

**APPENDIX VII**  
**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BIBLE TRANSLATIONS**  
**APPOINTED BY SYNOD COALDALE 1977**

**Committee**

Synod Coaldale 1977 appointed a committee on Bible Translations consisting of the brethren: Dr. J. Faber, Rev. W. Huizinga, Drs. H.M. Ohmann, Prof. L. Selles and Rev. C. Van Dam. Rev. Van Dam requested in 1978 to be relieved from work for and presence at the committee meetings till he would have finished his Master's study. He withdrew from the committee when he moved to B.C. in '79. The rest of the members were able to continue and to meet 14 times between May '78 and June '79.

**Mandate**

Synod Coaldale gave the Committee the mandate:

- a. to continue to make recommendations to the Standard Bible Committee for changes considered necessary in the Revised Standard Version translation.
- b. to keep the Churches posted as to the developments in new editions of the Revised Standard Version.
- c. to report to next Synod (Acts Coaldale, Article 104, sub Recommendations).

Synod added to the mandate:

- a. to make a comparative study of the New American Standard Bible and the New International Version with the Revised Standard Version and the King James Version in order to determine which one translation can be positively recommended for use by the churches, whereby the criteria are: Faithfulness to the original text and linguistic character of the translation.
- b. to report to the next Synod on the progress or the result of its work.

Synod decided that pending this study only the use of the KJV and the RSV is in the freedom of the churches (Acts Coaldale, Article 105, sub Recommendations).

**Work**

The committee concentrated its efforts on the comparative study of the NASB and NIV with the RSV and the KJV. No recommendation for changes were made for that reason to the Standard Bible Committee of the RSV. The only exception is a letter dated January 25, '80, which was answered February 5, '80. See appendix.

As no new edition of the RSV was published since '77, the churches could not be informed of new developments.

The following parts of Scripture were studied in the respective translations: Isaiah 1, 2, 7, 8; Proverbs 3; Genesis 40, 41; Micah 7; Judges 5; Jeremiah 7-9; Joel 1, 2; Luke 24; Romans 1:1-4; Romans 13; Philippians 1-4; I Thessalonians 4:13-5:28; II Thessalonians 2; Hebrews 1-4; Revelation 11.

**Report Bible Translation**

The choice of these parts was determined by the wish to study various books in terms of number and of kind.

Prof. Ohmann presented the submissions on the Old Testament and Rev. Huizinga and Prof. Selles likewise on the New Testament; Prof. Faber checked the faithfulness of the translations of the mentioned passages to the content of Scripture.

**Observations**

To introduce the character of the two translations, added to the KJV and RSV, we quote the foreword of the NASB of 1973 containing the following statement: "The New American Standard Bible has been produced with the

conviction that the words of Scripture as originally penned in the Hebrew and Greek were inspired by God."

"The Editorial Board had a twofold purpose in making this translation: To adhere as closely as possible to the original languages of the Holy Scriptures and to make the translation in a fluent and readable style according to current English usage."

Goal of the Committee for the New International Version was, according to the Preface of the edition of 1977, "that it would be an accurate translation and one that would have clarity and literary quality and so prove suitable for public and private reading, teaching, preaching, memorizing and liturgical use." "In working to these goals, the translators were united in their commitment to the authority and infallibility of the Bible as God's Word in their form."

Different from RSV, NASB, "The New International Version is not a revision but a completely new translation of the Holy Bible . . . ."

To give a general impression of the findings of the Committee, extracts of the minutes are quoted.

- a. The study of the translations of Isaiah 1 and 2 led to the following comments: "The NIV could sometimes stay closer to the Hebrews text rather than give interpretations of the same. Even the traditional rendering "LORD of Hosts" is lost in favour of "LORD Almighty," Isaiah 1:9. Other examples of unnecessary interpretations include Isaiah 1:6, 13; 2:2, 16.

On the other hand the NASB seems to give a much more literal translation, but is sometimes stilted.

An important factor working in favour of the NIV is its apparent freshness and ability to communicate effectively" (Minutes, June 21, '78, Article 3).

- b. The study of the translations of Romans 1-4 resulted in the following observations: "All agree that with recognition of the merits of the KJV many words are so outdated that the KJV should be replaced by a more modern version . . . ."

. . . "all agree that *qua* style, language and clarity the NIV is superior to the RSV and NASB.

Objections against the NIV are that in various instances it is too free and too interpretative. Because of the modernization in language, justice is not always done to the exact meaning of the text . . . ." As to the NASB the faithfulness to Scripture and to text is generally undisputed. In Romans 2:14 the translation "instinctively" is not right in the NASB; it should be "by nature." The drawback of this version is that the translation is often stilted and the language not up to date."

One of the committee members considers differences between KJV and NASB so slight that it does not warrant a shift from the one to the other. "If the translation of *ek pisteos* by 'on the ground of faith' in Romans 3:30 was dropped in favour of 'by faith,' he would prefer the RSV in these chapters to the other versions." Another member is more inclined to choose for the NASB (Minutes, October 11, '78, Article 4).

- c. After a study of the translations of Proverbs 3 and Isaiah 7 and 8 the conclusion of the member who made the submission was that "the giving language had made sacrifices to the receiving language in the NIV." Another member gave as his impression "that the NIV is a smooth English translation but not always close to the Hebrew words." Two more members "do not see that the NIV in these particular chapters deviates from the Hebrew text" (Minutes, December 6, '78, Article 4).
- d. Study of the translations of Hebrews 1 and 2 led the member concerned to the conclusion "that the translation of these chapters, as found in the RSV, is the best; that the rendering of the NIV is somewhat freer, but still good; and that the NASB on these chapters is acceptable but not so good as the other two

*qua* translation." "The other deputies agree with this conclusion to a similar or smaller degree" (Minutes, December 6, '78, Article 5).

- e. The comparative study of the translations of the Epistle to the Philippians taught, according to the brother who made the submission, that each translation seems to have its share of weaknesses and strong points; "the NASB is very accurate and follows the Greek almost slavishly but it tends to cloud the meaning sometimes by its literalness. The RSV is scholarly and sound with minor weaknesses." "The NIV is the clearest, fresh and direct, but, as the discussion brought out, it has a tendency to give interpretation in its translation. See, e.g., Philippians 4:17: 'dear friends' instead of 'beloved' (all over the Epistles); 3:14: 'heavenward' instead of 'upward'; 2:6: 'being in the very nature God' instead of 'being in the form of God.' So, in addition to improvements made on the other translations, especially in clarity, there are also evidences of being too free with the text, e.g., Philippians 2:22, 24 which have 'body' in spite of the fact that, different from verse 20, not *sooma*, 'body,' but *sarx*, 'flesh,' is used" (Minutes, February 28, '79, Article 5).

- f. The conclusion of the brother who introduces the translations of Genesis 40, 41 was that we have outgrown the KJV and that the RSV on these chapters is really a revised KJV.

The NASB offers a valuable translation.

The NIV seems to build on the NASB. The merit of the NIV is that it gets away from the Hebraisms which were taken over into other translations. The NIV is often freer than we are used to, but in most instances in agreement with the text, though not always. Another member "agrees that the NIV on this chapter is the smoothest and the best translation of the four versions." A third member is of the opinion that the NIV is sometimes too free in its renderings to offer a smooth translation in better English. He mentions Genesis 40:15 where is spoken of "forcibly carried off" instead of "stolen" as required by the verb used. Another example is Genesis 41:42 where instead of "hand," as indicated by the text, the rendering "finger" is used. He considers the translation of the NASB too stilted. The fourth member is of the opinion that "the NIV is acceptable and the most appealing on these chapters" (Minutes, April 11, '79, Article 3).

- g. In connection with a discussion of the translations of Micah 7 the deputy making the submission "prefers in some passages of this chapter the translation of the KJV because it makes 'us' aware of what is written in Hebrew. Another member points out . . . 'that time and again elements are inserted into the KJV which do not belong to the Hebrew text.'

As to the NIV rendering, he regrets with the other members that the words: 'watch the doors of your mouth' in verse 5 are rendered in the NIV by 'be careful of your words' and that the RSV translates 'righteousness' in verse 9 by 'deliverance.' "

The NASB is praised for its rendering: "I will watch expectantly for the LORD" in verse 7. One member finds it hard to make a choice between the RSV, the NASB and the NIV on this chapter. "Each translation has its own pros and cons" (Minutes, June 20, '79, Article 3).

- h. The brother who makes a submission on Judges 5:1-14 comes to the conclusion "that, in spite of the difficulty of the chapter, the four translations generally are in accord with each other." Another member remarks "that this general accord shows that there is no basic difference between the translations." A third member is of the opinion that the character of Judges 5 as a Psalm, finds clear expression in RSV and NASB (Minutes, September 26, '79, Article 3).

- i. Study of Hebrews 3 and 4 in its various translations caused the reporter to observe that there are flaws in each translation: The RSV and NIV left out a

couple of particles, the KJV is not always clear, the NASB missed the point in verse 12 of the chapter 3 by translating *gar* by "for" but is on a par in other points. The literal translation of *homologia* by "confession" in RSV and NASB is appreciated by another member (Minutes, September 26, '79, Article 4).

- j. Introducing the second part of Judges 5 the reporter states that though he is inclined to give preference to the rendering of the NASB, no farfetched conclusions should be drawn from a difficult chapter like Judges 5.

Another member observes "that different from what the RSV does in the prophets, it hardly took refuge to the ancient versions in Judges 5. It shows that the use of the versions cannot be marked as a general trend in the RSV" (Minutes, November 22, '79, Article 3).

- k. The objection of the deputy who submitted a study on the translations of Luke 24 against the RSV was "in addition to a certain stiltedness which it shared with the NASB, that the RSV in a couple of instances preferred the shorter manuscript D text to the longer text of the majority of reliable manuscripts. He preferred the NIV translation which is clear and refreshing" (Minutes, November 20, '79, Article 4).

- l. In the following meeting it is decided to write Prof. B.M. Metzger, secretary of the RSV Bible Committee, on the matter of the use of versions in disputed places of the prophets by the RSV and the preference of the RSV for the D text in Luke 24 (Minutes, January 23, '80, Article 2).

In his reply Dr. Metzger wrote that he has the impression that the Old Testament Section of the Bible Committee has a tendency to return to the masoretic text from the ancient version and that New Testament Section adopted the 3rd edition of the United Bible Societies Greek text, which replaces the D. readings for the majority readings, as basic text for the New English edition. (See appendix for complete letter.)

- m. A study of the translations of Hebrews 13 convinced the reporter "that, in spite of its attractiveness, the NIV should not be recommended to the churches, because it does not stay close enough to the Greek text and therefore falls short in the exactness of translation. As to the NASB, his study of this and other chapters had confirmed his view that the NASB leans heavily on the RSV and, where it does not do so, is, in many instances, not a smooth appealing translation. He was of the opinion that the RSV, which stays close to the Greek text in the chapter discussed and uses good idiomatic English, recommended itself for recommendation."

Another member was opposed to dropping the NIV and recommending the RSV.

"It was decided to continue the study of the translations" (Minutes, November 22, '79, Article 5).

- n. A study of the translations of Jeremiah 7:9:7 was submitted. It struck the brother who made the presentation "that the NASB in various spots was very close to the RSV.

The NIV used a couple of times words which clarified the meaning of the text, e.g., chapter 7:21c 'Go ahead' and 7:22 'I did not just give them this command.' The committee agreed that, though justified in a paraphrase, such additions do not belong in a translation" (Minutes, January 23, '80, Article 3).

Reviewing the translations of Revelation 11 the reporter concluded "that the KJV in its translation of verse 1 and verse 17 used an inferior text and in verse 4 added 'before the God of the earth.' Good is the reading 'spiritually' in verse 8. A plural was wrongly used in verse 15 and a wrong connection made in verse 19. All this makes the KJV on this chapter, in addition to archaic, unsatisfactory."

"As to the RSV, the NASB and the NIV, all could be evaluated as sound translations." Because of its freshness the brother "personally preferred the NIV" (Minutes, January 23, '80, Article 4).

- o. A presentation was made on Joel 1 and 2. "Although no basic objections are brought forward against the various translations, the RSV is preferred to the NASB and the NIV" (Minutes, May 7, '80, Article 4).

"A general discussion is held on the contents of a report which should be made. All agree that a church or churches which have insurmountable objections against a particular version should have the freedom to use another one. The majority of the committee, however, does not share the view that the choice of a version for use in the worship services should be completely left in the freedom of the churches. To prevent confusion, a recommendation of a particular translation should be our aim, but no version should be declared 'authentic' by the churches" (Minutes, May 7, '80).

### **Some summary conclusions from the minutes**

1. None of the four translations can be qualified as unscriptural.
2. The KJV cannot function any longer as a translation in contemporary English and as the best rendering of the original text.
3. It is generally felt that the NIV is the most appealing translation but not the most exact one.
4. The NASB, in spite of its closeness to the KJV in sticking to the letter of the accepted text, misses the appeal which the KJV once had because of the beauty of its language and style and the clarity of expression.
5. The RSV is acknowledged as a scholarly sound translation in dignified English. A weak point in the rendering of textually disputed places in the Prophets is that the RSV in more than one instance, without absolute necessity, gives preference to the readings of the ancient versions over the readings of the Hebrew masoretic text in its first edition of the Old Testament.

### **Some additional observations regarding the translations.**

#### **The King James Version**

The translation is faithful to the Hebrew and Greek text as known from a restricted number of manuscripts in the 16th century.

Although the beauty of the KJV has been sung in past and present, our judgment regarding the clarity of this translation for *our time* must be rather negative. The development of the language over the centuries is one reason. To mention a few obsolete words and expressions: Genesis 41:4: cows "ill favoured and lean fleshed"; Romans 13:13: walk "not in chambering"; I Thessalonians 4:15: we who remain "shall not prevent them which are asleep"; Hebrews 2:2 "recompense of reward" for "retribution."

In other instances the translation is simply incorrect: Isaiah 1:29: "gift" should be "bribe"; Joel 1:17 "rotten" should be "shriveled"; the translation of Joel 2:17 "should rule over them" instead of "be a byword" is due to a misunderstanding of the root of the verb used in Hebrews. "Let them slip" in Hebrews 2:2 should be "lest we drift away"; the addition of "him" and "them" in Hebrews 2:3 and 4 is wrong.

That does not mean that the KJV does not have any merits for us. Micah 7:7 "In that day shall the decree be far removed" is the best rendering of the four. "Melted" in Judges 5:5 is faithful to the original text. "Let us be silent" and "the LORD has put us to silence" is the right rendering of the original. Many other instances could have been added. That does not change the fact, however, that progress in the study of languages and manuscripts call for a New Translation in present day English.

### **The Revised Standard Version**

Going over the chapters under consideration, one of the members counted the words and took in account the word order. The concordance of the RSV with the KJV in that respect struck him over and over. As already said the RSV translators depart quite a few times from the Hebrew text to follow the ancient versions, as usually indicated in the footnotes. In some instances the emendations are preferable, e.g., Isaiah 8:6 "melt in fear." In other instances, however, these emendations are unwarranted, e.g., Micah 7:4 "their" instead of "your"; 7:12 "to Egypt" instead of "and cities of." It was, therefore, a pleasant surprise to find that in the translation of Judges 5 no use was made of the many suggested emendations.

Compared with the colloquial character of modern speech, the translators of the RSV preserved dignity of language. It makes the version suitable for pulpit reading and qualifies it as a worthy successor of the KJV.

### **The New American Standard Bible**

Compared with the KJV, the textual basis of the NASB is widened in agreement with Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* and Nestle's *Greek New Testament*. In so far the NASB is a real improvement over the KJV reaping the benefits of ongoing study of the Bible and its languages. It shows, e.g., in the use of "instruction" instead of "law" in Isaiah 1:10; of "bloodshed" instead of "blood" in Isaiah 1:15. The translation "kidnapped" in Genesis 40:15 is unequalled by any other translation. Genesis 41:38 "divine spirit" is best understandable in the mouth of an Egyptian. "Roundabout ways" in Judges 5:6, just as "warriors" in 5:13 and "reached out for" in 5:21 are correct and clear translations. So are Joel 1:18 "wander aimlessly" and 1:20 "they pant for Thee." The translation of Philippians 1:9-11 is more exact than the rendering of the other versions.

However "very much better" in Philippians 1:23 and "to remain on," in the flesh, namely, are awkward. "Have this attitude in yourselves" is literal but is stilted in English. So is the translation of Philippians 1:27-30, and therefore unclear. Hebrews 1:1 "in many portions" is unclear; "if indeed God is one" is a literalistic rendering which obscures the meaning "since God is one."

### **The New International Version**

Among the chapters studied, Genesis 40 and 41 were most appreciated. Genesis 40:15,16 are a real improvement; 41:12 has the best rendering of the four versions; Genesis 41:21 is somewhat free but to the point. The translation of Isaiah 7:9 "if you do not stand firm in your faith, you shall not stand at all" brings out the play on words of the original. The Assyrian onslaught described in Isaiah 8:7-9 is vivid and picturesque. "Gloat over me" and "I will see her downfall" in Micah 7:8 are good modern translations. "All who live in distant places" instead of "who cut corners of the hair" come close to the KJV. So does "virgin" in Isaiah 7:14.

The NIV has a beauty of its own because of its clarity and its freshness of expression.

There is, however, another side to the coin, that, namely, the translation is rather free or too free.

Examples are "cleansed" in Isaiah 1:6; "field of melons" in Isaiah 1:13; "evil assemblies" of Isaiah 1:13; "impurities" instead of "dross" Isaiah 1:25, "ships of Tarshish" is rendered "every trading ship" in Isaiah 2:16. "Put my trust in Him" of Isaiah 8:7 is not exactly the same as "to wait for" of the original. "Spiritists" in Isaiah 8:19 is too modernistic and incorrect; "bears my name" in Jeremiah 7:10 is a loss in comparison to "which is called by my name" of the other versions.

As to the New Testament translation, the same can be said of the NIV's translation. There are good and clear renderings, e.g., Romans 3:30 "through the same faith"; Romans 5:12-18 is a very transparent rendering; Philippians 1:22 is

an excellent expression of the dialogue style; but there is also an unnecessary freedom with the words or texts: Romans 1:16 "for the gentile" instead of "for the Greek"; Romans 2:15 "the requirements of the law" instead of "the work of the law"; Romans 3:20 *ou pasa sarx* (no flesh) rendered by "no one." Romans 4:11 "he received circumcision as a sign and seal" instead of "he received the sign of circumcision as a seal of." Philippians 1:18 "But what does it matter? The important thing is" as rendering of *Ti gar; Plen* is rather periphrastic.

The NIV, as a deputy remarked, tends too much to bring out the interpretation of a word or verse in the translation of it.

### Considerations

1. General Synod New Westminster 1971 stated "on the ground of the report of the committee that no valid reasons have been adduced why the RSV should be declared unacceptable for use by the churches" (Acts, Article 33, Recommendation 2).

Synod reappointed the Committee on the Revision of the RSV with the mandate, among others, "to continue with their work of checking the RSV and to pass on also their own criticism of same." This work has gone on now for more than ten years.

2. The present committee received from the last Synod Coaldale 1977, a broadened mandate "to make a comparative study of the New American Standard Bible and the New International Version with the Revised Standard Version and the King James Version in order to determine which one translation can be positively recommended for use by the churches . . ." The committee understands this mandate this way: that *one* modern translation should be recommended. The question, therefore, is now: did our study of the NASB and the NIV result in a preference of one of these modern translations above the RSV? You will understand that on the basis of our comparative study our answer is negative. This negative answer is *not* based on the fact that the NIV uses "You" as address for the persons of the Trinity instead of "Thou." The committee feels that this use should not be a factor in the choice of a translation since the original languages do not make this distinction and it may be expected that sooner or later all modern translations will change over from "Thou" to "You."

This negative answer is *not* based *either* on the notion that the NASB and the NIV must be qualified as unscriptural translations and that the RSV would be perfect. The study of the four versions has made it once more clear that something like a perfect or near-perfect translation does not exist. Synod 1977, in its quest for a positive recommendation, cannot have meant that one of the translations should be qualified as near-perfect. The churches do not authorize any specific translations, but, for the sake of a desired uniformity, express a preference for a particular translation.

3. *The King James Version* has become obsolete because of the progress in textual criticism and of changes in the English language. *The New American Standard Bible*, though close to the RSV in acknowledging modern research, is not to be preferred above the RSV. The translation of the NASB is often too literal to be lucid and clear and it does not render itself suitable for liturgical use. Although the *New International Version* uses clear and contemporary English, the so-called dynamic equivalent manner of translation makes the version too free for use in the pulpit. This is sometimes aggravated by a lack of footnotes.

As far as the *Revised Standard Version* is concerned, the committee likes to make the following remarks:

- a. Previous synods left the use of the RSV in the freedom of the churches. Many churches do use the RSV in worship services and catechism instruction. The committee feels that continuity in the use of a Bible translation is

a good thing and that for that reason there must be strong arguments to switch over to another modern version.

- b. The RSV recommends itself as a scholarly word for word translation. Its more than necessary use of the ancient versions, especially in the translation of the Old Testament prophets, is to a certain extent balanced by the meticulous footnotes.

Moreover the letter of Dr. Bruce M. Metzger gives reason to expect improvement in this respect in the next edition.

- c. The second edition of the translation of the New Testament in the RSV showed an increased use of the majority Greek text. In this respect the letter of Dr. Metzger gives reason for confidence with regard to a third edition.
- d. The English of the RSV is dignified and best suited for liturgical use.
- e. Of all the modern versions the RSV has received the broadest acceptance on the North American continent.

### **Recommendations**

On the basis of its mandate and of a comparative study of the King James Version, the Revised Standard Version, the New American Standard Bible and the New International Version the committee recommends that Synod decides:

- I, 1a. to use the Revised Standard Version for the Scripture quotations in the linguistic modernization of the Creeds and the Liturgical Forms as much as possible.
- 1b. to recommend to the churches, for the sake of desired uniformity, to use this translation in the worship services and for catechism instruction.

### **Ground**

The Revised Standard Version, though not the most modern translation, renders the Bible text in a dignified and contemporary English which agrees with the character of our worship services, creeds and forms and also with the teaching ministry in the catechism instruction.

- II. To leave it in the freedom of the churches to use the King James Version, the New American Standard Bible or the New International Version, if the acceptance of the Revised Standard Version meets with insurmountable objections.

### **Grounds**

- a. The use of one and the same Bible Version, though desirable, is not an ordinance of God nor a rule of the Church Order.
- b. The question which version should be used by the churches has been a controversial point within the churches for decades. To make the use of one particular version binding does not solve the controversy and does certainly not promote peace and unity in and among the churches.

Respectfully submitted  
J. Faber,  
H.M. Ohmann, Convener,  
L. Selles, Secretary.

The fourth member of the committee, Rev. W. Huizinga, agrees with the body of the report, but could not put his signature under the considerations and recommendations of the majority of the committee. His minority considerations and recommendations are enclosed with this report.



## MINORITY CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Rev. W. Huizinga,

Considering,

1. The committee feels that the use of "Thou" or "You" as an address for the persons of the Trinity should not be a factor in the choice of a translation since the original languages do not make this distinction and it may be expected that sooner or later all modern translations will change over from "Thou" to "You."
2. The study of the four versions has made it clear once more that a completely acceptable translation has not come as yet. This study has also taught us that none of the four versions must be qualified as unscriptural.
3. The mandate for this committee was to come to a positive recommendation of one translation. This means that the translation should receive more than a "negative" endorsement (as was done in 1971 General Synod, Article 33, Recommendation 2). With respect to this it must be said that the committee has not found any of the four translations beyond criticism.
4. The two criteria to be applied were "Faithfulness to the original text and linguistic character of the translation." Moreover, the translation to be recommended is to be used for church purposes. In applying these criteria to the four translations we found:
  - a. KJV. Linguistically it is outdated and the original text from which it translated left much to be desired. Therefore we cannot give it a positive recommendation.
  - b. RSV. Linguistically it is scholarly and sound. However, its faithfulness to the original text is the problem. Its frequent use of the ancient versions in place of the masoretic (Hebrew) text in the Old Testament and its choice of the Greek text (often shorter than that used by the NASB and NIV translators) make it weak. To recommend it positively as faithful to the original text is questionable.
  - c. NIV. Of all the translations it is one of the most faithful in using the original text. Linguistically it is clear and fresh. However, owing to its method and principles of translation, it tends to be too interpretative, and in this sense is not always as faithful to the original text as it should be.
  - d. All translations are suitable for church use.
5. The use of the one and same Bible version, though desirable, is not an ordinance of God nor a rule of the Church Order. The question which version should be used by the churches has been a controversial point by the churches for decades. To make the use of one particular version compulsory does not solve the controversy and certainly does not promote peace and unity in the churches.

*Recommends* on the basis of the above considerations:

1. To cease the use of the KJV in the churches unless a local church has insurmountable objections against the other three translations.
2. To leave the churches free to use any of the three modern translations which were investigated — RSV, NASB, NIV — since the application of the criteria to the modern translations could not yield a clear and unanimous endorsement of one translation. All three translations have advantages and disadvantages. Moreover, it is impossible to give a positive recommendation of any one translation, since the committee has certain objections to all translations and therefore any recommendation must be conditional.
3. To appoint a new committee on Bible Translation with the mandate:
  - a. to continue to make recommendations to the translation boards of the RSV, NIV, NASB to improve these translations.

- b. to keep the churches posted about developments in new editions of these translations.
- c. to report to the next Synod on the progress or the results of its work.
- d. to continue the comparative study of the three modern translations with an eye to new editions, with an eye to making recommendations to the translation boards and, possibly, with being able to come to a positive recommendation of one translation.
- e. to receive, invite and evaluate any submissions by the churches or church members.