

**WHICH BIBLE?
A Paper Presented At**

**The 20th Anniversary Of
[1978-1998]**

**The Dean Burgon Society
July 22-23, 1998
Calvary Baptist Church
Grayling, Michigan**

By

**Dr. Gary E. La More, Ph.D., D.D.
Pastor of Grace Missionary Baptist Church
And
President of Historic Baptist Bible College and Seminary**

**369 Lawson Road
Scarborough, Ontario, Canada
M1C 2J8
1-416-281-4865**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| WHAT IS DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCY? | 6 |
| SOME OTHER NAMES BY WHICH DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCY IS KNOWN | 7 |
| SUMMARY | 11 |
| APPENDIX I - IN DEFENSE OF GOOD LANGUAGE | 12 |
| APPENDIX II - SANDRA'S LETTER | 16 |
| APPENDIX III - WHICH TRANSLATION IS REALLY INSPIRED? | 18 |
| APPENDIX IV - WHY I REJECT THE VIEW THAT BIBLE INSPIRATION INVOLVES ONLY THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS | 23 |

WHICH BIBLE?

INTRODUCTION

The issue is this, is one going to accept a THOUGHT FOR THOUGHT translation served up to him by subjective man? This is what one has in modern translations. This is known as DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCY. The writer will return to this later in the paper. **OR** is one going to accept a literal WORD FOR WORD translation as given to him by the Holy Spirit? This is what one has in the KJB. After all, if one has the right Hebrew text of the OT (MT), and he does, and if he has the right Greek text of the NT (TR), and he does, then if he has a right English translation based on a right Hebrew and Greek text, and he does, then he has the Word of God and that Word of God is in the authorized Version of 1611. After all, God only wrote one Bible. [Certain Bible College presidents to the contrary notwithstanding.]

NOW let the reader examine the following text [**I Peter 1:22-25-22** Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: **23** Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. **24** For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: **25** But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.] more closely. **READ** the text from the 1611 Edition, KJB, NKJV, NASB and the NIV.

How can one allow unholy hands to be put on God's Holy Book? One cannot and yet this is what is happening today. Their unholy fingerprints are all over God's Holy Word.

The writer also refuses to be balanced on the "Which Bible?" issue because this is how Satan is attacking God's Word today. Let us look at Genesis 3:1 - 7. Satan in Genesis 3 started "EVE'S School for Liberal Theologians." What did Satan do at this point? Satan did three things. First of all, Satan ADDED to the Word of God - "neither shall ye touch it," 3:3. Second, Satan SUBTRACTED from the Word of God - "freely," 2:16; "we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden," 3:2. Third, Satan ALTERED the Word of God - "Ye shall not surely die," 3:4 (Genesis 2:17). How did God respond to Satan's new seminary? God had a message for President Satan. Listen to God's message in Rev. 22:18, 19. [**18** For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: **19** And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.]

Remember that Satan started out sitting under the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. **AND** Satan is still there today. However **some** are not intelligent enough to recognize this. Today's so-called scholars are not as smart as they think they are.

ONE CAN CONCLUDE THIS PART OF THE PAPER THAT **ALL** TRANSLATIONS SINCE 1611, AND THIS INCLUDES ALL PARAPHRASES, HAVE COME ULTIMATELY FROM EVE'S SCHOOL FOR LIBERAL THEOLOGIANs. How can one say this? Look at I Timothy 3:16. [**16** And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: **God** was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.] What does President Satan hate? Satan hates the Deity of Jesus. It is interesting to note that every translation and paraphrase since

1611 attacks the Deity of Jesus Christ. Eve's School for Liberal Theologians has done its job and these theologians are being amply rewarded by the school's president.

Now the writer will look at "The Value of the KJB as a Translation."

As Dr. Thomas Strouse *says*, two criteria arise with regard to the value of a translation of the Bible. 1) How reliable are its ...language texts? Remember spurious or fallacious ancient Greek manuscripts of the Greek NT were burned. What does one think the monks were doing on Mt. Sinai at St. Catherine's Monastery when Count Tischendorf arrived? They were burning the Aleph (Sinaiticus) manuscript. This manuscript was a favourite of Westcott and Hort and forms the basis for their Greek text along with "B" (Vaticanus). Remember what we said in our introduction. 2) How reliable is it as an accurate translation? Are the other translations that we read on I Peter 1:22 - 25 really an improvement over the KJB?

Just what is the KJB? ...The KJ[B] is a word for word, "Static Equivalency" translation. In other words, it translates the original words with the corresponding English words, as well as translating the cultural backdrop of the Greco-Roman world. It is **not** an example of "Dynamic Equivalency," as are many of the modern versions. (Thomas Strouse, The Lord God Hath Spoken: A Guide To Bibliology, Virginia Beach, VA.: Tabernacle Baptist Theological Press, 1992. p. 22)

Having mentioned Dynamic Equivalency, what is it? **Dynamic Equivalency** is the theory that the translator must consider not only the difference between the language of the prophets and their modern readers, but also the difference in the conditioning of the cultural patterns of the two periods. This modern translation theory, originated and propagated by the liberal **Eugene Nida**, attempts to re-phrase the Bible in the culture of the receiving audience, instead of retaining the Greco-Roman culture. The TEV (Today's English Version) is the classic example of the Dynamic Equivalency theory in English. But any attempt to eliminate the religious, political, geographical, and cultural backdrop of the Bible for translation purposes, effectively changes the divine message. For instance, Brother David Cloud records an example of this folly,

The Apostle John said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Charles Kraft and other anthropologists tell us that if you go into a culture where lamb is vulgar and the pig is sacred, you cannot say, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" because that would be invoking a wrong meaning to the people. So Jesus becomes "Behold the Pig of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. (D. W. Cloud, **Dynamic**

Equivalency: Death Knell of Pure Scripture (Oak Harbor, WA.: Way of Life Literature, 1990), p. 15.

Fundamental Baptist missionaries should be familiar with not only Cloud's book but also with J. Van Bruggen's **The Future of the Bible** (NY: Thomas Nelson Inc., Publ., 1978), pp. 67-96.)

Before looking at "The KJB as the Word of God," the writer would like to share with the reader Brother David Cloud's observations on the subject of Dynamic Equivalency.

In answering the question, what is Dynamic Equivalency?, Brother Cloud says, during the last two decades, a new concept has been developed in the field of Bible translation which

has dramatically affected the kind of Bibles being produced. This phenomena has spread rapidly within the circles of translation scholars but has been largely hidden from the average Christian. While working as a foreign missionary in South Asia I was involved in establishing the principles and guidelines for a Bible translation project. I also have considerable contact with men working on translations in several other languages. Through this experience I have become familiar with dynamic equivalency, and the more I have learned of this method and its growing influence, the more alarmed I have become. I, therefore rejoice to have an opportunity to share some details of this matter with friends through this article.

WHAT IS DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCY?

The new method of Bible translation to which I refer, dynamic equivalency, is also called "common language translation," "idiomatic translation," "impact translation," "indirect transfer translation," and "thought translation." While some would make a distinction between some of these methods, for the most part we can say they are used synonymously. In English, the two key examples of this are the **Today's English Version** (Good News for Modern Man) and **the Living Bible**. These are dynamic equivalency translations and were produced through the principles which have been developed among professional translators and which are presently promoted within **Wycliffe Bible Translators**, the **United Bible Societies** and **Living Bibles International**, the three most influential groups in Bible translation work today.

Doubtless most readers will be familiar with the TEV and Living Bible, but perhaps you thought they were only considered "paraphrases" or commentaries, or Bible study helps and had not taken them seriously. Think again. These two dynamic equivalency versions are now being called the best Bible versions in the English language by many professional translators and well-known Christian leaders.

The cover jacket of Thomas Nelson's Good News Study Bible claims: "Today's English Version is a true translation. It is accurate and faithful to the original texts." An ad in Eternity magazine for June 1983, said that Today's English Version is "clear and simple to the modern reader yet faithful to the everyday Greek and Hebrew in which it was originally written."

Of the Living Bible, well-known Evangelist **Luis Palau** said this: "Throughout the world, there is a need for clear and understandable Scriptures. That is why I am sold on the work of Living Bibles International and the kind of Scriptures they are producing...The beauty of the Spanish and Portuguese living translations, produced by Living Bibles International, is that they are good translations, trustworthy in content."

Not only are the TEV and Living Bible considered accurate English versions, but these very translations, which are frightfully corrupt, have become models for Bible translation work in all languages. Surprised? Read on.

Dynamic equivalency is actually a good term, but it has been given a bad meaning in modern Bible translation work. "Dynamic" means "energetic, lively, forceful." "Equivalent," of course, means "equal, or virtually equal in meaning or effect." A truly dynamic equivalency translation of the Scriptures would be a good translation. It would be equal in meaning and effect to the original writings and would be energetic and forceful. That is what the Word of God in reality, is, and what a translation of the Bible should be. That is what excellent translations of

Scripture such as the KJB and Luther's Bible were for the English and German speaking peoples.

But modern dynamic equivalency theories of Bible translation have changed the common definitions of these words. "Dynamic" has come to mean that literal translation of the Bible is dull and stale and lifeless, so the translator's job is to CREATE a lively Bible by his clever re-phrasing of Scripture into colloquial language. "Equivalency" no longer means that the translator strives as perfectly as possible for an equal transfer of the words and structure of the original. Rather, the emphasis is on a general equivalency, with the translator having great freedom to restate, change, add to, and take away from the original writings.

Dynamic equivalency is a frightfully proud concept. Man is saying that that which claims to Be the Word of God is dry, stuffy, unintelligible to modern man, locked in ancient cultural language which no longer holds import to today's cultures. Man is saying that the Bible translator's work, then, to unlock the hidden treasures of this dry book and make it LIVE for TODAY'S people. Hence we have versions called THE LIVING BIBLE and TODAY'S ENGLISH VERSION. This attitude is seen in the words of Kenneth Taylor, author of The Living Bible.

"We take the original thought and convert it into the language of today...We can be much more accurate than the verbal translation...Once you get the real meaning of the Scriptures, they are life-transforming...I felt such a thrill at my own privilege of stripping away some of the verbiage...being a co-worker with God in that respect...I flipped open my Bible and began to **experiment** with this new method of translation" (Interview with J.L. Fear, Evangelism Today, December 1972).

Some other names by which dynamic equivalency is known

1. Thought or idea translation. The primary professed aim of dynamic equivalency is to transfer, not the very words and structure of the original, but to transfer the general thoughts.

2. Paraphrasing. The general thoughts of the Bible are to be rephrased in modern, colloquial language.

3. Impact translation. Dynamic equivalency attempts to understand exactly how the original hearers of scripture were impressed, and then create the same impression in modern hearers. This is the rationale behind, for example, the Living Bible's use of gutter and slang language; i.e. "son of a bitch" in I Samuel 20:30. Another example is the use of symbols for explicit language in the new comics published by the United Bible Societies in Asia. The passage in I Samuel 20:30 is illustrated with a picture of an angry Saul and a comic balloon containing the symbols, "@#!", which, of course, is a commonly used symbol for expletives or swear words. In the October 1985 issue of UBS's Bible Translators, this comment is made: "This symbolic device is useful in languages where the explicit use of an expletive or swear word would be taboo." This, supposedly, is impact translation.

4. Idiomatic translation (inculturalization). Dynamic equivalency has also been called Idiomatic translation. This refers to the attempt by such translators to use the cultural idioms of the language of the people for whom the translation is intended, and as much as possible to avoid using the cultural context in which the Bible was originally written. An example is a new Bengali version produced by **ABWE** [Association of Baptists for World

Evangelism] which is intended primarily for marginally literate Muslim and Hindu readers.

5. Functional equivalence translation. The director of Translations of the American Bible Society, David Burke, used this expression to describe the newly released **Contemporary English Version**. The American Bible Society announcement said, "The Contemporary English Version differs from other translations in that it is not a word-for-word and sequence-by-sequence rendering which reproduces the syntax of the original texts. Instead, it is an idea-by-idea translation, arranging the Bible's text in ways understandable to today's reader of English...The principle used in the translation is called 'functional equivalence,' which means that while the English rendering must equal the original language in meaning or context, the order of the words and style is determined by today's English usage, not by the original Greek or Hebrew. Dr. Burke noted that Bible Societies' translations were the first to develop and use the 'functional equivalence' principle."

6. Common Language translation. This has become the term most frequently and popularly used to describe the new dynamic equivalency versions. Common Language in this context refers to the attempt of the translators to put the Bible into that range of the receptor language which is common both to the highly educated and to the uneducated. The range of a language stretches from the technical and highly literary levels to the everyday, casual speech.

Lynn Silvernale, translator with the Association of Baptists for World Evangelism, describe the Common Language method of Bible translation as it was used in the ABWE Bengali Bible:

"It became clear that what we needed to produce was a common language translation," using the colloquial form of Bengali and the type of language common to the people. We wanted our translation to be accessible to uneducated readers and yet acceptable to the uneducated. This meant avoiding forms used only in the various local dialects of Bengali, and also avoiding technical and high level language used only by educated people as well as vulgar language used mainly by the uneducated. We had to strive for the area of overlap in the language spoken by all Bengalis."

Common Language versions, then, strive to put the Bible into the mid-level range of the receptor language, those words and forms which are common both to the highly educated and to the uneducated. In practice, this means that the literary level of the particular people who speak the language of the new Bible determines that Bible's language level. A Common Language version produced for a highly educated people such as the German people will use a language level much higher than a Common Language version intended for people who are largely illiterate.

Herein is a great danger and error. It might be possible for an acceptable translation of the Bible to be made in the common language of an educated people, since the common language of such people is high enough to do justice to the original text of Scripture. But when an attempt is made to create a Bible in the common language of an illiterate people the translators are forced to make drastic departures from the original text. The Bible was not written in a language equal to that of a person who is only moderately or barely literate, and it is not therefore possible to create a version of the Bible in such a low level of language without making unacceptable changes in God's Word.

The writer hastens to add that the Common Language versions being produced today

are not acceptable and accurate translations in any language. This is because there is much more to the method of Common Language translation than the simple goal of reaching a certain literacy level. This will be described more fully in the following principles of dynamic equivalency. (David W. Cloud, Dynamic Equivalency Death Knell of Pure Scripture, Oak Harbor, WA.: Way of Life Literature, 1990. pp. 3 - 7)

The KJB is **the** Word of God in the English language. It has no errors in it because it carefully reflects the original language texts closest to the autographa. **REMEMBER** since the Masoretic and Received Texts are superior, it follows that their resultant translation, the KJB, is superior. (Strouse, p. 21) The AV, like all translations, has 'language limitations,' but these are **not** errors. Language Limitations occur when the nuances of the original word do not correspond exactly with the nuances of the translated word. Several examples of Language Limitations in the KJB are the words "love," "know," "baptism," and "church." (The **lack of corresponding nuances** or shades of meaning, or the **lack of precision** in translated words do not constitute errors.) Nevertheless, the KJB is the Word of God, the Breath of God, the Bible, in the English language. [See Appendix I - **In Defence of Good Language**]

Consequently, since the AV is the Word of God, and since its Hebrew MT and its Greek TR are closest to the **autographa**, believers should use the KJB. It is [my] opinion that the AV should be used for personal devotions and for Bible memorization. After all, if the believer attempts to re-memorize Scripture according to the modern versions' rendering, the believer would merely be memorizing the concept of the passage, thus encouraging the fallacious theory of 'conceptual inspiration,' or that only the concepts of Scripture are inspired and not the very words. It is [my] opinion that believers should use the AV in public worship to avoid confusion and disharmony. It is [my] opinion that the Masoretic Text, the Received Text and the AV should be used in all missionary translation endeavours. (Strouse, pp. 23 - 24)

In looking at "the importance of the KJB", we need to remember that the KJB has been the Bible for English-speaking Christendom for most of the 387 years of its existence. The KJB, along with Shakespeare, has established and standardized the English language. Fundamentalists have identified with the KJB because of its textual and theological integrity, because of its beauty and strength of expression (**See Appendix II - SANDRA'S LETTER**), and because of its protection from liberalism. Barr makes an interesting observation, stating,

The virtual use of only one English version, and its one originating within very traditional early 17th century Christianity, thus indirectly but very powerfully supported the alienation of the fundamentalist public from, and its opposition to, the positions, interests and methods from which all biblical criticism grew and on which it depended.

Dr. James Barr is certainly no friend of Fundamentalism. Again, a conservative commentator states the reason for his employment of the KJB, saying he uses "the Authorized Version of the Bible (KJB) since this is still regarded as the text of fundamentalism." [Dr. Robert G. Gromacki is however no friend of the TR. **See Appendix III - Which Translation Is Really Inspired?**] The KJB is the Bible of fundamentalism and it seems apparent then, that fundamentalists should use the KJB. [See Appendix IV - **Why I Reject The View That Bible Inspiration Involves Only The Original Manuscripts**] (Strouse, pp. 21 - 22)

In **SUMMARY**, the doctrine of Scripture, or Bibliology, is important because it is the source for all other theology. The 66 books of the Masoretic Text of the OT and the Received

Text of the NT as represented in the KJB are God's divine revelation about Himself for mankind. It behooves the fundamentalist Christian, and the fundamentalist Baptist, to recognize that the AV is **the** Word of God in the English language, and to **believe** it and to **practice** it.

(Strouse, p. 24)

The writer and compiler of this short presentation on **Which Bible?** is indebted to Brother David Cloud and his book Dynamic Equivalency: Death Knell of Pure Scripture and Brother Thomas M. Strouse and his book The Lord God Hath Spoken: A Guide To Bibliology.

The writer would also like to encourage the reader to read **prayerfully** and carefully Appendix IV and what Brother Cloud and Brother Barnett have to say.

The writer of this paper is only reporting to the reading public what he has found through his readings and research. He personally holds to the KJB as **the** Word of God in the English language. To do anything less is to have an Alexandrian mentality and not an Antiochian mentality. Dear reader, which mentality do you have?

APPENDIX I
IN DEFENSE OF GOOD LANGUAGE

APPENDIX II

SANDRA'S LETTER

APPENDIX III

WHICH TRANSLATION IS REALLY INSPIRED?

APPENDIX IV

**WHY I REJECT THE VIEW THAT BIBLE INSPIRATION INVOLVES ONLY THE
ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS**