

The Use of Modern Translations and Their Effect in Replacing the King James Version

[Dakota-Montana District Pastoral Conference Mobridge, South Dakota April 13-14, 1971]

by Joel Frank

First of all, I would like to acknowledge several sources of material which proved invaluable. I wish to thank Pastor Thomas B. Franzmann of St. Mark's Lutheran Church of Citrus Heights, California, for making his essay entitled "The Use of Modern Bible Translations in Public Worship" and the subsequent Bible questionnaire, which was distributed by the California Pastoral Conference, available to me. I also wish to thank all those who graciously filled out the questionnaire and returned it to me with their many remarks.

In general during the past year I have found that almost everyone has a rather definite opinion on the subject "Modern Translations vs. The King James Version." Some, unfortunately, have reached this decision with a prejudiced mind and a very definite lack of knowledge. We have heard the comments from dedicated Christians: "The King James Version is God's Word. The modern translations are the works of man." "The modern translations are too far away from the original." "I don't like the modern translations because they don't sound like the Word of God." "We should not lose the real Word of God." Others, who perhaps understand the problem a little better, can begin to appreciate the many newer translations.

At any rate, we have a problem – the problem of translation. Is the King James Version adequate for our needs today? Has it become outdated and obscure? Are we losing the meaning of Scripture because of our allegiance to a 350-year-old translation? Would a modern translation in the language of today more adequately fill our needs? F.F. Bruce says:

"Traduttore traditore," says an Italian proverb: 'the translator is a traitor.' An exaggeration certainly; and yet an honest translator is bound to confess that something is lost, something is changed, in the course of translation. Those of us—alas! a diminishing band—who in our earlier years were taught to read Homer in the original know perfectly well that no translation can ever give us the true feel of the authentic Homer. No doubt the Bible suffers less in translation than many other works do, but no Bible translator who knows his business counts himself to have attained perfection. I too have made my own private ventures into the field of Bible translation; and these ventures have at least taught me to deal very leniently with other translators."¹

God gave us His Word in the Hebrew and Greek languages. The people of our congregations cannot work with these languages. A translation or translations are absolutely necessary, but translations pose difficulties. The meanings of words, word order and sentence structure, and idiomatic expression seem to defy translation. Pairs of words that are exactly equivalent in any two languages are rare. Word order and phraseology that are smooth and correct in one tongue seem halting and stiff in another. The English has no direct equivalent for many word pictures and idioms such as "bowls of mercy." No one was more aware of this dilemma than Luther, He writes:

"We are now sweating over the translation of the Prophets into German. O God, what a great and hard toil it requires to compel the writers against their will to speak German! They do not want to give up their Hebrew and imitate the barbaric German. Just as though a nightingale should be compelled to imitate a cuckoo and give up her glorious melody, even though she hates a song in monotone."²

¹ F. F. Bruce, *The English Bible*, page X.

² E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times*, page 647.

Even if the language of the Bible were easy to translate into the language of today, there would still be the barriers to understanding erected by the customs and institutions of the past. Slavery, time and money, military matters, social status, political structure, agriculture, climate, habits of dress and eating – these all seem to defy translation into modern thought patterns.

But the fact remains, we do need a translation. Which translation most accurately conveys the meaning of the original, solves these problems of a different time and custom, and speak to us in a language which we can readily understand? Is it the King James Version? Is it a modern translation? Let us briefly examine the King James Version, secondly, the modern translations, and then finally, on the basis of the questionnaire, reach a conclusion.

To begin let us consider those areas where our King James Version affects the clarity of God’s Word as it comes to our people. First, there is the text. In 1611 the Greek New Testament upon which the King James translators relied was the so-called “*Textus Receptus*,” which was essentially the work of the Dutch scholar Desiderius Erasmus in 1516. In preparing the first edition of his Greek New Testament Erasmus had no manuscript older than the tenth century, and some of his manuscripts were as late as the sixteenth century. For the book of Revelation he had only one-twelfth century manuscript. Since it lacked the last six verses of the book, Erasmus translated these verses from the Latin into Greek and incorporated them into his text, The *Textus Receptus* was compiled on the basis of about 1/100 of the textual evidence that is currently available to us. According to Herbert Dennett in his “Guide to Modern Versions of the New Testament the received text on which the King James Version was based was in error in over 5000 places.³ As has often been said, no Christian doctrine is at stake in these variations; however, the clarity of individual passages is! If in our worship services or Bible Classes we correct the false impressions caused by inaccuracies of the text, do we shake the faith of our people? Is it not better to warn them that there is doubt about the meaning of a word or phrase than to give them a false security? Even the King James translators said:

“They that are wise had rather have their judgments at liberty in differences of readings, than to be captivated to one, when it might be the other.”⁴

The second area which affects the clarity of God’s Word in the King James Version is lexicography. Many of the words used once or only a few times in the Bible have been discovered in recent archeological finds. In the last seventy-five years through the discovery and examination of countless “ordinary” documents of the time of Christ, we have been able to recapture something of the language of the day: in bills and receipts, deeds and grocery lists, in letters from traveling fathers, anxious mothers, and prodigal sons. Let us look at just one example. The idea of buying on the installment plan, with a small initial down payment, is nothing new. Contracts and bills of sale from the first century record such transactions and specify the down-payment which seals and binds the contract, The word used for this initial payment is “*arrabon*,” the very word which in three passages is used of the Holy Spirit, whose presence in the life of the believer is the promise and pledge of even greater blessings to come. What a difference the real meaning of the word means. Notice the difference in the two translations: (II Cor. 1:22) “Who gave the Holy Spirit in our hearts as the guarantee of all that he has for us,” (TEV); “Who hath given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts,” (KJV). The King James translators themselves admitted that there were many times when they chose a word, not from confidence that they were on firm ground, but simply because they had to say something.

The third area which affects the clarity of God’s Word in the King James Version is the unclear words and expressions. “Conversation” used to mean “conduct,” “way of living.” Today the word is restricted to only one aspect of our way of life; namely, the way we talk. We are liable to misunderstand the passage when this word appears. For example 1 Peter 3:1 seems to contradict itself when it speaks of the possibility that non-Christian husbands “may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives.” But the Apostle is

³ Herbert Dennett, *Guide to Modern Versions of the New Testament*, page 118.

⁴ Bruce, *op. cit.* page 103.

warning Christian women not to nag their husbands; instead of talking so much, their silent Christian conduct would be a more convincing witness to faith. In II Peter 2:7 the “filthy conversation” of the wicked is really their “immoral conduct.” Or consider these expressions: “instant in prayer,” “keep under his body,” “froward person,” “superfluity of naughtiness,” “chief estates of Galilee.”

The fourth area which affects the clarity of God’s Word in the King James Version is the distracting words and phrases. How many of our long-time Christians, not to mention children and new Christians, are able to maintain their train of thought when they hear: “rent his clothes,” “asses,” “though they come out of the loins of Abraham,” “bowels of mercy,” “Be sober!”?

The fifth area which affects the clarity of God’s Word in the King James Version is perhaps the most glaring. These are groups of words and passages which cause misunderstandings. Which person, who has not been warned previously, can understand 1 Cor. 13 (the “charity” chapter) properly! Who, if he took the words “eateth and drinketh damnation” according to their twentieth century values, would dare to take a chance on approaching that “awful” table? What kind of God do we have if we must exclaim of Him in the Introit of Jubilate Sunday: “How terrible art Thou in Thy works”? According to the modern use of the word “will” as denoting the future tense, how does the modern listener understand: “God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth”? Thus read this passage teaches the heresy of universalism. In the light of modern rules of punctuation and modifying clauses the following passage also teaches a false doctrine: “God hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin.” Or consider 1 Tim. 6:5: “Supposing that gain is godliness.” This follows the order of the Greek, but the meaning is exactly the opposite: “They think that religion is a way to become rich.”

The sixth area which affects the clarity of God’s Word in the King James Version is the heaviness of style. The King James style is heavy by modern standards for two reasons. First, it is often bound to the style of a foreign language because it is a very literal translation. Paul, for example, often strings out a very long sentence by the use of subordinate and relative pronouns. Though this may do very well in Greek, in English the reader soon tires and his mind wanders if the translation tries to duplicate Paul’s style. Ephesians 1:3-14 is one sentence in Greek. In the King James it is broken up into two sentences, but even then the text proves difficult for the reader; so current translations break the passage up into five, six, ten, or even fourteen sentences. Ephesians 1:15-23 is another long sentence in Greek, and it is one long sentence in the King James. Modern translations will use from two to five sentences. What matters is equivalent meaning and effect, not equivalent words and style. A recent survey indicated that the average sentence length in conversational English is 17 words. We need to remember that in the public worship service rarely do our worshipers have a chance to see the words they hear. Therefore, the words they hear read from the Bible ought to be in a style that lends itself to listening. If we take random sentences from the King James Version, we find that the average length is well over 17. In the Old Testament the average ran into the thirties.

Secondly, the King James Version is written in an English style of a bygone era. Who of us speaks the language of the King James? Who of us addresses our fellow man with a “thee” or “thou”? Who of us uses the terms: “Wist,” “anon,” or “verily” in our conversations? Who of us uses the following words in their 1611 sense: “charity,” “prevent,” “corn,” “by and by,” or “feeble-minded”? Some will be quick to point out that the elegance of style is an advantage because it presents a sacred book in a sacred language, We hear the comment, “It sounds like the Bible should.” But is it more sacred when it is expressed in Shakespearean English? Will the Bible lose its sacredness if put into the English of today? Herbert Dennett writes:

“The New Testament was originally written in Greek, not the highly polished language of the classical writers, but in a kind of common Greek, which was hammered out by the soldiers of Alexander the Great from the various dialects spoken among them.”⁵

⁵ Dennett, op. cit. page 1.

If elegance of style affects the sacredness of Scripture, why did Paul say: “In the same way, my brothers, when I came to proclaim to you God’s secret purpose, I did not come equipped with any brilliance of speech or intellect. You may as well know now that it was my secret determination to concentrate entirely on Jesus Christ himself and the fact of his death upon the cross. As a matter of fact, in myself I was feeling far from strong; I was nervous and rather shaky. What I said and preached had none of the attractiveness of the clever mind, but it was a demonstration of the power of the Spirit! Plainly God’s purpose was that your faith should rest not upon man’s cleverness but upon the power of God.” 1 Cor. 2:1-5 (Phillips).

Others may point out that the widespread use of the King James Version for 350 years is an advantage. This claim cannot be denied. The King James is the version of many of our commentaries and reference works. It is also the version of our liturgies, our hymnals, our lectionaries, our agendas, and our catechisms. This might seem to be an insurmountable problem, until we realize that Christians throughout the history of the church have faced it and met it. They did it under far less favorable conditions than ours.

Finally, it is my conviction that the people who are enjoying the King James Version of the Bible in our public worship services and in their private readings are enjoying it, not because of its style, or elegance, or long use, but because it is the Bible, God’s Word. It is also my conviction that our people could enjoy the Bible more if they would use it in modern translations. God’s Word would be clearer, more effective, and more alive if we would free it from the shackles we have placed around it.

Secondly, let us consider the use of modern translations. A change in translations sooner or later is inevitable. The changing nature of the English language will demand such a change, if it has not already demanded it. Notice the change that has already taken place. The following quotation from Matthew 13:3 was translated sometime during the ninth century. “*Sothlice ut eode se sawere his saed to sawenne.*” The following was written during the end of the fourteenth century: “Oure Fader that art in heuene, halewed be thi nam.” And finally we have Tyndale’s translation of about 1525: “God in tyme past diversly and many ways, spake vnto the fathers by Preophetes: but in these last dayes he hath spoken vnto uv by his sonne” (Heb. 1:1). Go forward 200 years from now. What will the King James Version, or even our English, look like then? The problem is not going to get better with time. In a recent publication by the American Bible Society they have listed no less than 506 archaic and obsolete words and phrases found in the King James Version which have changed in meaning in the last 350 years.

The saving nature of our work also makes a change to modern translations inevitable. If souls are to be saved, we will have to communicate God’s Word to them. For most of us that means communicating in English - good, up-to-date English. When Luther was translating the Bible for his Germans, he grappled with this very thing:

“Whoever would speak German must not use the Hebrew idioms; but if he understands the Hebrew writer, he must see to it that he grasps his meaning and must think: Now let me see. How does a German speak in this case? When he has the German words that serve the purpose, then let him dismiss the Hebrew words and freely express the sense in the best German he is capable of using.”⁶

Listen to C. S. Lewis, the convert from atheism:

“It would have saved me a great deal of labor if this book had come into my hands when I first seriously began to try to discover what Christianity was.”⁷

He is speaking about Phillips’ “Letters to Young Churches.” Phillips himself tells us that his procedure in his translation was

⁶ *What Luther Says*, page 104.

⁷ Bruce, *op. cit.* page 214.

“to forget completely the majesty and beauty of the AV and to translate the Greek text as one would translate any other document from a foreign language, with the same conscientiousness but also with the same freedom in conveying, as far as possible, the meaning and style of the original writer.”⁸

What translation or translations can we use? I doubt that one single translation can be found that will meet all our needs in the public services and in our private reading. Even if one translation were to be found that is adequate and that we could agree on, wouldn't that simply duplicate the problem we have today? Our children and our grandchildren would again be faced with an Authorized Version. Herbert Dennett had some instructive words on choosing a translation:

“Which is the best version to use? It is impossible to give a simple answer to this question. It is rather like asking which is the best place to go for a holiday: the answer depends on what you want. So with versions of the New Testament; there are different types intended for different purposes. There are in fact four main kinds of versions, and it is important that the student or teacher should know the general characteristics of each of them.”⁹

He goes on to list the four types of translations as follows:

1. The literal, or word-for-word version.
2. The colloquial or idiomatic version.
3. The versions in simplified English.
4. The expanded translation.

In short, it is the pastor who best knows the people in his flock. In line with his duty of feeding the flock to the very best of his ability, it is up to him to present God's Word in the clearest way possible. How is he to do this? First, the pastor should study and know the meaning of the portions of Scripture that are to be used. Secondly, he should select the translation which best conveys that meaning to the people as he knows them. Finally, he should present the selection in the most worshipful and effective manner he can muster.

This would mean that a pastor would have to acquire a skill in assessing translations. This is not as difficult as it may sound. One could use Luther's principles of translating to assess translations. These principles are outlined as follows:¹⁰ First, regard the entire Bible as a whole. Translate obscure passages in the light of the clear Gospel. This principle, one of the basics in Biblical interpretation, is most helpful in evaluating translations of Old Testament passages with Messianic character. The RSV of Isaiah 7:14 (virgin vs. young woman) is the most noteworthy example.

Luther's second principle was: Always keep the cross in view. Regarding this principle he said:

“Ah, translating is not every man's skill as the mad saints imagine. It requires a right, devout, honest, sincere, God-fearing, Christian, trained, informed, and experienced heart. Therefore I hold that no false Christian or factious spirit can be a decent translator. That becomes obvious in the translation of the Prophets made at Worms. It has been carefully done and approaches my German very closely. But Jews had a hand in it, and they do not show much reverence for Christ.”¹¹

In this light we again consider the RSV and its translators. Beck states:

⁸ Bruce, *ibid.* page 215.

⁹ Dennett, *op. cit.* page 3.

¹⁰ Schwiebert, *op. cit.* page 661.

¹¹ *Luther's Works*, American Edition; Vol. 35, page 194.

“We have searched through more than a hundred volumes written by the translators of the RSV in order to find evidence of a Christian faith, and we have found a hard creed, as uniform and clear-cut as the Apostles’ Creed, but denying all of it. For the first time in history men who reject Christ, the God-man who saves us from sin, have given us an ‘authorized version.’ ... They have only done their best to make our Bible a modernist book. R. C. Foster says: ‘The RSV is frankly Unitarian.’”¹²

Luther’s third principle was: Penetrate beyond the external linguistic peculiarities, study the grammar carefully, attempt to grasp the meaning exactly, and then forget all about the original language. Perhaps the clearest illustration for the application of this principle is found in his own comment on Romans 3:28:

“I knew very well that the word ‘*solum*’ is not in the Greek or Latin text; the papists did not have to teach me that. It is a fact that these four letters, *S O L A*, are not there. And these blockheads stare at them like cows at a new gate. At the same time they do not see that it conveys the sense of the text: it belongs there if the translation is to be clear and vigorous. I wanted to speak German, not Latin or Greek, since it was German I had undertaken to speak in the translation. But it is the nature of our German language that in speaking of two things, one of which is affirmed and the other denied we use the word *solum* (*allein*) along with the word ‘*nicht*’ or ‘*kein*.’”¹³

Luther’s fourth principle was this: Remember that God spoke through the media of human language to the soul, and the message must be in a language comprehended by the common man. Again let us hear Beck:

“God wants His Word to be in the language of the people who read and hear it. He spoke Hebrew to the Hebrews, Greek to the Greeks, and on Pentecost to everyone in the language in which he was born. He wants to speak to our people in the English of today in order that they may understand Him. Paul says: ‘I would rather say five words so as to be understood, in order to teach others, than ten thousand words in a language which nobody understands.’ (1 Cor. 14:19)¹⁴

A few other areas where translations are likely to be weak are pointed out by F. F. Bruce in his book, “The English Bible,” and by Herbert Dennett in his work, “Guide to Modern Versions of the New Testament.” They advise double checking translators on their use of the tenses, especially continuous action verbs; on their renderings of the definite article; on their use of more recent findings due to archeology; and on their distinction of synonyms. One example of the last type is found in the opening verses of the fifth chapter of Romans:

“Where the A.V. says, ‘we ... *rejoice* in hope of the glory of God’ (verse 2), ‘we *glory* in tribulation’ (verse 3), and ‘we also *joy* in God’ (verse 11), the italicized verbs represent one and the same Greek verb. The R. V. renders all three occurrences by ‘rejoice.’ If the aim of translation should be the production of the same effect in the reader of the translation as the original wording produced in the reader of the original text, then there is much to be said in a passage like this for translating the same original word by the same word in English; for a good part of the effect intended by the original writer was produced by his deliberate repetition of one and the same word.... The English language, for example, has a considerable range of words more or less synonymous with ‘horse;’ but it is the repetition of ‘horse’ that makes Richard III’s cry so effective: ‘A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!’ Let the reader replace the second and third occurrence of ‘horse’ by two other words with much

¹² W. F. Beck, *We Need a Good Bible*, pages 17-18.

¹³ *Luther’s Works*, American Edition: Vol. 35, page 188.

¹⁴ Beck, op. cit. page 17.

the same meaning, and realize how inept the result is. It is probably right to say that the A.V. has gone too far in its love of variation, whereas the R. V. runs to the opposite extreme.”¹⁵

Such careful scrutinizing of the translations, prayerful planning of the service, and dedicated concern for communicating the Gospel could result in pleasant surprises for our people.

But, as every pastor knows, whenever something new or different is tried, the weak are likely to be offended. How shall we avoid these offenses? First, the pastor must be sure of his ground. He must be confident that the use of various translations, properly chosen, is for the edification of his people. He can use St. Paul as his guide. Paul, when quoting the Bible, sometimes quoted directly from the Hebrew, sometimes from the Septuagint translation, and sometimes he departed from both. There are at least four instances in our regular Epistles in which Paul quotes the Septuagint translation where it disagrees from the Hebrew or where he varies from both Septuagint and Hebrew. These are the Epistles for Advent I, Epiphany III, Lent IV, and Trinity Sunday. None of these variations affects the sense but they do show that the Apostle was free in choosing his medium for expressing the Truth.

Secondly, the pastor can avoid offenses by being able to show clearly the benefit to the worshiper or the reader in the use of modern translations. He can be prepared, by comparing several translations, to show that God’s Word is truly expressed more clearly in many places. Luther’s words concerning the book of Job are helpful:

“In translating Job, Plaster Philip ... and I labored so, that sometimes we scarcely handled three lines in four days. Now that it is translated and finished, everybody can read and criticize it. One now runs his eyes over three or four pages and does not stumble once - without realizing what boulders and clods had once lain there where he now goes along as over a smoothly planed board. We had to sweat and toil there before we got those boulders and clods out of the way, so that one could go along nicely,”¹⁶

Thirdly, we should very carefully select our translation. This will go a long way toward avoiding offenses. Translations that have a particularly bad reputation, that are offensively slangy, and which are generally poorly done should be avoided. On one occasion in a Bible class I read Luke chapter 2 in the TEV to those present. The majority were startled, if not offended, at the translation of verse 5: “She was pregnant.” Having heard the “being great with child” of the King James Version for so many years, the TEV sounded too vulgar, too crass; and one member was even led to say: “That doesn’t even sound like God’s Word.” This also points to the need of patient education of our people so that they, too, may one day appreciate God’s Word in modern English.

There will be criticism. It seems that in our circles the King James Version has become *The Bible* instead of just another translation. The two have become synonymous. Jerome was faced with this same problem. He states:

“So great is the force of established usage that even acknowledged corruptions of text please the greater part, for they prefer to have their copies pretty rather than correct.... They attack it in public and read it in secret.”¹⁷

Luther also felt the lash of the critic. He said:

“There is a saying, ‘He who builds along the road has many masters.’ That is the way it is with me, too. Those who have never been able to speak properly, to say nothing of translating, have all at once

¹⁵ Bruce, op. cit. page 105.

¹⁶ *Luther’s Works*, American Edition, Vol. 35, page 188.

¹⁷ *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 2, page 124.

become masters and I must be the pupil of them all. If I were to have asked them how to put into German the first two words of Matthew's Gospel, ... none of them would have been able to say, 'Quack!' And now they sit in judgment on my whole work. Fine fellows!"¹⁸

So much for the pastor and modern translations. Now what about the layman? What should we advise him to use in his private Bible reading? The following questionnaire was prepared for this very purpose. Several questions we hoped to answer were: Do our members understand the King James Version adequately? Would God's Word be clearer to them in a modern version? What is the average Christian's attitude towards these modern translations? Approximately 100 questionnaires were distributed among the members in our Montana congregations. 35 were returned. The following is that questionnaire with the results.

NEW TESTAMENT TRANSLATIONS

This questionnaire has been prepared in connection with a conference paper entitled, "The Use of Modern Translations and Their Effect in Replacing the King James Version." It is based on a similar project of the pastors of our Wisconsin Synod congregations in California. Its purpose is to determine whether or not the use of acceptable modern translations would benefit the average worshiper. This is not a test of your Bible knowledge. You need not sign your name unless you wish to have your copy back later for checking the results. Please follow the directions carefully so the results will be an honest reflection of your comprehension.

Part I: Check the version which speaks most clearly to your heart.

1. II Peter 1:16

- 48 A. For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty. (KJV)
- 25 B. For we did not follow cleverly devised tales when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of His majesty. (NAS)
- 17 C. For we have not depended on made-up legends in making known to you the mighty coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. With our own eyes we saw his greatness. (TEV)
- 10 D. We didn't follow any clever myths when we told you about the power of our Lord Jesus Christ and His coming. No, with our own eyes we saw His majesty. (Beck)

2. Matthew 6:34

- 10 A. So do not worry about tomorrow; it will have enough worries of its own, There is no need to add to the troubles each day brings. (TEV)
- 22 B. "So, don't worry about tomorrow. Tomorrow will take care of itself. Each day has enough trouble of its own." (Beck)
- 37 C. Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. (KJV)
- 22 D. "Therefore do not be anxious for tomorrow; for tomorrow will care for itself. Each day has enough trouble of its own." (NAS)

3. Luke 2:48-49

- 17 A. His parents were amazed to see Him there. "Son, why did You do this to us?" His mother asked him. "See how anxiously Your father and I have been looking for You!" "Why were you looking for me?" He asked them. "Didn't you know that I must be in My Father's house?" (Beck)

¹⁸ *Luther's Works*, American Edition, Vol. 35, page 183.

55 B. And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? (KJV)

11 C. And when they saw Him, they were astonished; and His mother said to Him, Son, why have You treated us this way? Behold, Your father and I have been anxiously looking for you." And He said to them, "Why is it that you were looking for Me? Did you not know that I had to be in My Father's house?" (NAS)

17 D. His parents were amazed when they saw him, and his mother said to him, "Son, why did you do this to us? Your father and I have been terribly worried trying to find you." He answered them, "Why did you have to look for me? Didn't you know that I had to be in my Father's house?" (TEV)

4. Luke 6:41-42

32 A. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Either how canst thou say to thy brother, Brother let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye. (KJV)

36 B. "And why do you look at the speck that is in your brother's eye, but do not notice the log that is in your own eye? "Or how can you say to your brother, 'Brother, let me take out the speck that is in your eye? When you yourself do not see the log that is in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take out the speck that is in your brother's eye. (NAS)

15 C. Why do you look at the speck that is in your brother's eye, but pay no attention to the log in your own eye? How can you say to your brothers "Please, Brother, let me take that speck out of your eye," yet not even see the log in your own eye? You imposter! Take the log out of your own eye first, and then you will be able to see and take the speck out of your brother's eye. (TEV)

17 D. "And why do you look at the speck in your brother's eye and don't notice the log in your own eye? How can you say to your brother, 'Brother, let me take the speck out of your eye,' as long as you don't see the log in your own eye? You hypocrite, first throw the log out of your own eye. Then you'll see clearly enough to take the speck out of your brother's eye." (Beck)

5. Luke 21:34-35

20 A. "Be on guard, that your hearts may not be weighted down with dissipation and drunkenness and the worries of life, and that day come on you suddenly like a trap; for it will come upon all those who dwell on the face of all the earth. (NAS)

38 B. Watch yourselves! Don't let yourselves become occupied with too much feasting and strong drinks and the worries of this life, or that day may come on you suddenly. For it will come like a trap upon all men over the whole earth. (TEV)

6 C. "Be careful never to get your hearts burdened with drunkenness and its nausea and with worries about this life, or that day will take you by surprise like a trap. It will surprise all people wherever they live on the earth. (Beck)

36 D. And take heed to yourselves; lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. (KJV)

6. Mark 10:14

6 A. When Jesus noticed it, he was angry and said to his disciples: "Let the children come to me! Do not stop them, because the Kingdom of God belongs to such as these." (TEV)

- 20 B. But when Jesus saw this, He didn't like it at all, "Let the little children come to Me," He told them, "Don't keep them away. God's kingdom belongs to such as these." (Beck)
- 56 C. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. (KJV)
- 18 D. But when Jesus saw this, He was indignant and said to them, "Permit the children to come to Me; do not hinder them; for the kingdom of God belongs to such as these. (NAS)

7. Hebrews 1:1-2a

- 27 A. Long ago God spoke to our fathers in many different ways by the prophets, but in these last days He has spoken to us by His Son ... (Beck)
- 21 B. God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Sons ... (KJV)
- 4 C. God, after He spoke long ago to the fathers in the prophets in many portions and in many ways, in these last days has spoken to us in His Son. (NAS)
- 27 D. In the past God spoke to our ancestors many times and in many ways through the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us through his Son. (TEV)
- 21 E. God, who gave to our forefathers many different glimpses of the truth in the words of the prophets, has now, at the end of the present ages given us the truth in the Son. (Phillips)

The totals for this section are as follows: King James Version—38%; Today's English Version—21%; New American Standard Bible—20%; Beck's Version—18%; Phillips—3%.

Part II: Give the meaning of the word or expression in your own words.
(The meaning is also here given and the percentage of correct answers.)

1. sojourn – live 34%
2. superfluity – excess 46%
3. sore (as in sore afraid) – exceedingly 57%
4. privily – secretly 54%
5. magnify – exalt, praise, glorify 9% (Luke 1:46); enlarge 74%
6. transfigure – change in form 86%
7. whence – from where 80%
8. whither – to where 74%
9. terrible (as in how terrible are thy works) – awe-inspiring 46%
10. propitiation – appeasement, payment 37%
11. justification – declare freed from sin 31%
12. atonement – make amends, the setting at one of God and man 43%
13. cubit – 18 inches 11%
14. penny – denarius, a workman's average daily wage 14%
15. communion (as in: the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?) – sharing, union 17% 40%
16. mete (as in: with what measure ye mete) – measure out, give out
17. meet (as in: it is not meet to take the children's bread) – fit, right 80%
18. meat (as in: my meat is to do the will of him who sent me) – food 40%
19. suffer (as in: suffer ye thus far) – (Luke 22:51 Stop, no more of this) allow, permit 49%
20. will (as in; whom will ye that I release unto you?) – want, wish 69%

(Omitting No. 5. the average for this section was 48% correct)

Part III: Read the Scripture portion carefully, Read it only once. Answer the questions as best you can. Please do not look ahead. Please do not look back.

A) Ephesians 4:17-24

This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart: who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness with greediness. But ye have not so learned Christ; If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus: That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; And be renewed in the spirit of your mind; And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

1. What name is given to the unbelievers in this section? *Gentiles* 89%
2. What are their hearts like? *blind* 47%
3. What are their actions like? *lasciviousness with greediness* 40%
4. What is the “former conversation” which is to be put off? *the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts* 47%
5. What is the “new man” which we are to put on? *righteousness and true holiness* 17%

B) I Corinthians 13:1-5 and 12-13

1) Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. 2) And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing, 3) And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. 4) Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up; 5) Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; ... 12) For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known. 13) And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

1. This chapter praises: (Circle the correct letter)

a) giving to the poor	10
b) Christian love	22
c) saving faith	3
2. The first part of verse two speaks of:

a) telling God’s Word	5
b) telling the future	17
c) neither of these	13
3. The first part of verse four means:

a) bearing pain with courage	6
b) being sick a long time	1
c) being patient with the weakness of others	28
4. The first part of verse five speaks about:

a) not being “phony”	17
b) not being unchaste	7
c) not behaving ignorantly	10
5. The first part of verse twelve pictures:

- a) looking in a mirror and not seeing everything 15
- b) looking through a window in the dark 14
- c) looking through a dirty glass 5

C) Ephesians 4:17-24 (Beck)

So I tell you and call on you in the Lord not to live any more like the people of the world. Their minds are set on worthless things. Their understanding is darkened. Their ignorance and their closed minds have made them strangers to the life God gives. Having lost their sense of right and wrong, they've given themselves up to a life of lust to practice every kind of vice and greed. But that is not what you learned when you got to know Christ, if you have heard Him and in Him have been taught the truth as it is in Jesus: Strip off your old self, which follows your former ways of living and ruins you as it follows the desires that deceive you. Become new in the spirit of your minds, and put on the new self, which is created to be like God, righteous and holy in the truth.

1. What name is given to the unbelievers in this section? *people of the world* 83%
2. What are their minds like? *closed, set on worthless things* 83%
3. What are their actions like? *life of lust* 83%
4. What is the "old self" which we are to strip off? *former way of living* 54%
5. What is the "new self" which we are to put on? *like God, righteous and holy* 63%

The averages of the preceding percentages are: KJV – 48%; Beck – 73%.

D) I Corinthians 13:1-5 and 12-13 (Beck)

1) If I speak the language of men and angels but don't have any love, I've become a loud gong or a clashing cymbal. 2) Even if I speak God's Word and know every kind of hidden truth and have every kind of knowledge, even if I have all the faith to move mountains but don't have any love, I'm nothing. 3) Even if I give away all I have to feed the hungry and give up my body but only to boast and don't have any love, it doesn't help me. 4) Love is patient. Love is kind, Love isn't jealous. It doesn't brag or get conceited. 5) It isn't indecent. It isn't selfish. It doesn't get angry, It doesn't plan to hurt anyone. 12) Now we see by a mirror and are puzzled, but then we'll see face to face. Now I learn only a part of any but then I'll know as He has known me. 13) And now these three, faith hope, and love, go on, but the most important of these is love.

1. This chapter praises:
 - a) giving to the poor 0
 - b) Christian love 33
 - c) saving faith 2
2. The first part of verse two speaks of:
 - a) telling God's Word 27
 - b) telling the future 2
 - c) neither of these 4
3. The first part of verse four means:
 - a) bearing pain with courage 1
 - b) being sick a long time 0
 - c) being patient with the weakness of others 32
4. The first part of verse five says that Christian love does not:
 - a) act in a "Phony" way 9
 - b) act in an unchaste way 17
 - c) behave ignorantly 7
5. The first part of verse twelve pictures:

- a) looking in a mirror and not seeing everything 29
- b) looking through a window in the dark 3
- c) looking through a dirty glass 3

The total correct answers are: KJV – 77; Beck – 138

Part IV. Questions about you

1. How old are you? How long have you known Jesus as your Savior?
2. How often do you read your Bible?
3. Do you read more than one translation?
4. Would you like to have modern translations used in public worship services?
 - a) Yes (4) b) Some day (0) c) Only with extreme care (19) d) No (8)
 Reasons for your answer:
5. If you are a pastor – Do you use translations other in the KJV in your service?
 - Yes No (If yes, please list which ones you use:)

Please return to Rev. Joel Frank, Box 256, Winnett, Montana 59087

If you wish to have this questionnaire returned to you, please write your name and address on back.
 THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

The results of this questionnaire seem to point to two things. First, there is a definite need for the newer translations so that God’s Word can once again come through this medium loud and clear. Each of us must take a long, hard look at this problem. Are we practicing good stewardship? Are our people being edified in the best possible way when we continue to use the King James Version? Secondly, there is an appalling lack of knowledge on the part of our members in respect to the various translations. It would seem that before anything can be done, this void must be filled. Paul wrote to Timothy: “And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” (II Tim. 3:15). May these holy Scriptures continue to speak out to us and to our people and fulfill this objective!

Bibliography

- Beck, William F. *We Need a Good Bible*. Essay delivered to the pastoral conference of the Southern Illinois District of the Lutheran Church - Synod. 1953. (Available from *Christian News*)
- Bruce, F. F. *The English Bible*. Oxford University Press: New York. 1961.
- Danker, Frederick W. *Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study*. Concordia: St. Louis, Mo. 1960.
- Dennett, Herbert. *A Guide to Modern Versions of the New Testament*. Moody Press: Chicago. 1967.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther’s Works*. American Edition. Muhlenberg Press: Philadelphia. 1960.
- Luther, Martin. *What Luther Says*. Concordia: St. Louis, Mo. 1959.
- Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Baker Book House: Grand Rapids, Michigan 1958.
- Schwiebert, E. G. *Luther and His Times*. Concordia: St. Louis, Mo. 1950.