

**LOST IN TRANSLATION: A COMPARISON OF POLITICAL INFLUENCES ON THE  
AUTHORIZED VERSION AND THE HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE**

An Honors Project submitted by

Joshua W. Carpenter  
428 Caney Creek Road  
Rogersville, Tennessee 37857  
(423) 754-5547

in partial fulfillment for the degrees  
Bachelor of Arts in Religion/ Philosophy  
Bachelor of Arts in Biblical Languages

April 28, 2010

Project Advisor: Dr. Charles Wade Bibb

© 2010 Joshua W. Carpenter

Approval Sheet

Lost in Translation:  
A Comparison of Political Influences on the Authorized Version  
and the Holman Christian Standard Bible

---

Faculty Director

---

Chair, Department of (insert department here)

---

Director, Honors Program

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Outline	iii
Chapter I: Introduction and Methods	1
Chapter II: The Authorized Version: Ecclesial Necessity or Political Tool?	15
Chapter III: Holman Christian Standard Bible: Bonafide Translation or Theological Treachery?	35
Chapter IV: Comparisons and Conclusions	56
Appendix I: Interview with Dr. Ray Clendenen	62
Appendix II: Articles of Affirmation and Denial of the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy	75
Bibliography	80

## I. Chapter 1: Introduction and Methods

### A. Introduction to the Thesis

1. General background on both texts
2. Thesis statement: An examination of AV and the politics surrounding its translation can serve to illuminate modern translations such as the HCSB so that possible political biases may come to light.

### B. Historical Background of AV and HCSB

#### 1. AV

##### *a) Protestant Reformation*

- (1) Influence of Renaissance thinking on Luther, Calvin, etc.
- (2) Luther's influence on Tyndale, Wycliffe

##### *b) English Reformation*

- (1) Henry VIII and Roman Catholicism
- (2) Concerning Anglicans, Catholics, and Puritans

#### 2. HCSB

##### *a) The Southern Baptist Takeover*

- (1) Concerns over doctrine
- (2) Issues with other translations and their backgrounds

##### *b) Mid 20th-Century America*

- (1) Women's Rights Movement
- (2) Crisis of the Family: Divorce and Homosexuality
- (3) "The Jesus Movement"

### C. Translation Theory

1. Discussion of Nida and Taber's principles of translation
2. Use of Nida and Taber in the rest of the paper

- D. Limits of the Thesis
  - 1. Use of myriad sources in KJV translation
  - 2. Material Selection
  - 3. Unable to verify the language skills of some translators of KJV

## II. Chapter II: The Authorized Version: Ecclesial Necessity or Political Tool?

### A. Political/Religious Background

- 1. The road to an authorized version
  - a) *The myriad of English Scripture texts and the Anglican Church's response*
  - b) *The King and the Church*
- 2. Issues at stake
  - a) *Family structure*
  - b) *Authority of Church and State*

### B. Evidence of Political /Religious Influences on AV

- 1. Ephesians 5:21- 6:9
- 2. 1 Peter 2:13- 3:7

### C. Summary

## III. Chapter III: Holman Christian Standard Bible: Bonafide Translation or Theological Treachery?

### A. Political/Religious Background

- 1. Baptist History from 1611 on
  - a) *Roots of American Baptists*
  - b) *The Birth of Southern Baptists*
  - c) *Crises in Southern Baptist life prior to 1980*
  - d) *The Southern Baptist Takeover*

2. Reasons for the HCSB: A Crash Course in Fundamentalist Theology
    - a) *Inerrancy/Infallibility of Scripture*
    - b) *Gender Inclusive Language*
  - B. Evidence of Political /Religious Influences on HCSB
    1. 2nd Timothy 3:10-17
    2. Romans 16:1-2
  - C. Summary
- IV. Chapter IV: Comparisons and Conclusions
- A. Differences between the AV and the HCSB in purpose.
  - B. Similarities between the AV and the HCSB in substance of the claim.
  - C. Prognosis for the Church: AV's purpose in political bias vs. HCSB's purpose in political bias.

## CHAPTER ONE

### BACKGROUND AND METHODS

Of all the different qualifications for an organism to be considered biologically alive, perhaps the one that stands out most is response to the environment. This qualification differs from the others due to the action (whether or not the organism is conscious of said action) taken as a result of a stimulus. Each human is a living creature; therefore, whether or not a human perceives its response to its environment, it certainly has one. This notion of response to environmental factors takes on a new form in humans as their creative works also reflect their social and emotional backgrounds.

Thus music, art, and literature often reflect the societies out of which they come. This concept is evidenced by satirical works such as Voltaire's *Candide* and Swift's "A Modest Proposal." The political influences on these works are relatively simple to see by those with appropriate historical background. Perhaps one area of literature in which scholars have not yet explored societal influences is in translations, particularly of Biblical texts. An examination of the Authorized Version (AV) and the politics surrounding its translation can serve to illuminate modern translations such as the Holman Christian Standard Bible (HCSB) so that possible political biases may come to light.

The AV (King James Version) of the Bible came into existence in 1611 at the behest of King James I of England. It was not the first English version, but it was the version that bore the

mantles of both the king's favor and the Anglican Church's endorsement. The text emerged from a series of disputed attempts at an English text and reflected the church's concern over heresy and religious inconsistency flowing out of the Protestant Reformation.

AV's roots extend at least to a man named John Wycliffe, an English philosopher and theologian who lived during the mid to late 14th century.<sup>1</sup> He championed the cause of scriptural authority as a basis for the church's and the state's authority despite substantial opposition from both Pope Gregory XI and the Bishop of London.<sup>2</sup> He also contended that "the Bible. . . was the sole criterion of doctrine, to which no ecclesiastical authority might lawfully add, and that the authority of the Pope was ill-founded in scripture," a claim which Gregory condemned as heresy.<sup>3</sup> While Wycliffe played no part in translating the first English text, he and fellow reformers during his time laid important groundwork for the Protestant Reformation.

It is from Wycliffe's conflicts with the Papacy that the issues of the Protestant Reformation take shape. In his work, *De Viritate Sacrae Scripturae*, Wycliffe expounds upon his own hermeneutic and uses it to critique Catholicism's institutional authority structure as well as its influence on secular governments.<sup>4</sup> These issues spread through the intellectual community, creating deep lines of division and controversy. The seeds of an intellectual revolution begin to take root.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Oxford Dictionary of the English Church*, 6th ed., s.v. "Wycliffe, John."

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Kantik Ghosh, *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 22-23.

However, other important issues came to bear in the 1300's. The Black Plague called into question the morality of Catholic Europe, and many began to question whether the church was doing its duty in securing the safety and redemption of Christendom.<sup>5</sup> The century saw a period in which both Rome and Avignon had a Pope, and complicated theological debates were commonplace.<sup>6</sup> This climate of distrust allowed thinkers like Wycliffe and his fellow reformers to flourish.

Perhaps the most important change the 14th century brings is a change in philosophical orientation. Medieval philosophy until this point is saturated with an idea as old as Plato: the notion of Realism. Realism is an epistemic system that claims that humans know a thing because it shares in an eternal form that exists either as a physical manifestation, a celestial or immaterial construct, or in the Divine mind.<sup>7</sup> During this time period, Nominalism, or the idea that these eternal constructs are simply names given to individual items, becomes Realism's theoretical nemesis.<sup>8</sup> As Placher details, this distinction changes the face of Christianity from corporate and standardized to solitary and individualized.<sup>9</sup> This growing sense of independence gave rise to another reformer: Martin Luther.

Luther's early struggle with his faith is largely a result of this philosophical conflict. Luther was educated at the monastery of the Augustinian Hermits at Erfurt where he encountered

---

<sup>5</sup> William C. Placher, *A History of Christian Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1983), 162.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 163.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 162.

Nominalist thought.<sup>10</sup> Yet due to an internal conflict about his own salvation, Luther came to believe that the central message of the gospel was justification by faith, a conclusion he reached by reading Augustine's work and the book of Romans.<sup>11</sup>

This Augustinian influence was inherently Realistic,<sup>12</sup> putting Luther in tension between the two feuding ideologies. It is out of these tensions and Luther's reflection on his struggles that Luther responded contemptuously against the Catholic Church. He posted his famous 95 theses following a sermon on the practice of indulgences in 1517.<sup>13</sup> These theses spread like wildfire, causing rejoicing in likeminded German reformers and dismay in ecclesiastical figures.<sup>14</sup>

Luther continued his assault three years later with three writings focused around three issues. The first work, *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*, persuaded German princes to split with Rome and work out their own salvation.<sup>15</sup> The second, *De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesia*, rebelled against all sacraments except baptism and the Eucharist, claiming that the other sacraments were used by the Catholic Church for selfish interests.<sup>16</sup> The last and most important, *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen*, declared that faith liberates Christians as

---

<sup>10</sup> *Oxford Dictionary*, "Luther, Martin."

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Walter Kauffman and F. E. Baird, *Philosophic Classics, vol II: Medieval Philosophy* (Grand Rapids: Prentice-Hall, 1994), 45-47.

<sup>13</sup> "Luther, Martin."

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

opposed to good works.<sup>17</sup> These three works were the deathblow to any semblances of unity in the church. The Protestant Reformation had begun.

Luther also did something else extraordinary: he translated the Hebrew and Greek scriptures into German.<sup>18</sup> This was another act of heresy in the Catholic mind as any common language was considered too vulgar for the Bible.<sup>19</sup> Luther's willingness to challenge structures of authority in the realm of translation gave others both inspiration and courage to bring the scriptures to the common people.

From this brief historical background, one can identify a few central issues at work in Christendom that influenced the development of AV. Wycliffe's struggle for the superiority of scriptural authority indicates that the Catholic Church struggled with the role of scripture. Luther's conflicts with both ecclesiastical and secular authorities indicates a power struggle between the Church and secular authorities (as more often than not German princes protected Luther from the Church).<sup>20</sup> Luther's internal conflicts, which lead him away from salvation by actions into salvation by grace, suggest that the Church at the time believed that its salvation came through sacrament and good deeds. This conflict of soteriology is perhaps the issue which most sharply divided the Church.

Conflict seems to be the Church's constant companion for several hundred years following Martin Luther. Indeed, the Church still entertains conflict on a regular basis as the

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> David Daiches, *The King James Version of the English Bible* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1941) 8.

<sup>20</sup> "Luther, Martin."

circumstances that lead up to the HCSB's translation show. Though the focus shifts from the newborn Protestant denominations to a well-established Southern Baptist church, sociopolitical influences still bear heavy upon the minds of theologians in the 20th century.

HCSB is one of the newest translations available. Published in 2004, this translation makes clear its goals in its introduction: "provide. . . an accurate, readable translation in contemporary English, equip serious Bible students with an accurate translation. . . ., give. . . a text that has numerous reader helps, is visually attractive. . . and is appealing when heard, affirm the authority of scripture as God's Word and to champion its absolute truth against social or cultural agendas that would compromise its accuracy."<sup>21</sup>

This last purpose is quite politically charged, but the introduction turns political charge into an indictment against particular political agendas. It protests against people who "ignore the Bible's teachings on distinct roles of men and women in family and church. . . to eliminate those distinctions. . . ." and claims that these people "have begun a program to engineer the removal of a perceived male bias in the English language."<sup>22</sup> It can easily be concluded that this translation is attempting to do more than just provide a readable English version.

The origins of HCSB's charged tone are to be found in a radical reformation of ideas beginning during the 1960's. Factions in Baptist circles arose: fundamentalists and moderates. Fundamentalists adhere to a strict literal interpretation of scripture while moderates hold that scripture must be interpreted through critical methods.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Holman Christian Standard Bible* (Nashville: Holman, 2004) ix.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, xii.

Ralph H. Elliott's book entitled *The Message of Genesis* illustrated this sharp distinction in Baptist life.<sup>23</sup> Elliot raised serious hermeneutical questions and caused concern amongst Southern Baptists.<sup>24</sup> In response to Elliott, Southern Baptists revised the 1925 *Baptist Faith and Message (BF&M)* in 1963, focusing on what Southern Baptists believed true concerning Scripture.<sup>25</sup> This action marked the beginnings of a shift towards a solidified orthodoxy and creedalism in the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC).<sup>26</sup>

Yet these changes were not enough for some fundamentalist thinkers. In 1979, three men emerged to purge the Convention of moderate ideologies: Paige Patterson, Paul Pressler, and Adrian Rogers.<sup>27</sup> Patterson (the theologian), Pressler (the politician), and Rogers (the face) joined together to present a plan to gain political control over the SBC.<sup>28</sup>

The plan worked, and fundamentalist thinking became normative via revisions to the *BF&M* in 1998 and 2000. Anyone in a position of ecclesial authority within a SBC related structure is encouraged if not forced to sign the BF&M to symbolize agreement with it.<sup>29</sup> It is in the alterations in this document that political/theological issues are most evident.

---

<sup>23</sup> Jerry Sutton, *The Baptist Reformation* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2000) 7-10.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 10-11.

<sup>26</sup> Walter Shurden, Forward of *Stand with Christ: Why Missionaries Can't Sign the 2000 Baptist Faith and Message* ed. Robert O'Brian (Macon: Smyth and Helwys, 2002) 3.

<sup>27</sup> Walter Shurden, *Not a Silent People: Controversies that Have Shaped Southern Baptists* (Macon: Smyth and Helwys, 1995) 84.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

Russell Dilday gives a list of twelve changes between the *BF&M 1963* and the *BF&M 2000*, of which these are a few:

- The deletion of the Christocentric criterion in Biblical interpretation.
- The diminishing of the doctrines of soul competency and the priesthood of the believers.
- The diminishing of the doctrine of autonomy and freedom of the local church under the leadership of the Holy Spirit.
- The narrow interpretation of the role of women in marriage.
- The narrow interpretation of the role of women in the church.
- The trend toward including a catalogue of specific current sins.<sup>30</sup>

Dilday goes on to elaborate on each of these, citing specific changes in *BF&M* versions that lead to theological shifts in response to political stresses. These shifts suggest the possibility of politically charged translations.

Among these political stresses are two phenomena of the mid-20th century that were in the background of the Baptist conflicts. The first of these is the feminist movement, the

---

<sup>29</sup> Kenneth Massey, “A Crooked and Perverse Generation Demands a Sign(nature),” in *Stand with Christ: Why Missionaries Can’t Sign the 2000 Baptist Faith and Message* ed. Robert O’Brian (Macon: Smith and Helwys, 2002) 55-56.

<sup>30</sup> Russell Dilday, “A Serious Look at the Baptist Faith and Message Revisions,” in *Stand with Christ: Why Missionaries Can’t Sign the 2000 Baptist Faith and Message* ed. Robert O’Brian (Macon: Smith and Helwys, 2002) 37.

“perception that there is something wrong with society’s treatment of women.”<sup>31</sup> The second of these is the conflict over the nature of the Biblical text.

Feminism and the Women’s Rights campaign secured a major victory in 1920 when women gained the right to vote in American elections, but feminism as a movement did not cease with this success. Feminism continued to gain steam in the 1960’s, assailing any societal aspect in which there existed a perceived andocentric bias (including scripture).<sup>32</sup> Feminism thus gave birth to feminist criticism of the Bible, and gender-neutral language became an issue.

The doctrine of inerrancy is a difficult doctrine to pinpoint as it means something different to various different groups. Fundamentalist thinkers use the term to refer to the Bible being completely free from any sort of error. More moderate Christians use the same term to describe the perfection of the message of the Bible. As the Southern Baptist Takeover shows, most of the conflicts among Southern Baptists revolve around which definition of inerrancy the Convention should adopt.

With this context in mind, a number of distinct political/theological issues can be identified as candidates for influencing HCSB. The first is scriptural inerrancy which sparked the revision of almost every version of the *BF&M*. Another issue is gender-neutral language and gender roles, represented by the attitude fundamentalists take toward women in light of the feminist movement.

---

<sup>31</sup> Lisa Tuttle, “Feminism” in *The Encyclopedia of Feminism* (New York: Facts on File, 1986) 107.

<sup>32</sup> Dana Noland Fewell “Reading the Bible Ideologically; Feminist Criticism” in *To Each its Own Meaning*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999) 268-280.

To search the entirety of the Bible in search of political influences is beyond the scope of this paper. Thus each issue merits its own applicable scripture passage to be examined. The superiority of scriptural authority coincides well with 2 Timothy 3:14-16. Church and state issues are best examined under Romans 12:14-13:7. Issues of faith and works in soteriology call Ephesians 2:8-10 into question. The issue of scriptural inerrancy coincides well with 2 Timothy 3:10-17 and 2 Peter 1:16-2:3. Ephesians 5:21- 6:10 suffices for gender roles. It is important to note that these passages are not exhaustive of the text's response to these issues; as a result, other passages may also be relevant.

Discerning what makes a translation authentic or inauthentic to the text seems a monumental task. However, the United Bible Society (UBS) has compiled a number of guidelines applicable to both the AV and the HSCB.<sup>33</sup> These guidelines follow order of importance: reproduction of meaning, equivalent phrases outweigh identical phrases, natural equivalence rather than grammatical awkwardness, the closest equivalent, the priority of meaning, and style if at all possible.<sup>34</sup>

These enigmatic phrases deserve some exposition. The translator's primary task is to reproduce the meaning of a text as best he or she can given the historical structure out of which the writer is presumed to have written.<sup>35</sup> This idea assumes that something can be known about the writer and his or her historical setting, and it also assumes that the translator can understand

---

<sup>33</sup> Eugene Nida and Charles Taber, *Translation Theory and Practice* (Leiden: E.J. Brill on behalf of the United Bible Societies, 1969) 12-14.

<sup>34</sup> Nida and Taber spend several chapters in technical argument concerning why these principles are so. It is sufficient, however, to state that their argument will be accepted as a foundation upon which to build a critical method. An analysis of said argument is well outside the scope of this work; however, the reader is encouraged to read it for himself or herself.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 8, 12.

how the writer viewed said setting. To illustrate the point, Nida and Taber use the Pauline phrase “bowels of mercies” as found in Col. 3:12. This phrase means little to the English speaker as the ancient idiom that Paul employs is no longer used. A more meaningful translation would be “tender compassion.”<sup>36</sup>

With regard to the second guideline, Nida and Taber attempt to urge translators that in order to preserve the meaning of a text, radical restructuring of sentences may be necessary.<sup>37</sup> Simply put, the Hebrew and Greek phrase and sentence structures look nothing like English phrase and sentence structures simply because Hebrew, Greek, and English belong to different language families. Thus while verbs in Hebrew, for example, are generally first or at least near the front of the sentence, English verbs typically fall somewhere in the middle to late part of the sentence. To translate without restructuring the sentence would make a reader of the translation frustrated and confused.

The third guideline speaks largely for itself: wordy, awkward sentences make for difficult reading.<sup>38</sup> The fourth guideline, however, deserves some explanation. While at first glance it may seem that Nida and Taber are being repetitive, they now emphasize the cultural constraints of translation. To illustrate their point, they turn to Christ’s encounters with demons. While American culture may have little to no room for demonic possession, first-century Jews and Greeks were quite familiar with the concept. Thus while America may be more comfortable with

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 13.

mental distress or illness as opposed to demonic possession, the cultural background of the writer is to be respected.<sup>39</sup>

Ambiguity is the subject of the fifth guideline; in short, a good translation must be very clear about what precisely the writer intends to convey. Nida and Taber give the example of John 1:1. Rather than the traditional “the Word was God,” the New English Bible opts for “what God was, the Word was.” As Nida and Taber identify, the purpose of this change is “to make this attributive function of the predicate noun quite clear, and thus to avoid the prevalent error of reversing the order. . . an interpretation which has been followed by some of the heretical sects. . .”<sup>40</sup> Sacrificing grammatical identity for the clarity of the message is an acceptable and encouraged practice.

Finally, the translator should make every effort to show the literary brilliance of the writer in their translation. This is particularly hard to do because different languages have different grammatical structures, and puns, plays on words, and figurative language relies upon the grammatical structure of the original language. Thus Hebrew poetry seems somewhat lackluster in English, and the Greek wordplays used by almost every writer go largely unseen.<sup>41</sup> If the translator can find some means to point these structural traits out without sacrificing the message of the text, then he or she should employ said means.

The purpose of considering Nida and Taber's work is to give some means of considering a translation's efficacy in accomplishing the ideal goals of any translation of the Bible: to

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 13-14.

represent the Bible to a new group of people in such a way as to help them connect with the ancient events recorded therein. I concede that this is an ideal goal and as such will not be reached. However, in accordance with the goals of Christianity as outlined in Jesus' teachings (see Matt. 28, Acts 1, etc.), this surely must be the foremost goal of translating the Bible. Should a translation be completely outside of these principles, then one must question first whether the principles necessarily lead to the aforementioned goal. Secondly, one must question whether the translation ever sought first and foremost to aspire towards that goal.

Several limitations must be mentioned. It is nearly impossible to tell exactly what sources the AV translators used in their translation.<sup>42</sup> In fact, the translation skills of some of the AV translators are unknown to us.<sup>43</sup> Also, it is impossible to survey the plethora of writings on the political backgrounds and interpretations of the texts; therefore, there is a text selection bias. Finally, while one can consult other sources to assist in evaluating a translation's faithfulness to the message, it is unlikely that said sources will agree in that regard. Thus the arguments that precede the selection's evaluation will reflect the author's understanding of the message as derived from the sources cited.

One goal of historical studies is to learn from previous generation's errors so that said errors might be avoided. Thus the historian must necessarily look for causal relationships amongst events and draw comparisons between ancient history and modern society for his or her study to be useful. Likewise, an examination of AV and the politics surrounding its translation

---

<sup>42</sup> Though Daiches lists a handful of possible sources that the AV translators worked from, he claims that it is almost impossible to sort out what sources were used where. Daiches, 139-66.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 177.

can illuminate modern translations such as the HCSB so that possible political biases may come to light.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE AUTHORIZED VERSION: ECCLESIAL NECESSITY OR POLITICAL TOOL?

The legacy of Wycliffe and fellow dissenters such as William of Ockham can be found in the strata of mistrust prevalent in the 1300's and 1400's. Their questions shake Christendom's unity; their struggles with the papacy and monarchy's growing resentment of the Catholic Church's monopoly on political power create a scenario ripe for revolutions. The Protestant Reformation, the Anglican Church, and the subsequent struggle between Catholics and Protestants for political power all stem from these reformers' questioning of papal authority.

However, the spirit of questioning authority did not die with Wycliffe and Ockham.<sup>1</sup> Despite a growing Protestant party, England remained Catholic up until the early 1500's during the reign of King Henry VII who declared himself supreme head of the Anglican Church.<sup>2</sup> In 1523, just before Henry parted ways with the papacy, William Tyndale offered a translation of a speech of Isocrates to the Bishop of London seeking permission to translate the New Testament into English. The bishop denied Tyndale due to a Catholic precedent against such a translation,

---

<sup>1</sup> For this chapter, I am indebted to David Daiches' history, *The King James Version of the English Bible*. His report of the events transpiring within England during the 14th and 15th centuries drawn from various primary sources has saved me much labor in tracking down said sources. For a complete list of primary sources, the reader may explore the appendix of Daiches' work.

<sup>2</sup> David Daiches, *The King James Version of the English Bible* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1941) 12- 13.

and for the next year Tyndale attempted in vain to find someone who would sponsor him in his quest.<sup>3</sup>

Tyndale eventually tired of his search and resorted to Hamburg where he finished his New Testament translation with little regard for what the Church thought of it.<sup>4</sup> Despite its many heretical glosses (many of which came from the thought of Martin Luther), Tyndale had managed to start a movement larger than one anti-Catholic man.<sup>5</sup> Tyndale had made the New Testament readable to the common Englishman and, in essence, would ultimately force the hand of English ecclesial leaders to provide a translation that would reflect a more positive view of authority figures.

The advent of the printing press prevented the King and the Church from destroying Tyndale's work. Copies were smuggled in and circulated during the 1520's, and despite numerous royal decrees that Tyndale's New Testament be destroyed, people began to read Tyndale's Bible more than the Latin Vulgate. The whispers of heresy began to circulate, and church leaders became quite uncomfortable.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 1.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 3-4.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 2-3. Though Daiches does not discuss the glosses in depth, he does mention Tyndale's "violence of opinion. . . to the pope, for example, and to the ecclesiastical hierarchy generally. . ." Thus one can only assume that Tyndale's glosses were pointed anti-papal statements, especially given the correlation between Wycliffe, Luther, and Tyndale. Daiches spends a good amount of time fleshing out this correlation and thus I assume the link based on his argument.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 5-12. Daiches cites a letter on May 14, 1530 from Richard Nix, bishop of Norwich to the Archbishop of Canterbury which suggested that the king should voice his opposition to the "arronious bokes in engleshe."

Before the translation crisis could become critical, Henry broke with Rome and founded the Anglican Church. No longer did the Pope decide orthodoxy for Englishmen. No longer was translation of the Bible into English deemed instantly heretical. Though Henry had no intention of hastening the translation of the Bible into English or seriously challenging the authority of Rome, he had essentially given the Anglican Church permission to translate the Bible into English.<sup>7</sup>

Yet the Anglican Church leaders maintained that Tyndale's work was heretical due to his challenges towards ecclesiastical authority.<sup>8</sup> As Daiches argues for a link between the thinking of Wycliffe, Luther, and Tyndale, these challenges must include Wycliffe's argument for the superiority of scripture's authority. This argument is one that Tyndale embraces and seeks to interweave into his translation of the New Testament.<sup>9</sup>

Although the English Reformation had removed the Pope from his position, it did nothing to alter the ecclesiastical authority structures. In an effort to preserve their authority in spiritual matters, the church leaders began to call for an authorized version for the church's use.<sup>10</sup> However, Henry had no interest in such a project. The church leaders would have to settle for a

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 12-13. As I have little desire to deal with a lengthy analysis of the English Reformation, I have chosen to condense Daiches' argument into a very brief form which suffices for the purposes of this paper. I am only concerned with those political elements within England's history preceding AV. For a more detailed analysis, please review Daiches' consideration of the topic.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 5

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 1-10.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 15.

version by Coverdale with a dedication to the king until a monarch arose that would authorize a Bible.<sup>11</sup>

The Anglican leaders waited almost 100 years for such a leader to arise. During this time, England danced between Anglican and Catholic states, creating frustration and confusion amongst its people.<sup>12</sup> After the fall of the Tudors, King James I became King of England.<sup>13</sup> During the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, the Puritan Dr. John Rainolds called for a new translation of the Bible as he (and other Puritans) felt that the variety of English translations were corrupt and maintained no relationship to the original text of the Bible.<sup>14</sup> The king agreed, and preparations were made to translate the text into what would be known as the Authorized Version.

Forty to fifty educated men were selected and divided into committees to translate the Greek and Hebrew texts into English. The translators were selected based on reputation, education, and status. It is typical to find that the translators were professors at Cambridge and Oxford. Both Anglican translators and Puritan translators shared in the process. It seems that the leaders of the different committees undertook the final revisions and then passed on for review to an uninvolved scholar from each participating university.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>12</sup> For more information about the political and religious tensions in England during this period, see David Lindsay Kier, *The Constitutional History of Modern Britain 1485-1951* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1955) 71-153.

<sup>13</sup> Kier, 155.

<sup>14</sup> Daiches, 64.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 159-166. Daiches also lists the names of the translators of the Hebrew text along with their credentials in these pages.

As David Daiches records in his history, James issued a plethora of guidelines for the translators to follow. First, they were to follow the style of the Bishop's Bible, a Church-endorsed English version that had been the theoretical (though less in practice) Bible of choice amongst the English.<sup>16</sup> The translators treated this rule as more a suggestion. The second rule suggested that the translators render proper names as close as possible to how they were used among common Englishmen. This is a clear break from the Catholic tradition which sought to render proper names in Latin, just as the third rule which prohibited replacing old ecclesiastical words with newer terms was intended to dissuade the abandonment of such terms by Puritans.<sup>17</sup>

Rule four declares that words with multiple meanings would be reduced to the most commonly used meaning. Rule five forbids any superfluous reworking of chapter divisions. Rule six prohibits unnecessary marginal notes except where the Greek or Hebrew is obscure. The seventh permitted cross references in the margins.<sup>18</sup>

Rules eight through eleven prove to be much more substantial. According to this group of rules, each translator translated the same portion of text until he was satisfied with it. He then submitted the portion to the other translators. The group would deliberate over the translation until all members agreed upon it. The group then sent it to other groups who also considered the

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 57-58, 167.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 168- 169.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 169.

translation and communicated their issues with it to the original group. A meeting of the leaders of all the groups discussed any disputes which could not be resolved.<sup>19</sup>

Rule twelve ordered that each bishop make his clergy aware of the translation process. Rule thirteen dealt with the selection of translation group leaders, and rule fourteen allows the use of other sources than the Bishop's Bible when they agree more closely with the Hebrew and Greek texts. The final rule declares that an elder scholar from each university represented be involved in a final review of the work.<sup>20</sup>

It is from these rules that one begins to see the concerns that the King and the Church intended to address in this translation. The first seven rules deal with the reception of the text. The lack of marginal notes except where necessary prevented the translators from propagating their own interpretations in a state sponsored translation. More specifically, Steven Sheeley notes that many translators of the time utilize marginal notes to challenge the divine right of kings.<sup>21</sup> James certainly cannot endure such a challenge in a translation he endorses, and thus the marginal notes are forbidden.

The King intended that the common Englishman could pick up a copy of this Bible with as little awkwardness as possible. The Bible was to become popular, so popular that the English

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 169-170.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 170.

<sup>21</sup> However, Sheeley also notes that the antipathy toward marginal notes was seated in both the Anglican and Puritan church largely as a response against Calvinistic theology. James simply takes advantage of a sentiment already present within the church. Steven Sheeley, "Baptists and Bible Translation: Toward a Deeper Understanding," *Baptist History and Heritage* 42 (Spring 2007): 10.

would use it as opposed to other translations (Tyndale's Bible, the Great Bible, the Geneva Bible, etc.) which might be considered heretical.

What precisely the Anglican Church meant by "heretical" is up for debate. However, I would maintain that the King of England and the Anglican Church, in light of the Protestant Reformation, the advent of Nominalist philosophy, the conflict between Protestant and Catholic groups in recent English history, and Tyndale's challenge to ecclesial authority, were concerned about the possibility of a translation which would undermine their authority over the English people's spirituality. This would explain why the King commanded the translators to make the translation very readable to the common Englishman. They sought to define orthodoxy through their translation.<sup>22</sup>

The other rules are pragmatic devices pertaining to how the translation process would proceed. While James and the Church may have had other motives for the translation, they were still concerned that the translation be of the highest caliber possible. Thus qualified, educated men were chosen to assist, lead, and evaluate the translation without a great deal of input from the church or the state other than these fifteen rules.<sup>23</sup>

Tyndale's first translation of the Bible into English was motivated out of a felt distrust and antipathy toward the church hierarchy. The church hierarchy and the King are concerned

---

<sup>22</sup> While I know of no one who has advocated this theory, it is not unthinkable that someone else's work has slipped past me unnoticed either because I did not have access to it or because I overlooked it. Should this be the case, this theory does indeed belong to them and not to me, a confession that I make alongside my sincere apologies.

<sup>23</sup> I will grant that many of the professors at universities during this time were members of church orders (e.g. the Dominicans), and therefore these professors would thus represent the church to one degree or another. However, we have no reason to believe that the church had any oversight on the translation other than through the translators and the scholars responsible for the final review.

about Tyndale's version due to heretical glosses that attack the authority of the church. The King authorizes a translation of the Bible to serve as the standard translation for the Anglican Church. In light of these three things, I find that the question that the translation process raises is that of authority.

To what extent did the concerns of the King and of the Church influence the translation of the AV? This question may be split into two secondary questions. The first deals with the basic element of social authority: the family. Does the KJV support a view of the family which the original texts do not? The second question deals with the institutions themselves. Does the AV paint a picture of the monarchy and church that the original texts do not warrant?

To investigate the matter, it becomes necessary to consider three things. The first of these is the context of the translation of AV. As previous pages deal with the milieu of the translation, one must then consider the context of the original documents. Finally, a comparison of the Greek or Hebrew with the AV should illuminate any areas in which the ideas of that day unduly impacted the AV.

When discussing original context concerning the Bible, specificity is important as the period of time in which the Bible was written extends several hundred years at least. For the Israelites, the family structure was a social norm that went largely unchallenged during the time of Biblical writing. Society viewed the oldest male as a patriarch, and his sons and grandsons (particularly the firstborn) carried on the family heritage and power. Society viewed women as lesser persons.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Ansion Rainey, "Family," in *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 6, ed. Frank Skolnik (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 2007), 690-693.

The Israelite government, however, was a very different story. During the early days of the Israelite “nation,” it is highly unlikely that the Israelite people united under one banner for any substantial period of time. Early signs of unity revolved around one person of divine appointment (e.g. Moses or any of the various judges) whom the people followed. As recorded in the Old Testament history books, there was no king until Saul.<sup>25</sup>

The monarchy stabilized under David and reached its apex under Solomon. After Solomon, Jeroboam became king over the northern ten tribes, and Rehoboam took the southern two. While the Davidic dynasty maintained its lineage until the time of the fall of Jerusalem to Nebuchadnezzar, the Israelites went through kings very quickly and were ultimately obliterated. However, the Jews returned to Judea, rebuilt Jerusalem, and struggled for independence from the Greek and Roman invaders.

Rome captured Jerusalem in 63 B.C., well before the life of Christ.<sup>26</sup> During that period, Antipater II (the political leader) and Hyrcanus II (the high priest) were lauded by Rome for the troops they sent to Julius Caesar’s aid, and Antipater was appointed procurator of Judea.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> While I have chosen to assume that the Biblical record of Israel’s ancient history is capable of standing alone as an accurate account of the origins of the Kingdom of Israel, there are a plethora of theories that better explain how Israel came about. For other theories, see Albrecht Alt, “The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine,” in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. R. A. Wilson (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968) and George E. Mendenhall, “The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine,” *Biblical Archaeology*, Vol. 25, No.3 (1962): 66-87.

<sup>26</sup> Georges A. Barrios and Phillip J. King, “Geography, History, and Archaeology,” in *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*, ed. Bruce Metzger and Roland Murphy (Oxford: Oxford Univ., 1991), 417.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

Antipater's grandchildren saw the province of Judea split into fragments and divided amongst them.<sup>28</sup>

During the time frame of the New Testament's writing, the Roman idea of family became the standard. Roman fathers were dictators over their family units. A Roman man could have his children executed for no reason without regard to their age.<sup>29</sup> A Roman woman was not even allowed to plan her children's weddings.<sup>30</sup>

As the Roman male was the patriarchal dictator of the family, Caesar was to the state in both religious and political matters. After Julius Caesar took up the mantle of divinity, each consecutive Caesar became a god in the Roman mind.<sup>31</sup> To defy Caesar is to forfeit one's life.<sup>32</sup>

In 66 A.D., the first Jewish revolt against Rome broke out.<sup>33</sup> Jerusalem fell in A.D. 70.<sup>34</sup> The Jews revolted again in A.D. 132-135. Though they reoccupied Jerusalem, the Romans managed to stop the revolt and prohibit Jews from living in or even visiting Jerusalem.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 418.

<sup>29</sup> Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 36.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Tenney Frank, *Roman Imperialism* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1925) 342-343.

<sup>32</sup> An interesting story which makes the point is recorded in Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 18.8.6, cited in Shane Claiborne and Charlie Haw, *Jesus for President: Politics for Ordinary Radicals* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008) 76. The emperor Caligula orders the death of the general Patronius who protested an order to slaughter a crowd of nonviolent protesting Jews as they held that "... God...was their governor...." rather than Caesar.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 419.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

Needless to say, tensions between Rome and Jerusalem escalated after Jerusalem's capture for 100 years until Rome destroyed it. The source of such tensions is fanatical Jewish ethnocentricity fueled by foolish Roman procurators.<sup>36</sup> Though the Jewish people never truly submitted to Rome, the Roman ideas of community, life, and family certainly made their way into the Jewish community.

Into this clash of cultures come the Christian writers of the New Testament. The Christians followed Christ and regarded God as their king.<sup>37</sup> Christians owed loyalty not to Caesar but to God the Father, Jesus the Son, and the Holy Spirit.<sup>38</sup>

Some of the earliest Christian writings are the Pauline letters. As Paul served the church as a missionary to the Roman world, he wrote letters to the churches he founded (with the exception of the letter to the Romans). One of those churches was at Ephesus, and in the Ephesians letter a passage challenges the Roman ideas of empire and family.

Both the AV translation and my translation of Ephesians 5:21-6:9 from the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece follows:<sup>39</sup>

21 Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.  
22 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. 23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> F.J. Foakes Jackson, *Josephus and the Jews* (Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1978). 181-183.

<sup>37</sup> *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, trans. Philip Schaff (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1886) 188-189.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 184-185.

<sup>39</sup> All translations from the Greek text based on Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, et. al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. XXVII, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (Stuttgart: 1993).

the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body.

24 Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing. 25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; 26 That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, 27 That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. 28 So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. 29 For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: 30 For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. 31 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. 32 This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church. 33 Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband. 6:1 Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. 2 Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; 3 That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. 4 And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. 5 Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; 6 Not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; 7 With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: 8 Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. 9 And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him.-- AV

21 Subjecting yourselves to one another in the fear of Christ.

22 Wives, become subject to your own husbands as to the Lord.

23 Because the husband is the head of a wife even as Christ is the head of the church; he is savior of the body. 24 Even as the church submits to Christ, therefore also the wives submit to their husbands in all things. 25 Husbands, love your wives just as also Christ loved the church and handed himself over on her behalf. 26 In order that he might make her holy, clean by baptism in water through the Spirit. 27 In order that he might place the honorable church beside himself, not having a stain, a wrinkle, or anything like that, but in order that she might be holy and blameless. 28 Therefore, husbands are obligated to love their own wives like their own bodies. 29 For no one has ever hated his own flesh but he nourishes and cherishes it just as Christ also nourishes and

cherishes the church. 30 For we are parts of his body. 31 Because of this, a man will leave father and mother and become faithfully joined to his wife, and the two will be one flesh. 32 This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church. 33 But each one of you men, therefore, should love their wives as themselves, but also a woman should fear her husband. 6.1 Children, obey your parents [in the Lord], for this is right. 2 Honor your father and your mother, which is a primary commandment in promise. 3 In order that it might be well with you and that you might have a long life on the earth. 4 And fathers, do not make your children angry, but nourish them in the instruction and admonition of the Lord. 5 Slaves, subject yourselves to masters according to the flesh with fear and trembling, in sincerity of your hearts as to Christ. 6 Not according to self-interested service like people pleasers, but like slaves of Christ, ones that do the will of God in spirit. 7 With benevolence, serving as to the Lord, not to men. 8 Knowing that if anyone does good to the end, that person receives from the Lord whether slave or free. 9 And masters, do the same to them, departing from threats, knowing that also their Lord and your Lord is in heaven and is not partial toward anyone.-- Author's translation

From a surface reading of both AV and my translation, there seems to be little difference. However, may I direct your attention to verse 33 of chapter 5. AV reads "...and the wife see that she reverence her husband." The Greek construction ἡ δὲ γυναῖς ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα more correctly translates as "but also a wife should fear her husband." The *inclusio* from v. 21 is lost in AV; at least on the surface, it seems that Paul's emphasis on the responsibility of all believers to be subject to each other based on the fear of Christ is skipped over in AV. As Andrew Lincoln claims, "the wife's attitude to her husband is to be modeled on the Church's attitude to Christ. Her fear of her husband reflects the fear of all believers for Christ."<sup>40</sup> Thus it is not that the wife respects her husband on the basis of her faith but on the basis of a societal expectation.

---

<sup>40</sup> Andrew Lincoln, *Ephesians*, In *Word Biblical Commentary*, vol. 42, Ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 384. It should also be noted that Lincoln himself claims that the use of "fear" as opposed to "respect" is a bit barbaric, and

Paul is utilizing an analogy throughout the passage in which women are on the same ground as the Church. Christ does not withhold authority or privileges from the church and would certainly not applaud the Roman concept of women.<sup>41</sup> In fact, Paul's excurses on a woman's role in the household are far from repressive.<sup>42</sup> Rather, the men are told to love the women as Christ loved the church, and it is extremely unlikely that a husband who loves in this way is going to treat his wife like a slave.

Yet in England, the standard patriarchal social order had yet to be challenged.<sup>43</sup> Notice that Daiches does not record a single female scholar who worked on the translation.<sup>44</sup> Also take into consideration a woman's education at that time; even Elizabeth I's magnum opus was a translation of "The Glasse of the Synnefull Soule" complete with a cover "embroidered with blue and silver threads with clusters of purple flowers."<sup>45</sup> If Christ allowed Mary a place of learning

---

ordinarily I would agree. However, here I would contest that Paul's clever use of vocabulary is a testament to how he views women; not as lesser than but as having great value in both Christ's eyes and in the eyes of Christians as well.

<sup>41</sup> See Rev. 2:26, 3:21, 4:4, 5:9-10, 20:4. For a good overview of Christ's views on women, see John 4:1-42; Luke 7:36-50, 8:1-3, 10:38-42, 13:10-17, 21:1-4.

<sup>42</sup> Delling argues that Paul's use of *υποτάσσω* (I submit) in Eph. 5:21-6:9 is much less about the submitting and more about exhibiting love towards all members of the community so that the community can function within the bounds of love. See Delling, *Upotasso*, in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. VIII, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Freidrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972), 45.

<sup>43</sup> One could make an argument for the recent queens of England breaking that mold. However, Susan Bassnet notes that they ascended to their thrones as rulers of last resort and were strongly encouraged to wed during their reigns. See her work, *Elizabeth I: A Feminist Perspective* (Oxford: Berg, 1988) for a thorough analysis.

<sup>44</sup> Daiches, 159-166.

<sup>45</sup> Bassnette, 21.

among his disciples, he would surely allow them a place at the table of translation as well.<sup>46</sup> Thus at this point the AV is not necessarily as faithful to the New Testament concept of family as it could have been. Paul clearly challenges the Roman family system within these verses in such a way that, taken to its logical end, promotes women to a place of equal respect. This is lost due to the political conceptions that the translators brought to the AV.

Another textual discrepancy between AV and my translation is to be found in 6:5-6:6. AV reads "Servants, be obedient... the will of God from the heart," yet the Greek word καρδια (heart) is not to be found in v.6. Instead, Paul uses the word ψύχη (soul). The use of the translation "servant" rather than "slave" for the Greek δούλοι (slaves) is also significant.

This may seem to be a minor distinction; however, biases and political propaganda typically are not explicitly obvious in a text. The use of the word "heart" paired with the will of God concerning servanthood at least suggests that the authority figures in England were attempting to foster a sense of goodwill and love in their servants through the text. This is further evidenced by Paul's use of κἀτα σάρκα κύριοις (according to earthly authorities) which stands in contrast to the slave's obedience to Christ, which is the will of God ἐκ ψύχης (in spirit).

However, Paul's intentions can hardly be seen to foster good will toward Caesar, the High Priest, or any other political power figure. Thus Paul exhorts the slaves to serve as to Christ, not for their own standing, but to allow the community to live in a sense of ἀγάπη (love).<sup>47</sup> Should the master fail to exhibit love to the slave, then the master should be mindful that all men have the same Lord in heaven who cares little for human designations of master and slave (v.9).

---

<sup>46</sup> Luke 10:38-42.

<sup>47</sup> Delling, 44.

Moreover, Lincoln argues that "For slaves to have their hearts and souls in doing the will of God... would make possible an experience of inner independence within their situation."<sup>48</sup> This is especially true considering Paul's expression of divine reward in v.8; the servant does not serve to please men but to please Christ, a motif that is hidden due to the substitution of "heart" for "soul." It is here that the AV's view on servanthood does not necessarily represent Paul's view on the matter.

It is far too easy to take one passage and make an argument based on it. Thus let us consider 1 Peter 2:13-3:7. As with the previous passage, AV will be followed by my translation.

13 Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; 14 or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. 15 For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: 16 as free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. 17 Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king. 18 Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. 19 For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. 20 For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. 21 For even herunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: 22 Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: 23 Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously; 24 Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed. 25 For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls. 3:1 Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; 2 While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear. 3 Whose adorning let it not be that

---

<sup>48</sup> Lincoln, 422.

outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; 4 But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. 5 For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: 6 Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement. 7 Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered. -- AV

13 Submit to all human rulers, whether they are kings or governors, on the Lord's behalf 14 whether they are rulers sent because of the king for punishing wicked people or for praising those who do good. 15 This is the will of God: those that do good should silence the senseless, ignorant people. 16 Be as free people (even though you are slaves of God) and not as people having a pretext of freedom for wicked deeds. 17 Honor everyone. Love the brothers and sisters. Fear God. Honor the king. 18 Slaves, be submissive in all fear to your masters, not just the good and kind ones but also the harsh ones. 19 For this is grace if on account of your conscience concerning God you endure grief, suffering unjustly. 20 For what kind of fame is it if you endure punishment for something you did wrong? But if you do good and endure punishment, that glorifies God. 21 For you were called to this. When Christ suffered on your behalf, he left you an example that you might follow in his footprints. 22 Who neither sinned nor spoke any untruth. 23 When he was insulted, he did not return the insult. When he suffered, he did not threaten his tormentors. He handed himself over to God who judges with righteousness. 24 He bore our sins himself in his body on the cross, in order that we might have no part in sin but live in righteousness. By his wounds you are healed. 25 For you were as sheep having gone astray, but now you have turned toward the Shepherd and Guardian of our souls. 3:1 Likewise, women should submit to her own husband so that even if someone rejects the Gospel, the conduct of you women might convince them without words 2 as they see your holy fear and lifestyle. 3 Do not feel it necessary to braid or adorn your hair with gold ornaments or put on the garments of the world. 4 Instead, adorn yourselves in the concealed parts of the hearts of people, in an incorruptible gentle persona and quiet spirit, which is valuable in God's sight. 5 For in this way even the holy women of old handled themselves. They had hope in God and submitted to their own husbands. 6 As Sarah listened to Abraham, calling him lord, you become her daughters when you do good, not fearing what

others might do. 7 Likewise, husbands who live according to the knowledge of Christ, be gentle to your wife, valuing her worth. You and she are fellow heirs of living grace. Act this way so that your life may not impede your prayers. -- Author's translation.

The major difference between the two translations is found in verse 13. AV counts the king's authority as supreme whereas the Greek text clearly identifies sub-rulers which the Christian is to honor as well. Charles Bigg argues that though the divine right of kings might stand on Romans 13, it cannot stand on Peter's treatment of a Christian's responsibility to the government.<sup>49</sup> The realization of the divine directive in providing a society of peace and equality rests upon the people involved rather than on the institution itself and thus the institution is inherently neutral.<sup>50</sup> Thus it would seem that AV forces Peter to say something which he does not: the King of England is the supreme authority.

With regard to family issues, women are again instructed to submit to their husbands, and slaves their masters. However, Peter is using the submission of the wives to impact the culture. If these Christian women submit to their husbands with joy and solidarity, one can only imagine what the other women, who submit out of fear and necessity, would think of Christians! Peter is not attempting to foster social control over the women but rather ask them to consider their priorities.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Charles Bigg, *Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, in *the International Critical Commentary*, New York (Charles Scribner's Sons: 1922), 139.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Bigg makes the argument that the slaves and wives were to shift their focus from their liberty in Christ to their responsibility to Christ. They were free from Roman culture, but they were bound to Christ's mission to redeem the world. Thus Peter urges them to bear their social roles well, using them to win others for Christ. Ibid., 139-153.

It is the end of 3:6 that betrays AV's political motivations. While the women were to submit out of respect towards God rather than out of fearing their husbands, AV fails to highlight that notion.<sup>52</sup> Rather, it highlights the fear involved; given Henry VIII's recent revolving door of wives, the women of England were likely very timid in angering their husbands. This translation does nothing to inspire strong women lead by God. Rather, it supports the social structures of the day.

Furthermore, the women are regarded as "weaker vessels" in AV. The Greek construction ὡς ἂ σθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ (lit. as weak female pots) is a word picture that depicts women as weaker than men of the day. The Roman family unit as a means of societal control testifies to the weakness of women during this time.

Thus Peter highlights the frailty of the women rather than the strength of men; he urges men to not use their socially privileged status as a platform for harming the women.<sup>53</sup> He reminds them that women have value, and the husband and the wife both share in the living grace of Christ. A veiled threat follows: if you mistreat your wives, God will not hear your prayers.

Certainly this reading is not the impression one gets from the AV. Rather, the AV's portrayal of women as "weaker vessels" only highlights the social constraints which women found themselves in during that time period. One gets the sense that women are to be treated like a tender flower: nurtured, but never taken seriously.

---

<sup>52</sup> Bigg contests that not only would the women be concerned about their husband's wrath but also about the children, the slaves, and whatever else she, as the governess of the household, would be in charge of. *Ibid.*, 154-155.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

The tumult of England's political scene in the 1600's sparked the first major effort to translate the Bible into English. The impact and magnitude of such a feat should not go understated. In truth, any translation is interpretation, and all too often, the translator's interpretation limited by what he or she knows. It would be a grave mistake to hold that the AV is an example of poor scholarship. There are no translations, no novels, no scientific research, and certainly no senior theses that are written without bias. Rather than balk at the biases, one should seek to appreciate the author's viewpoint and to understand more fully the text that he or she is studying.

This chapter is little more than my own seeking to appreciate and to understand more fully. Through an examination of this passage, I have shown how subtly the politics of England in the 1600's has impacted the AV, especially in sensitive areas such as social authority. Many more such elements could be found within the AV, but a thorough examination of the text is outside the scope of this work.

HOLMAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE: BONAFIDE TRANSLATION OR  
THEOLOGICAL TREACHERY?

There seem to be many more questions than there are answers in Christianity. Over the course of nearly the past two millennia, Christians have used difficult issues to isolate and exclude other Christians who refused to conform to the orthodox position.<sup>1</sup> Some conclude that the orthodox elite have political reasons in mind for such exclusions while others point to a need for church unity and definition as causes of excommunication.<sup>2</sup>

In either case, whether by creed, by declaration, or by translation of texts viewed as authoritative, orthodox believers have routinely ostracized dissenters. This was true in the era of AV. This principle, therefore, begets the issue of whether such exclusions occur in Protestant (particularly Southern Baptist) circles today. No ecumenical church council has been called since the Council of Nicea, and certainly the Southern Baptists do not call ecumenical councils to

---

<sup>1</sup> See the historical incidents that resulted in a council's ruling on orthodoxy as early as the First Jerusalem Council as recorded in *The Acts of the Apostles* and Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*.

<sup>2</sup> For an extensive examination of both these views, see Elaine Pagels' *The Gnostic Gospels*.

handle their business.<sup>3</sup> Rather, the ministers and members from all Southern Baptist Churches, in a fashion akin to a representative democracy, meet annually to deliberate issues.

As Broadman & Holman Publishing Company, a branch of LifeWay (the Southern Baptist agency for dealing with printed material, media, and the like), is responsible for producing the HCSB, it is prudent to discuss both the political history behind Southern Baptist politics over the course of the past century as well as the history of Biblical translations during such a period.<sup>4</sup> One should also be careful to highlight the distinctly Southern Baptist responses to said translations. By comparing the HCSB with its competitors, we learn how political bias impacts the text that, according to LifeWay, is “a standard for English Bible translations.”<sup>5</sup>

Puritan critiques of the Anglican church during the time of King James form the cultural strata in which American Baptists begin.<sup>6</sup> American Baptists also have the Radical Reformation, an offspring of the Protestant Reformation which comes out of the work of Zwingli, in their distant ideological heritage.<sup>7</sup> Baptist traditions in America began with the Puritan personality

---

<sup>3</sup> Very good arguments could be made for Vatican II being an ecumenical council, but as the Catholic church splintered into offshoot groups such as the Eastern Orthodox Church in the time after Nicea, I find no cause for calling any other church council ecumenical.

<sup>4</sup> Interview with Dr. Ray Clendenen, Associate General Editor, HCSB.

<sup>5</sup> Sam Gantt and Greg, Webster, “Another English Bible Translation? Why Bother!” Available from LifeWay Christian Bookstore's webpage, [http://www.lifeway.com/lwc/article\\_main\\_page/0%2C1703%2CA%25253D152435%252526M%25253D200718%2C00.html](http://www.lifeway.com/lwc/article_main_page/0%2C1703%2CA%25253D152435%252526M%25253D200718%2C00.html), Accessed 04 Oct 2009.

<sup>6</sup> Jesse Fletcher, *The Southern Baptist Convention*, Nashville (Broadman and Holman: 1994.), 19-25.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 25- 27.

known as Roger Williams.<sup>8</sup> Banished from the Puritan sect he had challenged, Williams and a few others of the Free Church mindset formed a small community out of which the Baptist church would grow.<sup>9</sup>

Grow it did. Due to such phenomenon as the Great Awakening and the American Revolution, the Baptist church had little trouble taking root in America.<sup>10</sup> By the time preceding the Civil War, Baptist state conventions had begun to spring up.<sup>11</sup>

However, all churches face disagreement, and Baptists in America are no exception. The first is a historical phenomenon known as Landmarkism.<sup>12</sup> Began by James Robinson Graves in the era just before the Civil War, Landmarkism is essentially denominational elitism: Baptist churches are the only true churches.<sup>13</sup> However, the theory goes on to say that the local Baptist church is the only true church: any concept of a universal church is simply erroneous.<sup>14</sup>

Yet the issue of slavery overshadowed this debate in Baptist life. Slavery drove a wedge between Southern Baptists and the Baptists of the north when “the General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States refused to appoint slaveholders as

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 14.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 16-17.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 27-35.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 37-39.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 60.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 60-61.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 61.

missionaries.”<sup>15</sup> The Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) was formed out of Southern racism and unethical treatment of those considered “less than,” a pattern that will color the entirety of its history.<sup>16</sup>

The theological and ecclesial issues continue later that century. Crawford Howell Toy, a professor at Southern Seminary, caused a stir via articles he wrote concerning Isaiah.<sup>17</sup> Adopting Wellhausen's source critical methodology, Toy argued for a multi-source authorship of Isaiah.<sup>18</sup> Many Southern Baptists associated this theory with the emergence of Darwin's theory of evolution.<sup>19</sup> This controversy fueled the fire already burning in Baptist life: the suspicion that education and liberalism are in fact synonymous and negative terms.<sup>20</sup>

Toy penned a letter of resignation and explanation that his superiors accepted without a thorough analysis of his ideas.<sup>21</sup> However, this episode set the tone for Southern Baptist theological conflicts (especially given its recurrence in the life of William Whitsitt).<sup>22</sup> Any teaching, theory, or ideology which someone finds particularly challenging is to be written off as

---

<sup>15</sup> Mark Newman, *Getting Right with God: Southern Baptists and Desegregation*, Tuscaloosa (University of Alabama Press, 2001), 1.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Fletcher, 89-92.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 90.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 105.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 90, 105.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 105-107.

inconceivable and heretical without thorough examination. This precedent will be the basis for exclusion of credible critiques in future generations.

America in the early 1900's finds herself undergoing change. Prohibition and women's suffrage become major issues, and most Christian denominations assist in these struggles.<sup>23</sup> However, Southern Baptists generally overlooked any sort of societal impact of their faith, preferring to evangelize and to focus on missionary ventures.<sup>24</sup>

The issue of education and liberalism comes to a head in the 1920's with the action of J. Frank Norris. He charged Southern Baptists with teaching Darwinian evolution and departing from traditional Biblical teaching and preaching.<sup>25</sup> Norris' critiques lead the SBC to vote to draft the Baptist Faith and Message of 1925.<sup>26</sup>

The appearance of the Faith and Message in Baptist life marks a very different era in Baptist politics. Heretofore, if Baptists did not agree with each other as they did in the 1860's, the two opposing groups would go their separate ways. The Faith and Message served to resolve a conflict within the SBC without creating an entirely new Baptist group (which proved especially valuable to Southern Baptists during the Great Depression).<sup>27</sup> At least in part, this trend continues during the Southern Baptist conflicts in future eras.

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 133.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 138-140.

<sup>26</sup> Amanda Axely , *Controversy Surrounding the Baptist Faith and Message 2000*, Honors Project, Jefferson City (Carson-Newman College: 2005), 6-7.

<sup>27</sup> Fletcher, 154- 155.

The pattern of unethical social practices is to reappear in the 1930's with the rise of Nazi Germany and the Holocaust. Southern Baptists, true to their abatement of any sort of societal aspect of the Gospel, felt that though the persecution of Jews in Germany was merely an internal phenomenon.<sup>28</sup> As the spiritual salvation of souls became the paramount object for the Southern Baptists, the idea that Jesus desires to make a qualitative difference in world affairs became foreign to them. The complacency of the Church as a whole, not only the Baptist church, to the plight of the Jews at the hands of Hitler is a testament to the spiritual poverty in which the Church found herself in. As Placher notes, had the Church made a definite statement against anti-Semitism, the Holocaust would have never happened.<sup>29</sup> Their blood is on our hands.

The post-Nazi 1950's and 60's sees several watermarks in Baptist history. The first and perhaps most important is the move to desegregation in the south. The Supreme Court's ruling in the *Brown vs. Board* case made a monumental step in African-Americans being viewed as equals.<sup>30</sup>

However the average Southern Baptist took the ruling, the state and regional conventions both encouraged Southern Baptists to work out the ruling "in harmony with the constitutional guarantee of equal freedom to all citizens . . . ."<sup>31</sup> When the Supreme Court ordered a swift move

---

<sup>28</sup> Amanda Ford, *A Comparative Study of British and Southern Baptist Reactions to Germany 1933- 1939*, Honors Project, Jefferson City (Carson-Newman College, 2006), 22.

<sup>29</sup> William Placher, *A History of Christian Theology*, London (Westminster John Knox: 1983), 293.

<sup>30</sup> Newman, 113.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 114.

towards desegregation, however, Virginia Baptists and Arkansas Baptists remained silent concerning the growing aggression and dissention amongst both races.<sup>32</sup>

Perhaps most remarkable is the impact of an African-American pastor named Martin Luther King, Jr. In a scathing critique of Southern social policies concerning segregation, King challenges Southern Baptists (and indeed Southerners in general) to examine their ethics.<sup>33</sup> However, fundamentalist Southern Baptists depicted King's message as "a blueprint for the destruction of God's plan for America," and it is the Federal Government, not the Southern Baptist Church, which history credits with the administration of the desegregation order.<sup>34</sup>

The second watermark in Baptist history is the revisiting of the Baptist Faith and Message 1925. The whispers of liberalism begin to stir in response to a book entitled *The Message of Genesis* by Ralph Elliott which took a "parabolic and symbolic approach" in interpreting the book.<sup>35</sup> This created a division in the Convention, resulting in the Baptist Faith and Message 1963.<sup>36</sup>

The precedent set in the 20's of revising a confession of faith in response to a theological disagreement is maintained in the 60's. One element in particular sets the BF&M 1963 apart

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 115.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 308-309.

<sup>34</sup> John Kater, Jr., *Christians on the Right: the Moral Majority in Perspective*, New York (Seabury Press: 1982), 35.

<sup>35</sup> Axely, 7. Also see Jerry Faught, "The Ralph Elliott Controversy: Competing Philosophies of Southern Baptist Seminary Education," *Baptist History and Heritage* 34 (Summer/Fall 1999): 11.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

from its early predecessor: a preamble designed to prevent the BF&M from becoming a binding creed.<sup>37</sup> The BF&M also contains expansions to other doctrines, especially the doctrine of scripture in response to Elliott's book.<sup>38</sup>

The 1970's saw a handful of interesting phenomenon, the repercussions of which are still being felt today. The concerns over race relations together with the push for legal abortions and the emerging homosexual movement pushed a Baptist minister named Jerry Falwell to abandon the Baptist doctrine of separation of church and state.<sup>39</sup> Instead, he held rallies across the nation in which he would stir up Christian laypeople to challenge secularism and moral decay in America.<sup>40</sup>

While the Moral Majority headed by Falwell challenged liberal politics and social ills, the fundamentalists within the Southern Baptist Convention began to use their own propaganda techniques to gain power. By circulating the claim that liberals have invaded the Convention, Paul Pressler, Adrian Rogers, and Paige Patterson stirred up their own constituency of concerned laypeople to take over the Convention.<sup>41</sup> By the late 1980's, any hope that the fundamentalist takeover would fail had been crushed. Southern Baptists had become something that Baptists historically were not: a church bound by a creed rather than by the Bible.

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Kater, 36-37.

<sup>40</sup> Robert Liebman and Robert Wuthnow, *The New Christian Right*, New York (Aldine Publishing Company: 1983), p. 58.

<sup>41</sup> Axely, 8.

In the 1990's Southern Baptists continued to apply the fundamentalist hermeneutic to the Bible, creating new obligatory laws. Trustees dismissed Seminary professors and presidents without cause, and SBC committees removed leaders of organizations such as the Sunday School Board, the International Mission Board, and the Home Mission Board from service.<sup>42</sup>

In 2000, the SBC determined to revisit the BF&M once more. The new BF&M "elevates the Bible to a position above Jesus Christ and downplays the doctrines of priesthood of the believer and local church autonomy."<sup>43</sup> The document also removes the preamble present in the BF&M 1963 and adds fundamentalist language by which the document can be used to serve as a litmus test for doctrinal accountability.<sup>44</sup> Indeed, it is to be used in such a way, for all those SBC missionaries who would not sign the document were asked to resign in 2002.<sup>45</sup>

This is the state into which HCSB was introduced. As it is a Southern Baptist translation, the same fundamentalist hermeneutic coloring all that the SBC has touched in the past thirty years appears within the pages of HCSB. However, it is yet unclear as to why the SBC would desire a translation. Before continuing an examination of the political influences on HCSB, it is prudent to first have some idea how the SBC would apply such influences in the realm of Biblical translation.

---

<sup>42</sup> Leon McBeth, "Condensed Chronology of the Southern Baptist Takeover," Available from the Fundamentalist Takeover of the Southern Baptist Convention Website, <http://www.sbctakeover.com/chronology.htm>, Accessed 15 Oct 2009.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid. See also Axley's perceptive outlay of the changes made between the 1963 BF&M and the 2000 BF&M, p. 20-33.

<sup>45</sup> Axley, 51-53.

Perhaps the best place to begin searching for the rationale behind HCSB is the publishing house, Broadman & Holman Publishers. Broadman & Holman is a wing of LifeWay Christian Resources, the renamed entity of what used to be the Sunday School Board of the SBC.<sup>46</sup> An interview with Dr. Ray Clendenen, the associate general editor of the HCSB project, reveals that LifeWay was unhappy with the New International Version (NIV), which led them to pursue their own translation.<sup>47</sup>

The NIV is the most widely used and known translations today. Published by Zondervan in the early 70's, it reflects a wide denominational base from various English speaking countries.<sup>48</sup> However, the translation theory behind the NIV is dynamic equivalency, an ideology of translation that essentially takes the ideas behind a text and represents them in the language to which the text is being translated.<sup>49</sup> However, this fact is bothersome for LifeWay administrators as it "[i]sn't literal enough."<sup>50</sup> The translation theory of NIV simply does not sit well with fundamentalist theology of scripture, an issue to which I will return to shortly.

Another translation, *Today's New International Version* (TNIV), caused quite a stir in Southern Baptist life. TNIV developed out of a felt need for the language of NIV to become

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 49-50.

<sup>47</sup> Interview with Dr. Ray Clendenen, Associate General Editor of HCSB, interview by author, 7 August 2007, tape recording (Transcript, E-mail, etc.), Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville. Appendix I contains a copy of the interview.

<sup>48</sup> *The Story of the New International Version*, New York (New York International Bible Society: 1978), 7.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 12-13.

<sup>50</sup> Clendenen.

more gender inclusive.<sup>51</sup> Twenty-six scholars claim that they "cannot endorse" the TNIV primarily due to its "troubling translational inaccuracies-- primarily (but not exclusively) in relation to gender language . . . ." <sup>52</sup> This statement further elevates suspicion of the impact which the fundamentalist theology of scripture impacts translations as there seems to be little other reason to have any disagreement with gender inclusive language.

Given HCSB's purpose statement ("to . . . affirm the authority of scripture as God's Word and to champion its absolute truth against social or cultural agendas that would compromise its accuracy"), it is very safe to think that gender inclusive language would be enumerated amongst those social and cultural agendas.<sup>53</sup> Why the SBC would think that gender inclusive language and a dynamic equivalency theory of translation are threats to the authority of scripture is somewhat less clear.

One could argue that if the Bible is indeed absolute truth, then no social or cultural agenda could hope to compromise it, thereby making the purpose statement void of any true meaning. However, I feel that this almost *de facto* dismissal of the HCSB would not give the HCSB just consideration. I will therefore assume the aforementioned argument irrelevant to the discussion and press on with my analysis.

Two key ideas seem to surface when discussing scripture from a fundamentalist standpoint. The first is the doctrine of inerrancy. The second is the notion of translation theory.

---

<sup>51</sup> Art Toalson, "26 scholars 'cannot endorse' the gender-neutral NIV revision," Baptist Press News, Online: <http://www.bpnews.net/printerfriendly.asp?ID=12653>, Accessed 11 March 2009.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> *Holman Christian Standard Bible* (Nashville: Holman, 2004) ix.

In order to see what precisely the qualms of the SBC are with the NIV and TNIV, we shall have to examine their standpoints on these issues.

The doctrine of inerrancy is only hinted at in the BF&M 2000. The opening phrase of the section on the scriptures reads, "The Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired and is God's revelation of Himself to man."<sup>54</sup> This reflects a departure from the BF&M 1963 in one key way: the phrase "the record of" is removed from its place before the word "God."<sup>55</sup> Also the sentence, "The criterion by which the Bible is to be interpreted is Jesus Christ" is removed, opting instead for a mere shell of the theological statement held in the 1963 BF&M.<sup>56</sup>

Thus one can easily extrapolate that if the Bible is "God's revelation of Himself to man," then it is necessary that the Bible becomes the ultimate standard by which the SBC or any other branch of Christian fundamentalism can make value judgements. Thus the fundamentalists must hold that the original documents are void of error in any grammatical, logical, historical, contextual, or any other way. Though the BF&M does not explicitly say that this definition of inerrancy is the standard, it certainly suggests it.

But conjecture and suggestion are hardly enough to base an argument on. In considering the issue in a more concrete fashion, Gordon James looks to Article X of the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy's (ICBI) definition which begins, "inspiration, strictly speaking,

---

<sup>54</sup> "1963 and 2000 Baptist Faith and Message Statements: Comparison and Commentary," Available from the Baptist General Convention of Texas Website, <http://www.bgct.org/TexasBaptists/Document.Doc?&id=610>, Accessed 15 Oct. 2009.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

applies only to the autographa not to any copy (present day Bible) of Scripture.”<sup>57</sup> As James explains, the ICBI is recognized as a valid formula for inerrancy by Southern Baptist fundamentalists.<sup>58</sup>

A more careful look at the ICBI’s statement of inerrancy will suffice to show what precisely the Southern Baptist fundamentalists have in mind. I will relay the ICBI’s Short Statement here and offer up the Articles of Affirmation and Denial in Appendix II.

#### A SHORT STATEMENT

1. God, who is Himself Truth and speaks truth only, has inspired Holy Scripture in order thereby to reveal Himself to lost mankind through Jesus Christ as Creator and Lord, Redeemer and Judge. Holy Scripture is God’s witness to Himself.
2. Holy Scripture, being God’s own Word, written by men prepared and superintended by His Spirit, is of infallible divine authority in all matters upon which it touches: it is to be believed, as God’s instruction, in all that it affirms; obeyed, as God’s commandment, in all that it requires; embraced, as God’s pledge, in all that it promises.
3. The Holy Spirit, Scripture’s divine Author, both authenticates it to us by His inward witness and opens our minds to understand its meaning.
4. Being wholly and verbally God-given, Scripture is without error or fault in all its teaching, no less in what it states about God’s acts in creation, about the events of world history, and about its own literary origins under god, than in its witness to God’s saving grace in individual lives.
5. The authority of Scripture is inescapably impaired if this total divine inerrancy is in any way limited or disregarded, or made relative to a view of truth contrary to the Bible’s own; and such lapses bring serious loss to both the individual and the Church.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Gordan James, *Inerrancy and the Southern Baptist Convention* (Dallas: Southern Baptist Heritage Press, 1986), 24.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 70-71.

Thus earlier suspicions garnered from the BF&M 2000 seem to be correct. There is no room for discussion as one interpretation of an ancient document with a tradition very different from 20th-Century America is the irrevocable standard. Sections Two and Four yield as concrete of a fundamentalist definition of inerrancy as exists, and Section Five ensures that the fundamentalists are not open to discussion on the issue.

Thus any translation that contradicts such a theory is itself illegitimate. Due to the changes in the BF&M 2000, the Bible cannot be treated as a group of symbols and meanings which portray Christ, the Truth of God, and cannot be adapted to be more meaningful for an audience several thousand years later. Rather, in its original form, the Bible is exactly what God wanted it to be. To alter or change this in any way is to abandon God's direct revelation of himself as Christ no longer fills the role of God's direct revelation. Thus the fundamentalists believe that should the Bible be anything but rigidly interpreted, then Christians betray God himself by abandoning the structure and wording of the Bible. This is unacceptable to the fundamentalists.

This leads into the issues which the fundamentalists have with dynamic equivalency. Dynamic equivalency cares little for Greek and Hebrew structures, viewing them as elements of the language.<sup>60</sup> English and other languages have their own distinct sets of structures; the translator's job is to take the Greek and Hebrew structures and convert them into meaningful

---

<sup>60</sup> Eugene Nida and Charles Taber, *Translation Theory and Practice* (Leiden: E.J. Brill on behalf of the United Bible Societies, 1969), 1-6.

English structures or the structures of another language.<sup>61</sup> This is the pattern that the NIV and TNIV follow.

However, HCSB does not follow this pattern. Instead, LifeWay lauds the praises of "optimal equivalence," a term which even for Dr. Clendenen seems to have very little practical meaning.<sup>62</sup> Essentially, HCSB is using an empty term to give uneducated laypeople the sense that this new translation is quite different from rigid, wooden translations such as the American Standard Version.

The reason for such an awkward policy is that the SBC has two very serious issues with translations. On one hand, it cannot afford to produce an unsellable translation. This would defeat the overall purpose of the translation. It is exceptionally difficult for any text to validate itself in the first place (some would indeed argue that it cannot be done), but this is even more the case when the text is so cryptic that no one can read it. On the other hand, the SBC has a doctrinal statement that it cannot go against, and that doctrinal statement excludes the outright use of dynamic equivalence.

Thus there are methodological and ideological reasons for the HCSB's existence. The power struggle in the SBC did not end with the BF&M 2000. The SBC leaders now have a method of excommunicating those who might challenge their doctrinal statements, but the

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> A difference that makes no difference is no difference. In the interview, Clendenen attempts to explain what precisely distinguishes optimal equivalence from either formal equivalence or dynamic equivalence. In essence, his argument results in being fairly consistent with a formal equivalent theory translation (as Nida and Taber define it on pages 1 and 2 of their work cited in footnote 57) that attempts to be somewhat readable. Again, a copy of the interview is found in Appendix I.

BF&M does little against a layperson who might cause the local pastor some woes and thus undermine the authority of said leaders. In addition, if these laypeople convince their fellow laypeople of a more moderate theology, the future begins to look less than appealing for fundamentalist leaders within the SBC. The fundamentalists need something more; they need a standard of orthodoxy. Just like King James and the Anglican Church, the SBC leaders need a translation of the Bible.

This is the crux of my argument. Due to the doctrinal rigidity of the BF&M 2000, Southern Baptist politics over the past 160 years, and the abandonment of traditional Baptist doctrine, the HCSB is more a reflection of the views of fundamentalism intended to ensure the status quo in Southern Baptist life than it is a bona fide translation. Hidden behind carefully crafted rhetoric and hollow terminology, the HCSB's sole purpose is to create fundamentalist orthodoxy within each and every church (not only Southern Baptist Churches) in which it is used and in each and every individual that uses it.

However, I have not yet provided any direct evidence of this. I offer for examination a selection of the HCSB from 2nd Timothy 3:10-17. This passage is commonly used to ground the fundamentalist doctrine of the scriptures, but typically only verses sixteen and seventeen are used (and by "used" I mean "mentioned in passing:" I have yet to hear an honest attempt to exegete them). This passage is also very useful in that not only does it deal with the issue of doctrine, but it also serves to illustrate gender inclusive language. As with the AV, my translation will follow.

<sup>10</sup>But you have followed my teaching, conduct, purpose, faith, patience, love, and endurance, <sup>11</sup>along with the persecutions and sufferings that came to me in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra. What persecutions I endured! Yet the Lord rescued me from them all. <sup>12</sup>In fact, all those who want to live a godly life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted. <sup>13</sup> Evil people and imposters will become worse,

deceiving and being deceived. <sup>14</sup> But as for you, continue in what you have learned and firmly believed, knowing those from whom you learned, <sup>15</sup> and that from childhood you have known the sacred scriptures, which are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. <sup>16</sup> All scripture is inspired by God, and is profitable for teaching, for rebuking, for correcting, for training in righteousness, <sup>17</sup> so that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work. --HCSB

<sup>10</sup> But you followed my teaching, my conduct, my way of thinking, my faith, my endurance, my love, and my patience. <sup>11</sup> What kind of persecutions and misfortunes happened to me in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra! What kind of persecutions have I endured, yet out of all things the Lord has delivered me! <sup>12</sup> But also all the ones who want a godly life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted. <sup>13</sup> Evil people and swindlers, those who are leading others astray and are themselves being led astray, will advance severely. <sup>14</sup> But you remain in the kind of knowledge you found out and have been convinced of, knowing those from whom you learned. <sup>15</sup> Even from childhood you knew the holy writings, which are able to make you wise into salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. <sup>16</sup> All God-inspired writing is advantageous towards teaching, towards conviction, towards improvement, towards training in right conduct. <sup>17</sup> That the person of God might be complete, having been equipped toward each good work. --Author's translation

I would begin with the claim that Paul (assuming Pauline authorship) is not speaking about a doctrine of scripture. Paul is speaking about the future of the Church; he realizes that just as both Christ and he were persecuted, the Church would also be persecuted.<sup>63</sup> His desire is to ensure that the future has the leadership necessary to endure the test of time, suffering, and evil men. Since this next generation of believers could not access Christ directly, they would have to

---

<sup>63</sup> William Mounce, *The Pastoral Epistles*, in *Word Biblical Commentary*, Ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, Dallas (Thomas Nelson: 2000), 554-571.

settle for the writings into which God had breathed his Spirit into (θεῷ πνευστος (God-spirit or God-breath)).<sup>64</sup>

The main issue that the fundamentalists will have with the translation is my treatment of the word γραφή (word, scripture). They are all too ready to translate the word as "scripture," but seeing that γραφή has various other meanings leads me to believe Paul to be more subtle.<sup>65</sup> Were Paul to have meant scripture, then he would have been referring to the Hebrew scriptures (there was no list of Christian scriptures until well after the deaths of Paul and of the apostles) and thus excluding early Christian writings from this list. I cannot accept that Paul would think so little of his own writing, particularly when many of his letters were to be passed around to other Christian communities near the primary recipient.<sup>66</sup> Thus I have chosen to translate the text without the addition of εἰ μὴ (I am) in verse 16 as Paul is anticipating the day in which Christians will agree upon which writings God did indeed infuse with his Spirit.<sup>67</sup>

Also, I refrain from using "men" in verses 13 and 17 as I see little logical problem with saying that women could oppose or advance Christianity just as much as men. I see no way in which translators diminish the Gospel by allowing women to also come under the beneficial

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> "Graphe," In *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. I, Edited by Gerhart Kittel, Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids (Wm. B. Eerdmans: 1964), p. 750.

<sup>66</sup> David Garland gives a brief overview of the arguments that II Corinthians is a letter whose parts were distributed to other communities and reconciled under a redactor. Garland rejects this idea, but it still serves to illustrate that Paul's letters were not likely sent to a particular community. David Garland, *2 Corinthians*, in *The New American Commentary*, Vol. 29, Edited by Ray Clendenen, Nashville (Broadman & Holman: 1999), 33-44.

<sup>67</sup> Mounce.

effects of the texts into which God breathed, and it is also the case that Revelation cites a woman who opposes Christianity from the inside.<sup>68</sup> Any claim that HCSB is "gender accurate" can come under fire just from these few verses.<sup>69</sup>

Yet to take one passage and to attempt to build an argument about an entire book is very weak. Thus I offer Romans 16:1-2 for consideration as it will help shed more light on the issue of gender-neutral language in the HCSB.

<sup>1</sup> I commend to you our sister Phoebe, who is a servant of the church in Cenchreae. <sup>2</sup> So you should welcome her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and assist her in whatever matter she may require your help. For indeed she has been a benefactor of many — and of me also. --HCSB

I recommend our sister Phoebe, who also is a deaconess of the church at Cenchreae. So that you should welcome her in a manner worthy of the saints in the Lord and assist her in whatever work she needs of you. For also she was the patroness of many and even of me. -- Author's translation

Paul's writings have been used to silence the female voice in the church. Such passages as 1 Cor. 13:34-15 and 1 Tim. 3:1-13 are prime examples of texts that add to the confusion that many Christians hold over women in ministry. Yet in this passage Paul recommends Phoebe, a woman who holds the office of deacon, to the Roman churches and essentially places them under her supervision. He even claims that he himself benefited from her insight and motherly concern.

Yet in the very sense that Phoebe is praised HCSB disrespects her. No more is she deaconess; she is only a servant. Here I make two concessions. First, the HCSB does offer a

---

<sup>68</sup> Rev. 2:20

<sup>69</sup> Clendenen.

footnote that recognizes that some interpret δῖ ακοβοϑ (deacon, servant) as deacon. The translation at least tips its hat at the notion, though both HCSB's and the NIV's preferred translation leave much to be desired as James Dunn points out in his discussion of the passage.<sup>70</sup> I must also concede that all deacons are truly servants by another name, but had HCSB chosen this theological approach to the term, then 1 Tim. 3:8 should also read servant. However, the HCSB translates δῖ ακοβοϑ there as deacon.

The very fact that HCSB offers an alternative in a footnote is in itself a suggestion that the fundamentalists are very torn when two very important doctrines collide. Women cannot hold authority over men as they cannot be both graciously submitting to their husbands and appropriating spiritual leadership over them at the same time. The doctrine of Biblical womanhood as outlined in the BF&M 2000 and the doctrine of inerrancy here conflict, and all the HCSB can do is offer a footnote. This should be indicative that there is a flaw in the system.

The obvious disparity is that Paul seems to be suggesting a role for Phoebe that the fundamentalists are simply not comfortable with. Were Phoebe male the translation of δῖ ακοβοϑ would certainly have been deacon; the HCSB translation of 1 Tim. 3:8 shows what happens when the term refers to a masculine noun. Thus I suggest that Phoebe is demoted to a simple servant as a direct result of the purpose statement of HCSB and its great qualms with gender inclusive language.

---

<sup>70</sup> Dunn claims that were Phoebe a simple servant, Paul would have likely used the term διακονέω (I serve) or διακονία (assignment, act of service). He further claims that as "δῖ ακοβοϑ together with οὗσαν (being) points more to a recognized ministry . . . or position of responsibility within the congregation." James Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, in *Word Biblical Commentary*, Ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker Dallas (Thomas Nelson: 1988), 886.

The theology of the SBC over the past thirty years is the lens through which the translators of the HCSB translated. Of course, one selection of one text can neither prove nor disprove the claim which I have made on HCSB. In no way should anyone take these brief vignettes and use them inappropriately to dishonor this genuine attempt to address social issues. These vignettes are not conclusive by any means, and one should not view them as such.

## COMPARISON AND CONCLUSION

Christian history is plagued with historical tragedies of human greed. Countless conflicts and religious wars dot the landscape of the past two thousand years; though no one cause is sufficient to adequately explain these conflicts, political motivations and a desire for increased power are almost always involved in some way. These conflicts have served to define Western Christianity, either for better or for worse.

While these conflicts are indeed unfortunate, distressingly many modern Western Christians have not learned from the past. I have suggested that both the Authorized Version and the Holman Christian Standard Bible are prime examples of translations that have sought to push the political agendas of a group in power. I now suggest that in reality the translations not only serve the same purpose but illustrate two overarching truths that are as old as humanity itself: those in power go to extremes to stay in power, and the well-being of the nation, religion, or other people group is secondary to the well-being of those in power.

In providing a few premises for my conclusion, please consider that I have explained at length the political motivations behind both the AV and the HCSB. These motivations are as different as the political structures in which they arose. AV was intended to unify England behind the monarchy and the Anglican Church while the HCSB is intended to unify Christianity behind the banner of the Fundamentalist agenda.

Yet while the *sitz im leben* of the translations are very different, the substance of the claim is almost identical. King James I of England had sovereign authority over the English

nation and over the Anglican Church.<sup>1</sup> England was a substantial player in European politics by the 1600's, and it is unlikely that James wished to concede any ounce of that authority or of that clout in European politics.<sup>2</sup>

The Fundamentalist Takeover of the Southern Baptist Convention in the 1980's saw a Fundamentalist sect seize the reigns of one of the wealthiest and most influential Christian groups in the world. This Christian group has a voice in Washington D.C., a publishing house, missionaries worldwide, six seminary facilities, state-level conventions with countless colleges and universities, and legions upon legions of churches and laypeople. It is unlikely that the Fundamentalists wish to concede any ounce of authority over Southern Baptist assets.

Simply stated, the political influences within AV and HCSB aim at maintaining their authority. The differences between the two are that AV is concerned about maintaining the legitimacy of King James's political and ecclesial authority while HCSB is concerned with doctrinal uniformity as a means of maintaining Fundamentalism in the SBC.

While this concept serves as an argument for the first conclusion I drew, it does little to explain how translating the Bible can be detrimental to the Church, state, or other people group. It is here that one must consider the two translations separately rather than as a group as the differences in the political motivations for the translations, as minute as they may be, are of utmost importance.

King James sought to bind people to his political will by means of their faith. Thus the political influences on AV are manifest in an over-exaggeration of the servant/master and

---

<sup>1</sup> As Henry VIII established the Anglican Church, he and the monarchs after him became head of the Anglican Church. See Robert Bruce Mullin, *A Short World History of Christianity*, Louisville (Westminster John Knox Press: 2008), 143-148 for more information.

<sup>2</sup> For a synopsis of European politics during the English Civil War, see Samuel Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War: 1642-1649*, New York (AMS Press: 1965).

husband/wife pericopes in the Pauline corpus. James did not care about the orthodoxy of England insofar as it had no effect on his status (though the Anglican Church certainly had those concerns, but any theological bias on their behalf was countered by the Puritan influence on the text). Political power was the underlying force behind the translation, and as such the theology of England was largely unaffected though it did shape the politics of England.

A change in politics can potentially be dangerous to a nation, especially if the nation has undergone recent political turmoil.<sup>3</sup> As history records, few years would pass before the people of England under Cromwell would lash out against the monarchy. While James had intended to use the translation to bring unity and peace to England, AV did not and perhaps could not bring such unity and peace.<sup>4</sup>

The political impact on the HCSB, however, is vastly different. The political struggles within Southern Baptist life are inextricable bedfellows with the theology of Southern Baptist life. Thus simply because the Fundamentalists used theological manipulation to seize power, the theology of Southern Baptists underwent an inherent change.

As I have pointed out, the HCSB is rooted in the fallout of the Fundamentalist takeover of the SBC. As such, the political influences on the work are also inherently theological. These influences manifest in gender inclusive language, pericopes concerning the role of women in

---

<sup>3</sup> Political theorists seem ambivalent about this notion, yet notable theorists such as Marx, Hegel, and Weber seem to think so. For more information, consult Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*, New York (Croft's Classics); Anthony Giddens, *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the writings of Marx, Durkheim, and Max Weber*, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press: 1971); and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, Translated by J. Sibree, New York (Willey Book Co.: 1900).

<sup>4</sup> In *The History of Christian Theology* p. 227-233, William Placher illustrates how theological and political controversies in England split the country into factions. AV was too little too late; no document could possibly hope to satisfy all the factions within England. Even the Westminster Confession, a document which was formed by Parliament to define English orthodoxy, failed to encompass the Separatists and radical wings of English Christianity.

the church, and pericopes regarding scripture. Any alteration to these items results in a theological shift, changing the nature of the church altogether.

Though AV could not speak to the people of England, HCSB has the ability to speak, especially to the Fundamentalist wing of not only Southern Baptists but also of Methodists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Pentecostals, Catholics, etc. What is truly frightening is that the average layperson cannot distinguish between political/theological slant and the text itself. Thus the average layperson views those biases with the same respect they hold for the scripture, and bias becomes orthodoxy.

HCSB gives theological permission for laypeople to condemn women in ecclesial leadership. It gives a view of scripture that Greek texts do not support. It paves the way for a view of the church that the scriptures do not support. It is too readily accepted by Fundamentalist laypeople, ensuring the reign of Fundamentalism in Southern Baptist life and generating a form of Christianity that is disingenuous to the life, death, and resurrection of Christ.

This claim is monumental on my part. However, Christ gave women a place of discipleship amongst his disciples.<sup>5</sup> Christ also ignored social stigmas in speaking to the Samaritan woman at the well.<sup>6</sup> Christ alone claimed to be truth, and that the scriptures were subject to his authority.<sup>7</sup> Christ is the chief cornerstone of the Church, and any church system that is not based in Christ is not a Christian church.<sup>8</sup>

The danger in such a radical departure into Fundamentalism appears in statistics concerning the decline in SBC churches and the general distrust of organized churches as a

---

<sup>5</sup> Luke 10:39

<sup>6</sup> John 4

<sup>7</sup> John 14:6

<sup>8</sup> Ephesians 2:20

whole. LifeWay Research says it best: “Southern Baptist membership will fall nearly 50 percent by 2050 unless the aging and predominantly white denomination reverses a 50-year trend and does more to strengthen evangelism, reach immigrants, and develop a broader ethnic base.”<sup>9</sup> The Barna Group found that 61% of young adults disengage from any sort of spirituality after being active in a church during their teenage years.<sup>10</sup>

One can easily generalize from these statistics that something is amiss in Southern Baptist life and indeed in Christianity as a whole. I would contend that a religion in which people are ostracized, ridiculed, and viewed as less than based on a creedal statement is a religion that is destined to die. No Christian would claim that Christ has nothing beneficial to say to world issues. Yet the Christian perspective is being viewed with increasing disrespect as a direct result of the kind of judgmental attitude from the Fundamentalist perspective.

History is riddled with examples of church movements that threatened the future of Christianity for the benefit of the ruling power. The Protestant Reformation, the Great Schism, the Babylonian Captivity of the Church, and misguided doctrine as in the case of the Crusades all serve as reminders of how leadership can, out of self-interest, jeopardize the future of the Church. History also has a frightening tendency to repeat itself, especially if we are so foolish as to ignore the lessons it has to teach us.

We in the Baptist tradition now stand at a crossroads. The world desperately needs a message of hope, but all we seem to communicate is a message of damnation. Jesus came

---

<sup>9</sup> Rob Phillips, “Southern Baptists face further decline without renewed evangelism emphasis,” LifeWay Research, <http://www.lifeway.com/article/?id=169334>, accessed Nov. 23, 2009.

<sup>10</sup>The Barna Group, “Most Twentysomethings Put Christianity on the Shelf Following Spiritually Active Teen Years,” Barna Research, <http://www.barna.org/barna-update/article/16-teensnext-gen/147-most-twentysomethings-put-christianity-on-the-shelf-following-spiritually-active-teen-years>, accessed Nov. 23, 2009.

preaching good news to the weak, vulnerable, and outcast of society while preaching judgment to the affluent, the empowered, the apathetic, and the hypocrites. We must decide whether the Fundamentalist message is indeed contrary to the message of Jesus. We must also decide whether we are willing to follow Christ despite persecution from fellow believers. May we cast aside our prestige, our desires, and our lust for power, take up our crosses, and follow Christ.

## APPENDIX I: HOLMAN INTERVIEW

Among the many forms of instruction that I have received during my college career, correct methodology for performing interviews has not been among them. This is a layperson's clumsy attempt to provide such a thing.

Aug. 7, 2009 1:00PM Interview with Dr. Ray Clendenen, Associate Editor, HCSB

JC: Josh Carpenter, interviewer.

RC: Dr. Clendenen

JC: It should be recording now. All right, I have about six or seven questions for you. First of all, very general, I would like to know about yourself; where you graduated from, where you got your PHD from, [and] things of that nature.

RC: I am from Dallas. I went to Rice University in Houston and then to Seminary in Dallas, Dallas Theological Seminary [DTS]. [I] studied Hebrew and Old Testament [OT] and was a pastor in Illinois for three years and then moved to Philly and studied at Dropsy<sup>1</sup> which is a Hebrew graduate school Jewish grad school. [I] got a second Master's degree while I was teaching Bible at Philly College of Bible, taught there for three years, and then moved to Dallas where I taught at Crystal College. [I taught] Hebrew and OT among a few other things for 10 years and came here to be General Ed. of New American Commentary [NAC] which I still am. I've had various other responsibilities through the years, but that was seventeen years ago. So I

---

<sup>1</sup> The recording of the interview is most unclear at this point.

was Associate General Editor of translation project working under Ed Blum who was [the] General Editor, and I still have attachment to the project in that role. But since it came out, less fortunately, as now I am on academic and working strictly with academic books aside from my work with New American Commentary. Oh, and by the way, while I was at Dallas teaching at Crystal College, I finished my PH.D in linguistics at University of Texas Arlington, which was at that time closely associated with Wycliffe Bible Translators.

JC: Second question. I've done a little bit of research on the project itself, and I have heard of this Dr. Amstad. He was editor of New King James Version [NKJV], and he was working on a new project which eventually became Holman Christian Standard Bible [HCSB]. What prompted the shift from an updated version of NKJV to the HCSB project as it is somewhat different than the Anglican translations such as NKJV?

RC: I was trying to figure out your use of the word Anglican, but I see what you mean in the King James [Version, KJV] tradition. Um, what happened was that even as soon as I came to work here 17 years ago, there were rumblings. New International Version [NIV] and KJV were the two translations that Life Way used in curriculum. And the NAC uses NIV. But there were a lot of administrators that weren't happy with the NIV thought it wasn't literal enough so there were rumblings about we would like to do a translation that would be more literal than the NIV.

And a lot of people liked the New American Standard Bible [NASB], so we talked to Lochman Foundation about possibly forming a business relation with them (something that we could be the publisher). But that didn't work out, and we tried a couple of other ventures associations with people who were already working on a translation that perhaps we could fit.

One was the International Standard Version [ISV] (I think it was some of the people used to work on NASB started the ISV), and that didn't work out. And so the publisher met, at some point, Dr. Amstad and liked him and began talking to him.

With his background in translation, he knew a bunch of different languages and [was a] very competent scholar. And we considered simply producing the translation that he was already working on. As soon as NKJV project was finished, he, as general editor, started work on a new one as he was not really happy with the NKJV. Because he was really a majority text scholar, and NKJV is really a received text translation; it's not really a majority text. So he really wanted to do a majority text translation. So he had been working on this; we discussed internally and some people externally (some scholars that we thought a lot of), "Do we really want to produce a majority text translation?" OT would be same; New Testament [NT] would be different, and we finally decided, "No, we did not."

But the publisher had the idea that since he liked Art Armstad and respected him a lot, perhaps Art Armstad could produce two translations at one time: one that would be majority text and one that would not. And so we entered into a business agreement with him that he would be general editor of a new translation which for all practical purposes would be totally independent work, and what he did on the side to produce some other translation was his business. So we entered into that agreement and began. He already had a lot of the NT done with or without other people, and it, of course, had to be revised. The project began, and then six months later he died.

And with my Hebrew background, I was mostly involved in selecting translators for the OT books, and (a fellow who had been working with Art and had been a former colleague of his

at DTS, Ed Blum) we asked him to become General Editor so that's the connection there I guess does that give you what you need?

JC: Yes it certainly does. Since you were involved in selecting translators, this question should be right up your ally. How did you choose which translators [to employ]?

RC: Having been working on NAC, I was familiar with the breadth of evangelical scholars. Particularly through the Evangelical Theological Society [ETS] which Ed and I were both attached to. And so we began to think first of we wanted: to find someone who was committed to the doctrine of inerrancy and one who was extremely competent and (in the case of OT, of course) Hebrew or Aramaic, and ideally someone who was familiar with contemporary or modern linguistic theory and translation technology, and someone who had thought a lot about Bible translation and how it should be done. And of course preferably someone who had already done work in a particular book. So we thought first of the authors of the NAC; those who had finished a volume and in some cases we enlisted them and simply scholars that we knew outside of that. We wanted about half the scholars to be Baptist and half to be non-Baptists so that was another thing to keep in mind.

JC: Okay. Once you had selected the translators who were going to work on a particular book, how did they proceed to produce the translation?

RC: We actually asked them to produce a relatively literal translation kind of like an NASB trans except using more modern language tools, commentaries, and so forth that were not available at NASB's time. And if possible to run their work by an English stylist individually before they turned it in to us. Some of them did; some of them did not. What they sent us eventually was a relatively literal translation, readable, but not as readable as eventually we

wanted it to be. They also added in the process of translating added in some notes. We knew we were going to have some "or" notes which would give alternate translations, and we knew we would have some "literal" notes where we would translate it a certain more readable way and give the literal in the footnote. And we knew we wanted a few explanatory notes like explaining who Cyrus was and, of course, cross references. They turned in their work, and it would go to a committee.

At the very beginning, I forgot we had four OT section editors, so it would go from the translators to the section editors. One of those was James Rice who was the OT guy on NKJV and a professor at TN Temple. I think he was over the historical books. Mark Rooker teaches at Southeastern Seminary; he was Pentateuch section editor. Dwane Garret, who is now at Southern (he was at Gordon-Conwell at the time), he was the poetic books editor, and then prophetic books editor was Todd Neil who teaches at Capitol Seminary in Washington. The section editors would go through it and make on paper suggested changes as far as accuracy or whatever as they would understand a bit better what our translation philosophy was. And so at that stage it got a bit closer to what we eventually were going to have.

It went from them to Calvin Miller the author/writer and he read through it with an eye to English style. And made suggestions as far as "I think I understand what this is saying; if I just wrote this in English, this is how I would say it." So we kind of went from literal on one end of things to very readable on the other end of the spectrum from him, and so we kind of had both of those. The next stage it went to a committee of Ed Blum, the General Editor, and a couple of scholars (NT and OT scholars) working in Dallas, and a couple of English stylist. And they worked through it, and then it went to another English stylist and came back to them. And [it]

came up here to us and we read it. So that was pretty much the process that we followed with the OT.

JC: The KJ[V] scholars who worked on the trans way back when were instructed by the hierarchy to ensure that their translation was adequate in that they gave them a certain number of guidelines by which to go. Did you all prescribe any guidelines for your translators while they were translating?

RC: Only that they used the latest language tools and commentaries that were available preferably using computerized Bible search software. And we made known certain style issues at the beginning for instance in conversation where we thought it was fitting, we would use contractions. We made some decisions up front; well, throughout the whole process, we discussed at some level how to translate some frequently occurring terms like "amen amen" in the NT (or "verily verily," I think we settled on "I assure you"). And Yahweh, how to render that in the OT so those were the only guidelines that I recall other than relatively literal.

JC: In the introduction to HCSB as well as in other literature I've read, the text uses the term "optimal equivalence." What precisely do you mean by that and how does that differ from other translations which use both formal and dynamic equivalence?

RC: We were not comfortable [with] what was generally associated with the term formal equivalence because we felt that that was too closely tied to forms of the words and construction of Greek and Hebrew words and sentences. And [we were also not comfortable] in terms of word order and things of that sort (and, you know, sometimes it produces, such as NASB, being a somewhat wooden translation). And so we were not wanting to be as strictly tied into the form of the words as NASB.

On the other hand, the NIV in its effort to be readable and to present to the English reader the attempt (which was certainly a good effort) to present, "If Paul had written this today, this is the way he would say it." In the process of doing that, what would be, in general, a readable, natural sounding translation, in order to do that, they often failed to transfer from Greek or Hebrew into the English sentence or paragraph some of the data which was in the original text.

And so the optimal equivalence is an attempt to produce a natural sounding translation in English but not to leave aside [but rather] to transfer as much of the data from the language as possible. And the forms, there's a view that in translation, you can easily separate the form from the meaning (you know it uses participles, it uses certain articles, adjectives, word order, things like that), and there's thought to be the idea that those forms are somewhat irrelevant. That you can use them to get at the meaning, and then you can bring that over and say, "Well here's the meaning. How would we say that in English?" And I think that that approach is somewhat naive in thinking that form and meaning can be separated that simply. And bringing over as much data into the translation as possible involves making sure that if the author perhaps used a particular word a verse or two before and he uses in this verse a synonym, maybe. It would be rather simplistic to say, "Well, he just decided to vary his wording for style's sake." Well maybe so; maybe not.

But if we could reflect the difference of words in the translation, we wanted to do that. If he used a participle instead of finite verb, whether in Hebrew or Greek, a participle in any of those languages reflects some kind of generally an ongoing activity. So we wanted, if possible, to translate that to reflect that participle or at least reflect the ongoing activity however we interpreted the use of the participle at that point. Plurals and singulars and so forth, [in fact] all the data that we could possibly transfer into the translation we wanted to do that, and whatever

data that we couldn't bring over that we felt like was at all significant in meaning and application we would put things like that in footnotes, and so we would attempt to capture everything.

The NIV has been criticized a lot for not transferring certain connective particles (the therefore's and things of that sort). That was one thing we did not want to do; we did not want [to] leave particles out which the Greek or Hebrew writer put in there so we tried to translate all those. That is optimal equivalence; [it] hasn't been worked out in regular scientific manner, but that in general is what we are aiming for.

JC: I was sort of confused when I tried to contact you. I tried first contacting Holman in particular. I cannot remember her name, but I think she is a secretary here. She contacted me back and said the gentleman that I was trying to contact had retired. And she referred me to you. She first had a Holman email address, but when she emailed me back, she had a Life Way email address. What exactly is the relationship between Holman and Life Way?

RC: Life Way is the current name of what used to be the Sunday School Board [SSB] of the Southern Baptist Convention. In those days, the publishing division within the SSB, the division that published Bibles and books for the general Christian market, was called Broadman press. I forget the dates, but Broadman purchased Holman Bible Publishers out of Philly. We acquired Holman, and about fifteen years ago, we became Broadman and Holman. So we were Broadman and Holman and two to three years ago, we became simply B&H. So that [is] who we are.

JC: So Life Way simply is a bigger company and B&H does the publishing for Life Way?

RC: Yeah we put Holman on everything... Bibles at least for quite a while. You can think of it as an imprint; print those with Holman. I don't know if we still use Holman or not.

JC: I read an article by Dr. Blum and he claims, and this is a direct quote, "The Today's New International Version [TNIV] has gone overboard to avoid gender insensitivity and is more gender neutral. We would claim that the NIV is gender biased, the TNIV attempts to be gender neutral and the HCSB is gender accurate." What does he mean that the HCSB is gender accurate and what are the TNIV's flaws in being gender neutral?

RC: I think this will be helpful. At the time we began the trans, this issue was heating up about the use of inclusive language in everything. I presented a paper at ETS several years ago discussing the gender issue of inclusive language. We investigated the matter, and determined where we wanted to land. At about the same time, the English Standard Version (ESV) project was beginning (Wayne Grudham and others). Where we wanted to be was virtually the same philosophy as they had. I did a-- I got the idea from a Wycliffe Bible translator to produce a-- quantified study of inclusive language in Bible translations, and it was very interesting. He suggested the use of numbers to identify a translation at a particular point of a text which followed gender specific translation or gender neutral translation. If it was gender specific, it got a one and if gender neutral, it got a zero or something like that.

In Hebrew and Greek, I compiled a list of seems like about forty different types of grammatical constructions that could be translated [in which] you would have to make a decision whether to translate [them] as gender specific or gender neutral (like in Greek article with masculine participle singular referring to someone who does something; a carpenter, or the one who believes). It would use a masculine article and masculine participle, and so the inclusive,

some would say in order to keep the translation from being biased to one gender or another, in order for it to reach men and women both equally, all of those cases where a decision had to be made whether to translate as masculine or non-masculine, they would always do it non-masculine. Various translations would fall at various places on the spectrum as to how important that was or not. So I took all those places in . . . like, the particle *pistuoin*, KJ[V] would translate that as "he who believes" because its masculine, and so we had to decide whether the masculine element in that grammatical construction had meaning significance or was it just form was it just grammar.<sup>2</sup> In that particular case, we decided that it wasn't intending to identify a male individually. It was just a grammatical construction, so we translated it as "the one who believes." But KJV would translate it (and NASB as I recall would translate it) " he who believes," and so I studied.

I identified about one hundred different passages, several examples of different grammatical constructions in OT and NT, and I looked at how each translation handled each passage, and I gave it a quantified number. I can't remember how many translations I used but it was like fifteen to twenty I think. And it was very interesting to look at bottom line, because I added up how gender neutral or specific each translation was by how it handed all those places. And I believe KJ[V] was--on that wide spectrum--was the most gender specific in that it made masculines out of things that most everybody today would recognize were not male or intended to be understood as male. So they went overboard (not intentionally, but that was the world they lived in); they were more masculine than the Biblical text. The NASB fit in that category, and the Revised Standard Version fit in that category. On the other end of that, the Christian Evangelical Version (CEV), as I recall, was the most gender inclusive, and I think it even got a

---

<sup>2</sup>The omitted text, " the how," was removed for its lack of English grammatical utility and overall unclearness.

score of one hundred percent (virtually every place that they could translate something as a non-masculine they did). All the other translations were in-between.

And it was interesting that the quantification scores did seem to cluster in three groups. You know, there was a cluster of translations that we believe were more masculine than the Biblical text, and on the other end of things there was a cluster of those like CEV that elected to translate as [non-]masculine<sup>3</sup> some things that we believed the writer intentionally made masculine having in mind male persons. And the ones in the middle (which, of course, we fit; everybody always wants to be in the middle; you always want to have people who are more or less whatever it is on either side of you so you feel comfortable). So anyway that's what it is along with the ESV the HCSV and the ESV scored almost exactly the same. The Second Edition of the New Living Translation was just slightly more inclusive than ours; the first edition was more inclusive than that. The DTS translation called the Net Bible was almost the same as ours. Does that answer your question?

JC: Yes it does. Now what would you say are the TNIV's problems?

RC: The TNIV was in that third group, and in many cases we believed that they touched which the author had in mind a male individual or group for that matter. They chose to translate as gender inclusive, and in some of those cases we felt like the case for a masculine translation was really quite strong. And it appeared to us that they made those decision on political grounds. Nobody knows why somebody else does something, but at least in many places there was a they rendered things as non-gendered that we believe should have been recognized as gendered. There are some passages; you know Psalm 1, "happy is the man" if you insist on an inclusive

---

<sup>3</sup> I assume here that Dr. Clendenen misspoke else his argument is nonsensical.

translation you would render that as "happy is the person" or something like that. But based on various things we decided that the text was thinking (I mean the author of the text was thinking) of a male individual who was perhaps representative of people in general but the example he was using was a man so we translated it as "happy is the man."

JC: This will be my last question. There is no translation or any other book for that matter which is above critique. As Dr. Blum has noted in his essay, "A Comparison of the HCSB with Other Major Translations," there have been accusations that part of the motivations behind the HCSB involves financial grounds. Is there any foundation to these accusations? Why would anyone want to criticize the HCSB on these grounds?

RC: I think the reason for that impression that some people had early on (I don't know where it started), but the claim or theory was that we wanted our own translation so that we didn't have to pay Zondervan or someone for the use of their translation. And you know, in fact, we don't actually pay them very much. When we publish an NAC volume, we pay them four hundred dollars, so we aren't talking about [a huge sum of money] (I don't know what it is in other cases but that is not it isn't that significant an amount in the first place), and in the second place in all the meetings and discussions that I had from the beginning 17 years ago (and although I wasn't in charge of the project at all I was usually involved in the meetings) that was never a motivation. The motivation was always primarily [as follows:] we aren't happy with what we have, and we think we would do better to have a different kind of translation. So there was (I can't remember; he may mention it in that article) [the fact that] we paid a great deal of money to produce that translation. So we could have saved a lot of money if we hadn't done it, so that accusation is rather found[ation]- less.

JC: So why would people want to criticize this translation on these grounds?

RC: Well, that is a good question. I guess a question at that time came up; it was an obvious question, "There are already a lot of translations. Why do you want to do another one?" And the particular answer was an easy answer since we are somewhat of a business even though we are a nonprofit business, we operate according to business principles. It was an easy thing to think, "Well, it was our business principles that were driving our need to do a Bible translation." And those people didn't know and most people still don't know that we are non-profit, so that seemed to be an easy solution. And that's the only thing that I recall as being a reason why they might feel a need to criticize our motivation. That's the only thing I can recall.

JC: Well thank you for your time, and I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you.

RC: It was my pleasure.

APPENDIX II: ARTICLES OF AFFIRMATION AND DENIAL OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON BIBLICAL INNERANCY

This appendix is taken from Gordan James, *Inerrancy and the Southern Baptist Convention* (Dallas: Southern Baptist Heritage Press, 1986), 24.

ARTICLE I

We affirm that the Holy Scriptures are to be received as the authoritative Word of God. We deny that the Scriptures receive their authority from the Church, tradition, or any other human source.

ARTICLE II

We affirm that the Scriptures are the supreme written norm by which God binds the conscience, and that the authority of the Church is subordinate to that of Scripture. We deny that Church creeds, councils, or declarations have authority greater than or equal to the authority of the Bible.

ARTICLE III

We affirm that the written Word in its entirety is revelation given by God. We deny that the Bible is merely a witness to revelation, or only becomes revelation in encounter, or depends on the responses of men for its validity.

#### ARTICLE IV

We affirm that God who made mankind in his image has used language as a means of revelation. We deny that human language is so limited by our creatureliness that it is rendered inadequate as a vehicle for divine revelation. We further deny that the corruption of human culture and language through sin has thwarted God's work of inspiration.

#### ARTICLE V

We affirm that God's revelation in the Holy Scriptures was progressive. We deny that later revelation, which may fulfill earlier revelation, ever corrects or contradicts it. We further deny that any normative revelation has been given since the completion of the New Testament writings.

#### ARTICLE VI

We affirm that the whole of Scripture and all its parts, down to the very words of the original, were given by divine inspiration. We deny that the inspiration of Scripture can rightly be affirmed of the whole without parts, or of some parts but not the whole.

#### ARTICLE VII

We affirm that inspiration was the work in which God by His Spirit, through human writers, gave us His Word. The origin of Scripture is divine. The mode of divine inspiration remains largely a mystery to us. We deny that inspiration can be reduced to human insight, or to heightened states of consciousness of any kind.

#### ARTICLE VIII

We affirm that God in His Work of inspiration utilized the distinctive personalities and literary styles of the writers whom He had chosen and prepared. We deny that God, in causing these writers to use the very words that he chose, overrode their personalities.

#### ARTICLE IX

We affirm that inspiration, though not conferring omniscience, guaranteed true and trustworthy utterance on all matters of which the Biblical authors were moved to speak and write. We deny that finitude or fallenness of these writers, by necessity or otherwise, introduced distortion or falsehood into God's Word.

#### ARTICLE X

We affirm that inspiration, strictly speaking, applies only to the autographic text of Scripture, which in the providence of God can be ascertained from available manuscripts with great accuracy. We further affirm that copies and translations of Scripture are the Word of God to the extent that they faithfully represent the original. We deny that any essential element of the Christian faith is affected by the absence of the authographs. We further deny that this absence renders the assertion of Biblical inerrancy invalid or irrelevant.

#### ARTICLE XI

We affirm that Scripture, having been given by divine inspiration is infallible, so that, far from misleading us, it is true and reliable in all the matters it addresses. We deny that it is possible for the Bible to be at the same time infallible and errant in its assertions. Infallibility and inerrancy may be distinguished, but not separated.

## ARTICLE XII

We affirm that Scripture in its entirety is inerrant, being free from all falsehood, fraud, or deceit. We deny that Biblical infallibility and inerrancy are limited to spiritual, religious, or redemptive themes, exclusive of assertions in the fields of history and science. We further deny that scientific hypotheses about earth history may properly be used to overturn the teaching of the Scriptures on creation and the flood.

## ARTICLE XIII

We affirm the propriety of using inerrancy as a theological term with reference to the complete truthfulness of Scripture. We deny that it is proper to evaluate Scripture according to standards of truth and error that are alien to its usage or purpose. We further deny that inerrancy is negated by Biblical phenomena such as a lack of modern technical precision, irregularities of grammar or spelling, observational descriptions of nature, the reporting of falsehoods, the use of hyperbole and round numbers, the topical arrangement of material, variant selections of material in parallel accounts or the use of free citations.

## ARTICLE XIV

We affirm the unity and internal consistency of Scripture. We deny that alleged errors and discrepancies that have not been resolved vitiate the truth claims of the Bible.

## ARTICLE XV

We affirm that the doctrine of inerrancy is grounded in the teaching of the Bible about inspiration. We deny that Jesus' teaching about Scripture may be dismissed by appeals to accommodation or to any natural limitation of His humanity.

#### ARTICLE XVI

We affirm that the doctrine of inerrancy has been integral to the Church's faith throughout its history. We deny that inerrancy is a doctrine invented by Scholastic Protestantism, or is a reactionary position postulated in response to negative higher criticism.

#### ARTICLE XVII

We affirm that the Holy Spirit bears witness to the Scriptures, assuring believers of the truthfulness of God's written Word. We deny that this witness of the Holy Spirit operates in isolation from or against Scripture.

#### ARTICLE XVIII

We affirm that the text of Scripture is to be interpreted by grammatico-historical exegesis, taking account of its literary forms and devices, and that Scripture is to interpret Scripture. We deny the legitimacy of any treatment of the text or quest for sources lying behind it that leads to relativizing, dehistoricizing, or discounting its teaching, or rejecting its claims to authorship.

#### ARTICLE XIX

We affirm that a confession of the full authority, infallibility, and inerrancy of Scripture is vital to a sound understanding of the whole of the Christian faith. We further affirm that such confession should lead to increasing conformity to the image of Christ. We deny that such confession is necessary for salvation. However, we further deny that inerrancy can be rejected without grave consequences, both to the individual and to the Church.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "1963 and 2000 Baptist Faith and Message Statements: Comparison and Commentary."  
Available from the Baptist General Convention of Texas Website. <<http://www.bgct.org/TexasBaptists/Document.Doc?&id=610>>. Accessed 15 Oct. 2009.
- Ammerman, Nancy, Diane Winston, et al. *Southern Baptists Observed: Multiple Perspectives on a Changing Denomination*. Edited by Nancy Ammerman. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1993.
- Axely, Amanda. *Controversy Surrounding the Baptist Faith and Message 2000*. Honors Project. Jefferson City: Carson-Newman College, 2005.
- The Barna Group. "Most Twentysomethings Put Christianity on the Shelf Following Spiritually Active Teen Years." From *Barna Research*. <http://www.barna.org/barna-update/article/16-teensnext-gen/147-most-twentysomethings-put-christianity-on-the-shelf-following-spiritually-active-teen-years>. Accessed 23 Nov. 2009.
- Barrios, Georges A & Phillip J. King. "Geography, History, and Archaeology." In *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*. Edited by Bruce Metzger and Roland Murphy. 417. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Elizabeth I: a Feminist Perspective*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1988.
- Bigg, Charles. *Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. In *The International Critical Commentary*. Vol. 38. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.
- Bois, John. *Translating for King James*. Translated by Ward Allen. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1993.
- Bull, Chris and John Gallagher. *Perfect Enemies: The Religious Right, the Gay Movement, and the Politics of the 1990's*. New York: Crown, 1996.
- Butterworth, Charles. *The English Primers (1529-1545): Their Publication and Connection with the English Bible and the Reformation in England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.
- Carleton, Kenneth. *Bishops and Reform in the English Church, 1520- 1559*. Rochester: Bodell and Brewer Ltd., 2001.

- Clendenen, Ray. Associate General Editor of Holman Christian Standard Bible. Interview by author, 7 August 2007. Tape recording (Transcript, E-mail, etc.). Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville.
- Cook, Matthew A. "Christian Scripture: an evangelical perspective on inspiration, authority and interpretation." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42, no. 3 (September 1999): 524-525. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost* (accessed March 7, 2009).
- Cranmer, Thomas. "Preface to the Great Bible, 1540." In *Documents of the English Reformation*. Gerald Bray, ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Daiches, David. *The King James Version of the English Bible*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1941.
- Delling, Gerhard. *Upotasso*. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. VIII, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972.
- Dilday, Russell. "A Serious Look at the Baptist Faith and Message Revisions." In *Stand with Christ: Why Missionaries Can't Sign the 2000 Baptist Faith and Message*. Edited by Robert O'Brian. Macon: Smith and Helwys, 2002.
- Dixon, Suzanne. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1992.
- Dunn, James. "Romans 9-16." In *Word Biblical Commentary*. Vol. 38B. Edited by David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Dallas: Thomas Nelson, 1988.
- Eusibius, Bishop of Caesaria. *Ecclesiastical History*. Trans. Christian Frederick Cruse. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.
- Fewell, Dana Noland. "Reading the Bible Ideologically; Feminist Criticism." In *To Each its Own Meaning*. 268-280. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
- Fletcher, Jesse. *The Southern Baptist Convention: A Sesquicentennial History*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994.
- Ford, Amanda. *A Comparative Study of British and Southern Baptist Reactions to Germany 1933-1939*. Honors Project. Jefferson City: Carson-Newman College, 2006.
- Frank, Tenney. *Roman Imperialism*. New York: MacMillan Co. 1925.
- Fraught, Jerry. "The Ralph Elliott Controversy: Competing Philosophies of Southern Baptist Seminary Education." *Baptist History and Heritage*. 34. Summer/Fall 1999.

- Gantt, Sam and Greg Webster. "Another English Bible Translation? Why Bother!" Available from LifeWay Christian Resources Website. <[http://www.lifeway.com/lwc/article\\_main\\_page/0%2X1703%2CA%25253D152435%252526M%25253D200718%2X00.html](http://www.lifeway.com/lwc/article_main_page/0%2X1703%2CA%25253D152435%252526M%25253D200718%2X00.html)>. Accessed 04 Oct 2009.
- Gardiner, Samuel. *History of the Great Civil War: 1642-1649*. New York: AMS Press, 1965.
- Garland, David. *II Corinthians*. In *The New American Commentary*. Vol. 29. Ed. Ray Clendenen. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1999.
- Ghosh, Kantik. *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim, and Max Weber*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Graham, Rose. *English Ecclesiastical Studies*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929.
- Hefley, James. *The Truth in Crisis: The Controversy in the Southern Baptist Convention*. Dallas: Criterion Publications, 1986.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Philosophy of History*. Trans. J. Sibree. New York: Willey Book Co., 1900.
- Holman Christian Standard Bible*. Nashville: Holman, 2004.
- Jackson, F.J. Foakes. *Josephus and the Jews*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.
- James, Gordon. *Innerancy and the Southern Baptist Convention*. Dallas: Southern Baptist Heritage Press, 1986.
- Johnson, Thomas K. "Citizen Christians: the rights and responsibilities of dual citizenship." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40, no. 3 (September 1997): 509-510. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost* (accessed March 11, 2009).
- Jordan, W.K. *The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. 18.8.6. Cited in Shane Claiborne and Charlie Haw. *Jesus for President: Politics for Ordinary Radicals*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Kater, John. *Christians on the Right: The Moral Majority in Perspective*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1982.

- Kauffman, Walter and F. E. Baird. *Philosophic Classics, vol. II: Medieval Philosophy*. Grand Rapids: Prentice-Hall, 1994.
- Kier, David Lindsay. *The Constitutional History of Modern Britain 1485-1951*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1955.
- Lewis, Jack Pearl. "Doctrinal problems and the King James version." *Restoration Quarterly* 14, no. 3-4 (1971): 142-154. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost* (accessed March 8, 2009).
- Lewis, Jack P. "The Holman Christian Standard Bible, Preview." Unpublished.
- Liebman, Robert and Robert Wuthnow. *The New Christian Right*. New York: Aldine Publishing Company, 1983.
- Lincoln, Andrew. *Ephesians*. In *Word Biblical Commentary*. Vol. 42. Ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
- Margo, Todd. *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*. London: N. Y. Routledge, 1995.
- Marx, Karl. *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Croft's Classics.
- Massey, Kenneth. "A Crooked and Perverse Generation Demands a Sign(nature)." In *Stand with Christ: Why Missionaries Can't Sign the 2000 Baptist Faith and Message*. Edited by Robert O'Brian. Macon: Smith and Helwys, 2002.
- McBeth, Leon. "Condensed Chronology of the Southern Baptist Takeover," Available from the Fundamentalist Takeover of the Southern Baptist Convention Website, <http://www.sbctakeover.com/chronology.htm>, Accessed 15 Oct 2009.
- Morgan, David. *Southern Baptist Sisters: In Search of Status, 1845-2000*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2003.
- Mounce, William. "The Pastoral Epistles." In *Word Biblical Commentary*. Vol. 46. Dallas: Thomas Nelson, 2000.
- Mullin, Robert Bruce. *A Short World History of Christianity*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
- Newman, Mark. *Getting Right with God: Southern Baptists and Desegregation, 1945-1995*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 2001.
- Newton, David E. *Gay and Lesbian Rights*. Santa Barbara: Instructional Horizons, 1994.
- Nida, Eugene and Charles Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill on behalf of the United Bible Societies, 1969.

- Norris, Richard A. 2008. "Some notes on the current debate regarding homosexuality and the place of homosexuals in the church." *Anglican Theological Review* 90, no. 3: 437-511. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost* (accessed March 10, 2009).
- Novum Testamentum Grace*. Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo Martini, and Bruce Metzger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Pagels, Elaine. *The Gnostic Gospels*. Vintage Books: New York, 1979.
- Phillips, Rob. "Southern Baptists face further decline without renewed evangelism emphasis." From LifeWay Research, <http://www.lifeway.com/article/?id=169334>, accessed 23 Nov. 2009.
- Placher, William C. *A History of Christian Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1983.
- Polaski, Sandra Hack. "That we may be mutually encouraged: feminism and the new perspective in Pauline studies." *Interpretation* 60, no. 2 (April 2006): 230-230. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost* (accessed March 30, 2009).
- "The Preface to the Authorized (King James) Version, 1611." In *Documents of the English Reformation*. Gerald Bray, ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Rainey, Anson. "Family." In *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 6, edited by Frank Skolnik, 690-693. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 2007.
- Sheeley, Steven M. "Baptists and Bible translation: toward a deeper understanding." *Baptist History and Heritage* 42, no. 2 (March 1, 2007): 8. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost* (accessed February 4, 2010).
- Shrank, Cathy. *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Shurden, Walter. *Not a Silent People: Controversies that Have Shaped Southern Baptists*. Macon: Smyth and Helwys, 1995.
- Shurden, Walter. *Not an Easy Journey: Some Transitions in Baptist Life*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2005.
- Shurden, Walter. Forward. In *Stand with Christ: Why Missionaries Can't Sign the 2000 Baptist Faith and Message*. Edited by Robert O'Brian. Macon: Smith and Helwys, 2002.
- The Story of the New International Version*. New York: New York International Bible Society, 1978.
- Sutton, Jerry. *The Baptist Reformation*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2000.

*Teachings of the Twelve Apostles*. Translated by Philip Schalt. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1886.

Toalston, Art. "26 scholars 'cannot endorse' the gender-neutral NIV revision." *Baptist Press News*. Online: <http://www.bpnews.net/printerfriendly.asp?ID=12653>. (accessed 11 March 2009).

Tuttle, Lisa. "Feminism." In *The Encyclopedia of Feminism*. 107-108. New York: Facts on File, 1986.

Tyndale, William. "Preface to the New Testament (1526)." In *Documents of the English Reformation*. Gerald Bray, ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

Wilson-Kastner, Patricia. *Faith, Feminism, and the Christ*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Yoder, John Howard. *The Politics of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1972.

Zagano, Phyllis. "The question of governance and ministry for women." *Theological Studies* 68, no. 2 (June 2007): 348-367. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials*, EBSCOhost (accessed March 10, 2009).