

FTBC

GROWTH TRACKS


*Dr Peter Ng*

Welcome to Growth Tracks which is FBC's program designed to set the disciple on the firm foundation spiritual maturity.


*In 2 Corinthians 4:6 (ESV) Paul writes "For God, who said, "Let light shine out of darkness," has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ".*

The key to growth in our spiritual lives is encountering the glory of God through the person of His Son who is His perfect image. The more our hearts are filled with the knowledge of Him the more our characters are moulded, the more our hearts are filled with His love and more our lives will be directed towards the purpose for which we were created....to glorify Him. Each chapter is designed to provide a progressive track to show the face of Christ through selected but key passages in the Bible laying down the bed rock foundations of faith that will form the basis for a life -long learning and growing in to the likeness of Christ. Prayerfully follow these chapters and His Spirit will propel you into a trajectory of robust growth and spiritual transformation. Learn how to read the bible by tackling whole passages of Scripture rather than piece meal verses. See how principles from the passages will be translated to everyday life. For those disciples going into the Gamma program these presentations will help bridge the gap between the Alpha Beta programs and the more in- depth Gamma discipleship program.

For those who prefer to listen and see the contents of this book you can go to our website at [www.fbc.com .my](http://www.fbc.com.my) and each chapter will be presented in a series of slides at the resources section of our site under the title "Growth Tracks"



MODULE 6



# **INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE**

This is a first of a two-part series which is basically introduction to how to go about reading God's word. We start off with this presentation on the Introduction to the bible. We are going to discuss:

- What the Bible is
- How did we actually get it?

The Bible is a collection of books actually, written by 40 different authors living at different periods of time. In fact, the time period span is 1400 years from AD 1300 BC to AD 90.

The preceding Old Testament prophets, starting off with Abraham and Moses moving on to the prophets and finally the greatest revelation of God which is in Jesus Christ.

*No one has ever seen God; the only God, who is at the Father's side, he has made him known. John 1:18*

In this astonishing verse from the gospel of John we learn that Jesus reveals God completely. If we want know God, John is insisting, then it must be through Jesus because Jesus is God as John writes ...the only God referring to Jesus because He is the only one who is at the Father's side. Man, in his fallen evil state with his mind darkened by the ravages of sin cannot know God or even seek to know God or even want to know God. God has to reveal Himself to man and He has done it through the bible with a whole series of prophets acting in the life of the chosen people Israel and the final most complete revelation from Jesus who is God Himself.

### **Bible's Message:**

The Bible's message is about the disease of sin. Man has rebelled against God in his sin and faced destruction. The bible records what God has done to save man from this awful scourge of sin. The Bible is about the gospel, which is the good news of what God has specifically done for us through his son Jesus and the victory Jesus has won over death which is the spiritual consequence of sin. This gospel is proclaimed to the whole world, so that the people everywhere will have a testimony of what God had done for us. The Bible is not a rule book just about what you can or cannot do to earn eternal life and avoid condemnation. Despite this fact even religious leaders at the time of Jesus got it wrong. The Pharisees were the religious leaders. John writes about them,

*You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness about me, 40 yet you refuse to come to me that you may have life. John 5:39-40*

The religious leaders were serious about studying the bible but despite with serious scholarship they failed to grasp the very basic idea that the Bible was all about Jesus.

### **How does God actually speak to us through the Bible?**

The process is called inspiration. This is the act where God guided the writers of Scripture, giving them His words while fully utilizing the human element within the man utilizing his language, culture and temperament to produce the scriptures. This only happens with the prophets and apostles not to ordinary men and women.

The other process is illumination which is a process where God enlightens us, normal people, to understand His revelation when we actually read God's word. So inspiration is God guiding the prophets and apostles as they write the scriptures. Illumination is a process where God opens up our eyes when we read the Bible that we really

understand it and it effects our emotion and our minds and moves our will.

The below verse is taken from a letter of Paul to Timothy and it tells us what the word of God can do for us.

*2 Timothy 3:16-17 All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, 17 that the man of God may be competent, equipped for every good work.*

So here we actually have, it is the whole package. It is the entire revelation of God, by studying it transforms us, it equips us, makes us holy, it equips us to do his job, his work.

At its very essence the central theme of the bible is the gospel. The gospel is good news of what God has done for us through his son Jesus, so through the gospel God deals with sin in our lives through Jesus Christ, but the same gospel also teaches us how to live in Christ and in obedience to righteousness. So in the first instance, gospel is instrumental in us being born again. It is also instrumental into how we live our new life in Christ.

### **How do we actually get the Bible?**

In this section we will be dealing with the formation and transmission of the Bible. In general, in the Old Testament it is the prophets inspired by God who actually speak out God's words and it is then written out into original autographs, which are then incorporated into numerous manuscripts which have been passed down. In the New Testament it is the apostles mainly instead of prophets usually through their oral tradition and writing it down in original autographs and then passed down through manuscripts.

So all scripture is inspired by God, which was God moving in the mind of the prophet as they write down in the original documents (called autographs). These original autographs are inerrant which means they actually have no errors and are actually passed down through the centuries to from this scripture which is the final authority in life.

The process of God inspiring apostles and prophets does not negate the person's personality. It uses the person's language, style, culture, context and even emotion.

God inspires man to write scripture in a combination where the contribution of man is 100% man and it is also 100% from God. They are both involved in the writing scripture.

The Bible is written in its particular historical context, so therefore it will use everyday language of the time. For example, 'the rising sun' or 'the ends of the earth'. Even though we know that the world is round and there is no end of the earth and the sun does not rise, we actually rotate around the sun, but it uses language of the day hence when we read the bible we need to be cognizant of to this and take it into account as we read it.

Take for instance the use of numbers; usually round numbers are quoted. The Bible is not interested in giving you exact numbers of soldiers for a battle.

### **Now which is true in what implications do either of these statements have?**

"The Bible contains the word of God" or "The Bible is the word of God".

Obviously, it is Bible which is the word of God because if we believe the Bible contains the word of God then we could actually start to troll through the Bible and ask ourselves, which part of the Bible contain God's word and which doesn't. Instead, we believe the entire Bible is the word of God.

## **HISTORY OF BIBLE:**

Let's look at the history of the Bible. The Old Testament is written in the Hebrew language in 99% of its contents and there are various kinds of Hebrew writings. It all started off in Paleo script in the 8th century BC and later on from 538 BC, there is a Square or Assyrian script and when the Israelites returned from exile there was introduction of Vowel points from 500 AD to 1000 AD.

There are various kinds of languages used in the Old Testament. There is the original Paleo Hebrew script and then later on Square script. Silver Amulets is the oldest Bible inscription in existence. It aged from 725 to 650 BC, where a section of the Book of Numbers is quoted.

Numbers 6:25--Yahweh bless you and keep you;

Numbers 6:25--Yahweh make his face shine upon you, and be gracious to you;

Numbers 6:26--Yahweh lift up his countenance upon you, and give you peace.

The use of Aramaic language in the Bible was due to exposure and influence during captivity when the people of Israel were taken in to exile in Babylon and in Assyria. When they returned from exile, very few of them were actually pure Hebrew speaking. The influence of other languages like Aramaic was obvious during Jesus time where quotation is like

*Eloi Eloi Lama sabachthani Mark 15:34. This is in Aramaic.*

## **So how do we get the Bible?**

The bible starts out with oral transmission from the prophets which were then written down in the original manuscripts. The authenticity and reliability of the Old Testament is owed to a tradition of scribes or Sopherim from 500 BC to about 100 AD. who used to transcribe all the original autographs in a very meticulous fashion. There were strict rules to ensure accuracy like counting all the letters in the Torah, noting the middle letter of each sentence and other means and all this were written either on leather or papyrus.

## **How did we get to our current English Bible?**

We start off with God who inspires the various prophets, who then write down the original text, called the autographs. This original document or autograph has to be duplicated hence it is copied into the many manuscripts to pass on to the next generation. In the process of copying minor copying errors creep into the document and because of these differences the individual manuscripts with these different rendering of words are called variants. All the variant manuscripts are actually collected together and the reconciled using a scientific method called textual criticism to get back as close as possible to the original autograph forming one critical text. This will go through the translation committees where it will be translated it into various languages, into English and then it comes down to us as readers. There are no more original autographs. All we have today are copies of the original text, in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek.

## **Reasons for not having original autographs or manuscripts:**

There are many reasons why there are no original autographs or manuscripts. Firstly, because over the course of thousands of years, there is natural aging, and decay. Secondly manuscript destruction occurred when there was violence when the prophets were persecuted and manuscripts were intentionally destroyed especially when Jerusalem was besieged in 586 BC and 70 AD and other people were taken into exile in Assyria or Babylon. Lastly the scribes themselves intentionally destroyed manuscripts when they were old because age would cause the ink to be smudged and therefore there would be a risk of misreading, so they were quickly copied before the original copies were destroyed.

We have manuscripts mainly from Palestine and Babylon. They were all collected and all their variants and differences were removed and from the Old Testament there was a standardized text about 100 years AD and this later on was copied and became known as the Masoretic text from AD 500 to 1000.

## **So what are the earliest Old Testament manuscripts left today?**

Well, there were the earliest manuscripts as early as 400 BC, the standard text at 100 AD and then the Masoretic text from 500 AD to about almost a 1000 AD, but none of these are in existence anymore. All we have is the Codex Leningradis, which is basically aged about 900 AD and after that from 1100 AD almost about 12000 Old Testament manuscripts. In addition to this there are the early Targums, which are Aramaic paraphrases of the Old Testament after AD 200.

You will see the Leningrad Codex today in the British Museum as the oldest Old Testament manuscript which they have and from then onwards from 12th century onwards there are about 12000 manuscripts and out of these there are collected and summarized and the first printed Hebrew Bible was in 1488 AD. This has been faithfully reproduced and today, we all use the Hebrew Bible called the **Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia**, which was basically published in 1977. This a collection of all the Old Testament manuscripts with the differences removed and controversies ironed out. So it is from this basic Hebrew text that we all start translating Bibles into different modern languages.

## **The obvious question how do we know that the OT scriptures were accurately copied?**

How do we know that the translation in Hebrew of which the oldest one we have is the Codex Leningradis is accurate. Well fortunately for us, there was a group of 72 Greek scholars in AD 250 to 100 BC on the Island of Pharos who got together and grabbed the Hebrew Bible at that time and translated into the Greek language into a body of work known as the Septuagint or the Greek Old Testament. This Septuagint was recopied down and the currently preserved documents still with us are the Codex Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus dated somewhere between 200 and 500 AD. Subsequently, when all the Hebrew Bibles were destroyed and the earliest copy we have is the Codex Leningradis, which is still quite early at 900 AD. So, what we can do now is take the Codex Leningradis and compare it with the Septuagint -Greek translations Codex Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus which are much older at 200 to 500 AD and you actually find there is great accuracy and correspondence confirming the accuracy of the Codex Leningradis.

The Greek translation of the Old Testament was useful because there were local Greek speaking Jews in Egypt, which numbered 1 million at the time and it helped them maintain their faith as they had been forced to abandon

their mother tongue. In fact, the Greek Old Testament is the standard Old Testament text adopted by Christians in 1st century. Most of the Old Testament quotations from New Testament are from the Greek text of the Old Testament, especially Luke and Hebrew.

As impressive as the Greek Septuagint was in confirming the accuracy of the transmission of the old testament yet the most important evidence to date of the accuracy of the transmission of the original Hebrew bible actually comes from the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. What if we have something as early as 300 BC and you compare it with the Codex Leningradis to verify the accuracy of transmission? The Dead sea scrolls were discovered in 1948 and it was actually the Hebrew Bible written as early as 300 BC. The Dead sea scrolls were located in hills near the Dead Sea in one of the caves where a little shepherd boy found lots of pottery and jars that contained the scrolls.

The Dead Sea Scrolls were found in 1948. It contained copies or portions of every book in the Old Testament except Esther. There is a full copy of Isaiah dating back to 135–200 B.C. They found that there is a 90-95% accuracy confirmed comparing the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Codex Leningradis. So these are copies of the same Hebrew Bible separated by almost a 1000 years and the transcription is actually 90 to 95% accurate.

### **Are there errors in copying of these ancient Bibles?**

There is a very meticulous scribble tradition for accuracy which actually ensures accurate transmission of the text.

- They use special black ink from a special recipe
- There is no word or letter written from memory. So which means they didn't actually memorize whole phrases and then copied it down. It would be exactly word for word or letter for letter.
- Spacing rules.
- There were no obsolete Hebrew words used.
- Everything was counted, number letters in a book, in the Pentateuch, which is the first five books.
- Count number of letters in the book and note the middle alphabet, middle verse

So therefore, there was very little room for error. The original text did not have any verse or chapter divisions. The verse divisions were a man-made thing. They were introduced by the Ben Asher family in AD 900 and the chapter divisions by Steven Langton in 1150 AD to 1228 AD.

### **Formation and Transmission of New Testament:**

Let's now look at the formation and transmission of the New Testament, which is basically apostles, who will then have it transmitted to a written text.

The materials used were scrolls of papyrus. So the scrolls were papyrus with wooden dowels and these were used up to the second century AD. After second century scrolls were phased out, as there were too bulky and Codex were used, which means more books could be placed and they were started to be referred to by the Greeks as 'Biblia' or 'Bible'.

The New Testament was exclusively written in the Greek language, in a particular variant called the Koine Greek language, which was only in use from 330 BC to 330 AD, after which it was over taken by Byzantine Greek language and today the modern Greek language.



## How New Testament was developed?

There was an unwritten tradition of the apostles teaching and slowly there were letters and gospel is written up to about AD 90 was the latest one, the Revelation of John. Now these were collected and only recognized in AD 100 to AD 300 and they were actually declared authoritative as the word of God from anywhere between AD 300 to AD 400.

There were reasons for scripture being written:

- To ensure accuracy especially after first hand witnesses has died
- Spread of Christianity mandated material as apostles could not be everywhere
- To combat heresies
- Greco-Roman society was highly literary

From the original New Testament documents, we have about 5400 copies of the Greek manuscripts, early translations were about 15000 copies and early church father's writings based on these Bibles were actually 1 million copies.

The New Testament primary documents consist of Papyri, Uncial and Miniscules. These are various names given to the different kinds of manuscripts and they are all very recent, spanning from 200 AD to about 900 AD. We have Chester Beatty papyrus which is dated 200-250 AD, one of the earliest papyrus New Testament documents.

So we actually have huge resources from which we can actually reconstruct the original autographs of the New Testament Greek autographs. We have 5400 copies of the Greek manuscripts, early translations of 15,000 copies and early church fathers of 1 million copies. They were all used to reconstruct the original text, so we actually know what original authors wrote.

Let's compare the Bible with other literature. If you look for example at the New Testament written between AD 40 and 100, the earliest currently existing copy is AD 125. So therefore timespan from its first writing till its original copy is still in existence today is actually about 25 years. The number of New Testament copies are in excess of 5000. If one were to look comparisons in history there is no ancient book that has been better authenticated or evidenced as the Testament. The Homer was written in 900 BC, the earliest existing copy is 400 BC. So the timespan between the original copy and the earliest copy is 500 years and there are only 643 copies. If you believe in Julius Caesar, the history of Julius Caesar was written between 100 to 44 BC but the earliest copy we have is AD 900. So there is timespan between the original written and the earliest copies is a whopping 1000 years and the number of copies we actually have in hand is a paltry 10. So the evidence for the New Testament authenticity is far-far-far greater than any historical figure ever.

## CANONIZATION OF THE BIBLE:

In this section we will deal with how we have decided which of the various books would qualify to be included into the Bible. Canonization of the Bible means recognition of the Bible. The recognition of the Bible was a gradual process, which took over 200 years from AD 100 to AD 300.

The reason for adoption of a Bible or set of books that were recognized to be inspired by God as the Bible was simply because there was a heretic that came out at that time in AD 144. His name was Marcion. He created his

own bible by using only all Ten Pauline letters and all the Gospel of Luke and all the rest he didn't recognize and certainly all the Old Testament he rejected as well. So this is actually a heresy and to combat this, the early church had to do something and come out with its own recognition of its own set of books, which were recognized to be the authentic Bible.

Marcion was this heretic's name and he introduced his Bible in AD 140 and by AD 190 the church countered by setting up the Muratorian canon comprising of the four gospels, Acts, 13 letters of Paul, Jude, 1-2 John, wisdom of Solomon, Revelations and Apocalypse of Peter. Then Eusebius adopted all the New Testament books except James, 2-Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude which were disputed at 300 AD. All of the New Testament books that we have today were all officially recognized by the time of 367 AD. So this was again confirmed by the Council of Hippo in 393 AD, the Synod of Carthage 397 AD and the Council of Carthage in 419 AD, all the New Testament books were gradually recognized from the process where all the churches got together to compare what they had been using and it turned out that it was an actual miracle that they got all agreed that these were the books that they all had used.

These were some of the criteria whereby the early church recognized a book to be inspired by God,

- Was it written by an apostle or at least by someone of recognized authority (“under the apostolic umbrella”)? For example, Mark was an apostle but he wrote the Gospel of Mark under the influence of Peter the apostle.
- Did it agree with the canon of truth? Did it contradict known Scripture?
- Did it have a self-authenticating nature?
- Did the church accept it?

The Old Testament canonization criteria was similar:

- Was it written by a prophet or at least by someone recognized as having authority
- Did it not contain contradiction?
- It originated from Inspiration of God?
- Did the Jews accept it?

As we know, most of the Old Testament already accepted by most of the Jews by AD 100.

The Catholic church has some extra books called the Apocrypha which are basically hidden books, which Protestants don't recognize as inspired by God. They contain odd doctrines like praying for the dead and to saints.

## **BIBLE TRANSLATIONS:**

In this section we will deal with Bible translations which is a very important question. So which Bible should I use? We really have a confusingly large number of translations of Bible in various languages.

We will revise how we actually got our English Bible. Firstly, we have God, who then inspires a prophet, who writes the original text. There are no more original manuscripts anyway and these copies are passed down in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek and they are summarized in the critical text and then we have got translation committees which then translated it in English for us to read. So there is a process of inspiration, transmission and translation and interpretation.

John Wycliffe from Britain was the first person to translate the bible from the Latin text into English. William

Tyndale in 1494 to 1536 was the first English man who translated the English Bible from the Greek text.

All Bible translations fall under one of two categories.

- Formally equivalent
- Dynamically equivalent.

Within dynamic equivalent Bibles, there is a paraphrase or a transculturalization. Now let's look at the various kinds of translations.

**Formally Equivalent Translation:** When you translate something of an ancient text, you can translate it paying more attention to its outward form, less to its meaning, more to its form. So you stick to its original text. So the King James Version is a translation which sticks closely to the original Greek text.

*Matthew 5:2 And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying,*

The question here is, why would you want to write something saying, he “opened his mouth “ which is really not necessary, but because this is a formally equivalent translation, they translate every single word as is.

The problem with formally equivalent translations is that the:

- The meaning is not the sum of the individual words
- In Chinese for example “Chee Seen” means crazy. Well that's a combination of some wires being stuck literally. So we translate it literally. People years from now might not really understand what it means because the meaning is not the sum of the individual words. We should actually translate it as crazy.
- Chinese word “Gwai Lo” means white devil, which actually means Caucasian but the meaning is not the sum of the two words as it would be pejorative
- Pineapple? It is a kind of fruit, but it is not a combination of a pine nut and an apple.

For example, the Australian Chinese chef, Kylie Kwong visited China and wrote up a book. Everywhere she went, in Cantonese they will ask her ‘Sik Pau Mei’? In Hokkien it is ‘Chia Par Ber’? Is it literal or does it mean that they actually were interested in whether she actually had eaten? Actually if you were to translate it literally, it would be. ‘Sik Pau Mei’ means have you eaten. ‘Chai Par Ber’ in Hokkien is have you eaten. But people weren't really interested in whether the guest had eat or not. It is a way of saying, hello. In Australia where she comes from, when you meet anybody they won't ask you if have you eaten, they will actually say “Good day mate”. So formal equivalent translations have problems because the form obscures the meaning because of its cultural anchors.

**Dynamic or Functional Equivalent Translation:** So if formal equivalent Bibles are problematic and you may not understand its actual meaning years from now, perhaps we should have a a more easily understood Bible translation by utilizing the principle of dynamic or functional equivalents, which means it seeks to translate the meaning rather than the form. So therefore you sacrifice some of the form to ensure the function. So that the meaning is accurate and understood and we sacrifice the form to gain function. Hence if I were to translate Matthew 5:2 again using the New International Version which is a dynamic or functional equivalent Bible

*Matthew 5:2 and he began to teach them, saying:*

As you can see, “open the mouth” is actually omitted, although the actual original words are present in the

manuscript, it doesn't add to its meaning, it is confusing, so therefore they only translate it into,..." he began to teach them saying". In this kind of translation ,they have actually distilled the meaning out rather than the form.

So lets compare formal equivalent translations with dynamic equivalent translation in another example:

#### FORMAL EQUIVALENT TRANSLATION

*Luke 3:6 and all flesh shall see the salvation of God."* ESV

#### DYNAMIC EQUIVALENT TRANSLATION

*Luke 3:6 And all mankind will see God's salvation."* NIV

In the Greek text, there is a word 'sark', which actually literally means flesh, but the actual meaning of 'sark' can mean many things. It can mean "mankind", or "human flesh" itself. So what dynamic equivalent translator has done is that, it has taken the original word 'sark', which is flesh and interpreted it as all "mankind". So the translator decided that this verse didn't refer to him in "flesh", actually referred to "mankind". So it is translated as all mankind will see God's salvation.

So all bible translations exist within a spectrum. For formally equivalent bibles are the NASB, KJV, RSV, NKJV or ESV. The dynamic equivalent side you have got the GNB, NLT, and The Message etc. The NIV or today's NIV actually belong in the middle. It is between the formal equivalent and the dynamic equivalent. So it is basically a spectrum.

Paraphrase Bibles are a little bit different. What they do is they reword a sentence from the same language. So when you actually paraphrase something, you actually paraphrase from a Bible that is already translated from the original Greek or Hebrew. For example, the Living Bible is paraphrased from the American Standard Version, which actually was translated from the original Greek and Hebrew text.

The extreme form of paraphrasing is transculturalization.

- This type of translation bridges time and culture as well
- The goal is less about original meaning but more about contemporary relevance
- Examples of this The Message (Eugene Peterson), Cotton Patch Version (Clarence Jordan), The Word on the Street 2003 (Rob Lacy)

So let's look at a verse from Matthew 23:25 from a formally equivalent Bible called the English Standard version

*"Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs, which outwardly appear beautiful, but within are full of dead people's bones and all uncleanness. Matt 23:25*

These are the exact words, which you will actually find in the original text which is translated. The English Standard version is more literal than the NIV. So it is largely free of the problems that come with the use of so-called "dynamic equivalence" versions; but it is not so severely literal that ordinary readers will struggle to understand it. It is a good study Bible.

So this is a paraphrase bible. Same verse

*"How terrible it will be for you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs-- beautiful on the outside but filled on the inside with dead people's bones and all sorts of impurity.*

The transculturalization Bible, the message makes it even more understandable but actually distorts the meaning somewhat.

*You're like manicured grave plots, grass clipped and flowers bright, but 6 feet under its all rotting bones and worm eaten flesh.* **The Message**

It is vivid, when you read the message, it drives the message home but it is so far off from the original words. I mean the original Greek manuscript never wrote about flowers, bright or 6 feet under or worms. So while it gives you an easy read, it does distort the meaning somewhat.

Let's look at the three versions of the same verse

**Formally equivalent** – *ESV Genesis 18:12 So Sarah laughed to herself, saying, "After I am worn out, and my lord is old, shall I have pleasure?"*

The context is that God has told Sarah and Abraham that they will have a baby, so she is laughing out of incredulity.

**Dynamically equivalent** – *NIV Genesis 18:12 So Sarah laughed to herself as she thought, "After I am worn out and my master is old, will I now have this pleasure?"*

Which means she is interpreting the “pleasure” here as the pleasure of having a child.

**Paraphrased version** – *NLT Genesis 18:12 she laughed silently to herself. "How could a worn-out woman like me have a baby?" she thought. "And when my master-- my husband-- is also so old?"*

So here is a paraphrase. What they have done is that they have taken the original language and they have translated this in such a way that added interpretation and there is no mention of the word pleasure at all. It has been interpreted rather than translated as to having a “baby”. But if you look in the original English Standard Version, the actual Hebrew word says, “shall I have pleasure”. This could actually mean ,shall I have “orgasmic pleasure” at this advanced age, not necessarily meaning a “baby”. So there are problems in dynamic equivalent Bibles as well as paraphrases, because the translator has taken the liberty to not only translate but to also interpret. Bible teachers will usually prefer to stick to a Bible which is formally equivalent, normal lay people will either read the NIV which is a dynamic equivalent or New Living Translation, because actually the differences are minor, only important if one is teaching.

Next we are going to deal with the authorized version, King James Version. Some people think, it is the most accurate version, actually it is not. If you look at the original text or manuscripts they use, they use six manuscripts and all of them are basically later than 10 century, which means they are rather late manuscripts, they are not early manuscripts and 10 passages have readings found in no other Greek text variants. So all these six manuscripts are combined into the Textus Recepticus, from which you get the authorized King James Version.

Now if you compare this King James Version translation, it is used of six manuscripts, all quite late, 10th century byzantine. They form the majority of text, Textus Recepticus and then is translated into the King James Version in

1611. Compare this to in the majority of other bible translations where they actually used the 5358 New Testament manuscripts in fragments, Old Testament 800 manuscripts in versions, combined together to have one Eclectic text and from which they actually form one Bible, the Nestle Aland or United Bible Society for the Greek New Testament and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia for the Hebrew Bible and from that they translate all the Bibles into different languages.

So the King James Version is not accurate because it only uses as its primary documentation six manuscripts where else the normal bibles translated from the Eclectic text use far larger number of New Testament and Old Testament manuscripts, so therefore it would be probably more accurate.

## **TRANSLATION PROCESS:**

Usual process is translation review scholars about 50 of them with the advisory council of about 54 and these give input into a translation committee of about 14 members. The New International Version was worked on by 110 evangelical scholars from USA, UK, Australia, NZ and Canada from 34 denominations including the Anglicans, Baptists, Brethren, Church of Christ, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Presbyterian and Assemblies of God. It is a dynamic equivalent Bible.

### **What kind of bible should we be using?**

Children	Living Bible
Older person	KJV or RSV
Fine literary tastes	NEB or Phillips
English as second language	Good News Bible
Unchurched person	GNB

Those who would like to study the bible more academically or preach or teach should be using

Study Bible	ESV, NASB
Easy to memorize and public worship	NIV, RSV
Devotional read	Good News Bible, Phillips

When one chooses a Bible to use, it is always better to choose Bibles that have team or committee translations, so that it will appeal to a wide audience, rather than individual translation. Let's say if you have got Bible like the Eugene Peterson's Bible which is called 'The Message', it is translated by one person. The biasness of one person would be there, which would not happen with a team translation.

### **Questions on the passage**

1. Why are there no original autographs left today
2. What language was the Old Testament written in? What about the New Testament?
3. What evidence is there to suggest that the bible has been accurately transmitted to us today?
4. What was the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls?
5. What are the two major kinds of bible translations? What are the pros and cons of each type? Which bible translations do you use?