

# EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 4

---

Volume 4 • Number 2 • October 1980

---

## Evangelical Review of Theology

*Articles and book reviews selected from publications  
worldwide for an international readership,  
interpreting the Christian faith for contemporary  
living.*

EDITOR: BRUCE J. NICHOLLS



Published by  
THE PATERNOSTER PRESS

poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us for this very purpose. 'Entire sanctification'—which Wesley sees as the result of the Spirit's fullness—'is neither more nor less than pure love—love expelling sin and governing both the heart and life.'<sup>66</sup> Love, as the highest of the Spirit's gifts and the first of the Spirit's fruits, is the *sine qua non* of the Christian life.

Wesley lived at the heart of the most remarkable revival that Britain has ever known. It reflected various characteristics and conveyed many benefits. Wesley himself, however, was in no doubt at all as to what was the clearest proof of its authenticity. 'Many of our brethren and sisters in London, during that great out-pouring of the Spirit, spoke of several *new* blessings which they had attained. But after all, they could find nothing higher than *pure love* ...'<sup>67</sup>

---

Dr. A. Skevington Wood is Principal of Cliff College, England. p. 189

# New International Version—The Bible of Evangelicals

A review article by Robert G. Bratcher

*Reprinted from The Bible Translator (July 1979) with permission*

**The Holy Bible—New International Version.** Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Bible Publishers 1978; London: Hodder & Stoughton 1979. (Copyright: New York International Bible Society)

At long last conservative Protestants in the United States have brought forth a translation that bids fair to establish itself as the Bible for evangelicals. When the Revised Standard Version appeared in 1952, it was subjected to severe criticism by many conservatives and fundamentalists. Several Bibles were eventually published under conservative auspices (e.g. the Amplified Bible in 1965, the Modern Language Bible in 1969, and The New American Standard Version in 1971), but none of them succeeded in taking its place as the standard Bible for evangelicals.

## BACKGROUND TO THE TRANSLATION

The effort which finally culminated in this translation began in the 1950s, when committees were appointed by the Christian Reformed Church (in 1956) and the National Association of Evangelicals (in 1957) to study the possibility of a new translation. In 1967 the New York Bible Society assumed responsibility for the project and appointed a committee of fifteen scholars to direct it. In 1968, Dr. Edwin H. Palmer became the full

---

<sup>66</sup> *Letters*, 5.223; cf. *Sermons*, 2.448: 'Love excluding sin; love filling the heart, taking up the whole capacity of the soul.'

<sup>67</sup> *Letters*, 7.57. The reference is to the intensification of the revival in the year 1762.

time Executive Secretary of the project. Work began in 1968, and the Gospel of John was published in 1969; the New Testament appeared in 1973; Isaiah was published in 1975, Daniel in 1976, and Proverbs and Ecclesiastes in 1977.

The total cost has been reported at two and a quarter million dollars. One hundred and fifteen scholars from more than a dozen evangelical denominations took part in the work. They were divided into twenty teams composed of five persons each: two co-translators, two consultants, and one English stylist. Each team's work went to an intermediate editorial committee (either of the Old Testament or of the New Testament), then to the General Editorial Committee, and finally to the fifteen-member Committee on Bible Translation.

The publicity released with the publication of this translation stresses the interdenominational and the international character of the work. The Preface (p. vii) lists thirteen different denominations represented. As for the countries represented, a pamphlet entitled [p. 190](#) *The Version of Our Time* gives a "partial list" of ninety-seven scholars, of whom eighty-seven are Americans; there are three each from Canada and England, and two each from Australia and New Zealand. Evangelical seminaries are strongly represented; seven scholars are listed from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, of Chicago, Illinois.

Emphasis is also placed on the translators' "high view of Scripture". The New Testament Preface states that they were all committed to "the full authority and complete trustworthiness of the Scriptures, which they believe is God's Word in written form." In the Preface to the Bible the following is stated: "The translators were united in their commitment to the authority and infallibility of the Bible as God's Word in written form."

The following principles guided the translators in their work:

1. Begin with and be faithful to the original text in Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic languages.
2. Clearly reflect the unity and harmony of the Spirit-inspired Writings.
3. Retain only what the original languages say—not inject additional elements of unwarranted paraphrasing.
4. Communicate God's revelation in the language of the people—to do for our time what the King James Version did for its day.
5. Be equally effective for public worship (pulpit and pew), for private study and devotional reading.
6. Establish universal acceptance by creating an ecclesiastical team of 100 scholars who hold to a high view of Scripture as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Belgic Confession, and the Statement of Faith of the National Association of Evangelicals.

All of these are commendable and, by and large, unexceptionable. There might be differences of opinion as to what constitutes "unwarranted paraphrasing". Certainly in Mt 8.25 "we're going to drown" should not be seen as an unwarranted paraphrasing of *apollumetha*, nor should "will take their places at the feast" in Mt 8.11 be thought an unwarranted paraphrasing of *anaklithe&181;sontai* (see also "the entire Roman world" for *pasan tēn oikoumenēn*; in Lk 2.1).

Principle number 4 seems to reflect the idea that the King James Version of 1611 was written in the language of the people; it certainly was not the popular language of the day. Principle number 2 should not be taken to mean that artificial unity and harmony must prevail throughout the whole Canon. A translator must represent faithfully the meaning intended by each separate account and not try to harmonize different accounts where there are divergences. Certainly this translation does not appear to have attempted to do so. [p. 191](#)

The reception accorded this newest translation has been nothing short of spectacular. By December 1978 over 1,200,000 copies had been sold, and it is reasonable to assume that in time this translation will replace the King James Version as the Bible of evangelicals.

The mechanical part has been superbly executed. The book is a manageable 4cms. thick (15.5cms. wide, 23cms. long), the paper is top quality, thin enough to make for a reasonably sized book yet opaque enough to keep the print from showing through to the opposite side of the leaf. The text is printed in one column; the use of poetic structure is frequent and effective. The text is divided into sections, with section headings. The psalms do not have headings. In Job the speakers are identified in the margin. Meticulous attention has been paid to punctuation; e.g. Mt 21.16: praise<sup>c?</sup>; Mk 4.12: forgiven!<sup>a</sup> Lk 20.17: capstone<sup>a, b?</sup>

After the end of the New Testament there is a page-long Table of Weights and Measures followed by fourteen maps (eight for the Old Testament and six for the New Testament); the color of the maps may not command universal approval.

The Preface provides useful information on several aspects of the work, and should be carefully read by translators who intend to use this Bible in their work.

## TRANSLATORS' USE OF STANDARD TEXTUAL PRINCIPLES

In making textual decisions the translators were guided by standard textual principles. *For the Old Testament* their text was "the standard Hebrew text, the Masoretic Text as published in the latest editions of *Biblia Hebraica*" (Preface, p. viii). Use was made of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Samaritan Pentateuch "and the ancient scribal traditions relating to textual changes". All ancient Versions were also pressed into use. Standard procedures are followed throughout, but one looks in vain for anything that is labeled a conjecture. 1 Sam 13.1, for example, appears as follows:

Saul was  $\lfloor$  thirty  $\rfloor^a$  years old when he became king, and he reigned over Israel  $\lfloor$  forty-  $\rfloor^b$  two years.

<sup>a</sup>1 A few late manuscripts of the Septuagint; Hebrew does not have *thirty*.

<sup>b</sup>1 See the round number in [Acts 13:21](#); Hebrew does not have *forty*-.

The lower half-brackets are explained in the Preface (p. x): "To achieve clarity the translators sometimes supplied words not in the original texts but required by the context. If there was uncertainty about such material, it is enclosed in brackets." But this definition p. 192 does not square with the use of the brackets in 1 Sam 13.1. Another such example is to be found in 2 Kg 6.33, where the MT reads "the messenger arrived and said"; the words that follow, however, are manifestly spoken by the king of Israel, not by the messenger himself. So NIV has "... the messenger came down to him [that is, Elisha]. And  $\lfloor$  the king  $\rfloor$  said ..."

In most instances the half-brackets seem quite unnecessary. Some examples are given: "the wings of  $\lfloor$  my  $\rfloor$  dove" ([Ps 68:13](#)); "will possess  $\lfloor$  the land  $\rfloor$  as far as Zarephath" ([Ob 20](#)); "I will not turn back  $\lfloor$  my wrath  $\rfloor$ " ([Amos 1:3](#), [6](#), [9](#), [11](#), [13](#), [2:1](#), [4](#), [6](#)); "to alienate you  $\lfloor$  from us  $\rfloor$ " (Gal 4.17). This is a needless and needlessly distracting device, of interest only to scholars, who by definition are able to assess such matters on their own.

In some places NIV takes into account the *tiqqune sopherim* ("corrections of the scribes"). In [Job 32:3](#), for example, MT is translated in the text: "they had found no way to refute Job, and yet they had condemned him"; the footnote reads: "Masoretic Text; an ancient Hebrew scribal tradition, *Job*, and so had condemned God." In [Gen 18:22](#) the Hebrew text had read "Yahweh remained standing before Abraham." This was changed

by the scribes (a *tiqqun sopherim*) to “Abraham remained standing before Yahweh.” NIV translates the MT, which incorporates the scribal change, and cites the earlier text in footnote, again as “an ancient Hebrew scribal tradition”. In Hos 4.7 the earlier text had read “they changed my glory into shame”; this was changed by the scribes to “I will change their glory into shame,” and this is the text of the MT. Here NIV maintains the uncorrected text “they exchanged”, but prefers the corrected text “their glory”.

*The translators’ Greek text of the NT* was an eclectic one, and the Preface states (p. ix) that they used “the best current printed texts of the Greek New Testament”. [Mk 16:9–20](#) is separated from [16:8](#) by a space and a line, with the information: “[The two most reliable early manuscripts do not have [Mark 16:9–20](#).]” [John 7:53–8:11](#) is set off from the rest of the text by a space and a line, with a note at the top: “[The earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have [John 7:53–8:11](#).]” [John 5:3b–4](#) is omitted from the text, as are most other Textus Receptus scribal additions, even where complete verses are involved (see [Lk 23:16](#), [Acts 8:36](#)).

## CONSERVATIVE APPROACH TO EXEGESIS

As for the exegesis of the text, it is essentially conservative, that is, **P. 193** there is no determined attempt to break new ground in understanding the meaning of the original text. The beginning of the Bible reads in very familiar terms:

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. <sup>2</sup>Now the earth was<sup>a</sup> formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.

<sup>a2</sup> Or possibly *became*

Gen 3.15 differs little from what has become traditional:

And I will put enmity  
between you and the woman,  
and between your offspring<sup>a</sup> and hers;  
he will crush<sup>b</sup> your head,  
and you will strike his heel.

<sup>a15</sup> Or seed <sup>b15</sup> Or *strike*

Is 7.14 reads: “Therefore the Lord himself will give you<sup>a</sup> a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and<sup>b</sup> will call him Immanuel.<sup>c</sup>” The footnotes read: <sup>a14</sup> The Hebrew is plural <sup>b14</sup> Masoretic Text: Dead Sea Scrolls *and he* or *and they* <sup>c14</sup> Immanuel means *God with us*. [Psalm 2:12](#) is translated: “Kiss the Son, lest he be angry / and you be destroyed in your way, / for his wrath can flare up in a moment. / Blessed are all who take refuge in him.” The use of initial capital letters in this psalm for “his Anointed One” (v. [2](#)), “my King” (v. [6](#)), “my Son” (v. [7](#)) and “the Son” (v. [12](#)) seems an attempt to convert this psalm to Christianity.

Where the meaning of the text is still unknown, a footnote indicates this: “The meaning of the Hebrew for this word (or, sentence; or, phrase) is uncertain” (see, for example, [Ec 2:5](#), [Jer 8:13](#), [18](#), [Amos 3:12](#), [9:6](#)).

One rather unusual device is the use of quotation marks to set off a word or phrase which the translators judge is being used in a sense different from the normal one. In [Mt 9:10](#), [11](#) (and parallels) the text reads:

<sup>10</sup>While Jesus was having dinner at Matthew’s house, many tax collectors and “sinners” came and ate with him and his disciples. <sup>11</sup>When the Pharisees saw this, they asked his disciples, “Why does your teacher eat with tax collectors and ‘sinners’?”

Similarly in [Mt 6:1](#): “Be careful not to do your ‘acts of righteousness’ before men, to be seen by them.” In the same way “gods” appears in quotation marks in [Ps 82:1, 6](#), as well as in the quotation of [Ps 82:6](#) in [In 10:34](#). One curious instance is the bracketing of “seven(s)” within quotation marks in [Dan 9:24–27](#). [p. 194](#)

## TRANSLATION OF CULTURAL DISTINCTIVES

Some cultural features may be examined. For terms of distances and measures NIV gives the American equivalent in the text and in a footnote provides the Hebrew or Greek form and the metric equivalent. So in [Lk 24:13](#) the text has “about seven miles,” while the footnote reads: “Greek *sixty stadia* (about 11 kilometers).” [John 2:5](#) has “from twenty to thirty gallons” in the text, and the footnote says: “Greek *two to three metretes* (probably about 75 to 115 liters).” Monetary equivalents are handled somewhat differently. In [In 6:7](#), for example, Philip is made to say, “Eight months’ wages would not buy enough bread for each one to have a bite!” The footnote reads: “Greek *two hundred denarii*.” In [In 12:5](#) the three hundred denarii appear as “a year’s wages” in the text.

The hours of the day, however, are not given their modern equivalents; the translation is literal, “tenth hour” ([Jn 1.39](#)), “third hour,” “sixth hour,” and “ninth hour” ([Mk 15:25, 33, 34](#)). The same is done in the parable of the workers in the vineyard ([Mt 20:1–16](#)).

The word “leprosy” is used both in the OT and the NT but in each section where the word is used, a footnote is given: “The Hebrew/Greek word was used for various diseases affecting the skin—not necessarily leprosy” (see [2 Kg 5.1](#), [Lk 5.12](#)).

In some instances modern names are used for areas and countries, but this is not consistently done. “Cush” appears in the OT at all times, with a footnote: “the upper Nile region” (and see [Acts 8.27](#)). “Caphtor” is always explained in footnotes as meaning Crete (see [Amos 9.7](#)). In the NT the traditional “the Sea of Galilee” is used as a name, but when that body of water is referred to it is called a lake. In the OT *yam suph* is always translated “the Red Sea”, always accompanied by a footnote: “Hebrew *Yam Suph*; that is, Sea of Reeds” (and see also [Acts 7.36](#) and [Hebrew 11.29](#)).

It would seem that “prayer shawls” in [Mt 23.5](#) is an anachronism.

The use of the nonce word “kinsman-redeemer” to translate *gō’ēl* in [Ruth](#) (see [2:20, 3:9, 12, 4:1, 3, 8](#)) seems ill-advised. The sacrifices known as *shelāmim* are translated “fellowship offerings”, with the traditional term “peace offerings” given in footnote (see [1 Kg 8:63, 64](#)). The Hebrew *herem* is translated “devoted thing(s),” with a good explanatory footnote (see [Jos 6:18, 7:1](#)).

For some reason “Mary Magdalene” is used in the Synoptics, but in [John](#) she appears as “Mary of Magdala”.

Although in some places the translation is not characterized by male-oriented language, still it persists in others. So [Ps 1:1](#) begins, [p. 195](#) “Blessed is the man who ...” and [Is 40:6](#) reads “All men are like grass ...” In the Sermon on the Mount the disciples are enjoined, “let your light shine before men” ([Mt 5:16](#); see also [5:13](#); [6:1, 2, 5, 14, 15, 16, 18](#); [10:32, 33](#)).

Literalism also persists in such titles as “Daughter of Tarshish” ([Is 23:10](#)), “Virgin Daughter of Sidon” ([Is 23:12](#)), “Daughter of the Babylonians” ([Is 47:1](#)). The literal “horn” continues to appear: “by your favor exalt our horn” ([Ps 89:17](#); see also [89:24, 112:9, 132:17, 148:14, Lk 1:69](#)). Since this translation got rid of “gird up your loins” (see [2 Kg 4.29](#), “Tuck your cloak into your belt”; see also [1 Kg 18.46](#)), why couldn’t they eliminate the horns?

Some passages are painfully literal: [Rom 3:18](#) (quoting [Ps 36:1](#)) reads, “There is no fear of God before their eyes”; [Eph 1:18](#) has “the riches of his glorious inheritance in the



saints". In [Rom 3:25](#) "God presented him as a sacrifice of atonement, through faith in his blood," the structure of the English sentence requires that "faith" modify God. [Lk 9:55-56](#) reads: "But Jesus turned and rebuked them, and they went to another village." In English this can only mean that "they" are the same ones referred to by "them", that is, James and John; the meaning that comes from the English text is that Jesus rebuked James and John and so the two went to another village. [Ps 147:10](#) is needlessly literal:

His pleasure is not in the strength of the horse,  
nor his delight in the legs of a man.

The chiasmus in Mt 7.6 is disregarded. Sometimes there is a restructuring of the text, such as at the ending of Jonah: "But Nineveh has more than a hundred and twenty thousand people who cannot tell their right hand from their left, and many cattle as well. Should I not be concerned about that great city?"

The translators stated that in matters of style their purpose was that the English should be "clear and natural ... idiomatic but not idiosyncratic, contemporary but not dated." The archaic "thou," "thee" and "thine" have been discarded, along with archaic forms of the verbs. Conscious of the differences between American and British English, a British edition has been prepared which "reflects the comparatively few differences of significant idiom and of spelling" (Preface, p. viii).

To sum up one's impression after spending some time with this translation, the New International Version is a product of careful and conscientious scholarship. While still too closely tied in form to the underlying Hebrew and Greek structures, it is nonetheless a significant [p. 196](#) achievement, and its appearance is an occasion for rejoicing.

The irony of the situation is worth pondering: had this translation appeared in 1952 it would have been bitterly denounced as a perversion, a devil's masterpiece produced by people with a low view of Scripture.

I, for one, hope this Bible is carefully read and studied by many people for many years to come.

---

**Dr. Bratcher is Translation Research Associate of the United Bible Society. He was the main translator of TEV (N.T.) and Charmani of the panel for TEV (O.T.). [p. 197](#)**

## **A Consideration of the New International Version of the New Testament**

by a Special Committee commissioned by the Council  
of the Fellowship of Independent Evangelical  
Churches (UK)

*Reprinted from Foundations (November 1978) with permission*

The New International Version (NIV) was published in the USA in 1973. It is the first translation into English in the 20th century compiled by a team of scholars who are “*all committed to the full authority and complete trustworthiness of the Scriptures, which they believe to be God’s word in written form*” (Preface).

It has been adopted by the Gideons for distribution in schools in the UK and is in increasing use by evangelicals. Our concern has been to consider whether the translation itself lives up to what its users should expect from translators holding an evangelical view of Scripture.

The task is, to say the least, extensive. If there are about 8,500 verses in the Greek NT and an average of 30 words and textual or grammatical issues in each verse then the translators have been faced with a quarter of a million decisions to make. Although our Committee considered the whole of the NT, some parts were studied in more depth than others. Our conclusions are given here, each followed by further notes on the basis for our views.

## THE ORIGINAL TEXT

In our view no translation should be disregarded solely because it is based on an original text which departs from the Textus Receptus. The NIV text does so depart from the TR but does not slavishly follow any one alternative text.

*Notes* The Committee approached this intricate and controversial subject with some care, conscious that our brief summary may oversimplify the issue.

Among many ancient manuscripts available to translators of the NT there is one copy found by Tischendorf at Sinai known as “*Aleph*” and another in the Vatican known as “*B*”. The so-called “*traditional text*” (Textus Receptus—TR) is the form of Greek original underlying the AV of 1611.

The NIV has been strongly criticised for its failure to adopt the TR. The critics argue that TR represents most closely the original and that texts such as Aleph and B contain variants introduced deliberately to weaken the doctrines of the Trinity and the Deity of Christ. [p. 198](#)

Evangelicals have not universally subscribed to this argument. Donald Macleod’s article in the June, 1972 *Banner of Truth* quotes Warfield, Machen, Cunningham and Spurgeon in support of an “*eclectic*” text, that is, one compiled from all available sources. It is clear that no strictly Biblical argument can be advanced for the primacy of any text. Nor does Scripture give the Church the authority to confer upon any text the status given for instance to the Vulgate Latin by Roman Catholics.

The principal argument for the use of an eclectic text is that, since no one text is sacrosanct, the use of established textual criteria is indicated to obtain the most authentic text. The NIV proceeds on this basis. This means in practice that in some cases NIV uses Aleph B texts in preference to TR. In other cases it uses TR rather than Aleph B. That is, NIV does not systematically attack TR but adopts each reading on its merits. The Committee did not, however, agree with all the textual conclusions of NIV, notably in [Matthew 5:22](#); [Mark 1:2](#); [Luke 2:43](#) and [John 1:18](#). While respecting the concern felt by the advocates of the primacy of TR the Committee believe that to dismiss the NIV on the basis of its use of an eclectic text is unjustified.

## FOOTNOTES



The NIV footnotes are not always helpful. The textual evidence is treated inconsistently and in our view sometimes wrongly.

*Notes* It seems unnecessary to be told so often that “*Christ*” means “*Messiah*” or that “*evil spirits*” is literally “*unclean spirits*”; in the latter case it would seem better to translate as the footnote.

More important is the textual evidence. In Matthew and Mark together there are only 43 footnotes drawing attention to MSS variations whereas the RSV has 80. (Moreover the textual variants might justify even more.)

One particularly misleading footnote is on [Matthew 5:44](#) which says, “*Some late MSS add, ‘bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you’.*” But another clause, “*those who spitefully use you and*”, has as much MSS support as the two clauses mentioned; two of the MSS referred to cannot be classified as “*late*” and the “*some*” masks the fact that almost all Greek MSS include these words.

## ENGLISH STYLE

In general the accuracy of translation renders the original meaning in **P. 199** good, flowing modern English, giving special help with difficult passages.

*Notes* The narratives of the Gospels read well and there are many good and helpful renderings, e.g. [Matthew 1:19](#), “*did not want to expose her to public disgrace*”, and [Matthew 3:14](#), “*But John tried to deter him*”.

The doctrinal reasoning of the Epistle to the Romans comes through well, e.g. the first and second Adam in [5:12-21](#), the two natures in chapter [7](#) and the debate about practical issues in chapter [14](#).

Typology is handled in clear fashion, e.g. Melchisedec in [Heb. 7](#). Down-to-earth clarity brings us face to face with the essential issues for application to our present day in the faith and works debate in [James 2](#).

The Committee acknowledges that the NIV use of “*you*” for God would limit its usefulness among some at the present time but does not consider this factor justifies its rejection.

## LIBERTIES TAKEN

In narrative passages particularly, more liberty is taken with the original than we consider to be justified.

*Notes* The preface tells us the translators “*have striven for more than word-for-word translation*” and this has led to a greater freeness than seems warranted, e.g. [Mark 3:6](#) omits “*immediately*”, [Matthew 1:20](#) and elsewhere omits the dramatic effect of “*behold*”. [Matthew 21:33ff](#) the same word is translated “*farmers*” and then “*tenants*”. [Matthew 6:25](#) the word “*important*” is added. [Matthew 15:9](#) “*teaching as doctrines the precepts of men*” becomes “*their teachings are but rules made by man*”.

Many more examples could be given and of alterations of sentence structure. Singly they are often not vital but taken cumulatively they indicate a freer handling of the text than might have been expected.

Our review also produced examples of places where the translation of verb tenses can be faulted, e.g. [Acts 19:18](#) “*confessed*” (past for present), [Romans 4:2](#) “*had*” (past for present), [Romans 11:7](#) “*sought*” (past for present).

## CLOSER ACCURACY IN THE EPISTLES

In the Epistles and Revelation less liberty is taken and the closer rendering retains the necessary theological precision. **P. 200**

*Notes* NIV retains for the most part the accepted English theological terminology such as justification, atonement, reconciliation, wrath etc. An exception is “credited” for “imputed” in [Romans 4](#) but this seems reasonable. “Sinful nature”, is an improvement on “flesh” in [Romans 7](#) and [8](#). So is “slaves” for “servants” in [Romans 6](#). It is difficult to find any NIV rendering of the meaning of terms for which there is not some justification. Passages in the AV which can cause readers to lose the thread are rendered more clearly without loss of accuracy, e.g. [Romans 2:25–27](#); [5:12–19](#).

In the great majority of instances NIV is an improvement on AV in the matter of tenses, e.g. [Acts 2:47](#) “who were being saved” (pres. part), [Romans 6:4](#) “we were buried” (aorist), [Romans 5:12](#) “all sinned” (aorist), [Romans 9:17](#) “I raised you up” (aorist), [Romans 10:3](#) “they did not submit” (aorist), [1 Cor. 1:18](#) “are perishing, are being saved” (pres. part), [1 Cor. 2:6](#) “are coming to nothing” (pres. part), [Rev. 1:5](#) “him who loves us” (pres. part).

## DOCTRINAL PURITY

No major doctrinal issue is raised by any deviations we could discover from the original text used by the translators.

*Notes* In fact their choice of original text is not dictated by doctrinal considerations. See para. 1 above.

There are deviations from the Greek which the Committee would criticise as we have indicated. But we could find no renderings of root meanings or choice of tenses which seemed motivated by an heretical doctrinal position.

The absence of the term “propitiation” will disappoint some, but “atoning sacrifice” which replaces it retains the necessary objective reference lacking in other modern translations.

An overall study of the NIV NT would not bring the reader into heresy. Under the blessing of the Holy Spirit it could bring him to believe in Him who said, “If you hold to my teaching, you are really my disciples” [John 8:31](#). **p. 201**

# The Manger and the Inn: The Cultural Background of Luke 2:7

Kenneth E. Bailey

*Reprinted from Theological Review (November 1979) with permission*

*This significant article shows how the cultural and theological assumptions of the Church throughout the centuries have influenced the interpretation of the text of Scripture. It calls us to a more critical examination of our assumptions. We offer this article not because Dr.*