



General Topics :: What about the ESV

What about the ESV - posted by inotof (), on: 2005/6/30 15:04

Just curious if anyone knows anything about the ESV bible?

Re: What about the ESV, on: 2005/6/30 16:24

It is a more literal translation of the same **corrupted** Greek text that the NIV and the other modern versions are based on. The Old Testament is a translation of an inferior Hebrew Text.

I would recommend you avoid this "bible" as much as I would the NIV "bible".

No doubt I'll get hammered on this thread, but watch... not one person will come to the defense of the Alexandrian text... or explain why they reject the Received Text (which the KJV is based on). I'll just be called mean spirited, divisive, etc etc. But in all my time on this site not one supporter of the modern versions has ever tried to offer any argument for the Alexandrian Text.

And yes... that's a friendly challenge. Anyone wanna step up to the plate and show us why the stream of Greek texts that underly the modern versions is superior?

By the way, this is a friendly challenge for a friendly debate. Any and all overly emotional hot-heads will be ignored. (You know who you are)

Krispy

Re: - posted by inotof (), on: 2005/6/30 16:37

okay. that's all i really needed to know. i'll stick to my motto.

"textus receptus be the bestest" :-P Thanks Krispy.

Re: You are one of the giants in the land - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/6/30 16:45

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

By the way, this is a friendly challenge for a friendly debate. Any and all overly emotional hot-heads will be ignored. (You know who you are)

What do you mean? :-x You are one of the kingjamerite giants in the promised land of us dear believers. This giant that needs to be slain. :-P

Unfortunately I do not care enough to waste my time faffing with this stuff. Calling all Calebs and Joshuas.

Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/6/30 17:18

I have read my ESV twice now, (cover to cover). I am reading it the third time now, though it isn't my "main" study bible. I have two "main" study bibles - an NASB, and a NKJV.

I haven't limited myself to just these versions of course, having also read the KJV and the NET bible.

I have had a KJV for the last 30 years or so, and love the prose - it is a wonderfully accurate and poetic rendering of the Textus Receptus - and I prefer it to the NKJV, using it to memorize scripture (I like the Shakespearian English!) In fact, my church uses only the KJV and the NKJV in the pulpit, or for any church related studies.

General Topics :: What about the ESV

Yet for all that, and as much as I cherish these particular translations, I do not consider the underlying texts of the KJV/NKJV to be superior to the Greek compendiums that also include the Alexandrian texts (NA27/UBS4).

Which is why I think the ESV is one of the better translations out there, though I consider it to be inferior to the NASB.

It is a near literal rendering of the underlying texts, but in some places it renders the translators "best impression" as to the "meaning" the author was intending. I don't care for that line of thinking - but since I don't rely on any -one- translation, I am not affected by it either. I don't think I would want the ESV as my only bible - but I do use it since I have it. I usually study from four or five translations simultaneously, so take that for what it is.

As a person who prefers more literal translations, I would suggest getting a more literal translation to study from/compare to. The ESV bible is - nevertheless - more than fit for instruction in the Christian faith, and if it were the only bible a Christian had, he or she would not suffer from doctrinal error on account of it.

I do not agree with the KJVO crowd, or their close brethren the TRO (Textus Receptus Only) crowd. Having personally (and I believe thoroughly) studied the manuscript issue, I agree with the overwhelming majority, that the corruption (or lack thereof) of the Alexandrian body of texts in no way impacts the accuracy of the Nestle/Aland (27) or the United Bible Society (4) Greek compendiums, from which all modern (NT) versions are translated.

One has to understand how textual criticism works, and is applied to the underlying texts to get a full appreciation for my opinion, but such a study is easily done if one is really interested/concerned.

I will be the first to say that there are godly men on both sides of this issue - which is why it behooves us to diligently examine both positions before we adopt one as our own - and certainly before we entertain discussion about supposedly "corrupt" versions of the bible.

Bottom line - the ESV is a good translation - one of the better ones, but I would put the NASB above it.

Dan
/V
V\

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/6/30 18:08

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmode=flat&order0&topic_id1986&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) ESV? was the last time we looked at this topic.

Re: Double Minded - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/7/1 3:36

Quote:
-----Yet for all that, and as much as I cherish these particular translations, I do not consider the underlying texts of the KJV/NKJV to be superior to the Greek compendiums that also include the Alexandrian texts (NA27/UBS4).

This sounds good if you have a hole in your head. Think about it, if both are good and accurate, both can't contradict each other! **But they do contradict each other. Can both be the Word of God if both contain conflicting information?**

Quote:
-----I do not agree with the KJVO crowd, or their close brethren the TRO (Textus Receptus Only) crowd. Having personally (and I believe thoroughly) studied the manuscript issue, I agree with the overwhelming majority, that the corruption (or lack thereof) of the Alexandrian body of texts in no way impacts the accuracy of the Nestle/Aland (27) or the United Bible Society (4) Greek compendiums, from which all modern (NT) versions are translated.

What a smooth tongue you have. Great for politics. But a double minded man is unstable in all his ways.

Do you really want to ride the fence on this one?

RT

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/1 4:08

Quote:

-----What a smooth tongue you have. Great for politics. But a double minded man is unstable in all his ways.

RT

You know I share your preference for the Byzantine textform, but I think this comment is somewhat extreme. I know that doublemindedness is the source of much instability but I also like Churchill's definition of a fanatic as being someone who 'could not change his mind and would not change the subject'. ;-)

Re:, on: 2005/7/1 5:50

Dann... that was a nice post, but you have skirted my challenge. Obviously you prefer Alexandrian body of texts, but why? What is wrong with the RT that you have decided to side with the other?

Put textual criticism aside for a moment... explain to us why you believe the differences between the two streams makes no difference to accuracy.

Defend thy position, brother! :-)

(I agree with RT, there was a lot of fluff in your post...)

Krispy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/1 10:41

Quote:

----- (I agree with RT, there was a lot of fluff in your post...)

And there is a tremendous amount of **antagonism** in your and RT's! What is your point? What is your motivation? You ask him to defend his position? Against what? Your attacks? How could this discussion possibly honor God at the rate it is going? Tone down the rhetoric and maybe we'll listen.

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/7/1 10:51

To RT, and Krispy,

I know and appreciate the respect you two have for the received text. I am of the same mind as Ron B. is when it comes to the Byzantine text. However brothers what end are you seeking to achieve when the tone of your posts may be closer to the facts but lacking Grace? I say this in love.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/1 10:52

Quote:
-----You know I share your preference for the Byzantine textform, but I think this comment is somewhat extreme. I know that doublemin
dedness is the source of much instability but I also like Churchill's definition of a fanatic as being someone who 'could not change his mind and would
not change the subject'.

I agree with Ron here. I also side with the Byzantine textform and the KJV version. Yet the reasonable thing I see is to dr
aw from the source that best conveys the meaning of the particular passage of phrase in question. I have followed Ron's
works and he quotes from several different versions when the version best conveys the meaning. It may be a Alexandria
n based version also. It seems to me that wisdom would have it that the best version for the passage should prevail.

This is not an "either or" position. It is 'both' depending on what is being discussed. It would be quite unwise to limit ones
self to one particular group of manuscripts or translations when the other may have the better accuracy.

There are much better ways to express your faith than to draw swords with everyone you find using what you deem as a
"corrupted" text.

Always bemusing... - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/7/1 16:13

...is just how the plain speaking to the heart gets missed.

*"If the Church is the salt of the earth, this holy righteousness imparted by God to give us holy living would help us to turn
the other cheek. Have you ever seen someone do that? Touch a man's theology and see if he turns the other cheek. O
ftentimes there is something sinful in the way he defends his doctrine."*

Keith Daniel

What will it take if even a "corrupt" version which still has even the most basic of basics preserved doesn't penetrate the
heart? If it only sits in the mind and then ends up being denied by the truth it brings by how it is represented?

What good is a perfect translation if it doesn't translate the reader? And how can one argue with someone who has read
a 'poorer' version but has a purer understanding?

Re: I like the NIV, on: 2005/7/1 16:16

I like the NIV, I have one. I like the ESV, I have one. I like the KJV, I have one. I like the NKJV, I have one.

I love the Word of God.

God knows those who try to divide the flock.

God knows.

Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/7/1 19:24

I have started a thread called "Textual Criticism" which I hope explains my position with regards to that matter. It
seemed inappropriate to post it in this thread.

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id6133&forum35) Link to thread

Grace,

Dan
/V
V\

Edited to add link...

Re: Always bemusing... - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/7/1 19:38

crsschk,

Quote:
-----Touch a man's theology and see if he turns the other cheek.

Jesus never commanded us to "turn the other cheek" in our theology. What is this supposed to mean?

Quote:
-----Oftentimes there is something sinful in the way he defends his doctrine."

Please give an example of this.

Quote:
-----What will it take if even a "corrupt" version which still has even the most basic of basics preserved doesn't penetrate the heart?

Answer: The Truth. Or we could reply with a question,

"What will it take if even a "poisoned" chocolate cake which still has even the most basic of basics (flour, butter, eggs, et c) preserved doesn't bring enjoyment to the eater?

Answer: A Real Chocolate Cake.

Quote:
-----If it only sits in the mind and then ends up being denied by the truth it brings by how it is represented?

I don't get you here. What does this mean?

Quote:
-----What good is a perfect translation if it doesn't translate the reader?

The Bible always translates (or effects) the reader. It will either propel them or draw them.

Quote:
-----And how can one argue with someone who has read a 'poorer' version but has a purer understanding?

General Topics :: What about the ESV

If someone has a "purer" understanding from a "poorer" version, it wasn't really the "poorer" version that is responsible for this "purity." We must give the credit to special grace from God and give Him glory. We must not use legitimize the fault of a translation based upon the grace of God. This would produce treachery of the highest degree.

RT

Re: - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/7/1 19:43

Quote:
-----This is not an "either or" position. It is 'both' depending on what is being discussed. It would be quite unwise to limit ones self to one particular group of manuscripts or translations when the other may have the better accuracy.

If Vaticanus, Siniaticus, or Alexandrinus have any "better readings" that contain "additional information", the additional information is "new information" to us, since they necessarily would have been absent from the Christian world for about a thousand year period. Did God's words get lost?

It is necessarily "either, or" because of the necessity of preservation. Was the Bible always available in it's purest form throughout history?

Do you believe a pure Bible exists today? If so, please let us know where you think it is.

RT

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/7/2 0:17

Quote:
-----This sounds good if you have a hole in your head.

Re:, on: 2005/7/2 7:24

My intention was not to cause a fight... and my original challenge should have made that clear... if people would actually slow down and read entire posts before they get offended. So for those who missed it, this is what I wrote:

Quote:
-----By the way, this is a **friendly challenge for a friendly debate**. Any and all overly emotional hot-heads will be ignored. (You know who you are)

But yet, somehow... I managed to offend even tho I havent posted anything yet on this topic.

I cant win here sometimes... so y'all enjoy the thread. I find some other topic.

I'm beginning to think I should change my name, cuz I think if I posted what I posted on this thread under any other name... no one would be offended.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/7/2 7:48

It's been suggested that I change my name to "Not-So-Krispy" ... or perhaps Medium-Rare....

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/7/2 7:51

Krispy/medium-rare
i'm rolling with laughter now! :-P

Re: - posted by inotof (), on: 2005/7/2 10:24

wow. what a hot topic this is all i wanted to know was what everybody thought about the ESV. I've learned more about Bible texts listening to the arg..er....hmm...debates on this site (they be many) than most 4 year students at Asbury. Didn't mean to get nuthin' started. Next tome I'll PM a couple of people and let it go.

Re: Ought not to be that way - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/7/2 11:07

Hi inotof,

There is room brother for discussion, need not shy away from these things and yet at the same time some perspective is needed. It gets to be like a broken record but just same consideration for the other members here for one. The other is that which is going on in the heart. I am sorry that there can't be some greater consideration given to what the scriptures mean more so then how they are put together, how they are translated. It becomes just like the Pharisees and just as surely that will be chaffed at, but there are those that just don't care about anything other than their own opinion or if they do, they sure have a lousy way of showing it. In the end it misses the whole point.

1Ti 1:5 Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned:

1Ti 1:6 From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling;

1Ti 1:7 Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.

You didn't cause anything here brother.

For what it's worth here is something from a man many of us respect:

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid5014>) The Word by A.W. Tozer
Psalm 119

Re: What about the ESV, on: 2005/7/2 14:05

Quote:
-----What good is a perfect translation if it doesn't translate the reader? And how can one argue with someone who has read a 'poorer' version but has a purer understanding?

I think this is a very good point, because it reminds me of meeting a lady who had become a Christian only a few weeks previously, who had read (probably the KJV) from cover to cover in the first four days; she was now helping with a mission to school children and was completely bemused (that word) by the amount of doctrinal discussion being had between team members who were at University studying Divinity. She kept saying 'But it's *simple*' and her fresh faith was a river of living water in a desert.

Quote:
-----'Touch a man's theology and see if he turns the other cheek.'

This (from Keith Daniel) is the same point made as from a Bible school teacher, preaching from the Lord's Prayer, who pointed out that we are comfortable enough with forgiving another's debts, until it comes to *money*.

Quote:
-----What will it take if even a "corrupt" version which still has even the most basic of basics preserved doesn't penetrate the heart? If it

only sits in the mind and then ends up being denied by the truth it brings by how it is represented?

This seems to be a comment about mind over matter leading to the whole point being missed, whereas, the mind should give way to the matter - at least, it should be responsive to the word of God. I realise that some translations have serious problems, but you know what? That has never prevented God from being able to meet those who were seeking him.

Quote:

-----What good is a perfect translation if it doesn't translate the reader?

RT,

This is a comment about communication. It is important the reader can make head and tail of the message, more than to be reading the finest translation which is couched in language they don't recognise. Probably, this is why we have preachers and why the spoken word has always been more important than the written word. To be fair, let me back that up with

Hebrews 1

1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,
2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

inotof,

I think you asked a fair question and it has led to a lively discussion, which has been instructive. Thank you.

I'm not sure what ESV stands for, so can't comment on that exactly, but, I do have several versions of the Bible and use a website which enables me to compare verses quickly to see if there is a glaring difference between the way they read and the original. There are other modern versions too, not just Hebrew and Greek.

This is not perfect, but it is *visually instant* and I make my own judgment within the context of other verses on the same matter, *and* what the Lord seems to be showing me from them.