

**Review: Dr Kenneth Barker (ed.), *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, UK, 1987 (1991 edn.)**

Pages: 222

**The Making of a Contemporary Corruption**

This is a deceptive companion to the deceptive New International Version, unfortunately the world's most popular English translation. It could be no other way, since these translators have to justify their corrupt Bible somehow.

The benefit in reading is to understand how these so-called 'scholars' think, and their shallowness and overconfidence proves alarming. Their main errors can be summarised as followed:

-Deny verbal plenary preservation (e.g. for the Old Testament): “[while] the Masoretes did an amazingly good job ... their work was not safeguarded by divine inspiration.” [p47]

-False translation philosophy: “Languages do not correspond to one another so closely that nothing is lost in translation”. [p176]

The Bible perfectly translates Hebrew into Egyptian and Persian into Hebrew in the OT, and Hebrew to Greek in the NT.

-Personal bias: “it may be true that at times the NIV translators have been guilty of reading something into the text.” [p177]; “In a number of instances, the translation ... is improved greatly by the addition of a word or phrase ... not found in the original language.” [p180]

Although everyone has bias, this is important for the NIV due to their liberal nature (including sodomite OT translator Marten Woudstra, and lesbian-transgender NIV 'consultant' Virginia Molenkott), and their trust in the pseudoscience of Textual Criticism.

-Irreconcilability with the King James Bible due to basic differences such as geography (the NIV translators believe Moses crossed the unidentified “Sea of Reeds”, not the Red sea), and biology (e.g. “spiders” are “lizards”, “unicorns” are “wild oxen”, “greyhounds” are “strutting roosters”, etc.).

Both cannot be God’s preserved words in English at the same time.

Far from throwing ‘new light’ on the English Bible, the NIV is leading millions into darkness.

\*\*\*

### **Preface (pp. 11-12)**

Any evidence must be full, free from bias as far as possible, and non-contradictory.

### **In Memoriam: Dr Edwin H. Palmer, 1922-1980 [N. David Hill] (pp. 15-17)**

#### **I) The Importance of Literary Style in Bible Translation Today [Calvin D. Linton] (pp. 19-43)**

#### **II) The Footnoting System [Burton L. Goddard] (pp. 44-57)**

“Where manuscript evidence varies, [the Bible translator] may judge”. [p44]

Samaritan Pentateuch manuscripts are claimed to be an additional independent Hebrew witness.

“In some few cases the NIV emends the Hebrew text ... judging that a scribal mistake was made.” [p46]

While, “the Masoretes did an amazingly good job ... their work was not safeguarded by divine inspiration.” [p47]

For those familiar with the science of textual criticism ... if they have confidence in the translators as men of God wholly faithful ... and

competent ... notes give added assurance. [p49]

“We cannot be sure that the body of water crossed by the Israelites fleeing before the Egyptians was what we know today as the Red Sea.” (Ex 13.18).

### **III) How the Hebrew and Aramaic Old Testament Text Was Established [Earl S. Kalland] (pp. 58-67)**

“We continued to make full and constant use of expert English stylists as consultants.” [like Lesbian transgender Virginia Mollenkott!]. [p62]

Rabbi Akiba (AD50-135) made notes (*Masorah*) in manuscript margins. Two streams of Hebrew manuscripts arose over time, *ben Asher* and *ben Naphtali*, with the former prevailing.

### **IV) The Rationale for an Eclectic New Testament Text (Ralph Earle) (pp. 68-74)**

Beginning in the 1930s, “new finds” have been made in the dry sands of Egypt.

### **V) Why Hebrew *She’ol* Was Translated ‘Grave’ [R. Laird Harris] Man (pp. 75-92)**

### **VI) When the Spirit Was Poetic [John H. Stek] (pp. 93-116)**

“Prosody of Greek classical poetry provided the standards by which all good poetry is to be scanned.” [95]

A ziggurat is a stepped Mesopotamian pyramid topped with a sanctuary.

### **VII) Translation Problems in Psalms 2 and 4 (Bruce Waltke) (pp. 117-126)**

### **VIII) How the NIV Made Use of New Light on the Hebrew Text [Larry L. Walker] (pp. 127-142)**

Ugaritic is claimed to ‘illuminate’ the Hebrew, e.g., in Ps 68.5 where

“upon the heavens” really means “in the desert”.

“Continuing new light on the flora and fauna of the Bible was utilised by the NIV. The ‘spider’ of Proverbs 30.28 becomes a ‘lizard’, and the ‘snail’ of Leviticus 11.30 becomes a ‘skink’ in the light of the new information. The ‘tortoise’ of Leviticus 11.29 becomes a ‘great lizard’, and the ‘turtle’ of Song of Songs 2.12 is more accurately specified as ‘(turtle) doves’. The ‘unicorn’ (*r’em*) of the AV ... has become a ‘wild ox’ in the NIV and the ‘satyr’ ... ‘wild goat’ ... Finally ... we mention the AV ‘greyhound’ ... which appears in the NIV as ‘strutting rooster’. [p138]

The Dead Sea Scrolls gave little insight into the Hebrew language.

### **IX) YHWH SABAOTH: ‘The Lord Almighty’ [Kenneth L. Barker] (pp. 143-150)**

Παντοκράτορ is equated with Sabaoth and Shaddai.

### **X) Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament [Ronald F. Youngblood] (pp. 151-163)**

“Textual criticism ... ensures that we are reading and studying a New Testament that is as close to the divinely-inspired original as is humanly possible.” [p152]

### **XI) The One and Only Son [Richard N. Longnecker] (pp. 164-175)**

Clement of Rome (cAD95-6) spoke of the Phoenix as μονογενες: “The Phoenix ... lives for 500 years ... it makes for itself a coffin of frankincense and myrrh ... enters it then dies. But as the flesh rots, a certain worm is engendered, which is nurtured from the moisture of the dead creature, and puts forth its wings ... when it has grown lusty, it takes up that coffin ... it journeys from ... Arabia even unto Egypt, to the place called the City of the Sun.” [p168]

Contemporary Greek uses μονογενες as an adjective stressing quality rather than derivation or descent.

### **XII) When ‘Literal’ Is Not Accurate [Herbert M. Wolf] (pp. 176-189)**

“Languages do not correspond to one another so closely that nothing is lost in translation”. [p176]

“It may be true that at times the NIV translators have been guilty of reading something into the text.” [p177]

“In a number of instances, the translation ... is improved greatly by the addition of a word or phrase ... not found in the original language.” [p180]

**XIII) Anglicising the NIV [Donald J. Wiseman] (pp. 190-195)**

**XIV) Isn't the King James Version Good Enough? The KJV and the NIV Compared [Edwin H. Palmer] (pp. 196-214)**