

1 **History from 2009–2012**

2 ***Formation of the Translation Evaluation Committee (TEC) and initial work***

3 In 2009, our synod, through faculty members at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary (WLS) and
4 Martin Luther College (MLC) and editors at Northwestern Publishing House (NPH), became
5 aware of a revision that was being planned for the New International Version (NIV) Bible. This
6 major revision was slated to be released in early 2011, the 400th anniversary of the completion
7 of the King James (Authorized) translation of the Bible. Zondervan, the publisher of the NIV,
8 indicated that this 2011 NIV revision would replace the 1984 NIV edition of the Bible and that
9 shortly after its release the 1984 edition would no longer be available for use.

10 Since it was believed that the 2011 edition of the NIV might be based on the rather controversial
11 TNIV (Today's New International Version) that had been released in 2005, the Conference of
12 Presidents (COP) felt it wise to establish a committee to begin looking at other available
13 translations to see if they might serve as the WELS publication translation if the NIV2011 would
14 not be acceptable to us. In April 2010, the COP through President Mark Schroeder appointed a
15 committee to carry out that task. As the committee began to formulate its guiding principles and
16 map out its course of action in the fall of 2010, it was surprised by the early release of the text of
17 the NIV2011 via the Internet on Nov. 1, 2010. Since the committee felt it would be wise, now
18 that the text was available, to find out first whether or not the NIV2011 would be acceptable to
19 WELS, the focus of the committee was shifted to a review of the NIV2011 and a comparison of
20 this new version to the NIV1984 which had been in use by WELS as its publication translation
21 for more than 30 years.

22 It is important to reiterate that neither the synod nor the Translation Evaluation Committee
23 (TEC) can mandate the use of any translation in our congregations, because our congregations
24 are independent and are free to make decisions on local matters. The TEC, therefore, has always
25 and only been concerned with which translation would be appropriate for use in the
26 publications that we use together as a synod and that are distributed to those outside our synod.

27 ***Review of NIV2011 changes***

28 In the two months after the text of the NIV2011 became available online, the TEC did a
29 preliminary evaluation of the passages that might affect the doctrine of the roles of man and
30 woman and other passages that would especially be of concern in the *Christ-Light*® curriculum
31 or catechetical instruction. Following this brief review, the committee submitted its [initial](#)
32 [report](#) in January 2011 for publication in the Spring 2011 issue of the *Wisconsin Lutheran*
33 *Quarterly*. This report, also available online and in the 2011 *Book of Reports and Memorials*,
34 stated: "The committee's preliminary opinion is that the new revision may be a possibility for
35 WELS, but they would like the input of more WELS theologians. The committee is coordinating a
36 review of all the changes in the NIV2011, involving faculty members of WLS and MLC, NPH
37 editors, and COP members, beginning in January 2011." That report concluded with these
38 sentiments, "Rather than cursing the multiplicity of choices in the modern English-speaking
39 world and demonizing the translations we don't prefer . . . we should be thankful that God has

40 provided his Word to us in such abundance. We should work together in carefully evaluating our
41 choices, and pray that God guide us to a wise decision in this important matter.”

42 About 40 scholars in our fellowship participated in the above-referenced comparative review of
43 the NIV1984/NIV2011. Their evaluations and observations were included in a [supplemental](#)
44 [report](#) presented by the TEC to the July 2011 WELS convention held in Watertown, Wis. Another
45 part of that supplemental report was the TEC’s brief reaction to five other translations: An
46 American Translation (AAT), the English Standard Version (ESV), the Holman Christian
47 Standard Bible (HCSB), the New American Standard Bible (NASB), and the New King James
48 Version (NKJV). The TEC also presented in that supplemental report the six criteria that had
49 become their working document for evaluating translations. They are as follows:

- 50 1. We expect a translation to conform to the presuppositions of faith. These include a firm
51 conviction that we are dealing with God’s verbally-inspired, inerrant Word. Though speaking
52 through many different human authors, one single divine Author addresses us in every word.
53 The Scriptures find their center and beating heart in Jesus Christ, our Savior. The whole Bible
54 testifies of him and in his name proclaims repentance and remission of sins.
- 55 2. We expect, with Luther, that a translation will communicate in the language of the people,
56 using idioms and expressions that are understandable and in common, current use.
- 57 3. We expect that a translation will understand itself as a “direct quotation” of an ancient
58 document, rather than merely supplying the “gist” of the original’s meaning in a
59 contemporizing paraphrase.
- 60 4. We expect, with Luther, that when theologically necessary a translation will adhere closely to
61 the exact wording of the original.
- 62 5. We expect that the translation will be aimed at native English speakers who can handle
63 Standard American English at a late-primary school or early high school level, people who are
64 neither professional theologians nor biblical illiterates. They can appreciate the difference
65 between texts that don’t aim at literary beauty and those that do, and they have some
66 appreciation for the latter.
- 67 6. We expect that the primary way in which most WELS people experience most of the Bible
68 most of the time is by hearing it read—in the context of the public worship service.
69 Consideration must therefore be given to a translation’s suitability for being read aloud.

70 The committee concluded, “As we have considered all these matters, the committee has become
71 firmer in its consensus regarding the new NIV. We believe it could be used as a translation for
72 our synod’s publications.” It cited three reasons for that conclusion: 1) “While there are some
73 notable weaknesses, there are also even more notable improvements;” 2) “We believe that no
74 other current translation would be a significant improvement over the NIV, one that addresses
75 all the NIV’s weaknesses without adding its own new ones to the mix;” and 3) “Our synod is used
76 to the NIV. To continue using it in its revised form would provide the greatest continuity and
77 cause the fewest disruptions among us.”

78 ***After the 2011 synod convention***

79 Not everyone agreed with the committee's conclusions. The synod in convention understood
80 that not everyone agreed. While the delegates approved the TEC's work, they asked the
81 committee to help develop consensus going forward on the issue of which translation to use in
82 our publications. They also introduced a procedure for making a decision. The 2012 district
83 conventions would vote on a publication translation. If two-thirds of the vote were recorded for
84 any translation, the matter would be settled. If the districts could not arrive at a two-thirds
85 majority, the matter would be placed on the agenda for the 2013 synod convention.

86 The TEC made efforts to present the issues to pastoral conferences and congregations
87 throughout the synod. They produced a four-part [Bible study](#) for congregational use to help
88 laypeople become more familiar with translation issues. In addition, they chose to conduct a
89 translation symposium in January 2012. Two representatives from each district were invited to
90 attend the symposium at WLS along with the committee and other scholars the committee
91 deemed helpful for the discussion. The goal was to bring participants together who held
92 different opinions and to seek some way to arrive at a consensus. A few of the participants
93 remained unconvinced that the NIV2011 was acceptable for use in our publications.

94 Following the symposium, the TEC focused on three translations that had risen to the fore as
95 possible candidates for use as the publication translation of WELS: the ESV, the HCSB, and the
96 NIV2011. The AAT was not included because it is not readily available in electronic format, is
97 somewhat colloquial and idiosyncratic, and would need extensive revision. The NKJV was not
98 considered since those who would appreciate this translation would probably be happy with the
99 ESV which comes from the same translation family. It also uses a textual base that is not
100 commonly used by most modern translations and is limited to one manuscript tradition. The
101 NASB was eliminated because it was passed over by WELS in 1970 and even though a revised
102 edition has been available since 1995, it is still lacking in idiomatic English and inclusive
103 language in salvation passages.

104 ***"Review of the 102"***

105 The TEC then organized a comparative review of the three preferred translations by a wider and
106 more diverse group. They chose to ask 102 of the synod's professors, administrators, and
107 pastors to compare the ESV, the HCSB, and the NIV2011. The entire text of the Old and New
108 Testaments was divided into 34 sections, and the 102 men were divided into three groups of 34
109 reviewers. Each reviewer was assigned a section so that three different reviewers would
110 evaluate each of the 34 Scripture sections.

111 After comparing the three translations for their section, reviewers were asked to list the five
112 best passages in their section and the five weakest passages in their section for each of the three
113 translations. Then they were to evaluate on a scale of 1-10 the appropriateness of the English
114 style for each translation and its overall acceptability for WELS as a publication translation. In
115 this way the TEC was hoping to uncover useful data about the doctrinal reliability of each

116 translation, which was our primary concern. The TEC was hoping also to learn about the clarity
117 and readability of each translation, which was an important secondary concern.

118 Because this evaluation could not be completed by the time the districts met in the summer of
119 2012, the presidium of the synod suggested that one of the options on the ballot for the district
120 conventions should be to delay the decision until the synod convention in 2013. The districts
121 overwhelmingly approved. Now the time for the decision is approaching and the remainder of
122 this report is intended to help delegates come to a final conclusion on the best publication
123 translation for our synod.

124 **TEC activities since the 2012 district conventions**

125 ***Writing and speaking***

126 In the past year the TEC has continued to write and speak, as circumstances have warranted and
127 as we have been invited. TEC member Ken Cherney wrote a short [article](#) responding to the
128 statements of the ELS Doctrine Committee and the LCMS Commission on Theology and Church
129 Relations about the NIV2011. TEC member Thomas Nass added an "[Addendum](#)" to his paper
130 about messianic prophecy.

131 Of special note is the paper written by TEC chairman Paul Wendland on the topic of translation
132 theory for the Reformation Lectures at Bethany Lutheran College in Mankato, Minn. His paper,
133 "[Bible Translations for the 21st Century](#)," is in many respects a summary of the thinking of the
134 TEC on the topic of Bible translation. It can be recommended for newcomers to the translation
135 issue, as well as for those who have been studying the issue for some time.

136 All of these articles have been posted on the [TEC Web site](#). We have also posted some other
137 articles that we thought would be useful to our synodical discussion. We have tried to be
138 transparent about our thoughts and willing to share the viewpoints of others.

139 ***Completing the "Review of the 102"***

140 Our main activity in the past year has been the completion of the "Review of the 102." The last
141 individual review was received on Oct. 18, 2012, and by the end of October, all of the [unedited](#)
142 [results](#) were posted on the TEC Web site, along with an "[Introduction](#)" and some [summary](#)
143 [charts](#). The TEC sincerely thanks all the reviewers for the considerable effort they invested in
144 the project and for the many useful insights uncovered by them. We hope that the large amount
145 of data presented by them will be useful to many people, as it has benefitted us on the TEC.

146 **TEC conclusions from the "Review of the 102"**

147 As we on the TEC have worked through the 102 reviews with a view toward our synodical
148 translation decision, we have come upon six main observations or conclusions, which are
149 summarized below. For those who are interested, we have also prepared a list of examples
150 drawn from the 102 reviews to support our conclusions. This list of examples can be seen on the
151 TEC Web site under "[Examples from the 'Review of the 102' to Support the TEC Conclusions.](#)"

152 **1) WELS pastors do not always agree on translation decisions.**

153 It is obvious that WELS pastors do not always agree on what constitutes a good translation.
154 We observed a good number of passages where one reviewer gave a positive evaluation of a
155 specific translation decision and another reviewer gave a negative evaluation of the very
156 same decision. We noticed that it was very rare that all three reviewers commented on the
157 same verse as an obvious strength or weakness. Even in the sections where the NIV2011 had
158 its greatest critics, there was always at least one reviewer who rated the NIV2011 as the best
159 (cf. Genesis, Psalms 1–72, Isaiah 40–66, Romans, Hebrews). This diversity of opinion about
160 Bible translation, incidentally, is one reason why the TEC has not been enthusiastic about the
161 prospect of WELS trying to produce its own Bible translation.

162 **2) Each of the three translations has some generally recognized strengths.**

163 Though the opinions of the 102 reviewers differed on a good number of specific issues, there
164 was a general consensus about the overall strengths of each translation. The reviewers
165 recognized that the ESV, as a more literal translation coming from the KJV tradition, could be
166 a useful study Bible or a Bible for people accustomed to the KJV. A number of reviewers
167 commented on how the HCSB often has a fresh and insightful rendering. The NIV2011 was
168 frequently mentioned as the most polished of the three translations and the one that
169 communicates in the smoothest and clearest way. The TEC remains convinced that the
170 Christian faith could be taught with any of these three translations, and they all have value
171 and usefulness.

172 **3) Each of the three translations has some generally recognized weaknesses.**

173 Our study of the 102 reviews reinforced for us very emphatically that all three translations
174 have weaknesses. The reviewers pointed out weaknesses that we already knew about, as well
175 as additional weaknesses. For a fuller listing of examples, we invite you to look at our
176 [“Examples from the ‘Review of the 102’”](#) on our TEC Web site.

177 Though most weaknesses deal with translational preference and not doctrine, a few passages
178 can be found in all three translations that could be doctrinally misleading. The ESV weakens 1
179 Corinthians 11:3 by limiting the headship to husbands, it makes Exodus 7:13 and Proverbs
180 16:4 sound as though God may be responsible for evil, and it weakens Genesis 49:10 and
181 Daniel 9:25 as messianic prophecies. The HCSB sounds legalistic in many places by inserting
182 the word “must,” it downplays baptism as a means of grace in Acts 22:16, and it has a number
183 of undesirable footnotes (cf. Genesis 1:1, Psalm 45:6, Matthew 3:11, Ephesians 4:10, and
184 other places). The NIV2011 blurs the messianic prophecy in Psalm 8, it weakens gender
185 related passages in Acts 6:3 and 1 Timothy 2:12, and it also has a number of undesirable
186 footnotes (cf. Genesis 22:18, Psalm 45:6, Isaiah 7:14, Romans 3:22, and other places).

187 The question can be raised: In which translation are the weaknesses the most damaging and
188 the most dangerous? We don’t see that there is a simple, uniformly accepted answer to that
189 question. Opinions differ. One thing that we can all agree upon is this: There is no perfect
190 translation. No matter which translation we use, we need well-trained Lutheran pastors to

191 teach the Bible properly in our congregations—pastors grounded in Lutheran doctrine and
192 able to work with the original languages of Scripture.

193 **4) Because of the ESV’s widely recognized weaknesses in English style, it should not be**
194 **considered as the exclusive publication translation of WELS.**

195 Based on the widespread consensus of the 102 reviewers about the ESV’s weaknesses in
196 regard to English style and readability, we conclude that it would not be wise for WELS to
197 make the ESV the translation that is used exclusively in WELS publications. We notice that 93
198 percent of the 102 reviewers rated the ESV as “weakest or tied for weakest” in the
199 “appropriateness of the English style” for the section they reviewed. Reviewer after reviewer
200 made comments about readability issues with the ESV. We also notice that 82 percent of the
201 102 reviewers rated the ESV as “weakest or tied for weakest” in “overall acceptability” for the
202 section they reviewed. This is not to say that the ESV isn’t useful. Numerous reviewers
203 commented that the ESV could serve well as a study Bible, especially with the appearance of
204 *The Lutheran Study Bible*. There also may be congregations for whom the ESV is a good fit. If
205 we decide to have an eclectic approach toward translations, the ESV could be one of the
206 translations in the mix. But given the overall negative evaluation of the ESV, we don’t see that
207 the ESV should be put forward as an option to be the exclusive publication translation for
208 WELS.

209 **5) We don’t see that the HCSB is gaining widespread acceptance as a compromise**
210 **translation among us.**

211 The HCSB has been considered to be a possible compromise translation among us. It tries to
212 have the readability of the NIV, but its handling of messianic prophecy and gender language
213 is less controversial. The reaction of the 102 reviewers toward the HCSB, however, was
214 ambivalent. Some reviewers were quite enthusiastic about the HCSB. But others considered
215 the HCSB to be in need of further revision and polishing. We noted that 26 percent of the
216 reviewers rated the HCSB as best or tied for best in overall acceptability for the section they
217 reviewed, and 20 percent rated it as weakest or tied for weakest. Several of the strong
218 opponents of the NIV2011 were also strongly opposed to the HCSB. As with the ESV, the
219 HCSB may be a good fit for some congregations and it could be in the mix if we decide to go
220 with an eclectic approach. But if we decide to use the HCSB exclusively as our publication
221 translation, a high percentage of WELS pastors and congregations would see a translation
222 that is not their first choice. We fail to see a groundswell of enthusiasm for the HCSB.

223 **6) In spite of its generally recognized weaknesses, the NIV2011 is still considered the**
224 **best option for WELS publications by most.**

225 Seven out of the 102 reviewers were very strong in their criticism of the NIV2011 (Genesis
226 #2; Joshua #2; Isaiah 40–66 #2; Romans #2, #3; Hebrews #1; Revelation #2). Their full
227 comments may be read online, and selected quotes are included in our TEC “Examples.”
228 Three of these seven regarded the ESV as best (Genesis #2, Joshua #2, Revelation #2) and
229 three regarded the HCSB as best (Romans #2, #3; Hebrews #1). One rated both ESV and
230 HCSB highly (Isaiah 40–66 #2).

231 Otherwise, the majority of reviewers preferred the NIV2011. We noticed that 86 percent of
232 the reviewers rated the NIV2011 higher than the ESV in overall acceptability for their section,
233 and 70 percent rated the NIV2011 higher than the HCSB. In all of the 34 sections, at least one
234 reviewer rated NIV2011 the best.

235 **Recommendation of the TEC**

236 From the “Review of the 102,” our own findings, and literally hundreds of conversations in
237 which we have participated in various forums around our synod, two options have emerged,
238 given as Option 1 and Option 2 below. Each has advantages and disadvantages, but the TEC sees
239 either as entirely defensible and viable. Our recommendation is that the synod would discuss
240 the matter thoroughly in the coming months, and then choose either Option 1 or Option 2 at the
241 synod convention.

242 **Option 1: WELS adopts NIV2011 for use in materials produced by Northwestern** 243 **Publishing House.**

244 **Advantages:**

245 In our view, there is much to be said for uniformity—for having a single version of the Bible in
246 use both across our church body and across different NPH publications. There is benefit, for
247 example, in letting confirmands hear a passage read from the lectern in the same wording in
248 which they memorized it, or in not expecting them to relearn passages every time their family
249 moves. There is also benefit in choosing a version that communicates in idiomatic English to
250 those who are new to our congregations and publications and have little or no biblical
251 background. To the question, “Which version should this be?” the answer seems clear. The
252 NIV2011 was the strong preference of the majority of the 102 reviewers. 82 percent rated it as
253 best or tied for best in overall acceptability, and no other version really emerged from the
254 review process as a viable candidate. We should also mention the more than 30 years of history
255 that WELS has with this version. In practical terms, this would make the transition to NIV2011
256 relatively seamless; in some respects the transition is already underway in a number of our
257 congregations.

258 **Disadvantages:**

259 Like every Bible translation, the NIV2011 has its acknowledged weaknesses. Over the course of
260 this discussion there have been pastors and others who have expressed strong opinions on this
261 subject, including the opinion that its weaknesses are so serious that NIV2011 should not be
262 used. While those who hold this opinion are in the minority, it may be that our church body
263 simply cannot achieve the level of consensus about NIV2011 that will enable us to continue to
264 “walk together” in important areas of our work. There is value in translation uniformity, but it is
265 not more important than God-pleasing unity among us.

266 **Option 2: WELS does not adopt a single Bible version for use in its publications at this**
267 **time. NPH uses whichever version of these three (ESV, HCSB, NIV2011¹) seems best for**
268 **the passage cited and the publication in which the biblical text will appear (“eclectic**
269 **approach”).**

270 **Advantages:**

271 An obvious advantage to an eclectic approach is that a weak (in an author’s or editor’s opinion)
272 rendering from NIV2011 could be replaced with the text from another version. This approach
273 would also allow NPH to choose the version that best suits the purpose for a particular
274 publication, since versions of the Bible suit some purposes better than others. A case can be
275 made that an eclectic approach reflects today’s reality. Web sites, apps, and programs for Bible
276 study now put several versions at a reader’s fingertips (in addition to the Hebrew and Greek
277 source texts), and the proliferation of electronic resources means that a translational “mix-and-
278 match” approach to producing materials would be easier today than ever before. For us to adopt
279 an intentionally eclectic approach might not only reflect the kind of Bible-reading environment
280 in which our members increasingly live. It might also help us teach them to navigate that
281 environment effectively. Finally, with an eclectic approach pastors and congregations who have
282 strong feelings about a translation will be able to avoid the use of that translation more easily.
283 Individual preference has a higher priority in this approach.

284 **Disadvantages:**

285 We would lose the benefits of uniformity referred to above. We could expect the wording of
286 Bible verses in our synod publications to be different sometimes from the wording in our
287 congregation. When traveling or moving, we could encounter a different version. The matter of
288 Bible translation might become an issue when pastors receive calls and move. NPH can be asked
289 about the implications for their work. It would certainly not make their work easier, although
290 they have expressed a willingness to do whatever the synod directs them to do. Finally, we
291 harbor no illusions that an eclectic approach—or any other decision—will lead to a new reign of
292 peace and harmony among us, all by itself. Regardless of our decision, it will remain necessary to
293 defend the truth of God’s Word. It will remain just as necessary to recognize when we have left
294 the realm of “right” and “wrong” and entered the realm of “good,” “better,” and “best”—and to
295 speak thoughtfully and charitably about those whose decisions might be different from our own.

296 **Final thoughts**

297 Regardless of our decision, this is a time for an extra measure of charity and understanding on
298 the part of all in order to preserve harmony in our fellowship. It is evident that we have
299 differences of opinion in our fellowship regarding both translational philosophy and the merit of
300 individual translations. We are not all agreed on whether a more word-for-word or a more

¹ The NIV84 is also still available for limited use under fair use copyright laws. While the Bible itself will no longer be published, small portions of it may be able to be quoted in a limited range of publications such as *Meditations*, where only small portions of it are needed.

301 sense-for-sense approach is better for translating the Bible. We are not all agreed on which
302 translation has the greatest strengths and weaknesses.

303 As we go forward, we need to remember not to read hearts nor question motives. We should try
304 to characterize fairly and accurately the views of those who come to conclusions that vary from
305 our own. These are issues over which godly people can honestly disagree—and for valid
306 reasons. To give one obvious example: sometimes our differences may be influenced by location
307 and ministry setting. WELS is no longer a Lutheran synod located primarily in the upper
308 Midwest, but rather is made up of congregations of various sizes and types throughout the
309 length and breadth of North America. These different settings may lead people to different
310 conclusions regarding the advisability of one translation over another.

311 As a committee we are convinced that all the precious truths of our faith are clearly taught in all
312 the translations we have considered. They have all been translated by people who have a high
313 view of Scripture and who see the Bible's message centering in Christ. What differences exist
314 have more to do with translational preference. That is why the committee's earnest prayer and
315 fervent hope is that we can live with one another in peace, without passing judgment on each
316 other's preferences. Let us not speak ill of another's good!

317 In this connection permit us to share some concerns that have been growing in our minds over
318 the last few years. Our synod's deep love for God's Word has been the primary reason why we
319 have been engaged in this discussion. No one would say that a love for God's Word is a bad thing.
320 When the translation of God's Word is the subject, lively debate can be a sign of spiritual health.
321 It is infinitely to be preferred to a spirit of indifference.

322 However, it is also important to bear in mind that, over time, God's people can be adversely
323 affected by the vigor of the discussion in a number of ways. They may begin to wonder, for
324 instance, whether or not they can trust a particular version of the Scriptures—wondering if it is
325 really God's Word and not some falsification of it. They may begin to have doubts in a general
326 way about their access to God's Word in any version. Finally, they may be convinced that only
327 one version has the proper authority and that all other versions are to be rejected. Given the
328 general mobility of our society, one can readily see the practical and pastoral problems that
329 could arise here, especially if we decide to use a variety of translations in the synod. We must be
330 careful not to drive a wedge between God's people and the Scriptures.

331 Needless concerns over the "correct" version of the Bible can also lead to needless concerns
332 regarding the work of Northwestern Publishing House (NPH). From the very beginning of this
333 discussion, NPH has consistently demonstrated that it is a servant institution, eager to carry out
334 the will of the synod and to provide wholesome, biblically reliable materials for all our
335 congregations and members to use. NPH does not have a large market outside of our synod. It
336 relies on widespread WELS support to remain viable. Whatever decision is made, NPH should be
337 able to continue to count on that support.

338 Finally, we also believe that there have been many lessons we have learned over the course of
339 the translation discussion. Perhaps in the past we have been overly centered on using a single
340 version in every setting rather than recognizing the usefulness of different versions in different
341 settings. Having many versions to choose from—rather than being seen as cause for concern and
342 controversy—can in reality be evidence of God’s constant generosity and grace in giving us
343 more than we could ask or imagine. For instance, in a Bible class, it may be extremely valuable to
344 have more than one type of translation ready at hand. One version might be more useful to us in
345 public reading, in personal reading, and in memorization; another might be more suitable for
346 careful study and close reading of the text. One size does not have to fit all.

347 When questions arise as we compare one translation with another—as they inevitably will—we
348 will discover one more reason for thanking our gracious God. He has put us into a church body
349 that expends a great deal of time and treasure into training pastors who are equipped to study
350 and expound the Scripture on the basis of the original languages. We do not have to scour the
351 Internet or merely sit and wonder when one of those questions comes up. We can simply go to
352 our pastor. We will find in him a faithful shepherd who is able to “bring out of his storeroom
353 treasures old and new” (Matthew 13:52).

354 No translation is perfect. No translational approach is, either. One thing is sure. Old translations
355 will pass away. New ones will come to take their place. All people are like grass, and all their
356 glory is like the flowers of the field. A translation—to the extent that it is a product of human
357 skill and effort—is also one of those flowers. It springs up, is lovely for a time, but in the end it,
358 too, must wither and fall. Let us rather fix our hearts on this one unshakable truth: the Word of
359 our God endures forever!

360 *Pres. Paul O. Wendland, reporter*

361 *Pres. Paul O. Wendland, chairman*

362 *Prof. Thomas P. Nass, secretary*

363 *Rev. John A. Braun*

364 *Prof. Kenneth A. Cherney Jr.*

365 *Pres. Joel V. Petermann*