WRS Journal 10/2 (August 2003) 17-26

A SHORT HISTORY OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE

Earl L. Brown, Jr.

Early Church History and The English Bible

Before the end of the second century A.D. the gospel was brought to London, England. There might have been early translations of portions of the Greek New Testament into English. None are extent.[1] It remained for missionaries from Rome in the fifth century to bring Jerome's Latin Vulgate to England.[2] The need was great for an English translation of the Bible.[3]

Medieval Church History and The English Bible

An intelligible liturgy that both priest and laity could understand gave an impetus for the paraphrasing of Scripture into the English language. Foremost of the portions of the Bible paraphrased became the Psalms, sometimes with meter.[4] **Caedmon**, (a seventh century monk) made a metrical version of some portions of Scripture. **Bede** translated the Gospels into English. It is alleged that he finished translating the Gospel of John on his deathbed in A.D. 735. **Alfred the Great** (reigned 871-899) translated the Psalms and the Ten Commandments.[5] Some inter-linear translations remain from the tenth century.[6] **The Lindisfarne Gospels** are cited as the most famous of this period (ca. 950).[7] **Aelfric** (ca. 955-1020) made idiomatic translations of Scripture portions. Two of these exist until today. Almost three hundred years later, **William of Shoreham** and **Richard Rolle** each translated the Psalter. **Rolle's** work included a verse by verse commentary. Both Psalters were popular at the time of **John Wycliffe** (ca. 1329-1384).[8]

John Wycliffe (ca. 1329-1384) the "Morning Star of the Reformation" was the first with his associates to translate the entire Bible from Latin into English. He was the most recognized scholar and theologian at Oxford University of his day. Wycliffe's beliefs warranted that the only safeguard against the Church's abusive authority, was to make the Bible available in the languageof the people. The whole New Testament was completed in 1380 and the Old Testament in 1382.[9]

Modern Church History and The English Bible

In 1415, the Council of Constance condemned John Huss to burn at the stake, condemned the writings of Wycliffe, ordered his bones to be dug out of the ground and for them to be burned. His ashes were to be cast in the river. The influence of the Wycliffe Bible was great.[10] *It was still only an English translation of Jerome's Latin Vulgate.* Almost fifty years after the "Constitutions of Oxford" (1408), which condemned the writings of Wycliffe, Gutenberg printed the Latin Bible in 1456. The complete Hebrew Old Testament was printed at Soncino, Italy in 1488. Erasmus had the Greek New Testament printed in Basel in 1516.[11]

From Tyndale to the King James Version

The first English translation of the Greek New Testament was completed and printed by **William Tyndale** (1494-1536) in 1526. He saw great value in revising his New Testament in 1534. Though very active in theological dispute, Tyndale had translated the Pentateuch and several other Old Testament portions in 1530.[12] **Myles Coverdale** (1488-1569) completed the Old Testament which Tyndale had begun in 1535. For the first time the Old Testament Apocrypha was separated from the canonical books. Other revisions of the English Bible emerged. **John Rogers**, who took a pen name Matthew, in actuality had completed Tyndale's translation with some improvements of his own. Rogers was burned at the stake in 1555.[13] **The Great Bible** was printed in 1539. It was called great because of its size. The Lutheran order of the books of the New Testament was discontinued with this version. A lesser known work was that of **Richard Taverner** another revision of Matthew's Bible in 1539.[14] All of these translations were produced during the reign of King Henry VIII (1509-1547).[15]

The first English version to be brought to America was the **Geneva Bible.** It was first published in 1560. **William Wittingham** (ca.1524-1579) translated the New Testament from Beza's Latin text consulting the Greek New Testament. This translation contained annotations which reflected a pronounced Calvinism.[16] With great reaction by the bishops in the Church of England, the **Bishop's Bible** was produced in 1568. This was primarily a revision of the Great Bible. The low church Separatists championed the Geneva Bible. Conversely, the high church Anglicans promoted the Bishop's Bible.[17]

The first English Roman Catholic Bible was translated by **William Allen** and **Gregory Martin.** It was called the **Douay-Rheims Bible.** The New Testament was completed at Rheims in 1582. Martin died in 1584. The Bible was completed by William Allen and **Richard Bristow** at Douay in 1609-1610. The Rheims-Douay or the Douay-Rheims was a very stilted translation of the Latin Vulgate into English. This translation became the standard for Roman Catholics into the 20th century.[18]

The Authorized or King James Version of 1611

James I came to the throne of England in 1603 after Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603), having reigned in Scotland for some thirty-six years, since the age of one. In the calling of the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 he sought a discussion of the various parties within the Church of England. He sought for a resolution of the vying factions with the proposal of a new Bible translation which would be a compromise for the contending translations between the three rival traditions.[19]

From the outset, the **King James Version** was staunchly opposed by **Richard Bancroft**, a bishop in London. It was **Dr. John Rainolds** (1549-1607) the president of Corpus Christi College in Oxford who originally proposed the idea of it. The King James Version was a monumental scholastic effort of its day. Some 54 men, many the leading classical and oriental scholars of the day were set forth to revise the Bishop's Bible adopting less objectionable

renderings of the Geneva Bible influenced by the Latin vocabulary of the Vulgate and the Rheims-Douay.[20]

Quite surprisingly, the compromise Bible of its day, the King James Version, has become venerated by fundamentalists of today. It was the first translation to incorporate marginal notes which reflected alternative renderings of Hebrew and Greek into English. Although somewhat authorized by King James I, in the strictest sense it wasn't. Even James had a number of complaints against this version of the Bible.[21] However, James I was not popular among the British people. His monumental accomplishment for his reign was the production of the "new" Bible.[22]

Three panels translated the Old Testament headed by **Lancelot Andrewes**. One panel probably headed by **John Bois** translated the Apocrypha. Two panels headed by **Thomas Ravis** translated the New Testament. Of the five currently available primary uncial manuscripts, only Codex Beza was extant at the time, but there is no evidence it was utilized. Of the 5,358 known New Testament manuscripts, only 25 were known in their day. Papyri discoveries were still three hundred years later. Of the now 800 Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament, only two known sources were utilized. These were the Complutensian Polyglot (1517) and the Antwerp Polyglot (1572). What the Authorized Version lacked in manuscript availability, it compensated with the magnitude of scholarship of its day. To its credit the King James Version was the clearest, most fluent translation, with poetic rhythm and dignity based on the watershed of some seven previous translations of Scripture.[23]

Some Revisions of The Authorized Version.

There were a number of unofficial revisions of the 1611 KJV. The current printed edition of most of the common KJV texts is that of **Benjamin Blaney** in 1769.[24] Language does change. Reflecting upon such change was the noble attempt of **Charles Thompson** in 1808 to revise the AV or KJV. Even **Noah Webster** (1758-1843) produced his revision in 1833, finding the usage of some 150 words in the KJV misleadingly obsolete in his day.[25]

Two Traditions Emerge in Revision of the KJV

As new discoveries of ancient manuscripts became available to scholars, it became painfully obvious that there was clearly a need for revision of the KJV.[26] Only a few revisions utilized the same Greek textual base as the KJV. These were the **King James II** (1971) and the **New King James Version** (1982). The first was produced by **Jay Green** and his Associated Publishers and Authors. This revision was essentially a one man Bible despite his working in consort with a number of scholars who remained anonymous when their suggestions were ignored by the editor.[27] The second was prepared by 130 evangelical scholars, who thus produced the New King James Version. The Old Testament text used was Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia (1977). The New Testament text used was the Revised Textus Receptus (1881). Though infinitely superior to King James II, the New King James Version suffers from placing new wine of updated vocabulary in the old wine pouches of Elizabethan phraseology.[28]

Most revisions of the KJV follow a more eclectic approach to utilizing one or more families of Greek texts. In this short history of English Bible translation, we shall skip a multitude of private translations of the New Testament, or even the Bible, to concentrate on the more familiar versions of the Bible.[29]

In 1870 **Dr. Samuel Wilburforce** proposed the AV be revised. Some 65 scholars were involved. Two committees were formed with some Americans serving in order to produce one translation that would serve both sides of the Atlantic. The New Testament of the **English Revised Version** was produced in 1881, and in 1885, the whole Bible.[30] The purpose of the ERV was flawed. The translators were to limit vocabulary changes to that of Tudor and Jacobean authors. The method of the ERV was uneven. The Hebrew text used was the Massoretic Text. The New Testament text utilized was that of B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort. When issued the ERV contained a list of words revised by the Americans not adopted by the English in an edition for circulation in America.[31]

Subsequent British English Versions

In May of 1946 there was a proposal that there be a new translation undertaken in British English. The **New English Bible**, New Testament, underwent three revisions from 1961-1970. The entire Bible was produced in 1970. This New English Bible reflected the views of largely liberal scholars who followed the theory of Dynamic Equivalence in translation. The New English Bible was revised in 1989 and called the **Revised English Bible**.[32]

Subsequent American English Versions

The **American Standard Version** of 1901 was resultant as the work of ten American scholars including **Philip Schaff** and **William Henry Green** improving on their suggestions to the British ERV committees. It used the same text base as its British counterpart. In contrast to the ERV no Apocrypha was translated. Unfortunately, it suffered from similar archaic language and stilted style of the ERV.[33] Some have joked that the ERV and ASV brought the vocabulary up to 1650.[34]

Liberalizing Revisions of the ASV

In 1928 the copyright of the ASV was acquired by the International Council of Religious Education. This council was under the auspicious of the **Federal Council of Churches**, which eventually became the **National Council of Churches** in 1950. The most prominent of the 32 scholars of what would become the **Revised Standard Version** were **Luther A. Weigle**, **Edgar Goodspeed**, and **James Moffatt**. The two latter men are known particularly for their own private translations of the Scripture.[35] In 1946 the New Testament of the RSV was released. Ensuing was the release of the Old Testament in 1952, and the Apocrypha in 1957. On the whole the RSV was an excellent modern English translation. It was unfortunate that the liberal

bias against Messianic prediction rendered this translation unfavorable, distasteful and unworthy of trust by many conservatives.[36] In 1971 the whole New Testament was revised using a later Greek textual basis.[37] Thirty scholars from the National Council of Churches revised both the RSV Old and New Testaments. The text basis for the **New Revised Standard Version** of 1989 was that of Old Testament, Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia, and New Testament, the third edition of the Greek New Testament of the United Bible Societies (1975). Chief editor of this undertaking was **Bruce M. Metzger** of Princeton Theological Seminary.[38]

Conservative Revision of the ASV

The Lockman Foundation, working closely with some 58 anonymous scholars, produced in 1971 the **New American Standard Bible**. There were two revisions of this translation. The first was in 1977. A second occurred in 1995. This translation tries to consistently render the same word Hebrew or Greek word similarly into English. The first edition uncritically adopted the RSV rendering of Psalm 16:10. It corrected the liberal interpretation in its subsequent editions.[39]

Recent Translations Noted

About 110 Evangelical scholars worked on the **New International Version**. The New Testament was completed in 1973 and the Old Testament in 1979. A British version called the **New International Bible** was completed in 1983 with gender inclusive language. An American revision was finished in 1984.[40] The NIV is a translation, according to Kenneth Barker, as being somewhere between Formal Equivalent and Dynamic Equivalent.[41] Some scholars have held well that the NIV has the potential of becoming the Bible that most evangelicals will use in the future.[42]

In 2002 a gender inclusive New Testament was released called **Today's New International Version**. The TNIV is a conservative attempt at gender neutral translation. It offers 1/3 the amount of such translation in the NRSV.[43]

The twentieth century saw two major Roman Catholic translations. The **New American Bible** was completed in 1970 and revised in 1986. The texts utilized in it were Biblica Hebrica for the Old Testament, and the 25th edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek text. This was the product of 59 Roman Catholic scholars. The annotations make concessions to higher critical theories of the origin of Scripture.[44] **The Jerusalem Bible** (1966) was the first Roman Catholic Bible to be completely translated from the original languages of Scripture. It was revised and called the **New Jerusalem Bible** in 1989. Originally the product of **Alexander Jones** of Corpus Christi College and 27 contributors. The extensively annotative notes reflect a warm acceptance of liberal Protestant views regarding authorship of many of the books of Scripture. In the Old Testament, this translation resorts to some unwarranted textual emendation.[45]

Though called a version, the **Today's English Version**, or **Good News Bible** is properly a modern speech translation and not a version. The New Testament was translated in 1966. The

complete Bible appeared in 1976. **Dr. Robert Bratcher** of the American Bible Society was its editor in chief. The Old Testament text used was Biblica Hebraica 1937. The 1st edition of the United Bible Society's Greek text was used in the 1976 revision. Although intended for use with readers for whom English is a second language, the liberal bias shown at places in negates the Dynamic Equivalence incorporated. **The Bible in Basic English** (1949) does a much better job, as does Ol**af Norlie**'s **Simplified New Testament** (1961).[46] Comments made in this light can equally in manner of degree be mentioned of the **Contemporary English Version** (1991, 1994), and the **New Century Version** (1991), both are designed for children, but are examples of over simplification in economy of speech and over usage of Dynamic Equivalence.[47]

Another misnomer is the one man work of **Kenneth Taylor**, the **Living Bible** (1966, 1971). He conceived of the work of paraphrasing the ASV of 1901 for his children. More than 40 million copies have been sold. The deficiencies of the work led to its revision by its publishers. At least 93 translators were involved with the **New Living Translation** (1996), which is basically a scholarly rework of Taylor's along the lines of Evangelical Dynamic Equivalency. Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia was used for the Old Testament; the New Testament employed the 4th edition of the UBS Greek text (1993).[48] The translators were dissatisfied with the resultant work and are working on a thorough going retranslation which should appear in a few years.

In stark contrast, **Eugene Petersen**'s, **The Message** (2002) tries to do what Taylor did in the late 1960's—bridging the century gap. His purpose is to provide an impact translation. It is at places over-translation for sake of impact. This was much like the **New Testament** of **J. B. Phillips** (1958). He revised it in 1973 and with revision deleted the time bound colorful language which made the original so popular.[49] If we live long enough maybe Peterson will repeat the venture as J. B. Phillips did.

Reaction to Gender-Neutrality in Translation

The year A.D. 2000 saw among many things another translation worthy of discussion. The **Holmon Christian Standard Bible** New Testament was released. Although the whole Bible will not be released for at least another few years. The goal of this translation is to "be as accurate as the NASB and as readable as the NIV."[50] The translation theory adopted called Optimal Equivalence is in essence the combination of the best of Formal and Dynamic Equivalence. Some 90 scholars are participating. The text of this translation is that of the UBS 4th edition of the Greek text. This translation was conceived in the wake of Southern Baptist outcry against the attempt to come up with gender neutral translations like the NRSV, the ESV of 2001, and the TNIV.[51]

An Ecumenical Version Accepted by Conservatives

As this short history is brought to a close, it appears that we shall come full circle on KJV revision. The **English Standard Version** of 2001 bridges many gaps for many reasons. It bridges the gap between British and American English. A team of 100 members sought out to

revise the text of the 1972 revision of the RSV by conservative, evangelical translators. In reality, it is a conservative purification of many of the readings of the NRSV.[52] It is interesting that, regarding the issue of gender neutrality, it contains more renderings than the TNIV, but fewer than the NRSV.[53] The ESV of 2001 retains the generic "he" in many places where the NRSV has dropped it. To summarize the goal of the ESV of 2001, "In each case the objective has been transparency to the original text, allowing the reader to understand the original on its own terms rather than on the terms of our present-day culture."[54] Although the NIV has been the Bible of many evangelicals, time may prove the ESV of 2001 to become the KJV of our day, and, perhaps, the NIV or NASB the Geneva Bible of our day.[55]

---

[1]Philip W. Comfort, *Essential Guide to Bible Versions* (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 2000), 134. Paul D. Wegner, *The Journey from Texts to Translations: The Origin and Development of The Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, corrected printing, 2000), 274. Ira Maurice Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 2nd rev. ed., 1934), 225.

[2] Ibid.; David Ewert, *From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations: A General Introduction to The Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 183.

[3] Price, 225, notes for us that the language as we now know as English was not then the majority language. There were many languages on the British Isles.

[4] G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation* (vol. 2 of *The Cambridge History of The Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975, repr. 1980), 365-387.

[5] Comfort, 134; Wegner, 274-277; Price, 226-228.

[6] Wegner, 277.

[7] Comfort, 135.

[8] Ibid. Note also Price, 230-231.

[9] Comfort, 135-136; Wegner, 281-283; Price, 232-239; Lampe, 2:387-415; W. F. Moulton, *The History of The English Bible* (London: Charles H. Kelly, new and revised edition, c. 1900), 17-32; Frederic Fiivie Bruce, *The English Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1961), 12-23; Ewert, p. 184; and Bruce Manning Metzger, *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 57; on doubt that Wycliffe had direct part in the translation.

[10] Wegner, 284; Ewert, 184; Metzger, *The Bible In Translation*, 57-58.

[11] Wegner, 284; Bruce, *The English Bible*, 24-25.

[12] Bruce, *The English Bible*, 28-52; Comfort, 138-140; Ewert, 186-189; Jack P. Lewis, *The English Bible from KJV. to NIV* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 20-22; Metzger, *The Bible In Translation*, 58-60; Moulton, 43-94; Price, 240-251; Wegner, 284-292; S. L. Greenslade, ed., *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of The Bible.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975, repr.1980), 141-147.

[13] Bruce, *The English Bible*, 53-66. Coverdale's version had the distinction of being the first printed Bible in England. Comfort, 140; Ewert, 190-191; Greenslade, 147-153; Metzger, *The Bible in Translation*, 60-61.

[14] Bruce, *The English Bible*, 67-80; Comfort, 140-141; Ewert, 189-191; Greenslade, 147-155; Metzger, *The Bible In Translation*, 60-63; Moulton, 95-136; Price, 252-259; Wegner, 292-296.

[15] Comfort, 140-141; Wegner, 304. Henry VIII vacillated between permission for Coverdale's version in 1537 to the authorization of the Great Bible for public use in 1538, and then reversing himself by 1543, the English Parliament passing a law restricting the use of any English translation.

[16] See Charles C. Ryrie, "Calvinistic Influences in the Geneva and Bishop's Bibles," *BSac* 122:485 (January-March, 1965): 23-30. Ryrie's conclusion was that only predestination and election were "toned down" in the Bishop's Bible.

[17] Bruce, *The Bible In English*, 92, makes the statement that the Bible of Shakespeare was the Geneva Bible. While this is true, the Bible of the liturgy would be the Bishops' Bible which was utilized in the Common Book of Prayer. For an extensive treatment of the Geneva Bible see:
Bruce M. Metzger, "The Geneva Bible of 1560," Theology Today 17 (1960):339-352.

[18] Wegner, 304-305; Metzger, *The Bible In Translation*, 67-69; Moulton, 181-189. See notes 44 and 45 for modern Roman Catholic versions.

[19] The three rival traditions were the High Church Protestants, the Low Church Separatist Protestants, and the Roman Catholics. Lewis, 28, notes in addition that the last printing of Tyndale's New Testament was 1566, the

Coverdale Bible, 1553, and the Great Bible, 1569. Also there was not uniformity even about the Geneva Bible concerning various texts, Lewis, 26.
[20] Ewert, 198-203. For two works on the biographies of the men who worked on the KJV, see Alexander McClure, *The Translators Revived: Biographical Notes of the KJV Bible Translators* (Worthington, Pennsylvania: Marantha Publications, reprint); and Gustavus S. Paine, *The Men Behind the King James Version* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977).
[21] Ewert, 203. Lewis, 29-34, extensively uses sources of criticism of the KJV from its own time period. This sounds a lot like KJV criticism of modern translations! Wegner, 313. For recent constructive criticism, see Comfort, 147-160; Lewis, 35-68.
[22] Wegner, 309.
[23] Lewis, 41-42, also cited in Wegner, 311, for the textual deficiencies of the KJV. Praise of the KJV prose can be found in Comfort, 146. Ewert, 203-204.
[24] Wegner, 314. Bruce, *The English Bible*, 127-134, notes for us some private translations after the KJV to the time of the ERV. Ewert, 204-205; Wegner, 314.
[25] Greenslade, 361-371; Metzger, *The Bible In Translation*, 81-92.
[26] Ewert, 204. Comfort, 149-151.
[27] Comfort, 151-154; Wegner, 327-329. For a short synopsis of the KJV debate, see Wegner, 337-340. Extensive discussions from the eclectic Greek text position include D. A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate; A Plea for Realism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979); James R. White, *The King James Only Controversy: Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Bethany House, 1995); Roy E. Beacham and Kevin T. Bauder, *One Bible Only? Examining Exclusive Claims for the King James Bib*le (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2001).
[28] Wegner, 329-331.
[29] Ewert, 250-251, for a pretty exhaustive list of translations 1900-1982. For an extensive list of translations and paraphrases 1950-1996, see Wegner, 394-395. For evaluations of translations from 1900-1950, see Wegner, 341-355. For evaluations of translations 1950-1996, see Wegner, 357-397.
[30] Moulton, 212-242; Bruce, *The English Bible*, 135-152; Comfort, 161-162; Ewert, 206-209; Metzger, *The Bible in Translation*, 99-102; Price, 278-289.
[31] Wegner, 315-318.
[32] Wegner, 365-370; 383-386. For an early analysis of the NEB see Oswald Thompson Allis, *The New English Bible: The NEW Testament of 1961. A Comparative Study* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1963).
[33] Lewis, 69-105; Wegner, 318-320.
[34] This was the analysis of Thomas Vernon Taylor at Biblical Theological Seminary in 1977. See Metzger, *The Bible In Translation*, 103-104.
[35] Primary documentation on the RSV: Luther A. Weigle, *An Introduction to The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament* (1946); Luther A. Weigle, *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament* (1952). Secondary material on the RSV is voluminous; see Comfort, 165-170; Ewert, 226-230; Lewis, 107-128; Metzger, *The Bible In Translation*, 117-122; Wegner, 320-324 (also note his evaluations of both the Moffatt and Goodspeed translations); Wegner, 345-348, 349-351. For an early criticism of the RSV see Oswald Thompson Allis, *Revision or New Translation? Revised Version or Revised Bible?* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1948); published with Oswald Thompson Allis, *Revised Version or Revised Bible?* (1953). The first computer generated concordance was undertaken for the RSV (1957). *A New Testament Octapla* and *A Genesis Octapla* were issued by Thomas Nelson publishers, containing eight translations from Tyndale to the RSV. Millar Burrows, *Diligently Compared: The R.S.V. and K.J.V.* (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964), attempts to be an apologist for Old Testament improvements of the RSV over the KJV.
[36] Comfort, 168-170; Ewert, 229-231; Lewis, 111-128.
[37] Wegner, 332.
[38] Wegner, 331-335. Note his analysis in contrast with Metzger, *The Bible in Translation*, 155-162.
[39] Ewert, 239-240; Lewis, 165-197; Wegner, 324-327.
[40] Wegner, 379-382; Metzger, *The Bible in Translation*, 138-141; 171-174 on the New International Reader's Version of 1996.
[41] Kenneth Barker has repeatedly stated this in explaining the difference between the NASB, the NIV, and the New Living Translation.
[42] Wegner, 383, citing Dr. Robert Bratcher, *In the Word of God*, 152.
[43] I have read that there are 3,300 instances of gender neutral translation in the NRSV. See Vern S. Poythress and Wayne Grudem, *The Gender Neutral Controversy* (Nashville: Broadman and Holmon Publishers, 2000), 277. At

present only the New Testament exists for the TNIV. I have read that there are approximately 500 instances of gender neutral translation in the TNIV. If this is correct and the rate of translation is a constant, then I would guess that this fraction will be correct when the whole Bible is produced. Unfortunately I do not have access to a computer program which would tabulate the exact figures for the TNIV or the ESV of 2001.

[44] Comfort, 188-189; Ewert, 238-239; Lewis, 215-228; Wegner, 352-354. The conclusion is mine based upon a healthy perusal of the 1970 Saint Joseph Edition. See the forward to the NAB in *The Complete Parallel Bible: NRSV, REB, NAB, and New Jerusalem Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), xxxiv-xxxvi.

[45] Wegner, 375-379; conclusion mine. See *The Complete Parallel Bible*, xli, for the update on the Jerusalem Bible. No attempt has been made to discuss Jewish English translations; the interested reader may find helpful material in Wegner, 348-49, 359-361.

[46] Wegner, 375-379. Analysis is mine based on a comparison of this translation and the aforementioned translation.

[47] Comfort, 194-196. Analysis is mine again based on a comparison of these translations.

[48] Wegner, 389-396.

[49] Wegner, 386-389. Analysis is mine based on a comparison of these paraphrases. The complete *Message* was not in existence when Wegner completed his text.

[50] *Holmon Christian Standard New Testament* (Nashville, Tennessee: Holmon, 2000), page 2 of the preface.

[51] *Holmon Christian Standard Bible: Clearly the Word* (advertisement literature; Holmon, 2000).

[52] *The Holy Bible; English Standard Version* (advertisement literature; Crossway Books, 2001).

[53] This analysis is based upon random comparisons between the translations.

[54] The Holy Bible; English Standard Version (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Bibles, 2001), p. viii.

[55] This is my analysis based upon the fact that liberals will not accept a conservative translation. Liberals and ecumenicals can accept a liberal translation reworked by conservative scholars.