JOURNAL FOR BIBLICAL MANHOOD AND WOMANHOOD
is a biannual publication of the
Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
ISSN: 1544-5143

CBMW
Executive Director
Randy Stinson

JOURNAL STAFF
Editor
Peter R. Schemm, Jr.

Associate Editors
Christopher W. Cowan
David W. Jones

Contributing Editor
Rob Lister

Assistant Editor
Lance Johnson

Senior Consulting Editors
J. Ligon Duncan, III
Wayne Grudem
Rebecca Jones
Bruce A. Ware

Design
Bowin Tichenor

Contributors
R. Albert Mohler, Jr.
Russell D. Moore
Nancy Leigh DeMoss
Todd L. Miles

JBMW
Editorial Correspondence
journaleditor@cbmw.org
Subscription Correspondence
journal@cbmw.org

Orders and Subscriptions
Single issue price $10.00. Subscriptions available at $15.00 per year. Canadian Subscriptions $20.00 per year. International Subscriptions $25.00 per year. Ten or more copies to the same address, $12.00 per year.

Contact CBMW for institutional rates.

2825 Lexington Road · Box 926
Louisville, Kentucky 40280
502.897.4065 (voice)
502.897.4061 (fax)
office@cbmw.org (e-mail)
www.cbmw.org (web)

UK Address:
CBMW
9 Epsom Rd.
Leamington Spa, Warwickshire, CV32 7AR
Annual Subscription £10

The purpose of The Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood is to set forth the teachings of the Bible about the complementary differences between men and women, created equal in the image of God, because these teachings are essential for obedience to Scripture and for the health of the family and the Church.

CBMW is a member of the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability and the National Association of Evangelicals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JBMW Responds to the TNIV

Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 2-3

Editorial

Peter R. Schemm, Jr.
Editor, Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
Dean, Southeastern College at Wake Forest
Associate Professor of Christian Theology
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina

We offer this issue of *JBMW* in order to assist the reader in a charitable yet discerning critique of Today's New International Version (TNIV). It does not appear that evangelicals will soon come to an agreement on the use of gendered language in Bible translations. Yet, as this debate continues, we hope to make substantive contributions that honor God's Word, as well as those with whom we disagree. We are aware that other translations also deserve interaction. However, since the TNIV is a revision of the widely read NIV, we believe it demands a concentrated response.

Two mistakes ought to be avoided in this debate. First, it is not our intent to judge the motives of those on the Committee on Bible Translation (CBT). We do not pretend to know the hearts of the translators. They have stated clearly that they want to produce an accurate and faithful translation of the Scriptures.[1] In and of itself, this is a commendable goal. But asking hard questions about motives is still fair play.

Second, it is naïve to think that anyone comes to the task of translating the Bible with a completely unbiased and objective posture. Even for the most skillful translators, pre-understanding and presuppositions exist. Though the members of the CBT have clearly stated some of their presuppositions, it is appropriate to evaluate whether those presuppositions do, in fact, yield an "improved representation of the Word of God."[2] Thoughtful readers will still ask,

to what degree should "many diverse and complex cultural forces"[3] influence the use of the English language in translating God's Word?

We begin with Russell Moore's concern that individualism among evangelicals—as evidenced, in part, by the proliferation of Bibles marketed toward specific groups—overshadows the fact that the Bible belongs to the community, the church. Moore argues that only in a context where evangelicals look more to parachurch ministries and publishing houses than the church could the production of the TNIV emerge. The next article, by John Mark Reynolds, responds directly to statements made by Zondervan that explain their reasons for publishing the TNIV. These statements, Reynolds shows, are based on fallacious reasoning or faulty assumptions and should not, therefore, guide the translation of Scripture.

Wayne Grudem and Vern Poythress each contribute articles drawing from their years of evaluation of gender-neutral translations. Comparing several passages of the TNIV with the NIV, they show how revisions distort or obscure the message of the text. Justin Taylor also approaches translation methodology in the TNIV by evaluating certain key texts. Ironically, the changes introduced result at times in language contrary to the CBT's stated aim of accessibility by limiting readers' interpretive options.

Old Testament scholar Bob Cole offers a thorough examination of the TNIV's rendering of Psalm 1. Analyzing the history of interpretation and verbal and thematic ties between Psalms 1 and 2, Cole argues that the TNIV has allowed a generalizing interpretation of Psalm 1 to dictate their translation. In so doing, the TNIV hides from the English reader the connections of Psalm 1 with Psalm 2 present in the Hebrew text. This is particularly significant, argues Cole, because Psalms 1 and 2 abound with Messianic implications.

The next article in this issue examines a larger consequence of the TNIV's translation. Michael Travers and I offer an inter-disciplinary look at the ancient conversation on gender that permeates literature and Scripture. By veiling the gendered-language of the Scriptures for the English reader, the TNIV effectively mutes the authoritative word on gender in this centuries-long discussion.

Finally, Russell Fuller recognizes the need for modern translations of the Bible, and yet he argues that modern translators ought to follow certain proven principles that have blessed the church for centuries. Doing so will result in a translation that is accurate and faithful to the original languages, not one informed by contemporary ideologies or modern sensibilities.

We hope the work of these authors will contribute to a critical approach to the TNIV and the wider debate on gender-specific language in translation. More than that, we want to encourage greater reverence for the written Word of God. The efforts of the CBT to produce an accessible translation of the Scriptures are laudable. Yet the translation philosophy guiding their work unnecessarily distorts and obscures the message of the text in many places. The authors contributing to this issue, then, cannot endorse or commend the TNIV as a reliable translation. ■

---

[1] See "A Word to the Reader," in *The Holy Bible, Today's New International Version*, ix.
[2] Ibid, xi.
[3] Ibid.

Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 4-6

I Want My NIV: Gender Issues, Bible Translations, and the Rise of Evangelical Individualism

Russell D. Moore
Dean, School of Theology
Senior Vice President for Academic Administration
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky

A gender-neutral Bible translation would never have flown in my home church. Actually, no Bible translation would have made it long, except one.

I grew up in a KJV-only church. It is not that my congregation defended the King James Version as the only inspired text. Nor did we disparage other translations as deficient. In truth, we did not really know there were other translations. Everyone had always used the old King James, from the five-year olds memorizing verses for "Sword Drills" to senior adult ladies crocheting texts to hang in their living rooms.

There were, of course, many drawbacks to this one common text, drawbacks that explain the need for contemporary translations. But in moving beyond this era, we must admit that we have lost something. A pastor could say "and the glory of the Lord shone round about them" in virtually any context, and the congregation would know exactly to what he was referring. As teenagers, we read and meditated on the same texts our parents and grandparents and great-grandparents had worked through in the generations before.

That era is now long gone, and I do not really want it back. I do not usually preach from the King James Version (although I love it), largely because we now have translations that are more accurate, translating the original words of God into contemporary language that unbelievers and believers can understand. What I do want back, however, is the sense that the Bible forms the church, and, thus, that the Bible belongs to the community—not just to the individual.

My Own Personal Bible

This evangelical individualism explains much of what is going on in the current debates over "gender-neutral" Bible translations such as Today's New International Version (TNIV) and The New Living Translation (NLT). For too long, we have assumed that the Bible is primarily about individual Bible study and personal devotion. Thus, our publishers give us niche Bibles in every possible variety—Bibles for sportsmen, Bibles for

teens, Bibles for middle-aged women, even Bibles bound in leather, the color of one's favorite sports team.

It is perhaps not insignificant that many of the more "gender-accurate" Bible translations originated in attempts to produce a children's Bible version. For generations, evangelicals have sought to mediate the Scripture to children via "story Bibles" and even animated videos that convey the "important" nuggets of the Bible—often by robbing children of the narrative flow of Scripture itself. When this happens, the result is most often a Christian moralism tailored especially for children: "Jesus shared; you share."

This phenomenon is grounded in an even deeper contemporary evangelical commitment to the individual as the locus of God's saving purposes. Our understanding of the church so often seems simply like a place where individuals can learn how to be a better Christian, and where individuals can pool their money together for missions.

And so, supporters of the TNIV make the case that a "gender-accurate" translation is necessary so that little girls can see that the text is written to them—and not just to "men." It is tempting for those of us who are opponents of such translations to focus only on translation principles, or on the theological implications of tampering with the meaning of the texts. But, beyond this, we must ask a more basic question: Where is the church in this discussion?

Reclaiming the Bible for the Churches

As evangelical Protestants, we do not believe that the Bible is formed by the church, but that the church is formed by the Bible. That is, the church does not invest the Scriptures with their authority. Rather, the church recognizes and is "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (Eph 2:20 ESV). Nonetheless, the church is given the responsibility to be "the pillar and support of the truth" (1 Tim 3:15 NASB). Christ Jesus has given to his church pastors and teachers who are to guard the church from error and to protect the flock of God from dangerous wolves.

Contemporary evangelicalism, however, looks too often to parachurch ministries and publishers for this function, often corporations with accountability to donor boards rather than to churches. Thus, publishers flood churches with curricula—and the Bible translations to go with them—often then shaping the "personal Bible studies" of church members, with little or no accountability to the larger Body of Christ. The Christian individual then makes decisions about doctrine, and the words of the Bible itself, not on the basis of faithful teaching from the pulpit, but from the recommendation of a local bookseller. It is in this context, and only in this context, that the TNIV could emerge.

Thankfully, there is in some segments of evangelicalism a recovery of the church's role in teaching and preaching, including in the arena of Bible translation. When the TNIV was released, the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) and the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) immediately expressed concerns about the translation philosophy behind the new version. The SBC messengers, sent from churches all over the country, moreover, directed its LifeWay Christian Stores not to sell or recommend the TNIV.

This is a healthy development—and not only because it takes seriously the verbal plenary inspiration of the Scriptures and, thus, the importance of accurate Bible translation. It is healthy precisely because pastors and church leaders are talking

about Bible translation. What must come of this, however, is not just a general denunciation of "gender-neutral Bibles." Instead, we must get at why our people want gender-neutral Bibles—because we live in a gender-neutral society.

That means that churches must do more than simply warn against bad Bibles. We must instruct our people what the Bible is all about—what Jesus told us on the road to Emmaus: It is all about Christ (Luke 24:27). This is the reason, after all, that the apostle Paul speaks of the Roman, Galatian, and Ephesian believers—both male and female—as "sons" of God. They are "in Christ"—and find their identity in him. There is a reason why passages about the righteous "man" in the Psalms should not be translated in the plural—because there is no plural group of righteous ones, only one righteous Son of Man.

In order to drive our people back to the glorious truth of the Bible's focus, we must stop treating our Bibles and our biblical sermons as though the individual believer is the sum and substance of Scripture. We do this with endless "how-to" sermons and moralistic lectures from Scripture. Instead of pointing believers to their identity in Christ, we point them right back to their personally tailored Bible translations with a personally tailored message for them. In this context, a gender-neutral Bible is inevitable.

If, however, churches take seriously the task of instructing believers in the importance of all the words of Scripture—and applying its meaning to the whole body of believers—then perhaps our churches will be less susceptible to whatever fads blow in from Grand Rapids or Downers Grove. This might mean that the Christian seeking a Bible might go first to his pastor's study, and only then to the bookseller. And that would be a very good thing. ■

FALL 2005
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 7-9

A Response to "Why the TNIV Bible?"[1]

John Mark N. Reynolds
Director, Torrey Honors Institute
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Biola University, La Mirada, California

Here is the argument, such as it is, supplied by Zondervan for why we need a new translation[2] (Note: I have edited a book with Zondervan and think they are swell folk. Their comments are in italics). They say,

> *Perhaps the most important reason to produce a new translation is to reach today's generation of 18 to 34-year-olds, a generation that is leaving the church in record numbers. . . . Part of the reason for this mass exodus is that today's generation thinks differently than previous generation* [*sic*].

I dispute this as a generalization. What do we mean by a different way of thinking? There is not a different way of thinking. An equally possible hypothesis: There are students who are badly educated, post-literate, and unable to make good arguments. There is a tiny group of post-modern scholars in evangelical circles, pushing ideas passé in most of the Academy, who provide a wash of academic respectibility for this disaster because it suits their desire to change the propositions of theology. Of course it has nothing to do with translation any way. The Bible is what it is. It is not going to get more "story like" or less propositional to please today's young adults.

> *For example, they're more likely to relate to stories and personal experiences than to traditional expressions of propositional truth. For them, authentic religion is a* [*sic*] *much about* ***HOW*** *they live as* ***WHAT*** *they believe.*

Well, good. Both ideas are important. I seem to recall people saying this about my generation as well. Why not teach them the value of both?

> *While older forms of English may not present a problem for some readers, they can pres-*

ent barriers to understanding and fully engaging the Bible for today's generation because they've grown up using more contemporary English.

When was this not true? Why suddenly does this common occurrence of language change demand a new translation? Every generation of young people has their own jargon and identity. Yet in American history, when the Bible was most respected and read, there was actually a giant gulf between the language of the Bible and that of the youth. This was true of every generation in the USA up to recent times. No one demanded their Bible speak as they did in order to go to church. No one demanded a Bible in West Virginia dialect. No one demanded a Bible written in Flapper-speak.

In addition, the TNIV translators were mindful of what they were working on: Today's New International Version. It is intended for English-speaking readers no matter where they live. English usage keeps changing—between 1993 and 2003, Merriam-Webster made 100,000 changes and added more than 10,000 words and phrases to its collegiate dictionary. Thirty years have passed since the NIV was released.

This is a bizarrely irrelevant factoid. The question is—Have the relevant words of standard English changed much? How many of these "new words" are in areas unrelated to anything appearing in the Bible (e.g., blog, wok)? Fundamentally, is this not about one major change: gender use? Would not the rest of the changes amount to a small modification of the old translation?

A 2004 Harris Interactive Poll showed that 59% of 18-34 year-olds (churched or unchurched) said the Bible was relevant to their lives, yet more than half (53%) said they never read the Bible or read it less than once a year. Clearly there is a need to reach this audience.

Key question: How many of these kids read *any* book, let alone a book as hard as the Bible? Is there any evidence here, at all, that translation gets in the way of their reading the Bible? Does anyone who finds the NIV too hard or too dated really want to read the Bible, *really?* (Though, like learning a second language, everyone says they do.) These questions are not answered.

There are 32 million "spiritually-intrigued" 18-34 year-olds open to Christianity. There are 8 million twenty-somethings on the verge of disengaging from the church. Barna Research Group found that 40% of churched children stop attending church as adults. 77% of 18-34 year-olds prefer the text of the TNIV; 72% of 18-34 year-olds find the TNIV text easier to understand.

I would love to see the controls on this study! I have heard that 72 percent of people prefer New Coke. In any case, would these people actually *read* the text when it is released? Is the translation any good or overly paraphrastic? I assume 100 percent of my students would find a comics version of the Republic easier to understand, and even preferable, to a

standard work, but I doubt they should go that way. The opinions of the market are simply not relevent, even if true. If the translation places too much "of our culture" between the reader and what is, after all, a very old book, then it is perhaps worse than useless to them.

> *According to JET Market Research, 85% of 18-34-year-olds surveyed said they would like a copy of the full TNIV when it is released in 2005.*

Who said "no?" I am not a fan of the translation, but I will buy a copy. What exactly does this question prove? ■

---

[1]The following commentary previously appeared on 22 Feb 2005 on the website of John Mark N. Reynolds. Online: http://www.johnmarkreynolds.com/2005/02/why-tniv-bible-is-important.html. Used by permission.

[2]"Why the TNIV Bible?" [cited 22 Feb 2005]. Online: http://www.tniv.info/why.php.

Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 10-18

Today's New International Version: A Brief Look at Its Methodology and Some Examples

Justin Taylor
Director of Theology
Executive Editor
Desiring God Ministries, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Introduction

Before examining a few translation choices of Today's New International Version (TNIV) and the methodology behind it, I think it would be wise to express *gratitude to God* for the Committee on Bible Translation (CBT) for the TNIV. They labored over God's word for ten years in order to produce this translation for the church. The brothers and sisters on the translation committee are some of the finest biblical scholars in the world, and they made an enormous investment of time, talent, and energy over the course of the past decade. We can be, and should be, grateful for their labors. Countless people will read this Bible. Through its words and by the Spirit, they may meet our great covenant Lord, being convicted, instructed, and edified. For that, we should thank God.

Along with that expression of gratitude comes *regret for debate*. Doubtless those who were involved with this translation project have been on the receiving end of a great deal of criticism. When one part of the body hurts, we all should hurt. And one part of the body should not rejoice in the hurt of another part! And yet there is something more important than our limbs: the truth of God and the health of the church. That is why debate will be with us till Christ returns. John Stott said it well: "The proper activity of professing Christians who disagree with one another is neither to ignore, nor to conceal, nor even to minimize their differences, but to debate them."[1] That does not mean, however, that we take any pleasure in the necessity of participating in such debates.

Our aim in this debate should be *the glorification of God in Christ, the love of our neighbors as ourselves, and the edification of the church.* I pray that the concerns enumerated below—and expressed more fulsomely and eloquently by others—would be used of God to strengthen, not undermine, the church and her commitment to God's holy word.

The TNIV Website

Despite a proliferation of journal articles, academic papers, *festschrift* essays, blogs, debates, and books, the fact remains that most people in our churches remain unfamiliar with the key lines of argumentation from both sides. One resource at their disposal is the TNIV website: http://tniv.info. What one discovers upon using this site is a mixture of clarification and inconsistency.

The Goals of the TNIV

Those who visit this site will be helped in understanding some of the rudiments of translation theory and what the TNIV in particular was trying to achieve. Like all Bible translators, they sought to balance the twin goals of accuracy and clarity, producing a version of the Bible that faithfully represents in English the meaning of the original text, and is at the same time clear and understandable for today's readers.[2]

This is an important point for laypeople to understand. The translators of the TNIV have the same *purpose* as translators of essentially literal translations. But they disagree on *methodology*, the way in which one seeks to achieve those ends.

Gender-Neutral or Gender Accurate?

The most controversial aspect of the TNIV has been its so-called "gender neutrality." But according to the TNIV website, they do not consider their translation "gender-neutral."

> The TNIV is not gender neutral; it is in fact "gender accurate." Gender neutrality suggests the removal of specific male or female attributes. The TNIV does not remove these attributes or "neuter" any passages of Scripture. The TNIV uses generic language ***only*** where the meaning of the text was intended to include both men and women. These changes reflect a more precise rendering of Greek and Hebrew words.[3]

Note that the italicized bold words are in the original. The claim is that *every* instance of generic language in the TNIV reflects the authorial intention of the biblical authors to include both men and women. In responding to another question, they write,

> All gender-related changes in the TNIV are made to update masculine terminology that has generic intent and is often misunderstood by today's generations. **References originally intended to be masculine remain masculine in the TNIV.**[4]

Again note the universalizing word "all." The claim is that every instance of generic language in their translation is warranted by an underlying generic meaning or application in the original text. No male-specific references have been changed. But can such reasoning really be sustained consistently? I suggest that it cannot.

1 Cor 15:21 as a Test Case

For example, consider the TNIV's translation of 1 Cor 15:21, in comparison to the NIV.

> NIV: For since death came through a *man*, the resurrection of the dead comes also through a *man*.
> TNIV: For since death came through a *human being*, the resurrection of the dead comes also through a *human being*.

In this verse the TNIV renders *anthropos* as "human being," an obviously generic term. Based upon the criteria cited above for "gender accurate" translation—namely, that "the TNIV uses generic language ***only*** where the meaning of the text was intended to include both men and women"—one would have to conclude that the TNIV translators believe the use of *anthropos* in 1 Cor 15:21 was "intended to include both men and women"—despite the fact, as the TNIV acknowledges, that Paul is saying that death came through Adam (a man) and resurrection through Christ (a man).

Furthermore, based on their principle that "[r]eferences originally intended to be masculine remain masculine in the TNIV," one must conclude that the TNIV translators do not think that *anthropos* in 1 Cor 15:21 was "originally intended to be masculine"—despite the fact that Paul is causally tracing death and resurrection to two individual men, not two women.

This would be such a strange conclusion that it seems even the TNIV itself rejects it. In the TNIV website's "Most-Requested Passage Explanations" section, they address their critics. Their explanation, in full, is as follows:

> A "change in meaning" occurs in this verse, our critics claim. The Greek *anthropos* can mean either "man" or "person"; but, since it refers here to Christ, it should be translated "man."

• An initial response is to question the nomenclature "change in meaning." The phrase has apparently been chosen for its rhetorical effect, since it often does not apply to the situations in which it is quoted. Consider the present text. If *anthropos* can **mean** either "man" or "person," than [*sic*] the TNIV decision to choose here "person" can hardly be called a "change in meaning." Our critics may want to quarrel with the translation decision we have made, but calling that decision here a "change in meaning" is both inaccurate and unfair.

• But what about the decision? Why "person," when Christ is demonstrably male? The issue here, of course, is whether Paul intends to highlight the fact that Christ was a **male** human being or that he was simply as [*sic*] a human being. The NLT, another gender accurate translation, chooses the former here; and the TNIV uses just this language in speaking about Adam and Christ in vv. 47-49 (see also Rom. 5:12, 19). And some might argue that the representative significance of Adam and Christ hinges on their being men. But this does not seem to be the point that Paul wants to stress. As the one who inaugurated the

> eschatological resurrection from the dead, Christ is the "firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep" (v. 20). That is, his resurrection includes within it, in principle, the resurrection of all who belong to him, men or women. It is his identification with human beings, not the fact of his being a male human being, that is the focus here.[5]

Let us examine this response one step at a time. First, they suggest that the charge of "change in meaning" is merely rhetorical and not substantive. Their argument is as follows: (1) *Anthropos* can mean either "man" or "person." (2) The TNIV decided to translate *anthropos* in this verse as "person." (3) Therefore, this translation choice cannot be called a "change in meaning." But this is not good reasoning, as can be shown by a thought experiment. Imagine that we found a translation that commanded us to "walk not according to the flesh but according to the wind" (Rom 8:4). One could easily reason: (1) *Pneuma* can mean either "spirit" or "wind." (2) This translation decided to translate *pneuma* in this verse as "wind." (3) Therefore, this translation choice cannot be called a "change in meaning."[6]

The second stage of their response is to deal with the actual translation decision. Why, after all, did the TNIV feel compelled to translate *anthropos* as "person" when clearly Christ, who is male, is the obvious referent? They answer: "The issue here, of course, is whether Paul intends to highlight the fact that Christ was a **male** human being or that he was simply as [*sic*] a human being. . . . It is his identification with human beings, not the fact of his being a male human being, that is the focus here." Now I do not know a single person who thinks that the maleness of Adam and Christ is the main point of this passage. The question is, what is so problematic with identifying two men as, well, men?

The TNIV response again shows poor reasoning. It is a *non sequitur*; that is, the conclusion does not follow from the premises. The presupposition seems to be that if maleness is not the focus or the highlight, that one need not translate a word that points to males.

Consider the following passages from John (all from the TNIV):

- John 1:6—There was a man sent from God whose name was John.
- John 3:1—Now there was a Pharisee, a man named Nicodemus who was a member of the Jewish ruling council.
- John 4:29—"Come, see a man who told me everything I ever did. Could this be the Messiah?"
- John 7:51—"Does our law condemn a man without first hearing him to find out what he has been doing?"
- John 9:1—As he went along, he saw a man blind from birth.

One can easily imagine the TNIV translating all of these references of *anthropos* as "person," and then patiently explaining that (of course) the apostle John was not intending to *highlight* these characters' maleness, and that is not the focus of these verses.

But there is an even more serious inconsistency at play in the TNIV explanation. Careful readers will note that this explanation—namely, that

male-specific terms need not be used if the referent's maleness is not in focus or highlighted—is quite different than their overarching principle that states, "The TNIV uses generic language ***only*** where the meaning of the text was intended to include both men and women." Instead, it now becomes something like, "The TNIV uses generic language only where the meaning of the text was intended to include both men and women, *or when a male-specific reference is not really the main point or focus of the text."*

It is difficult for me to see how this principle is consistently applied even in the same context as 1 Cor 15:21. As they point out in their explanation, they repeatedly translate *anthropos* as "man" in 1 Cor 15:47–49:

> The first man was of the dust of the earth; the second man is of heaven. As was the earthly man, so are those who are of the earth; and as is the heavenly man, so also are those who are of heaven. And just as we have borne the image of the earthly man, so shall we bear the image of the heavenly man.

By translating the reference to Christ as "man" in vv. 47–49, are they intending to imply that Paul wants to highlight in this passage the masculinity of Adam and Christ?

This is but one illustration of the way in which the TNIV translates terms with grammatical gender. I conclude that in at least this instance, their translation is unwarranted and their explanations are confusing and inconsistent.

When the *Lord's People* Go Marching In

The TNIV translation of generic language has certainly been its most controversial feature. But I believe it is important to see that this is but one part of a larger methodological problem—namely, the separation of form and meaning in the interest of understandability. When the translators encounter a translated term that they feel will be misunderstood by "today's generation of readers," form becomes virtually inconsequential as long as the referent of the term is preserved.

To illustrate this phenomenon, consider a word unrelated to grammatical or biological gender: *hagios*. Historically, this term has usually been translated "saints." But the TNIV finds this translation problematic. As they explain on their site, "The TNIV translators were concerned to reflect the original sense of the term and avoid confusion with the process of canonization within religious tradition."[7] Donald Madvig, one of the TNIV translators, expands on this explanation: "Most people understand the term 'saint' to refer to people of exceptional holiness."[8]

While understandable, I do not find such an explanation compelling. I am glad they chose, at times, to translate *hagios* as "holy people."[9] But if the translators think it is mistaken to understand *hagios* as a reference to people of exceptional holiness, I am not sure that "holy people" is going to help matters. In fact, it would often exacerbate the problem. For example, consider what would happen if we translated *hagios* with "holy people" in Rom 12:13: "Contribute to the needs of *the holy people* and seek to show hospitality."

So, more often than not, the TNIV chooses to translate *hagios* simply as "people," "God's people," or "the Lord's

people."[10] Of course *hagios* ultimately *refers* to the people of God. But so do translated terms like "temple," "sheep," "bride," "household," and "body" (all of which, incidentally, can be easily misunderstood). If God wanted to convey the sense of "God's people," it would be easy to do so in Greek.[11] But he did not, and our translations should not give the impression that he did.

The irony is that in bypassing "form" in favor of "meaning,"[12] the translators have obscured for English-only readers the very meaning of the term as it was to be understood in its original context. Except in the few places where "holy people" was chosen as the translation, English readers of the TNIV can no longer see the rich connection to positional sanctification. In other words, the translators have deprived English-only readers of a designation that God intended for the readers of his word to know.

Jews and Jewish Leaders

Another example where this occurs in the TNIV is found when they render the word "Jews" as "Jewish leaders."[13] I would argue that it is not the job of the translator to clear away all possible misconceptions; it is the job of the translator to translate faithfully the original words of Scripture into clear, readable English. There was a clear and simple way for the biblical authors to write "Jewish leaders" (*Ioudaios prōtous*)—see Acts 28:17. But in many other passages, God inspired the authors to use the term "Jews" (*Ioudaios*) without being more specific. But the TNIV changes all of these references to "Jewish leaders" instead.

Could it be that in some of these cases, the biblical authors, though immediately referring to the leaders and not referring to every Jew without exception, chose to use the more general term in order to convey a corporate sense of responsibility upon Israel? One need not answer in the affirmative in order to grant that it is a legitimate question for Bible readers to ask. But the TNIV, in effect, decides that issue for you, cutting off the question before it is even raised.

On the Prevention of Misunderstanding

The prevention of misunderstanding is a laudable goal. But do we ever stop to ask, "What if the terms *in the original language* were misunderstood in the original context?" For example, it seems highly likely that *hagios*, from the root for "holy," must have suggested to many that those in the church were claiming a label of exceptional holiness. It also seems likely that *Ioudaios* was thought to refer to every Jew. Assuming the validity of the supposition, is it not troubling to think that (1) God knew that these terms could be misunderstood, (2) he could have easily inspired other words that would accurately identify the true referents, yet (3) he chose not to?

Interpretation vs. Translation

There is an irony in that the translators' methodology might end up creating the opposite of what they intend. While it is an admirable goal to make the Bible more accessible to today's generation, the reality is that the range of interpretive options shrinks when the translators supply them for us. In other words, ambiguity often creates greater accessibility! I would argue that standard translations for study, preaching, and memorization should make the options more transparent, rather than attempting to clarify ambiguity through an overly interpretive translation.

The response to my perspective is usually that *all* translation is interpretation. There is a sense in which that is true, and there is a sense in which that reasoning is fallacious. Leland Ryken draws a helpful distinction here:

> [T]here is a crucial difference between linguistic interpretation (decisions regarding what English words best express Hebrew or Greek words) and *thematic interpretation of the meaning* of a text. Failure to distinguish between these two types of interpretation has led to both confusion and license in translation.[14]

In my view, dynamic-equivalent translations like the TNIV make unnecessary interpretative decisions on behalf of the reader. The intent is greater clarity and less confusion. The result is that the reader has less options to choose from; and, therefore, must rely upon the experts to provide him with the correct reading.

Here are some examples—none related to gender—where the TNIV's choice of translation limits the range of interpretations and, in fact, unnecessarily interprets the meaning for the reader:

ESV	TNIV	Reference
the Spirit	the spirit of leadership	Num 27:18
obedience of faith	faith and obedience	Rom 1:5; 16:28
works of the law	observing the law	Rom 3:20, 27; Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10, etc.
who hopes for what he sees?	who hopes for what they already have?	Rom 8:24
we are being killed all day long	we face death all day long	Rom 8:36
desiring to show his wrath	although choosing to show his wrath	Rom 9:22
law of works	law that requires works	Rom 3:27
the law of marriage	the law that binds her to him	Rom 7:12
did they stumble in order that they might fall?	did they stumble so as to fall beyond recovery?	Rom 11:11
owe no one anything	let no debt remain outstanding	Rom 13:8
love bears all things	[love] always protects	1 Cor 13:7
husband of one wife	faithful to his wife	1 Tim 3:2, 12; Titus 1:6
dead works	acts that lead to death	Heb 6:1
the law of liberty	the law that gives freedom	Jas 2:12
he was foreknown	he was chosen	1 Pet 1:20

All of these examples, I would suggest, are overly interpretive. Some of the interpretations I agree with; others I disagree with. But the point remains the same: The translator has unnecessarily done the job of the reader and the teacher.

Conclusion

I close this paper by attempting to cut off three possible misconceptions. First, despite the impression one may have from the above, I do not disagree with every translation decision that the TNIV has made! There are numerous places where the TNIV is an improvement over the NIV, and we can be grateful for those improvements.

Second, when criticisms are examined in isolation, one can ask if the issues are really that significant. But we must remember that we are not dealing here with an ordinary document. We are dealing with the translation of God's very word. Every word was inspired by him. The New Testament authors often built arguments based upon a single word or a single grammatical form found in the Hebrew Old Testament.[15] Jesus, quoting Deut 8:3, said, "Man lives . . . by every word that comes from the mouth of God" (Matt 4:4). "*Every word of God proves true*" (Prov 3:5). No translation is infallible. But when there are systemic changes made to a translation of God's word, and those changes obscure or distort God's intended meaning for his people, that is a matter worthy of our concern.

Third, some readers may get the impression that I see absolutely no value for dynamic-equivalent translations. I strongly believe that the church should be united around an "essentially literal translation." And yet at the same time I believe that other versions may be used as a supplement to regular Bible reading. In some cases, the translators' choice will prevent the reader from asking the right questions or making the correct connections. But in other cases, using such translations may suggest another faithful way of interpreting the text.

What is a mistake, I would argue, is to make a dynamic-equivalent translation like the TNIV a primary translation for studying, memorizing, teaching, and preaching. ■

---

[1] John R. W. Stott, *Christ the Controversialist* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1970), 22.

[2] Kenneth Barker, a member of the CBT, expresses these goals as the desire to be (1) "as faithful to the original text as possible" and (2) "equally faithful to the target or receptor language" (See Kenneth Barker, "The Balanced Translation Philosophy of the TNIV," n.p. [cited 21 Sep 2005]. Online: http://www.tniv.info/light/balanced.php).

[3] Responding to the question, "Is the TNIV gender neutral?" in "Common TNIV Bible Questions and Answers," n.p. [cited 21 Sep 2005]. Online: http://www.tniv.info/qanda.php#GENDER_N (emphasis in original).

[4] Responding to the question, "How does the TNIV differ from the NIV" in "Common TNIV Bible Questions and Answers," n.p. [cited 21 Sep 2005]. Online: http://www.tniv.info/qanda.php (emphasis in original).

[5] "Passages Commonly Asked About," n.p. [cited 21 Sep 2005]. Online: http://www.tniv.info/bible/sample_resultsingle.php?rowid=50.

[6] One might object that the analogy is unfair. While "man" is a subset of "person," "wind" and "spirit" are two different things entirely. But this misses the point. The point is that just because one has used a *possible* meaning does not mean that it is the *correct* meaning. And if it is an *incorrect* meaning, or against previous translations that had the *correct* meaning, then it is a *change* of meaning.

[7] "Clarity in Contemporary English," n.p. [cited 21 Sep 2005]. Online: http://www.tniv.info/story/clarity.php.

[8] Donald H. Madvig, "A CBT Member's Response to the 'Statement of Concern about the TNIV,'" 4. Cited 21 Sep 2005. Online: http://www.tniv.info/pdf/DonaldMadvig.pdf.

[9] See Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1; Eph 1:1; Phil 1:1; Col 1:4, 12, 26.

[10] See Acts 9:13, 32; 26:10; Rom 8:27; 15:25–26, 31; 16:2; 1 Cor 6:1, 2; 14:33; 16:15; 2 Cor 8:4; 9:1; 13:13; Eph 1:15, 18; 3:18; 6:18; Phil 4:21, 22; 1 Tim 5:10; Philem 1:5, 7; Jude 3; Rev 5:8; 8:3, 4; 11:18; 14:12; 16:6; 17:6; 18:20, 24; 19:8.

[11] See, e.g., Heb 4:9; 11:25.

[12] For more on this crucial theme, see C. John Collins's excellent essay, "Without Form, You Lose Meaning," included as an appendix in Leland Ryken, *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2002), 295–319.

[13] See John 1:19; 5:10, 16; 7:1, 11; 9:22; 18:14, 28, 36; 19:31, 38; 20:19; Acts 13:50; 21:11; 28:17, 19.

[14] Ryken, *The Word of God in English*, 85.

[15] See Matt 2:15; 4:10; 13:35; 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 4:8; 20:42, 43; John 8:17; 10:34; 19:37; Acts 23:5; Rom 4:3, 9, 23; 15:9–12; 1 Cor 6:16; Gal 3:8, 10,13; Heb 1:7; 2:12; 3:13; 4:7; 12:26; Gal 3:16—as cited by Roger Nicole, "New Testament Use of the Old Testament," in *Revelation and the Bible*, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958), 138.

FALL 2005
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 19-27

Changing God's Word[1]

Wayne Grudem
Research Professor of Bible and Theology
Phoenix Seminary, Scottsdale, Arizona

Eight years ago I compared fifteen Bible passages in the New International Version (NIV) and the NIV-Inclusive Language Edition (NIVI), which had already been published in England.[2] Zondervan and the International Bible Society were quietly making plans to publish a similar gender-neutral NIVI in the United States, but when the Christian public saw the actual changes that had been made to the NIVI in the interests of "inclusive language," many decided they could not trust such a translation.

Now in 2005 Zondervan and the IBS have published another revision of the NIV called Today's New International Version (TNIV). Has it corrected the gender-neutral translation policies that were found in the NIVI? Yes, in one of the fifteen passages (Prov 29:13). But in the other fourteen passages it is disappointing to see that nothing has changed (in eleven passages) or that partial corrections were made that did not really solve the problem (in three passages). In spite of a handful of helpful changes, the gender-neutral translation philosophy of the 2005 TNIV is essentially the same as that of the NIVI that caused the controversy of 1997 in the first place. It is the same committee giving us essentially the same Bible.

Genesis 1:26–27

Current NIV: Then God said, "Let us make man in our image. . . ." So God created man in his own image . . . male and female he created them.

TNIV (2005): Then God said, "Let us make human beings in our image. . . ." So God created human beings in his own image . . . male and female he created them [identical to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: The change from singular "man" to plural "human beings" obscures the unity of the race as "man" (indicated by the singular Hebrew noun '*adam*). The word "man" in English can mean either "a male human being" or "the human race," and thus it is the best translation for Hebrew '*adam*, which can also refer either to man in distinc-

tion from woman (Gen 2:22, 25) or to the human race as a whole (as here). The TNIV thus fails to convey as much of the meaning of '*adam* as it could in English today. Why is the male-oriented aspect of the meaning of the Hebrew word removed?

Genesis 5:2

Current NIV: He created them male and female. . . . And when they were created, he called them "man."

TNIV (2005): He created them male and female. . . . And when they were created, he called them "human beings" [identical to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: God's activity of naming is important in the Bible. Here the TNIV has renamed the human race, refusing to use the male-oriented name "man." But in the previous four chapters this same singular Hebrew word '*adam* has been used eight times to refer to man in distinction from woman (as in "The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame," Gen 2:25), and also five times as the proper name "Adam." So Hebrew readers would hear clear male nuances when God named the human race '*adam* in Gen 5:2, and "man" is the best English translation. The TNIV incorrectly removes the male-oriented aspect of the name God gave the human race.

TNIV supporters say the change was necessary because the English language has changed. But people today still understand that "man" can mean the human race, as in the *Wall Street Journal* headline about the recent tsunami, "Man, Nature, and Disaster."[3]

Psalm 1:1

Current NIV: Blessed is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked or stand in the way of sinners or sit in the seat of mockers.

NIVI (1996): Blessed are those who do not walk in the counsel of the wicked or stand in the way of sinners or sit in the seat of mockers.

TNIV (2005): Blessed are those who do not walk in step with the wicked or stand in the way that sinners take or sit in the company of mockers [identical in gender language to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: Here the word "man" means "a male human being," and it is the correct translation of the singular Hebrew word '*ish*, which (except in special idioms) means "man" in distinction from woman, and surely is singular, not plural. The Hebrew text holds up an individual righteous man as an example that all Israel should imitate. The next verse says more about this man: "His delight is in the law of the Lord, and on his law he meditates day and night" (v. 2). But the TNIV changes "the man" to "those," removing the concrete example of an individual man. It changes the Bible's singulars to plurals in hundreds of such cases (as it does here), in each case removing one of the primary teaching methods of the Bible: holding up an individual man as an example for all believers to imitate.

The result is (1) an incorrect translation of the singular noun *'ish*, (2) a loss of the picture of the moral courage of a solitary righteous man standing against plural sinners, (3) a shift away from the Bible's emphasis on the relationship between God and individual persons to a greater emphasis on groups, (4) a loss of any possibility of seeing this "blessed man" in the Psalms as a foreshadowing of Christ, the truly righteous Man, and (5) a loss of historical accuracy, because the original writer of Psalm 1 did not speak of "those" but of "a man."

The change to plural also produces

a comical picture in verse 3: "He is like a tree planted by streams of water, which yields its fruit in season" (NIV) becomes "they are like a tree…" (TNIV). All God's people around the world are like one tree? Another amusing example is a whole group of sluggards now reaching into one dish: "Sluggards bury their hands in the dish and are too lazy to bring them back to their mouths" (Prov 26:15).

Psalm 8:4

Current NIV: What is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you care for him?

TNIV (2005): What are mere mortals that you are mindful of them, human beings that you care for them? [identical to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: The singular "man" meaning "the human race" is changed to plural "mere mortals," wrongly removing the sense of unity of the human race (the Hebrew is singular). The Hebrew singular *ben* which means "son" and the singular '*adam* which means "man" are incorrectly translated with the plural "human beings," removing masculine meaning, and thus removing the title "son of man," which Jesus often used of Himself (The TNIV also incorrectly removes "son of man" when this verse is quoted in Heb 2:6.).

Psalm 34:20

Current NIV: He protects all his bones, not one of them will be broken.

TNIV (2005): He protects all their bones, not one of them will be broken [identical to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: The third-person masculine singular "his" rightly represents the third-person masculine singular pronoun suffix in Hebrew, and the TNIV incorrectly pluralizes this to "their bones." This obscures the fulfillment of this verse in Christ's crucifixion in John 19:36. This part of Psalm 34 speaks of God's protection of an individual righteous man: God protects "his bones." Why does the TNIV refuse to translate hundreds of third-person masculine singular pronouns in the original languages as third-person masculine singular pronouns in English? What is the objection to male-oriented language when it accurately reflects the original Hebrew or Greek text?

Proverbs 5:21

Current NIV: For a man's ways are in full view of the Lord.

TNIV (2005): For your ways are in full view of the Lord [identical to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: The Hebrew male-specific noun '*ish* means "a man," as the NIV correctly translated it. The TNIV incorrectly changes this to "your," and thus restricts the statement to the "you," which in this context is the son being warned by his father in the previous verse. The text no longer affirms God's observation of the ways of every person (represented by the concrete example of "a man").

These last two verses (Ps 34:20; Prov 5:21) also demonstrate another serious result of systematically changing singulars to plurals in hundreds of cases: The TNIV will ultimately lead to a loss of confidence in tens of thousands of plural pronouns in the Bible. A preacher cannot rightly use the TNIV to make a point based on the plurals "they/them/their/those" or the second-person pronouns "you/your/yours" because he can no longer have confidence that those represent accurately the meaning of the original. Maybe the original was plural ("their"), but then again maybe "their" is a gender-neutral substitute for a singular

("his"). Maybe the original was second person ("you"), but then again maybe "you" is a gender-neutral substitute for a third-person singular pronoun ("he") or a singular noun ("a man"). How can any ordinary English reader know? He cannot. So no weight can be put on those pronouns. "He" in the NIV has become "we" or "you" or "they" in the TNIV hundreds and perhaps even thousands of times.

How many pronouns are thrown into doubt? The forms of "we/us/our/ourselves" occur 4,636 times, the forms of "you/your/yours/yourselves" 21,205 times, and the forms of "they/them/their/themselves/those" 19,372 times, for a total of 45,213 pronouns. How can we know which of these 45,213 are trustworthy, and which are the TNIV's gender-neutral substitutes for the correct translation "he/him/his"? The only way is to check the Hebrew and Greek text in each case, and who is going to do that? Can you really study, or memorize, or teach or preach from such a Bible where you cannot trust this many pronouns?

Another measure of the extent of the changes comes from seeing that the TNIV has 1,826 more instances of second-person pronouns such as "you/your/yours/yourself" than were in the NIV. Did 1,826 new examples of second-person verbs and pronouns suddenly appear in the original Hebrew and Greek texts? No, most of these are gender-neutral substitutes for the objectionable words "he/him/his," which were translated correctly in the NIV. And the TNIV has 2,321 more examples of forms of "they/them/their/those/themselves" than the NIV. Did 2,321 new examples of third-person plural verbs and pronouns suddenly appear in the original Hebrew and Greek texts? No, most of these again are gender-neutral substitutes for "he/him/his," which were translated correctly in the NIV. You cannot trust the pronouns in the TNIV. This is a deficiency so great as to render the TNIV unsuitable for widespread use in the church.

Proverbs 29:3

Current NIV: A man who loves wisdom brings joy to his father, but a companion of prostitutes squanders his wealth.

NIVI (1996): Those who love wisdom bring joy to their parents, but companions of prostitutes squander their wealth.

TNIV (2005): A man who loves wisdom brings joy to his father, but a companion of prostitutes squanders his wealth [a helpful correction, restoring the NIV wording].

Change in meaning: None. The TNIV returns to the original NIV in this verse.

Luke 17:3

Current NIV: If your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he repents, forgive him.

NIVI (1996): Rebuke a brother or sister who sins, and if they repent, forgive them.

TNIV (2005): If a brother or sister sins against you, rebuke them; and if they repent, forgive them [changed but no improvement over the NIVI; the words "against you" are added but they are not there in the Greek text].

Change in meaning: The words "or sister" are inserted into the Bible but Jesus did not say them, and they have no basis in the Greek text. (The Bible can say "brother or sister" when it wants to, as in James 2:15.) The words "against you" are inserted into the Bible, but they have no basis in the Greek text. The words "them"

and "they" hinder clear communication because they will be taken as plural by some people, as singular by others, and as bad grammar by many. A common reaction will be some uncertainty as to whether the original Greek was singular or plural. The TNIV is going through linguistic gymnastics simply to avoid the ostensibly offensive word "him," but "him" is the most accurate translation of the masculine singular Greek pronoun *autos*.

I agree, of course, that "If your brother sins against you" also applies to sisters who sin, just as the parable of the prodigal son also applies to prodigal daughters, and just as "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife" (Exod 20:17) also applies to not coveting your neighbor's husband! (And the TNIV did not change those passages.) But people have easily understood this for centuries: When the Bible uses an example of an individual man or woman to teach a general principle, the principle also applies to people of the opposite sex. We do not have to add the words "or sister" to understand this. We should not add to Jesus' words things that have no basis in the Greek text.

John 6:44

Current NIV: No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him, and I will raise him up at the last day.

TNIV (2005): No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws them, and I will raise them up at the last day [identical to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: There is a loss of clear emphasis on the Father drawing an individual person. "Them" seems to be plural here, referring to a group. It is an incorrect translation of the third-person singular Greek pronoun *autos* in both places.

John 11:25

Current NIV: Jesus said to her, "I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in me will live, even though he dies. . . ."

NIVI (1996): Jesus said to her, "I am the resurrection and the life. Those who believe in me will live, even though they die. . . ."

TNIV (2005): Jesus said to her, "I am the resurrection and the life. Anyone who believes in me will live, even though they die . . . ." [a partial correction changing plural "those" to singular "anyone," but still using the incorrect plural "they"]

Change in meaning: I agree with the change from "He who believes in me" to "Anyone who believes in me," because there is no masculine pronoun in the Greek text. ("Anyone who" is consistent with the Colorado Springs Guidelines for this kind of Greek construction, and it retains the singular meaning.)[4] But the TNIV still adds an element of confusion because of the plural expression "they die" (with the plural verb "die") instead of the more accurate NIV rendering, "he dies" (correctly rendering the third-person singular Greek verb).

John 14:23

Current NIV: If anyone loves me, he will obey my teaching. My Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him.

NIVI (1996): Those who love me will obey my teaching. My Father will love them, and we will come to them and make our home with them.

TNIV (2005): Anyone who loves me will obey my teaching. My Father will love them, and we will come to them and make our home with them. [a partial correction, changing plural "those" to singular "anyone," but keeping "them" instead of "him"]

Change in meaning: Again the change back to the NIV's "anyone" is helpful. But the "If" that Jesus said (Greek *ean*) is omitted, and three masculine singular pronouns (Greek *autos*) are incorrectly translated with "them," removing the amazing emphasis on the Father and Son dwelling with an individual person. In the TNIV, maybe "them" refers to the whole group of those who obey. How can we know?

Acts 20:30

Current NIV: Even from your own number men will arise and distort the truth in order to draw away disciples after them.

TNIV (2005): Even from your own number some will arise and distort the truth in order to draw away disciples after them [identical to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: The TNIV removes the word "men" used to refer to the elders of the church at Ephesus. The Greek word is not *anthropos*, which can mean "man" or "person," but *aner*, which means "man" in distinction from woman. The Greek expression for "from your own number" is emphatic, referring specifically to the elders and not to the Ephesian church. Why not call elders "men"?

1 Corinthians 14:28

Current NIV: If there is no interpreter, the speaker should keep quiet in the church and speak to himself and God.

NIVI (1996): If there is no interpreter, the speakers should keep quiet in the church and speak to themselves and God.

TNIV (2005): If there is no interpreter, the speaker should keep quiet in the church; let them speak to themselves and to God [singular "speaker" is rightly restored but the incorrect plural "themselves" is retained].

Change in meaning: In attempting to avoid "himself" (which was the NIV's correct translation of the masculine singular pronoun *heautō*), the TNIV inserts "them" followed by "themselves," which many readers will take as plurals. The verse will easily be misunderstood to encourage groups of tongue-speakers to go off together and speak in tongues "to themselves." But that is not what Paul wrote.

James 1:12

Current NIV: Blessed is the man who perseveres under trial, because when he has stood the test, he will receive the crown of life. . . .

TNIV (2005): Blessed are those who persevere under trial, because when they have stood the test, they will receive the crown of life . . . [identical to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: TNIV removes the example of a single "blessed man" who perseveres under trial and changes it to a group: "those" and "they." The focus on God's blessing on an individual believer is removed. The TNIV pictures a group under trial and suggests that reward waits until "they" all have stood the test. "Those" is an incorrect translation of the singular Greek word *aner*, which means "man," not "person," and certainly not "those."

Revelation 3:20

Current NIV: I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in and eat with him, and he with me.

TNIV (2005): I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in and eat with them, and they with me [identical

to NIVI (1996)].

Change in meaning: The idea of Christ coming into an individual person's life is lost; Christ no longer eats with "him" but with "them." Many readers will understand "them" to refer to the plural group "those whom I love" in the previous verse, so the TNIV now pictures Christ coming into a church and eating among a group of people.

Additional Verses

In addition to these fifteen verses, the TNIV has other types of unacceptable translations, which I can mention briefly:

Changing "son" to "child" and "father" to "parent" when the original meant "son" and "father"

NIV Prov 13:1: A wise son heeds his father's instruction, but a mocker does not listen to rebuke.

TNIV Prov 13:1: A wise child heeds a parent's instruction, but a mocker does not respond to rebukes.

Removing "brother" when the original meant "brother" (singular)

NIV Matt 7:3: "Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye. . . ?"

TNIV Matt 7:3: "Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in someone else's eye. . . ?"

De-emphasizing the manhood of Christ

NIV 1 Cor 15:21: For since death came through a man, the resurrection of the dead comes also through a man.

TNIV 1 Cor 15:21: For since death came through a human being, the resurrection of the dead comes also through a human being.

Comment: Here the Greek word is *anthropos*, which can mean either "man" or "person," depending on context. But in this context it refers to Adam and Christ and the meaning "man" is appropriate. What is the objection to calling them "men"?

NIV Heb 2:17 For this reason he had to be made like his brothers in every way, in order that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in service to God, and that he might make atonement for the sins of the people.

TNIV Heb 2:17: For this reason he had to be made like his brothers and sisters in every way, in order that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in service to God, and that he might make atonement for the sins of the people.

Comment: Did Jesus have to become like his sisters "in every way" in order to become a "high priest in service to God"? All the Old Testament priests were men, and surely the high priest was only a man. This text does not quite proclaim an androgynous Jesus, but it surely leaves open a wide door for misunderstanding, and almost invites misunderstanding. Meditate on that phrase "in every way" and see if you can trust the TNIV.

Removing whole phrases from the Bible

NIV Matt 7:4: How can you say to your brother, 'Let me take the speck out of your eye,' when all the time there is a plank in your own eye?

TNIV Matt 7:4: How can you say _____, 'Let me take the speck out of your eye,' when all the time there is a plank in your own eye?

NIV Matt 15:5: . . . if a man says to his father or mother, 'Whatever help you might otherwise have received from me is a gift devoted to God,'

TNIV Matt 15:5: . . . if anyone declares _____ that what ____ might have been used _____ to help their father or mother is 'devoted to God,'

Expanding the penalty for adding to the words of Scripture

NIV Rev 22:18: I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds anything to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book.

TNIV Rev 22:18: I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this scroll: If any one of you adds anything to them, God will add to you the plagues described in this scroll.

Comment: The first "you" added by the TNIV is plural, referring to the whole group of hearers. Therefore, the second "you" is also plural, and if anyone in the group adds to the words of prophecy the penalty is now expanded to the whole group.

Objections by TNIV defenders

The defenders of the TNIV respond, saying that all translations make these kinds of translation decisions. No, they do not. They do not systematically remove hundreds of male-specific terms when there is a male-oriented term in the original, nor do they change hundreds of singular verses to plural just to avoid using the word "he."

Defenders of the TNIV fail to mention that in the major "essentially literal" translations (such as the ESV, NASB, HCSB, and NKJV) translating singulars as plurals is rare, done only in unusual cases like collective nouns that have a singular form in Greek but require a plural for the same plural sense in English, or neuter plural subjects that take a singular verb because of a particular feature of Greek grammar that does not match what English does. In addition, there are some difficult Old Testament poetic verses where the Hebrew pronouns shift frequently in ways difficult for anyone to understand. But these are unusual exceptions.

To say that "the TNIV is just doing what all translations do" is not coming clean with the Christian public regarding the extent of the changes. It is like saying that a student who misspelled one hundred words in a term paper "is just doing what the teacher does" because she misspelled one difficult word in class five months ago. It is not the same.

Another question is, "Why are you only attacking the TNIV?" First, Vern Poythress and I systematically critiqued several gender-neutral translations in our book, *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy*.[5] Second, the NIV is the most widely used translation in the English language, so its policies have great influence. Third, other translations that use much gender-neutral language (such as The Message or the New Living Translation) have been "dynamic equivalent" translations that are read more as commentaries and interpretations of what the Bible says rather than as "word for word" or "essentially literal" translations. But the NIV is different, because many people use it as their main Bible for study, teaching, preaching, and memorizing, and they depend on it much more for accuracy in the very words. I believe the TNIV is not sufficiently trustworthy to be used for these purposes.

The most frequent reason given for the TNIV is that updates in language are needed to reach younger readers today, especially those 18–34 years old. But the words that are systematically removed are not archaic words. What reader 18–34 cannot understand the words "father,"

"son," "brother," "man," and "he/him/his"? Yet these male-oriented words have been removed many hundreds of times where they correctly represented the original Hebrew or Greek in the current NIV. The best term to describe this Bible is not "gender-accurate" but "gender-neutral."

I agree with removing male-oriented words when there is no male-oriented meaning in the original Greek or Hebrew text. But when there is a male meaning, we dare not under-translate and conceal that meaning just because that emphasis is unpopular today.

If we believe that "all Scripture is God-breathed" (2 Tim 3:16), and that "every word of God is flawless" (Prov 30:5), then we must believe that every word of Scripture as originally written is the very word God intended to be written. To put it another way, our doctrine of the "verbal inspiration" of Scripture is that the very words of Scripture—not just the general ideas—are "God-breathed" and are therefore the very words of God. Jesus and the New Testament authors sometimes base arguments on a single word of Old Testament Scripture (see Matt 4:10; John 10:34; Gal 3:10, 16; Heb 3:13; 4:7) and sometimes a single letter of a word (see Matt 22:44). Anyone who does expository preaching knows how often good preaching makes use of the sense of individual words. These words are not ours to tamper with as we wish; they are the words of God.

If the TNIV should gain wide acceptance, the precedent will be established for other Bible translations to mute unpopular nuances and details of meaning for the sake of "political correctness." The loss of many other doctrines unpopular in the culture will soon follow. And at every case Bible readers will never know if what they are reading is really the Word of God or the translators' ideas of something that would be a little less offensive than what God actually said.

In many hundreds of places, then, the new words in the TNIV do not accurately reflect the meaning of the words God originally caused to be written, and thus they are not the words of God. They are human words that men have substituted for the words of God, and they have no place in the Bible. "You shall not add to the word that I command you, nor take from it" (Deut 4:2). ■

---

[1] This article originally appeared in *World,* 26 Feb 2005. Used by permission from *World* magazine, Asheville, NC, www.worldmag.com.

[2] Wayne Grudem, "Comparing the Two NIVs," *World*, 19 Apr 1997.

[3] *The Wall Street Journal*, 28 Dec 2004, sec. A10.

[4] "The Colorado Springs Guidelines for Translation of Gender-Related Language in Scripture" may be viewed at www.cbmw.org/resources/nivi/guidelines.php.

[5] Vern S. Poythress and Wayne A. Grudem, *The TNIV and the Gender Neutral Bible Controversy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2004).

Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 28-34

Small Changes in Meaning Can Matter: The Unacceptability of the TNIV

Vern S. Poythress
Professor of New Testament Interpretation
Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

On February 2, 2005, I received from Zondervan a free copy of the new TNIV, which includes the TNIV Old Testament. (The TNIV New Testament appeared in February, 2002.) A friendly cover letter asks me to reconsider my earlier criticisms of the TNIV. It alludes to the fact that in 2002 I signed a public statement along with more than 100 other evangelical leaders, judging that "we cannot endorse the TNIV as sufficiently trustworthy to commend to the church." I am certainly willing to reconsider, and I am grateful for the invitation to do so. However, when I examine the new TNIV, I find that little has changed. Consider the following.

Genesis 1:27

NIV:[1] So God created *man* in his own image,

TNIV: So God created *human beings* in his own image,

Change in meaning: The change to a plural obscures the unity of the human race.

Psalm 34:20

NIV: He protects all *his* bones, not one of them will be broken.

TNIV: He protects all *their* bones, not one of them will be broken.

Change in meaning: The change to plural obscures the fulfillment of this verse in the crucifixion of Christ, as indicated in John 19:36: "These things happened so that the scripture would be fulfilled, 'Not one of *his* bones will be broken'" (NIV).[2]

Proverbs 13:1

NIV: A wise son heeds his *father's* instruction,

TNIV: A wise child heeds a *parent's* instruction,

Change in meaning: A male meaning component in the underlying Hebrew words has been removed by changing "son" to "child" and "father" to "parent."[3]

In his article in this issue of *JBMW*, Wayne Grudem shows that the TNIV changes meanings again and again as it

tries to eliminate male-oriented words like "father," "son," "brother," "man," and "he/him/his." Grudem's article considers not only the verses above, but many others.[4] Many of the changes in these verses are the same ones that were already made in an earlier (1996) gender-neutral rendering, the New International Version Inclusive Language Edition (NIVI), which sparked the first gender-neutral Bible controversy in 1997.[5]

The examples that Grudem provides are disturbing enough. But what is more disturbing is that these examples can be multiplied. An article in 2002 offered a list of no less than 901 examples of "Translation Inaccuracies in the TNIV" in the New Testament alone.[6] A few of these have been corrected in the 2005 edition, but most remain in place. Now the TNIV in 2005 has come out in an edition that includes the Old Testament as well, and the Old Testament translation has its share of problems with meaning.[7]

Consider the following examples of meaning changes that have crept in because the TNIV determined to eliminate generic "he."[8]

1 John 4:16

NIV: Whoever lives in love lives in God, and God in *him*.

TNIV: Whoever lives in love lives in God, and God in *them*.

Change in meaning: TNIV opens the door to a corporate interpretation, in which God dwells in the group, not in each individual.[9]

1 John 3:3

NIV: *Everyone* who has this hope in him purifies *himself*, ...

TNIV: *All* who have this hope in him purify *themselves*, ...

Change in meaning: TNIV allows a corporate interpretation, in which the group purifies itself, or in which each person purifies the others.

1 John 3:9

NIV: *No one* who is born of God will continue to sin, because God's seed remains in *him*; *he* cannot go on sinning, because *he* has been born of God.

TNIV: *Those* who are born of God will not continue to sin, because God's seed remains in *them*; *they* cannot go on sinning, because they have been born of God.

Change in meaning: TNIV has a principle that applies to the group corporately, but it is not as clear whether it applies to each individual. Perhaps the group as a whole has turned from sins, but a few individuals within it are exceptions. This is not as strong a statement as in the NIV.

Luke 9:26

NIV: If anyone is ashamed of me and my words, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him when he comes in his glory ...

TNIV: If anyone of you are[10] ashamed of me and my words, the Son of Man will be ashamed of you when he comes in his glory ...

Change in meaning: TNIV changes to the second person, "you," thereby seeming to restrict the principle to the immediate addressees, "you," the disciples to whom Jesus is talking. By contrast, the NIV, with the unrestricted word "anyone," makes it clear that the principle is completely universal.

1 John 4:20

NIV: If anyone says, "I love God," yet hates *his* brother, he is a liar. For *anyone* who does not love *his* brother, whom

he has seen, cannot love God, whom *he* has not seen.

TNIV: If *we say we* love God yet hate a brother or sister, *we* are liars. For if *we* do not love a fellow believer, whom *we* have seen, *we* cannot love God, whom *we* have not seen.

Change in meaning: Third person singulars—"anyone" and "he, his"—have been changed to first person plural, "we." In the process, the principle is no longer formulated in such universal terms, but only concerning the immediate group, "we." Moreover, in the second sentence, "brother" has become "fellow believer," omitting the family-like relationship in the meaning of "brother."

We could multiple these examples. Each particular case involves a fairly small change in meaning. In a hasty, superficial reading, one might think at first that the two renderings make the same basic point. But a closer look shows that there are small changes in meaning, and that some of these changes make a significant difference in interpretation.

Why make all these changes? The obvious answer is that generic "he" has been judged "politically incorrect."[11] The TNIV rewords the verses to eliminate it. Likewise, the TNIV regularly removes male meaning in cases that express a general truth using a male example, as when it changes "son" to "child" and "father" to "parent" in Prov 13:1.[12] This is gender-neutral translation.[13]

Some people have defended the TNIV's decision in these cases, and one can read book-length defenses if one wishes, as well as a book-length critique.[14] Many things go into the discussion. But the two principal defenses are (1) that the English language has changed and translations must adjust to the changes; and (2) that the changes are necessary to avoid misunderstanding or offense. Much can be said in reply.[15] Briefly, (1) the words "son," "father," and "brother" remain in the English language, with the same meanings that they always had. The word "man" (for the human race) and generic "he" (to refer to a case representative of a general truth) still occur in major secular media.[16] (2) The problem with using male-oriented meanings is not that they will actually be misunderstood—the occurrences in the secular press dispel that notion. Rather, it is that some people, having been trained by feminist propaganda, will perceive offense or evidence of insensitivity in such use. But that is no different in principle than perceiving offense in calling God "Father," or in the doctrine of hell or the doctrine of substitutionary atonement.[17] We are not free to remove a pattern of thought from the Bible just because it is offensive.

Changes like those illustrated above are a regular feature of the TNIV. So if one is using the TNIV as one's main Bible, without comparing it with another translation, one never knows exactly where the changes will show up, and what sort of alternations will take place. The problem is severe, not because of any one verse by itself, but because of the way in which many, many verses are affected. One cannot have confidence as to where one is reading the pure word of God, and where one is reading something that is close to being the word of God, but with some small alterations. That is disturbing for anyone who deeply values the word of God.

A Startling Change in Meaning

Consider a final example in Hebrews 2:6:

NIV: What is *man* that you are mindful of *him*, . . .

TNIV: What are *mere mortals* that you are mindful of *them*, . . .

Again, the main point sounds similar in the two renderings. But there are small differences. The original Greek here has the word *anthropos*, which means "human being," "man." TNIV has, instead, the expression "mere mortals." The idea of mortality is not in the original. It has just been imported from nowhere.[18]

Some people will not worry about TNIV's use of "mere mortals" here. "What is the difference?" they may say. "Mere mortals" refers to the same thing as did the earlier translation "man;" namely, it refers to the human race. Yes, the *reference* may be the same, or nearly the same.[19] But the *meaning* is not the same. Putting in the expression "mere mortals" confuses *meaning* with *reference.*

Consider a parallel example. The expressions "God," "Father," "Almighty," "Creator," and "Alpha and Omega" refer to the same God. The reference is the same. Is the meaning the same? If it is, then we can freely substitute "God" for "the Father" or for "God the Father," thus eliminating all the politically incorrect occurrences of the word "Father" with reference to God.[20]

In fact, the expressions referring to God all have different meanings. Sameness in reference is not enough for a translation to preserve *meaning*. Similarly, "man" and "mere mortals" have different meanings, because the latter expression has added the idea of mortality.[21]

The distinction between *reference* and *meaning* has been well known to semantic theory for decades.[22] Even before it was formally defined, it was intuitively used by translators throughout the ages. Despite this, the TNIV translates reference but not meaning. Once a translation becomes sloppy with meaning in this way, it permits meanings that do not belong. And then it opens the door to false inferences.

The TNIV text has introduced the word "mere," indicating that the person so designated is not more than mortal. But that is not valid. Notice that Heb 2:6–8 contains a quotation from Ps 8:4–6. (At this point we will quote from the English Standard Version [ESV], in order to show the sequence of thought better.)

> It has been testified somewhere, "What is man, that you are mindful of him, or the son of man, that you care for him? You made him for a little while lower than the angels; you have crowned him with glory and honor, putting everything in subjection under his feet" (Heb 2:6-8a).

Hebrews then goes on to draw out some implications:

> Now in putting everything in subjection to him, he left nothing outside his control. At present, we do not yet see everything in subjection to him. But we see him who for a little while was made lower than the angels, namely Jesus, crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death, so that by the grace of God he might taste death for everyone (Heb 2:8b-9).

The expression "crowned with glory and honor" in v. 9 applies to Jesus. It echoes the specific wording of the earlier quotation in v. 7. Hebrews is obviously applying the wording of the Psalm to Jesus. The Psalm finds its fulfillment

in him. Thus v. 6, along with the other verses quoted from the Psalm, applies to Christ.

But that creates a theological problem with the expression "mere mortals," which the TNIV has inserted back in v. 6. Verse 6, we have seen, applies to Christ. So was Christ a "mere mortal," as the TNIV wording suggests? With respect to his human nature, Jesus was indeed mortal, and suffered death. But he was not a "*mere* mortal." "*Mere* mortal" implies that he was not divine. *Whatever* else one says, one ought not to use this kind of language. And it is not there in the original Greek. The TNIV has pushed it in against the principles of sound lexicography and meaning representation. By doing so, it has (without realizing it) opened the door to an *attack on the deity of Christ*.

So is this difference in translation a small difference? Is it unimportant? No, not now. The difference does not look that big, at least at first. But in the end it *is* a big difference. It affects the deity of Christ! How can such a small difference have such a big effect? Because a difference in meaning affects what kind of inferences we draw from it. A fallible human translation cannot always anticipate this kind of effect. Hence, it is not only wiser to stick as close to the meaning of the original as one can; it is important. It can become exceedingly important when we start drawing inferences—which we must do if we are going to take the Bible seriously and apply it to our lives. We need a Bible that we can trust. Is the TNIV that Bible? I do not think so.

The failure of the TNIV in Heb 2:6 is all the more serious because there is a history behind it. In February, 2002, the TNIV New Testament was issued. That New Testament portion had, in Heb 2:6, exactly the same wording as it still has in its 2005 edition. Why was there no change in this verse in the new edition? In February, 2002, thirty-seven scholars signed a public statement critical of the TNIV New Testament, and later more than one hundred evangelical leaders signed a similar public statement.[23] In 2002 a leading critical article by Wayne Grudem, "A Brief Summary of Concerns About the TNIV," cited Heb 2:6, including the expression "mere mortals," as one of a half-dozen principal examples of the problems.[24] Yet in 2005 the TNIV has not changed the wording. An obvious inaccuracy in meaning, to which public attention was drawn, remains in place. Why? I do not know why. But a case like this magnifies the problems of trusting the TNIV.

Spiritual Dangers in Cultural Pressure

We do not know what was going on in the minds of the translators. But we do have the product, and the product regularly suppresses male meanings. It regularly gives up accuracy in meaning when required in order to avoid generic "he" and "man" (for the human race) and other patterns of thought that the politically correct elite has pronounced unacceptable.[25] At such points, the product is in effect bowing down to the canons of political correctness rather than to God, who speaks authoritatively in his word.

Our culture is also a culture of pragmatism. Whatever works justifies itself. So if a gender-neutral Bible works in getting some people to read the Bible, we no longer worry. I am saying that we should worry. Pragmatism has become a false god if it tells us to trim meanings off of the word of God.

The Larger Conflict

Larger issues are at stake. Mainstream prestige culture finds certain patterns of thought politically incorrect. It is at war with the word of God. And so the integrity of the word of God is at stake. The TNIV fails at crucial points to maintain that integrity. The rejection of the TNIV is important for the spiritual health of the people of God. I repeat the warning that Wayne Grudem and I issued at the end of our book in 2000:

> The issue is therefore tied in with the doctrine of Scripture and its authority. Do we follow the Bible alone, submitting to all its teachings and nuances? Or do we trim it in order to fit in more comfortably with modern thought patterns?[26] ■

---

[1] The New International Version, 1978, revised in 1984.

[2] For further discussion, see the article by Wayne Grudem ("Changing God's Words") in this issue of *JBMW*. Extensive discussion of the broader issues is found in Vern S. Poythress and Wayne A. Grudem, *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004), esp. 236–38 for Ps 34:20.

[3] See the fuller discussion in Vern S. Poythress, "TNIV's Altered Meanings: An Evaluation of the TNIV," n.p. [cited 21 Sep 2005]. Online: http://www.cbmw.org/article.php?id=108; and Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 217–20, 367–75.

[4] Gen 1:26; 5:2; Ps 1:1; 8:4; Prov 5:21; Matt 7:3, 4; 15:5; Luke 17:3; John 6:44; 11:25; 14:23; Acts 20:30; 1 Cor 14:28; 15:21; Heb 2:17; Jas 1:12; Rev 3:20; 22:18.

[5] See Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 121–48.

[6] "Translation Inaccuracies in the TNIV: A Categorized List of 901 Examples," *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 7, no. 2 (2002): 9–14; reprinted in Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 73–84.

[7] See, for example, Poythress, "TNIV's Altered Meanings."

[8] I discussed these at greater length in Vern S. Poythress, "Avoiding Generic 'He' in the TNIV," *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 7, no. 2 (2002): 21–30; reprinted in Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 85–100. In some cases the TNIV 2005 has made changes, but they have not eliminated the problems.

[9] It is claimed by some that the word "they" here has a singular reference, because of the preceding singular word "whoever." But the actual situation is more complicated. See Poythress, "Avoiding Generic 'He,'" 25–26; and Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 92–95.

[10] Since in English the subject "anyone" is grammatically singular, the verb should also be singular: "If anyone of you is ashamed . . ." But the TNIV has "are."

[11] See the extensive discussion of various aspects of generic "he" in Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 223–344; and Vern S. Poythress, "Gender and Generic Pronouns in English Bible Translation," in *Language and Life: Essays in Memory of Kenneth L. Pike*, ed. Mary Ruth Wise, Thomas N. Headland, Ruth M. Brend (Dallas, TX: SIL International and The University of Texas at Arlington, 2003), 371–80.

[12] See Vern S. Poythress, "Gender in Bible Translation: Exploring a Connection with Male Representatives," *Westminster Theological Journal* 60, no. 2 (1998): 225–53.

[13] Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 117–18.

[14] With some reservations, Carson and Strauss defend gender-neutral translations in D. A. Carson, *The Inclusive Language Debate: A Plea for Realism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998); and Mark L. Strauss, *Distorting Scripture? The Challenge of Bible Translation & Gender Accuracy* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998). Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, criticizes the policy of removing male meanings.

[15] Ibid., esp. 275–344.

[16] Note the following examples:

> "HOW MAN EVOLVED: Amazing new discoveries reveal the secrets of our past" (Time, front cover, Aug. 23, 1999).
>
> "Years ago, man thought everything revolved around the earth" (cartoon caption in USA Today, Jan. 18, 2000, A14).
>
> "Cold, snow good for man's soul" (by Jeremy Manier and Sue Ellen Christian, Chicago Tribune, January 10, 1999, 1).

For uses of generic "he," consider the following:

> "Nobody comes off a trans-Atlantic flight looking better than when he got on it" (*Chicago Tribune*, August 22, 1999, Sec. 8, p. 3).
>
> "Little is more incendiary than a member of Congress who feels he has been misled—unless it's a law enforcement agency that fans conspiracy theories through incompetence" (*USA Today*, Aug. 31, 1999, A14).

An extensive list of such uses could be compiled (see Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 351–54; 315–22. Lists were initially published in 2000 in Vern S. Poythress and Wayne A. Grudem, *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy: Muting the Masculinity of God's Words* [Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000], 239–42, 203–10).

Some of the defenders of the TNIV and other gender-neutral Bible translations assert or assume that these kinds of usage "must" be avoided. But they cannot give a satisfactory reason. People who know English (in distinction from people who may be still learning the language at an early stage) do not misunderstand. The one remaining reason is that such usages are labeled politically incorrect in elitist circles. See Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 223–357; and Paul Mankowski, "The Necessary Failure of Inclusive-Language Translations: A Linguistic Elucidation," *The Thomist* 62 (1998): 445–68.

[17] Poythress and Grudem, The TNIV, 278–87.

[18] On the meaning of the Greek word, see Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, with supplement 1968 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), under *anthropos*, esp. meaning 1; and Frederick William Danker, ed., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 81, under *anthropos*. The Danker lexicon has Heb 2:6 listed under meaning 1, "human being," together with those passages that refer to Christ (subsection 1d), because the subsequent verses leading to Heb 2:9 clearly apply the quotation to Christ.

For meaning 2 the Danker lexicon also has "a member of the human race, w.[ith] focus on limitations and weakness, *a human being*." It then notes that one such weakness is being "subject to death Hb 9:27; Rv 8:11; Ro 5:12." Conceivably someone might use this data as an excuse for importing the meaning "mortal" into Heb 2:6. But one should note several problems with such reasoning: (1) The lexicon indicates the sense of a Greek word using boldface and italics; but the wording concerning death is not in boldface or italics, indicating that it is part of the context in various verses, not the actual meaning of the word; (2) all three verses mentioned in the lexicon as being associated with death explicitly *mention* death; (3) nowhere in Heb 2:6 is there any hint about death (there is mention of Jesus' death in Heb 2:9, but that is later, after the reader has already digested 2:6); (4) there is no mention of death in Psalm 8, from which Hebrews quotes; and (5) specialists in meaning are well acquainted with the difference between the actual sense of a word and the large set of encyclopedic associations that may be called into play.

Someone might claim that the idea of mortality is appropriate because Heb 2:6 is a quotation from Ps 8:4 (8:5 in Hebrew numbering), which has the Hebrew word *'noš*, associated with weakness. But now notice how desperate the argument has become. The Hebrew verbal root *'nš* does mean "to be weak, sick." But (1) it is doubtful how far this carries over to the cognate noun, *'noš*, which means "man," "mankind." (2) "Weak" and "mortal" are two quite distinct meanings. (3) The quotation in Heb 2:6 is in Greek, not Hebrew; it is a fallacy to suppose that all the meaning associations of a Hebrew word carry over to whatever Greek word is used in a translation. The tenuousness of these connections indicates how flimsy is the case that can be produced for the translation "mere mortals." By similar sloppy reasoning one could justify almost any translation that has the loosest connection with the meaning of the original.

Finally, someone might point to an English dictionary that gives "a human being" as the definition of *mortal* when used as a noun (for example, *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*). But it takes only a moment's reflection to see that this is a case where the dictionary has provided the *reference* and left to the reader the obvious inference that the word "mortal" still retains its meaning associations with the idea of mortality. Similarly a dictionary may provide "God" as one definition of "Father" (*Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary,* meaning 1b under "father"). Such a definition supplies the reference but not the obvious meaning.

[19] As we shall see, the reference of "mere mortals" must logically leave out Jesus Christ, who with respect to his human nature was mortal, but is not merely mortal.

[20] On the slippery slope that might lead to eliminating "Father" as a designation for God, see Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 298–99.

[21] The inadequacy of the word "mortal" for translating common words for human beings is discussed in Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 362–63.

[22] See, for example, John Lyons, *Semantics* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 1:177–205.

[23] "Scholars Statement of Concern About the TNIV," *Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 7, no. 2 (2002): 91; and "Over 100 Christian Leaders Claim that the TNIV Bible is Not Trustworthy," *Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 7, no. 2 (2002): 92–95; see Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 101–9.

[24] Wayne A. Grudem, "A Brief Summary of Concerns About the TNIV," *Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 7, no. 2 (2002): 6–8; Heb 2:6 is mentioned on p. 7. The article is reprinted in Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 1–5. Grudem lists some further verses and problems, beyond the initial sample of six verses, but does not devote extended space to the later examples.

[25] It is worth reiterating that generic "he" and "man" (for the race) both occur regularly in the secular press (see note 16). One cannot rightly excuse the TNIV by saying that otherwise people would not understand. Rather, they would be offended. For a full discussion of these excuses, see Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 275–357.

[26] Poythress and Grudem, *Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy,* 298; reprinted in Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV*, 410.

FALL 2005
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 35-50

(Mis)Translating Psalm 1

Robert L. Cole
Assistant Professor of Old Testament and Semitic Languages
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina

The recent Today's New International Version (TNIV) translates the opening words of Psalm 1 as follows: "Blessed are those…," rendering the singular articular masculine noun הָאִישׁ (lit., "the man") as a genderless plural.[1] Since this particular noun is the subject and grammatical antecedent for the verbs and pronouns that follow through v. 3, the plural translation has been continued throughout. So the three masculine singular perfect verbs which follow in verse one (הָלַךְ…עָמַד…יָשָׁב) have been pluralized ("who do not walk…stand…sit"). The third masculine singular pronominal suffix and third masculine singular verb of verse two (…יהגה…חפצו…) are also made to conform to this pattern ("but who delight…and meditate…."[2]), as is the translation of the third masculine *singular* wəqatal of verse three (וְהָיָה) by "They are." The same is true for the translation of the third masculine singular imperfect יעשֶׂה of verse three. Such a translation is a change from the previous NIV which reads: "Blessed is the man who does not walk….But his delight…he meditates…. He is like a tree…."[3]

History of Interpretation

Final judgment on the plural generalizing translation of the TNIV must be based on the content and context of the psalm, but it is instructive as well to survey the history of interpretation. Translators since antiquity have consistently rendered this form (הָאִישׁ) by the masculine singular.[4] Nonetheless, there has been a long and deeply entrenched history of interpretation that understands it to refer not to any single and identifiable individual but rather to all people in general. For example, according to the fourth century Antiochene interpreter Diodorus the psalm is "instructing not any particular person but people in general."[5] Clifford, in a recent commentary, surveys patristic commentators and considers the "ethical view" of Psalm 1 to be the majority opinion of the time as opposed to the "christological interpretation."[6]

Since antiquity commentators have also seen in the man of Psalm 1 a specific individual. *Midrash Tehillim* cites various rabbinic opinions that identify him as David, Adam, Noah, Abraham, the tribe of Levi, or individual scholars who dedicated themselves completely to the law,[7] such as those rabbis whose names are attached to collections of Mishnah.[8] Ancient Christian commentators such as Justin Martyr,[9] Augustine,[10] and others[11] read the first psalm christologically. In the New Testament Ps 1:5 is apparently interpreted as eschatological judgment (Matt 13:49–50),[12] over which the Son of Man presides according to Matt 25:30–46.

For Calvin the message of Psalm 1 was "that they are blessed who apply their hearts to the pursuit of heavenly wisdom," presumably a generalizing view of it,[13] while Luther read it christologically.[14] Alexander regarded the psalm to "admit of an easy application to all times and places where the word of God is known."[15] For Delitzsch the first psalm represented a hymn, "adapted to form the *proœmium* of the Psalter from its ethical…character," implying of course a generalizing view.[16] Gunkel saw in Psalm 1 wisdom poetry of the type seen in neighboring ancient cultures.[17] His form–critical approach, practiced by many commentators up to the present era, has only solidified further the generalizing interpretation of האישׁ in the first psalm.

Further examples of modern commentaries exhibiting the generalizing view of Psalm 1 include Kirkpatrick, for whom it "expresses a general truth, and does not appear to refer to any particular person or occasion,"[18] and Craigie, who classified it among the "*wisdom psalms*," and so predictably applies the first three verses to the righteous in general.[19] For Hakham the first two verses contrast the deeds of the righteous (he uses the plural הצדיקים) and the wicked.[20] Alonso Schökel in the same vein labels it a wisdom psalm with, "universal purview, since it has to do with *'iš*, meaning anyone."[21] Wilson's recent commentary expresses similar sentiments concluding that the psalm is, "an exhortation—through positive and negative examples—to adopt the fruitful and satisfying life."[22] The TNIV translators have undoubtedly seized upon this widely held interpretation of Psalm 1 as a basis for their genderless and plural rendition of האישׁ, as has the NRSV.[23] The ESV renders in the traditional, "Blessed is the man…his…he…," but a footnote informs readers that the "singular Hebrew word for *man (ish)* is used here to portray a representative example of a godly person."[24]

In spite of a long entrenched history of the generalizing view, descriptions of unmitigated piety and success in Psalm 1 have led commentators to qualify their view. Kraus identifies the psalm as "didactic poetry," but that "everything stated in Psalm 1 about the צדיק basically entails a character that transcends any one individual…definitely bears the features of the super individual, the paradigmatic person."[25] For Weiser, the first psalm promises happiness "to the God-fearing people…gives clear guidance regarding the way in which they shall conduct their lives," but warns that the strong optimistic faith in this psalm can be "dangerous if it is distorted into a calculating belief in recompense…or if the idea of success becomes the sole motive of action."[26]

Leupold qualifies the language of verse three so that it "is meant absolutely only in so far as the devotion to the Word is absolute…generally speaking, it will be obvious in such a life that God is crowning the man's endeavors with suc-

cess."[27] Alexander notes that even the best of men fall short of what this psalm describes and so is not taken from real life.[28]

Briggs interprets the idealistic language from another perspective. Because he views the psalm as originating in a time of "intense scribal devotion to the Law," it is a description of the ideal man such a community would envisage; "not…all men, or all Jews…or all pious men…but…one devoting his whole time…to the study of the Law…such as Ezra."[29] Similarly, the recent *Jewish Study Bible* notes how this psalm uses "biblical imagery…to develop the picture of the ideal righteous individual."[30] Indeed that imagery is taken from portrayals of two individuals, Joseph and Joshua (Gen 39:3, 23; Josh 1:8). Joshua was promised success *conditionally* (Josh 1:7, 8), and was victorious in all military campaigns except Ai and with the Gibeonites (Josh 7, 9). There are, however, no exceptions nor conditions stated in the success attributed to the man of Psalm 1, undoubtedly a purposefully induced difference between the two texts.

The Relationship between Psalm 1 and Psalm 2

The most ancient interpretation of Psalm 1 is its context within the Psalter itself,[31] a perspective increasingly recognized in recent years. According to Braulik, the "principal trend in current research on the Psalm" is a reading of "any given individual psalm in the context of the entire book…[E]xegesis of the *Psalms* thus developed into exegesis of the *Psalter*."[32] However, such a reading of the Psalter is by no means innovative and was clearly practiced in antiquity. The Talmud cites arguments, first for the unity of Psalms 1 and 2, and then for reading Psalm 3 in light of Psalm 2.[33] Recognition of the close relationship between the first two psalms is present in the Church Fathers,[34] Jerome,[35] and some later Hebrew manuscripts.[36] The case of Acts 13:33, which in a small number of manuscripts reads, "in the first psalm" before quoting Psalm 2, is further evidence that in antiquity their close relationship was recognized.[37] The evidence for the original discreteness of each of Psalms 1 and 2 is convincing (as the abbreviated acrostic within Psalm 1 itself demonstrates), but numerous overt connections (see below) undoubtedly explain persistent ancient attempts at combination.

In more recent times lexical links between the two have been duly noted, but often without fully appreciating the resulting implications. Delitzsch lists parallels but can only conclude that "Perhaps Ps. ii. is only attached to Ps. i. on account of those coincidences…."[38] Alexander would go further stating that the two are "parts of one harmonious composition, or at least kindred and contemporaneous products of a single mind…contrast, which the first exhibits, of the righteous and the wicked, is reproduced, in the second, as a war against the Lord and his Anointed."[39] In spite of such statements he fails to uncover their ultimate implications for the understanding of both psalms.

Brownlee listed four vocabulary links between Psalms 1 and 2 as well as thematic parallels.[40] While he argues for the use of the two in a coronation ritual, he mentions the possibility of the two being joined as "a Messianic treatise."[41] Because Brownlee is taking seriously the implications of juxtaposition and verbal ties, he is driven logically to a correlation between the king of Psalm 2 and the just man of Psalm 1. So he states, "the just man recites Yahweh's Law and the king

recounts Yahweh's decree (1, 2; 2, 7)," and, "prosperity and success of the godly man of Ps 1 has its counterpart in the victory of the Lord's 'son' over the nations in Ps 2."[42]

Aufffret, in a more detailed study compares the sitting of the wicked in Psalm 1 with the sitting of Yahweh in Psalm 2, the murmuring of the nations in Psalm 2 and the murmuring of the righteous in Psalm 1, the impotence of the stubble in Psalm 1 and the impotent resistance of the wicked in Psalm 2, the righteous man who meditates on the law daily with the result that he gives his fruit in Psalm 1 and the giving of the nations to the son on a chosen day in Psalm 2, etc.[43] His conclusions are as follows:

> The relationship of the two psalms thus appears to be closer than simple recurrences of vocabulary or allusions to themes would permit one to imagine. The righteous and the anointed one experience very similar trials and opposition, but the covenant of God is promised to them, and therewith success and prosperity, as contrasted with their adversaries who, if they persist in their opposition, can only run headlong to destruction.[44]

Brennan has observed that Psalms were juxtaposed "in such a way that various key words and expressions in one pick up and develop a theme already enunciated in another…provid[ing] an inner coherence for an otherwise apparently disorganized collection."[45] After listing verbal parallels between Psalms 1 and 2 he considers that the first presents the just versus the wicked, with the former being "led by his anointed king, and whose happy lot is proclaimed in 1:1 and 2:12."[46] Although he fails to note the uniqueness of the individual in 1:1–3, he is driven logically to recognize the continued discussion in the second psalm of topics raised in the first.

Sheppard also takes seriously the pairing of the first two psalms, and concludes that the "psalms constructively interpret each other by means of several parallel features."[47] Those he lists include the following: the easy transition from the wicked at the end of Psalm 1 who are spelled out as the nations and their rulers beginning in Psalm 2; the contrast between meditation of the righteous in Psalm 1 and that of the nations and rulers in Psalm 2; the wise man's avoidance of session with scoffers in Psalm 1 as opposed to the heavenly session where the Lord has the world leaders in derision; and finally, the similar terminology of "way" and "perish" concluding both psalms.[48] Like Auffret and Brownlee, Sheppard also notes a "close relationship between Ps. 1 and Ps. 2," which means that the "nations and rulers in Ps. 2 are identified with those who walk in the way of the sinners…in Ps. 1," and, "David is represented in Ps. 2 both as the author of the Psalms and also as one who qualifies under the injunction of Ps. 1 to interpret the Torah…."[49] So the king of Psalm 2 identified as David, is also the man of Psalm 1.

Hakham, who takes note of the linkages generally between psalms across the book, considers the first two as being joined together into one unit.[50] He lists the more obvious verbal parallels between the two and suggests a similar opposition between the wicked and the righteous of Psalm 1, and the wicked nations opposite the Lord and his messiah of Psalm 2.[51]

Wilson's well-known work on the

editing of the Psalter analyzed the role of superscriptions and includes surveys and unifying summaries of the content of the five books.[52] In regards to Psalms 1 and 2 he follows Willis in rejecting any integrated reading, regarding the first psalm as the introduction. The latter "emphasizes individual meditation rather than communal recitation," while Psalm 2 introduces the idea of the Davidic covenant and functions with Psalm 41 to bind Book 1 "as an independent unit."[53] Nonetheless, as Barbiero has shown, Psalm 1 also functions in its vocabulary to bind Book 1 together.[54] Not only does a twofold occurrence of אשׁרי open and close Book 1 (1:1, 2:12 and 40:5, 41:2), but also the sequence חפצו ובתורתו in 1:2 resonates closely with חפצתי ותורתך in 40:9.[55] Furthermore, the prediction that many will see and "fear" of 40:4c (ויראו) indicates the warning of 2:11 (יהוה ביראה עבדו את) would eventually be heeded.

Wilson argues for the discrete nature of books in the Psalter based on similarities between beginning and end such as the royal Psalms 2, 41, 72 and 89,[56] or, "the interweaving of theme and verbal correspondences" within Psalms 90–106,[57] *inclusio* between 90 and 102, answers in 103 to 90,[58] and two Davidic groups of psalms at the beginning (108–110) and end (138–145) of Book 5.[59] In the case of Psalms 103–104 he argues that they are connected by the *inclusio* of ברכי נפשי את יהוה at either end.[60] However, this is the same evidence (*inclusio*, interweaving of themes and verbal correspondence, answers in subsequent psalms to previous) found in Psalms 1–2. In fact, the evidence for a discrete reading of the first two psalms is as abundant, if not more so, than that found in the larger book sections of the Psalter.

Wilson describes the correct procedure for study of the Psalter as follows:

> In my opinion, the only valid and cautious hypothesis with which to begin is that the present arrangement is the result of purposeful editorial activity, and that its purpose can be discerned by careful and exhaustive analysis of the linguistic and thematic relationships between individual psalms and groups of psalms.[61]

Indeed, when Psalms 1 and 2 are subjected to a careful and exhaustive analysis of linguistic and thematic relationships, the logic and sense of their editorial combination becomes apparent.

When form–critical categories are applied to the first two psalms the interpretive results are predictable, and inevitably at odds with the purposes of the Psalter's compilation and composition. While there are often concentrations of what form critics would characterize as identical *Gattungen*, there are sequences quite glaringly inconsistent with these categories. At its very outset the Psalter reveals a so-called wisdom or torah psalm (Psalm 1), royal psalm (Psalm 2), and individual lament (Psalm 3), respectively.[62] Only by setting aside form-critical categories can one begin to understand the logic of such a sequence on the part of the book's compiler, who was unconstrained by modern genre classifications.[63] Gunkel concluded that for the most part there was no logical principle to the canonical sequence and set about the task of re-ordering it.[64] In good form-critical tradition, Wilson protests that the "two pss are of very different 'types'"[65], i.e., "wisdom" or "torah," and "royal," but in the mind of the Psalter's shaper they were in fact quite suited to each other.

McCann expresses the need to take the final shape of the book of Psalms seriously and states regarding the first two psalms that they "are meant to be read together."[66] As a result he identifies the nations and rulers of Psalm 2 as the wicked of Psalm 1.[67] Nonetheless, because of his prior commitment to form criticism the first psalm is predictably categorized as "a beatitude, a form usually associated with wisdom literature"and so generalized as offering a choice to all.[68]

In a discussion of the Psalter's beginning, Miller recognized that the "connections between the two are undeniable…Psalms 1 and 2 were to be read together as an *entrée* into the Psalter… they stand closely together as a single, if complex, way into the psalms that follow."[69] He suggests a link between Psalms 1 and 2 furnished by Deut 17:18, in which the king is required to have a copy of the law to read all the days of his life.[70] Thus the man of Psalm 1 is the ideal king and ruler. However, Miller also contends without substantiation that he is a representative figure for anyone in opposition to the wicked.[71]

Continental scholars such as Hossfeld and Zenger consider Psalms 1 and 2 as a "Proömium" for the entire Psalter and see the revolt in Ps 2:1–3 as a paradigm for the activities of the wicked described in Ps 1:1, 6.[72] In a study focussed on Book I, Barbiero spells out in more detail, evidence for the structural unity of Psalms 1 and 2 and its implications.[73] He identifies the רשׁעים of Psalm 1 with the מלכים of Psalm 2, and then observes how both the single righteous one (Psalm 1) and the Messiah (Psalm 2) are confronted with a larger crowd.[74] He cites both Millard, who compares the two righteous individuals in Psalm 1 and 2 who resist God's enemies,[75] and Wénin who identifies the man of Psalm 1 with the messiah of Psalm 2.[76] Manatti likewise reads Psalms 1 and 2 as an integrated prelude to the Psalter, equating the rebellious ways of 1:6 and 2:12, and the success of the just one in Psalm 1 with the judgment of the king messiah in Psalm 2.[77]

Barbiero detects eschatology in terminology of the first two psalms themselves, such as "chaff"[78] (1:4, cf. Mal 3:19[79]), and "judgment" (משׁפט) of 1:5.[80] As for Psalm 2, he cites "wrath" (אף) in Ps 2:5, 12, and "then" (אז) of Ps 2:5 (cf. Mic 3:4; Zeph 3:9, 11), as indicators of final judgment.[81] This endtime perspective is also increasingly recognized for the entire book. Childs observed that "the final form of the Psalter is highly eschatological in nature."[82] Rendtorff observes the collection as a whole and notes the movement toward "praise of God in the *hallelu yah* psalms," and "the emphatic position of the royal psalms."[83] For him, "There can be no doubt that at this stage they were understood in messianic terms: the praise of God is not only directed to the past and the present, but also includes the messianic future."[84] Hossfeld and Zenger likewise detect an eschatological perspective in Psalm 2, and across the entire book.[85] Mays states regarding the Psalter and its beginning, "[B]y the time the Psalter was being completed, the psalms dealing with the kingship of the Lord were understood eschatologically.… Psalm 2, reread as a vision of the goal of history, puts the torah piety of Psalm 1 in an eschatological context."[86] Mitchell notes that Psalms 1 and 2 together "announce that the ensuing collection is a handbook for the eschatological wars of the Lord, describing the coming events and the Yhwh-allegiance required of those who would triumph."[87]

A most recent study by Grant addressing the issue of "royal psalms"

suggests that the Psalter's editor paired them with "torah psalms," in order to highlight the description of the ideal king in Deut 17:14–20.[88] Regarding Psalms 1 and 2 he notes that they "are linked by several significant lexical and thematic repetitions, which associate the figure of the king in Ps 2 with the torah–lover of Ps 1."[89] Later he states that "Ps 2 represents an eschatological hope for the restoration of Yahweh's king … he is to be an exemplar of the piety represented by Ps 1, as is indicated by the close lexical links between the two psalms."[90] Grant defends form-critical categories, but admits they were not the basis of the book's organization.[91]

Analysis of the Varied Links between Psalm 1 and Psalm 2

The foregoing review demonstrates current interest in the relationship of Psalms 1 and 2. Analysis of that relationship is in fact simply a serious reckoning with the final editor's understanding of these poems. The numerous mutually supporting lexical, phonological, and thematic ties point to a deliberate integration and cannot be ignored, nor explained as superficial aesthetic literary ties void of interpretive significance. A list of lexical parallels is offered here:

Psalm 1	Psalm 2
אשׁרי האישׁ – 1:1a[92]	אשׁרי כל חוֹסי בוֹ – 2:12d
ובמוֹשׁב…ישׁב – 1:1d	יוֹשׁב – 2:4a
יהגה – 1:2b	יהגוּ – 2:1b
יוֹמם – 1:2b	היוֹם – 2:7c
כ(עץ)…כ(מים) – 1:3a, 4b	כ(כלי) – 2:9b
על – 1:3b	על – 2:6[93]
יתן – 1:3c	ואתנה – 2:8a
בעתּוֹ – 1:3c	ועתּה – 2:10a
וכל – 1:3e	כל – 2:12d
במשׁפט – 1:5a	שׁפטי־ארץ – 2:10b
ובדרך…דרך…ודרך – 1:1c, 6a, 6b	דרך – 2:12b
ודרך…תּאבד – 1:6b	ותּאבדוּ דרך – 2:12b

While some of the foregoing may appear at first glance to be incidental, not attaining the level of purposeful editorial design, closer inspection can often reveal an underlying purpose. Such is the case for the common preposition על in 1:3 and 2:6, or the noun כל in 1:3 and 2:12. The latter does not appear initially to rise to the level of compositional intentionality. Nonetheless, closer inspection reveals a deliberate linking and contribution to the overall message:

וכל אשׁר – 1:3e
אשׁרי כל־ – 2:12d

While one instance of the sequence אשׁר in 1:3 is the common relating particle, being quite different from the interjection אשׁרי in 2:12d, both forms appear in 1:1a – אשׁרי (האישׁ) אשׁר. Undoubtedly אשׁר in 1:3e ("and all whatsoever [he does prospers]") refers back to 1:1 ("Oh the blessings of the man who…"), defining "blessings" as success in his every (כל) venture.[94] The effect produced by the appearance of identical forms in 2:12 is to assure participation in that success to all (כל) those who trust in him.[95] Both 1:1 and 2:12 are quite explicitly linked by אשׁרי, while כל appears in both 2:12 and 1:3, implying that the blessings of האישׁ in 1:1 are defined as *unrestricted* success in 1:3, and participation in those blessings are offered to those *without restriction* who trust in 2:12.

As for the preposition על, there are examples in 1:3, 5; 2:2 (twice), 6.[96] However, the two in-

stances in 1:3 and 2:6 are closely related, referring to the establishment of a subject *upon* or *over* a given location.[97] In the first case the governing verbal predicate (שתול) indicates the transplantation of a tree over waters, and in the second the establishment (נסכתי) of a king upon a mountain. In addition, the phonological environment provides further evidence of deliberate linking:

1:3 – על פלגי
2:6 – מלכי על

The consonantal sequences in the two nouns are: a bilabial stop (*mêm* and *peh*), the consonant *lāmed*, a palatal–velar stop (*gîmel* and *kap*), and a long i class vowel represented by *yōd* (*ṣērê yōd* and *ḥîreq yōd*). Here then are features phonological, semantic and lexical converging in the integration of the two psalms.

The preceding parallels imply the blessed man of Psalm 1 is a king, as in Psalm 2. Indeed, his devotion to the torah in v. 2 is comparable to that prescribed for the ideal king of Deut 17:18–20.[98] Royal ideology is thus present in both the first and second psalm, a fact not escaping the notice of the Psalter's final redactor responsible for their juxtaposition.

The presence of יומם in 1:2 and the familiar יום in 2:7 also appear insignificant.[99] Nonetheless, both forms are found in contexts that describe attention to YHWH's torah or decree (תורה – 1:2, and חק – 2:7) by the man in the first psalm and by the king in the second. The result in Psalm 1 of the man's daily (יומם) torah meditation is expressed metaphorically as a tree that gives (ויתן – 1:3) its fruit. In Psalm 2 the edict consists of God's promise to give (ואתנה – v. 8) his son the inheritance on a specific day (היום – v. 7). A further temporal reference in 2:10 (ועתה) introduces a warning to rulers, forming a lexical parallel to the season of fruit-bearing in 1:3 (בעתו). So matching terminology between 1:2–3 and 2:7–10 indicates the tree metaphor of the first psalm is explained in the second as the son of God receiving his worldwide inheritance.

The apparently subdued pastoral image of a tree in 1:3 does not appear on the surface to correspond with the violent and destructive judgment of 2:8–12. However, Ps 1:3 has already suggested the connection. The latter describes the unmitigated success of this man in language used also for Joshua (Josh 1:8), whose triumphs were devastatingly militant.

The use of אשרי at the beginning and end of Psalms 1 and 2 effectively envelopes the two into an interpretive unity.[100] However, the first is followed immediately by the masculine singular articular noun האישׁ and the second by the noun phrase כל חוסי ("all those trusting"). There is general agreement that this final clause of 2:12 is all-encompassing, but according to the TNIV translators the singular of 1:1 is also universal in scope. However, they ignore the fact that the common generalizing expression איש אשר כל was available if that was intended.[101] Furthermore, Esth 4:11 (איש ואשה אשר וכל) demonstrates that a genderless plural was also available to the writer if desired.

Immediately following in 1:1 is a threefold description of the blessed man's absence from the company of evildoers, followed by identification of his constant meditation in the torah (v. 2). Unanswered is his actual location and a more substantive explication of the wicked's counsel, sinning, and scoffing. Undoubtedly v. 2 provides information by way of contrast between meditation

on the Lord's torah (בתורת יהוה) and the counsel of the wicked (בעצת רשׁעים) in v. 1, highlighted by the direct opposites יהוה and רשׁעם, and repeated preposition plus construct feminine noun. Likewise, "the congregation of the righteous" (בעדת צדיקים) of v. 5 is the counterpart semantically and phonologically to "the counsel/council of the wicked" (צדיקים בעדת) in v. 1. However, further concrete details concerning the man's actual abode and the content of the wicked's meditation are supplied by Psalm 2.

Repetition of the verbal root "meditate"in Ps 2:1 (יהגו) after its appearance in 1:2 (יהגה) specifies the meditation of the wicked, now designated as nations and their rulers. They meditate "vanity" (ריק), defined as planned rebellion against the rule of the Lord and his anointed. Confirmation comes from the combination of אבד and דרך at the conclusion of both psalms. The final clause of Psalm 1 promises that "the way of the wicked will be destroyed" (דרך רשׁעים תּאבד), while Ps 2:12 identifies the fate of rebellious kings: "and you are destroyed in the way" (ותּאבדו דרך). So Psalm 2 reaffirms with identical terminology the destruction of the wicked promised in 1:6, answers the immediately following question of 2:1 (למה) directed at the apparent nonfulfilment of 1:6,[102] and identifies the wicked of the first as the rebels of the second.[103] Phonological correspondence reinforces this association. The articulation of Hebrew *'ayin* was apparently close phonetically to *gîmel*,[104] indicating the aural resonance of רשׁעים[105] (1:1b, 5a, 6b) and רגשׁו גוים (2:1a).

Additional correspondence between the wicked of Psalm 1 and nations of Psalm 2 is provided by the semantic resemblance between "counsel/council" (בעצת) in 1:1 and the rulers of 2:2 who "have taken counsel together" (נוסדו יחד).[106] Exact lexical parallels as follows provide additional evidence. The wicked in Ps 1:1 "stand" in a way (דרך) from which the blessed one abstains (לא עמד). Both 1:6 and 2:12 assure the destruction (אבד) of the same way (דרך) seen in 1:1. That way of destruction seen in 2:12 is one from which kings in 2:10 (מלכים) are warned to abstain, but which was defined as their stance against the Lord and his anointed in 2:2 (יתיצבו מלכי ארץ). So links connecting the way of the wicked (Ps 1:1, 6) with the rebellion of nations (2:1–2) is provided not only by distribution of אבד, דרך and מלכים, but also by the semantic proximity of עמד in 1:1 and יתיצבו in 2:2.[107]

A counterpart to the subject of session in Ps 1:1d is also provided by Psalm 2. It is not difficult to draw a connection between the conclave of conspiring rulers in 2:2b and seated scoffers in 1:1d, but Psalm 2 will go on to identify the as yet unknown session of Psalm 1's blessed one in v. 4. Just as Psalm 1 revealed the blessed one's object of meditation while that of the wicked was delayed until Psalm 2, so the session of the former is not known until the second psalm.

The twofold occurrence of the root ישׁב in 1:1d (ובמושׁב…ישׁב), has as its overt and deliberate lexical counterpart the masculine participle יושׁב of 2:4. Undoubtedly further information regarding session is provided at this point. Indeed, 1:1d begins with a locale (במושׁב) and 2:4 in response identifies another (בשׁמים) using the same preposition ב. Each prepositional phrase of place includes the identical consonants *bêt, šin, mêm,* so that phonological links combine with those lexical to heighten the association. This can be extended to the second clause of Ps 2:4 where the combination *lāmed*, laryngeal and *mêm* (ילעג למו), recalls the same in 1:1d (לצים לא). Included is the

obvious semantic similarity between scoffing (1:1d), and derisive laughter (2:4a, b).

The cumulative effect of these semantic, phonological, and lexical parallels is to inform the reader in Psalm 2 where in fact the blessed individual of Psalm 1 does sit. Although these links are straightforward, the implications are astounding. Can the man of Psalm 1 now be identified as seated in heaven? It would appear that colon B of 2:4 identifies that sitter as אדני, obviating any possibility of identification with האישׁ of Psalm 1. Nonetheless, the nexus formed between 1:1d and 2:4 on various levels cannot be simply ignored nor considered inconsequential.

Answers to this question can be found in the immediate context and language of Ps 2:4 and of the Psalter at large. First of all, the only two antecedents for the singular masculine participle יוֹשֵׁב within the psalm itself are יהוה and מְשִׁיחוֹ of v. 2, the latter being most proximate. Immediately previous to v. 4 the archaic third person plural pronominal suffix מוֹ– is found twice (v. 3) in the mouth of the recalcitrant rulers, uniting closely in reference both the Lord and his anointed. Both are simultaneous targets of the rebellion and both possess the defied governing constraints. Secondly, the divine epithet אדני of 2:4b[108] unexpectedly replaces יהוה used in v. 2. The poet has deliberately created this ambiguity, and the implication of shared authority between YHWH and the anointed king (מְשִׁיחוֹ) in 2:2 was undoubtedly preparatory to it. Thirdly, the chosen king is established on holy Mt. Zion (הר קדשׁי – v. 6), the location of the temple (cf. Ps 15:1a–b באהלי…בהר קדשׁ). In the following Ps 3:5 (מהר קדשׁוֹ) it is clearly identified as the place from which YHWH answers prayer, suggesting a heavenly locale. Further support is found in Ps 48:2–3, where the description of the holy mountain (הר קדשׁוֹ…הר ציון ירכתי צפון) is identical to the celestial realm of Isa 14:13–14 (בהר מועד בירכתי צפון).

Final proof that the blessed and anointed one is seated in the heavenly realm comes from the closely parallel text of Psalm 110. Psalms 2 and 110 are particularly similar in content and vocabulary,[109] not the least of which are found in the latter's opening words:

נאם יהוה לאדני שב לימיני – Ps 110:1
יוֹשֵׁב בשמים ישחק אדני… – Ps 2:4

The closely parallel vocabulary reveal that the same event of heavenly coronation is in view. Furthermore, the distinction between the divine names יהוה and אדני suggested by Ps 2:2–4, with the latter (אדני) including the human king is now confirmed and maintained in 110:1.[110] As just noted, holy Zion (110:2, 3 and 2:6), the place of this coronation, is clearly located in the heavenly realm of divine session and power (110:1). Psalm 2:2–3 indicated the participation of God's anointed one in divine power and authority, but now v. 4 (and later 110:2) declares he is also partaking of heavenly divine session. Furthermore, he is clearly identified as the blessed man of Psalm 1, however surprising that may appear.

Psalm 1 includes two contrasting similes representing the ultimate fate of the righteous man and the wicked.[111] Psalm 1's healthy, fruit-bearing tree, becomes in Psalm 2 the all-conquering king, heir to the nations. The chaff or wicked of Psalm 1 become the recalcitrant nations and rulers in Psalm 2 and an additional simile is composed to describe their fate. Instead of driven chaff they are characterized as pottery smashed by the king himself. While the common

preposition כ is present in both similes (1:4; 2:9), there exist further phonological parallels between the verbs of destruction and the immediately preceding forms:

כמץ אשר תדפנו – 1:4
ככלי יוצר תנפצם – 2:9

Three identical consonants are found in each verb and the preceding relating particle (1:4), or masculine singular participle (2:9), conclude with the sequence, sibilant, *rêš*. Such aural parallels simply provide further confirmation of the fact that characters in Psalm 1 are subject to further comment in Psalm 2.

The final clause of Ps 1:3 (יצליח וכל אשר יעשה) also resonates intertextually with the description of Joseph in Gen 39:3, 23.[112] Joseph is eventually elevated to the highest position and authority in the land under Pharoah, while the man of Psalm 1 is elevated in Psalm 2 to the eschatological heavenly throne on Zion over all kings and nations. Evidence from the larger canon is then consistent with that deduced from parallels between the two psalms.

The anointed king of Psalm 2 is established on God's holy Mt. Zion, a transparent reference to the sanctuary.[113] He is undoubtedly functioning as priest and king in Zion, which the closely parallel Psalm 110 makes explicit (vv. 2, 4). If Ps 2:6 makes reference to the (ultimate) temple, one might expect, in light of the foregoing evidence for Psalm 1 to do likewise. First of all, the imagery and language of a transplanted tree is found again in Ps 92:13–14 to describe the righteous one in the temple:

כתמר…כארז…שתולים בבית יהוה
– Ps 92:13–14

Note how the righteous one is "like" (כ), a palm tree or cedar "transplanted" (שתולים), in the house of the Lord, repeating elements from Ps 1:3 (כעץ שתול).[114] The reference to "channels of water"(מים פלגי – 1:3) also implies a temple context, as confirmed by other psalm texts (אלהים פלג אלהים מלא מים, 46:5 – נהר פלגיו עיר – 65:10).[115] Secondly, Ps 1:3 contains language seen in Ezekiel's vision of the eschatological temple:

כעץ…ועלהו לא יבול – Ps 1:3
עץ…לא יבול עלהו – Ezek 47:12[116]

Consequently, the man of Psalm 1 is being portrayed as a priest in the eschatological temple, again consistent with the portrayal in Ps 2:6. His royal characteristics were already suggested in Ps 1:2 (meditation in the torah required of king) with the result that both psalms attribute to him the dual role of king and priest.

While the intertextual link to Ezekiel 47 demonstrates the eschatological vision present in Ps 1:3, there is further evidence for such a reading. The same v. 3 opens with a verbal form common to prophetic oracles directed to the distant future (והיה). Note especially in this regard Isa 2:2 (והיה באחרית הימים).[117] Once the eschatological thrust of the simile in Ps 1:3 is established, the contrasting description of the wicked's destruction in vv. 4–6 (and the destiny of the righteous)[118] is presumably ultimate as well.[119]

Reference to judgment (משפט) in 1:5 is echoed again in 2:10, where the same root is used in the warning to earthly judges (שפטי ארץ). This again identifies the wicked of Psalm 1 with the recalcitrant rulers of Psalm 2 and reveals that they are subject to a greater judge and judgment. If they do not heed the warning of Ps 2:10ff they will suffer the destruction of 2:12 (ותאבדו דרך), identi-

fied in 1:6 as that promised the wicked (ודרך רשעים תאבד). As seen repeatedly, the wicked of Psalm 1 have been further identified as the cabal of rulers and their nations of Psalm 2 in revolt against the rule of the son of God. Correspondingly, he is the blessed man of Psalm 1, now in Psalm 2 being granted the authority to mete out that judgment. Just as the simile of driven chaff in 1:4 is defined as *destruction of the way* in 1:6, so also the simile of smashed pottery in 2:9 is defined in 2:12 as *destruction of the way*.

Psalm 2 identifies the one who metes out that destruction as the son of God, both in vv. 7–8 and 12. He is identified under the Aramaic form בר (v. 12) since he wields the ברזל (v. 9), consonantal alliteration lending more bite to the warning.[120] Likewise, the wicked rulers are identified as שפטי (v. 10) since they, who formerly wielded the שבט, must now submit to the one held by God's chosen king and son.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it would appear that the TNIV translators have adopted one viewpoint of Psalm 1, but certainly not the only one represented in the history of interpretation. More recent studies of the first psalm and its relationship to the second have further undermined this generalizing interpretation. Most importantly, the TNIV translators have ignored the viewpoint of the Psalter's final composer, expressed through its juxtaposition and resonance with Psalm 2. That composer expended considerable literary effort to identify האיש of Ps 1:1–3 as the chosen messiah in the second. He is not any person, nor any man, but rather the all-conquering king and son of God portrayed in Psalm 2.

Ironically, the TNIV would have better served the text by pluralizing the opening term of Ps 1:1 (אַשְׁרֵי) instead of the second (האיש), since the former is strictly speaking a masculine plural construct, while the latter is an articular masculine singular.[121] Consequently, its rendering pluralizes a noun (האיש), clearly identified contextually as a masculine singular subject, and singularizes what (at least on the formal level) is a plural (אַשְׁרֵי). A translation such as, "Oh the blessings of the man…" would represent the Hebrew text more faithfully. ■

---

[1] Abbreviations will follow Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999).

[2] Between these two forms the TNIV has rendered the prepositional phrase, ובתורתו, "and in his teaching…," presumably because the Tetragrammaton of colon A is the antecedent to the masculine pronominal suffix. Note however that the nearest antecedent to the pronoun is in the immediately preceding noun phrase, "his delight"(…חפצו ובתורתו…), motivating Rashi's comments as follows:

ובתורתו יהגה – מתחלה היא נקראת תורת יי׳
ומשעמל בה היא נקראת תורתו

Menahem Cohen, *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'HaKeter': Psalms, Part 1* (Ramat–Gan, Israel: Bar Ilan University, 2003), 2.

[3] The aforementioned change in the TNIV from the NIV resembles that seen between the NRSV and RSV in Psalm 1. The former reads, "Happy are those who do not follow…or take…or sit…but their delight…they meditate…They are like trees…all that they do, they prosper," whereas the latter reads, "Blessed is the man who walks not…nor stands…nor sits…but his delight…he meditates…He is like a tree…all that he does, he prospers." On the other hand, the latest edition of the Jewish Publication Society *Tanakh* translation (1999) maintains the masculine singular: "Happy is the man who has not followed…or taken…or joined…his delight, and he studies…He is like a tree…whatever it produces thrives."

[4] Cf. LXX (μακάριος ἀνήρ ὃς οὐκ ἐπορευθη….), Targum (….טובוהי דגבר דלא הליך), Peshitta (*ṭwbwhy lgbr' db'wrḥ' d'wl' l' hlk*), and Vulgate (Beatus vir qui non abiit….).

[5] Diodore of Tarsus, *Commentary on Psalms 1–51* (trans. Robert C. Hill; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 5.

[6] Richard J. Clifford, *Psalms 1–72* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 41–42. Those holding the ethical view are listed as "Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome's *Tractates*

(disputed attribution), Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria and the Antiochene School." His list of those holding to the christological view includes "Hippolytus, Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus and the later Latin tradition generally." Clifford would mark Augustine as the watershed and source of christological readings in later Latin tradition in contrast to earlier ethical views. His characterizes christological readings as "esoteric ingenuity"(42).

[7] William G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms* (vol. 1; New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1959), 3–34.

[8] Ibid., 22–23. Reading the pronoun suffix of "and in his law" (ובתורתו) as a reference to the individual rabbi.

[9] St. Justin Martyr, *The First and Second Apologies* (trans. L. W. Barnard, New York: Paulist Press, 1997), 50–51. Brownlee, "Psalms 1–2," 334, observes that "Justin Martyr could cite the whole of Pss 1 and 2 as a single messianic prophecy."

[10] "This statement (Ps 1:1) should be understood as referring to our Lord Jesus Christ…."Augustine, *Exposition of the Psalms;* 1–32 (Part 3, vol. 15 of *The Works of Saint Augustine; A Translation for the 21st Century;* ed. J. E. Rotelle; translation and notes by M. Boulding, introduction by M. Fiedrowicz, Hyde Park, NY: New City Press), 67.

[11] See Clifford, *Psalms 1–72*, 41.

[12] Matt 13:49 – καὶ ἀφοριοῦσιν τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκ μέσου τῶν δικαίων

[13] John Calvin, *Commmentary on the Book of Psalms* (vol 1; trans. J. Anderson; Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1845; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 1.

[14] Hilton C. Oswald, ed., *First Lectures on the Psalms I* (vol. 10 of Luther's Works; St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1974), 11.

[15] Joseph A. Alexander, *Commentary on the Psalms* (Edinburgh: A. Elliot and J. Thin, 1864; repr., Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1991), 17.

[16] Franz Delitzsch, *Psalms*. Three Volumes in One: C.F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament* (vol. 5; trans. James Martin; repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 82.

[17] Hermann Gunkel, *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel* (completed by J. Begrich; trans. J. D. Nogalski; Macon, GA: Mercer Univ. Press, 1998), 293–96.

[18] A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), 1.

[19] Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC 19; Waco: Word Books, 1983), 58–62.

[20] Amos Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim* (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1979), 3 [g].

[21] "Con alcance universal, ya que se trata de *'iš*, de uno cualquiera."Luis Alonso Schökel and Cecilia Carniti, *Salmos* I (Estella, España: Editorial Verbo Divino), 139. It is noteworthy that Alonso Schökel summarily omits the definite article in this statement (*'iš*).

[22] G. Wilson, *Psalms: Volume 1* (The NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 93.

[23] Clifford, (*Psalms 1–72*, 39) states this explicitly: "NRSV makes the righteous plural in order to make the translation gender inclusive."

[24] As with Alonso–Schökel, the definite article is conveniently omitted.

[25] H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*: *A Continental Commentary* (trans. H. C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 114, 121.

[26] Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary* (trans. H. Hartwell; London: SCM Press, 1962), 102, 106.

[27] H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms* (The Wartburg Press, 1959; repr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969), 36.

[28] Alexander, *Commentary on Psalms*, 19.

[29] Charles A. Briggs and Emilie G. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, vol. 1 (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987 impression), 4–5.

[30] Adele Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1284–85.

[31] Note the opening words of M. D. Goulder, *The Psalms of the Return* (Book V, Psalms 107–150) (JSOTSS 258; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 8: "The earliest commentary on the psalms is the Psalter."

[32] Georg P. Braulik, "Psalter and Messiah: Towards a Christological Understanding of the Psalms in the Old Testament and the Church Fathers," in *Psalms and Liturgy* (JSOTSS 410; ed. D. J. Human and C. J. A. Vos; London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 18–19. Braulik also argues that the two patristic commentators, Hippolytus and Asterius (pp. 30–36), saw interpretive relevance in the sequence of the psalms.

[33] *The Talmud of Babylonia, An American Translation*. I: Tractate Berakhot. (trans. Jacob Neusner; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984), 82–83. See also Berlin and Brettler, *The Jewish Study Bible*, 1285; Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, 10 [y]; Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 82; Jesper Høgenhaven, "The Opening of the Psalter: A Study in Jewish Theology," *SJOT* 15 (2001): 169–80, and William H. Brownlee, "Psalms 1–2 as a Coronation Liturgy," *Biblica* 52 (1971): 321 (n. 2), 322 (nn. 1, 2).

[34] Diodore, *Commentary on Psalms*, 10; St. Justin Martyr, *The First and Second Apologies*, 50–51.

[35] John T. Willis, "Psalm 1 — An Entity," *ZAW* 9 (1979): 389, and Høgenhaven, "The Opening of the Psalter," 171, n. 10.

[36] Willis ("Psalm 1—An Entity," 381) lists the Kennicott and de Rossi manuscripts. Cf. also Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 82. Willis ("Psalm 1—An Entity," 381–401), by way of response to Brownlee ("Psalms 1–2 as a Coronation Liturgy") et al, includes a thorough rehearsal of the ancient evidence and admits that it is "formidable" (389). He correctly criticizes the idea of the two being one original psalm. However, his statement that the two psalms "should be studied separately"(401), ignores the interpretive implications behind their juxtaposition and literary bonding. He

further argues that lexical links between the two discrete and separate Psalms 2 and 3 do not prove their unity. Indeed, but the few parallels he cites (there are more), support the reading of Psalm 3 in the light of Psalm 2, just as in the case of Psalms 1 and 2.

[37] For a description of the manuscript and rabbinic evidence see, Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1975), 412–14, and Willis, "Psalm 1—An Entity," 385.

[38] Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 82.

[39] Alexander, *Commentary on Psalms*, 27.

[40] Brownlee, "Psalms 1–2," 322–24. Regarding the use of the root ישׁב in Pss 1:1 and 2:4, he makes the unconvincing assertion that it is "sheer coincidence" (323).

[41] Ibid., 326.

[42] Ibid., 324

[43] Pierre Auffret, *The Literary Structure of Psalm 2* (JSOTSS 3; Sheffield: JSOT, 1977), 32–33.

[44] Ibid., 34.

[45] Joseph P. Brennan, "Psalms 1–8: Some Hidden Harmonies," *BTB* 10 (1980), 25.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Gerald T. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientalizing of the Old Testament* (New York: de Gruyter, 1980), 136–44.

[48] Ibid. Sheppard also notes that the LXX has added δικαία to Ps 2:12 (ותאבדו דרך becomes ἀπολεῖσθε ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας) in order to heighten the verbal symmetry with 1:6 (דרך צדיקים). He concludes that the LXX, "seizes upon this functional resonance predisposed by the redactional association of the two psalms and heightens the effect" (141).

[49] Ibid., 142.

[50] Hakham, Sefer Tehillim, 10 [׳] :והוא מצטרף אל מזמור א לחטיבה אחת

[51] Ibid.

[52] Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985).

[53] Ibid., 143, 209–210

[54] Gianni Barbiero, *Das erste Psalmenbuch als Einheit: Eine synchrone Analyse von Psalm 1–41* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999), 51. Barbiero cites the supporting statement of Delitzsch in *Symbolae ad Psalmos illustrandos isagogicae* (Leipzig, 1846), 46, as follows: "Notandum est praeterea, Psalterii librum I., uti duobus אשרי incipit, sic duobus אשרי [40, 5. 41, 2.] concludi."

[55] In addition, note חפצתי in 41:12 (cf. 1:2), יאשר in 41:3 (cf. 1:1) and משכיל in 41:2 (cf. 2:10).

[56] Wilson, *The Editing*, 207–14. He also demonstrates how the superscriptions are consistent with book divisions marked by doxologies (154–67).

[57] Ibid., 215.

[58] Ibid., 218.

[59] Ibid., 220–21.

[60] Ibid., 219.

[61] Gerald H. Wilson, "Understanding the Purposeful Arrangement of Psalms in the Psalter: Pitfalls and Promise" in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (ed. J. Clinton McCann; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 48.

[62] Another example is the sequence of "individual lament" (Ps 86), "Zion psalm" (Ps 87) and "individual lament" (Ps 88).

[63] Cf. the comments of Harry P. Nasuti, "The Interpretive Significance of Sequence and Selection in the Book of Psalms," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (eds. P.W. Flint and P.D. Miller Jr.; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 322: "First of all, some of these analyses clearly depend on modern form-critical definitions of individual psalms, definitions that might not necessarily have been shared by those responsible for the shaping of the Psalter…the distribution of psalm 'types' is more a matter of dominant tendencies than of exclusive groupings of certain types in different parts of the Psalter…one can certainly find laments in the latter part of the Psalter and psalms of praise and thanskgiving in the earlier parts."

[64] Hermann Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms*, 2–3: "There can be little doubt that one finds the text of the psalter in a particularly dismal condition…No *internal ordering principle for the individual psalms has been transmitted for the whole*…to be sure, sometimes related psalms stand together in the collection….the *particular task of psalm studies should be to rediscover the relationships between the individual songs* that did not occur with the transmission."

[65] Wilson, *The Editing*, 205.

[66] J. Clinton McCann, *The Book of Psalms* (NIB 6; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 642, 689.

[67] Ibid., 689.

[68] Ibid., 683–4.

[69] Patrick Miller, "The Beginning of the Psalter"in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (ed. J. Clinton McCann; JSOTSS 159; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 85.

[70] Ibid., 91.

[71] Ibid. He rightly observes the identification of the wicked in the first (רשׁעים—vv. 1, 4, 5, 6) with the nations in the second (גוים—v.1), and its confirmation in Ps 9:17–18 (ibid., 90). Ps 9:17–18 describe the "judgment" (משׁפט—cf. Ps 1:5) executed upon the "wicked" (רשׁעים…רשׁע—cf. Ps 1:1, 5, 6), further specified as "all the nations" (כל גוים—cf. Ps 2:1, 8).

[72] F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger, *Die Psalmen I: Psalm 1–50* (NEB; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1993), 51: "die in 21–3 geschilderte Revolte ist nun als Paradigma des in 11.6b geschilderten Treibens »der Frevler« zu lesen." They note as well connections between the first two psalms and Psalms 148–150, those to the Torah (Deut 6:13, 15) and to Prophets (Josh 1:7, 8, Mal 3:16–20).

[73] Barbiero, *Das erste Psalmenbuch*, 31–61.

[74] Ibid., 37.

[75] Matthias Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters* (FAT 9; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994), 9: "Gemeinsam ist beiden Psalmen trotz des unterschiedlichen motivfeldes von Weisheits– bzw. Königspsalmen die

gegenüberstellung des einzelnen Gottgemäßen mit den vielen Gegnern Gottes. Ps 2 ist verschiedentlich zusammen mit Ps 1 als ein Psalm angesprochen worden." Observe here again how form–critical categorizations work at cross–purposes with the present shape of the Psalter.

[76] A. Wénin, "Le psaume 1 et l'"encadrement' du livre des louanges," in *Ouvrir les Écritures*, (FS P. Beauchamp; ed. P. Bovati and R. Meynet; Paris: LeDiv, 1995), 168, "Dans le paralléle du Ps 2 (versets 1–3) l'idée est prolongée. Les méchants — ici, les nations et leurs rois — s'opposent á l'homme de la Loi du Seigneur — le messie, en l'ocurrence — en se liguant contre lui et contre le Seigneur."

[77] "N'est–il pas dit d'ailleurs que la voie des rebelles se perd (v. 12), comme se perd celle des impies en Ps 1, 6? Ce n'est pas par un procédé artificiel que le Psaume 2 a été joint au Psaume 1 pour former le prélude du psautier; malgré la différence de style, ils ont été mis intentionnellement à la suite l'un de l'autre, pour préciser que l'opposition des deux voies est un gigantesque affrontement, que la réussite du Juste, c'est le Jugement du Roi–Messie, que l'ére messianique, c'est la réalisation, à travers les aléas et les bouleversements visibles de l'histoire, du plan d'un Dieu tout puissant…." M. Manatti, *Les Psaumes* (Tome I; Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1966), 92. She observes (n. 10) that the verb to *succeed* in Ps 1:3 (יצליח) is applied to the warring king messiah in Ps 45:5 (צלח). Military success is already implied in יצליח of Ps 1:3 by its association with Josh 1:8 (תצליח), as will be argued below.

[78] Barbiero, *Das erste*, 40, n. 53, notes use of כמוץ in Isa 17:13; 41:15; Hos 13:3; Zeph 2:2.

[79] "Die eschatologische Metapher der Spreu verbindet Ps 1,4 mit Mal 3,19." Barbiero (ibid., 39–40).

[80] Ibid., 39–40.

[81] Ibid., 40.

[82] Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 518.

[83] Rolf Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 249.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Hossfeld and Zenger, *Die Psalmen* I, 51; "Gegenüber dem »Grundpsalm« tritt nun die eschatologische Zielperspektive der universalen Königsherrschaft JHWHs in den Vordergrund (vgl. 210–11 mit 7211), die auch den Schluß des Psalmenbuchs bestimmt."

[86] James L. Mays, "The Place of the Torah-Psalms in the Psalter," *JBL* 106/1 (1987): 10.

[87] David C. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms* (JSOTSS 252; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 87. His second option for the interpretation of Psalm 1 as delineating a person not the king is an example of the traditional hortatory view of Psalm 1.

[88] Jamie A. Grant, *The King as Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy's Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 2: "the editors wished to reflect the theology of the Law of the King through the deliberate juxtaposition of kingship psalms alongside torah psalms."

[89] Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 3.

[90] Ibid., 67.

[91] Ibid., 15, "…but it seems unlikely that the redactors of the Psalter used genre classification as an organizational tool—content (including superscriptions) rather than type seems to have directed the editorial placement of the psalms."

[92] The initial *'āleph* of אשרי opens the psalm and with the initial *tāw* of the final form תאבד forms an abbreviated acrostic, and thereby proves the original integrity of this psalm.

[93] There are two additional instances of this preposition in 2:2c which governs a personal object, as opposed to those of 1:3 and 2:6 governing locative noun complements. As will be seen, the latter two instances of this preposition are also linked through accompanying forms of phonological similarity.

[94] See Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 681: "…אַשְׁרֵי 'O the blessings of, enviable the situation of,' a petrified plural noun found only in construct phrases." Rashi also prefers, as noted by Mayer I. Gruber in *Rashi's Commentary on Psalms 1–89 (Books I–III) with English Translation, Introduction and Notes* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 50, to read אשרי as the plural subject of a nominal sentence.

[95] The identity of "him" (בו) is found in the closest antecedent noun "son" (בר), who wields the consonantly resonant "iron" (ברזל) rod, and is the chosen anointed king of 2:2, 6, 7. As will be seen, parallels between the psalms point clearly to him being also the man of Ps 1:1, so that the pair of psalms begin (אשרי האיש) and end (אשרי...בו) with reference to the same individual man.

[96] This preposition in 1:5 is simply part of compound conjunction (על כן), while the twofold use in 2:2 indicates the personal target of a revolt.

[97] Cf. Pierre Auffret, "Complements sur la structure litteraire du Ps 2 et son rapport au Ps 1," *BN* 35 (1986): 13, "En 1, 3 et 2, 6 nous lisons la même préposition *'l* pour introduire à une précision de lieu." The twofold use of the same על in the rebellion of Ps 2:2 provides a bridge to 3:2 where the revolt against divine rule is explored further.

[98] See Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 66–70, and other studies cited there. Psalm 1:2, 3 (יהגה יומם ולילה…יצליח ובתורתו) are quite explicitly linked to Josh 1:8 (התורה…והגית בו יומם ולילה…תצליח), while the previous Josh 1:7 (התורה…אל תסור ממנו ימין ושמאול למען) overtly recalls Deut 17:19–20 (התורה…ולבלתי סור מן המצוה ימין ושמאול למען). Thus Psalm 1 and Deuteronomy 17 are indirectly, yet undeniably linked. Once the intertextuality is established, use of terms indicating "session" immediately previous to Ps 1:2 in v. 1 (ובמושב…ישב) can be compared with Deut 17:18 (כשבתו), and suggest anticipation of

enthronement from the psalm's beginning. Furthermore, the intertextual parallels between 1 Kgs 2:2–3; 2 Chr 28:20; 2 Chr 32:7; 34:31; 35:26, and Josh 1 proves the royal overtones of the latter was recognized by biblical writers.

[99] They are significant for Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, 32–33: "But 2:7–9 uses again two words from 1:2–3: *ym* and *ntn*. In 1:2–3 it is the righteous man who chooses to meditate on the law all day long and thus in the end yields his fruit. In 2:7–9 it is Yahweh who chooses the day when he makes of his elect one his son and gives him the nations as an inheritance. So there are two choices, and two gifts, which correspond well to one another."

[100] Absence of an intervening superscription over Psalm 2 strengthens the integrative effect.

[101] Cf. Exod 35:22, 23; 25:2, Lev 21:18, 21; Josh 1:18; 1 Sam 22:2; 2 Sam 15:4; Ezek 9:6.

[102] The use of למה at the outset of a psalm questioning promises of the previous (2:1) is found again in Psalm 10. The question of 10:1 (למה…תעלים לעתות בצרה) is specifically directed at the nonfulfilment of 9:10 (בצרה משגב לעתות). Note also the absence of superscription between Psalms 9 and 10.

[103] Cf. comment of Auffret, "Complements sur…" 13, "Comme en outre 1, 6b et 2, 1–3 évoquent fin et révolte des ennemis de Yahvé…."

[104] As illustrated by the Greek transliteration of place names; Γάζα for עזה and Γόμορρα for עמרה. The medial position of *gîmel* (רגשו) may have occasioned less constriction and thus closer resemblance to *'ayin*. The latter is characterized in a recent grammar (Allen P. Ross, *Introducing Biblical Hebrew*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 24) as "a pharyngeal…producing a guttural sound rgh….In its strongest form, it is similar to the beginning of the g sound, but it is not g—not enough closure takes place in the throat to make g."

[105] Consonantal alliteration between the explicitly contrasted רשעים and (האיש) אשרי in 1:1 is a further example of the phonological aspect of Hebrew poetry.

[106] The similar opening consonantal sequence (*rēš*, sibilant) between masculine plural nouns "rulers" (רוזנים) of 2:2b and "wicked" (רשעים) of 1:1, 5, 6, may be another example of supporting phonological parallelism.

[107] Cf. Isa 21:8 – עמד…נצב

[108] This reading is clearly preferred based on its distinctiveness or difficulty, thereby giving rise to the more common יהוה seen in numerous manuscripts noted in the apparatus of *BHS*.

[109] Cf. Rolf Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 248, "…in Ps.110 we again have a royal psalm which has particularly clear parallels to Ps.2."

[110] If Masoretic vocalization is ignored, the form אדני is identical in 110:1 and 2:4. Note the interpretive reversion to אדָני in 110:5 after the initial אדֹני of 110:1, in spite of ימין being common to both contexts.

[111] Note the consonance between כעץ (1:3) and כמץ (1:4), focusing attention on the contrast drawn between the blessed man and the wicked.

[112] וכל אשר הוא עשה יהוה מצליח בידו – Gen 39:2
ואשר הוא עשה יהוה מצליח – Gen 39:23

[113] Cf. Ps 15:1 באהלי…בהר קדשי, as noted above. The association between Davidic covenant and temple of Psalm 2 is also seen in Ps 132:13–14 where Zion is identified as God's eternal dwelling place and where a horn for David would sprout forth (v. 17). Of course, temple and house of David are already inextricably linked in 2 Samuel 7.

[114] Cf. J. F. D. Creach, "Like a Tree Planted by the Temple Stream: The Portrait of the Righteous in Psalm 1.3," *CBQ* 61 (1999): 34–46.

[115] Ps 65:2, 5 reveal the פלג אלהים of v. 10 is associated with the temple. See William P. Brown, *Seeing the Psalms* (Louisville: WJK, 2002), 74.

[116] Ezekiel 47 is also replete with language from Gen 2, indicating that the eschatological sanctuary represents a restored Eden.

[117] Identical to Mic 4:1 (והיה אחרית הימים). See also the same verb form in Mic 5:4, 6, 9; Amos 8:9; Joel 3:1; 4:17, 18; Hos 1:5; 2:1 and *passim*. Cf. GKC §112y, "Very frequently the announcement of a future event is attached by means of וְהָיָה *and it shall come to pass*."

[118] Psalm 2:12 provides further identification of the suddenly appearing righteous in 1:5–6 as those who trust in the son of God. As already noted, the second psalm also provides further identification of the wicked in Psalm 1.

[119] Both Targum (מטול כן לא יקומון רשיעי ביום דינא רבא) and LXX (διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀναστήσονται ἀσεβεῖς ἐν κρίσει) read Ps 1:5 in this manner and for good reason. See Sue Gillingham, "From Liturgy to Prophecy: The Use of Psalmody in Second Temple Judaism," *CBQ* 64 (2002): 480.

[120] Note as well the same sequence *bêṯ – rêš* repeated in the final form of each of three, increasingly shorter, imperative-initial clauses across vv. 11–12a:

עבדו את יהוה ביראה וגילו ברעדה נשקו בר

The final and shortest command, "kiss the son!" constitutes a climactic and phonologically parallel conclusion.

[121] Recognized by Rashi: אשׁוּריו ותהלּותיו שׁל אדם ("The commendations and praises of a man…") M. Cohen, *Mikra'ot Gedolot,* 2.

FALL 2005
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 51-55

Sons of Adam and Daughters of Eve: How the TNIV Cuts Off the Ancient Conversation

Peter R. Schemm, Jr.
Editor, Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
Dean, Southeastern College at Wake Forest
Associate Professor of Christian Theology
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina

Michael E. Travers
Professor of English
Southeastern College at Wake Forest, Wake Forest, North Carolina

Introduction

> So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them (Gen 1:27 ESV).

The "conversation" we address in the present essay is as old as God's creation of "man" (*'ādām*), for "male and female he created them." Christian theology rightly invests everything in the fact that God has spoken and that he has done so perfectly and authoritatively. The ancient conversation begins in God's word before man fell into sin, and it continues to this day. Sin distorts the conversation, but it does not negate or abrogate it. Unfortunately, the ancient discourse has been hindered recently in an unexpected manner. Some have chosen to cut it off intentionally because its language is said to be no longer an effective means of communication. Indeed, the translators of Today's New International Version (TNIV) have cut off the ancient conversation.

In order to sustain the ancient conversation about the "Sons of Adam" and "Daughters of Eve," we offer this essay. In it we hope to (1) introduce the reader to C. S. Lewis as one who tutors us in the conversation; (2) suggest the importance of the conversation in the great literature of the ages; and (3) argue for the value of retaining such language in the English Bible today.

Lewis as a Tutor in the Conversation

We take our title from *The Chronicles of Narnia*. The "Sons of Adam" and "Daughters of Eve" are the human children who enter C. S. Lewis's imaginary world of Narnia. The terminology Lewis chooses to describe the humans in the stories is significant, for it points to gender and heritage. Sons and daughters become husbands and wives, and, in these stories, kings and queens. They are the only characters in the Narnia stories who are "man" (*'ādām*) and as such the only ones descended from Adam and Eve.

The Sons of Adam and Daughters of Eve are present at all the important events in Narnian history. In *The Magician's Nephew*, they witness the creation of Narnia. In this story, Aslan calls Digory a "Son of Adam" and a few pages later addresses him as "My son, my son," relating him first to Adam and Eve and secondly to himself.[1] The Sons of Adam and Daughters of Eve participate in the important points in Narnian history, always anticipating Aslan's return. And they are present in *The Last Battle* at the consummation of time when Narnia is destroyed and they enter "heaven" with Aslan. Throughout *The Chronicles of Narnia*, there is an inherent irony in the titles the children are given, for the White Witch (Aslan's sworn enemy and emissary of Satan, if you will) has no way to refer to them other than by the terms "Sons of Adam" and "Daughters of Eve;" she too is under Aslan's dominion. In subtle ways like this, Lewis shows that "man" (*'ādām*) is grounded in the fabric of nature and "super-nature" in Narnia.

The Conversation in Literature

When we turn to the great literature of the ages, we discover the ancient conversation of man and woman in all but the sagas of early Germanic culture. In the classical epics, we find the relationship of men and women to be important, as we do throughout the later literature of the West. How could it be otherwise? Helen's face may have launched a thousand ships, but it was the treacherous betrayal of Menelaus and Helen's marriage by Paris of Troy that demanded retribution. One does not accept a man's hospitality and then leave with his wife.

One of the great scenes in ancient literature is the reunion of Odysseus and his wife Penelope in Book XXIII of *The Odyssey*. Odysseus has been fighting the battle of Troy and has labored hard and long to return home to Ithaca. (To be sure, he has been unfaithful to his wife in the forced relationship with the goddess, Calypso.[2]) For twenty years, his wife has been queen of Ithaca, and "Nobody's" wife. The reunion scene, following Odysseus's defeat of the suitors, is one of the tender scenes of ancient literature. Penelope, worried that a god might be impersonating Odysseus, goads him into telling the tale of their marriage bed which he had carved from a live olive tree. When she is convinced that this man is Odysseus, she joyously runs to him and throws her arms around his neck. Penelope is a masterpiece of characterization, a fully-developed person—"valiant" and "faithful," as she is described in Book XXIV—and a loving wife. Homer understood the conversation and made it the climax of his last epic.

Much of the world's literature tells the tales of the dysfunctional relationships of men and women. Chaucer's famous gallery of characters in *The Canterbury Tales* includes only two women—the prioress and the Wife of Bath, both of whom have failed to be all they were made to be. The two women are diametrical opposites. The prioress has chosen the cloister over marriage, and the Wife of Bath has buried five husbands and lived wantonly. The important point is that neither woman is happy. The prioress attempts to satisfy her desire to be a woman of the world in social niceties inappropriate to her office, and the Wife of Bath flaunts herself, looking for husband number six.

Jumping three centuries, we turn to John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, that great epic on the fall of man. Milton's presentation of the first married pair in their prelapsarian state emphasizes the complementary, respective functions of

the man and woman in marriage,[3] and his portrait of the fall in the Garden of Eden shows Adam uxoriously forsaking his God-given role as head to a wife who has already decided to bring him down with her in sin.[4] The contrast could not be greater. Still, at the end of the poem, Adam and Eve leave Eden "hand in hand"[5] committed to their roles as husband and wife in a world of woe, the result of their own sin. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton shows the ideal conversation and the damage done to it by sin.

Fast forward three centuries again, this time to F. Scott Fitzgerald's classic American novel, *The Great Gatsby*. Jay Gatz loves a married woman, Daisy Buchanan. He has loved her since before she was married, and, to be sure, her marriage to Tom Buchanan is not happy. Throughout the poignant and at times painful novel, Fitzgerald anatomizes the disaster Gatsby's pursuit of Daisy creates: Tom Buchanan has an affair with Myrtle Wilson; in a freak accident, Daisy kills Myrtle, and Gatsby takes the blame; George Wilson, Myrtle's husband, shoots Gatsby and then kills himself. The principal actors flaunt the conversation and pay with their lives.

The examples are legion—virtually unanimous. The conversation of men and women in their gender roles is rarely pretty in the world's literature, and is to be expected, is it not? We live in a fallen world, and marriage is one of the stress points in human relations.

The Conversation in the English Bible

It is precisely because of the dysfunction in gender roles in a fallen world that the Bible ought to be afforded the proper place in the ancient conversation. Scripture is the authoritative source of the "ancient conversation" of which we speak and, as such, it speaks to the man-woman relationship as it should be. The early chapters of Genesis begin the conversation of "man" (*'ādām*) as male and female (Gen 1:26–28; 2:18–25; 5:1–2). In order for this conversation to continue in a meaningful way, English translations of the Bible must be reliable. The problem with the TNIV is that it does not sustain what reliable English translations have passed down to it as part of the ancient conversation. Simply put, it neuters the language of "man" introduced in Genesis (cf. 1:26–27; 5:2)—the language we are identifying with the terms "Sons of Adam" and "Daughters of Eve." But "man" ought to be retained because it is an indispensable canonical thread interwoven throughout the language of creation, anticipation, and consummation.

Creation

When the TNIV replaces "man" with "human beings" in Gen 1:26–27 and Gen 5:2 it obscures the unity of the race created as "man."[6] In the absence of this textual link, humanity is no longer seen as a race directly related to Adam, the first man. Without unity individual men and women are disconnected from Adam and Eve. The creation story reads more like an encyclopedia than a well-written narrative. The new story is built on individual beings that are distantly related. Without unity the ancient creation story—including its understanding of gender roles—does not connect to those in the rest of history, those throughout the literary conversation, and those today.

Anticipation

Psalm 8 is another troubling example where the TNIV cuts the linguistic thread. It is troubling because the absence of "man" does not prompt the reader to

anticipate the full humanity and perfect dominion of the last Adam, which was lost by the first Adam. The psalmist, though reflecting on creation, speaks of a glorious dominion of man (8:5–8) that is presently not "strictly true," to borrow the words of C. S. Lewis.[7] Man in his fallen condition is often anything but glorious and honorable and exercising godly dominion. It is most fitting, therefore, to render *'ĕnôsh* "man" (8:4) in order to indicate the frailty of mankind—an imperfection that will only be fully and finally perfected in the ultimate man.

In the TNIV *'ĕnôsh* is translated as "mere mortals" (8:4) replacing the singular "man," again removing the sense of the unity of mankind. Perhaps even more disturbing, however, is the removal of the phrase "son of man" (8:4).[8] It has been replaced with the plural "human beings," a somewhat amorphous term that does not convey the individuality and personality found in "son of man." It is more precise to render *ben-ādām* "son of man," not "human being" (even in the singular), because the former conveys a sense of origin and continuity that the latter does not. Indeed, all of mankind is related to Adam. Both the origin and continuity of this relation are seen on two levels: (1) the original life God gave to Adam and (2) the image of God in man, both of which are passed on in the son (Gen 5:3; 9:6).[9] In this sense, we are all sons of Adam, and we all await—with great anticipation—ultimate conformity to the image of the last Adam. It is the Genesis language extended in Psalm 8 and woven throughout Scripture that promotes anticipation in the reader, an anticipation the author of Hebrews had, as seen below.

Consummation

Finally, the TNIV obscures the restoration and consummation of man in the last Adam. It replaces "man" with "mere mortals" and "son of man" with "human beings" in Heb 2:6. This replacement disconnects the created and fallen man from *the* perfect man by removing the language that demonstrates the unity of the race. Yet this is precisely the connection that the writer of Hebrews intends to make. The author would enter the "ancient conversation" saying that man, created for dominion, glory, and honor, but fallen from that lofty place, has been restored through his unity with the consummate man. But by changing the inspired language of Scripture to meet modern sensibilities, the TNIV cuts him off.

The glory and honor that the created man lost has already been restored in Jesus Christ, though it is not yet fully realized in a cosmic sense. We read in the NT of the full and perfect display of the glory of God in man—the man Christ Jesus. Indeed, the writer of Hebrews says, "He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature" (1:3). The author goes on to explain that he is the Son of God (1:5ff) and the Son of Man (2:5ff); all the fullness of deity *and* humanity dwells in Jesus Christ. Looking to Psalm 8, the author explains that the Son became man to taste death for everyone so that in him the dominion, glory, and honor might be "strictly true" for man. In Jesus we see man crowned with glory and honor; through his victorious death we see man fully restored; in the world to come we see the consummation of man—he was made like us that we might reign with him.

Conclusion

The instances in which the TNIV abrogates or negates the language of "man" (*'ādām*) are simply inaccurate translations which cut counter to the weight of Scripture and the realities of human gender distinctions. The literature of the ages participates in the great conversation by expressing the reality of gender inscribed by God on the created order. C. S. Lewis addressed the fundamental issue of gender in all of his fiction, not just *The Chronicles of Narnia*, and developed a worldview that sees gender emblazoned in all of created nature.[10] Modern attempts to neutralize gender language have not removed the issue; they have only obscured it.

When we turn to Bible translations, we find the same dilemma. In an attempt to reduce or remove the "problem" of gender in Scripture, the translators of the TNIV have ironically neutralized the effectiveness of their translation in addressing one of the earliest and most important issues in God's self-revelation—"man," a radical unity, yet created as male and female. In retaining the language of "man," other reliable translations of the Bible have not bowed to modern social and linguistic conventions; rather, in keeping the dynamic of gender relations in their language they have retained one of the central tensions of nature and the supernatural—unity in diversity. Such is man because such is God. In regard to the ultimate realities to which gender points, the TNIV is simply out of step and inaccurate. ■

---

[1] C. S. Lewis, *The Magician's Nephew* (New York: Harper Collins, 1994), 146 and 154.

[2] Homer *Odyssey* 3, 4.

[3] John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003), 4.610–780.

[4] Ibid., 9.342–75, 816–33.

[5] Ibid., 12.648.

[6] This unity is clearly indicated by the singular Hebrew noun *'ādām*. Throughout Genesis 1–11 there is an intentional and precise use of the singular "man" to refer to all of mankind. Not translating *'ādām* as "man" is significant because it obscures the author's intentional connection between "man" and "mankind." The most awkward rendering of *'ādām* as "human beings" is found in Genesis 5. Gen 5:1 in the TNIV speaks of "Adam's family line." The author's intention is to describe the unity shared by those who follow after Adam. But in Gen 5:2 the TNIV translates *'ādām* as "human beings," which conceals the connection the author intends to make by using *'ādām* in 5:1a for the proper name, *'ādām* in 5:1b to describe his descendents, and *'ādām* for the whole race beginning with Adam and Eve in 5:2. Using "human beings" clearly hides the author's verbal connections for the English reader.

[7] C. S. Lewis, *Reflections on the Psalms* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958), 133.

[8] To their credit, the Committee on Bible Translation does offer "a son of man" as an alternate reading in a footnote.

[9] R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Acher, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, eds., *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody, 1980), 114.

[10] Several of C. S. Lewis's works of fiction come to mind here. *Perelandra* and *That Hideous Strength* are the second and third novels in the Ransom trilogy. In *Perelandra*, Lewis shows us a paradise retained, and in *That Hideous Strength* a strained new marriage. *The Chronicles of Narnia*, though they are children's fiction and do not express an adult experience of gender, reflect the great conversation in unobtrusive ways, not the least of which is the principle of unity-in-diversity inherent in Narnia. And *Till We Have Faces*, Lewis's last novel written after he was married and in which the marriage of Psyche and Cupid draws all the principal characters under its benevolent influence, is grounded in gender. For Lewis, gender reflected something of the Trinity and was one expression of the *imago dei* in us.

Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 56-65

Choosing a Translation of the Bible

Russell T. Fuller
Associate Professor of Old Testament Interpretation
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky

A generation or two ago, choosing a translation of the Bible was more a matter of choosing the color of the cover than choosing the version. Virtually, there was only one version—the King James Version. It was the only Bible that most people knew. It was the English translation of the Bible. It influenced the church, the society, and the English language itself. Indeed, the church and society thrived under it. The King James Version blessed the people of God for centuries.

But language changes. No language, except a dead one, is static. A cursory reading of English prose of a century ago demonstrates this. Take, for example, the description by Douglas MacArthur, the great American general educated in the nineteenth century, of the World War I French general, Henri Gouraud:

> His Algerian exploits had won him the soubriquet of *le lion d'Afrique*, and his Gallipoli campaign had become almost a classic. But I was not prepared for the heroic figure to whom I reported. With one arm gone, and half a leg missing, with his red beard glittering in the sunlight, the jaunty rake of his cocked hat and the oratorical brilliance of his resonant voice, his impact was overwhelming. He seemed almost to be the reincarnation of the legendary figure of battle and romance, Henry of Navarre. And he was just as good as he looked.[1]

Of course, this prose is still well understood today, but the vocabulary, the idioms, the turn of phrases have a different ring to them, the sound of a bygone Victorian era. But go back further in time, to the time of the King James Bible. The language sounds even stranger to our ears, almost foreign. Yet, with some study and a very good dictionary, even

that Early Modern English prose may be understood.

But all translations, including the King James Version, seek to put the word of God in the language of the people. In fact, God inspired the authors of the New Testament to write in the Greek dialect of the common (Koine) people, not in the Greek dialect of the academy (Attic). So it should be with modern translations. Translators should put the word of God, which is the power of God unto salvation, into the language of the common man that he might know God and what God requires of him. Hence, there is a real need for modern translations—perhaps not so many modern translations—but nonetheless, there is a need, especially in our biblically and generally illiterate times.

Although the King James Version can no longer be widely used because English has changed, the translation principles of the King James Version have not changed nor have become obsolete. Indeed, it was those principles that blessed generations. Of course, the translators of the King James Version did not invent them. From the King James Version to Luther's translation, from Jerome's Vulgate to parts of the Septuagint, these principles—to one degree or another—have been followed. This is true even from the days of King James to our modern times. In selecting a modern translation, therefore, for public and private worship for Christians and for the common man who does not know the Lord, choose a modern translation that follows these proven and venerable principles that have blessed the church for centuries. Choose a translation then (1) that translates faithfully and accurately the meaning of the original Hebrew and Greek without unnecessary interpretation, (2) that reflects a high view of Scripture, and (3)that—especially for our day—follows the natural changes of modern idiom, but does not follow unnatural language changes of political movements or agendas.

Choose a translation that translates faithfully and accurately the meaning of the original Hebrew and Greek without unnecessary interpretation

A translation ought to translate. This is obvious, to be sure, but what is a translation? The word "translate" denotes bearing or transferring the meaning of one language to another language. This transference of meaning from one language to another may take many forms. At one extreme, one may woodenly transfer the grammar and idiom of one language to another without actually transferring any meaning. On the other extreme, one may ignore the grammar and idiom and may simply interpret or paraphrase the meaning of one language to the other. This will certainly transfer meaning, but is this the proper meaning? Clearly a middle course is needed.

Many today choose paraphrases for their translation of Scripture, finding them easier to understand, especially for children. In fact, they are easier to understand because they are not actually translations, but interpretations, mini-commentaries on the Scriptures. As such, they have their place, and they can certainly be helpful. Moreover, paraphrases are not just recent inventions with the Living Bible, but some ancient versions, such as the Targums and the Septuagint, are also paraphrastic in many places. Also modern versions such as the NIV try to follow a middle course between a paraphrase and a more "literal" translation.

Again, these also have their place and they can be helpful, but they take many liberties in interpreting the text. They are more like a paraphrase in this aspect.

But do we simply trust the interpretation of the translators? For general conversation or understanding, this may be acceptable, but for Scripture, and for other writings that demand greater precision, such as law, a translation closer to the phrasing of the original is helpful, and indeed necessary. While interpretations and paraphrases are helpful, translating the grammar and idiom of Scripture to allow the reader to have a sense of the wording of Scripture and to interpret it for himself is more than helpful—it is essential.

All translations, of course, require some interpretation. Issues of context, both grammatical and historical, and authorial intent must enter into any translation. Sometimes a grammatical construction may allow multiple understandings. In such cases, a translator must decide which rendering is appropriate, based on his judgment and interpretation. With the original texts of the Bible, the situation is still more complicated. The Greek New Testament is without punctuation. The translator must supply this, based on his understanding of the passage. This does not mean, however, that the language is at the mercy of the translator to make what he will of the passage through the punctuation. The Greek language with its intricate subordination often makes the punctuation clear, with issues of parentheses being the most difficult. Even more complicated than Greek, Hebrew, also written without punctuation, is often written without vowels. Furthermore, Hebrew does not have the subtle subordination of Greek. Yet, God has preserved the understanding of the vowels and the punctuation through the Masoretic tradition. These issues do require interpretation on occasion, but again, God has not left us to our own devises. Though translations require some interpretation, it should be kept to a minimum.

Keeping interpretation to a minimum, a translator should represent the Hebrew and Greek to allow the reader the privilege and responsibility to interpret the text. Too often Sunday School classes are left confused because their "translations" read differently. Actually, of course, their translations are interpretations that differ. Many wonder how translations can differ so widely. Some wonder just how accurate their English translations are. For example, 1 Thess 4:4 reads in part, "that each might know how to possess his own vessel." The TNIV interprets "his own vessel" as "your own body." To be sure, the TNIV emasculates the gender (and changes the person from third to second) with "his own" becoming "your own," which does not reflect the Greek, but it also interprets "vessel" as "body." The New American Bible (NAB), however, has a different interpretation: "that each of you know how to acquire a wife for himself." Here "vessel" is interpreted as "wife." Paul, of course, could have written "body" or "wife," but instead he wrote "vessel." Perhaps, it is better to translate the Greek as intended by the human and divine author and leave interpretation to the reader. The situation is even more serious when the translator botches an interpretation. In Exod 21:22, the TNIV interprets the passage, "If people are fighting and a pregnant woman is hit and gives birth prematurely." This interpretation of Exod 21:22 as a premature birth is certainly wrong.[2] The TNIV, to be fair, has the proper interpretation in the footnote, but the TNIV does not always put an alternative interpretation

or the correct interpretation in a footnote. Again, translate the passage to let the reader interpret. Do not prejudice or mislead the reader with interpretational blunders.

A similar principle applies to emending the text. A translator should not change or "correct" the text except in a very few cases, such as obvious copyist mistakes. For instance, the TNIV in Ps 12:6 emends the Hebrew text, which reads, "The words of the Lord are pure words, (like) silver refined *in the furnace of the earth*, refined seven times," to "And the words of the Lord are flawless, like silver purified *in a crucible, like gold* refined seven times,"[3] without sufficient textual justification to satisfy their notions of how the text should read and of how the biblical parallelism should be. In a footnote, the TNIV instructs the reader that their correction of the text is the "probable reading of the original Hebrew text." The Committee on Bible Translation of the TNIV in their "A Word to the Reader," the preface to the TNIV, states that such emendations "are *usually* indicated in the textual notes."[4] Of course, all emendations should be noted and perhaps emphasized by italics. Again, to be fair, the TNIV is not alone. Many conservative translations take too many liberties in "correcting" the text. The translator, again, must restrain himself and let the text speak for itself. The text just may be correct.

As much as possible, a translation should reflect the text as it is and the grammatical structure to allow the reader to interpret the text when possible, allowing other study aids to assist in interpretation. A translator should restrain the urge and resist the temptation to emend or to interpret the text for the reader.

Choose a translation that reflects a high view of Scripture

Although a translator must interpret with restraint and caution, a translator does not come to the text theologically neutral. Even if without theological training, a translator has certain presuppositions, consciously or unconsciously, when he comes to a text. If a translator, for instance, comes to the Bible believing that it is like any other book, merely a human product, the result of human ingenuity, then he does not properly understand the true nature of the book. His translation will err. Not necessarily often, but yet too often. His translation will miss the unity of the divine mind behind the Scriptures. It will fail to appreciate the divine wisdom of the Scriptures. It will lack the divine pathos of the Scriptures. In short, the translation will be sterile, with unnecessary errors and blunders. Worse yet, some translators come to the Bible with a negative bias, with an agenda to subvert the clear teachings of the Bible. The Revised Standard Version (RSV), for instance, often shows this bias. In Rom 9:5, the RSV distorts the syntax to shun Paul's assertion of Christ's deity: "to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed for ever. Amen." The RSV renders the last part of the verse as an independent sentence, a doxology. Such a rendering, while imaginative, is forced—indeed, forced by a theological bias.[5] Perhaps because of the severe criticism that the RSV received over this unfortunate rendering, the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) emends the translation of its forbearer to the appropriate rendering, "to them belong the patriarchs, and from them, according to the flesh, comes the Messiah, who is

over all, God blessed forever. Amen." This correction, however, is isolated. The NRSV, unfortunately, follows the same bias against the word of God as its forerunner, the RSV. Moreover, the NRSV adds a layer of gender-inclusive language to its bias. Other translations with the same bias, such as the Revised English Bible (REB) and the NAB, still refuse to surrender to the correct translation of Rom 9:5, as the NRSV has.

Modern translations may also show their negative bias towards Scripture by stretching the syntax of the biblical text to conform with Babylonian texts, which the Hebrews presumably borrowed. For example, the REB and NAB translate Gen 1:1 as a temporal clause to agree with the beginning of the Babylonian creation account, Enuma Elish, which begins with a temporal clause. This is against the natural rendering of the syntax and the Masoretic understanding of the verse.[6] Moreover, it is against the New Testament understanding of the verse as John 1:1 and Heb 11:3 probably indicate. In another example, the NRSV, REB, NAB, and the New Jerusalem Bible (NJB) begin a new paragraph within Gen 2:4 to make the following account, which they assume to be a second creation account consistent with a naturalistic approach to Scripture, start with a temporal clause for the same reason as Gen 1:1. Again, the Masoretic understanding, which sees a new paragraph beginning after Gen 2:3 but not within verse four, contradicts these modern translations and their biases.[7] Sad to say, examples like these can be multiplied many times.

Perhaps the worst example of this pernicious attitude towards Scripture occurs when translations rearrange the word of God to suit their own opinion of how the text should read. This is emendation gone mad. Without the slightest textual justification, without sound contextual reasons, indeed without reason itself, the REB and the NAB cut Zech 4:1–3 and paste it after Zech 4:10. This is not an isolated example. The REB does this several times as do other translations of this mindset. The cut-and-paste Bible, however, is the New English Bible (NEB), the forerunner of the REB. A cursory reading of the footnotes shows that the NEB rearranges the text at will, often mixing textual comments like "transpose" and "probable reading" with "corrupt" and "Hebrew unintelligible." After reading the textual notes of the NEB, one wonders how the Old Testament could have ever been translated or interpreted with such pervasive "corruptions" in the text. Recently, such translations have moved away from the excesses of the NEB—at least somewhat—returning to a resemblance of sanity in dealing with the text.

Instead of following such a destructive philosophy against the Scripture, both in understanding it and in translating it, a translator must have proper views about the Scriptures. He must see them as a supernatural product and not just as a natural or human product. Although the Scriptures are the product of many men writing over many centuries, ultimately they reflect the thinking of one mind—one divine mind. As such, they possess a unity of thought and instruction, not a collection of inconsistent and contradictory "texts." Furthermore, they possess a wisdom and a teaching worthy of their infinitely wise Author. Hence, the translator should love, cherish, and gladly receive the Scriptures—he should appreciate the things of the Spirit of God (1 Cor 2:12–15). In short, he must see the Scriptures as the very word of God. This principle supplies the overall context or philosophy of the transla-

tion. If a translator misunderstands the nature of the work that he translates, he will almost certainly mistranslate it. If he translates a comedy as a tragedy, a joke as a law, or a comic strip as a sober historical account, the translation, though perhaps grammatically correct, will fall wide of the mark. A translator, therefore, must come to the text with an orthodox understanding of Scripture.

This does not imply, of course, that orthodoxy must drive translation; on the contrary, proper translation and interpretation must drive orthodoxy. A translator must translate Scripture faithfully, seeking to please its Author, not to please a theological point of view. Hence, as a translator must restrain the urge to interpret individual verses and passages, so he must restrain himself, as much as possible, from inserting his own theological views or agendas into a translation. He must allow the translation, or actually the word of God, to speak for itself and allow the reader to interpret its teachings and to develop its theology.

Hence, although a translator cannot approach the Scriptures theologically neutral, a translator must first believe God and his word, then he must translate the Scriptures as accurately and as honestly as is humanly possible, allowing the Scriptures to speak for themselves.

Choose a translation that follows natural language changes of modern idiom, but does not follow the unnatural language changes of political movements or agendas

As a translator should restrain the urge and resist the temptation to emend or to interpret the text or to insert his theology into the text, so he should also resist following or conforming to political movements. Political movements and issues, to be sure, have impacted the interpretation and translation of Scripture. The King James Version is the result of a political compromise, at least somewhat, between King James and the Puritans.[8] This compromise did not affect the translation, but only the production of the translation. The existence of some inordinately large commentaries in America on the book Philemon before 1861 seems odd until one realizes the political issue of that time—slavery. The translation of Exod 21:22 was non-controversial in America until 1973, the year of *Roe v. Wade*. When political passions run high on any issue, sometimes the issue has controlled biblical interpretation. At other times, biblical interpretation has been allowed to speak for itself concerning the issue. In past times, translators and interpreters attempted to let the Bible speak for itself without allowing political considerations to override or to control the translation or interpretation of Scripture. This is not to say that they have always been successful, but the attempt is honorable and noble. Most Christians, if not all, recognize this.

But times are changing. Now some believe that the translator should adjust his work to avoid offending modern sensibilities. The Committee on Bible Translation for the NIVI—the New International Version: Inclusive Language Edition (the predecessor to the TNIV)—stated in its policy on gender-inclusive language that

> Authors of Biblical books, even while writing Scripture inspired by the Holy Spirit, unconsciously reflected in many ways, the particular

> cultures in which they wrote. Hence in the manner in which they articulate the Word of God, *they sometimes offend modern sensibilities*. At such times, translators can and may use non-offending renderings so as not to hinder the message of the Spirit.[9]

This principle opens a Pandora's box for the translator. If the writers of Scripture, inspired by the Spirit, write things offensive to modern sensibilities, who is the translator to correct the words of the Spirit so as not to hinder the message of the Spirit? Should translators commission polls, gather focus groups, or interview various special interest groups to determine whose sensibilities are offended? Perhaps the Spirit intended to offend modern sensibilities. But there is more. The next principle declares,

> The patriarchalism (like other social patterns) of the ancient cultures in which the Biblical books were composed is pervasively reflected in forms of expression that appear, in the modern context, to deny the common human dignity of all hearers and readers. For these forms, alternative modes of expression can and may by used, though care must be taken not to distort the intent of the original text.[10]

Again, permission is granted to adjust translations if "forms of expression appear, in the modern context, to deny the common human dignity of all hearers and readers." Such subjective and arbitrary principles are a license to insert all sorts of modern agendas into Bible translation.

Which brings us to the gender-inclusive language debate. For non-evangelical interpreters and for translators of the NRSV and the REB, gender-inclusive language is fully embraced. For evangelicals, on the other hand, the issue is hotly contested, with some accepting and others rejecting gender-inclusive language.

The gender-inclusive language debate has both political and linguistic dimensions, with proponents and opponents of gender-inclusive language agreeing on one point: Secular feminism is the source and the driving force behind the gender-inclusive language. D. A. Carson, a proponent, states, "I acknowledge that much of the demand of reform of the English language on this point is from active feminists. Much of the push for change is ideologically driven. I don't think all of it is, but certainly much of it is."[11] Similarly, Bruce Waltke, another proponent, says, "Although I resent it, the English language has been impacted by secular (non-biblical) feminism and many students today are trained to hear 'man' and 'he' and their equivalents as referring only to males, excluding females."[12]

But the agreement ends there. Carson goes on to indicate, as I read him, that while he has disagreements with the feminist movement, he agrees with them concerning gender-inclusive language—"One must try to assess where, in the light of Scripture, feminist agendas make telling points, where their demands make little difference (from a biblical point of view), and where they seem to fly in the face of Scripture."[13] Indeed, though an opponent of gender-inclusive language, I agree with Carson that feminism may well "make telling points" on issues, such as pornography, for example. But they do not "make tell-

ing points" on gender-inclusive language. They instead attempt to politicize speech and thought, as part of our current culture wars, against the traditional culture of the West and its source, the Scriptures. Listen to Bruce Metzger, for instance, writing for the Committee of the NRSV, "During the almost half a century since the publication of the RSV, many in the churches have become sensitive to the danger of linguistic sexism arising from the inherent bias of the English language towards the masculine gender, a bias that in the case of the Bible has often restricted or obscured the meaning of the original text."[14] Of course, the writers of Scripture and the Writer of Scripture may be (and have been) charged with possessing a similar "linguistic sexism and bias." Listen to the preface of the NIVI: "It is often appropriate to mute the patriarchalism of the culture of the biblical writers through gender-inclusive language."[15] The biblical writers, however, never condemn patriarchal culture *per se*, and throughout the Scriptures, the Bible teaches a male headship that implies, at least to some degree, a patriarchal culture. Even if "their demands make little difference (from a biblical point of view)," translators of the word of God must not consider or accept the demands of the feminists, or for that matter, the demands of any group. Their demands, however, do make a difference—they politicize the word of God.

The disagreement goes even deeper. Carson writes, "*translations* [should] change as the receptor languages change, *regardless of the motivations that some entertain for those changes*."[16] On the contrary, we must, in the strongest terms, reject language changes, both in the culture generally and in the Bible specifically, that have improper motivations. Suppose a society like Nazi Germany were to decree, or just promote, that the term "Jew" no longer be used, but instead an insulting slur be used. The language change may be accepted by nearly all, it may even be embraced by all, but the Christians of that society, including Christian translators, must resist such language changes. Certainly language changes, but the motivations for that change must be considered. Natural changes in languages are benign. Changes like the dropping of case endings, the elimination of rare forms, the obsolescence of certain words and idioms, and the adding of new words and idiom are common and natural. The movement towards gender-inclusive language, however, is clearly an unnatural change in the language. Such changes must be viewed with extreme caution. This unnatural change in the language is politically driven, as Carson and other evangelicals acknowledge. Language has now become a target to deconstruct the Bible and society, a tool for speech codes on college campuses, an issue to control speech and thought through law in Europe and Canada. This ideology views the Bible as hate-speech, sexist, homophobic, and bigoted in thought and in expression. While translations should reflect natural changes in a language, they should not reflect unnatural changes, forced on the language through political and ideological motivations.

For many evangelical proponents of gender-inclusive language the issue is not the motivations for the language change, but whether the language change actually distorts the word of God. Again, Carson writes, "Where the line must be drawn is where a translation is domesticating God's Word such that the truth of Scripture is distorted."[17] Obviously, for Carson and other proponents, gender-inclusive language does not distort Scripture. But for opponents it certainly does distort

Scripture. Much has been written about particular verses of the TNIV, whether they distort Scripture or not.[18] But in the larger context and culture of Scripture, gender-inclusive language clearly distorts Scripture by giving the reader the mistaken idea that the Scriptures themselves employ gender-inclusive language, thus giving the mistaken impression that the Bible supports such language. Moreover, such language, to use the words of the NIVI, "mutes the patriarchalism of the culture of the biblical writers." Gender-inclusive language not only mutes the culture of the biblical writers, but it distorts it, leaving the mistaken impression that the biblical culture was not so patriarchal after all and that the writers of Scripture and the speakers within Scripture were sensitive, indeed supportive, of gender-inclusive language and perhaps even of other aspects of that ideology. Gender-inclusive translations, accepting an unnatural language change of political ideology, inject the deadly viruses of the modern culture wars directly into Scripture. Such translations present a view of biblical culture and expression, both anachronistic and distorted.

Because gender-inclusive language is an unnatural language change, the linguistic and political dimensions cannot be separated. Certainly, the translation and the interpretation of the Bible have been influenced through the centuries by many factors, including political and theological factors, but gender-inclusive translations overtly politicize Scripture in a manner unparalleled in history. Biblical translation and interpretation, while they must speak to political and social issues where applicable, must stay above politicization. Translators and interpreters must avoid many temptations, incuding reading their own interpretations or theology into the text and allowing political agendas to influence their work.

Conclusion

There are many Bibles to choose from today. I recommend (1) those that translate, yet do not interpret—when possible—for the reader; (2) those that reflect a high view of Scripture, yet do not insert their own theological views; and (3) those that follow the natural changes of modern idiom, yet do not follow the unnatural language changes of modern agendas and ideology. I also recommend translations that reject principles that approve modifications in translations so as not to offend modern sensibilities. This means, of course, that I recommend Bibles with a translation philosophy similar to the New American Standard Bible and others like it. Other translations that are more paraphrastic may be used with profit, but use them as interpretations or commentaries. This also means, of course, that I reject the TNIV as a politicized work.

The English language changes. And like most languages, it changes slowly and naturally. The language of a hundred years ago is still clear and well understood, with perhaps some idioms or grammatical forms becoming obsolete. In the last twenty-five years the language change is slight, except in one area—language has become politicized. Let us not allow the translation and interpretation of the Bible to become politicized as well. Let us, therefore, allow the Bible to speak clearly and boldly from its own culture, time, and agenda, and let all others read and consider whether their culture, time, and agenda honors God and his word, or not. ■

[1] Douglas MacArthur, *Reminiscences* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 57.

[2] Russell Fuller, "Exodus 21:22: The Miscarriage Interpretation and the Personhood of the Fetus,"

Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 37, no. 2 (1994): 169–184.

[3] The italics highlight the different renderings of the passage.

[4] *Holy Bible: Today's New International Version* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), x (italics added).

[5] See William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *Romans* (The International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1903), 233–238. Compare a similar opinion against the deity of Christ by the majority of the Editorial Committee of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament. B. Metzger summarizes the majority opinion for punctuating Rom 9:5 consistent with the RSV, "In fact, on the basis of the general tenor of his (Paul's) theology it was considered tantamount to impossible that Paul would have expressed Christ's greatness by calling him God blessed for ever" (Bruce Metzger, ed., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed., [Stuttgart: United Bible Society, 1994], 461). Instead of allowing their theology to inform their understanding of the Paul's writings, perhaps the majority of the Committee should have allowed Paul's writing to inform their theology. Then the impossible may just become possible, as Yogi Berra once said, "They said it couldn't be done—but that does not always work."

[6] E. J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One* (Philadelphia: P&R, 1964), 1–14.

[7] In the other ten occurrences of this construction, the NAB never begins a paragraph within the verse; the NRSV and the REB begin a new paragraph within the verse once—I believe erroneously—in Gen 37:2.

[8] Alister E. McGrath, *In the Beginning* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 130–71.

[9] Quoted in D. A. Carson, *The Inclusive-Language Debate* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 41 (italics added). Carson indicates that, at the time of writing, the CBT was "preparing a revised set of guidelines"(39).

[10] Ibid.

[11] D. A. Carson, "The Limits of Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation—and Others Limits, Too" in *The Challenge of Bible Translation,* ed. Glen G. Scorgie, Mark L. Strauss, and Steven M. Voth (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 83. See also, Carson, *Debate*, 187–189.

[12] Bruce Waltke, "Personal Reflections on the TNIV," a paper distributed by Zondervan, September 4, 2002.

[13] Carson, "The Limits of Functional Equivalence," 84–85.

[14] *Holy Bible*: *New Revised Standard Version* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), xvii.

[15] *Holy Bible: New International Version Inclusive* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2001), vii. Carson's understanding(s) of this statement is (are) curious and unconvincing. See Carson, *Debate*, 27-28.

[16] Carson, "The Limits of Functional Equivalence," 84 (italics in original). In the same vein, Carson writes, "Regardless of the source of the pressure for linguistic change, the changes (I shall argue) are here. If that is the case, *this is the language that, increasingly, we have to work with*, even if we may not approve all the reasons that have brought these changes about (even as some did not appreciate the reasons for dropping 'thou' and thy'). In short, whatever the reasons for the changes in the English language now taking place, the translator's job is always the same: translate the Word of God into the *current* language" (*Debate*, 188 [italics in original]). I completely disagree with Carson about the translator's job. The translator of God's word should translate the Scriptures faithfully not just into the target language (English), but also from the source language (Hebrew and Greek). The translator is not a politician pandering to the sensitivities and demands of special interest groups. The dropping of "thou" and "thy" are natural language changes; gender-inclusive language unnaturally changes the language to sterilize the "sexist," "patriarchal" English language and the biblical text. As language naturally changes, most allow the old and the new language to continue together until the old language dies of natural causes. If anyone believes that gender-inclusive language is a natural change, I challenge them to go to any re-education camp found in the English departments, feminist studies departments, and many seminaries in North America. There, the sensitivities go one way. There, the sinner dies quickly—of unnatural causes for using unapproved language—if he (and I mean he) is lucky. That same freedom of thought and speech will be for all of us soon. This language change is forced and enforced—naturally, of course.

[17] Carson, "The Limits of Functional Equivalence," 84.

[18] For particulars of the linguistic arguments, see the excellent work of Vern S. Poythress and Wayne A. Grudem, *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2004), which opposes gender-inclusive language. For proponents of gender-inclusive language, see Carson, *Debate*; and Mark Strauss, *Distorting Scripture? The Challenge of Bible Translation and Gender Accuracy* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998).

Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
JBMW 10/2 (Fall 2005) 66-74

Annotated Bibliography for Gender Related Books in 2004

Compiled and Annotated by Rob Lister
Contributing Editor,
Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, Louisville, Kentucky

In this issue of the journal we profile some of the most significant gender-related books from 2004. Here is a brief reminder about the categories we are using and our intent in using them. **Complementarian** designates an author who recognizes the full personal equality of the sexes, coupled with an acknowledgment of role distinctions in the home and church. **Egalitarian** classifies evangelicals who see undifferentiated equality (i.e., they see no scriptural warrant for affirming male headship in the home or the church). Under the **Non-Evangelical** heading, we have classified important secular works and books that address the subject of biblical gender issues from a religious, albeit, non-evangelical point of view. This category also serves as our classification for liberal scholars wanting to retain some sort of Christian identity. Finally, under the **Undeclared** heading, we have listed those books that do not give sufficient indication of their fundamental stance for us to classify them more specifically.

Complementarian

Chanski, Mark. ***Manly Dominion in a Passive-Purple-Four-Ball World.*** **Merrick, NY: Calvary Press, 2004.**

Chanski argues that far too many men today are like the four-ball in billards—passive and knocked around by their environment. By contrast, he contends that biblical manliness is to be marked not by passivity but by the exercise of assertive leadership. In developing this concept of "manly dominion," Chanski's book is marked by its breadth of biblical analysis and application to such significant areas of life as career choice, decision-making, churchmanship, and child raising.

Clarkson, Sally. ***The Ministry of Motherhood: Following Christ's Example in Reaching the Hearts of Our Children.*** **Colorado Springs: WaterBrook, 2004.**

Given her own experience with the hectic realities of a mother's world, Clarkson knows how quickly even necessary daily tasks can eat up the hours of the

day, leaving a mom to feel that, at best, she has only just survived the day. As a result, in *The Ministry of Motherhood*—a companion to her earlier volume *The Mission of Motherhood*—Clarkson has mapped out a very intentional plan for mothers to use in strategically weaving the discipleship of their children into all the other facets of a given day. She writes in very congenial manner, employing a variety of personal anecdotes to illustrate her points. In all of this, it is clear that Clarkson desires to use everyday realities as a training ground, in the lives of children, for growing Christian character and building a Christian worldview, much in the fashion that Deuteronomy 6 instructs us.

Dobson, James. *Marriage Under Fire.* Sisters, OR: Multnomah, 2004.

Dobson has penned an eloquent plea for the defense of the institution of marriage against the current efforts to legalize homosexual "marriage." After tracking some of the political and legal steps that have brought us to the current situation, he addresses the consequences that will result—both for individual families and for society as a whole—if homosexual activists win the day. In the concluding chapter Dobson articulates his concern for the necessity of a Federal Marriage Amendment (FMA). Appendices address common questions about "gay marriage," provide suggestions for supporting the FMA, and suggest a list of organizations and resources that will be of benefit to the reader in addressing this issue.

Ennis, Pat and Lisa Tatlock. *Designing a Lifestyle That Pleases God.* Chicago: Moody, 2004.

In this companion volume to their earlier book *Becoming a Woman Who Pleases God* (Moody, 2003), Ennis and Tatlock—both professors of Home Economics at The Master's College—use the principles of Titus 2:3–5 to establish biblical priorities for Christian women that will guide them in the building of their homes. The authors combine sound reasoning from Scripture with an abundance of practical wisdom as they cover topics ranging from embracing submission to managing motherhood to cultivating a hostess's heart and dressing with discernment.

Grudem, Wayne. *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than 100 Disputed Questions.* Sisters, OR: Multnomah, 2004.

This resource is unsurpassed for its value in responding to the key claims of evangelical feminism, and in my judgment that makes it an essential companion of *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (still the definitive statement of the complementarian view). Whereas, RBMW established the major contours of complementarianism, this new volume is noteworthy for the way it focuses in on critiquing the egalitarian view, as well as for the updated scholarship it provides. Herein, Grudem answers over one hundred egalitarian arguments that range from matters of biblical exegesis and theology, to issues of hermeneutical method, to areas of application. In addition to being a wonderful analysis of the issues at hand, Grudem's book exhibits several strengths that commend it to a wide readership. First, while providing an example of first-rate scholarship, *EFBT* reads very easily, which will endear the volume to pastors and lay leaders as well as scholars. The book also has the advantage of treating each question in a succinct manner. So, if a reader wants an analysis of a particular claim he or she

can look it up in the very thorough and well-organized table of contents, go right to topic in question, and read Grudem's analysis of it, usually in a matter of just a few pages.

Heimbach, Daniel R. ***True Sexual Morality: Recovering Biblical Standards for a Culture in Crisis.*** **Wheaton: Crossway, 2004.**

This book may well be the best one volume treatment of Christian sexual ethics available. It is both thorough as to its range of subject matter and insightful as to its analysis. In section one, Heimbach surveys how our culture came to the point of such sexual chaos. Then he extensively portrays the superior path of biblical sexual morality. Contained herein, is a very nice statement of seven positive principles that distinguish biblical sexual morality. In the third section, he turns to provide an analysis of leading "counterfeit" views of sexual morality. Then, in the last section, Heimbach analyzes where the current trajectory might lead.

Kennedy, D. James, and Jerry Newcombe. ***What's Wrong with Same-Sex Marriage?*** **Wheaton: Crossway, 2004.**

Kennedy and Newcombe make the case for resisting the advancing efforts to legalize same-sex "marriage." In their defense of traditional marriage, the authors unmask the real reason that homosexual activists are pushing for same-sex marriage: not a desire to enjoy marriage, but to destroy it and force widespread acceptance of the homosexual lifestyle on everyone else. They present a two pronged strategy for a response: (1) conversion of homosexuals who want to change and (2) an aggressive push for a Federal Marriage Amendment.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., with David W. Jones. ***God, Marriage, and Family: Rebuilding the Biblical Foundation.*** **Wheaton: Crossway, 2004.**

This is perhaps the most comprehensive volume on its theme. The authors plumb the depths of scriptural teaching and then apply that teaching to a whole range of issues (e.g., divorce, contraception, singleness, etc.) facing contemporary families. Specific roles for fathers, mothers, and children are clearly conveyed. The book comes complete with a study guide, enhancing its value for use in group discussions. The bibliography of resources for additional study is also extremely valuable.

Lutzer, Erwin W. ***The Truth About Same-Sex Marriage.*** **Chicago: Moody, 2004.**

Lutzer pleads for the church to resist the advancing agenda of same-sex "marriage," while also insisting that the church reach out to the homosexual community with compassion. He opens the book by diagnosing how homosexual activists have been able to exercise such a strategic influence over the culture so as to bring us to the current cultural moment. Then, he shows how the legalization of same-sex marriage will, in effect, destroy the institution of marriage, thereby harming children and undermining the very fabric of society. In all of this, Lutzer displays the pastoral wisdom required to stand unapologetically for the truth of Scripture in the midst of a hostile culture, while also demonstrating great compassion for and outreach to homosexuals—many of whom intuitively sense the wrongness of their behavior or are likely to have had traumatic experiences as children.

Mahaney, C. J. ***Sex, Romance, and the Glory of God.*** **Wheaton: Crossway, 2004.**

Mahaney's discussion of sexual intimacy in marriage is superb. He correctly recognizes the larger purpose of marriage in pointing to the relationship between Christ and his church. He also understands that passion in the bedroom is not isolated and unrelated to the larger reality of the marriage relationship. Consequently, Mahaney's guiding principle for husbands is to lead their wives lovingly in this area by touching their hearts and minds before touching their bodies. Beginning from this principle, Mahaney proceeds to blend insights from the Song of Solomon with advice and applications from his own observations and experience about how a husband can truly romance his wife in various dimensions of their relationship. All of this, of course, feeds into (and, in turn, benefits from) the unabashed pleasure of intense sexual joy between a husband and wife bonded together by covenant love. In my own estimation, every Christian husband should read this book.

McCulley, Carolyn. ***Did I Kiss Marriage Goodbye? Trusting God With a Hope Deferred.*** **Wheaton: Crossway, 2004.**

In this very thoughtful volume, McCulley offers encouragement to single women, by helping them see their singleness through a God-centered lens. Laced throughout with solid Bible exposition (especially framed around Proverbs 31), McCulley does not skirt the real frustrations and struggles of singleness. Instead, treating those issues head-on, she continually points her readers to the grace and wisdom of God. She maintains that growth in godly femininity is a biblical objective no matter what one's marital status may be. McCulley also encourages her readers to make the most of the opportunities for ministry unique to singles.

Moore, Doreen. ***Good Christians, Good Husbands? Leaving a Legacy in Marriage and Ministry.*** **Ross-shire, Scotland: Christian Focus, 2004.**

Moore provides a well-researched account of the efforts to balance ministry and marriage by John Wesley, George Whitefield, and Jonathan Edwards. All of this is undertaken not just as an interesting historical study, even though it would be of interest for that reason alone. Instead, all of Moore's historical analysis builds toward her concluding chapter in which she makes use of her historical observations along with biblical guidance in order to outline an approach to balancing marriage and ministry for contemporary readers. Here, she distills thirteen well-conceived principles that make for one of the most thoughtful and well-rounded approaches to this topic that I have seen.

Patterson, Dorothy Kelley, and Armour Patterson. ***Parents in Ministry: Training up a Child While Answering the Call.*** **Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2004.**

Dorothy and Armour Patterson—wife and son, respectively, of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary president Paige Patterson—provide an excellent field-manual for parents faced with the unique challenges of raising children while serving in vocational ministry. Their combined experience as a mother and son trying to conduct ministry and home life amidst the tumultuous years of the conservative resurgence in the Southern Baptist Convention, gives the Pattersons an invaluable perspective

from which to address this issue. Chapter topics range from the adolescent years, to the importance of affirming the gender distinctives of sons and daughters, to a discussion of Christian virtues.

Pearcey, Nancy. *Total Truth: Liberating Christianity from its Cultural Captivity*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2004.

This is a book about the importance of the Christian worldview and Christian cultural engagement. Though it is not primarily devoted to a consideration of gender issues, Pearcey's book does devote one fine chapter to that end. As with the other chapters in the book, this particular chapter (entitled "How Women Started the Culture War") is a well-documented and extremely insightful piece of cultural analysis. Beginning with the Industrial Revolution, Pearcey deftly analyzes how the public/private dichotomy has infiltrated and reshaped the ordering of home life as well as cultural understandings of manhood and womanhood.

Poythress, Vern S., and Wayne A. Grudem. *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2004.

This is an update of the authors' *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy: Muting the Masculinity of God's Words*, which was also published by Broadman & Holman in 2000. In the fall of 2002, *JBMW* devoted its fall issue (vol. 7, no. 2) to responding to the recently released TNIV New Testament and the arguments made by its advocates. The contents of that journal now appear as chapters 1–6 of *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy*. These chapters address specific texts and categories of mistakes found in the TNIV New Testament, and they offer a response to key rebuttals from major proponents of the TNIV. The second half of *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy* retains all of the material from the previous volume by Poythress and Grudem. Combining these two components in one book allows the authors to present, in one place, the theoretical arguments against gender-neutral Bible translation, along with the focused application of these arguments to the translation practice and policy of the TNIV. For a more detailed outline of the key arguments advanced by Poythress and Grudem in their previous volume, readers may wish to peruse my lengthier review of the earlier edition (see *JBMW* 6, no. 1 [2001]: 31–34). In any case, it remains my judgment that Poythress and Grudem have provided us with the most thorough and persuasive approach to the hotly debated issue of translating gendered language in Scripture. The material they have compiled in response to the TNIV offers a timely response that sustains and extends the wisdom of their earlier observations.

Stanton, Glenn T., and Bill Maier. *Marriage on Trial: The Case Against Same-Sex Marriage and Parenting*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.

Marriage on Trial is a social-science field-manual for the defense of marriage against the onslaught of the homosexual agenda. The book is arranged in a question and answer format in order to provide sound responses to key questions about same-sex marriage. In the course of critiquing the arguments for same-sex marriage, the authors also build the positive case for the value of traditional monogamous marriage, which they term "natural marriage."

Egalitarian

Johnson, Alan F. *1 Corinthians.* IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.

For the purposes of the present bibliography, it is enough to comment briefly on Johnson's interpretations of 1 Cor 11:2–16 and 14:33-36. First, it should be noted that he does make some helpful observations. For instance, he does acknowledge the presence of a hierarchical ordering in 1 Corinthians 11, and unlike some egalitarians, he contends for the authenticity of 1 Cor 14:34–35. With respect to 1 Corinthians 11, however, he relativizes the force of his earlier observation by contending that in vv. 11–16 Paul proposes a "new creation" egalitarian model of gender relations that, for all practical purposes, trumps his earlier comments in vv. 2–10. According to Johnson, it seems that Paul wanted to maintain a sense of deference, in matters of dress and decorum, to the cultural patriarchal expectations so as not to attach unnecessary offense to the gospel. And yet, in Johnson's view, Paul was simultaneously laying the groundwork for a new egalitarian model of ministry. With respect to 1 Cor 14:34–35, Johnson advocates an understanding of this passage that limits the force of Paul's instruction to the isolated circumstance—namely certain wives interrupting the worship service and prophetic ministry by asking questions—of his direct recipients alone. Since spatial limitations preclude a detailed interaction with Johnson's proposals, allow me to point the interested reader to a couple of helpful resources that can give a brief response to interpretations such as these. (1) For a more persuasive reading of the relationship between 1 Cor 11:2–10 and vv. 11–16, see Tom Schreiner's chapter "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity" in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 124–39. (2) Concerning Johnson's specific interpretation of 1 Cor 14:34–35 see Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 242–47.

Mathews, Alice P., and M. Gay Hubbard. *Marriage Made in Eden: A Pre-Modern Perspective for a Post-Christian World.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.

In a variety of ways, Mathews and Hubbard contend for an egalitarian framework for marriage. Historically speaking, they suggest that complementarianism was largely a development of the Victorian age that has accommodated itself to the culture. They maintain that complementarian theology is a key indicator of domestic violence. Sociologically, they have conducted several surveys, which indicated to them that those with complementarian views were more likely to rate their marriages negatively. The authors further contend that Scripture unequivocally supports an egalitarian model of marriage—so much so that they see 1 Cor 7:2–5 as the only NT text that "explicitly addresses the question of authority in marriage." For a deft analysis of these and other claims by Mathews and Hubbard, the reader is encouraged to see John Tarwater's thorough review of *Marriage Made in Eden* in *JBMW* 9, no. 2 (2004): 42–48.

Pierce, Ronald W., Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, with Gordon D. Fee, eds. *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.

According to the editors, "*Discovering Biblical Equality* is the first multiauthored volume to comprehensively, systematically and consistently articulate

an egalitarian position based on the tenets of biblical teaching" (18). To that end, it serves as the counterpart to the one-volume multiauthored statement of the complementarian vision of gender roles found in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (Crossway, 1991). *DBE* proceeds in five main sections, successively addressing historical concerns, exegetical treatments of key passages, theological syntheses, hermeneutical issues, and practical applications. Many of the chapter topics herein mirror those found in *RBMW*, although the conclusions clearly differ. Given the sheer magnitude of the volume, a detailed interaction is not possible in the limited space presently available. (For the needed depth of interaction, the reader is encouraged to see *JBMW* 10, no. 1 [2005]—an issue completely devoted to responding to the pivotal chapters in *DBE*.) For the moment then, drawing attention to just two issues will have to suffice. First, it should be noted that, at the outset, the editors (Pierce and Groothuis) of *DBE* disallow the possibility of finding "middle ground" on the basic issues at stake (17). They are correct in their conclusion; complementarianism and egalitarianism are mutually exclusive in their core distinctives. We should all, therefore, feel the obligation of searching the Scriptures diligently to ensure the biblical fidelity of our views. Second, this recognition of fundamental incompatibility on the part of *DBE*'s editors raises questions concerning their appropriation of the term "complementarity." The editors of *DBE* affirm "complementarity without hierarchy," and they suggest that the term "complementary" may more appropriately speak to areas of agreement between the two opposing evangelical views. In my judgment, however, this clouds the terms of debate. Complementarians, for instance, rightly insist on the complete equality of men and women as creatures made in the image of God. But, they do not as a result attempt to appropriate the term "egalitarian," since this label has long been a self-designation of those who affirm, not only full equality as image bearers, but an undifferentiated equality with respect to roles and relationships in the church and home. Conversely, the term "complementarian" is the long established shorthand designation for the view that simultaneously affirms equality of essence and distinction of roles. As such, it does not make for accurate representation to claim the complementarian label, while voiding the term of its established distinctives. This observation is especially important, when there is agreement over the mutually exclusive nature of the fundamental claims of the two views.

Non-Evangelical Books

Venker, Suzanne. *7 Myths of Working Mothers: Why Children and (Most) Careers Just Don't Mix.* Dallas: Spence, 2004.

While Venker's case is not made on biblical grounds, her book nevertheless contains some wonderful insights and observations. She does acknowledge differences between the genders, and as the title of the book suggests, she clearly rejects the "have it all" mentality that modern feminism has foisted on so many women today. Simply put, her main thesis is that mothering is an enormously valuable full-time job, not a responsibility on the side. Linked to this thesis, Venker discusses topics ranging from family economics to day care.

Wilcox, W. Bradford. *Soft Patriarchs, New Men: How Christianity Shapes Fathers and Husbands.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Wilcox presents a very interesting sociological analysis of Christianity's effects on the strength of men's attachment to their families. What emerges from his study—surprising as it may be to some secularist misconceptions—is that evangelical Protestant men, whom Wilcox terms "soft patriarchs," appear to be more dedicated to and involved with their families than either their secular or mainline Protestant peers. Indeed, Wilcox finds this group of committed evangelicals to be more affectionate with their families and to have lower rates of domestic violence than any other group. Wilcox suggests that this is an initially surprising finding given the history of evangelical support for "gender-role traditionalism." From his point of view, however, the drawbacks to affirming gender role distinctions are offset by three prominent factors: theological conservatism, familism, and church attendance.

Undeclared Books

Blankenhorn, David, Don Browning, and Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen, eds. *Does Christianity Teach Male Headship? The Equal-Regard Marriage and its Critics.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

This book is classified as "undeclared" because of the diversity of viewpoints contained herein. Contributors to the book range from non-evangelical to Roman Catholic to evangelical egalitarian to complementarian. In its layout, Part I of the book is given to making the case for what proponents term "equal-regard" marriage. With varying shades of emphasis depending on the particular author and chapter aim, this is a model of marriage that embraces the egalitarian rejection of male headship. Part II provides criticisms of the "equal-regard" marriage from a variety of perspectives, including a fine essay defending a traditional complementarian point of view by Robert Godfrey.

Dewey, David. *A User's Guide to Bible Translations: Making the Most of Different Versions.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.

Dewey examines a host of issues pertaining to the philosophy of translation, and he also surveys the history of English Bible translations all the way up through the twenty-first century phenomenon of internet Bibles. He favors a translation policy that incorporates inclusive gender-language. With respect to masculine generics, for example, Dewey believes that the broader culture is either incapable of understanding such passages or that the culture will take great offense at them. (With respect to these concerns, I refer the reader to *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy* by Vern Poythress and Wayne Grudem. See the review above.)

Thomas, Gary L. *Sacred Parenting: How Raising Children Shapes Our Souls.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.

Much as his earlier volume (*Sacred Marriage*) did with respect to marriage, Thomas's newest book focuses on the spiritual formation that comes to parents as a result of raising children. To that end, he suggests that parenting is not, first and foremost, about raising successful well-adjusted kids. On the contrary, he maintains that the parent-child relationship is an instrument, in the hands of God, designed to make us more holy as parents, even as we try to impact our children with the beauty of the gospel.

Peppered with anecdotes, personal illustrations, accounts from church history, and biblical analysis, this book brings a healthy perspective and needed reminder to the issue at hand. (In the interest of full disclosure, the reasons for classifying Thomas's volume as "undeclared" should be noted. As helpful as I have generally found Thomas's writings to be, I have come across a few passages in my reading of his publications that, so far as I can tell, reflect conflicting intuitions on his part concerning the notion of male headship.)

Thompson, Chad W. *Loving Homosexuals as Jesus Would: A Fresh Christian Approach*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2004.

Thompson, who himself has come out of the gay lifestyle, pens a thoughtful volume aimed at helping conservative Christians reach out in love to homosexuals without condoning homosexuality. While he honestly depicts his own story and addresses controversial issues such as the causes of homosexuality and the possibility for change, he is keenly concerned to address the church's shortcomings in actually reaching out to the gay community. He suggests that the confrontational "turn or burn" approach employed by many street preachers is less than helpful when the recipients do not already have a sense of their own sinfulness. By way of contrast, Thompson suggests that something akin to Paul's approach in Acts 17 may be a fruitful evangelistic model in attempting to reach homosexuals with the gospel and the hope of change. ■