



BIBLE WORD STUDY

"THE GREAT PRETENDER:" The New International Bible 2011

MARCH 2012 WORD STUDY NIV #4

Typical attitudes of backslidden Christians toward modern Bibles:

1. "A person can still be saved reading the NIV, ASV, RSV" ...etc

Answer: A person can be saved by reading only a few verses. For example, on a tract or small booklet on the subject of salvation. A person can be saved with only a few verses, but doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction depends upon ALL scripture--see 2 Timothy 3:15-17.

2. "The subject is too complicated." Not to those with this attitude: " My soul hath kept thy testimonies; and I love them exceedingly. (Psalm 119:167).

3. "You can find the deleted words and doctrines in other passages."

To this, God says:

"A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." (Galatians 5:9)

Change, add, or subtract one word and a systematic chain of Bible understanding and blessing is destroyed. For example, even prepositions or conjunctions such as "of" "in" "but" "and" are critical. Baptism "by" the Spirit (1 Corinthians 12:13 KJB) conveys different doctrine from the NIV 2011 footnote that reads "Or with; or in" at 1 Corinthians 12:13 and the ESV , Douay, et. al., reading "For in one Spirit..."

What about "and"? The NIV removes the grammatical device that connects several phrases together to build toward an important fact--such as the "ands" in Genesis 22.

The NIV 2011 reads:

"Abraham looked up and there in a thicket he saw a ram caught by its horns. He went over and took the ram and sacrificed it as a burnt offering instead of his son." (Genesis 22:13 NIV)

Notice the "ands" in the KJB:

"And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son." (Genesis 22:13 KJV).

The six connectors (and) are deliberate in the KJB. Look at the emphasis the KJB has with its usages of "and".

1. And Abraham lifted up his eyes,
2. and looked,
3. and behold behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns:
4. and Abraham went
5. and took the ram,
6. and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son. (Genesis 22:13 KJV).



Each phrase is distinct, separate, and higher than the former action; all are building toward the key action, OFFERING of a SUBSTITUTE. There are multiple instances of this King James Bible feature (polysyndeton) in Genesis 22. The chapter is one of the most important in the OT and the word of God.

The secular usage is said to be incorrect but the occurrences in the Bible are deliberate and designed by God. Perversions such as the NIV see the conjunctions as superfluous and poor grammar!

Genesis 22 is one of the clearest and most definitive passages of the typology of Christ. Here are some typological blessings in the passage:

1. The passage deals with a father's love for his son.
2. The first occurrence of the word "love" is in Genesis 22.
3. Three days and nights.
4. A mountain.
5. Two companions are with the son on the mountain.
6. Fire and a knife.
7. Isaac is said to be Abraham's "only son" and in Hebrews 11:17:

"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son," (Hebrews 11:17 KJV)

The type (Isaac) is the "only begotten son" of Abraham although Abraham had other sons! The reason is evidently because Isaac was Abraham's son by promise--born when Sarah and Abraham were past the ages of child-bearing and reproduction--a miraculous conception and birth. The only other Person called Only Begotten Son is the Lord Jesus Christ in describing His Humanity relationship to His Father. (cf. John 1:14; 1:18).

What about the NIV 2011 and the "only begotten son"? Here is Hebrews 11:17:

"By faith Abraham, when God tested him, offered Isaac as a sacrifice. He who had embraced the promises was about to sacrifice his one and only son," (Hebrews 11:17 NIV 2011)

Genesis 22:2:

"Then God said, 'Take your son, your only son, whom you love—Isaac—and go to the region of Moriah. Sacrifice him there as a burnt offering on a mountain I will show you.'" (Genesis 22:2 NIV 2011).

John 1:14:

"The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the one and only Son, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth. (John 1:14 NIV 2011).

Notice the NIV error: In their ignorance and unbelief, they do what they HAVE to do with the "monogenais" issue. It is the nemesis of the Bible correctors. "What will we do with this Bible term reserved for Jesus Christ?"

Mono= only genais= begotten

Simply stated, the term is one reserved for Christ and denotes His eternal generation. He has no beginning and since He is of the same Essence as the Father, His Sonship is eternal. "Only Begotten Son" has been a Bible term to designate the relation of the Second Person of the Godhead to the First Person for centuries. The term rejects any beginning of the Lord Jesus Christ and insists upon eternal generation. "One and only son" has no historical or scriptural basis whatsoever.

The NIV removes the English Bible designation reserved for this Greek term and simply translates it as "the one and only son." But now they have committed another

error in addition to the removal of the Bible definition. They have now blundered into saying that God has "one" son!

After making the Bible say that God has only one son--the confusion continues:
FACT: Adam is called "the son of God" in Luke 3:38 (KJB) and angels are called "sons of God" in Job 1:6---but the NIV changes "sons of God" in Job 1:6 to "angels" and throws the "sons of God" into a footnote. The NIV leaves "sons of God" in Genesis 6 because the translators do not believe they are angels but do believe that they are the "godly line of Seth" !(There has never been a "godly line" of men anywhere. All have sinned and nobody in the Bible claims to be "godly" after they are saved.

The NIV was forced to call Adam "son of God" in Luke 3:38 because it was preceded by 74 "sons" in the chapter!!! In no way could they change those to "daughters" or even "children."

So--the NIV is caught again in a doctrinal mess. After claiming there is only one son, they admit there are many sons of God. All of this happened because they messed with the "Only Begotten Son"--(an old modernist trick that has been pulled out of the hat for centuries).

Also, the "sons of God" in 1 John 3:3 are demoted by the NIV to "children" because the feminists and other ignatz's (with apologies to the eminent surgeon, Semmelweiss) are up in arms at being called "sons." Like all covenant theologians they know nothing of Israel's unique heritage as God's "firstborn son" (Exodus 4:22) and their new birth in the Kingdom (John 3; Joel 2; Isaiah 43:6) and the relevance of 1 John to those "sons."

Those of us (male and female) who read and believe One Book (KJB) rejoice in being called "sons" as opposed to the lessor and more distant "children." "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Romans 8:14).

FACT: All believers (male and female) are "sons" by adoption and they are never called "daughters." What the translators of the NIV do not know and can not know (because they are set on correcting the word of God) is that sonship is a principle of Bible adoption and that it has nothing to do with whether the word "teknon" is masculine, feminine, or neuter. The Book says:

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." (1 John 3:2)

The perversion says:
"Dear friends, now we are children of God, and what we will be has not yet been made known. But we know that when Christ appears, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." (1 John 3:2 NIV)

There are children, sons and daughters, sons of God, sons, an Only Begotten Son: all are in the Bible but the NIV crew is apparently ignorant of it. Paul goes into adoption in detail in the Book of Galatians and it is very clear that "sonship" is not just an issue for males. (Galatians 3:27-28)

All textual arguments aside--the NIV is not even a fair translation of God's words; it is filled with pitiful interpretations, clouded by feminism, deceived by modernism, and has committed plagiarism with prejudice.

According to the Merriam-Websters Online Dictionary plagiarism, among other things, is:

"to steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own"

In my opinion, ALL Bible translations that attack the KJB in advertising or by preface statements, and then use 50%-70% of the KJB against itself are plagiarists and Bible perverters. Their work is not original--they are simply destroying a previous work while depending upon that labor of those who went before them. It would be a fair estimate to say that for every "correction" the NIV offers in place of the KJB reading, hundreds of scholars with as much or more educational achievements, evaluated the NIV correction and rejected the term or phrase as unworthy. This is to say nothing of the multiplied millions of English readers who have found nothing wrong with the KJB for centuries.

The sexism raised by the NIV against the KJB goes against reason. There was no male/female issue at stake when God created Adam--the first man. (Adam was "one man" according to Genesis/Romans 6 in the KJB--not "mankind" as the NIV states in Genesis 1:27). God made the man first and the woman was made from Adam's rib--not the other way around. God chose His way rather than some big-mouthed, small-brained off-shoot that bears her daddy's name no matter what she calls herself.

Male/female has nothing to do with who is better than who or who is more important than who or who runs the show. It has to do with (1) Order (2) Responsibility (3) Accountability. In creation the buck must stop someplace. Wise women thank God they were not the cause of the fall--the Book says "...by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin." (Romans 5:12). And, ladies, don't blame God if some men thought they had larger biceps than you in order to knock you around. (You should have caught you a God-fearing man that read his Bible instead of the NFL Sunday schedule), What goes around comes around though, and many a man will wish women were accountable when he stands naked at the judgment--having mis-used and abused his responsibilities.

OPEN BIBLE COLLEGE
Distance Study-On Your Schedule
Practical-Doctrinal-Dispensational
KJB-Reasonably Priced
www.right-division.com



Illustrations on page 1 by Jonathan W. Johnson
jwillustration@gmail.com