

## The NIV Apostate – Yes

### *Explanatory Note*

This writer believes that today's believer will benefit from a reminder about the corruptions of a premier supposedly 'evangelical' translation still widely used today. The following excerpt is from this writer's earlier work [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) '*O Biblios*' – *The Book* Chapter 13.

That work should be consulted with respect to the graphic and tabulated source material to which the following excerpt refers.

Note especially the remarks in the following excerpt on the term "**Lucifer**" Isaiah 14:12 AV1611, which term is wrongly rejected by many Christian fundamentalists.

Note that the corruptions of the NIV will largely match those of later Bible counterfeits such as the ESV English Standard Version.

Note further that the NIV has itself been subjected to numerous textual changes resulting in wholly different meanings in many passages between the 1984 and 2011 Editions, the later edition, compared with its predecessor, moving *further* from the Text of the AV1611. The NIV's attacks on major doctrine remain effectively unchanged in both editions. See:

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1431878225.pdf](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1431878225.pdf) *AV1611 versus Changing NIVs*

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) '*O Biblios*' – *The Book* Chapter 7 *Flood of Revision*

## 13

**“The NIV - Apostate?” (Yes)**

[2015 update. Extract from [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) ‘O Biblios’ – The Book Chapter 13, pp 234-238, 247. See **Introduction**. Note again that while their origins differ, all disclosures about the nature of the NIVs that follow *apply equally* to the NASVs]

**13.1 “The “Totally Evangelical” NIV”**

Our critic begins with the statement **“I notice that one of your illustrations describes the NIV as apostate. This is, I am afraid, simply ludicrous.”** The illustration is **Figure 5**.

Our critic evidently failed to “notice” that in the nine pages immediately preceding **Figure 5**, in the version of Chapters 1-7 which he received, 110 verses were listed where the NIV agreed with the JB or NWT or BOTH AGAINST the AV1611 **in cutting out, corrupting or casting doubt on** 101 of the 110 examples given. The list of Old and New Testament verses given in Chapter 7 now numbers 194. See **Appendix, Tables A1, A2**.

The equivalent result for the extended list from Chapter 7 that **Tables A1, A2** summarise is **180 of 194** verses, where the 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs agree with the JB, NJB, NWT AGAINST the AV1611 **in cutting out or casting doubt on** AV1611 readings, or **93%**.

Our critic cited ANOTHER **64 VERSES**, which do not appear in Sections 7.3 or 12.6 in **Tables 7, 8**, where the NIV agrees with BOTH the JB and NWT in **42 verses or 66%**! Those repeated are Daniel 3:25, Mark 6:20, Acts 2:47, 4:27, 30, 9:6. See **Table 3a**.

The updated equivalent result is that the 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs agree with the JB, NJB, NWT against the AV1611 in **41 of the 64** verses or **64%**. See **Table 3b**.

In addition, this study has revealed a further **69** verses where the NIV reading has been found to be either incorrect or inferior to the AV1611. See Sections 10.15.

Overall, the agreement between the NIV, JB, NWT against the AV1611 for the entire New Testament based on this author’s separate study of **1218** verses appears to be approximately **80%**. See Section 10.15, where, as indicated, a figure of **80%** agreement between the 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs and the JB, NJB, NWT appears realistic for the whole New Testament.

**Table 6**, Section 11.4 lists 60 verses which show that omissions in the NIV obviously stem from the Douay-Rheims version of the Roman Catholic Church, together with the 1582 Jesuit Rheims New Testament. See also **Table 1**. **Tables 1, 6** show a total of **153** serious departures from the AV1611 New Testament by the 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs in agreement with the 1582 Jesuit Rheims New Testament, the Douay-Rheims Challoner Version and the JB, NJB *against* the AV1611.

Moreover, **Table 8** in the previous chapter lists 62 verses to show the influence on the text of the 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs of Greek editors who were mostly unsaved heretics and who were NOT in perfect agreement.

I am then supposed to believe that the NIV is NOT “*apostate*”? I find that proposition somewhat “*ludicrous*”.

[2015 update. Detailed figures are not available for the NASVs versus the AV1611. However, the results will be approximately the same as for the NIVs versus the AV1611. See *What is the Bible? – AV1611 Overview, Table 1 Flood of Revision – Verse Comparison, Pre-1611, Post-1611 Bibles and the AV1611* [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) pp 48-55. Table 1 lists 262 verses of scripture where modern departures are widely held to be improvements on the equivalent AV1611 readings. Table 1 shows that the departures of the NKJV, NIVs, NASVs, NWTs, JB/NJB from the equivalent AV1611 readings are 35%, 97%, 94%, 92%, 94-95% overall showing appreciable i.e. for the NKJV to very good ecumenical agreement between fundamentalists and evangelicals with Rome and Watchtower. For a summary Bible version comparison giving similar results see the inserted tabulated study [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php) *English Reformation to Last Days Apostasy – To and From the AV1611*]

Moreover, **Figure 5** is obviously the frontispiece of a BOOK. If our critic is so convinced that the NIV is NOT apostate, why did he not ask to see a copy of that book, so that he could refute its contents, no doubt with the help of “*the standard scholarly works on the subject*”?

Our critic then states that “*The hundred scholars responsible for (the NIV) came from all the main Protestant denominations and all had to subscribe to the high view of Scripture as set out in the Westminster Confession, the Belgic Confession and the New Hampshire Confession.*”

If the “*hundred scholars*” had such a “*high view of Scripture*” - which is not necessarily the same as actually BELIEVING ANY BIBLE to be the pure word of God AND the FINAL AUTHORITY - WHY did they VIOLATE The Westminster Confession of Faith in Section 8, Para. 2 of that Confession, [*True or False? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition David Otis Fuller, D.D., Grand Rapids International Publications, 1983*] p 25?

““*Two whole perfect and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one Person...Which Person is very God and very man, yet one Christ...*” *The Scripture proofs annexed to section 8, para. 2, include 1 Timothy 3:16, “God was manifest in the flesh.” The Westminster Divines evidently regarded this verse as one of the essential proofs of the Trinitarian doctrine of the Bible, that the Father is God, the Son is God and the Holy Spirit is God.*”

Our critic and the NIV translators “*evidently regarded*” the Westminster Divines as having been deceived by a “*late highly doubtful reading*” - according to our critic. See Sections 11.1 and Chapter 14 of this work.

[2015 update. The NASVs, NIVs, both change “**God**” to “**He**” in 1 Timothy 3:16]

Yet our critic insists that the NIV translators “*were totally evangelical*” in the “*historic doctrinal sense*” whereas “*The KJV consisted of many high churchmen and so could hardly be claimed to be translated by a completely orthodox evangelical body.*”

Dr Laurence Chaderton was one of the AV1611 translators. His sermons won 40 of the clergy to Christ, Section 4.2. Does our critic mention ANY NIV translator whose sermons have won even half that number to Christ? No.

Dr Lancelot Andrewes was one of the AV1611 translators - AND a high churchman. “*He was the means of converting many papists by his preaching and disputations*” Section 12.4.

Does our critic mention even one NIV translator whose “*preaching and disputations*” have been “*the means of converting many papists*”? No.

Regardless of who translated the AV1611, Finney and Sunday between them led 1,500,000 souls to Christ because they believed the AV1611 to be the pure word of God from cover to cover. See Chapter 8 and Section 12.5.

Does our critic name any two preachers who have led even one-tenth of that number to Christ with a “*totally evangelical*” NIV? No.

Dr Peter Trumper [[Should We Trust The New International Version? FOCUS Christian Ministries Trust](#)] p 10 has some penetrating observations about “*all the main Protestant denominations*” among the NIV translators:

*“Reading the Preface of the NIV...We are told that “Anglican, Assemblies of God, Baptist, Brethren, Christian Reformed, Church of Christ, Evangelical Free, Lutheran, Mennonite, Methodist, Nazarene, Presbyterian, Wesleyan and other churches - helped to safeguard the translation from sectarian bias. That is quite a cross section!...Are we to be palmed off so easily? There are some queer fish swimming about in these denominations, all blithely calling themselves “evangelical.” By the way, what about that ominous-sounding phrase, “and other churches”? What other churches? The reader should demand to know.”*

The TBS [[Items from the TBS Quarterly Record, No. 473, Oct.-Dec. 1980 and No. 501, Oct.-Dec. 1987](#)] have answered Dr Trumper’s questions in their *Quarterly Record*, Oct.-Dec. 1987 No. 501, p 8. “*Advice was also sought from Jewish, Roman Catholic, and atheistic scholars, according to a news release by the publishers.*”

The TBS article continues, p 11 “*Attention must also be drawn to the fact that, although the NIV professes to be an evangelical translation, the Greek text on which it is mainly based was not prepared by evangelical scholars but by the editors of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament. The UBS editors included several who deny the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures, working in cooperation with a Roman Catholic Cardinal, Carlo Martini. The soundness of a translation which relies upon such a source must be questioned by every one of the NIV’s evangelical readers.*”

Not by our critic, who on this occasion appears quite ready to ignore “**evidence which is inconvenient to one’s case**” although he has “**collected, for a number of years, literature taking a similar approach.**”

Would he consider Cardinal Martini to be “*totally evangelical*” in the “*historic doctrinal sense*” of the word?

Anyone wishing to confirm the similarity between the NIV and UBS texts should consult the footnotes in the Samuel Bagster 1982 British usage Edition of the NKJV.

Dr Trumper is obviously quite justified in his assessment of the NIV translating committee as having “*an ecumenical flavour*” rather than an evangelical one.

E. L. Bynum [[Should We Trust The New International Version?](#)] p 8, [[Why Not The NIV? G. R. Guile, Amainthakarai Gospel Hall, Post Office Box No. 2501, Madras-600 029, India](#)] pp 5-6, comments about these “*totally evangelical*” scholars:

*““New Evangelical” schools are heavily represented on the translation committee. Among others, we find that this committee contains six men from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and several from Fuller, Wheaton, Dallas and even Oral Roberts University. Why does Oral Roberts University need to be represented? How sad to see Clyde T. Francisco of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary represented. In the early 60’s Dr Ralph Elliott stirred a furore in his book, “The Message of Genesis”. Dr Elliott’s book denied the historical accuracy of the first 12 chapters of Genesis.”*

‘Evolutionary progress!’ Westcott only denied the first three. See Sections 6.1, 12.6.

Pastor Bynum continues:

*“Adam meant mankind and Moses did not write the Pentateuch, the tower of Babel is a parable, Enoch was not translated, and the age of the men before the flood is doubtful, these as well as other heresies are contained in Elliott’s book. And where did Elliott get his ideas? In his introduction he said, “Though the material in this book is mine, and I do not wish anyone else to be charged with its deficiencies, I do wish to express my appreciation to DR. CLYDE T. FRANCISCO, my teacher and later a colleague on the faculty of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. It was in an eclectic course in the Pentateuch under his guidance that I first gained inspiration and*

*purpose to attempt a serious study on the Book of Genesis. THUS, I AM SURE THAT MANY OF THE INSIGHTS WHICH CULMINATED IN MY OWN MIND WERE PLACED THERE IN SEED-BED FASHION BY HIM.”*”

Pastor Bynum concludes *“To this date we have never heard of Dr Francisco denying this.”*

Yet I am assured that Dr Francisco is *“totally evangelical”* in the *“historic doctrinal sense”* of the word.

What of Edwin Palmer, the *“coordinator of all the work on the NIV”* [[www.avpublications.com](http://www.avpublications.com) *New Age Bible Versions* Gail Riplinger pp 230-233] Gail Riplinger states *“He ... “selected all of the personnel of the initial translation committee.” He also edited the NIV Study Bible which Zondervan says includes the “liberal position.” His scandalous and sacrilegious statement will stun and shock the reader. In one of his books he quotes a verse from his NIV, then says:*

*““This (his NIV) shows the great error that is so prevalent today in some orthodox Protestant circles, namely that regeneration depends on faith...and that in order to be born again man must first accept Jesus as his Saviour.””* The verse in question is John 1:13.

The AV1611 reads **“Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.”**

The NIV reads *“children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband’s will, but born of God.”*

Palmer’s error and that of the NIV is seen in the words *“nor of human decision.”* *“Human decision”* is EXACTLY how ANY individual is *“born of God.”*

*Although no-one can “will” himself to be “born of God,” the Bible extends an open invitation to anyone to AVAIL himself of the new birth:*

**“Whosoever WILL, let him take of the water of life FREELY”** Revelation 21:17.

It is a *“human decision”* whether to receive the Lord Jesus Christ, John 1:12, 3:36 or to reject Him, John 3:36, 12:48. God cannot make that decision for ANYONE. It is an individual matter for **“whosoever believeth in him”** John 3:16.

Having made the right *“human decision,”* that individual is then empowered to become a son of God by the new birth, John 3:3. Gail Riplinger continues:

*“If he denies “faith” and each individual’s responsibility to “accept Jesus as his Saviour,” what does he offer in its place?*

*“Luke 21:19*

*“NIV “By standing firm you will save yourself.” [2015 update. The NASVs read correctly in John 1:13 but read similarly with the NIVs in Luke 21:19]*

*“AV1611 “In your patience possess ye your souls.”*

*“He is not alone in his views. Another ‘liberal’ new version editor comments regarding this switch in Luke 21:19:*

*““Of all the changes in the RV, that in Luke 21:19 is the one to which I look with most hope. We think of our souls as something to complete...””*

*The RV reads “In your patience ye shall win your souls.” This is also the sense of the NIV, namely that salvation depends on an individual striving for it, to gain his soul as a prize at the end. In the AV1611, the believer in the context by his patience keeps what he HAS - his soul. Doctrinally, the passage applies to the tribulation, Matthew 24:13, where patience in trial is an element of salvation. Gail Riplinger continues:*

*“Palmer devoted an entire chapter in his book, The Five Points of Calvinism, to disprove the idea that ‘man still has the ability to ask God’s help for salvation.’ His ‘Five Points’ form a Satanic pentagram. His book is so irrational that he is periodically forced to interrupt himself with comments like, ‘...as contradictory a that may see.’ In defense of the obviously unscriptural character of his chapters, he quips, ‘The lack of a (scripture) text does not destroy their character.’ He whittles away at John 3:16 and concludes that the view ‘that Christ loved the whole world equally and gave himself up for the world’ is wrong...”*

*“(Palmer) says, ‘God intends that salvation shall be for only a few...’ Sounding like one of the Jehovah Witness 144,000 he says, ‘God chose only a certain number to be saved.’ ‘For God so loved the world’ becomes ‘only those whom he loved...would be saved...If God loves us, we are called’...”*

*“Palmer’s chapter on the ‘Elect’ elite is reflected in his translation of 1 Thessalonians 1:4, ‘he has chosen you.’ He admits his change ‘suggests the opposite of’ the KJV’s **“your election of God.”** In his system, God elects a few ‘winners’. In Christianity, God calls ALL sinners, but few elect to respond. Palmer denies that man should respond...Palmer believes, ‘Man is entirely passive.’ He points to his alteration of John 1:13 asserting that it ‘proves’ man has no free will.”*

*1 Thessalonians 1:9 bears out Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis. She continues:*

*“His ‘elite’ were serenaded by the heavenly host in Luke 2:14 in the NIV...However, in the KJV the good will of God was extended to all men, not his favorite ‘God-pleasing’ elect.*

*“NIV reads ‘Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men on whom his favor rests.’ [2015 update. The NASVs read similarly to the NIVs in Luke 2:14, 1 Thessalonians 1:4]*

*“KJV reads **“Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will toward men.”***

*“Here, the new versions follow manuscripts Aleph, B, C and D. Their Greek differs from the overwhelming majority of manuscripts by one letter, ‘s’. The former has the genitive “eudokios,” while the latter has the nominative “eudokia”...the KJV and the Majority text reading of “eudokia” is attested by not only MOST MSS but also by the oldest witnesses.*

2<sup>nd</sup> Century: Syriac Version and Irenaeus

3<sup>rd</sup> Century: Coptic Version and the Apostolic Constitution

4<sup>th</sup> Century: Eusebius, Aphraates, Titus, Didymus, Gregory, Cyril, Epiphanius, Ephraem, Philo, Chrysostom.

*“In their passion to give space to Satan’s sermon, (the NIV committee) follow four corrupt fourth and fifth century MSS while ignoring a total of 53 ancient witnesses including 16 belonging to the second, third and fourth centuries and 37 from the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth centuries.*

*“Although the advertisements for the NIV boast that it was translated by a committee of 100 scholars, Palmer’s hand picked CBT (Committee on Bible Translation) “would choose a translation other than that of the initial or intermediate or general editorial committees.” Therefore Palmer and his cronies could ignore all three intermediate committees and make their own translation. This is evident in verses such as Romans 1:28 where a concept from Palmer’s chapter entitled “Total Depravity” finds its way. He admits his purposeful switch saying, “Paul was not speaking of the reprobate but the depraved”...”*

*“His power and influence can also be seen in the Commonwealth edition of the NIV in which “Edwin Palmer...agreed with many of the changes himself to save time.” (The Greek Textus Receptus is often ignored by critics who insist Erasmus hurried it along to save time.) Palmer’s Calvinism did not rest with his influence in the NIV. The New King James Committee boasts seven members who subscribe to Palmer’s elite ‘Elect’ and damned ‘depraved’ classes.”*

Yet Palmer is supposed to be “totally evangelical” in the “historic doctrinal sense” of the word.

Our critic should have noted the reading from Romans 13:9 listed in Section 7.3 and omitted from the 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs.

**“Thou shalt not bear false witness”...** [2015 update. The NASVs cut out this statement along with the NIVs]...

### 13.5 “The Effect of Modern Versions”

Our critic continues **“modern versions do not present a different God, a different Christ, a different salvation, or a different morality. To suggest otherwise is absolutely untrue.”**

Gail Riplinger does not “*suggest*” anything of the sort. She proves it. It is the main thesis of her book, which our critic should have read before passing judgement. See Section 13.1 for a small sample.

For another example, consider Isaiah 14:12a in the AV1611: **“How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!”** and in the NIV: “How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn!” **“Lucifer”** has been changed to “morning star” or similar in the 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs, JB, NJB, NWT, still lock-step in ecumenical oneness in **“the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will”** 2 Timothy 2:26.

Dr Mrs Riplinger explains [*New Age Bible Versions*] pp 42-43: “*Twentieth century versions have removed the name Lucifer, thereby eliminating the ONLY reference to him in the entire bible...The Hebrew is “helel, ben shachar,” which is accurately translated, “Lucifer, son of the morning.” The NIV...give(s) an English translation AS IF the Hebrew said, “shachar kobab, ben shachar” or “morning star, son of the morning (or dawn)”. Yet the word for star (kobab) appears nowhere in the text. Also ‘morning’ appears only once, as the KJV shows, not twice as new versions indicate...*

*“The ultimate blasphemy occurs when the “morning star” takes “Lucifer’s” place in Isaiah 14. Jesus Christ is the “morning star” and is identified as such in Revelation 22:16, 2:28 and 2 Peter 1:19. With this sleight of hand switch, Satan not only slyly slips out of the picture but lives up to his name “the accuser” (Revelation 12:10) by attempting to make Jesus Christ the subject of the diatribe in Isaiah 14.”*

And the new versions do not present “*a different Christ*”?

**“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. Abstain from all appearance of evil”** 1 Thessalonians 5:21, 22.


[2015 update. In sum, as indicated the NASVs, NIVs are partners in apostasy. Sister Riplinger’s observations on Isaiah 14:12 and the modern elimination of the name **“Lucifer”** apply to both the NASVs and the NIVs. It was the NASVs, NIVs’ heretical elimination of the name **“Lucifer”** from Isaiah 14:12 that prompted Sister Riplinger’s extensive research that she published as *New Age Bible Versions*. It is not surprising therefore that Sister Riplinger’s approach has unsettled New Age Satanic Version advocates... As Paul states **“They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one”** Romans 3:12]

[2018 update. From *KJO James White Review Full Text* p 274.

See also *KJO Review Full Text* [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php).]

As an additional note on Isaiah 14:12, Dr Gerardus Bouw has a detailed discussion of the term **“Lucifer”** in his book, *The Book of Bible Problems*, p 210ff and reveals that the word is found in the Old Latin Bible of 150 AD. It did not originate with Jerome, as White mistakenly believes.]

*Conclusion*



Confidence in an unfaithful man in  
time of trouble is like a broken  
tooth, and a foot out of joint.  
Proverbs 25:19 KJV

[twitter.com/rairayhollis](https://twitter.com/rairayhollis)