

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: NASB not a good translation for the conscientious objector.****NASB not a good translation for the conscientious objector. - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/10/24 23:54**

I have held both perspectives when it comes to a conscientious objector standing, the scripture that started leading me to more of a nonresistance stance was

Luke 3:14 KJV

And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages

That is a radical statement that John is telling soldiers to Do violence to no man. But the Gospel of the kingdom is radical.

I noticed today that the modern versions like the NASB have interpreted this passage a bit differently

Luke 3:14

New American Standard Bible (NASB)

14 Some soldiers were questioning him, saying, "And what about us, what shall we do?" And he said to them, "Do not take money from anyone by force, or accuse anyone falsely, and be content with your wages."

One can not make a very good conscientious objector case if John was just telling the soldiers "Do not take money from anyone by force" but if John was telling the Soldiers

"Do violence to no man" the conscientious objector has a very strong case for his position. diaseivw Diaseio

Choice of Bible translation does matter

**Re: NASB not a good translation for the conscientious objector. - posted by richrock, on: 2012/10/26 17:25**

I will confess, I rather like the NASB, but as a non-violent Christian (and how could we justify violence, with the exception of Christ's anger at those who desecrated His temple?) I would point rather to the core teaching of Christ, where He told us to love our enemies, and turn the other cheek.

<http://bible.cc/luke/3-14.htm> has a good parallel and also an explanation of why this was said - Roman soldiers were notorious for 'adding' to their pay packet with the threats of violence. An early form of protection rackets, no doubt.

Thanks for pointing this out, it's certainly got me thinking!

**Re: NASB not a good translation for the conscientious objector. - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/10/26 22:05**

Well let's break this down quickly.

In Luke 3:14, the word we have being translated in the KJV is the word *διασειω* (*diaseiō*), which is only used once in the New Testament, defined as:

- 1) to shake thoroughly
- 2) to make to tremble
- 3) to terrify
- 4) to agitate
- 5) to extort from one by intimidation money or other property

But we see in the New Testament, when they're using a word that specifically describes physical violence, and entirely different word is used. That word is *βιάω* (*biaō*), as found in verses such as;

Acts 21:35

When he got to the stairs, he was carried by the soldiers because of the violence (bia) of the mob;

Defined as:

- 1) strength, whether of body or mind
- 2) strength in violent action, force

Honestly, just a few minutes of research can clear up this sort of stuff. This idea you've been proposing on several threads on this topic that the modern translations are giving people a license for licentiousness is getting rather silly.

One reads the Bible as a whole. Picking one text in one version (especially if it's not in the original language) and forming doctrines and theology out of it is proof texting. Unbelievers and those deceived have always, do always, and will always do this sort of exegesis. It's the crowning mark of Satan, as it's the same sort of exegetical tactic He tried against Jesus.

We don't need John to specifically say "do no violence" especially if that's not specifically what was originally said in Greek, to follow the words of Jesus on the subject. We don't need 1 John 5:7 to prove the Trinity, as it's easily shown other places in Scripture (including the Old Testament). etc. etc.

Do a bit more research beyond just comparing two English versions to each other and declaring one anathema.

I'll say it one last time, like I've said in every thread you've posted on this subject;

Adding to the Word of God is just as serious as taking away from it.

**Re: richrock - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/10/26 22:20**

Hi richrock

RE: richrock wrote, I will confess, I rather like the NASB

I must give the NASB as well as the ESV credit for striving to be literal translations even though I personally am bothered by their underlining text.

I have not studied the NASB as I have the NIV, I find the NIV full of obvious theological biasedness, this is allowed under the heading of dynamic equivalence, Since the NASB and ESV have striven for a Literal translation, I find that they tend to less biaseness than does a paraphrased version, But I question if some biaseness may have played a role in the interpretation of the verse that I posted.

RE: richrock wrote ///but as a non-violent Christian (and how could we justify violence,///

Well It depends on our understanding of the role of Christians and government, If we believe that Christians are allowed and even called to take part in a countrys defense and law enforcement as what the majority of Christianity has believed since Constantine and Augustine, than taking up the sword and violence is allowed when ordered by a ruling power. The majority of Evengelicals believe this, I have believed this way most of my life because it was hammered into me with old testament examples.

RE: richrock wrote ///with the exception of Christs anger at those who desecrated His temple?) I would point rather to the core teaching of Christ, where He told us to love our enemies, and turn the other cheek.///

John the Baptist was preparing people for the Gospel of the kingdom that Jesus was bringing, He would not have preached allowance for something that Jesus would have been opposed to.

If the command that John is giving the soldiers is just "Do not take money from anyone by force" than honestly the conscientious objector has no scriptural leg to stand on But if John who is preparing people for the Gospel of the Kingdom is saying "Do violence to no man" than this is a Radical message and seems to fit the rest of the core teaching of Christ.

That was the conclusion that I came to before I even reliezed that translations differ on this verse. That is how come it st

uck out to me when I read it from the NASB.

RE: richrock wrote /// <http://bible.cc/luke/3-14.htm> has a good parallel and also an explanation of why this was said - Roman soldiers were notorious for 'adding' to their pay packet with the threats of violence. An early form of protection rackets, no doubt.///

These may have been some of the same soldiers that a few years later would be the physical vessels used to crucify Christ, was John really just telling them "Do not take money from anyone by force" ??

RE: richrock wrote ///Thanks for pointing this out, it's certainly got me thinking!!!

thank you for your reply it gets me thinking too.

**Re: EverestoSama - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/10/27 0:09**

Hi EverestoSama

EverestoSama wrote ///Well let's break this down quickly.//

I already broke it down I already looked up the word Greek (diaseivw Diaseio), hence why I added "diaseivw Diaseio" at my second to the last sentence in my original post. I already knew before I posted that you specifically would try to take me down this rabbit trail.

RE: EverestoSama wrote ///But we see in the New Testament, when they're using a word that specifically describes physical violence, and entirely different word is used. That word is βία; (bia), as found in verses such as:///

EverestoSama how many Greek words are there for our single English word LOVE??

How many different English words do we have that are SYNONYMOUS for the word violence???

RE: EverestoSama wrote ///Honestly, just a few minutes of research can clear up this sort of stuff.///

Honestly this thread is only intended and would only be of concern for a conscientious objector.

RE: EverestoSama wrote /// This idea you've been proposing on several threads on this topic that the modern translations are giving people a license for licentiousness is getting rather silly///

My conviction on this topic is not uncommon to many of the preachers promoted on SI

RE: EverestoSama wrote ///One reads the Bible as a whole. Picking one text in one version (especially if it's not in the original language) and forming doctrines and theology out of it is proof texting. Unbelievers and those deceived have always, do always, and will always do this sort of exegesis. It's the crowning mark of Satan, as it's the same sort of exegetical tactic He tried against Jesus.///

Jesus used the verb tense of a word to prove a doctrine. by doing so He showed the kind of confidence we need to have in the written word.

One word can totally change the meaning of a text and a doctrine. The NWT the JW's Bible another translation from the eclectic critical text adds the word "A" in the book of John, just that one single letter word completely changes one's understanding of the "Word"

Re: EverestoSama wrote /// We don't need John to specifically say "do no violence" especially if that's not specifically what was originally said in Greek ///

I do not read Greek and even if I did I would be at the hands of the lexicographers. rather than putting my trust in the scribes, I personally have chosen to put my trust in God's sovereign hand in inspiring the Bible into my language.

RE: Everstosama wrote /// We don't need 1 John 5:7 to prove the Trinity,///

1 John ch 5 v 7 is the only proof text for the Trinity! If you where to ask me my thoughts of the Trinity, I would read to you 1 John ch 5 v 7. If you where able to convince me that some one added this verse against the will of God than you will indeed place doubt of this doctrine within me. and cause me to start coming to conclusions like what Issac newton did with his "An Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture"

RE: EverestoSama wrote /// Do a bit more research beyond just comparing two English versions to each other and declaring one anathema///

This may be a fine debate tactic but I say this confidently not boastfully I have researched and spent many more hours pondering these thoughts than what you have.

Everstosama wrote ///I'll say it one last time, like I've said in every thread you've posted on this subject; Adding to the Word of God is just as serious as taking away from it.///

As I posted on another thread in response to you

Everestoma, Do you believe that we should throw out the woman caught in adultery "The Pericope Adulterae" john 7:53-8:11 out of our bible ??

Everestoma, Do you believe that we should include the Letter of Barnabas and Shepherd of Hermas in our Bibles??

Re: - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/10/27 1:10

Quote:  
----- already broke it down I already looked up the word Greek (diasei&#333;),hence why I added "diaseivw Diaseio" at my second to the last sentence in my original post. I already new before I posted that you specifically would try to take me down this rabbit trail. EverestoSama how many greek words are there for our single english word LOVE??

How many different English words do we have that are SYNONYMOUS for the word violence???

-----  
But the problem is, this word is only used once. And it's in Luke. And the translators seem to agree in almost all of the modern versions that what's being talked about is extortion/intimidation.

You can go off on synonyms and whatever, but it's still the only time we see it in the text.

I'm not for violence either, but I don't need the definition of a word changed to suit my belief, as like I said, since the Bible speaks as a whole, you should be able to validate anything said in there in more than just one place. By the mouth of two or three witnesses a matter is established.

I'm not saying your belief is incorrect about "not doing violence to anyone", but you can't proof text with something that seems to be commonly understood as an incorrect application.

Same with the Trinity, it can be demonstrated without the section in 1 John. If you ever try to share that with a Jehovah's Witness or liberal critic they will eat you for breakfast. You can't just say, "Here's my one verse in my one translation!"

Quote:  
-----My conviction on this topic is not uncommon to many of the preachers promoted on SI  
-----

Still doesn't make it any less misinformed, in my personal opinion.

Quote:  
-----Jesus used the verb tense of a word to prove a doctrine. by doing so He showed the kind of confidence we need to have in the written word.

One word can totally change the meaning of a text and a doctrine. The NWT the JW's Bible another translation from the eclectic critical text adds the word "A" in the book of John, Just that one single letter word completely changes ones understanding of the "Word"

-----  
But we're talking about something that was already there, that everyone knew was there. He didn't have to debate with the Sadducees about if the word existed or not, or if they somehow lost it's meaning in Aramaic. It wasn't an issue of the words conclusion or exclusion, or even translation. It was the fact that they had overlooked the significance of what it meant, it's application and it's reality.

And the Sadducees were the one's who were in the wrong, only accepting the words of Moses, and denying the full counsel of God revealed in all of the Tanakh. He knew they were proof texters. He just beat them at their own game.

Quote:  
-----I personally have chosen to put my trust in Gods soverign hand in inspiring the Bible into my language.  
-----

That's fine, but there are proven mistakes in the KJV translation (which seem to only be debated by the KJVO camp, even to the point of claiming that the scriptures were fully inspired in 1611). The fact that people didn't educate themselves throughout history, and give priority to the original languages before trying to do a sound exegetical teaching on doctrine

has led to all sorts of funny beliefs down through the centuries.

No believer needs to read or understand Greek or Hebrew to be able to understand salvation, to be fed from the Word of God, to do ministry, to operate in the gifts, etc. etc. But I personally wouldn't trust someone to expound on doctrinal detail much unless they were at least a little bit handy with a lexicon.

Quote:  
-----This may be a fine debate tactic but I say this confidently not boastfully I have researched and spent many more hours pondering these thoughts than what you have.  
-----

I'm glad that you feel confident to make such an assertion. :)

Quote:  
-----As I posted on another thread in response to you

Everestoma, Do you believe that we should throw out the woman caught in adultery "The Pericope Adulterae" John 7:53-8:11 out of our Bible??

Everestoma, Do you believe that we should include the Letter of Barnabas and Shepherd of Hermas in our Bibles??  
-----

I'm personally not for the inclusion of any of the three.

**Re: EverestoSama - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/10/27 1:28**

Hi EverestoSama

I have to get to bed now but will try to get back to this thread later.

off of topic.  
just out of curiosity  
what time of the day is it in Japan??

how is the weather this time of year in Japan??

good night.

**Re: - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/10/27 1:37**

Right now as I write this it's about 2:30PM. The weather where I am is getting colder day by day, but fortunately this year, I'll be back in the States from December to March, so I'll miss out on the worst of it. The Japanese with all of their technological breakthroughs and methods of making life easier still have not discovered the benefits of insulation, so that makes the peaks of summer and winter rather interesting. :)

-Grant

**Re: NASB not a good translation for the conscientious objector. - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2012/10/27 19:58**

papa,

I was not going to respond to this question but decided that perhaps I will add my two cents - if it is worth that much.

The doctrine of Biblical non-resistance does not rely on one verse. To take one verse and run with it, making a doctrine out of it is dangerous at best.

Biblical non-resistance was introduced first in the OT, expanded by the prophets and confirmed by Jesus. And this requires a lot of verses.

My understanding.

**Re: EverestoSama - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/10/28 2:27**

Hi EverestoSama

///But the problem is, this word is only used once. And it's in Luke. And the translators seem to agree in almost all of the modern versions that what's being talked about is extortion/intimidation.///

I agree that since this greek word is used only once it puts us both at a disadvantage on the true meaning of the word but not really for me so much because I am very confident that God in his Sovereignty has inspired it just they way I find it written.

Just because all of the modern translators interpret the verse a particular way does not make it any the more true.

From all the information that I can gather the idea that the greek Diaseio means "extortion/intimidation" has no solid foundation

Jamieson Fausset and brown says that the meaning of the word probably includes in order to extort money or other property. So in other words There is no solid evidence for this interpretation.

Could it be possible That this word in the greek means nothing other than "Do violence to no man" But that kind of interpretation seems to radical for a modern evangelical translator so he starts looking out side of the Bible, brainstorming some other possible solutions to this understanding and comes up with the possible solution that John the Baptist was really just exorting these Soldiers to "Do not take money from anyone by force"

Lets remember a few years after this roman soldiers are going to be the physical instruments that Crucify Christ.

I believe I am just going to believe the Bible "Do violence to no man"

RE: EverestoSama wrote ///I'm not for violence either, but I don't need the definition of a word changed to suit my belief, as like I said, since the Bible speaks as a whole, you should be able to validate anything said in there in more than just one place. By the mouth of two or three witnesses a matter is established. ///

The definition of the word has only been changed in the modern versions by which I have not found any justified evidence for doing so. If you look at an old strong's or at least mine did not mention anything about extortion

conscientious objector view of the scripture is heavily debatable the majority of christians since Augustine have believed in Just war, It is not a view that is black and white. The 10 commandments clearly said do not kill and Than God clearly instructed Israel to kill and even punished King Saul for not killing, So we see in the old testament that there was an exemption to the do not kill with that in mind It becomes a gray area with Christians serving in combatant positions. As I said It was this reading "Do violence to no man" That changed my perspective on this subject. And that is the reason that It caught my attention when I read the NASB say "Do not take money from anyone by force" Because If I believe that is the correct interpretation than it is clear that it is fine for a soldier take a combatant position as long as it is in the line of duty and not for personal gain.

We can play off that the difference in these interpretations are insignificant but that just is not so.

RE: EverestoSama wrote ///I'm not saying your belief is incorrect about "not doing violence to anyone", but you can't proof text with something that's seems to be commonly understood as an incorrect application.///

I can "proof text" as you call it any and all scripture That is inspired, What I need to do is Beware of the scribes

RE: EverestoSama wrote//Same with the Trinity, it can be demonstrated without the section in 1 John. If you ever try to share that with a Jehovah's Witness or liberal critic they will eat you for breakfast. You can't just say, "Here's my one verse in my one translation!"///

I have been in this situation Everestoma before I even new that the modern version omitted 1 John ch 5 v 7 and I was not ate for breakfast. The second verse I brought up was

1 Tim ch 3 v 16

1 tim ch 3 v 16 KJV

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.

1 tim ch 3 v 16 NASB

(He) who was revealed in the flesh,  
Was vindicated in the Spirit,  
Seen by angels,  
Proclaimed among the nations,  
Believed on in the world,  
Taken up in glory.

These two versions do not say the same thing they are from two different greek text the conclusion one would reach is completely different.

I have been in the Scenarios that you have presented and I have not "been ate for breakfast" but your position would already agree that the strongest verses on that doctrine was added by agreeing with them on that point you would have "all ready been ate for breakfast" as you call it

we could say that Paul had been eaten for breakfast on mars hill but regardless he was the one whom held the truth' So I find the fear of being "ate for lunch" as no incentive for me to change my conviction

RE: EverestoSama wrote///

Quote:

-----My conviction on this topic is not uncommon to many of the preachers promoted on SI  
-----

Still doesn't make it any less misinformed, in my personal opinion.///

I would listen to a Spirit filled preachers view that agreed with my own any day over a modern day Scribe.

EverestoSama their you go again trying to do that very thing U accused me of building a strawman, Giving an impression that all whom hold any view simmlar to my own do so because they are misinformed. I have studied several books wr itten with the opposing position, I am no less informed than you are stop trying to down play this position as one that is o nly held by those whom have a lack of knowledge on the subject.

RE EverestoSama wrote ///

Quote:

-----I personally have chosen to put my trust in Gods soverign hand in inspiring the Bible into my language.  
-----

That's fine, but there are proven mistakes in the KJV translation (which seem to only be debated by the KJVO camp///

When faith is applied to these supposed mistakes, I find that answers come that is an application that all Bible believers should use towards the scripture.

RE EverestoSama wrote ///even to the point of claiming that the scriptures were fully inspired in 1611///

I do not use a 1611 the spelling and puncuation is to much like my own and it is hard to read. I use a 1769 version and n ot a nelson.

RE: EverestoSama wrote/// No believer needs to read or understand Greek or Hebrew to be able to understand salvatio n, to be fed from the Word of God, to do ministry, to operate in the gifts, etc. etc. But I personally wouldn't trust someone to expound on doctrinal details much unless they were at least a little bit handy with a lexicon///

I would rather listin to the views of a Spirit filled Christian that did not have an eighth grade education over some one tryi ng to convince me that the original greek actually says just the opposit of what the English bible says, any day of the we ek.

this verse came to mind

1 Corinthians 1:20

Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?

I have to get to bed again, goodnight.

**Re: - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/10/28 5:07**

After reading through your post, I think I'll just leave it at this;

I'm glad you have the confidence and conviction to believe such as you do. It seems you've put a lot of thought into it.

Sleep well!

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2012/10/28 19:42**

I'm a die hard NASB supporter. Yet for a couple years now, I've been convinced that Christians are not to be violent people, and we are not to participate in war. In fact, we need to preach that because Jesus has come, people need to war no more.

**Re: - posted by ArtB (), on: 2012/10/28 20:53**

by KingJimmy on 2012/10/28 16:42:37

"I'm a die hard NASB supporter. Yet for a couple years now, I've been convinced that Christians are not to be violent people, and we are not to participate in war. In fact, we need to preach that because Jesus has come, people need to war no more."

King Jimmy, I'm curious what you would do if you walked quietly up from the cellar with a big wrench in your hands and you find a bad man with a gun who just shot one of your kids and about to shoot another family member, would you have a problem with taking a quick big swing at the gunmans' head with that wrench, and killing him

When evil triumphs and rise to power, many decent people and their families suffer greatly. That is what fighting a just war is all about, to contain evil.

God had no problem with this. Saul killed his thousands, David did even better - David killed his ten thousands, Joshua killed every man, woman, and child as Israel took over the pagan cities living in the promise Land. Samson killed a large number of people with the Jaw of a Donkey. Before he died in the Philistines uge 'house' they used for entertainment, upon which Samson requested of God to give the return of his strength so he could knock down the Pillars supporting the Pagan temple so He could kill the people that came to see Samson, God granted Samsons' request, and Samson knocked down the two pillars supporting the building filled with Philistines they were in, bringing the house down - "So the dead whom he killed at his death were more than those whom he killed in his life."

I sincerely personally hope I would never have to kill or maim anyone, but if it saves my son, or my daughter, or my wife, or my neighbor, I hope I would maim the evil-doer, or if necessary, to kill the bad guy. I hope I never have to make that choice.

It is good that we know that no one really dies at death. Our body dies, but we are not our body, we are spirits, and our spirit lives and goes where-ever Gods wills us to go.

Revelation 20:4 Then I saw thrones, and they sat on them, and judgment was given to them. And I SAW THE SOULS OF THOSE WHO HAD BEEN BEHEADED BECAUSE OF THEIR TESTIMONY OF JESUS AND BECAUSE OF OF THE WORD OF GOD, and those who had not worshiped the beast or his image, and had not received the mark on their forehead and on their hand; and they came to life and reigned with Christ for a thousand years.

This is just my two cents. And I realize you wrote what you wrote with a good intent and a good heart.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2012/10/28 22:48**

Art

I appreciate the moral conundrum your question raises. I've often thought of such scenarios, and perhaps worse. But I still take the position I do. Jesus Christ has come, and He has established a kingdom that knows peace without limit. It is a kingdom where men beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. It is a kingdom where we are taught to war no more.

Even if there are justified reasons to wage war, those reasons are no longer good enough. The kingdom of God has come. The world is no longer as it once was. The cosmos were fundamentally changed when Jesus Christ entered this world, died on a cross, was raised from the dead, and ascended into heaven. In the old age, men had to wage war because death conquered all men. In the new age, men no longer have to wage war because death has been defeated by means of the risen Lord.

This answer may not satisfy your question in the way you wish. But I fear you are asking the wrong questions.

Jimmy