

13.2 REPORT OF THE STUDY DEPUTIES APPOINTED AS A RESULT OF THE PETITION OF PROTEST AGAINST THE APPROVAL OF THE (AFRIKAANS) 1983 BIBLE TRANSLATION (Artt 87, 160)

- A. Prof GJC Jordaan delivers the Report.
- B. **Besluit:** The Report is refer to Commission Bible Media and translation.
- C. Dr J Lion-Cachet reports on behalf of the Commission Bible Media and translation.

D. REPORT

1. Matters for cognisance

1.1 *Mandate and procedure*

- 1.1.1 The National Synod GKSA 2006 appointed the following persons as Study Deputies as a result of the Petition of Protest from GL Erasmus and others regarding the approval of the 1983-translation of the Bible (AT83) for use in churches: Proff GJC Jordaan (Chairperson), PP Krüger, dr AH Grové, rev BCG Fourie.
- 1.1.2 The decision of the Synod from which the mandate of the Study Deputies flows, is on page 154 of the Acta of 2006:
 - "3. Recommendations
 - 3.1 The Petition of Protest is receptive
 - 3.2 Die protest is referred to Study Deputies.
 - Motivation:** The work is extensive with many Appendices that have to be checked. It will be impossible to finalise as is by the Synod.
 - Decision: Approved."**
- 1.1.3 The Study Deputies interpreted the mandate as that the Report has to weigh the Petition of Protest with its grounds for protest, and that it has to make recommendations regarding the Petition of Protest to the Synod 2009 for decision making.
- 1.1.4 The Study Deputies completed the assignment by way of electronic media and the telephone.
- 1.1.5 Appendices that served with the Petition of Protest have been included in the study as background, as well as information from other study materials (for example the book *Skrifgesag: Manuskripte en Bybelvertaling* (2003) of Jeanette Erasmus).
- 1.1.6 For the sake of clear reporting numbers were allocated to the different grounds for protest of the Petition of Protest (with reference to the corresponding ground of protest of the Petition of Protest).

1.2 *Decisions that are protested*

- 1.2.1 The decisions that are protested, are the following:
 - 1.2.1.1 Acta 1970:301 and 302: The Synod decides that a new translation will be undertaken, which will take into account the development of Afrikaans in recent times and the results of scientific research, while it should remain as close as possible to the original text and should be a dignified translation that speaks to our nation inside and outside of the church, in services and for use in homes – *in our current situation and time*. As guideline for the translation the Synod decides that the translation should be as comprehensible as possible, also for young people, but that the original colouration should be maintained as far as possible, with emphasis on the dignity of the translation. Translation is no paraphrases (description) – that is the work of commentaries.
 - 1.2.1.2 Acta 1985:576, 4.2: *The 1933/53- and 1983-translations of the Bible into Afrikaans may be used alongside each other by the churches.*
 - 1.2.1.3 Acta 1985:593, 2.4.2, pt 1: The 1983-translation does not replace the 1933/53-translation, which is still a translation that is valid and *of equal value*.

- 1.2.1.4 Acta 1991:113, 2.1.2.5.1.3: *Within the above-mentioned principle framework (2.1.2.5.2) different translations that differ from each other in the translation aim, can be created and can exist alongside of each other (see 2.1.2.4.3).*
- 1.2.1.5 Acta 1991:128, 14: *The Petition of Protest does not provide proof of exhaustive reasons why the decision of 1985, namely "The 1933/53- and 1983-translation of the Bible can be used alongside each other by churches" (Acta 1985:576) should be annulled or revised. The Petition of Protest in its entirety does not succeed.
Decision: Approved.*
- 1.3 *Points of departure of the Petition of Protest*
- 1.3.1 The following are stated as points of departure of the Petition of Protest:
- 1.3.1.1 CO, art 30, parts of Scripture and the Confessions that form the foundation of the article, are stated as basic points of departure. Regarding CO, art 30, the emphasis is on the fact that church meetings should deal with ecclesiastical matters in an ecclesiastical manner. It is consequently argued that the 'ecclesiastical manner' implies 'in agreement with the Bible'. If a church does not comply with the procedures prescribed by the Bible, she busies herself with wilful religion contrary to CO, art 30.
- 1.3.1.2 The following Biblical 'testing principles' are stated for weighing ecclesiastical behaviour: Evaluate the spirit, whether it comes from God (1 John 4:1); the fruits must be tested by the tree, and the tree by the fruit (Matt 7:16-21; 12:33-37); witness/testimony should be trustworthy (Ex 20:16; Deut 17:6; Matt 18:16; Ruth 4:11; Prov 24:28; Acts 1:22, 10:41; 1 Tim 6:12; John 5:16-47, 8:16,17).
- 1.3.1.3 Bible translation is ecclesiastical work (Acta 1991:111 and 112, 2.1.2.4 & 5) and may therefore only be done guided by Scripture itself.
- 1.3.2 **Finding:** Above-mentioned matters are not grounds for protest, but merely a statement of the points of departure on which the Petition of Protest rests.

Decision: Points 1.1.1 to 1.3.2 noted.

2. Matters for adjudication

The grounds for protest of the Petition of Protest (PP) are presented in three categories: a formal ground for protest (point 3 of PP), principle ground for protest (4.1-4.7 of PP) and a few more practical protests (4.8-4.11 of PP).

2.1 *Formal ground for protest*

The Petition of Protest states the following formal protest (Acta 2006:135, 3) – Ground for protest 1: "The NAT (New Afrikaans Translation) does not meet the requirements of the mandate"

2.1.1 **First motivation for the ground for protest** (Acta 2006:135, 3.1)

The First motivation is summarised as follows: The 1983-translation of the Bible (AT83) does not meet the requirements of the translation mandate and the translation policy set by the National Synod of 1970, namely that the translation should be as close to the original text as possible, that the original correlative should be maintained as far as possible and that there should not be paraphrases (description) (Acta 1970:302, 3).

2.1.1.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

- 2.1.1.1.1 "Trueness to the original text" does not only mean that the *manner of expression* of the original text should be relayed as closely as possible in the translation, but also the *meaning*. Due to the differences between the source language and the target language, it is impossible to create a translation that consistently does justice to both the original manner of expression and the meaning. Sometimes the original manner of expression can be conserved without the translation becoming incomprehensible in the target language; sometimes the translation has to move away from the original manner of expression for the sake of comprehension. Translations that are too focussed on the conservation of the original manner of expression result in an incomprehensible "interlinear" transcription. Translations that are too focussed on comprehensibility in the target language result in paraphrases. With the AT33/53 the focus was on the conservation of the manner of expression of the source language, but not to such an extent that the translation became a transcription. With the AT83

the focus was on the comprehensibility in the target language, but not to such a degree that it became paraphrases. The 1970 Synod decision, on which this Petition of Protest is based, should be understood within this context ("translation is no paraphrases (description) – that is the function of commentaries" [Acta 1970:302, 3]). The Synod did not pronounce upon a translation that is more focussed on comprehension (than the AT33/53). What the Synod did do, is to warn against the planned translation becoming paraphrases. The Petition of Protest thus does not understand the 1970 Synod decision (Acta 1970:302, 3) within its full context.

2.1.1.1.2 Consequent Synod decisions referred to in the Petition of Protest should also be understood within the above described context. After the appearance of the first test translation the 1976, Synod warned that the translation tends to be too free in places, moves too far away from the original text's own manner of expression and even tends towards paraphrasing too much (Acta 1976:563, 3.2). The Synod especially warned against de-imaging and depoetisation with the translation of the Psalms and other poetic sections (Acta 1979:414-418; 1982:643-644; 1985:572). However, the Synods decided from the outset that the intended translation, different from the AT33/53, will focus on the comprehensibility of the text in the target language according to the D-E-translation method. The Synod of 1982 consequently decided that "the two translations (the dynamic equivalent translation and the translation of 1933) should not be regarded as absolute alternatives, but that the unique nature, and therefore the unique value and sphere of use of each should be recognised" (Acta 1982:643, 3.2.2.1; also see Acta 1985:575-576, 2.3.2). In as far as the AT83 stayed within the boundaries of the D-E-translation method without becoming paraphrasing, it met the requirements of the translation mandate of the National Synods.

2.1.1.2 **Finding:** The First motivation of the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.1.2 **Second motivation for the ground for protest**

"The decision in favour of a formal-corresponding translation at the National Synod 1991, is proof that the NAT did not meet the requirements of the mandate of 1970 ... The decision of the Bible Society of South Africa (PPA) against a formal-corresponding translation (*Die Beeld*, 12 April 2002; *Die Kerkblad*, 16 June 2002) also shows that conduct is not according to Synod decisions" (Acta 2006:135, 3.1.2).

2.1.2.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.1.2.1.1 At no stage did the National Synod of 1991 or any of the subsequent Synods state as reason for a new formal-corresponding translation that "the NAT did not adhere to the mandate of 1970." In fact, the motivation for the Petition of Protest based on which the decision of 1991 was taken, was exactly that such a new translation should be considered an alternative for the revision of the AT33/53 (Acta 1991:131-133). The allegation in the Petition of Protest that this decision was taken "after it has become clear that the original mandate has not been met" therefore also has no grounds.

2.1.2.1.2 The news reports to which the Petition of Protest refers according to which the Bible Society decided against a formal-corresponding translation in 2002, were misleading. At that stage the Bible Society was still in the process of weighing the request from the GKSA Deputies and asking the cooperation of other churches. In fact, after the investigation the PPA accepted the advice of the Church Advisory Committee (on which the GKSA has representation) on 23 April 2004 and agreed to launch a source language focussed translation of the Bible in Afrikaans. A "Source language focussed" translation and a "formal-corresponding" translation is in essence the same thing (see the Point of Description based on which the 1991 Synod's decisions were taken, Acta 1991:132). The deduction in the Petition of Protest that the PPA decided against a formal-corresponding translation is therefore unfounded.

2.1.2.2 **Finding:** The Second motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.1.3 Third motivation for the ground for protest

Neither the AT83 nor its final editing adhered to the requirement repeatedly stated by the National Synods that the Names of God in the OT should be translated distinctively (Acta 1982:642, 2.2.5.6; Acta 1985:582; Acta 1991:110, 2.1.9.1.1.3; p114, par 2; Acta 1994:122 & 123, 2.1.2; p124, art 2.1.2, Acta 2006:135, 3.2).

2.1.3.1 Argumentation of the motivation

2.1.3.1.1 The protesters' statement that the (translation and revision commission of the) AT83 did not adhere to this request of the GKSA is correct. Therefore the Names of God (*JHWH* and *Adonai*) are not rendered distinctively in the revised edition of the Translation either.

2.1.3.1.2 Although this state of affairs is regrettable, the Synods of the GKSA did not state such distinctive translation as an absolute prerequisite for the use of the AT83. The GKSA's decision about this did not go any further than to "seriously request from the Bible Society that a distinctive use of the God names *JHWH* and *Adonai* should apply in Bible translations", and that the Deputies should "discuss (this matter with the PPA) and evaluate it with a view to existing and eventual future translation" and that "the Synod deems it preferable that the formulation should be such that the *reader and hearer* can identify the distinction" (Acta 1991:114, 2.1–2.3). The fact that the PPA has decided to indicate the names separately as "LORD/Lord" in the source text oriented Afrikaans translation that is currently being launched, shows that they did take the request seriously. The decision to leave the names unchanged in the AT83 is lamentable, but does not serve as a disqualification of the Translation in its entirety.

2.1.3.2 **Finding:** The Third motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.1.4 Fourth motivation for the ground for protest

The protesters indicate that although the Synod initially decided that the Greek text of the United Bible Societies (UPP-text) will be used (Acta 1970:304), the 1979 Synod decided that "no given text other than the best should be used and that the TR should also be considered" (Acta 1979:439 ao). Their protest is that in actual fact the UPP-text was used as the original text for the AT83 almost throughout (Acta 2006:135, 3.3).

2.1.4.1 Argumentation of the motivation

2.1.4.1.1 The 1979 decision surely meant well, but unfortunately it was not very specific. It for instance gives the mandate that the "best text" should be used, but seemingly leaves it to the translators to decide which text is the best. It furthermore gives the mandate that the "TR should also be considered" without specifying to what degree it should be considered. Therefore it is difficult to use the decision as ground for protest.

2.1.4.1.2 Given the lack of clarity of the 1979 decision it should be granted that the 1983-translators used the original text that they deemed best according to their own judgement. That was the UPP-text. In addition, they did not follow the UPP-text sheepishly, but included readings of the TR into the translations in a few places, for instance the conclusion of Mark (Mark 16:9-20) and the section on the adulterous woman (John 7:53-8:11). It can rightly be said that the AT83 translators used the text that was the best according to their judgement, and that they did not leave the TR out. The protesters in all probability have a different view from the 1983-translators on which text is best, but can not protest the translators' choice based on any Synod decision.

2.1.4.2 **Finding:** The Fourth motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

Recommendation: The Synod decides that the protest can not succeed on Ground for protest 1, since the motivations are insufficient.

Decision: Points 2.1 to 2.1.4.2 noted.

2.2 Principle ground for protest

2.2.1 Ground for protest 2.1: Unscriptural translation policy

The protest is that the AT83 rests on an unscriptural translation policy.

Four motivations are offered for the ground for protest.

2.2.1.1 **First motivation** (Acta 2006:136, 4.1.1)

2.2.1.1.1 **Arguments for the motivation**

The First ground for protest is motivated with the argument that in the AT83 “the unity of the Bible in the Old Testament and New Testament is neglected, contrary to amongst others 2 Timothy 3:16”. For this motivation it is argued that the AT83 is guilty of “demessiahansing” in the Old Testament. In the motivation there is reference to Synod decisions and statements in publications such as the *Bybel in Praktyk*.

2.2.1.1.2 **Argumentation**

The argument that the AT83 is guilty of “demessiahansing”, is not supported by proven examples from the AT83, but is founded on statements made in other publications such as the *Bybel in Praktyk* for instance, that Old-Testament references to Christ are not inherent to the OT, but rests on interpretations of the NT. However, the PP does not successfully indicate why such statements should also be layed at the door of the AT83.

2.2.1.1.3 **Finding:** The First motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.2.1.2 **Second motivation** (Acta 2006:137, 4.1.2)

2.2.1.2.1 **Arguments for the motivation**

The First ground for protest is further motivated with the allegation that also the Godliness of Christ is mainly “hidden, changed, disregarded or translated away” in the AT83 (Acta 2006:137, 4.1.2). In motivation of this the protesters discuss extended text-critical information with regard to Isaiah 9:5-6; Romans 9:5, 1 Timothy 3:16, Judas 4 and Romans 14:10 in Appendix B (which serves as motivation for the Second ground for protest).

2.2.1.2.2 **Argumentation** of the matters argued in Appendix B

2.2.1.2.2.1 In Appendix B of the PP Isaiah 9:5-6, Romans 9:5, 1 Timothy 3:16, Judas :4 and Romans 14:1 are offered as examples where the Godliness of Christ is endangered in the AT83. However, the protesters do not indicate anywhere that the AT83 itself has “hidden, changed, disregarded or translated away” the Godliness of Christ in any of the mentioned places. What they do show, is that the translation can in some places be *interpreted* in such a way that the Godliness of Christ is endangered.

2.2.1.2.2.2 Based on text-critical information the PP argues that the AT83 follows a reading in which it is withheld that Christ is God in 1 Timothy 3:16. However, the protesters do not pay attention to the context of the entire Christ hymn of which verse 16 forms part. If verse 16 is viewed in its entirety, it also speaks clearly in the reading followed in the AT83 of the Godliness and Messianity of Christ (see Ridderbos, H 1976. Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament. De Pastorale Brieve. p.106-108).

2.2.1.3 **Finding:** The Second motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.2.1.4 **Third motivation** (Acta 2006:137, 4.1.3)

2.2.1.4.1 **Arguments for the motivation**

The First ground for protest is thirdly motivated with: “In practice the translators depart from the point of view that the Messianic statements of the Old Testament are in reality New Testament interpretations and can therefore not be translated Messianically.” Appendix C is the protesters’ motivation for last-mentioned statement.

2.2.1.4.2 **Argumentation** of the matters argued in Appendix C

The Deputies come to the following Findings with regard to the information and arguments made in Appendix C:

2.2.1.4.2.1 With regard to Genesis 21:12, Galatians 3:16 and Genesis 3:15 (Seed, posterity, descendent): According to Louw and Nida (1, 1989:33,116) the Greek word *sperma*, usually has the meaning of *seed* where it refers to plants. However, when used in relation to humans, it can have the meaning of *posterity* and *descendent* – specifically from an ancestor. To translate *sperma*

in Afrikaans as *nasaat* (posterity) or with *nakomeling* (descendent) as in the AT33/53 (Gen 21:12) and in the AT83, is merely good Afrikaans. The protesters' argument that such a translation rests on the point of view that "Messianic statements of the Old Testament are in reality New Testament interpretations and can therefore not be translated Messianically", is therefore not valid.

- 2.2.1.4.2.2 With regard to the translation and possibilities of meaning of *'almâ* in Isaiah 7:14: The standard dictionary of Koehler and Baumgartner (KBL³, 709) explains *'almâ* merely as a nubile girl or young woman before the birth of her first child. From the context of Isaiah 7 there is nothing that indicates that it speaks exclusively of the birth of the Messiah from a virgin, or that the reference is to a woman in the time of Isaiah who has not yet had intercourse with a man. In fact, the child who will be born will still be young when the countries of kings Peka and Resin will be deserted (Isa 7:16). However, other references to *'almâ* in the Old Testament can all refer to unmarried women. The translation of *'almâ* is an old translation problem with which translators have been struggling for centuries, without necessarily wanting to demessianise or deny the virgin birth of Christ. The fact that Isaiah 7:14 is used in relation to the virgin birth in the New Testament, can be explained as a double fulfilment of a prophecy which had a closer fulfilment in Isaiah's own time. The translation of *'almâ* in Isaiah 7:14 with *young girl* does not as such undermine the Messianity or the virgin birth of Christ.
- 2.2.1.4.2.3 With regard to the "omission" of "first born" (son) in Matthew 1:25: The reading followed by the AT83 ("her Son", without "first born"), does not at all imply that Jesus was *not* Mary's first born Son. In fact, in Luke 2:7 the AT83 expressly calls Jesus the Firstborn Son of Mary. The protesters' allegation that the AT83 rests on a denial of the Messianity of Christ, can therefore not be proven by the "omission" of "first born" in Matthew 1:25.
- 2.2.1.4.2.4 With regard to Luke 2:33: Where the AT33/53 rests on an original text that refers to "Joseph and his mother", AT83 rests on an original text that refers to "his father and mother". The protesters suspect that an Egyptian heresy led to the reading "Joseph and his mother" being changed in some manuscripts to "his father and his mother". This is a suspicion that can not be proven. On the other hand the compilers of the UPP (the original text of the AT83) suspect that fear of a mistaken understanding of "his father and mother" led to it being changed to "Joseph and his mother" in some manuscripts. This suspicion can not be proven either. What is striking is that in Luke 2:41 Joseph and Mary are referred to as "his parents", without it leading to any text critical issue. It therefore seems that the reference to Joseph and Mary as Jesus' parents (his father and mother) in itself does not endanger Jesus' virgin birth and/or his Godliness (see Greijdanus S, Kort Verklaring van die Heilige Schrift).
- 2.2.1.4.2.5 With regard to Isaiah 53:4-11, ao: The protesters are of the opinion that to use capital letters with He or Him, as well as translating Jahwe (JHWH) with LORD, brings the Messianity of Christ in Isaiah 53 to the fore. It is indeed preferable to translate the God names JHWH and Adonai distinctively, as previous Synods have shown repetitively. However, the fact of the matter is that the NT does not translate these names distinctively itself. Neither the Hebrew nor Aramaic of the OT, nor the Greek of the NT uses capital letters for pronouns to distinguish between people and God. With translation into Afrikaans (or any modern translation) the translator should ascertain whether reference is to God (Father, Son and/or Holy Spirit) when he chooses to use a capital or small letter for pronouns. When a capital letter is used, the translation shows that a certain part (prophecy) *exclusively* refers to God, and closer fulfilments are effectively excluded. On the other hand the protesters feel that the non-use of a capital letter endangers the Messianity of Christ. The

preceding explanation clearly shows that this is not the purpose, but that the convention in Afrikaans to use either a small letter or a capital letter with pronouns, places translators before a dilemma. The protesters' argument is therefore invalid.

- 2.2.1.4.2.6 With regard to Psalm 22:17: The translation and explanation of the word *kā^arî* in Psalm 22:17 is a translation problem (*crux interpretum*). Ridderbos, J (1955, De Psalmen, 1, Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament, 192-193) indicates that *kā^arî* can either be translated with "tied" or with "pierced", but that the use of "pierced" in Psalm 22:17 offers a translation with "geen zeer natuurlijke verklaring". On the one hand Koehler and Baumgartner (KBL³:454) indicate that this highly unusual verb vorm and "stem" only appears in the Bible once and gave as its only meaning, derived from Arabic, as "tied" (*zusammenbinden*). On the other hand, some modern Bible translations such as the NIV and NKJV use *pierced* as translation. The AT33/53 translates it as "deurgrawe". The translation "pierced" makes the fulfilment of this statement at Jesus' crucifixion more apparent, but one can not justly claim that a translation with "tied" has the purpose to "make the Word a lie". The comments of the protesters regarding Zachariah 12:10b and 13:6 are on the same level and does not affect the Messianity of Christ. The protesters therefore do not prove with any of their examples that the Messianic character of the OT is disregarded in the AT83.
- 2.2.1.4.2.7 The AT83's "omission" of the quote from Psalm 22:19 in Matthew 27:35 rests on the original text that was used (UPP-text). The original text that includes the quote (the TR, which was followed for the AT33/53) only differs in one way, namely making mention of an apparent matter. Even without the inclusion the context of Psalm 22:17 is pretty obvious. Therefore the protesters do not prove in this case that either the AT83 or the original text disregards the Messianic character of the OT.
- 2.2.1.4.2.8 The reference of the protesters to Isaiah 53:9, 19 and Psalm 16:10 do not elucidate the matter of the Messianity of Christ, and is therefore irrelevant with regard to the Petition of Protest.
- 2.2.1.4.2.9 With regard to Psalm 2:7 the same argumentation is valid as has been followed above in point 2.2.1.4.2.5.
- 2.2.1.4.2.10 With regard to Acts 13:32-34 and Hebrews 1:5 and the translation of the word *gennaō*: According to Louw and Nida (1, 1989:257) a valid version of the word is *to be the father of* – as it is indeed used by the AT83. The argument of the protesters therefore has no validity. The translation in the AT83 does not affect the Messianity of Christ negatively.
- 2.2.1.4.2.11 With regard to Acts 8:37: The UPP-text that was used as original text for the AT83 had good reason to skip this verse. The verse is only seen in 7 Greek manuscripts of rather late date and apart from that only appears in old Latin translations. Text critically spoken, it is therefore almost a fact that verse 37 was not part of the original text. There is no reason to question the reading followed by the AT83.
- 2.2.1.4.2.12 With regard to John 6:69: The fact that the AT83 uses the words "Holy one of God" instead of "Son of God" rests on the original text (UPP-text). There was good reason for the compilers of the UPP-text to suspect that the words "Son of God" was taken over by copiers from the other gospels and added into the Gospel according to John. However, this does not remove or disregard Jesus as Son of God in the NT or in the John-Gospel, since there are many other places in the John-Gospel where Jesus, also in the AT83, is called Son of God (for example John 3:18, 35, 36; 10:36; 20:31).
- 2.2.1.4.2.13 With regard to John 9:35: For the same reasons as with John 6:69 the compilers of the UPP-text followed the reading "Son of Man" in John 9:35 instead of the reading "Son of God". Yet 9:35 differs from the previously

mentioned in the sense that there is no parallel part in the other Gospels. Jesus furthermore probably refers back to 9:35 in John 10:36 where He says: "You say 'you speak blasphemy', because I have said: 'I am the Son of God'". Therefore there is good reason to keep the reading "Son of God" in John 9:35. On the other hand the title "Son of man" is such an unmistakable Messianic title that its use can hardly be seen as a demessianising or ever a disregard of the Godliness of Christ. Also consider the many other places in the John-Gospel where Jesus is still indicated as Son of God in the AT83 (see 2.2.1.3.2.12 above). It seems that the protesters do not have grounds for their protest with this example.

- 2.2.1.4.2.14 With regard to die word *monogenê* in John 1:18: The protesters are of the opinion that it is erroneous to translate this word in John 1:18 with "only Son" (referring to Christ). In Luke 7:12, 8:42 and 9:38 this word is also used to refer to the only son/daughter of parents. The protesters' argument is therefore invalid and the AT83 uses a valid version of the word *monogenê*.
- 2.2.1.4.2.15 With regard to Psalm 45:7, 8: The protesters' problem is that the word Elohim (^e*lōhîm*) which normally indicates God, is translated here with "elevated being". Ridderbos, J (1958, *De Psalmen, 2, Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament*, p31-40) argues a strong case that the word ^e*lōhîm* in this Psalm is used to describe the king, since Psalm 45 is not merely prophetic, but also has direct relevance with regard to the king's marriage. Therefore the AT83 relates the word with "elevated being". It is not strange that a human is sometimes indicated with the word ^e*lōhîm* (see Ridderbos, J 1958:39). Such a use of the word is similar to the tradition (in modern languages) to use the same word (*Heer, Lord, Herr, Morena*) that is used to indicate God, to show respect and honour to a dignitary. The protesters do not take into account that a word (such as ^e*lōhîm* in this case) can not and should not be translated similarly everywhere in the Bible. In fact, the word ^e*lōhîm*, which usually refers to God in the Bible, is used in some other places in the Bible to refer to "gods" (idols). This protest therefore falls away.
- 2.2.1.4.2.16 With regard to Psalm 110: As indicated in the Petition of Protest, the AT83 version of Psalm 110 does not do justice to the Messianic character of the Psalm (also see the decisions of Synod 2006 regarding Psalm 110). In this regard the protesters are correct. Psalm 110 is an example of a rather unfortunate translation in the AT83. However, every translation contains examples of less fortunate translations. Such examples do not render the entire translation false or unmessianic, as the protesters argue. Although the protesters rightly indicate that the AT83 does not translate Psalm 110 Messianically, they do not prove with that that the entire AT83 departs from the point of view "that Messianic statements in the OT are in reality NT interpretations".
- 2.2.1.4.2.17 With regard to Isaiah 4:2 and Jeremiah 33:15: In these texts the argument is once again about the use of small/capital letters with the use of fountain/Fountain to indicate its Messianic reference. Once again it should be said that even though such a distinction in translation is preferable, neither the Hebrew OT nor the Greek NT made such a distinction. It can therefore not be claimed that the Messianic prophesies are disregarded.
- 2.2.1.4.2.18 With regard to Jeremiah 23:6 and 33:16: The same evaluation that the protesters give regarding the AT83 can be given regarding the AT33/53. In the translation "the Lord our justice" the "our" strongly comes to the fore, so that it can be said that man is not left out of consideration in the AT33/53. In Appendix C the protesters write themselves: "JHWH tree vir ons in." (Underlining by the Deputies). The Messianity of Christ is therefore not underemphasised in the AT83.

- 2.2.1.4.2.19 The protesters' discussion of Isaiah 57:15 and Luke 7:23 does not serve as support for the above-mentioned motivation for the First ground for protest, and is therefore not relevant to the Petition of Protest.
- 2.2.1.4.2.20 The protesters are of the opinion that it is invalid to relate the word *mā^asû* in Psalm 118:22 with "rejected" in the AT83. In Matthew 21:42 – which is clearly a play on Psalm 118:22 – the word *apedokimasan* is also translated with "rejected" in the AT83. The relation between the OT and the NT is therefore not contaminated by the translation in any way. According to Kittel (Abridged, 181) another possibility for the meaning of the word *apedokimasan* is "to test". And according to Grosheide (Mattheüs, 327) Psalm 118 refers to the building of a temple. The builders test the stones and if the stone was not suitable for the work (and was therefore rejected), it was thrown to the side. It does seem that the word – in Hebrew and Greek – has the meaning of testing (test, *afkeur* if it does not pass the test) and with that then necessarily *reject*. The AT83 therefore gave a valid translation of the word *mā^asû* in Psalm 118:22. In addition, the protesters do not indicate how the translation "afgekeur" in the AT83 endangers the Messianity of Christ.
- 2.2.1.4.2.21 In the discussion of Matthew 16:18 there is no reference to the AT83. This discussion is therefore irrelevant to the protest.
- 2.2.1.4.2.22 The protesters quote Luke 6:48 incompletely in their Petition of Protest as if the entire matter of *rock* and *foundation* has not been considered in the AT83 at all. In the AT83 the complete Luke 6:48 is as follows: "Hy is soos 'n man wat by die bou van sy huis die grond diep uitgegrawe en die **fondament** op die **rotsbodem** gelê het. Toe daar 'n oorstroming kom en die vloedwater die huis tref, kon dit hom nie beweeg nie, want die huis was goed gebou." In the AT83 the matter of the rock and foundation is therefore included, although it is not *repeated* as in the AT33/53. This is so because the UPP-text does not contain this repetition. The claim in the Petition of Protest that the foundation and the rock on which the house is built, is left out in the AT83, therefore falls away. For this reason also this example is not valid as motivation for the Petition of Protest.
- 2.2.1.4.2.23 With regard to the *corner stone* (AT33/53) or *most important stone* (AT83) (*kefalên gōnian*) in Matthew 21:42 and its parallels: In the old Eastern cultres the corner stone as we know it was not known. Commentaries and dictionaries therefore indicate that the *kefalên gōnian* at that time referred to a stone with an important function in the structure of the building (see Louw and Nida 1, 1989:88: "the most important stone' or ' the very important stone"). The AT83 therefore relates the words *kefalên gōnian* validly in Matthew 21:42. That the retention of "corner stone" in Ephesians 2:20 by the AT83 can possibly be improved, is true. However, the protesters do not indicate persuasively that this alternative translation endangers any aspect of Christ's Messianity.
- 2.2.1.5 **Finding:** The Third motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.
- 2.2.1.6 **Fourth motivation** (Acta 2006:137, 4.1.4)
- 2.2.1.6.1 **Arguments for the motivation**
The Fourth motivation for the First ground for protest is the following: "Covenant terms are the baby that has to disappear with the bath water of 'theological-technical, traditional-church concepts'". Appendix D forms part of the protesters' motivation for last-mentioned statement.
- 2.2.1.6.2 **Argumentation** for the matters argued in Appendix D
- 2.2.1.6.2.1 Paragraph 4.1 of Appendix D indicates certain words in the AT83 ("geseënd" instead of "salig", "ontvang" instead of "beërwe", "wat reg is" instead of "geregtigheid") which contains a dilution of meaning in the opinion of the protesters. There can definitely be differences in opinion about how well the involved words relate the original words. However, the protesters fail to indicate that the AT83 lets covenant concepts "disappear" with that.

- 2.2.1.6.2.2 Paragraph 4.2 of Appendix D does indicate how the word “blood” in the AT33/53 is indicated with other words in some places in the AT83. However, the protesters do not succeed in indicating *that* and *how* the covenant content is raped (according to them) in the AT83. Their argument does therefore not serve as motivation for the First ground for protest.
- 2.2.1.6.2.3 In Paragraph 4.3 of Appendix D the protesters claim that the word *echaristhê* in Phillipians 1:29 is translated wrong by the AT83 as “given privilege” because the element of *grace* is taken out of it. Although *charis* is often translated with *grace* (in a soteriological sense), and the word *charizomai* has the same origin as *charis*, this does not necessarily mean that *charizomai* also always has to have a soteriological meaning. Compare here for instance the use of *charizomai* in Acts 3:14. The question is whether *echaristhê* in Phillipians 1:29 should be used in a soteriological sense. Phillipians 1:29 is something of a *crux interpretum*. It is given to you (passive of *charizomai*) by God not only to *believe*, but also to *suffer* – all for the sake of Christ: to believe in Christ and to suffer for Christ. *Charizomai* does not have the same/equal meaning with regard to believing and suffering. When *charizomai* is used with *believe*, it has *soteriological* meaning, and when it is used with *suffer*, it has ordinary *practical* meaning (as for example in Acts 3:14). *Believing* is a crucial factor for ones sanctity, but not *suffering*. The AT33/53 rendered *charizomai*'s *soteriological* meaning, and the AT83 its *practical* meaning. The view of the protesters therefore does not support the First ground for protest nie. (For a more elaborate explanation of this matter, see Matter, M.M. 1965. Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament. De Brief aan de Philippenzen en de Brief aan Philémon.)
- 2.2.1.6.2.4 With reference to Jeremiah 4:4, Deuteronomy 10:16 and 30:6 the protesters are of the opinion that the AT83 translated covenant terms away by translating the verb form *mwł* with “sanctify” instead of with “circumcise” as in the AT33/53. Specifically these texts do not refer to physical circumcision, but to a spiritual circumcision – the circumcision of the heart. The circumcision of the heart means to live in devotion to God (For a more elaborate discussion of this see Smick, E.B. 1981. Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, Vol. 1. p.494-495.). Although there can be differences in opinion about the how preferable it is to translate the verb *mwł* in the parts of Scripture as “wy” in an explanatory manner, in other words to explain the metaphor, it seems that such a translation is a valid version of *mwł*. For this reason the arguments of the protesters do not serve as support for the First ground for protest.
- 2.2.1.6.2.5 At Paragraph 4.5 of Appendix D: The protesters are of the opinion that the AT83 errs when it relates the expression “face of the LORD” (AT33/53) in different texts without including the word “face”. The protesters see the phrase “face of the LORD” as typical covenant terminology. Of course it is covenant terminology and it is preferably retained in language or origin oriented translations. However, what the protesters loose sight of is the fact that the covenant can within the context also be introduced with other terminology. Furthermore, the protesters neglect to indicate how the AT83 translates the covenant away with the use of alternative translations of covenant terminology. For this reason the protesters' arguments do not serve as support for the First ground for protest.
- 2.2.1.6.2.6 In Paragraph 4.6 of Appendix D: The protesters are of the opinion that the AT83 errs by translating the word “holy” (AT33/53) (*qādōsj* in Hebrew) with different words in the translation. They do not take into account that the word can have more than one meaning and that more than one word can relate the same concept. Therefore a translation can, according to the context, often use different words to relay the same concept. The protesters are correct when they say the use of different translations makes text-to-text-comparison difficult.

However, one should keep in mind that the AT83, different from the AT33/53, is not really meant for text-to-text-comparison, but rather to communicate in an easy Afrikaans. The demand that the protesters therefore make is unfair, since such a demand is rather valid for more concordant translations such as the AT33/53. This argument therefore does not support the First ground for protest.

2.2.1.7 **Finding:** The Fourth motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

Decision: Points 2.2 to 2.2.1.7 noted.

2.2.1.8 **Finding with regard to Ground for protest 2.1**

The motivations for Ground for protest 2.1 do not offer enough grounds for protest for the protest to succeed.

Decision: Noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed based on Ground for protest 2.1, since the motivation for it is insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.2.2 **Ground for protest 2.2: The D-E-translation methodis principally unscriptural**

Two motivations are provided for this ground for protest.

2.2.2.1 **First motivation** (Acta 2006:137, 4.2.1)

In order to motivate the Second ground for protest, namely “The D-E-translation method is principally unbiblical/unscriptural”, the following statement is made: “There is no Scriptural foundation for the translation of the Bible other than the concordants.”

2.2.2.1.1 **Argumentation of the matters argued for the motivation**

2.2.2.1.1.1 This Ground for protest departs from the view that a translation method is fixed in the Bible – in other words the Bible gives principle guidelines for translations. However, Scripture does not prescribe any translation principles. On the contrary, in the Greek NT the OT is often quoted from different translations – sometimes these translations are more literal and sometimes more free. An example of this is the quote of Isaiah 6:9 in Matthew 13:14 and Acts 28:27 (reasonably concordant) and John 12:40 (very free). [Isaiah 6:9 (AT33/53) reads: “Maak die hart van hierdie volk vet en maak hulle ore swaar en bestryk hulle oë sodat hulle nie sien met hulle oë nie.” In Matthew 13:14 and Acts 28:27 the verse is quoted as follows (AT33/53): “Die hart van hierdie volk het stomp geword en met hulle ore het hulle beswaarlik gehoor en hulle oë het hulle toegesluit, sodat hulle nie miskien met die oë sou sien nie.” In John 12:40 the quotation is as follows (AT33/53): “Hy het hulle oë verblind en hulle hart verhard, sodat hulle nie met die oë sien nie.”] There are thus no grounds to claim that the Bible only prescribes concordant translations.

2.2.2.1.1.2 This Ground for protest excludes any other translation method as valid. It does not take into account that there is a wide spectrum of translation methods between the extremes of the translation methods that appear in the NT itself. The D-E-translation method on which the AT83 rests, falls more or less in the middle, as well as does the original text oriented translation method on which the AT33/53 rests for the greatest part.

2.2.2.1.1.3 In their argumentation of this matter the protesters play off *comprehensibility* and *trustworthiness* against each other. This is a false paradox. *Comprehensibility* and *trustworthiness* do not have to be one at the cost of the other. Often the trustworthiness lies in the fact that the translation relates the meaning of the original text accurately. On the other hand a translation can often be rather literal and at the same time clearly understandable in the target language.

2.2.2.1.1.4 The Petition of Protest contains certain generalizations that disempower the argumentation. The D-E-translation method and paraphrasing is often placed on the same level, while the D-E-method actually places itself opposite paraphrasing. In recent times several translations have been published that

rather has the character of paraphrasing and which is markedly different from the AT83. Furthermore, the point of departure is that the AT33/53 is consistently a concordant translation, without taking into account that there are very few translations that are really concordant. (Young's Literal Translation is an attempt). There are translations that are more strongly orientated towards the text of origin than other translations. The place that the D-E-translation method, the concordant translation method and the original text orientated translation method each takes on the spectrum of translation methods are therefore not taken into account adequately. As a result the arguments for this point of motivation are devoid of any strength.

2.2.2.2 **Finding:** The First motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.2.2.3 **Second motivation** (Acta 2006:137, 4.2.2)

The Second motivation which the protesters provide for Ground for protest 2.2, is that “the points of departure of the D-E-method is unscriptural”. With that they mean that this translation method goes against the Bible. As motivation for this they offer paragraphs 4.2.2.1 – 4.2.2.9 of the Petition of Protest (Acta 2006:138-141).

2.2.2.3.1 The protesters state: “One basic point of departure/practice of the D-E-method is that the original text is analysed and interpreted and the interpretation is then given in the target language.” (Acta 2006:138, 4.2.2.1) Appendix E serves as explanation of this point.

2.2.2.3.2 **Argumentation of the matters argued in point 4.2.2.1 of the protest**

2.2.2.3.2.1 The protesters claim that the D-E-translation method can lead to “free translation, de-imaging, loss of correlate, depoetisation, but especially to one-sided explanation”. They furthermore claim that the AT83 “weakens, dissolves, or changes” some concepts. The translation method at the basis of the AT83 indeed, as was indicated in point 5 of Appendix E, shifted from the dynamic-equivalent to the functional-equivalent approach. However, it is not correct to equate the D-E or F-E-methods to paraphrases or shock translation.

2.2.2.3.2.2 In 5.1 of Appendix E there are protests regarding the following points of departure of the D-E-method: That ideas rather than words are translated; that simple language and style is a goal; that it should be understandable for non-Christians; that “church” terminology should be avoided; that the formulation should fit into the target language’s culture. However, the protesters do not take the following into account:

(a) That most of the above-mentioned principles have to be applied to a greater or lesser extent with *all* translations, also more concordant translations such as the AT33/53 (In Philippians 1:18, for instance, a literal transference from the Greek would be: "Because what? Except that in every way ... " The AT33/53 was forced to adjust it for the sake of understandable Afrikaans to: "But what does it do? In any case, in different ways..."). The protest is therefore in essence only against the degree to which the points of departure were applied in practice.

(b) That in the NT translations of the OT are quoted that are sometimes even freer than what the D-E-method determines (see 2.3.1.1.1 above). It thus seems that protests against the points of departure of the D-E-method do not rest on principle grounds but are rather the result of a one-sided insistence on concordant translation.

2.2.2.3.2.3 Matters related to the covenant and the Covenant Name of God that are touched upon in point 5.1.4 of Appendix, have already been discussed in point 2.2.1.3.2.5 above.

2.2.2.3.2.4 In Appendix E (5.2.1) the protesters claim that certain words have been omitted with the AT83 translation of Romans 1:17. However, the protesters do not take into account that the phrase “from faith to faith” (AT33/53) is a Greek idiomatic expression that in Afrikaans carries the meaning of "from beginning to end through faith" or “singly because they believe” (AT83). To replace idiomatic

expressions in the original text with Afrikaans, is exactly the point of departure of the AT83 and therefore the translation can not be shoved to the side for this reason (see 2.3.2.1.1.2 above). The criticism of the protesters is therefore ungrounded.

- 2.2.2.3.2.5 In Appendix E (5.2.1) there is reference Romans 7:5, Galatians 5:16,17 and Jeremiah 23:6. The protest against the AT83's version of these texts is that it does not honour the amount of words in the original text, but rather adds or omits words. However, the ideal of equal amounts of words is not attainable in any translation (see 2.2.2.3.2.2(a) above). The important question with a D-E-Translation is not whether the same amount of words has been maintained, but whether the meaning of the words has been maintained. However, this question is not investigated in the Petition of Protest. The protesters' argumentation with regard to these Scriptural passages is therefore not persuasive.
- 2.2.2.3.2.6 In Appendix E (5.2.2) it is claimed that the AT83 supports the Roman doctrine. However, what they do not take into account, is that supporters of the Roman doctrine and other heresies also call on concordant translations such as the AT33/53. Each heretic has its proof. Each translation should be judged based on what it claims to be, not on how heretics use it.
- 2.2.2.3.2.7 **Finding:** The motivation in Acta 2006:138, 4.2.2.1 is insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.3 **Argumentation of the matters argued in** point 4.2.2.2 of the protest
- 2.2.2.3.3.1 The protesters state: "The D-E-translation method departs from the point of view that interpretation may, that it has a right, for interpretation to differ" (Acta 2006:138, 4.2.2.2).
- 2.2.2.3.3.2 The protesters justly make the statement that "there is a difference between interpretation as humble bow before the Word and the Holy Spirit to find the meaning in exegesis, and the search for meaning through interpretation." However, they neglect to argue the necessity of interpretation in the process of hermeneusis with the aim of the application of the Bible. They furthermore do not indicate how and where the AT83 makes the transition from explanation to interpretation.
- 2.2.2.3.3.3 **Finding:** The arguments in Acta 2006:138, 4.2.2.2 are insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.4 **Argumentation of the matters argued in** point 4.2.2.3 of the protest
- 2.2.2.3.4.1 The protesters state: "The D-E-method confuses inspiration with translation" (Acta 2006:138, 4.2.2.3).
- 2.2.2.3.4.2 The protesters do quote 1 Peter 1:21 to indicate the so-called mistake of the AT83, but they do not indicate where and how the AT83 errs by confusing inspiration and translation.
- 2.2.2.3.4.3 **Finding:** The arguments in Acta 2006:138, 4.2.2.3 are insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.5 **Argumentation of the matters argued in** point 4.2.2.4 of the protest
- 2.2.2.3.5.1 The protesters state: "The D-E-method departs from the point of view that the Bible is a mere human text that can be analysed like any other text and so denies the supernatural origin and essence of the Bible" (Acta 2006:138, 4.2.2.4).
- 2.2.2.3.5.2 In the discussion of this point 4.2.2.4 the protesters indeed do make valid claims. 2 Peter 2:19-21 and 2 Timothy 3:16 is quoted, which deals with the inspiration of Scripture. Yet the protesters do not prove that the D-E-method sees the Bible as a mere human text.
- 2.2.2.3.5.3 **Finding:** The argument for the motivation in Acta 2006:138, 4.2.2.4 are insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.6 **Argumentation of the matters argued in** point 4.2.2.5 of the protest
- 2.2.2.3.6.1 The protesters state: "The D-E-method confuses spiritual enlightenment with natural understanding" (Acta 2006:140, 4.2.2.5) and founds the statement in a

statement of Van der Maas that the D-E-method denies the difference between inspiration and enlightenment, "so that what the theologian says today has the same authority than something that the Bible said earlier".

- 2.2.2.3.6.2 What is left out of consideration is that all Bible translation is human work. Therefore no translation of the Bible can ever claim perfection. Each translation of the Bible remains testable to the text as it was written in the original languages. Matters concerning the motivation stated above are discussed in 4.2.2.5. However, the protesters do not indicate how the AT83 claims more than other translations that the work of theologians carries the same authority as the Bible in the original text.
- 2.2.2.3.6.3 **Finding:** The arguments for the motivation in Acta 2006:140, 4.2.2.5 are insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.7 **Argumentation of the matters argued** in point 4.2.2.6 of the protest
- 2.2.2.3.7.1 The protesters state: "The D-E-method underwrites ... the basic point of departure of the communication science." (Acta 2006:140, 4.2.2.6). Appendix F should be read with this.
- 2.2.2.3.7.2 That God reveals Himself to people of all times clearly and understandably in His Word, is without doubt. Therefore Bible translators should take care that their translation is also clear and understandable for all people. The protesters do not take into account that clarity and comprehensibility of translation can be reached in different ways, as is clearly proven by the different translations of the OT in the NT (see 2.3.1.1.1 above). The D-E-method tries to reach clarity and understandability of translation in a special way.
- 2.2.2.3.7.3 In point 4.2.2.6 and in Appendix F the protesters make the claim that for the D-E-translator "it is not God who speaks, but the author becomes a Bible writer who writes from his own limiting language and background about God to people with their own limiting language and background". The view of Scripture that the protesters indicate here should indeed be rejected. However, the protesters provide no evidence that this view of Scripture is inherent to the D-E-method.
- 2.2.2.3.7.4 **Finding:** The arguments for the motivation in Acta 2006:140, 4.2.2.6 are insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.8 **Argumentation of the matters argued** in point 4.2.2.7 of the protest
- 2.2.2.3.8.1 The protesters state: "(It) is the expressed goal of the modern translations science with the D-E-method as banner, to evoke the same reaction from the hearer/reader in the target language as with the original hearer" (Acta 2006:140, 4.2.2.7). The protesters furthermore make the statement: "It is clear that in the target language method the translator wants to take over the work of the Holy Spirit..."
- 2.2.2.3.8.2 With reference to Acts 2:13 and 37, Jeremiah 36:21-23 and Mark 15:13 the protesters discuss in a valid manner the divergent reaction/effect that the Word of God can have on hearers. In their discussion the protesters admit that each text (also in translation) causes a certain effect with readers (the first readers and also later readers). This is not only valid for the AT83 but also for the AT33/53. However, the protesters do not explain why the AT33/53 in their opinion has the right effect and the AT83 does not.
- 2.2.2.3.8.3 That a "reaction/shock"-translation does not suit the Bible, speaks for itself. However, the protesters do not indicate where and how the AT83 is guilty of sacrificing trustworthiness for the sake of effect.
- 2.2.2.3.8.4 **Finding:** The arguments for the motivation in Acta 2006:140, 4.2.2.7 are insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.9 **Argumentation of the matters argued** in point 4.2.2.8 of the protest
- 2.2.2.3.9.1 The protesters state: "The D-E-method attempts the impossible. They (D-E-method) claim that the exact meaning of the original text is given while they in reality allow large adaptations to the language and culture into which is translated" (Acta 2006:141, 4.2.2.8).

- 2.2.2.3.9.2 This remark of the protesters is a a certain sense true for all translations of the Bible. No translation can claim to give the exact meaning of the original text. The AT33/53's goal to keep to the original text word-by-word as far as possible sometimes causes a loss of meaning. The AT83 strives to establish a better transference of the meaning by making certain adjustments with regard to language and culture. Even with the adjustments it is impossible to always give the precise meaning of the original in translation. In this regard translation is always an attempt to do the impossible. Yet this fact may not leave translators hopeless or bring their work to a halt. The protesters do not prove in any way why the AT83 is specifically unacceptable on this point.
- 2.2.2.3.9.3 **Finding:** The arguments for the in Acta 2006:140, 4.2.2.8 are insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.10 **Argumentation of the matters argued** in point 4.2.2.9 of the protest
- 2.2.2.3.10.1 The protesters state: "The D-E-method ignores the prohibition on addition and omission from God's Word (Rev 22:18-19; Prov 30:5-6; Jer 26:2; Deut 4:2; Eze 3:10-11)" (Acta 2006:141, 4.2.2.9).
- 2.2.2.3.10.2 The examples that the protesters mention (also in Appendix D), include parts of Scripture where a certain word in the Greek is translated with different words in different translations, such as justice (AT33/53) and acquittal (AT83); fury (AT33/53) and punishment (AT83). However, they do not indicate or argue how these examples are related to the matter of addition or omission. The impression is created that the protesters feel that something from the AT33/53 has been left out or added.
- 2.2.2.3.10.3 **Finding:** The arguments for the motivation in Acta 2006:140, 4.2.2.9 are insufficient to let the Second protest succeed.
- 2.2.2.3.11 **Finding with regard to Ground for protest 2.2 in its entirety**
The motivations for Ground for protest 2.2 do not offer enough grounds for the protest to succeed.

Decision: Points 2.2.2 to 2.2.2.3.11 noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed based on Ground for protest 2.2, since the motivation for it is insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.2.3 **Ground for protest 2.3: The D-E-translation method, Eugene Nida, and most of his followers, are not in favour of the Reformed Confessions and view of Scripture**

2.2.3.1 **Motivation for the Third Ground for protest**

The protesters argue that the D-E method was founded by a heretic. "God will not give us HIS TRUTH through a heretic" (Acta 2006:141, 4.3; with reference to Appendices E and O).

2.2.3.2 **Argumentation of the motivation**

- 2.2.3.2.1 In reaction to the statement: "God will not give us HIS TRUTH through a heretic" one can state that in Numbers 23 and 24 four praise songs to God's honour saw the light through the godless Bileam. God used Bileam as his instrument to praise Him. Similarly, God prophesied from the mouth of Kajafas that Jesus would die for the people (John 11:51). Therefore one can rightly ask: Could God not also use Nida?
- 2.2.3.2.2 Appendix E does not indicate that the ground for protest, namely that Nida is claimed to be a heretic, makes the AT83 an invalid translation.
- 2.2.3.2.3 In Appendix O the protesters provide a description of the work and views of Nida (four times). From this it is clear the Nida certainly has doubtful views on Scripture and the authority of Scripture, and also the reconciliatory death of Christ. However, saying all kinds of things about the persons involved with the translation method or work does not prove that the AT83 is as such of no use for the church.

- 2.2.3.2.4 The protesters furthermore indicate that certain views of Nida influenced the way in which he formulated certain points of departure of the D-E-method. The implication of the argument seems to be that these views found entrance into the AT83 via the D-E-method. However, the protesters do not indicate where and how this comes to the fore in the AT83.
- 2.2.3.2.5 Although the mentioned view of Nida should be rejected, and although certain aspects of the D-E-method are certainly less acceptable, the translation work of the AT83 was still done by Christians from reformed background. In addition, the official statement of the 1983-translators was that they did not follow the D-E-method sheepishly. Therefore the burden is still on the protesters to indicate the alleged doctrinal impurity in the end product of the AT83.

2.2.3.3 **Finding with regard to Ground for protest 2.3**

The motivations for Ground for protest 2.3 do not offer sufficient ground for the protest to succeed.

Decision: Points 2.2.3 to 2.2.3.3 noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest cannot succeed on Ground for protest 1, since the motivation is insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.2.4 **Ground for protest 2.4: The original text used for the NT of the AT83 is an untrustworthy witness**

2.2.4.1 **First motivation for the ground for protest**

Based on the preamble of the AT83 and a comparison of the AT83 with the Good News Bibles, the deduction is made that the translators used the UPP³ as original text for the NT because they saw the UPP-text as the best edition of the Greek New Testament.

2.2.4.1.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

- 2.2.4.1.1.1 The deduction that the UPP³-edition was used as original text for the AT83 is correct.
- 2.2.4.1.1.2 To deduce from this that the translators saw the UPP-edition as the best printed version of the Greek New Testament is not necessarily correct. As proof of this, the 1933-translators followed the Textus Receptus in their translation for practical reasons even though most of them were not convinced that it was the best printed text (see JD du Toit in *Die Kerkblad* of 19 July 1940:7).
- 2.2.4.1.1.3 The question of whether the translators themselves regard the UPP-text as the best edition is not important for this ground for protest, but rather the question of whether the UPP-text is indeed the best edition of the Greek New Testament. This matter is addressed in 4.4.2 ao.

2.2.4.1.2 **Finding**

The First motivation can only be taken note of, since it in fact only states a factual situation with which the rest of the ground for protest is concerned, namely that the UPP³-edition was the original text for the AT83.

2.2.4.2 **Second motivation**

It is claimed that the text of the UPP is compiled from largely untrustworthy manuscripts, especially codices **Alef**, **B**, **A**, **C** and **D** (a so-called Western text) which is valued as the oldest and most trustworthy. The following arguments regarding the untrustworthiness of these manuscripts are explained in 4.4.2 of the Petition of Protest (backed by Appendix G):

2.2.4.2.1 **First argument for the motivation**

Measured according to the Biblical requirements of trustworthy witnesses/testimony the several differences between codexes **Alef**, **B**, **A**, **C** and **D** indicate that they are untrustworthy witnesses. Although **Alef** and **B** are very old manuscripts, this doesn't make them trustworthy, since several differences intrinsically disqualifies these two manuscripts as trustworthy witnesses according to the norms that God lies down

(with reference to par 2.2.3 of the Petition of Protest) (see Petition of Protest 4.2.2 (a), (c), (d), (g) and (h)).

2.2.4.2.1.1 **Argumentation**

- (a) The point of departure in paragraph 2.2.3 of the Petition of Protest is that according to the Bible “the essential characteristic of majority (two or more) witness/testimony is that it should be in agreement to be trustworthy.” However, with this the clear intention of Deuteronomy 19:15 (Matt 18:16 also places) is turned around. The Bible does not teach that the agreement of witnesses proves that their **testimony** is trustworthy, but rather that agreement of (trustworthy) witnesses proves that the case is fixed and certain. Two or more lying witnesses can be in agreement, but that doesn’t make their testimony trustworthy.
- (b) A Second faulty deduction is that testimony is only trustworthy if it agrees **word for word**. Trustworthy witnesses’ testimony does not have to (and should actually not) agree word for word. An excellent example of this is the synoptic parts of the Bible (especially the Synoptic Gospels) of which the testimony is completely in agreement, but which definitely do not agree word for word. Therefore the argument that several (word and formulation) differences between certain New Testament manuscripts prove that they are untrustworthy, is unfounded.
- (c) The statement that the age of codices **Alef** and **B** (and other old manuscripts) do not make them trustworthy as such is correct. However, it seems from the testimony of the compilers of the UPP-text (see BM Metzger’s *Textual commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 1971) that they considered not only the age of the manuscripts with the consideration of the readings, but also transcriptional and intrinsic considerations.
- (d) The theory mentioned in 4.2.2(h), namely that the same scriptor partially wrote on **Alef** and **B** (and that the two manuscripts still differ so much from each other) offers no persuasive argument for the untrustworthiness of both the manuscripts. The differences can merely be attributed to the fact that with copying of the manuscripts two different archetypes were used. Be that as it may, these statements rest on mere speculation, even if diverging scholars such as Tischendorf and Burgon agree on it.

2.2.4.2.1.2 **Findings** with regard to the argumentation

The arguments offered in 4.4.2(a), (c), (d), (g) and (h) of the Petition of Protest, offer no valid grounds for protest.

2.2.4.2.2 **Second argument for the motivation**

In the Petition of Protest it is argued that codices **Alef** and **B** was poorly edited and contains several repetitions, omission, spelling mistakes and corrections that disqualify it as trustworthy testimony (see 4.4.2(b) and (i)). Numbers and examples of the omissions, repetitions, spelling mistakes and corrections are provided in 4.4.2 (c), (d), (e), (f) and (h), and in Appendix G of the Petition of Protest. In 4.4.2 (e) it is claimed that **Alef** and **B** “together leave out 4000 words, add 2000, displace 3500 and alter 2000.”

2.2.4.2.2.1 **Argumentation**

The sources quoted as the Petition of Protest’s (Burgon, Hoskier, Grady and Green) point of departure and measurement for omission, addition, corrections, etc, is the Majority text, as it has become established in the Textus Receptus. If another text is taken, for instance the Alexandrian text, one could come to the conclusion that it is the *Majority text* that omits, adds, corrects, etc (as the Westcott & Hort school indeed concludes). The point is: With more than 5000 manuscripts of the Greek NT at hand, which all differ from each other to a greater or a lesser extent, it is humanly impossible to determine without a doubt which readings are additions and which are omissions, which are the original readings and which readings are the result of “corrections”. It is exactly this inability of man

that makes Text criticism as a science necessary in order to make motivated decisions. Because the manuscripts differ from each other, it is necessary for text compilers to choose amongst the different readings in a motivated manner. Of course their choices will depend on own preferences, preferences that sprout from their own persuasions, theories and arguments. Exactly because it rests on own persuasions, theories and arguments, each choice should be made with great humility. It is so that some text critics give preference to readings from the Alexandrian tradition for certain reasons, while others again give preference to the Majority Tradition for their own reasons. Of course each text critic sees his tradition of preference as norm and sees readings that do not agree with that as faulty. In the process one should guard against canonising personal preferences. This is valid for the supporters of the Alexandrian text and for the supporters of the Majority text.

The involved sections of the Petition of Protest therefore does not succeed in showing that the UPP-text is faulty, but only that the UPP-text deviates from the text tradition that the protesters prefer, namely the Majority text.

2.2.4.2.2.2 **Findings with regard to the argument**

The arguments offered in 4.4.2 (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the Petition of Protest, offer no valid motivation for the ground for protest.

2.2.4.2.3 **The Third argument for the motivation**

The protesters claim that the UPP-text's basis-manuscripts, codices **Alef** and **B**, come from a small geographic area and enjoyed no recognition in the Church for almost 1500 years (4.4.2 (j)).

2.2.4.2.3.1 **Argumentation**

It is so that the so-called Alexandrian manuscripts come from a reasonable small geographic area (the region of Alexandria). The (size of the) area as such, however, is not a disqualification. The fact that these manuscripts come from the region of Alexandria, probably offers an explanation for the fact that it "enjoyed no recognition in the Church for almost 1500 years". For the more or less 1500 years before the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament saw the light, the Greek New Testament was used mainly in the Greek speaking world (in other words in the Greek Orthodox Church) and copied permanently. For the Greek-Orthodox Church Greek manuscripts from other parts of the world were probably unknown. The result was that such unknown manuscripts also received no recognition from them (in other words that these manuscripts were not studied or copied by them).

As such the small geographic area from which the manuscripts come and the fact that it received no recognition in the Greek speaking churches during the time of the hand-written delivery, can not serve as proof of their untrustworthiness.

2.2.4.2.3.2 **Findings with regard to the argument**

The argument provided in 4.4.2 (j) of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid motivation for the ground for protest.

2.2.4.2.4 **Fourth argument for the motivation**

The fourth argument as motivation for the protest against the UPP-text is that the codices **Alef** and **B** "was known to Desiderius Erasmus, Beza, Stefanus and also the Reformers such as Calvin, but was not regarded" (4.4.2(k)).

2.2.4.2.4.1 **Argumentation**

(a) This argument rests on a doubtful interpretation of the run of events in the 16th century. It does not take into account that in the 16th century there was no science according to which manuscripts were weighed against each other. When Erasmus compiled the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament, he used the manuscripts available in Basel (where he did the compilation). He afterwards admitted himself that he did not weigh the manuscripts against each other. For him the most important matter was to print a text that at least appeared in one Greek manuscript. Obviously the

manuscripts on which he could lay his hands immediately were from late Byzantine origin, in other words coming from the Greek speaking world of that time. His choice therefore did not rest on a high regard for certain documents, but only on the practical circumstance in which he found himself. Although Erasmus saw other manuscripts later on as well, there was no science based on which he could give preference to “better manuscripts”.

- (b) The Greek New Testament that was used by the Reformers was that of Erasmus, or basic reprints of his edition. This was due to practical reasons: Erasmus’ text was the only available printed text and, due to a lack of text critical considerations, there was no reason why they should question it.
- (c) The current text critical issues did not exist in Erasmus and the other Reformers’ times. Although they knew some variant readings and compared them with each other, they did not weigh the manuscripts against each other. At the time the matters that they considered to be issues (for example the so-called *Comma Johanneum* in 1 John 5:17) the big question was merely if the reading appeared in any Greek manuscript. However, the trustworthiness of these manuscripts was not questioned at all. In fact, in the 16th century the trustworthiness of manuscripts was not (yet) an issue. So, to claim that Erasmus and the Reformers did not have any regard for **Alef** and **B** comes down to an anachronism.

2.3.3.2.4.2 **Finding with regard to the argument**

The argument provided in 4.4.2(k) of the Petition of Protest, offers no persuasive motivation for the ground for protest.

2.2.4.2.5 **The Fifth argument as motivation**

The Fifth argument is that **Alef** and **B** “represents a family of more or less 50 manuscripts, compared to an overwhelming amount of more than 5000 in the so-called Ecclesiastical Text (also called Majority text, Bizantine text), of which the Textus Receptus is a compiled original text. These Majority text manuscripts occur over a very wide geographical area and date from the 4th to the 12th century. Yet they differ very little from each other and therefore testifies of detailed transcription and trustworthiness as witness – and of God’s faithful conservation” (see 4.4.2(l) of the Petition of Protest).

2.2.4.2.5.1 **Argumentation**

- (a) The view that the majority of manuscripts contain the original text, comes from the so-called Majority theory. Although this view indeed has merit, it rests – just like the Westcott & Hort view – only on theory. Readings that occur in the majority manuscripts, are not necessary more trustworthy. The genealogical study of manuscripts shows persuasively that copies should rather be weighed than counted. The trustworthiness of a manuscript depends on the trustworthiness of its archetype (example manuscript) and not of the amount of copies that has been made of that archetype. The fact that there are today more than 5000 copies belonging to the Byzantine text family, does not necessarily indicate superiority, but can probably be ascribed to the fact that the Greek speaking churches of the 4th to the 12th centuries only knew and copied Greek texts in its Byzantine form. Greek manuscripts that were outside of the Greek speaking world were obviously copied less. That explains why there are so few texts from other text families today. The majority manuscripts are therefore not necessarily more trustworthy than the others.
- (b) The fact that the Byzantine manuscripts from the 4th to the 12th century differ from each other relatively little indeed indicates detailed transcription, and that is definitely part of God’s faithful conservation. Once again it has to be kept in mind that the trustworthiness of manuscripts depends on the trustworthiness of its archetype, and not merely on the accuracy with which it has been copied. If the archetype for argument’s sake contained ten faulty

readings, accurate copying in following manuscripts would only have the consequence that ten faults remained conserved. That does not say that the manuscripts of the New Testament are full of mistakes. More will be said about this later. At this stage it is only shown that accurate copying does not necessarily serve as guarantee for trustworthiness.

- (c) For this reason the great amount of Byzantine manuscripts and the great degree of congruence between them do not necessarily prove that they are more trustworthy than manuscripts from other text families.

2.2.4.2.5.2 **Finding with regard to the argument**

The argument provided in 4.4.2(l) of the Petition of Protest in support of the motivation for the protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.4.2.6 **The sixth argument for the motivation**

In the Petition of Protest it is argued that variant readings were rather on purpose than by accident (Petition of Protest 4.4.2(m)), with the suggestion that the great amount of variant readings in **Alef** and **B** (and other related manuscripts) were the result of purposeful changes (in 4.4.2(o) illustrated by differences in the Lord's Prayer text of Luke 11:2-4). Furthermore, the "purposeful changes" are attributed to the heretics Marcion and Origenes in emulation of Burgon (see 4.4.2(n) of the Petition of Protest).

2.2.4.2.6.1 **Argumentation**

- (a) Changes in manuscripts indeed sometimes occurred by accident and sometimes on purpose. However, it is very difficult to establish without a doubt which changes occurred by accident and which on purpose. Most of the considerations only bring us to probabilities. However, this state of affairs offers no proof with regard to the trustworthiness of any manuscript.
- (b) The list of differences in the Lord's Prayer text at **Alef**, **B**, **A**, **C** and **D** can not in itself serve as proof of untrustworthiness (see the argumentation at 4.4.2(l) above).
- (c) The differences are of such a nature that it does not change the essence of the prayer in any way – just as little as the differences between the Matthew version and the Luke version change the essence of the Prayer.
- (d) In about half of the examples named in 4.4.2(o) of the Petition of Protest, one or more of the manuscripts follow the Matthew version of the Lord's Prayer. Such changes are probably due to conscious or unconscious harmonising with the wording of Matthew. How such changes can be attributed to Marcion as falsifications is difficult to understand and is not argued in the Petition of Protest or its Appendix.

2.2.4.2.6.2 **Finding with regard to the argument**

The arguments offered in 4.4.2(m), (n) and (o) in support of the motivation of the ground for protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.4.2.7 **Finding with regard to the Second motivation**

The Second motivation of the Ground for protest 2.4 is insufficient to let the protest succeed.

2.2.4.3 **Third motivation**

As Third motivation for the claim that the New Testament original text of the AT83 was untrustworthy, 4.4.3 of the Petition of Protest argues that the compilers of the UPP's choices of text were highly subjective. As argument for this it is indicated that the UPP-compilers changed their text choices in several places between the different revised editions of the text. Furthermore, the fact that the UPP³ and the N-A²⁶ in actual fact became the new Textus Receptus of the Greek NT is protested.

2.2.4.3.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.2.4.3.1.1 In the first place it should be mentioned that all compilers' text choices are subjective since all texts rest on the compilers' own theories and preferences.

2.2.4.3.1.2 It is not unusual for compilers to change their opinion between different editions. The purpose of a revised edition is amongst other things to bring changes based

on new insights. Therefore the fact of changes in the different revised editions can not in itself be held against the UPP-text.

2.2.4.3.1.3 The protest against the fact that the UPP³ and the N-A²⁶-editions became the new standard text of the Greek NT is valid. These editions do rest on theories that often stand on loose screws and can therefore not be the standard for all text editions. However, the fact that the UPP-text is wrongly lifted to standard text by some scholars does not mean that it may never be chosen as original text for translations. Therefore it can not serve and motivation for the ground for protest against the UPP-text as original text for the AT83.

2.2.4.3.2 **Finding with regard to the Third motivation**

The motivation of the protest provided in 4.4.3 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.4.4 **Fourth motivation**

As Fourth motivation for the ground for protest it is claimed that the UPP-compilers' choice of manuscripts rested on the "doubtful criteria" of Westcott and Hort, "who in turn built on predecessors such as Tischendorf, Lachmann and others. Their theory on the origin and family history of the manuscripts could never be verified and it is clear that their results have been fabricated." "By enough theologians following their theory, it reached the status of science" (see 4.4.4 of the Petition of Protest).

2.2.4.4.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.2.4.4.1.1 The Petition of Protest has merit in the sense that Westcott and Hort's theory on the origin and the family history of the manuscripts could not be verified. However, this is true of every other theory on the origin and history of the manuscripts, also those of supporters of the Majority text. As historical science Text Criticism can hardly get any further than theories and assumptions. In itself this argument can therefore not serve as motivation of the ground of protest.

2.2.4.4.1.2 It is indeed so that the discovery of papyrus manuscripts in the 20th century showed that Westcott and Hort's reconstruction of the family history of manuscripts left much to do. However, up to now there has not yet been a better verifiable theory in the Text Criticism. This also goes for the Majority theories.

2.2.4.4.1.3 The protesters are also right when they say that theologians wrongfully give the status of science to Westcott and Hort's theories. This misplaced status should indeed be fought in Text Criticism and in Theology as a whole. This also goes for any other current theory to which such status should be attributed.

2.2.4.4.1.4 However, in themselves these protests can not serve as reason why the UPP-text should not be used as original text for the AT83.

2.2.4.4.2 **Finding with regard to the motivation**

The motivation of the ground for protest offered in 4.4.4 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.4.5 **Fifth motivation**

The Fifth motivation for the protest against the use of the UPP-text as NT original text of the AT83 is that those in favour of the Alexandrian manuscripts, such as Westcott and Hort, were scripture critical and with that also occultist, Mary-worshippers and supporters of the heretic Origenes. The argument is that we can not "praise as good and accept the fruits of such trees and their 'scientific' methods" (see 4.4.5 of the Petition of Protest).

2.2.4.5.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.2.4.5.1.1 This motivation contains the problem that it is in truth *ad hominem* (aimed at persons) and not *ad rem* (aimed at the issue). It helps very little to criticise the tree if it is not indicated where the bad patches on the fruits are. The important question is: Where do Westcott and Hort's alleged occultism, Mary-worship and support of Origenes find expression in the Greek texts that they published? This question is not answered sufficiently in the Petition of Protest or its Appendices. At the end of Appendix L (point 20) it is merely said: "The W&H-GNT places man

instead of God in the middle.” Unfortunately this statement is not supported by W&H’s Greek NT itself.

2.2.4.5.1.2 It is not clear whether the Petition of Protest means that the translators of the AT83 “praised as good and accepted” Westcott and Hort’s methods. If so, it should be indicated that one does not necessarily underwrite the methods of the compilers by using a certain text edition (see in this regard the remarks in 2.2.3.2). Therefore also this per-implication-claim offers no motivation for the ground for protest.

2.2.4.5.2 **Finding with regard to the motivation**

The motivation of the ground for protest offered in 4.4.5 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest for the claim that the original text of the AT83 was untrustworthy.

2.2.4.6 **Sixth motivation**

The sixth motivation for the protest against the UPP-text as NT original text of the AT83 is that the compilers of the UPP² and UPP³ are scripture critically inclined, are not in favour of the Reformed view of Scripture, includes Roman Catholic scholars and do not have great reverence for the Word of God (see 4.4.6 and Appendix M of the Petition of Protest).

2.2.4.6.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

Once again the *ad hominem* (aimed at persons) instead of *ad rem* (on the issue). Once again the Petition of Protest fails to indicate where and how the alleged Scripture criticism of the compilers influenced the text that they published.

2.2.4.7 **Finding with regard to the motivation**

Also this motivation of the ground for protest offers no valid grounds for the claim that the original text of the AT83 was untrustworthy.

2.2.4.8 **Finding with regard to Ground for protest 2.4 in its entirety**

The motivations for Ground for protest 2.4 do not offer enough grounds for protest to succeed.

Decision: Points 2.2.4 to 2.2.4.8 noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed based on Ground for protest 2.4, since the motivation is insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.2.5 **Ground for protest 2.5: The words: "in our current situation and time" is an unbiblical point of departure and contrary to the Confession in Belgic Confession, art 7**

Five motivations are offered for this ground of protest.

2.2.5.1 **First motivation** (Acta 2006:146, 4.5.1)

The First motivation for why the words “in our current situation and time” are unbiblical and contrary to the Belgic Confession, art 7 is that it leaves room for the so-called situation ethics. It leaves the impression that our current situation and time determines or influences the content of the Word of God in its original text or in translation. It leaves the impression that the Word of God is time-bound.

2.2.5.1.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.2.5.1.1.1 This motivation does not clearly distinguish between time-directed and time-limited. A time-directed translation aims to speak “in” a certain situation and time, amongst other things through the use of the target language. The Synod rightly used the words “in our current situation and time”. A time-limited translation wants to suit the Word to the spirit of the time. If the Synod said “for our current situation and time” their decision would have been open to misunderstanding. This motivation therefore offers not proof that the Synod was in favour of a time-limited translation in their decision.

2.2.5.1.1.2 The Synod itself gives a closer explanation of the words “in our current situation and time” with the continuance of the decision: “As guideline for the translation, it should be as understandable as possible, also for young people, but the

original correlate should be maintained as far as possible...” . With that the Synod makes it very clear that “in our current situation and time” rather refers to the understandability than the message. The original “correlate” should be maintained, which means the original colour, way of speaking, use of imagery and formal compilation should be given in the target language as far as possible. If this goes for the “correlate” it goes so much more for the content, the message. On last-mentioned the Synod says in its decision: “Translation is no paraphrases (description)...” With that the Synod clearly shows that the aim with the translation is not at all to dilute the message in the target language, or to harm it. The Synod does not leave any room for such an interpretation of its decision.

2.2.5.1.2 **Finding**

The motivation of the ground for protest offered in 4.5.1 of the Petition of Protest, does not offer any valid ground for protest.

2.2.5.2 **Second motivation** (Acta 2006:146, 4.5.2)

The Second motivation for the claim that the words “in our current situation and time” are contrary to Belgic Confession art 7, is that the “current situation and time” did have an influence on the translation. In other words: the AT83 has been influenced so much by time-bound thought frameworks and theories that it has become a tendentious translation and therefore a forgery of God’s eternal, unchanging Word. The translation of the following three phrases in Genesis 1 to 3 is mentioned as examples:

- (a) Gen1:26: *b^otsalmēnû kidmûtēnû* (AT33/53: *na ons beeld, na ons gelykenis*), that was translated as "as ons verteenwoordiger, ons beeld". Here the protesters see adaptation to modern concepts and that the essential characteristics of created man are replaced with a function.
- (b) Gen2:9 and par.: *ēts hadda’at tōv wārā’* (AT33/53: *die boom van die kennis van goed and kwaad*), which was translated as "die boom van alle kennis". Here the protesters see adaptation from the normative to modernist situation and time determination. “All knowledge” is seen as quantitative.
- (c) Gen2:18 and par: *’ēzer k^enegdō* (AT33/53: *’n hulp wat by hom pas*), that was translated as "iemand wat hom kan help, sy gelyke". Here the protesters see adaptation to feminism.

2.2.5.2.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.2.5.2.1.1 It is not for the Deputies to judge whether the three mentioned examples meet the requirements that the Synod set, namely: “understandable...as close to the original text as possible...correlate should be maintained”. An argument can be made that at least some of the examples are unfortunate translations because it tends towards paraphrasing.

2.2.5.2.1.2 However, the Petition of Protest fails to indicate that such translation is really an adaptation to modern concepts of the spirit of the times (including feminism). All three mentioned phrases can be understood as found in the AT83 based on exegesis and the semantics of the Hebrew source language. This is not to say that the translation as found in the AT83 translation is the best or the most desirable translation.

- (a) Gen1:26: *b^otsalmēnû kidmûtēnû*: The meaning of these two Hebrew words, which are used complementarily here, is the object of much philological and theological study over many centuries. Both words literally refer to an image, but because God is separate from his creation, man can not physically be an image of God. The meaning of the two words are often searched for in the context of Genesis 1, namely that man should submit the earth and should rule over it (1:28), similar to the command that they should cultivate the garden and guard it (2:15). Man cannot execute such rule in the place of God, but on behalf of God. On the question of whether “representative” is the best translation, there are some differences in opinion. However, it is not

far-fetched or an adaptation to modern concepts and the spirit of the time to see “beeld en gelykenis” as a type of metaphor which indicates man as God’s representative.

- (b) Gen2:9 and par.: *ēts hadda’at tōv wārā’*: Just as with the previous words, the translation found in the AT83 rests on a certain interpretation of the words and not on an ideology that was carried into the text. “All knowledge” aims to indicate knowledge of the total moral spectrum, from evil (on the one end) to good (on the other end). The fact that the correlate with Hebrew is endangered with such a translation does not mean that such a translation is a willful distortion of God’s revelation.
- (c) Gen2:18 and par.: *‘ēzer k^enegdō*: These words are difficult to translate. In Hebrew it literally means: “*helper/assistant* (masculine form!) *as-his-opposite*”. Last-mentioned can also be translated as “*as-his-compliment*” (KBL³:591: *Wie sein Gegenstück*). Both words necessarily have to be interpreted during any translation to make it comprehensible at all in the target language. Through interpretation often comes dilution. Even the Selfs AT33/53 (*help that fits him*) can be seen as a dilution of the Hebrew. The AT83’s version “*someone who can help him*” is a good interpretation of the first word, *‘ēzer*, which indicates a helper in the full sense of the word. God is also called the believer’s *‘ēzer* (ex Ex 18:4). The AT83’s version “*that suits him*” does justice to *k^enegdō*, which indicates that the woman was meant as the human’s “other half” (complement), who is in essence equal to him. Through this there is no statement on the role of the man as head of the woman in marriage.

2.2.5.2.2 **Finding**

The motivation of the ground for protest offered in 4.5.2 of the Petition of Protest, does not give a valid ground for protest.

2.2.5.3 **Third motivation** (Acta 2006:147, 4.5.3)

The third motivation for the claim that the words “in our current situation and time” are unbiblical and contrary to Belgic Confession, art 7, corresponds to the previous motivation. Further groups of examples are named to illustrate that the spirit of the time did have an influence on the 1983-translation. It is claimed that the 1983-translation is guilty of the following three transgressions:

- Demessiahansing in the OT
- Dilution of Christ’s Godliness
- Disbandment of the unity between the Old and New Testaments.

2.2.5.3.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

The Third motivation is not supported by arguments apart from a reference to 4.1.3 and 4.1.2 of the Petition of Protest. The third motivation therefore rests with the above argumentation (2.2.1 and sub-paragraphs) of the second ground for protest as its answer to its claims.

2.2.5.3.2 **Finding**

The motivation of the ground for protest offered in 4.5.3 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.5.4 **Fourth motivation** (Acta 2006:147, 4.5.4)

The Fourth motivation for the claim that the words “in our current situation and time” is unbiblical and contrary to Belgic Confession art 7, contains several claims or arguments, namely:

- (a) “The influence of the ‘current situation and time’ on the translation is possibly the only aspect of the mandate that has been fulfilled – and that to the detriment of the end result.”
- (b) Paraphrasing and D-E is essentially synonymous. The Bible is already offered digested (interpreted).
- (c) The spirit of the time has literally turned against translation. To support this claim the report for Bible translation of 1973 is quoted, where the Bible Society’s view is

presented, amongst other things that that which is implicit should sometimes be made implicit.

2.2.5.4.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.2.5.4.1.1 The first argument above is unclear, is qualified with the word “possibly” and is not supported. Several aspects (guidelines) for the translation is indicated by the Synod’s decision (which is being protested), for instance that the translations should take into account the development of Afrikaans, that it should be as comprehensible as possible and that it should be a dignified translation. The Petition of Protest does not indicate that the “current situation and time” is the only aspect that has been fulfilled and that the other aspects did not receive any attention at all.

2.2.5.4.1.2 The claim that paraphrasing and D-E is essentially synonymous is not proved and therefore there is no indication that the 1983-translation is indeed a paraphrase. Should the claim be true, it still does not serve as a ground for the claim that the 1983-translation (as so-called paraphrases) was influenced by the spirit of the time. It is possible to include paraphrases in the Bible that does not speak of the spirit of the times. Paraphrases do not necessarily claim to be Bible translations for church use (liturgical use).

2.2.5.4.1.3 Dynamic-equivalent translations were indeed a tendency during the sixties and seventies of the previous century – a tendency that this report does not want to defend by any means. In the mean time this tendency has passed (up to the present – 2008). However, this Petition of Protest does not indicate that the language-theoretical points of departure of the D-E-method are unbiblical and contrary to the Belgic Confession art 7. The contrary is true: the quote that the Petition of Protest offers as proof of their allegation emphasises that understandable language should be used in translations and that sometimes that which is implicit in the text is made implicit. All translations have to sometimes make explicit that which is implicit, including source language oriented translations such as the AT33/53. The degree to which this happens, differs the more the translation becomes target language oriented.

2.2.5.4.2 **Finding**

The motivation of the ground for protest offered 4.5.4 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.5.5 **Fifth motivation** (Acta 2006:147, 4.5.5)

The Fifth motivation for the claim that the words “in our current situation and time” is unbiblical and contrary to the Belgic Confession art 7, is that the D-E-translation method robs man of God’s Word because it omits, rejects or changes many words or replaces them with man’s words. The protest calls it a deviation of the “principle of literal translation”, which makes man’s words rather than the real Words of Scripture authoritative.

2.2.5.5.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.2.5.5.1.1 This motivation possibly contains the theoretical foundation of the entire Petition of Protest. The fact that the Bible was “uitgeadem” (breathed) by God is seen as indication that “the Biblical language is not primarily captured within a human culture”. The supernatural element in God’s revelation is so strongly emphasised that trustworthy translation is measured according to the maintenance of the words, rather than the concept, phrases and sentences. God gave his Word in human language and every specific human language has its own linguistic rules that should be taken into account.

2.2.5.5.1.2 It is simply not possible to make a valid translation without going further than words. This even goes for source language oriented (literal) translations. When a “translation” takes place word-for-word, the translation loses its character and rather becomes some kind of interlinear version of the original, which is incomprehensible to the reader without knowledge of the source language.

2.2.5.5.1.3 The Petition of Protest fails to indicate how literal the translation should be, so that it is not unbiblical and contrary to the confession. Should it for instance be literal in the sense that it is translated word-for-word, without considering the source language's idiom?

2.2.5.5.1.4 "Literal translation" is as such not a principle and deviation from it is not necessarily an example of modernism or that (as is said) "the Bible conforms to rather than confronts the heathen culture". The Hebrew Bible (OT) already wasn't translated consistently literally before the advent of D-E-translation method. An example is the Septuagint, a translation in Greek, which was done before the start of our year count and which was used as Canon by a large part of the OT and NT Church. In fact, when Jesus quotes to the disciples from the OT, it is often not with reference to the literal Hebrew text, but to Greek translations such as the Septuagint.

2.2.5.5.2 Finding

The motivation for the ground for protest provided in 4.5.5 of the Petition of Protest does not offer any valid ground for protest.

2.2.5.6 Finding with regard to Ground for protest 2.5 in its entirety

Decision: Points 2.2.5 to 2.2.5.6 noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest should not succeed based on 2.5, since the motivations are insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.2.6 Ground for protest 2.6: The GKSA effectively transferred its responsibility, calling and duty to conserve the true Word of God to the PPA by accepting the NAT

Four motivations are given for this ground for protest.

2.2.6.1 First motivation (Acta 2006:148, 4.6.1)

The First motivation for the claim that the GKSA effectively transferred its responsibility, calling and duty to conserve the true Word of God to the PPA by accepting the NAT is that the Bible Society decided on the translation policy and the translation method contrary to the decision of the GKSA.

2.2.6.1.1 Argumentation of the motivation

This first motivation is not supported by arguments, except reference to 3.1 of the Petition of Protest in which it is argued that the GKSA did not keep to its own guidelines. As answer to the first motivation, the protesters rests with the argumentation of ground for protest 3.1 (point 2.2.1 above).

2.2.6.1.2 Finding

The motivation of the ground for protest offered in 4.6.1 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.6.2 Second motivation (Acta 2006:148, 4.6.2)

The Second motivation for the claim that the GKSA effectively transferred its responsibility, calling and duty to conserve the true Word of God to the PPA by accepting the NAT, is that they lost final say through the democratic subordination via the translation commission of the Bible Society. The Petition of Protest founds this claim on a observation that more than 90% of the GKSA's Deputy Group for Bible Translation's Recommendations where not present in the final edition of the AT33/53.

2.2.6.2.1 Argumentation of the motivation

2.2.6.2.1.1 The Petition of Protest departs from the point of view that the GKSA had to ratify the process and final product of translation. However, it does not lie within the scope of majority meetings to lend official status to Bible translations. This would mean that the Synod would have to consider all the aspects of a Bible translation, which is an impossible task.

2.2.6.2.1.2 On the other hand there was at no stage any mention of a transfer of responsibility through participation in a translation project. Neither the cooperation churches (denominations), nor the church advice committee, nor

the translators that churches isolated for this project, bound their consciences to the project. Any church or individual was free to withdraw from the project should there be “democratic subordination via the translation committee”.

- 2.2.6.2.1.3 The GKSA’s decision of 1985 (p576, 4.2) only says that the 1933/53 and 1983-translations may be used next to each other in churches, with the implication that the calling, responsibility and duty to preserve the true Word of God rested with the local church councils, who guarded the ministry of the Word.
- 2.2.6.2.1.4 However, it does lie within the scope of the Synod to cooperate with other churches by means of Deputies to create a good Bible translation which will be made available at a sub-economical price, especially in the light of many private translations that sometimes takes place with little control and which is marketed economically. Local churches can not easily deal with such matters since it deals with things that can not be finalised in minority meetings (see KO, art 30). The Synod cooperated with other churches through the Bible Society. The Bible Society of South Africa was at the time of decision making the only suitable institution that could facilitate such cooperation. As is the case with any other joint project, the GKSA could make positive inputs (with regard to for instance the translation policy and process), but it was not possible to meet all the requirement set by the Reformed Churches. Any joint effort requires a process of giving and taking.
- 2.2.6.2.1.5 The Synods of 1985 and 1991, to which the Petition of Protest refers, did not regard the matters that the AT83 could not meet, as weighty enough to decline the use of AT83 for church use. However, in 1985 the translation was not accepted exclusively (as only translation) and unqualified (as translation without problems). The last mentioned (qualified acceptance) is evident from further inputs that the Deputies for Bible Translation made at the Bible Society, of which some were present in the 1991 revised edition. Furthermore, the following Synods upheld the protests against the way in which the Name JHWH was translated in the OT (for modifications, see 2.1.3 above). The GKSA’s insistence on a more source language oriented translation, eventually lead to the Bible translation project of which the GKSA is currently a part.

2.2.6.2.2 **Finding**

The motivation for the ground of protest offered in 4.6.2 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.6.3 **Third motivation** (Acta 2006:148, 4.6.3)

The Third motivation for the claim that the GKSA effectively transferred its responsibility, calling and duty to conserve the true Word of God to the PPA by accepting the NAT, is that the Bible Society of South Africa forms part of the United Bible Societies, which is in turn the Bible translation leg of the World Council of Churches. It is also claimed that the Bible Society has close ties to the Roman Catholic Church. A Second argument is offered as motivation, namely that Bible Societies worldwide give preference to D-E-translations and that the spirit of the time has turned against literal translation.

2.2.6.3.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

- 2.2.6.3.1.1 The Petition of Protest departs from the supposition that one can one cooperate with similar-thinking persons on Bible translation (churches with the same confession). Mere association with people from another confession does not contaminate the translation project and the product (the translation). The Petition of Protest does not show convincingly that the PPA indeed stands under the authority and influence of the WCC and how such a relation, if it really exists, has an influence on the translation. When there is honest interaction with the text during the translation project, people with diverging views can cooperate. The final corner stone remains a healthy translation policy and strict application of the policy. View of Scripture does not necessarily have

to reflect in translation. It is more valid when the translation is source language oriented, as the Petition of Protest pleads for.

2.2.6.3.1.2 The United Bible Societies and local Bible societies that are affiliated with them are not the only groups of Bible societies that busy themselves with translation. The *Wycliffe Bible Translators* is one of the many alternative organisations that is active in many countries with Bible translation. Each of the organisations determines its own translation policy, which may differ from translation to translation. Some of the translations the see the light are strongly source language oriented. To claim in general the spirit of the time has turned against literal translation, is simply not true. This allegation (in the Petition of Protest) was made in 2006, when it was already clear that the D-E-translation method has fallen into disrepute amongst Bible translators.

2.2.6.3.2 **Finding**

The motivation of the ground for protest offered in 4.6.3 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.6.4 **Fourth motivation** (Acta 2006:148, 4.6.4)

The Fourth motivation for the claim that the GKSA effectively transferred its responsibility, calling and duty to conserve the true Word of God to the PPA by accepting the NAT, is that the GKSA worked with the NGK and the NHK, which differ from the GKSA in view of Scripture and binding to the Confessions. This cooperation lead to consensus whilst there were initially (with the test translation) heavy protest.

2.2.6.4.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

2.2.6.4.1.1 This Fourth motivation is in essence the same as the Third motivation. With the Third motivation the WCC and Catholic-inclined were mentioned, while in this Fourth motivation two churches of Reformed Confession is named, which is closer to the GKSA, but which indeed did take part in the translation project. The Petition of Protest is therefore answered in the same way as above point 2.2.6.3.1.

2.2.6.4.1.2 The allegation that there was ultimately consensus ("If you can't win them, join them"), is not indicated persuasively. The Deputy Group for Bible Translation did propose reformulations after the completion of the AT83 and there was never unqualified acceptance (see 2.2.6.2.1.5 above).

2.2.6.4.2 **Finding**

The motivation for the ground for protest offered in 4.6.4 of the Petition of Protest, offers no valid ground for protest.

2.2.6.5 **Finding with regard to Ground for protest 2.6 in its entirety**

Decision: Points 2.2.6 to 2.2.6.5 noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed based on Ground for protest 2.6, since the motivations are insufficient.

Decision: Approved noted.

2.2.7 **Ground for protest 2.7: The statement of the Synod 1991 that the GKSA has never "canonised" one single Bible translation by accepting it as the only possible translation, is the language of disbelief**

Version of the protest: The decision of Synod 1991 that the Petition of Protest of Die Kandelaar offers no valid reason why the decision of National Synod 1985 to use both translations alongside each other should be withdrawn or revised is protested (Acta 1991:124, 9.2.1; 128, 14). The protesters claim: The accepted statement (by the National Synod) *that the GKSA did not canonise, accept, approve or sanction any translation* is the language of unbelief and is contrary to all axioms regarding the formulation *Word of God* and that the GKSA did accept a translation method. Five motivations are offered for this ground for protest (Acta 2006:148, 1.5 and 4.7).

- 2.2.7.1 **First motivation** (Acta 2006:149, 4.7.1)
Acceptance of both the 1933/53 and 1983-translations is denied by the Synod decision. It is a play of words and is not suitable in the light of CO, art 30.
- 2.2.7.1.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**
No argument is offered, just an opinion is stated. It is not indicated that CO art 30 is disrespected or ignored.
- 2.2.7.1.2 **Finding:** The First motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.
- 2.2.7.2 **Second motivation** (Acta 2006:149, 4.7.2)
The Belgic Confession, artt 4-7 is stripped of all power because canonicity should be awarded either the translation or the original text. The AT33/53 was accepted as Word of God axiomatically while the AT83 disqualifies itself as Word of God by the omission of the words “as close as possible to the original text” in its preamble.
- 2.2.7.2.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**
- 2.2.7.2.1.1 The content or impact of the mentioned articles of the Belgic Confession are not explained or argued. The motivation only consists of unqualified statements, without there being any proof. A translation should also be evaluated based on the translation itself and not only on a phrase in the preamble.
- 2.2.7.2.1.2 The protesters handle the words *canon*, *canonise* and *canonicity* as if the church should declare a translation as infallible Canon. The principle of the Report in 1991 was exactly to lay down the principle that the Bible is not canonised by the church. According to this principle it also does not lie with the church to award unchangeability to any translation. Different than Rome which declared the Latin Vulgate Translation to be unchangeable canon, the churches of the reformation is aware that all translations are fallible human work. Therefore the Reformed Churches have always guarded against lifting translations to the same level as the unchangeable Canon. Except for the fact that the protesters do not take this important fact into account, their motivation is characterised by unproven statements and confusion use of terminology.
- 2.2.7.2.2 **Finding:** The Second motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.
- 2.2.7.3 **Third motivation** (Acta 2006:150, 4.7.3)
The lack of canonic authority to the translations gives the Confessions more authority than the translations, and the confessions’ authority is undermined because there is no canon.
- 2.2.7.3.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**
Once again it seems as if the motivation rests on a misunderstanding of the concept *Canon* and the nature of Canon, as well as a misinterpretation of the intention of the Report 1991. What the Petition of Protest does not take into account, is that in the midst of the *quia*-authority of the confessions, the Reformed Churches still does not see it as infallible, but sees it as testable to the Bible as Canon. Equally, every Bible translation, taking into account that it is the canon in translation, always remains testable to the Bible in its original languages as Canon.
- 2.2.7.3.2 **Finding:** Due to the mentioned misunderstandings also the Third motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.
- 2.2.7.4 **Fourth motivation** (Acta 2006:150, 4.7.4)
The protesters claim that the 1991 decision brings us back to Rome where only spirituals had access to the canon. The lack of a canon prevents elders from supervising.
- 2.2.7.4.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**
Once again the motivation is based on a misunderstanding of the concept *canon* and the relationship between Bible translations and the Bible in the original languages (see 2.2.7.3.1 above). Therefore the claim on the Roman character of the decision is unmotivated.
- 2.2.7.4.2 **Finding:** The Fourth motivation for the ground of protest is insufficient.

2.2.7.5 **Fifth motivation** (Acta 2006:150, 4.7.5)

The protesters claim that the 1991 decision undermines certainty of belief because it acknowledges that there is no canon.

2.2.7.5.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

This motivation once again rests on a misunderstanding of the intention and implications of the 1991 decision (see 2.2.7.3.1 above). Consequently the conclusion that the translation is not canon is invalid, as well as the conclusion that the decision undermines certainty of belief.

2.2.7.5.2 **Finding:** Also the Fifth motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.2.7.6 **Finding with regard to Ground for protest 2.7 in its entirety**

Decision: Points 2.2.7 to 2.2.7.6 noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed based on Ground for protest 2.7, since the motivation is insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.3 *A few practical protests*

2.3.1 **Ground for protest 3.1: "The 1988 Protest of Kandelaar was unjustly rejected"**

The Protesters claim that the Protest that Die Kandelaar handed in at Synod 1988 against the acceptance of the AT83 was unjustly rejected (Acta 2006:150, 2.8). Two motivations are offered for this ground for protest.

2.3.1.1 **First motivation** (Acta 2006:150, 4.8.1)

The protesters claim that the Synod of 1988 erred by finding that the Petition of Protest of Die Kandelaar "has no valid reasons" for acceptance. "Throughout reasons are founded – even granted by Deputies – but with circumventing arguments that are insufficiently argued instead of stating reasons why the protests are unfounded"

2.3.1.1.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

The protesters merely states a personal opinion that is based on an own understanding of the words "founded reasons", "unfounded" and "insufficient". The protesters offer no proof based on which they found their protest.

2.3.1.1.2 **Finding:** The First motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.3.1.2 **Second motivation** (Acta 2006:150, 4.8.2)

The protesters claim that the protest of Die Kandelaar was founded because the Synod admitted such to the protesters in several places.

2.3.1.2.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

Seven examples are offered as proof for the statement in the protest. The fact that a few arguments are admitted does not prove that the protest was founded in its entirety. The arguments of a protest can be correct, but when put into context can not serve as foundation for the protest. Synod 1988 repeatedly indicated that some of the statements indicated in the Petition of Protest are correct, but that they are relativised:

(a) On the one hand the fact that the AT83 was not meant to be a concordant translation and it is unfair to expect that it should meet the demands of a concordant translation or fulfil its functions, and

(b) On the other hand the fact that the AT33/53 is still used "alongside AT83" in churches and can fill the gaps that the protesters indicate.

2.3.1.2.2 **Finding:** The Second motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

Decision: Points 2.3 to 2.3.1.2.2 noted.

2.3.1.3 **Finding with regard to Ground for protest 3.1 in its entirety**

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed based on Ground for protest 3.1, since its motivation is insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.3.2 **Ground for protest 3.2: "The two translations are not equal in value"**

The protesters express the opinion that in spite of the different statements of Synods, the protests against the AT83 proves that there is no equality in value between the

two translations. "Equality is determined by the content, not by a declaration" (Acta 2006:150, 4.9).

2.3.2.1 **Argumentation**

The protesters merely express their own opinion without providing concrete grounds for their protest. Furthermore, it is not taken into account that Synod clearly stated that AT33/53 and AT83 differ from each other in nature and purpose that it should not be seen as two alternative translations (see Acta 1985:593, 2.4.2, pt 1; Acta 1991:113, 2.1.2.5.1.3).

2.3.2.2 **Finding:** The arguments for the ground for protest are insufficient.

Decision: Points 2.3.2 to 2.3.2.1 noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed based on Ground for protest 3.2, since the arguments are insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.3.3 **Ground for protest 3.3: "Use the two translations alongside each other?"**

The protest is against the statement that the two translations can be used alongside each other by churches. The protesters claim that the decision was not well thought through, unfaithful and contrary to the ninth commandment (Acta 2006:150, 4.10). Three motivations are offered.

2.3.3.1 **First motivation** (Acta 2006:150, 4.10.1)

The decision was premature, since several protests still had to be dealt with. The *sub judice* rule should be applied here.

2.3.3.1.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

Even if the *sub judice* rule was applied, it does not suppose non-activity. The Synod therefore acted within its right to make a principle decision with the light and testimony that it had, and to with that decide that the protests and corrections should be sent for revision.

2.3.3.1.2 **Finding:** The First motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.3.3.2 **Second motivation** (Acta 2006:150, 4.10.2)

The AT83 does not underwrite the Confessions.

2.3.3.2.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

The relationship between the Confessions and AT83 is not argued except for the loose standing and unproven opinions regarding certain presupposition in the motivation.

2.3.3.2.2 **Finding:** The Second motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

2.3.3.3 **Third motivation** (Acta 2006:150, 4.10.3)

The strategy to promote the AT83 amongst the church people agrees with the strategy followed worldwide for similar translations.

2.3.3.3.1 **Argumentation of the motivation**

The Third motivation is stated without any proof.

2.3.3.3.2 **Finding:** The Third motivation for the ground for protest is insufficient.

Decision: Points 2.3.3 to 2.3.3.3.2 noted.

2.3.3.4 **Finding with regard to Petition of Protest 3.3 in its entirety**

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed on Ground for protest 3.3 since the arguments are insufficient.

Decision: Approved.

2.3.4 **Ground for protest 3.4: "The acceptance of AT83 was untrustworthy decision making"**

The protesters express the opinion that the acceptance of a translation that is contrary to the initial mandate, comes down to untrustworthy decision making (Acta 2006:150, 4.11).

2.3.4.1 **Argumentation**

The opinion that the protesters express in this ground for opinion, rests on the presupposition that the translation was contrary to the mandate of the Synod. Since

the presupposition has already been proven as unfounded (see 2.1 above) this argument falls away.

2.3.4.2 **Finding:** The arguments for the ground for protest are unfounded.

Decision: Points 2.3.4 to 2.3.4.2 noted.

Recommendation: The Synod judges that the protest can not succeed based on Ground for protest 3.4 since it is based on unfounded arguments.

Decision: Approved.

3. Matters for decision taking

3.1 Recommendation

The Deputies recommend that the Synod decides as follows based on the above-stated findings:

- 3.1.1 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 1.
- 3.1.2 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 2.1.
- 3.1.3 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 2.2.
- 3.1.4 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 2.3.
- 3.1.5 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 2.4.
- 3.1.6 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 2.5.
- 3.1.7 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 2.6.
- 3.1.8 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 2.7.
- 3.1.9 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 3.1.
- 3.1.10 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 3.2.
- 3.1.11 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 3.3.
- 3.1.12 The protest does not succeed on Ground for protest 3.4.

Decision: Approved.

3.2 Concluding recommendation

The Petition of Protest does not succeed in its entirety.

Decision: Approved.