

Intro:

The manuscript questions should leave no believer shaken or upset about the quality of their Bible – the manuscript tradition validates the words of the Bible like no other ancient book. We are better able to determine the original text of the Bible than *any* other ancient book.

From the manuscripts we turn to the English translations. Before discussing specific translations (versions), we will discuss *translation philosophy*.

I. The concept of dynamic equivalence**A. The principle defined**

1. Idiolect translation seeks to preserve the idiom of the Hebrew and Greek
2. Non-idiolect (dynamic equivalency) does not concern itself with the specific idiom
3. The idiom of the “receptor language” is the paramount consideration
4. Full blown dynamic equivalency advocates justify “the development of translations oriented to different audiences and Bible selections designed for specific groups.” van Bruggen, p. 68

The “Street Bible”, or the “Rapper Bible”, for instance

5. The assumption of the dynamic equivalency advocates is that the “receptor” is incapable of receiving communication except within the limits of his own cultural context.
6. Older translations took the receptor into account by translating into the receptors language, but gave little thought for the cultural and social aspects of the receptor’s environment.
7. In short, we must realize (acc. to dynamic equivalence advocates) that “we are faced not only with a different language, but different receptors.” van Bruggen, p. 71

B. The principle of dynamic equivalency applied

1. “If the biblical revelation may be described as mainly a communication event, it is the duty of the church to repeat or reenact this event.” van Bruggen, p. 71
2. Revelation becomes not the communication of doctrine so much as a communication that must be effectively delivered.

- a. Each cultural group needs to have its own effective communication of the message.
 - b. Even within a language group, there is diversity of culture, thus a need for diverse translations
3. Eugene Nida, one of the most influential people in the field of modern translation, “states emphatically that biblical revelation is not ‘absolute’ and applies Paul’s statement that ‘now we see through a glass, darkly’ (1 Cor 13.12) to the biblical revelation itself, which as the really incarnate Word *can* offer no absolute truth.” van Bruggen, p. 76
 4. Thus literal accuracy is not of primary importance for dynamic equivalent advocates.
 5. “Loyalty to the revelation of the incarnate Word, then, means that the needs of the receptor are given priority over the original form of the message.” *Ibid.*
 6. “The theory of dynamic equivalence takes into account the receptors of the Word as they see themselves, but not as God views them.” *Ibid.*, p. 81

C. Reasons for rejecting Dynamic Equivalency

1. “It rejects the orthodox doctrine of the unity of the unchanged divine and human natures of Christ by making His words subject to all the limitations of the first century.”
2. “It denies that the Bible reveals absolute truth that transcends the time in which it was written.”
3. “It confuses the people *present* and the people *addressed* and thus limits the horizon of God’s speaking in the Bible to the centuries of the past.”