Ch00 1/8/03 2:46 PM Page vii

Contents

Foreword xvii
by Valerie Becker Makkai, Associate Professor of Linguistics, University of Illinois-Chicago
Preface xxv
Abbreviations xxvii
Chapter 1: What's Going on with Bible Translations? 1
A. A controversy over gender terms 1
B. What are these new versions? 5
C. Controversy 6
Chapter 2: The Rise of Gender-Neutral Bible Translations 9
A. Earlier gender-neutral Bible translations 9
1. An unnoticed gender-neutral translation: the ICB / NCV 9
2. The first major gender-neutral translation: the NRSV (1990) 10
3. The Contemporary English Version (CEV) (1995) 12
B. The NIVI controversy 13
1. Prominence of the NIV 13
2. Revising the NIV 14
3. Timeline of events in the controversy over the inclusive-language NIV 15
C. Personal observations on the events in this timeline 28
1. Public reaction 28
2. Why did the issue become so heated? 29
a. The Christian public 29
b. Christian leaders opposed to the NIVI 30
c. Zondervan Publishing House 30
d. The Committee on Bible Translation 31
e. The International Bible Society 32
3. What was the fundamental problem? 32
4. What decided the issue? 32

Ch00 1/8/03 2:46 PM Page x

5. Clarity versus unclarity in the issues 33
6. The claims of truth and falsehood 34
D. Developments since the NIV controversy: other translations 35

Chapter 3: The Bible: The Word of God 37

A. All the words in Scripture are God's words 37
1. The Bible claims to be God's words 37
2. We are convinced of the Bible's claims to be God's words as we read the Bible 41
3. Other evidence is useful but not an ultimate foundation 42
4. Scripture is self-attesting 42
5. Objection: This is a circular argument 42
6. This does not imply dictation from God as the sole means of communication 44
B. Because all the words of Scripture are God's words, to disbelieve or disobey any part of Scripture is to disbelieve or disobey God 45
C. The truthfulness of Scripture 46
1. God cannot lie or speak falsely 46
2. Therefore all the teachings in Scripture are completely true and without error in any part 46
3. God's words are the ultimate standard of truth 47
4. Might some new fact ever contradict the Bible? 47
D. The inerrancy of Scripture 48
1. The Bible can be inerrant and still speak in the ordinary language of everyday speech 48
2. The Bible can be inerrant and still include loose or free quotations 49
3. It is consistent with inerrancy to have unusual or uncommon grammatical constructions in the Bible 49
4. It is consistent with inerrancy to have mistakes in later copies of the Bible 50
E. Written Scripture is our final authority 51
F. How should we respond to God's Word? 52
1. We should trust every detail of meaning in God's Word 52
2. We should love and treasure every bit of Scripture 54
3. We should tremble at God's Word 54
4. We should recognize that God's Word is powerful, eternal, and worthy of praise 54
5. We should fill our thoughts and lives with God's Word 55
G. Faithfulness to God's Word 55

Chapter 4: How to Translate 57

A. Translation based on the Bible's command 57
B. Difficulties in translating 58
1. Words take different meanings 58
2. Sentence formation differs from language to language 59

Ch00 1/8/03 2:46 PM Page ix

3. Form and meaning 61
4. The theory of dynamic equivalent translation 61
C. Use of early dynamic equivalence theory 63
1. Developing the theory of dynamic equivalent translation 64
2. Emphasis on clarity 64
3. Refinements in recognizing meaning nuances 65
D. Types of complexity 67
1. Limits in dictionary summaries 67
2. One word may combine several meanings 67
3. Factors that contribute to total meaning 68
4. Bible translators should try to capture the richness of the Bible 69
E. Translation as maximal equivalence 70
F. But a trustworthy translation is still possible 71
1. The richness and depth of the Bible 73
2. The richness of human language 74
G. The tension between preserving form and explaining meaning 74
1. The problem of idioms 74
2. Other problems 75
3. What about paraphrases? 75
4. Preserve the form or change the form? 77
5. But aren't different translations just different kinds of interpretation? 81
H. Excursus: Analyzing linguistic complexity 82
1. The naïve approach: word-for-word 82
2. The theoretically informed approach: using a linguistic system 82
3. The discerning approach: using native speakers' intuitive sense of subtleties 83
4. The reflective approach: explicitly analyzing subtleties 84

Chapter 5: Permissible Changes in Translating Gender-Related Terms 91

A. Replacing "man" and "men" when the original includes women 92
1. Replacing "all men" with "all" or "everyone" when translating Greek *pas* 92
2. Replacing "men" with "people" when there is no masculine term in the original text 93
3. Replacing "men" with "people" for Greek *anthrōpos* (plural) 93
4. Replacing "a man" with "a person" when translating Greek *anthrōpos* (singular) in certain cases 95
5. Replacing "a man" with "anyone" when translating Greek *tis* 96
B. Replacing "he who . . ." with "the one who" or "the person who" 97

Ch00 1/8/03 2:46 PM Page x

C. Replacing "sons" with "children" when translating Hebrew *banîm* 98

Chapter 6: Unacceptable Changes That Eliminate References to Men 101

A. Removing references to males in historical passages 101
B. Removing references to males in parables 104
C. Removing references to males who are examples of principles 105
D. Colorado Springs Guidelines concerning words for "father" and "son" 107
E. Why is only the male sex indicator deleted in gender-neutral translations? 108

Chapter 7: Generic "He" 111

A. What is generic "he"? 111
B. Changes in gender-neutral translations 112
C. Explicit and implicated meaning 113
D. A failure to recognize the linguistic issue at the heart of this controversy 115
E. Distortions in meaning 117
F. Psalm 34:20: Obscuring the New Testament fulfillment 124
G. Anything but "he" 126
H. Scholarly integrity 127
I. How many verses are affected? 128
J. The Colorado Springs Guidelines on generic "he" 129
1. Misrepresentations of the Colorado Springs Guidelines 129
K. Making our decision 132
L. The deeper issue: feminism 133

Chapter 8: Feminist Opposition to Generic "He" 135

A. The development of the conflict 136
B. Egalitarianism in the culture 139
C. Generic "he" seen as giving prominence to the male 142
D. Generic "she" 148
E. The "mandate" of the National Council of Churches of Christ 150
F. The explanatory statement of the NIVI 152
G. The explanatory statement of the NLT 159
H. Objections 161

Chapter 9: Arguments for Avoiding Generic "He" for the Sake of Acceptability 163

A. "Bible translations should avoid controversy where possible" 163
B. "Bible translations need to be sensitive to women" 166

Ch00 1/8/03 2:46 PM Page xi

C. "Bible translations should avoid negative connotations that attach to certain words" 169
1. Some questions to help decide when to seek to avoid a connotation in English 172
2. Translators should not eliminate the evidence 175
D. "Bible translations need to be updated for modern culture" 175
1. An analogy: "updating" the Bible's descriptions of earth? 177
E. "The audience today is no longer mainly men" 179
F. "Gender-neutral Bibles are needed for evangelism" 180
1. The ideological clash 181
G. "There is a need for niche translations" 182
1. Some problems with niche translations (constituency translations) 183
2. Content versus palatability 184
H. The slippery slope 186

Chapter 10: Other Objections against Generic "He" 189

A. Objections related to the meaning of the original text 189
1. "The basic meaning is still preserved" 189
2. "Critics are confusing form and meaning" 190
3. "We are just ignoring what is not 'intended' in the original language" 191
4. Differing views of translation 193
B. Objections that minimize the problem 195
1. "The problem is with isolated mistakes, not with the policy" 195
2. "But many verses are still OK" 197
C. Objections based on comparisons with other Bible translations and other languages 198
1. "New Testament writers and authors change person and number when using the Old Testament" 198
2. "Gender systems differ among languages, so no one can make them match perfectly in translation" 201
D. Objections based on the current state of the English language 203
1. "People are unfamiliar with generic 'he'" 203
2. "Generic 'he' is infrequent" 212
3. "Everybody uses gender-neutral language today" 213
4. "Generic 'he' will soon disappear" 213
E. The inevitability of generic "he" 215

Chapter 11: Ordinary People Can Understand Generic "He" 223

A. Objection: People will misunderstand generic "he" 223
B. Objections based on psychological studies 224
C. Experiments related to "man" for the human race as a whole 224

Ch00 1/8/03 2:46 PM Page xii

D. Experiments related to generic "he" 225
E. The limitations of decontextualized experiments 227
F. The greater importance of data from ordinary usage 228
G. The deeper issue: ideology 229
H. What about a niche translation for feminists? 229
I. Conclusion 232

Chapter 12: More Issues in Translating Gender: Man, Son of Man, Fathers, Brother, Son, and the Extent of the Changes 233

A. The use of "man" for the human race 233
1. Is the name "man" important for the human race? 234
2. Conclusion: "Man" is the most accurate translation for the name of the human race in Genesis 1–5 236
3. The unity of the human race obscured by plural terms 238
4. The use of "man" for the human race in English today 239
B. Eliminating "son of man" in the Old Testament 242
C. Individual male examples changed to plural groups 246
1. Old Testament examples with Hebrew *'îsh* ("man") or *geber* ("man") 246
2. But don't these passages *apply* to women, too? 250
D. "Mortal" for "man" 250
E. Words for ancestors 251
F. Words for children 255
1. More difficult cases with "son" 261
G. Brothers 263
H. Brother (singular) 268
I. The extent of the changes 277
1. The changes from singular to plural 277
2. Changes in other words 277
3. Why make these changes? 278
4. After all these changes, how many pronouns can you actually trust? 279

Chapter 13: More Examples Concerning Man, Father, Son 281

A. Deleting "man" and "men" for a male human being: more examples 281
B. Changing "father" to "parent" 285
C. Changing "son" to "child" 288
D. How can an "orphan" have a living mother? 289
E. More examples 289

Chapter 14: Practical Application Questions 291

A. Tests for gender-neutral policy 291

Ch00 1/8/03 2:46 PM Page xiii

B. Isn't this controversy for experts only? 292
C. What about the translators of gender-neutral versions? 293
D. Helping out 294

Chapter 15: Conclusion 297

Appendix 1: Colorado Springs Guidelines 299

A. The Guidelines, with the accompanying comments 299
B. A description of the meeting 304
C. Refinement of the Guidelines 312
D. Explanation 315
E. Assessment 318

Appendix 2: Analyzing the Meanings of Words: "Man" for *Anēr* 321

A. The Greek word *anēr* 321
B. Interpreting Bauer's *Lexicon* 323
C. Dealing with possible multiple senses 326
D. Possible origins of mistakes 327
E. Analyzing particular cases 328
F. *Anēr* in words of address 332
G. Conclusions 333

Appendix 3: The Relation of Generic "He" to Third-Person Generic Singulars in Hebrew and Greek 335

A. Differences among gender systems 335
B. Third-person singular statements about human beings and ordinary speaker expectations 336
C. What does the study of linguistics imply? 339
1. Gender systems as form 339
2. Perception in English 340
3. Meaning arising from choice 341
D. Shifts in number 341
E. Shifts in person 343

Appendix 4: The Spectrum from "He" in a Story to "He" in a General Statement 349

Appendix 5: Translation of *Anthrōpos* 353

Appendix 6: The Evaporation of an Argument: D. A. Carson's Lack of Evidence for the Unusability of Generic "He" in English 355

A. Answering the suppositions 356

Ch00 1/8/03 2:46 PM Page xvi

B. Chapter 9: But where is the argument? 357
C. A caricature of "the critics" 358
D. The long-awaited discussion of generic "he" 361
E. An argument from frequency of use 362
F. Constituencies 364
G. The great omission 365
H. Conclusion 366

Scripture Index 367

Index of Persons 375