

# QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ENGLISH STANDARD VERSION

*Robert R. Taylor, Jr.*

I have received a number of inquiries relative to the **English Standard Version** (ESV), a twenty-first century Bible version.

I did not buy this version when it first came out in 2001 but did purchase a copy in April of 2007. I have not read all it has in the Old Testament but have read and studied closely what it has in the New Testament. With one exception, all my questions will pertain to the New Testament.

Just because it is a new version does not insure it is better than the **KJV** (King James Version) or the **ASV** (American Standard Version) — versions which have brought the church to us in our lifetime. The **NRSV** (New Revised Standard Version) is not a superior version, but flawed in many places. The **NIV** (New International Version) has “new” in its name but that does not make it superior. Brother Guy N. Woods told me in the 1970s that “as little as I think of the RSV, I prefer it over the NIV. The NIV is *shot through with error!*” His assessment is the same as mine has been for over thirty years.

In **Genesis 49:10**, why did the **ESV** (English Standard Version) change “Shiloh” in the text to “tribute” and yet injects into a footnote “until Shiloh comes?” Why put into a footnote what its translators did not allow in the text? The **KJV**, **ASV** and the **NKJV** (New King James Version) do not tamper with this text. Jacob, in this prophecy, does not have tribute or Shiloh the city in mind, but a person “and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.” “Him” refers to a person. Had it been a city under consideration it would have been an “it!” The **ESV** does not do well with **Genesis 49:10**. With my **KJV**, I do not have to deal with this

created problem. Users of the **ESV** do!

We likely would not suspect the genealogy section of **Matthew 1** to find name changes. If you have memorized the list of kings over Judah during the Divided Kingdom period of some four hundred years, do you remember including *Asaph* as son of Abijah and this same *Asaph* as father of Jehoshaphat? *Asa* fits; *Asaph* does not fit. Yet the **ESV** has *Asaph* in the text and *Asa* in the footnote. In **1 Kings 15**, they have *Asa* consistently and not *Asaph* at all. Why this name change? Truth, even with names, belongs in the text and not just the footnote.

Not content with one name change in **Matthew 1**, they have *Amos* as the son of Manasseh and *Amos* the father of Josiah. Yet this version has *Amon* in a footnote. *Amon* is used by the **ESV** in **2 Kings 22**.

*Amon* and *Asa* we know from Scripture, but who are *Asaph* and *Amos* in this lineage line of **Matthew 1**? You may be thinking, why all this ado over name changes? We do not want our names changed nor names of our ancestors changed. Names mean something and should not have tampering hands on them! Even Kenneth Taylor in **The Living Bible** (TLB) did not tamper with these names. The **NIV** has *Asa* and *Amon*. Its translators did not opt for name changes.

Like so many of its translational colleagues, the **ESV** leaves **Matthew 5:17**, **Ephesians 2:15** and **Hebrews 10:9** in translational shambles and contradictions. It has Jesus to say in **Matthew 5:17**, “I have not come to abolish them (Law and Prophets) but to fulfill them.” Yet in **Ephesians 2:15**, the **ESV** has “by abolishing the law of commandments and ordinances....” According to the **ESV**, who is right — Christ in the

Sermon on the Mount or Paul in the Ephesian epistle? In Hebrews 10:9 the ESV has, “He abolishes the first in order to establish the second.” Who is right — Christ in Matthew 5:17 or Paul in Hebrews 10:9? Christ did not come to shatter or destroy Mosaic law and make it void of fulfillment. He came to fulfill it or fill it full and then remove, annul, abolish or take it out of the way in order to establish the second — His covenant. The ESV translators were very inept in dealing with these crystal clear passages. Give me the task “any day” of exegeting these passages from the KJV and ASV rather than the more difficult job of trying to harmonize these three verses by usage of the ESV. Have its strong supporters among us overlooked these three verses? If so, why?

It is nothing short of inexcusable the way the ESV, plus so many of its predecessors, makes shambles of this trio of verses. After they finished Matthew 5:17 and arrived at Ephesians 2:15 and later to Hebrews 10:9, did it not occur to them that they had produced a contradiction between Christ and Paul? They have Christ to deny abolishing the Mosaic law (covenant) only to have Paul affirm His doing that very thing. The fault is not to be laid in Christ’s speech and Paul’s written statement for they breathe perfect harmony. The fault lies with inept and incompetent translators who fail utterly to handle aright the word of truth or divide it aright. The *old* had to be removed before the *new* could become operative. Hebrews 10:9 makes this positively plain. If Mosaic law is still in effect, as many religious leaders contend it is, and Christianity is now valid, we are under *two* lawgivers, Moses and Christ. Yet Jehovah at the transfiguration scene in Matthew 17:1ff said to hear Christ — not Moses and Christ, not Elijah and Christ. James, the Lord’s half brother in the flesh and His full brother in the faith, affirmed *one* lawgiver (James 4:12).

Children in my Sunday evening class prior to service time know that we are under

the Christian covenant, not patriarchal precepts or Mosaic mandates. There is not an iota of justification for producing a glaring contradiction among these three passages. Paul’s counsel in 2 Timothy 2:15 relative to dividing truth in a right way is lost on people like this!

### **WEAK RENDERINGS OF *PORNEIA* AND *MOICHEIA***

These Greek terms are used many times in the Greek testament. In our older versions, these are rendered *fornication* and *adultery*. Has anybody across the years had that much trouble in understanding what fornication is and what adultery is? As a teenager, I knew what these terms meant. Yet so many of our modern versions opt for *sexual immorality* instead of precisely stated renderings like fornication and adultery. A man or woman may enjoy hearing sexy stories, reading sexy stories or viewing pornography which are sexually immoral and yet due to various constraints may never commit overt fornication or adultery. The ESV favors *sexual immorality* in **Matthew 5:32; 19:9; Mark 7:21; Acts 15:20; 21:25; 1 Corinthians 5:1; 6:9; 6:13; 6:18; 7:2; 10:8; 2 Corinthians 12:21; Galatians 5:19; Ephesians 5:3,5; Colossians 3:5; Hebrews 12:16; Jude 7 and Revelation 2:20ff.** Why use a term that is not nearly as precise as are fornication and adultery? The man in 1 Corinthians 5:1 was not just reading a filthy novel or viewing images of a woman immodestly arrayed. He was committing overt fornication with his own father’s wife. We do not need to soften these atrocious and widely practiced sins with words less precise than fornication and adultery. The world does this by calling such “affairs” instead of adultery or “meaningful relations” (of the unmarried) instead of fornication.

## TAMPERING WITH MATTHEW 19:28

The ESV has “Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of Man will sit on his throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” Why is “new world” in the text and in a footnote “Greek, in the regeneration?” The 148 men who translated the KJV (47) and the ASV (101) used “regeneration,” not “new world.” The NKJV has regeneration. The RSV that came out in 1952 has “new world.” Were I a patron of premillennialism, I would be happy with the “new world” rendering and would shy away totally from versions that use regeneration. Regeneration is a synonym for the “Gospel dispensation.” In Titus 3:5, Paul speaks of the “washing of regeneration” which is the excellent equivalent of “born of water” in John 3:5. It would be interesting to know how many premillennial people worked on this translation. Religious “isms” are welcomed into many of the modern versions now extant.

Here is another matter about a word in the text and the word for it in a footnote. In **Matthew 28:19**, the ESV has, “baptizing them *in* the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (emphasis mine). The Greek word for *in* here is *eis*. The KJV and the NKJV both have *in*. In a footnote the ESV has “or into.” The ASV has *into* which is my strongly preferred rendering and the way I quote it when I give Matthew’s account of the Great Commission. Why put *in* instead of *into* “the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit?” A. T. Robertson, in his *Word Studies of Matthew 28:19*, preferred *in* and said it should not be *into*. I can understand why, as a Baptist, he opted for *in* and not *into*. The ASV has *into* and had 101 Greek scholars behind that version. Robertson and the ESV translators were not superior to these 101 in the aggregate.

The late and lamented **H. Leo Boles** was a Greek-English scholar of wide reputation among churches of Christ and many in the

denominations recognized him as such as well. He had these scholarly comments in his *Gospel Advocate Commentary On Matthew*, “The baptism is to be done ‘into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.’ The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit means the combined authority of the Godhead. To be baptized into this is to be brought by baptism into actual subjection to the combined authority of heaven. To be baptized into the name of these three brings one into covenant relationship with the Godhead. Baptism is, therefore, not only a sacred act of obedience, but it brings one into the fullness of the blessings of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit” (pp.564-565). It is my judgment that the ASV has the better and more accurate rendering here. More accurate renderings belong in the text, not just footnote status.

Here is another baptismal matter found in the early part of Mark. The ESV has in **Mark 1:4**, “proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins” (Emphasis added). The KJV has “the.” The ASV has “the.” In *Living Oracles*, published by Alexander Campbell and translated by the renowned George Campbell, James Macknight and Philip Doddridge, we have “the immersion of reformation for the remission of sins” (Mark 1:4, p.106). Why the indefinite “a” and not the much more definite “the?” In the spring of 1922, the eloquent and scholarly **N. B. Hardeman** preached his first “Tabernacle Sermons” in Nashville, TN. One of his extraordinarily great sermons was on baptism. In that sermon he quoted Mark 1:4 by stating, “John preached ‘the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins’” (Vol. I, p.208). Brother Hardeman was a grammatical scholar second to none. He knew the difference between the indefinite “a” and the definite “the.” It is true he was quoting the KJV in Mark 1:4 but it was grammatically accurate. The ESV would have done itself better on Mark 1:4 by remaining with “the” as the scholarly KJV and the highly accurate ASV had done long

before.

Change is the translational trend of modern versions.

New versions will not leave their tampering off **Mark 16:9-20**. The RSV of 1946 left out twelve verses and left untranslated more than 160 Greek words. Later, this modernistic version added them, but not before much literary damage had been done to the inestimable portion of precious Scriptures.

The ESV placed these verses from Mark 16:9 to Mark 16:20 in brackets. *Living Oracles* did not do this early in the 19th century. The KJV did not do this. The ASV of 1901 did not place these twelve verses in questionable brackets. Neither did the NKJV.

In my book, *Challenging Dangers Of Modern Versions*, I devote a full chapter in defense of Mark 16:9-20 and refuting the highhanded and irreverent treatment modernistic scholars give in assault to this chapter. In that material I have some very significant and relevant observations by the late and lamented **Thomas B. Warren**. He knew more about the Bible in general and Mark 16:9-20 in particular than all the RSV translators in the aggregate did! He knew what belonged; they did not. ESV translators come up lacking on Mark 16:9-20.

Years ago brother **Noel Merideth** and I had a discussion with a professor of Bible in one of our schools. He said to us, "I cannot be sure Mark 16:9-20 belongs in the Bible!" Both of us said, in essence, "We can be sure and are sure it belongs." The Holy Spirit and Mark were sure it belongs. Reverent Bible scholars through the centuries have been sure it belongs. The ESV came up lacking on these twelve strategic verses. Are its defenders among us pleased with what ESV translators did to Mark 16:9-20? If they are, they need some real help relative to translational matters!

**Luke 1:3-4** in the ESV poses another relevant question. Why does this version make an attack upon Luke's inspiration by

having Luke to say that he had "followed all things closely for some time in the past..." (Luke 1:3)? This is of close kin to how the RSV treated this passage and raised the ire of conservative Bible scholars in the 1940s. The KJV says he had "perfect understanding of all things from the very first..." The ASV used "accurately" here. One may follow something closely and still not possess inspired understanding and totally accurate knowledge of what he writes. Like the other seven writers of the New Testament, Luke wrote by Holy Spirit inspiration. His two books are *verbally* inspired — they are *plenary* inspired. This means far more than following matters closely. It would be of interest to know what concepts of inspiration all the ESV translators had. The NKJV has "perfect understanding."

Why is an important part of **Luke 4:4** omitted in the ESV? The KJV and the NKJV do not omit this part of Jesus' first answer to the devilish tempter.

Why is the footnote of **Luke 4:35** more accurate than what the ESV has in the beginning of this verse? "Let us alone" or "leave us alone" are preferred over the "Ha" in the ESV.

In **Luke 10:1 and 17**, why put the number 72 and not 70? They have 70 in the footnote. The KJV, the ASV, the NKJV and even the RSV in 1952 did not opt for 72. Some of these will note that some manuscripts have 72. Why not put 70 in the text and 72 in the footnote instead of doing vice versa?

In **Luke 14:5**, is Jesus talking about "a son" or an ass (donkey) "that has fallen into a well on a Sabbath day" as we have in the ESV or "an ass or an ox fallen into a pit..." as we have in the KJV? The ASV has an "ass" with a footnote that some manuscripts have "a son." Why not put the "son" in the footnote and "ass" or "donkey" in the text as the KJV or the NKJV did?

In **Luke 16:23**, why change Abraham's bosom to Abraham's side? The KJV has "bosom." The ASV has "bosom." The NKJV

has “bosom.” The NIV preferred “side.” ESV does the same.

## MONOGENES

I was not surprised in the least to see how the ESV dealt with the comprehensive and beautiful term of *monogenes*. This term, in referring to Jesus, occurs in **John 1:14,18; 3:16,18** and **1 John 4:9** — five times total. It is *only Son* in four of these passages and *only God* in John 1:18 in the ESV. The *mono* portion of the word means *only*. What does the *genes* mean? It has to mean something. The ESV translators evidently did not think it meant anything for they left it minus any and all translation. Many of the modern translations do the same such as the **RSV** (Revised Standard Version) the **NEB** (New English Bible) the **NIV** (New International Version), the **Living Bible Paraphrased**, **Reader’s Digest Bible**, etc. The KJV, the ASV, Living Oracles, the NKJV and the NASB all translate the term as “*only begotten*.”

In December of 1988, brother **Noel Merideth** and I discussed *monogenes* with brethren **Hugo McCord** and **Ralph Gilmore**. Brother Merideth and I defended “*only begotten*.” McCord and Gilmore opposed that rendering. For my preparation of that discussion, I visited a number of prestigious libraries, including the one at Oklahoma Christian College where brother McCord taught for so long. I read the works of Greek scholars before A.D. 325, after 325, Reformation leaders and Restoration greats among us. I was overwhelmed with the unanimity of hundreds of these men who called Jesus God’s *only begotten Son*. Since *only begotten* is an accurate translation of *monogenes*, the term John employed, then we have John, the Spirit that inspired him, plus the Father and Son who told the Spirit to use this term, all in favor of what our *accurate* English translations have had all along.

Some years back a native Greek from

Greece operated a restaurant in Ripley. He and I became friends and he even came to hear me preach. I asked him one day, “How should *monogenes* be translated?” Minus even a moment of hesitation he stated, “*only begotten!*” This is where ripe Greek and English scholarship has stood for twenty centuries and where reverent scholarship still stands. The ESV did itself no real honor by mutilating this marvelous and monumental word of *monogenes!*

Why do we have “God is spirit” in **John 4:24** in a small “s” and not a capital one? It is Spirit in the KJV, the ASV and the NKJV. Even the Jehovah Witness Version and Living Bible Paraphrased have it in an upper cap. The ESV in John 4:24 joins company with the RSV, the Reader’s Digest Bible and the NIV. Our readers need to be aware that translators, as a rule, translated the Greek word for Spirit or spirit with Upper Case when the term references Deity and with Lower Case when the human spirit was under consideration. God is “Spirit” should have been retained since the Greek word refers to Deity.

Why are the twelve verses in **John 7:53-8:11** placed in brackets in the ESV? Our earlier versions like Living Oracles and KJV did not place them in brackets. Neither did the NKJV. If this section does not belong in the Sacred Canon and in the exact place where we have it, we have John 7:52 ending with “no prophet” and John 8:12 having “Then spake Jesus again unto them....” Something had to go in the gap. I agree with my very warm friend, J. Noel Merideth, who said, in essence, “This section belongs in the Bible and right where we have it!”

Why is **Acts 8:37**, in our reliable Bibles, omitted in the ESV from the text and placed in a footnote? If this verse does not belong, the inquiring eunuch did not even get an answer for the question he propounded. Look how awkward it is to go from verse 36 to verse 38 in the ESV. I fault the ASV for doing the same. Luke was not an awkward penman. There is an abrupt gap, as brother

McCord once explained it, if this verse is omitted. The Holy Spirit and the inspired Luke did not resort to abrupt gaps. When I deal with the Ethiopian nobleman's conversion I never leave out verse 37. The KJV from which I have preached for more than 63 years, does not omit it. The NKJV does not leave it out. If the verse does not belong, as per the ESV, then the inquiring African did not receive a response to his deeply important query. I cannot conceive of any sincere winner of souls ignoring a vital question like this. Surely, an inspired soul winner like Philip would not have done so. The ESV comes up lacking relative to this verse.

Why, in the ESV, are **Acts 13:24** and **19:4** not in line with each other? In the former passage it has Paul at Antioch in Pisidia to say, "A baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel" while it has Paul to say at Ephesus in Acts 19:4, "John baptized with the baptism of repentance...." It is the same baptism in both passages. The KJV and the ASV consistently use the in both passages. John's baptism deserves all the definitive words that can be given it.

In **Acts 19:14** at Ephesus, why is Sceva styled "a Jewish *high* priest?" As I write this, I have a complete list of all high priests from Aaron, the first one, to Phannis, the final one in A.D. 70. Sceva is *not* on the list! During the early 1980s brother Hugo McCord produced his own New Testament translation. He asked me to be one of his consultants and critique it. When he came to Acts 19:14 he listed Sceva as high priest. I disagreed with him on this and told him why. He listened to me and rendered it "a Jewish chief priest" and not a high priest. The ASV has "a chief priest." There were many chief priests who were never high priests. The ESV did itself no credit in this rendering.

Why in **Acts 21:34,37, 22:24, 23:10,16,32** does the ESV have Paul taken into the "barracks" and not into the castle? The KJV has "castle." The ASV has "castle." I know

some of the newer translations have barracks. Why the change? Castle allows the careful student to connect castle with the tower of Antonio which was located near the temple and housed Roman soldiers appointed to keep order in the temple area. It had been repaired at great expense by Herod the Great and named in honor of his Roman friend, Marc Anthony. Castle comes much closer in connecting the place with Herod's building at the northwestern corner of the temple than "barracks." Why is there such a yen for change in the new translations when older renderings have done so well across the passing centuries? I realize that the Greek word *parembole* can be translated "barracks." But it also can be translated "encampment." Barracks or encampments can be located in tents or wide open places. Castle comes much closer in picturing where Paul was to be taken — the tower of Antonio.

In **Acts 24:24ff**, why is *convenient season* replaced with *opportunity*? The KJV has *convenient season*. The ASV has *convenient season*. The NKJV has *convenient time*. Even the NIV has *convenient*. Felix had the *opportunity* to obey the Gospel and become a Christian the very day Paul preached with power and pathos to him and Drusilla. But he did not deem it *convenient* for him to do so. J. W. McGarvey was considered to be the finest Bible scholar in his era as per the *London Times*. Brother McGarvey presented a very fine argument on this word *convenient*. He said that if a man is called upon to do something toward which he has no liking, he may say to the one requesting such, "When it is convenient I will do it," meaning if it is ever as convenient for me to do it as not to do it, then I will do it. Brother McGarvey was of strong persuasion that Felix was saying, "Paul, if it is ever as convenient out there in the future for me to become a Christian as to remain a non-Christian, then I will call or summon you." Felix did not deem it convenient that day to become righteous, practice self-control and

live in such a way that judgment day horrors did not produce terror for him. Such would have demanded he give up his beautiful, adulterous wife, his dishonesty, all bribe receptions and no more cruelties as he had practiced in the past. *Convenient season* captures this much better than *opportunity* with its absence of preciseness. Why not stay with precise renderings that the older translations did?

Here are four renderings of **Romans 10:10**. “For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” “(F)or with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” “For it is with your heart that you believe and are justified, and it is with your mouth that you confess and are saved.” “For with the heart one believes and is justified, and with the mouth one confesses and is saved.”

The first two are alike and teach truth. Neither one teaches justification at the point of belief or salvation at the point of confession. Belief and confession are *unto* or *traveling toward* a desired attainment.

The last two are very similar, each teaching that justification is reached at belief and salvation is attained at confession.

The first two are the KJV and the ASV. The last two are the NIV and the ESV. Now, which two teach truth and which two teach error? Saving truth is with the first two. Damnable error is with the last two. To be in company with the NIV is not commendable at all for the ESV people and patrons.

The ESV has one justified at faith, saved at the point of confession and yet in Romans 6:3 and Galatians 3:27 has people baptized into Christ! Just when is a person justified or saved? At belief, at confession or when hearing, faith, repentance, confession and baptism have all occurred? According to the ESV, one is justified at belief. But it has people saved at confession and an entrance into Christ is at baptism. If one is justified at faith, then he would have to become

unsaved prior to the confession in order to be saved at confession. But again, he would have to become unsaved subsequent to the confession and prior to baptism in order to be baptized into Christ. And, this is a good translation that we should begin to use? Not for me it is not!

Why in **Romans 12:1** do we have *spiritual worship* in the ESV text and *rational service* in a footnote? The KJV has *reasonable service* and the ASV has *spiritual service*. The NIV has *spiritual worship*. The *Living Oracles* of the 1800s has *reasonable service*.

Were I an advocate that “all of life is worship,” I would be happy and elated with both the NIV and ESV on Romans 12:1. I would look no further for sustaining proof.

“Service” is much broader than “worship.” I remember some years back when several of us at Sharon, Tennessee, helped a fellow member, who was seriously sick, pick his cotton crop. This was before mechanical cotton pickers. We were rendering him a service. But filling a cotton sack, weighing it and emptying it into a wagon did not constitute worship such as singing, preaching, prayer, Lord’s Supper and the contribution.

The ESV and the NIV are in the same translational bed on Romans 12:1. Neither one did credit to a great passage of Scripture.

The ESV misses the truth in **1 Corinthians 7:36-38** as much as the RSV did in 1946 and the NIV did in the late 1970s. All three of these speak of an engaged couple or the man toward his betrothed. The KJV and the ASV treat the passage correctly as a man toward his virgin daughter — not his betrothed or the one to whom he is engaged. The ESV has, “*If anyone thinks that he is not behaving properly toward his betrothed, if his passions are strong, and it has to be, let him do as he wishes: let them marry — it is no sin. But whoever is firmly established in his heart being under no necessity but having his desire under control,*

and has determined this in his heart, to keep her as his betrothed, he will do well." The NIV also depicts here an engaged couple with the man engaged and not to a father-daughter situation where the father senses it better to keep his virgin daughter and not give her in marriage.

The ASV upholds the view that we have here a father-daughter situation, not a betrothed or engaged couple. The KJV is less clear than the ASV but is of the same view, a father toward his virgin daughter. This is seen in that the father does not give his daughter in marriage. In the first century it was the father who gave his virgin daughter for marriage, not the engaged man. The engaged man is the receiver, not the giver. The KJV does not pervert this passage as some have contended. The RSV and the ESV did pervert the passage. Translators of the RSV and ESV acted as commentators on this passage, not translators.

**Williams' Translation** has the father and his virgin or single daughter in mind. The father does the deciding, not the suitor.

The ASV has virgin daughter with daughter in italics. This means daughter has been supplied. Brother Roy Deaver, a Greek scholar in every sense of that term, deals with these verses in the fourth annual Fort Worth Lectures in 1981. Brother Deaver sustains his argument for father and his virgin daughter on *gamidzo* in verse 38. He quotes Thayer as saying, "...to give a daughter in marriage" citing 1 Corinthians 7:38 as an example. He quotes Williams on this word (page 372 of his translation) saying this word is the key in understanding verses 36-38. He quotes Robinson's Lexicon saying this word means "to give in marriage...e.g. one's daughter in 1 Corinthians 7:38." Strong's Concordance on page 193 has father or guardian and his daughter in mind. He says the idea of a couple living in some sort of relationship is untenable. The father, not the suitor, makes the decision touching whether he will give his virgin daughter in marriage or keep her single. The distress of

the time, in verse 26, plays a vital part in the father's decision.

The late and lamented Guy N. Woods had no superior, and scarcely an equal, in Greek-English scholarship during the twentieth century. In his famed *Questions And Answers Open Forum* of 1976, on pages 88-89, brother Woods deals with this very passage. Here are his seasoned and deeply scholarly remarks on 1 Corinthians 7:36-38. First he quoted these verses from the ASV and adds,

"This passage thus translated, readily yields itself to analysis, and the meaning is obvious. Under consideration is a father and his unmarried daughter. The daughter has reached and has passed the age when girls ordinarily marry. If the daughter is to marry at all, it is time that consent by the father be given and the usual arrangements be made. This procedure is entirely in order and violates no rule of revelation. However, if the father (who in that day arranged for the marriage of his children) chose to keep his daughter single and at home, in view of the trials soon to come, was now (not) subject to criticism inasmuch as such a course would likely work out to the advantage of the daughter. Either course was proper, perhaps the better one, because of impending persecution and trial, would be for the daughter to remain unmarried. If the American Standard Translation is correct, (and it is-RRT) the foregoing is obviously the meaning of the passage."

McGarvey (ripest Bible scholar of his age in the late 1800s and early 1900s) and Pendleton comment on this passage as follows, "Marriages in the East were then, as now, arranged by the parents. If a parent saw fit to marry his daughter he had a

perfect right to do so, and was guilty of no sin, but if he heeded the apostle's warning as to the coming trials and kept his daughter free from alliance, he acted more wisely" (*The Standard Bible Commentary: Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians and Romans*, p.84).

The RSV and the ESV are strikingly alike on 1 Corinthians 7:36-38. Brother Woods strongly objected to the RSV on this passage and would do so today toward the ESV were he still alive. The ESV takes the ridiculous position that the suitor here, not the father, controls the woman the rest of her life. He could decide on celibacy the rest of his life and consign her, by his arbitrary will, to spinsterhood the rest of her life! Such ineptitude is inexcusable on the part of the ESV translators. Are its defenders among us ready to accept such a reckless and totally irresponsible rendering? If so, they need more help on translational matters!!

Why is "will worship" in **Colossians 2:23** of the ESV changed to "self-made religion?" Our older translations, like the KJV, The Living Oracles and the ASV, have stayed with will-worship. It is worship based on the human will and not the divine will. The NKJV opted for "self-imposed religion" and did itself no real credit in so doing. Why such a yen for change? The new Bibles overflow with such!

In **Hebrews 2:11** why have the sanctifier (the Christ) and the sanctified (Christians) as all having "one origin" instead of "all of one?" The NIV did better here than the ESV. It did not opt for origin. Neither did The Living Oracles, the KJV, the ASV and the NKJV. Here the ESV is in the same translational bed as the RSV on the "origin" rendering. Again I ask, "Why the change from a rendering that has given us no trouble through the years?"

In **Hebrews 10:9** the ESV has Christ abolishing the first covenant when in Matthew 5:17 they have Christ to say He will not abolish "the Law or the Prophets."

Do not such contradictions in their translational product bother in the least these makers of modern Bibles? Apparently not!

In **Revelation 1:4, 3:1** and **4:5** why did the ESV leave "spirits" in small caps when it is very evident the fulness and perfection of the Holy Spirit is set forth with the perfect numeral of seven? The KJV and ASV have "Spirits," not "spirits." The ESV has "Spirit" in upper caps in Revelation 1:10 and 22:17. Why not the same in Revelation 1:4; 3:1 and 4:5?

## CONCLUSION

While you have read this review, perhaps you have thought, "Why all this ado over words 'here and there?' Are the objections really that valid and weighty?" The Bible is a *word* revelation and each one is important. Jesus thought so. In Matthew 5:18, He spoke of the "jot and tittle." "Jot" or "jod" was the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet. See what it looks like right before the tenth section of Psalm 119. The "tittle" was a little bend or point to distinguish Hebrew letters. It might be illustrated with the small "c" and small "e." Note how small the little marking is. Jesus based an argument with skeptical Sadducees in Matthew on "is" and "was." God "is" the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob -- not "was." These three still lived in the spirit world. In Galatians 3:16 Paul based an argument upon "seed" (singular) as opposed to "seeds" (plural). Here, *one* letter is of vast value.

I will not be vacating the KJV or ASV for the ESV. There is nothing I need to know, believe, obey, preach and defend to please God that I cannot find in my beloved KJV and the time tested ASV. Thanks for pondering these series of articles. Many, many hours have gone into the research for these articles and the writing of them.