. II)

Whether intentional or not, many footnotes create doubt. When a notes says: "This verse is omitted by some manuscripts", the question naturally arises: Was it inspired by the Spirit? Is it part of the word of God?

"Yea, hath God said" is still being used to create doubt, disbelief, disobedience, and eventually apostasy. Jesus charged the lawyers of his day, thus: "Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." (**Luke 11:52**).

Were Jesus here today, would he not make a similar charge? As one reads the NIV, he is met with footnotes on nearly every page that question the Divine inspiration of verse after verse. Make no mistake about it! Modern versions are destroying people's faith and undermining the church. Seeds of doubt will grow into roots of apostasy.

The NIV teaches many false doctrines, plays down the Deity of Christ, contradicts itself, weakens the teaching in many places, and falsely translates and paraphrases many passages. Jesus taught that a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. The NIV is truly a sadly corrupt "tree" and it cannot, therefore, bring forth good fruit.

The word of God has always been "the key of knowledge" in spiritual matters. If the Bible is robbed of its inspiration, we have no "key of knowledge." Translators of the modern versions are fast taking it away. If they succeed, we will have no standard of authority by which to settle anything, much less have a sure guide from earth to heaven.

In our previous lesson, we learned that although doubt is raised about the inspiration of **Mark 16:9-20** evidence is overwhelming that this passage is part of the inspired word of God, and can be believed with full assurance of faith.

Let us note another passage that is doubted by the higher critics, and by the translators of the NIV, **John 7:53 - 8:11**. A note inserted between chapters 7 and 8 reads: "(The earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have **John 7:53 - 8:11**)." Referring to this passage and to the one in Mark, The Trinitarian Bible Society remarks as follows: "The manuscripts which include these verses are more numerous and more reliable than those which omit them."

They, therefore, by all means should be retained as part of the inspired word of God. Why leave them out? I have observed that the translators are quick to omit a passage -- even on the ground of the most flimsy excuse.

Page Twenty Seven:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

The public has been deceived for years into thinking that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts are the most reliable. The truth has eventually come to light that these are two of the most corrupt. These two manuscripts were the main ones underlying the Westcott and Hort Greek text. This text is gradually being abandoned. Those who produced the New KJV did not use it, but went back to the Traditional or Majority text used by the translators of the KJV of 1611. Norman Ward points out: "Obviously these two codices differ from the Textus Receptus, but to what extent? In the Gospels alone, Vaticanus omits 2,877 words, adds 536, substitutes 935, transposes 2,098 and modifies 1,132. Sinaiticus omits 3,455, adds 839, substitutes 1,114, transposes 2,299 and modifies 1,265." (Perfected or Perverted?, Which Bible Society, Grand Rapids, Michigan p. 14).

If a passage is going to be expunged on the grounds that Vaticanus omits it, note some other passages Vaticanus omits: All of First Timothy; Second Timothy; all of Titus; nearly all of Genesis (**Gen. 1:1 - 46:29**; the last 12 verses of **Mark 16**; the Lord's prayer on the Cross, "Father forgive them...", our Lord's agony and bloodlike sweat in the garden of Gethsemane; 33 of the Psalms, and the last four and a half chapters of Hebrews, plus many more.

Another deceptive footnote is relating to **Luke 23:34**. "Then Jesus said, Father forgive them; for they know not what they do." The NIV footnote says: "Some early manuscripts do not have this sentence..." The implication is that it may not be inspired and maybe should not be in the Bible. John W. Burgon says, "And yet these precious words are found in every known uncial (MS in capital letters) and in every known cursive (MS in long-hand writing) copy, except four; besides being found in every ancient Version." (The Revision Revised, p. 83.)

Then why raise a doubt about this precious prayer of our Lord? It only creates doubt and confusion.

PART FIFTEEN

Doubt and Deception in the Footnotes (No. III)

As we proceed with our review, I call attention where doubt is raised about more precious words given by inspiration. The NIV translators either did not properly investigate or else ignored the evidence.

Verses, words and phrases are omitted when the bulk of the evidence shows that they should be left in. Many phrases, words and verses that are not expunged are questioned as possibly being spurious.

Page Twenty Eight:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

1. **Mark 1:1**: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." The NIV footnote says: "Some manuscripts do not have the Son of God." Thus, doubt is raised and the inspiration of these words is challenged. The illustrious John W. Burgon, one of the greatest authorities on manuscript evidence, says: "Why are we not informed that every known uncial copy except one of bad character - every cursive but two, - every Version, - and the following Fathers, - all contain the precious clause: (he then names a number of "church Fathers" that support this clause, and point out that opposition proves to be a mistake. He then continues - AGH): To speak plainly, since the clause is above suspicion. Why are we not rather told so?" (The Revision Revised (1883), p. 132).

See the deception here? The NIV footnote should not read, "Some manuscripts...", casting doubt on the validity of the phrase, "the Son of God."

2. **John 3:13**, NIV: "No man has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven." The NIV footnote say: "Some manuscripts (read) Man who is in heaven." Burgon asks: Why above all, are we not assured that the precious clause in question is found in every manuscript in the world, except five of bad character? - is recognized by all the Latin and all the Syriac versions, as well as by the Coptic, - (he then named other versions, and "Fathers", and continues thus): in short, quite above suspicion: why are we told that? Those 10 versions, those 38 Fathers, that host of Copies in the proportion of 995 to 5, -- why, concerning all these is not there not so much as a hint let fall that such a mass of counter-evidence exists? Shame, -- yes, shame on the learning which comes abroad to perplex the weak, and to unsettle the doubting, and to mislead the blind! Shame, -- yes, shame on that two-thirds majority of well-intentioned but most incompetent men, who, finding themselves (in an evil hour) appointed to correct 'plain and clear errors' in the English 'Authorized Version,'-- occupied themselves instead with falsifying the inspired Greek Text in countless places, and in branding with suspicion some of the most precious utterances of the SPIRIT! Shame, yes, shame upon them!" (The Revision Revised (1883), pp. 132-135).

These words were spoken by Burgon about the Revision Committee of 1881. The same could be spoken, at least in the main, concerning the translators of the NIV since they followed 98% or 99% of the time (according to their own admission) Nestle and the Bible Society Greek texts which are critical Westcott-Hort type texts. Thus, they omitted and called in question many words, phrases and verses which upon investigation, prove to be inspired beyond all doubt.

Page Twenty Nine:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

3. **Luke 22:43,44.** "And there appeared an angel unto him, strengthening him."

"And being in agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground."

The NIV footnote says: "Some early manuscripts do not have verses 43 and 44."

Should these verses be accepted as being inspired, or rejected as being spurious? Let us note the proof that they were inspired.

"Our Lord's agony and bloody sweat,' first mentioned by Justin Martyr (A.D. 150), is found set down in every manuscript in the world except four. It is duly exhibited by every known Version. It is recognized by upwards of forty famous Fathers writing without concert in remote parts of ancient Christendom. Whether therefore Antiquity, -- or Number, -- is considered, the evidence in favor of S. Luke xxii, 43,44 is simply overwhelming." (John W. Burgon, The Revision Revised (1883), p. 340).

Hence, we can rest with blessed assurance that these verses were given by Divine inspiration. Do not let your faith be shaken by the critical and doubting notes of the NIV.

Instead of building and strengthening one's faith, reading the NIV tends to destroy it. Which shall we believe? the text? or the footnotes? We cannot believe both. In many places neither, since the text is a perversion and paraphrase.

PART SIXTEEN

Doubt and Deception in the Footnotes (No. IV)

The devil has many devious devices to create doubt and disbelief in the word of God. One of his devices is to get men in high places to turn against the word of God.

Note a biblical example of a king. When the prophet Jeremiah warned of impending doom, and coming captivity, Jehoiakim was greatly perturbed.

"And it came to pass, that when Jehudi had read three or four leaves, he cut it with his penknife, and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire that was on the hearth.

Yet they were not afraid, nor rent their garments, neither the king, nor any of his servants that heard all these words." (**Jeremiah 36:18,19**).

Page Thirty:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

They burned the roll of the word of God with no compunction or conscience. Today, we have a similar situation. God has warned repeatedly for men not to add to nor to take away from his word. (**Deuteronomy 12:32; Revelation 22:18-19**).

Nevertheless, translators are expunging from the text and putting in the footnotes verses and phrases that are well authenticated as being inspired. It is bad enough when liberals do so. When brethren concur and also deny their inspiration, we have a problem right in our own midst. Let us note some specifics:

1. "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." (**Matthew 17:21**).

This entire verse, spoken by Jesus our Lord, has been omitted. The NIV footnote says that "Some manuscripts..." have this verse. The deceptive implication is that there is not sufficient textual evidence for its inspiration: therefore, they proceed to deny that it was given by inspiration and put it in the footnote. The evidence is abundant that this verse should be retained in the text as it is "witnessed to by all the Copies but 3: by the Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Armenian Versions: and by the following "Fathers": (1) Origen, (2) Tertullian, (3) the Syriac Clement, (4) the Syriac Canons of Eusebius, (5) Athanasius, (6) Basil, (7) Ambrose, (8) Juvenecus, (9) Crysostom, (10) Opus imp., (11) Hailary, (12) Augustine, (13), J. Damascene, and others. then (it will be asked), why have the Revisionists left them out? Because (we answer) they have been misled by B and Aleph. Cureton's Syriac and the Sahidic,--as untrustworthy a quaternion of witnesses to the text of Scripture could be named." (John W. Burgon, The Revision Revised (1883, p. 206).

2. "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost." (**Matthew 18:11**).

This verse is omitted by the NIV. A footnote says, "Some manuscripts..." have this verse. Now question: Shall we believe this verse, or cast it aside? Was it inspired or not? To omit this verse from the text is a virtual denial of its inspiration. Robert W. Flanagan says, "...eight major and fifteen minor manuscripts include this important verse." (A Critique of The New American Standard Bible New Testament, Biblion Press, Mt. Eden Calif. 94557, p. 11) John W. Burgon says that "...it is attested by every known cursive except three:...(he give a number of versions and church "Fathers" that testify to its inspiration, AGH; he then continued), "above all, by the Universal Eastern Church,--for it has been read in all assemblies of the faithful on the morrow of Pentecost, from the beginning." (The Revision Revised, (1883), p. 92).

Page Thirty One:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

Are the NIV translators being honest when they say that only "Some manuscripts" have this verse?

3. "Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of Judgment, than for that city." (**Mark 6:11b**).

These solemn words of Christ are omitted by the NIV without even a footnote. The evidence is abundant that this passage is genuine and part of the inspired word of God. These "precious words, witnessed to as they are by all the known copies but nine..." Burgon also points out that this passage had "witness of the Liturgical usage in the Eastern Church, -- which appointed these verses to be read on S. Mark's Day" and that it was "used by the 'Elders' with whom Irenaeus held converse, -- men who must have been contemporaries" of the Apostle John. He gives additional evidence for which see his book. (The Revision Revised (1883), p. 409, 410).

This, it is apparent that we cannot trust the footnotes of the NIV; and we have found that the text cannot be trusted as it teaches many false doctrines.

The conclusion is obvious: The NIV cannot be trusted.

PART SEVENTEEN Unwarranted Omissions (No. I)

The NIV omits many words, phrases and verses that should be in the text. Some of these are in the footnotes and some are expunged without even a note.

The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, in one of their annual reports, gleefully stated: "They are saving the ship of Christianity by throwing her cargo overboard...the virgin birth, atonement, and the resurrection. How long will men sail the sea in an empty ship? They will go ashore and enjoy life with the Atheists. We welcome the aid of the modernists and pledge them our fullest cooperation in ridding the world of any serious acceptance of Christian theology."

They could have named a few other things that are being thrown overboard: verbal and plenary inspiration and Divine preservation of the scriptures.

It is stated in the Introduction of the NKJV that "...the net effect of the Westcott-Hort type of text is to delete many words, phrases, and verses that are now found in the Authorized Version."

The NIV was based on this type of text, hence, so many omissions. Rightly speaking, the NIV should be called a "mutilation," rather than a translation.

Page Thirty Two:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

1. **Matthew 5:22:** Jesus said, "But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment..."

The NIV omits "without a cause" with a footnote stating that "Some manuscripts" have it. However, John W. Burgon cites 30 ancient witnesses, and then adds that it "is attested by every uncial Copy of the Gospels, except B and Aleph; - by a whole torrent of Fathers; - by every known copy of the old Latin, - by all the Syriac, (for the Peschito inserts [not translates] the word `eikn'), - by the Coptic, - as well as by the Gothic - and Armenian versions; - that such a reading is not to be set aside by the stupid dictum, `Western and Syrian.'" He adds further, "There really can be no doubt whatever - (that is if we are to be guided by ancient Evidence,)-`eikn' (`without a cause') was our Savior's actual word." Finally, Burgon says: "The sum of the matter proves to be as follows: Codd. B and Aleph (the two `two false Witnesses'), B and Aleph alone of MSS. - omit `eikn'" (The Revision Revised (1883), pp. 360, 361).

2. **Luke 23:38:** "And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS."

The NIV expunges "in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew." Why? Because of the following Greek texts of Nestle, and the Bible Society which omit these words. The Westcott-Hort text omits them. Going back to the construction of their text, they followed some corrupt versions while the bulk of evidence is that they were inspired and should be left in.

Without investigation, the readers of the NIV do not know what to believe. Their footnotes are unreliable and misleading.

3. **Luke 9:a54,55.** In verse 54b, the phrase "even as Elijah did" is omitted. Then 55b and 56a these precious words of Christ himself are deleted: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

The NIV omits this important saying of Christ "although Manuscripts, Versions, Fathers from the second century downwards, (as Tischendorf admits,) witness eloquently in its favour." (The Revision Revised (1883), p. 93).

It is distressing and a strong vote against using the NIV as we see more and more that they follow minority evidence and pass over the bulk of evidence that should be given precedence. It is a serious thing when men take the liberty to expunge words of Christ, and other inspired words and verses as we next note an entire verse omitted.

4. "And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors." (**Mark 15:28**).

Page Thirty Three:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

This prophecy is from **Isaiah 53:12**. It is serious and sinful to deny the inspired word of God. It is equally bad, if not worse, to deny the fulfillment of an inspired prophecy.

5. **Luke 4:4**: "And Jesus answereth him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God."

The NIV omits the last phrase: "but by every word of God." This is important. Why leave it out?

6. **I Peter 4:1**: "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh..."

The words "for us" are omitted by the NIV. This is significant that the atonement and suffering of Christ was "for us." He died "for our sins." (**I Corinthians 15:3**).

PART EIGHTEEN Unwarranted Omissions (No. II)

"He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame to him." (**Proverbs 18:13**).

Men are quick to speak out on things about which they are not informed. This is apparent on the question about the translations. Some are inclined to endorse every new version that comes from the press -- before reading it and studying it carefully.

One man said that he had 64 translations, and that he loved them every one. That does not prove that they are correct. Solomon had 700 wives and he loved them all.

Another remarked that the NIV is here to stay. Now what does that prove? The Methodist Discipline is, no doubt, here to stay. That does not mean that we should begin preaching from it, and handing it out to young people.

Let us note more omissions of the NIV.

1. **Matthew 5:44** omits: "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you."

2. **Matthew 6:13** omits: "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen."

3. **Matthew 19:9** omits: "and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

Shall we follow the destructive higher critics? or the conservative scholars? Let us note another key phrase.

4. **Matthew 20:7** omits: "and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive."

Page Thirty Four:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

5. **Matthew 20:22** omits the phrase: "and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with." This same phrase is also omitted from verse 23.

Next, let us note an entire verse that has been omitted by the NIV.

6. **Matthew 23:14** "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation."

7. **Mark 10:21** omits "take up the cross," Another important phrase is omitted from **Mark 10:24**, namely, "them that trust in riches." It is not having riches, if properly used, but trusting in riches that will cause one to miss the kingdom of God.

8. **Mark 13:11** omits the important phrase: "neither do ye premeditate." This has to do with direct guidance of the apostles by the Holy Spirit. They were assured that they would be given the very words they needed when they were delivered up under persecution and trials.

9. **Mark 13:14** omits the key phrase: "spoken of by Daniel the prophet."

10. **John 16:16** omits this vital phrase of Christ when he said, "because I go to the Father."

11. **John 17:21** omits a key word "ONE" in the great prayer of Christ for unity.

Jesus prayed for believers: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be [one] in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

The "one" in brackets is omitted by the NIV, Jesus did not just pray that believers be "in us." But that they be "ONE in us." Why omit this key word?

12. **Acts 9:6** omits this key sentence: "And he trembling and astonished said, Lord what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him..."

Why leave out such an important sentence?

13. **Acts 10:6** omits a key statement: "he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do."

14. **John 17:19**: The NIV reads: "For them I sanctify myself, that they too may be truly sanctified." the KJV reads: "And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth."

Thus, the NIV omits "through the truth", the medium and means of sanctification. Just a slight deviation is a serious matter since it changes the truth of the verse.

Page Thirty Five:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

The NIV Minimizes Divine Attributes

1. In **Romans 15:19**, "Spirit of God" is reduced to Spirit. The NIV says, "...by the power of signs and miracles, through the power of the Spirit..." The KJV reads: "Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God."

2. **Ephesians 5:9**: The KJV reads: "(For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth;)." the NIV changes "Spirit" to "light." The Greek "pneumatosis" means "Spirit" and never "light."

3. In speaking of the Spirit, the word "HOLY" is omitted by the NIV in **Matthew 12:31**, **John 7:39**, **Acts 6:3**; and **I Corinthians 2:13**.

4. **I Timothy 1:17**: The KJV says "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God our Saviour." The NIV, in referring to God, omits the word "wise." Does it mean to imply that God is not "wise"?

5. **Titus 1:2** states: "...God that cannot lie." The NIV merely says that God "does not lie." There is quite a difference.

In the NIV, "Jesus" is omitted 38 times; "Christ" is omitted 43 times; "Lord" is omitted 35 times; "God" is omitted 31 times. (Everett W. Fowler, "Evaluating Versions of the New Testament", Maranatha Baptist Press, Watertown, Wisconsin, p. 51.)

With some 17 complete verses left out, and parts of 180 verses omitted, and with the names and titles of Deity omitted so many times, how can one think that he has the word of God in the NIV?

Proverbs 30:5,6: "Every word of God is pure:...Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."

PART NINETEEN

A Few Miscellaneous Observations

(Note: This article brings to a close the present series written for The Handley Herald. In this "brief" review, I have barely "touched the hem of the garment", so to speak. "The half has not been told." Plans are in the making to launch a paper primarily to expose the errors and dangers of all current modern translations. This is a most urgent heed today.)

Please consider carefully the things pointed out in this review. The souls of men are at stake. The NIV is filled with false doctrines, contradictions, and misrepresentations. This cannot be successfully denied.

Page Thirty Six:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

1. THE NIV IS A PARAPHRASE AND NOT A TRANSLATION. This is evident from the first verse. Matthew 1:1, where "the book" is in the NIV rendered "A record." After "her firstborn" is omitted from verse 25. Dr. D.A. Waite, in his book, "NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION, A Paraphrased Perversion Not An Accurate Translation" (The Bible for Today, Collinswood, NJ), points out that in **John 1:1-18** there are THIRTY-NINE (39) examples and illustrations where the NIV has FAILED to TRANSLATE properly from the Greek language to the English language. (p. iii).

II. A FEW MISTRANSLATIONS.

1. **Mark 4:39:** When Jesus stilled the storm, "the wind ceases." The NIV says that the wind merely "died down."

2. **Matthew 18:22** has "seventy times seven." The NIV says "77 times." Which will you believe?

3. **I Corinthians 7:36-38.** This passage is perverted completely. It depicts a man engaged to a virgin. However, the majority of commentators understand this passage to deal with a situation when it was customary for fathers to arrange the marriage of their daughters. On the Greek word "ekgamizon" (from "gamizo"), Lenski says: "This verb invariably means 'to give in marriage' and never 'to marry'." (Lenski: "R.C.H. The Interpretation of I and II Corinthians": Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1963, p. 330). The word for "marry" is "gameo". There is a distinct difference in the meaning and use of these two words throughout the N.T. Jesus spoke of "marrying" and "giving in marriage." (**Matthew 22:30; 24:28; Luke 17:27**).

III. THE NIV IS ANTI-WOMAN

The word "brothers" is used repeatedly, evidently unaware that the word "brethren" is generic and includes the women. By using "brothers", the women are completely ignored.

IV. "NO REMISSION OF SINS."

This great and meaningful expression is completely expunged from the NIV, and replaced with forgiveness. Why? Men can forgive sins, as we sin against one another, but men cannot remit sin. Only God can remit sin. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." Only through a deficient knowledge of the truth and ineptness in translating would "remission of sins" be omitted from the word of God.

Page Thirty Seven:

From: The Handley Herald, Handley church of Christ, via CCFF
A. G. Hobbs, Fort Worth, Texas (Written during 1982)

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION: A Brief, Critical Review

V. THE PURPOSE AND DURATION OF SPIRITUAL GIFTS MISUNDERSTOOD

Ephesians 4:13, the NIV says "until we all reach unity in the faith." Spiritual gifts were to last until unity of "THE FAITH" came. Believers will never all "reach unity." Spiritual gifts were to last until the perfect law of liberty was revealed completely and confirmed. (Mark 16:20; Hebrews 2:3,4). The NIV also changes "that which is perfect" (I Corinthians 13:10) to "when perfection comes," implying maturity of character rather than completed revelation.

A Few Blunders in the Old Testament

We have devoted our present studies to the New Testament, primarily. Let us note just a few radical changes in the Old Testament.

1. "Make thee an ark of gopher wood..." (**Genesis 6:14**). The NIV says: "...of cypress wood" with a footnote stating "The meaning of the Hebrew for this word is uncertain." Why then, in the name of common sense, did they not leave it alone? Confusion, on top of confusion! Why raise another doubt?

2. **II Samuel 14:2**: "Anoint not thyself with oil." The NIV says, "and don't use any cosmetic lotions."

Some Textual Changes

The Trinitarian Bible Society says, "Every such change is debatable, and the process of reconstructing obscure passages of the Hebrew, with the aid of the Greek, Latin and Syriac translations of the Hebrew, is precarious and uncertain."

Why follow a course that is "debatable", "precarious" and "uncertain"? But the NIV translators are apparently bent on so doing.

1. **Genesis 36:24**, KJV has "mules." The NIV changes to "hot springs."
2. **I Samuel 13:5**: Hebrew: 30,000 chariots. NIV has 3,000.
3. **II Samuel 15:7**: Hebrew: "forty years." NIV has "four years."
4. **I Samuel 16:19**: KJV, most Hebrew manuscripts and Septuagint support the KJV, rendition of 50,070. The NIV has 70, Which will you believe? YOU CANNOT BELIEVE BOTH!
5. **I Kings 4:26**: Hebrew: 40,000; NIV: 4,000

The more one studies the NIV the more obvious it is that it is a MULTILATION of the scriptures, and NOT A TRANSLATION.

