

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?**What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?, on: 2005/9/9 8:18**

The New American Standard Bible (NASB or NASV) is a revision of the 1901 American Standard Version and was produced by a team of translators working with the Lockman Foundation, the publisher of the Amplified Bible. The NASB was produced as a more conservative counterpart to the Revised Standard Version., which was published in 1946 (NT) and 1952 (whole Bible). Work began on the NASB in 1959 and the New Testament was issued in 1963 and the complete Bible in 1971. The original foreword to the New Testament stated, "It has been the purpose of the Editorial Board to present to the modern reader a revision of the American Standard Version in clear and contemporary language." A similar statement appears in the preface to the 2002 NASB Thinline Bible..

ANSWER:

1. The New American Standard Version is basically a literal translation like the King James Bible, and as such it is superior to the modern dynamic equivalencies such as the New International Version.
2. In spite of its largely conservative approach to translation technique and the evangelicalism of its translators (as opposed to the rank theological liberalism of the translators who produced the Revised Standard Version), the NASB cannot be trusted because it is built upon the unsound scholarship of liberals and Unitarians.

The NASB is built upon the English Revised Version of 1885 and the American Standard Version of 1901 (which was the American edition of the English Revised). At least three Christ-denying Unitarians were on these translation committees (George Vance Smith, Ezra Abbot, and Joseph Henry Thayer). The committees also included many men of modernistic views, such as Philip Schaff (twice brought to trial for heresy), William Robertson Smith (who was evicted from the Free Church Theological College for his modernism), B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort (both of whom denied the infallible inspiration of Scripture and Christ's substitutionary atonement and believed in evolution), and Anglican Broad Church members William Moulton, George Milligan, R.C. Trench, Edward Bickersteth, Benjamin Kennedy, A.P. Stanley, Robert Payne Smith, William Humphrey, and John Vaughan.

3. In spite of its basically conservative, literal approach to translation methodology, the NASV cannot be trusted because it is based on the corrupt Greek New Testament that was produced through the skeptical pseudo-science of modern textual criticism.

The NASV is based on the corrupt critical Greek New Testament as opposed to the Greek Received Text underlying the Reformation Bibles. The critical Greek New Testament is built upon a handful of strange manuscripts from Alexandria, Egypt, which was a hotbed of theological heresy in the centuries following the apostles. Frederick Scrivener, a prominent textual scholar of the 19th century, testified, "It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that THE WORST CORRUPTIONS TO WHICH THE NEW TESTAMENT HAS EVER BEEN SUBJECTED, ORIGINATED WITHIN A HUNDRED YEARS AFTER IT WAS COMPOSED; and that Irenaeus and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior MSS. to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens, thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Received Text" (Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, II, 4th edition, 1894, pp. 264, 265).

Not only do the manuscripts preferred by modern textual critics (chiefly the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus) disagree in thousands of places from the vast majority of other extant manuscripts, they also disagree among themselves in thousands of places.

The modern critical Greek New Testament is built upon the strange and unbelieving principle that the alleged purest text of apostolic Scripture (the Alexandrian or Egyptian as represented by the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts) was set aside in the fourth century and was replaced with an artificially created recension (the Traditional or Byzantine text) that was formed by conflating various extant texts, and that it was the impure recension that became the Bible of the churches for 1,500 years of church history until the alleged best text was recovered in the 19th century through the principles of modern textual criticism. This was a foundational principle of Westcott and Hort (the Lucian Recension) and it has remained foundational to modern textual criticism into the 21st century, even though it flies in the face of any scriptural and reasonable doctrine of divine preservation.

The omissions alone in the critical Greek text equate the deletion of the entire books of 1 and 2 Peter from the modern version New Testaments.

The NASV omits outright or casts serious doubt upon 43 entire verses in the New Testament. It omits outright the following sixteen: Matthew 17:21; Mark 7:16; 9:44, 46; 11:26; 15:28; Luke 17:36; 23:17; 24:40; John 5:4; Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29; Romans 16:24; 1 John 5:7. It further casts serious doubt upon another twenty-seven verses (Matthew 18:11; 23:14; Mark 16:9-20; Luke 24:12; John 7:53-8:11) by putting them in brackets or by separating them from the previous passages and adding footnotes that discredit their authority.

The NASV also omits a significant portion of another 174 verses, not including those it casts doubt upon with marginal notes.

The NASV, following the critical Greek text, weakens key doctrines of the Bible. An example is the doctrine of Christ's deity. The omissions and changes in the NASV do not result in the complete removal of this doctrine, but they do result in an overall weakening of it.

Consider the following examples:

Mark 9:24 -- The father's testimony that Jesus is "Lord" is omitted.

Mark 16:9-20 -- This glorious passage is bracketed, signifying that it is not considered apostolic Scripture. A footnote says, "Later mss add vv 9-20," clearly implying that it is not authentic. With this omission, the Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Mark ends with no resurrection or glorious ascension and with the disciples fearful and confused.

Luke 23:42 -- The thief's testimony that Jesus is "Lord" is omitted.

John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18 -- "only begotten Son" changed to "one and only"

John 1:27 -- "is preferred before me" is omitted

John 3:13 -- "which is in heaven" is omitted, thus removing this powerful witness to Christ's omnipresence

John 6:69 -- "thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God" is changed to "you are the Holy One of God," thus destroying this powerful witness that Jesus is the very Christ, the Son of God, a doctrine that was under fierce assault in the early centuries.

John 8:59 -- "but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by" is replaced with "but Jesus hid Himself and went out of the temple," thus destroying the miracle of this scene. Whereas the Greek Received Text teaches here that Jesus supernaturally went out through the midst of the angry crowd that was trying to kill Him, the modern versions have Jesus merely hiding Himself.

Acts 8:37 -- The eunuch's glorious testimony that Jesus Christ is the Son of God is bracketed and a footnote says, "Early mss do not contain this verse," signifying that it is not apostolic Scripture.

Romans 14:10 -- "Christ" changed to "God"; the "judgment seat of Christ" identifies Jesus Christ directly with Jehovah God (Isaiah 45:23), whereas the "judgment seat of God" does not.

1 Cor. 15:47 -- "the Lord" is omitted

Eph. 3:9 -- "by Jesus Christ" is omitted

1 Tim. 3:16 -- "God" is omitted, thus removing one of clearest references to Jesus Christ as God in the New Testament

1 John 5:7 -- The glorious Trinitarian confession is omitted, even though it has more manuscript and versional evidence than most of the Alexandrian readings preferred by modern textual critics, including many of those listed above. For example, the omission of Mark 16:9-20 is supported by only three Greek manuscripts of the hundreds that are extant and that contain this passage.

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

The same can be demonstrated for the doctrine of the virgin birth, the blood atonement, the ascension, and ecclesiastical separation. All of these are weakened in the modern versions.

The NASV further attacks the doctrine of fasting. Though the word "fasting" is not removed entirely from the modern versions, the doctrine that fasting is a crucial element of spiritual warfare is removed. In this context the NASV omits the entire verse of Mat. 17:21, plus the word "fasting" in Mk. 9:29; Acts 10:30; 1 Cor. 7:5; 2 Cor. 6:5; and 2 Cor. 11:27.

Krispy

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by 5nva (), on: 2005/9/9 8:40

Krispy:

At first glance I just wanted to point out that my NASB does not omit these verses like you stated in this paragraph.

It omits outright the following sixteen: Matthew 17:21; Mark 7:16; 9:44, 46; 11:26; 15:28; Luke 17:36; 23:17; 24:40; John 5:4; Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29; Romans 16:24; 1 John 5:7.

My NASB also does not omit Mat. 17:21 and does not change the word fasting as you stated in this paragraph.

In this context the NASV omits the entire verse of Mat. 17:21.

I have not had time to research everything else you stated but the fact that these are errors in your argument would cause me to cast doubt on the rest of what is stated.

I may be wrong about this but I looked up these verses in my NASB and they are there.

I personally think the NASB is a good translation and when I study God's word I use the NASB along with the KJV and they always seem to be saying pretty much the same thing. One may use a different word but when you study verses through with a concordance the Lord brings it all together.

Sorry if I've disappointed you.

Mike

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by Joshua99 (), on: 2005/9/9 8:57

Apart from your detail summary on why I shouldn't use the NASV, what translation do you not find fault and error with? I have always in all my research used multiple translations to find the heart of God in study. Being that the Truth of the Word of God is in Spirit, and requires the Holy Spirit for anyone to come to understand the wisdom that lies between the words and thoughts written in scripture, I believe the hour we live in now, time would be better spent revealing the truth God has given to you, rather than finding fault and error. I know you will not except this, nor see why I am saying this. but to lift up the Name of Jesus, seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Speak the Word of God in all Truth, so by what you speak will bring encouragement and hope. Blessings

Re:, on: 2005/9/9 8:58

Let me ask you this... in your copy of the NASB does it refer you to the footnotes where it says something like "the oldest and most reliable manuscripts do not have this verse"? If so... it's the same thing.

When the footnotes say "the oldest and most reliable" it is referring to the Alexandrian Text, which there is absolutely no proof that it is the oldest and most reliable.

As to the verses you are claiming I missed it on, I know for a fact that the NASB I have on my shelf does in fact omit these verses.

Krispy

Re: - posted by 5nva (), on: 2005/9/9 9:05

Krispy:

My NASB does have something like that mentioned in the footnotes, but this is not the same as omitting the verse. Omitting the verse means to remove it like it does in the NIV.

Also, I have a NASB right here with me now and I have checked and those verses are present in my bible for me to read

I also agree with Joshua99 and will humbly receive what he is saying. I will continue to use my NASB and KJV together and seek the Lord and ask the Holy Spirit for understanding.

God bless you my friend.

Mike

Re:, on: 2005/9/9 9:14

Quote:
-----Apart from your detail summary on why I shouldn't use the NASV, what translation do you not find fault and error with? I have always in all my research used multiple translations to find the heart of God in study. Being that the Truth of the Word of God is in Spirit, and requires the Holy Spirit for anyone to come to understand the wisdom that lies between the words and thoughts written in scripture, I believe the hour we live in now, time would be better spent revealing the truth God has given to you, rather than finding fault and error. I know you will not except this, nor see why I am saying this. but to lift up the Name of Jesus, seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Speak the Word of God in all Truth, so by what you speak will bring encouragement and hope. Blessings

Truth is important. If you dont have the truth in front of you... you have false. Unlike you, I see this issue very important in this day of apostacy.

I'm not telling you what to do. You make up your own mind. All I'm doing is providing information. Whenever someone brings up something that needs to be addressed, the automatic response is "stop telling me what to do!" from some. I dont understand this.

Krispy

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/9/9 9:20

krsipy writes, and not for the first time...

Quote:
-----the NASB cannot be trusted because it is built upon the unsound scholarship of liberals and Unitarians

You can hold a preference for the Byzantine text without quite such an extreme statement. Personally I think the scholarship and theology behind the KJV could be challenged on very similar grounds. The churchmanship of its chief Anglican scholars and its elevation of the 'status quo' is evident throughout. In many ways it is an 'anti-protestant' version and was specifically designed to alter key aspects of truth found in Tyndale and the Geneva Bible.

The NASB is better than the KJV in its rendering of verb tenses, prepositions and most things to do with ecclesiastical patterns. The piety of some of its key translators is extremely questionable as was their persecution of non-conformists.

In this sense you should not 'trust' the KJV either. Check it out and check out the NASB too.

Re:, on: 2005/9/9 14:34

Bashing the NASB like its the Watchman's bible i believe is Non-Christlike. Saying it could lead us into apostasy. Well, so could anything; KJV, NLT, Amplified. It doesn't matter what version you use (to some degree yes) that will lead you into apostasy but the person who preaches outta it. Someone might say 'well, i believe this, cause my bible says it'. Well I put a few bibles together and lets truly figure out what God meant by it, and looking it all within context.

Each and every verse should be taken carefully and with a strong eye on them. I don't think anyone should EVER just use ONE bible. But numerous to compare and contrast.

But above all of that, I think its best to just say "Lord, where shall I go for You to speak to me today? Or what passage do You wanna teach me this very hour in my life"...etc..etc.

Re:, on: 2005/9/9 16:17

YeshualsMyGd... ever heard of the Alexandrian Text? Ever heard of the Received Text? Do you know the history of the m? If you dont, find out. Then we'll talk more.

Krispy

Re: NASV - posted by Gery, on: 2005/9/9 16:45

Dear Brethren,

I find that different Bible translations are actually a help in getting the best out of God's Word. The NASV is one translation that I do not yet have, but I would like to get one.

Look, I agree that some translations are more accurate and I even agree that certain verses were left out or wording changed. What is important is that we should be conscious of these facts. If you are going to choose to defend the Trinity, please don't use a NIV. The KJV is better. But then again, Jehovah's Witnesses will prefer that same KJV to prove some of their lies.

A Christian should be a fervent Bible Scholar and go in as deep into the meaning of God's Word as possible. Rather than thank God for the many translations that He has given us.

In Him,
Gery

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/9/9 16:47

Ultimately this comes down to a matter of opinion. I think it is sad Krispy that despite the conservative and evangelical that one of the NASB- being translated by men and women who were probably of pure heart in the task they undertook, and took it with the most grave seriousness- that you should just so deeply slam something that probably was done by many of your sincere brothers and sisters in Christ. And because they are brothers and sisters in Christ, you should show them respect.

Instead, you slam them just because they happen to agree with some liberal scholars on some principles of scholarship regarding textual criticism. Just because one is liberal doesn't mean they are always wrong. Just because some people were of possibly questionable character and such doesn't mean we should simply dismiss their work for that matter. Otherwise, we should burn our KJV's, for it was funded by a man with some deep sexual problems, not to mention other political problems, and the KJV included the Roman Catholic apocrypha. Likewise, Erasmus when he produced the RT, was far from perfect character. When it comes to matters of translation, while it is horrible some people might have been of questionable character that had their hands on the text, ultimately everything boils down to the quality of their translation and the scholarly discipline in which they approached the matter. For all we get is their final product.

We don't know how any scholar might have been acting on any given day. Perhaps some were quite full of pride. Perhaps some just had a heated argument with their spouse. Who knows what hidden sins lurked in any of their hearts. If we are looking for a team of scholars who are living in sinless perfection all at the same time for the duration of time in which they are making their translation... then we should entirely doubt and shun all translations, and just stick to reading Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek manuscripts (and we should probably do away with these as well, being that they are not the original autographs, and we don't know all of who had their hands in copying them).

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

Which manuscripts are best? Ultimately, only God knows. There is no text in existence today that we have access to that is entirely without error. No manuscript is perfect. No translation is perfect. And people like you and me, who don't know Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, etc. (and owning a Strong's Concordance does not count), should be very very very very cautious in making comments on which Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic texts are best, and which translations are best. People like you and me are highly dependent upon the opinions of other highly learned men whom we simply fancy for any number of given reasons. Ultimately, we can only point to them and say "they seem like a trusted authority, and their opinion seems sound, and I side with them."

Thus we should avoid blanket statements like "the NASB cannot be trusted." It can't? There seems to be much reason to trust it (though there might be many reasons to doubt it as well). Maybe I should start saying "KrispyKrittr is no scholar, and does not always show perfect character on the SI Forums, thus cannot be trusted in regard to these matters."

The NASB is my favorite of the modern translations, and I personally put a great deal of trust in it; enough so to take it with me when I stand in a pulpit, on a street corner, in a homeless shelter, and other situations in which I must speak as one who is the oracle of God, sometimes putting myself in physical danger for my Lord when I do so. If I had to, I'd die with it in my hand.

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/9/9 19:37

I like what Tozer said, That the NASV is great as long as you use it for its Old Testament Content but when it comes to the NT it's lacking. Good KJV for NT though :-D

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/9/9 22:57

I believe Tozer was well dead when the NASB came out. Perhaps the original version with the thee's and thou's was in existence then, but the one that is currently for sale was only made in 1995.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/9/10 22:30

hummmm?! I have an NASB published by AMG- Spiros Zodhiates in 1984. Tozer used the ASB basically the same as the NASB. Very little difference. Still the best in OT translations on the market, unless you go to one of the interlineals(sp?).

Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/9/13 22:46

The NASB translation was completed, copyrighted and published in 1971. Other portions were copyrighted earlier. Here is the copyright information as given by The Lockman Foundation

New American Standard Bible®,
Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation

Re:, on: 2005/9/14 8:31

Quote:
-----Otherwise, we should burn our KJV's, for it was funded by a man with some deep sexual problems

Care to offer some proof of this statement? Dead or not, if this isn't true, then you are bearing false witness against someone... There is a myth that King James was gay, but this has proven to be false.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

By the way, it was not funded by King James. He did nothing to fund it. Not one penny. So you're wrong on that fact. All he did was authorize the work to be done.

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

I'm not taking up for King James as a person. Tho he was a religious man, he persecuted many Christian groups... particularly the anabaptists, who many of us would identify with doctrinally if more of us really studied our church history. But I am saying that we cant just come on here and spout out things about people (living or dead) that we dont know is true. It discredits your entire argument when you propogate myths that are completely false.

This is but one area where your expertise on this topic seems lacking. Not sure I would trust the rest of what you say concerning this.

And you know I like ya, KJ... I'm not attacking you. Just surprised at your lack of knowledge when you're trying to sound so knowledgable.

Krispy

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by freedbyjc (), on: 2005/9/14 9:44

For those seeking to draw closer to God, I humbly post for your edification, an excellent article that may help shed some light on the discussion.

King James Only, Sometimes, Never:
Examining the Modern Versions of the Bible
William D. Barrick
Professor of Old Testament, The Master's Seminary

What Bible translations are best for use in the pulpit? Which ones are best for private Bible study? Good questions like these are the reason for this seminar.

Contrary to the impression that the seminar title might give, I will not be lecturing on the "King James Only" debate. Our purpose is to answer the preceding questions about Bible translations.

Pastors and churches ask about modern Bible translations because they want to use the most accurate Bible translation available for preaching, teaching, and personal devotional reading.

With the plethora of so-called "literal" Bible translations available on the market, how is a pastor or church member to know which is the best choice? We will not look at obviously inappropriate Bible translations in this seminar (e.g., Revolve New Testament). Instead, we will focus on the following versions: King James Version (KJV), New King James Version (NKJV), New American Standard Bible (NASB), New American Standard Bible Update (NASU), English Standard Version (ESV), New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), New International Version (NIV), and the Holman Christian Standard Bible (HCSB). These eight versions have the greatest potential of being chosen by evangelicals for pulpit, pew, or personal use. For those of you who are already wondering why the more dynamic NIV is listed with the seven more formal translations, just stick around. There is method to my madness.

To read the rest of the article you must go here.

(<http://www.gracechurch.org/shepnew/2005notes/BarrickKingJamesOnly.pdf>) Shepherd's Conference 2005 Notes

Barrick astutely concludes: This brief and limited analysis is but an example of the type of research that one needs to pursue in order to decide on a particular Bible translation for pulpit, pew, or personal reading.

One might choose the easy road by just accepting the conclusions of excellent volumes like Thomas's How to Choose a Bible Version. Or, one might choose to look even deeper into the matter and involve others in his search for the best translation.

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

For churches, this process should not be hasty. One to two years for church leaders to research and discuss the matter will prove well worth the effort. Personal Bible study can more readily adopt a variety of translations without causing division and confusion if the individual is willing to tie himself to solid literal translations and sound exegetical commentaries during the process of study.

No Bible translation is perfect. Many translations are disturbingly imperfect—above and beyond what one might expect out of an objective, original text-based translation. Evangelicals need to stay vitally involved in the production of Bible translations and evangelical churches need to make wise choices with regard to pulpit and/or pew versions. Lazy translations produce lazy expositors and lazy readers. Imperfect translations can contribute to the production of imperfect interpretation and flawed theology. Do not take the task lightly.

Re: NASB - posted by Manfred, on: 2005/9/14 11:46

Greetings,

I think that the best way to solve this never-ending discussions about Bible translations, versions, manuscripts, etc. would be to learn Greek. It is not difficult, and courses are offered for all levels.

I remember reading that someone like A. T. Robertson would lecture, and teach his classes using his Greek New Testament.

I think that most of us are young enough to start such a venture. I dare say that there would be no better way to use some of our free time.

Manfred

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/9/14 12:30

"No Bible translation is perfect."

I don't want to stir up trouble, but with that statement, you are basically saying that we don't have an accurate translation today.

That would mean either God cannot preserve His Word, or chose not to. By saying it is even 99.5% pure, is saying it is .5% corrupted. I believe God to be a God of absolutes.

Everyone in the world is learning English. I was just in Korea where the locals will go out of their way to have a conversation with an English speaking person.

Disagree if you will, but it seems reasonable to me that God would purposely have a translation ready for a world that is moving toward a particular language. Many families from other cultures don't even teach their children their native language, in hopes that the children would be accepted in the English-speaking 'business' world.

I believe God has preserved His Word, and my faith is not in the translators, the men that funded the translation, or any other person, but God only. And if he were giving us a roadmap to live by, shouldn't it be 100% trustworthy.

Matthew 4:4 "But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

Re:, on: 2005/9/14 13:33

Quote:
-----I think that the best way to solve this never-ending discussions about Bible translations, versions, manuscripts, etc. would be to learn Greek. It is not difficult, and courses are offered for all levels.

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

This would not solve the issue because the question then must be asked: Which Greek NT? The one that the KJV, and all the Reformation Bibles were based on? ..or the one that all the modern versions since 1881 are based on?

Most folks either are ignorant of the fact that there are two streams of very different Greek texts, or they chose to ignore the fact.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/9/14 13:38

I absolutely 100% agree with letsgetbusy's last post. Amen brother.

And this all begs another question to be asked: Since the modern versions all claim to make the Bible more understandable, why is ignorance of the scripture at an all time high in the church today? Seems to me that if the 100+ modern versions (with a new one coming out every 2 months average) made the Bible more clear and understandable, we would have churches chuck full of theologians. The opposite is true.

Krispy

Re: - posted by freedbyjc (), on: 2005/9/15 8:15

To address "KK's" new question ...I hope to God not!

The disciplines of theology have their place ... but 90% of the churches in America are not ready for the cut of that meat ... they are still enjoying the glut of milk and will not be weaned unless we 'slow the flow' and make them hungry for more substantial fare.

If in any churches today the emphasis is on making more theologians, IMHO we're headed in the wrong direction ... We need living, breathing disciples of Christ who have a REAL relationship with Him through His Word.

Two theologians arguing the merits of different translations are not winning their souls to Christ. You cannot discuss theology with the lost-it's like shaving a cat or describing love to a 1 year old. You CAN talk of the rule of law, sin, death and then of repentance, confession, profession, grace, mercy and love.

The new translations are to get the Word of God and the Words of Christ to those that need it most... The 'illiterate' of the world who cannot read anything deeper than a comic book or who buy 'bestsellers' by the pound and devour them in days to fulfill their loneliness for human interaction. They are 'ignorant' due to a lack of training to identify the needs of their souls and of the discipline to actively seek and read what nourishes the heart and soul.

Our worship services have become the new "American Idol" and are nothing but showcases of congregational prosperity. They'd rather pay to have someone else create an awesome performance than to get down on their knees and worship God with their personal and public lives.

"Chuck" full is an accurate perception "K", most could not stand the heat of holiness and are the 'up' spew that has departed that body of Christ and has collected in the lower places.

It is not enough to say that you know of God and Christ through the Word ... you must have a right relationship with them . You must know the heart of God by spending time with him daily not just reading and praying but listening and seeking His discernment in your life ... you must know the mind of Christ by allowing Him to live through you minute-by-minute and using His power to work His Father's miracles here on earth ... and you must know the voice of the Holy Spirit as intimately as you know the heart and mind of your lover-so much that you finish each others sentences and can know their thoughts, perceptions, needs and desires in a glance or in the inflection in their voice.

Whoa ... way more than I planned to post but hey, what are these things for but to share what's on our hearts ?

Back to the original question, what's the best version of the bible? The one that you will devoutly read the Word, study its precepts, meditate on its meaning and discuss how you've applied its tenets to your life with others daily.

If your eyes and mind show you that you are missing something from the Word or your heart and your soul gives you the

feeling that something is not right as you read the Word, as long as it is more than your heart and life being called into obedience...act on that discernment and make the next move to draw away from a worldly translation and closer to God by seeking a deeper place with Him so He can show you His heart.

Re:, on: 2005/9/15 8:26

I agree with your post... you are correct about the state of many churches today. My comment on theologians was merely a way of saying that more people would be of sound doctrine... and as demonstrated many times even on this website, sound doctrine is lacking.

Many are fond of saying that doctrine doesn't matter, but it sure mattered a whole lot to Paul when he wrote and instructed a young preacher named Timothy.

So let me rephrase what I was saying... if the 100 plus modern versions are meant to make the Bible more understandable, then it would seem to me that more Christians would hold to sound doctrine. However, this is not true.

Krispy

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/9/15 10:36

Hi Krispy,

Quote:
-----So let me rephrase what I was saying... if the 100 plus modern versions are meant to make the Bible more understandable, then it would seem to me that more Christians would hold to sound doctrine. However, this is not true.

I don't think that the lack of sound doctrine is the result of the multiple versions--and certainly there are a few versions that do damage to sound doctrine. Instead, the lack of sound doctrine is the result of the failure to *read* any of those versions and seek to understand what is being read.

Re: NASB - posted by Manfred, on: 2005/9/15 10:37

Quote:
-----Most folks either are ignorant of the fact that there are two streams of very different Greek texts

Which ones?

Re:, on: 2005/9/15 10:48

Quote:
-----I don't think that the lack of sound doctrine is the result of the multiple versions--and certainly there are a few versions that do damage to sound doctrine. Instead, the lack of sound doctrine is the result of the failure to read any of those versions and seek to understand what is being read.

I didn't say reading modern versions causes unsound doctrine among believers... merely saying that we have 100 plus modern versions since 1881, yet sound doctrine is lacking more today than ever before.

How many times do I have to clarify things that I say? Am I writing in tongues or something?

Krispy

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/9/15 10:56

Quote:
-----I didnt say reading modern versions causes unsound doctrine among believers... merely saying that we ave 100 plus modern versio
ns since 1881, yet sound doctrine is lacking more today than ever before.

How many times do I have to clarify things that I say? Am I writing in tongues or something?

Perhaps you should make an attempt to be more clear. The context of your statements seemed to carry that implication.
At least to me anyway.

Re:, on: 2005/9/15 11:31

Perhaps... and perhaps people read too much into what others are saying. I know I've done that myself.

Krispy

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by tom74, on: 2005/9/15 16:09

in my own opinion the reason why so many churches throughout christendom have adopted so many of these new trans
lations, namely NASV, NIV, and so many others, it is to cover the heresies that they practise and young believers are. su
cked into fantasies, and heresies like sabellianism and neo-montanism because the "Bible" says so. Brethren and Sisters
we should always be mindful, these are dark days were Satan is indeed an angel of light, deceiving many using a cloak
of religion. we do not need another version or should i say perVersion of God's holy word

Re: - posted by 5nva (), on: 2005/9/15 17:11

Tom74:

Welcome to Sl.

Could you please tell me what heresies the NASB covers or supports. I am just curious sense you made this statement
and so I may have a better undertanding of where you are coming from.

Thanks and God bless.

Mike

Re: - posted by tom74, on: 2005/9/15 19:00

in a previous message i mentioned about the Heresies contained within Churches and their use or misuse of Bible transl
ations to suit their own ends. while i dislike these new "bibles" they are only books, the heresies are within the churches.
Anything which dilutes God's word or removes the Diety of our Saviour Jesus Christ which many of these new version's
do should be shunned.

Re: Bible Version - posted by Gery, on: 2005/9/15 19:11

Dear Tom74

What is worse? The "wrong" Bible or the wrong gospel?

In His love,
Gery

Re: - posted by tom74, on: 2005/9/15 19:18

There is only one gospel the gospel of Jesus Christ there are however wrong "bibles".
God Bless.

Re: Gospels? - posted by Gery, on: 2005/9/15 20:13

Dear Tom

Why then does Paul say there are other gospels?

In His love,
Gery

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by gllorente (), on: 2005/9/15 21:07

Krispy,

I think it is important to be one diligent in studying the Scriptures to "rightly divide it." I do however understand that finding out the "errors" or "erroneously-influenced" translations of the manuscripts (be it the Textus Receptus, Vaticanus, or Sinaiticus, etc) can thought of something "worth arguing about."

Nevertheless, the Holy Canon of Scriptures--the Christian Bible (without the apocrypha and the pseudophigripha's)--is without a doubt God-Breathed. Most of us know this--from whatever translation or original manuscript you may have read it from--that "All Scripture is inspired by God..." the word "inspired" is unfortunately English's weak and pathetic rendering of the rich Greek word, "theopneustos." These Holy Words were GOD-breathed, by which men of God who were moved by the HOLY SPIRIT, wrote these things. Hence, the Bible is a Spiritual Book and clearly the Author of it is the HOLY SPIRIT.

So, the reason why I brought the later up is due to this: if we are to approach the Bible as a technical-logical-accurate-driven-scientific and man-founded-intelligence-based-book, then we might as well grab some text-book somewhere or some science or literature book and call it Holy. What I'm saying is this Holy Book is a Spiritual Book. If you are not born of the Spirit of God, it doesn't matter if you've studied this book for over 50 years and have 10 doctorates on it--it still is a GOD-BREATHED BOOK.

The issue is not about which translation is so accurate and which one is not; rather, it is about the PERSON of which this Holy Book was WRITTEN BY. If you know the Author, I believe wholeheartedly that He will guide you into the Truth.

In concluding this (because I know of those of you who are just tickled to argue and waste time on such earthly-logical-debates), I love the LORD and HE is my Teacher. Even if I may be stuck on an isolated wilderness and only have but the Amplified Bible (which I am NOT big on), I believe GOD is unmoved, unchanged, and unaffected by man's shortcomings. God is God--He IS and Will Always Be God!

"When all has been said and done, and said to have it done, but not finished...IT IS TRULY AND ONLY ALL ABOUT GOD HIMSELF, HIS PERSON AND TO HIS GLORY!"

Glenn Llorente

Re: - posted by tom74, on: 2005/9/16 4:29

dear gery

in galatians chapter 1 verse 6 you see the apostle paul warning the church of another "gospel" in verse 7 he tells them it is not another gospel but a perversion, and he tells them that anyone bringing or telling them this other "gospel" let them be accursed.

There are unfortunately today many trying to deceive believers with other gospels, namely mormons, russelites etc.

Let truth remain truth.

your brother in Christ

Tom

Re., on: 2005/9/16 7:56

glloriente,

You sound like you know what you're talking about, so I will assume that you understand the vast differences between the Received Text and the Alexandrian Text (chiefly comprised of the Vaticanus and Sainiaticus). You also understand that down thru church history, the Alexandrian stream of texts was rejected by the true Bible believing church.

Since there is such a big difference between the two streams of text, how than can you say "*The issue is not about which translation is so accurate and which one is not*"?

It certainly IS the issue. Man took what God inspired and changed it. Thats my belief on this matter. It didnt happen in 1881... it didnt happen when the NIV was published... it happened right after the originals were written. Paul even talked about those who would pervert the Word of God, and how they do so to their own distruction.

You suggest that I "*approach the Bible as a technical-logical-accurate-driven-scientific and man-founded-intelligence-based-book*". Nothing could be further from the truth. I believe that the Bible is God-breathed, and that the writers wrote down exactly what God wanted to have written down. I also believe that God has miraculously preserved His Word, and I believe it was handed down thru the Received Text. I do not believe that God left His Holy Word in the hands of the blasphemous, murdering Roman Catholic Church (which is where the Alexandrian stream of texts came out of).

We all agree that Satan uses counterfeits. Why then is it so hard to believe that Satan would not also have a counterfeit bible? Do we think the Jehovah's Witnesses bible is the only counterfeit? (By the way, the JW's bible is the pure unadulterated reproduction of Wescott & Hort's Greek New Testament... Wescott & Hort are the fathers of all modern versions. Thats a fact.)

I think I'll stick with the tried and true.

Krispy

textus receptus etc - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/9/16 11:27

Dear brethren

untill about 3-4 months ago when this issue of which is best bible version was discussed, i had no idea that there were multiple texts from which the different translations arose. till that point i'd used a good news bible and also an NIV which was a gift from a friend. Those work fine for me. i'm not a fan of the kjv because when i read it i have to retranslate the old english in my head but i'm learning how to read it. there are many millions of people who will die without ever knowing of these multiple texts (let alone the different origins etc of them) and yet will be saved anyway and will have died in God's service, perhaps even serving Him better than we will even with the knowledge of these texts.

i'm a Shona man of the Shona tribe in Zimbabwe and there are many english words which have no equivalent and are loosely translated so some things are lost in translation. i'm not even sure which text the Shona bible was translated from but i can't deny that the Lord has indeed saved many of my tribesmen and many do serve Him. How could this be without an exact translation or one from the R.T? The work of the Holy Spirit. i feel that things can be lost in translation but God's Spirit which breathed the scriptures DOES NOT CHANGE so if one is in submission to the Holy Spirit, the text may vary but the message that the Spirit is communicating does not. If we have the perfect text what then? what good does it do if we are not in submission to the Holy Spirit? How will it help if we don't allow the Holy Spirit to minister to us? Was it not by the Holy Spirit that the scriptures were written? Are the words in scripture not Spirit which require Spirit to minister to us?

my experience with God is that He has ministered to me whether i'm using the NIV, Good News, or KJV (although i have a hard time reading it) i'm beginning to believe more and more that the preservation of the word of God is not so much in the text but in that the message the Spirit of God is trying to get across has not changed, nor has the very Spirit that birthed that message changed.

Re: textus receptus etc, on: 2005/9/16 11:51

Quote:
-----there are many millions of people who will die without ever knowing of these multiple texts (let alone the different origins etc of them) and yet will be saved anyway and will have died in God's service, perhaps even serving Him better than we will even with the knowledge of these texts.

This is true, and you won't find me arguing against this point.

However there is a flip side to that. For those who have eyes, it doesn't take much effort to see the rank apostasy and worldliness that has invaded the church today. I personally believe that the many watered down modern versions are partly to blame for this. As I said before, it would seem that since the Bible is supposedly more readable and understandable in the modern versions, the opposite would be true. But it isn't. The church is in a steady decline. It has been for a long time, and it will only get worse.

Krispy

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/9/16 12:32

Quote:
-----However there is a flip side to that. For those who have eyes, it doesn't take much effort to see the rank apostasy and worldliness that has invaded the church today. I personally believe that the many watered down modern versions are partly to blame for this. As I said before, it would seem that since the Bible is supposedly more readable and understandable in the modern versions, the opposite would be true. But it isn't. The church is in a steady decline. It has been for a long time, and it will only get worse.

bro Krispy

perhaps even for the unbeliever this apostasy is obvious? I feel that the apostasy has more to do with lack of submission to the Spirit of God. I believe that without submission to the Spirit of God one is dead in the water perfect text or not.

to what else do you attribute this apostasy if the watered down texts are only partly to blame? if the state of the church is only going to get worse, how is finding the perfect text going to alleviate the situation?

please be patient, I'm trying to understand this?

Re:, on: 2005/9/16 13:11

Well... you answered the question for me. I agree with you on your first paragraph.

I'm about out of time. I'm gonna be offline for about a week... I'll have to fill you in later.

Krispy

Re: - posted by glloriente (), on: 2005/9/16 13:39

Krispy, to answer your question:

"Since there is such a big difference between the two streams of text, how can you say, "The issue is not about which translation is so accurate and which one is not"?"

I say that, not to discount and disagree to the fact of the matter today. People have been deceived; people have been misled--even with the uninfluenced translations from the Westcott and Hort's New Testament (as you know about the JW's). In fact, there are many people today who dance to the this modern-day Christendom based out serving the popular god of "mammon"--the god of financial wealth and "abundant" life they call it, but waving weapons of "words of faith" to get what they want out of God. I've seen it almost all my life: people who are supposed ministers of God but pose as wolves

s and steal from the gullible people who are in search of a better hope.

I know there's a mess out there--a huge mess, but I lay my complete confidence in the GOD who wrote the Holy Scriptures. The Person of GOD is very well capable of leading me and showing me what is of His nature and His will, and what is not. My point, in light of answering your question, is that I rely on the Spirit of God Who is the One who, by His Spirit, shows His Will--and He is the Author of these books/manuscripts that we're talking about. I know the Author of this Book and I trust to be guided by His Voice. Inevitably, the physical Bible itself and the fonts and texts (minuscules, etc) that are used to write it are just that--they're just text. It is the Life of God's Heart through these Words that makes this Book Alive. Jesus IS the Living Word--and He lives today. What I'm trying to say is that no matter how corrupted this world has become, and even the worse corruption that is in the so-called church (or mega churches for today's corporate-driven church businesses), I put my trust in Him who is Unchanging.

Hence, I said, "the issue is not about which translation is so accurate and which one is not," because I don't really put my trust in man's ability to translate. Granted, I use many of these English and Cebuano translations and refer back to their original manuscripts by which they were translated from. And since I don't speak ancient Koine Greek nor do I claim to even understand it all, I do what I just--just like anyone else in studying the Scriptures--but I don't have it all figured out. However, I do know this--the God of Abraham, Jacob, and Isaac (whether I even transliterated those words properly or correctly for this purpose)--knows everything. I put my trust in His guidance of what His Words and His Will is through these scriptures (erroneous or accurate). And even so, the most beautiful thing about this (vain) argument is that when all is said and done, God still requires faith--and that you cannot escape. Faith, unlike our systems of organization and translation and the such, requires us to keep our eyes fixed on Him--Jesus--who is the author and perfecter of it (Heb. 12:1-2). I'm not talking about the "faith" that many have been deceived to think as an incantation to summon things they want out of this physical life; no, I'm talking about the pure faith in Jesus--who is the promise and the hope beyond this finite life we tend to hold on so dearly.

So, while there may be billions of people who are lead astray into following the "god" of this world, I will put my trust in the Holy Spirit who is the Author of the Holy Scriptures in the first place. Those who do "have ears to hear" let them hear. If Jesus spoke in parables, then maybe God is no different in allowing what's going on in the world and church today. Those who are truly seeking after God Himself will find Him; those who are just looking for a reason to argue or a means to get what they want out of life, then they will have their reward. In a sense, it is almost like as if what God spoke to Isaiah has always been happening--even today:

Isaiah 6:8-10

He said, "Go, and tell this people:
'Keep on listening, but do not perceive;
Keep on looking, but do not understand.'
Render the hearts of this people insensitive,
Their ears dull,
And their eyes dim,
Otherwise they might see with their eyes,
Hear with their ears,
Understand with their hearts,
And return and be healed."

Judah, during the time of their physical wealth and abundance (at least before they were sacked to exile into Babylon), have become so perfunctory/mechanical, that even in their religious services to God was rejected:

Isa. 1:14 "I hate your new moon festivals and your appointed feasts, they have become a burden to Me; I am weary of bearing them."

In a sense, they have become deaf, although they could hear; they have become blind although they could see (at least physically). Just as it was during the time what Christ was here, He too spoke in parables lest those who are not after God Himself and His heart (such as the Pharisees, etc) would "see" and be "healed."

I know this topic can just go on and on like the Energizer bunny (which is by the way man-made so it is finite and will sadly break down eventually), so I will end my long reply with this:

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

God is all the matters, and if that pierce's anyone's heart to the pulp, then you "know" and "see" of what I have been talking about. If you just want to continue to "argue," then I guess God is not all that matters, other things seem to. But as for me, God is unchanged by this evil of this world; but He is moved by those whose hearts are loyal to Him.

2 Chronicles 16:9a "For the eyes of the LORD move to and fro throughout the earth that He may strongly support those whose heart is completely His."

In Christ Alone and not in myself,

Glenn Llorente

Re:, on: 2005/9/16 14:29

Glenn...

I agree with most of what you wrote.

However, your post was all about YOU, and where YOUR trust is... and that's fine. If you have studied this issue (which it seems you have), and you have drawn these conclusions, then God bless ya.

But I try not to be so focussed on myself. My concern is not that I be right about this, my concern is what I see in the church today. My concern is what I see going on in the world today. I'm not really concerned about you. I'm concerned about the people out there that are in watered down churches that have removed the blood from their message, and are not preaching salvation. My concern is about the worldliness that has crept into the church.

My argument is not with YOU... and that's where you have missed it. I'm not on a crusade to convert everyone to the KJV. Do I think everyone should dump the modern versions and pick up the KJV? Yea... of course I do. But what I am more concerned about is that people actually take this issue seriously and take the time to educate themselves. To be ignorant is no excuse.

If you go back over the threads I've been a part of, I hardly ever argue with someone who has studied this issue and drawn a different conclusion. I may debate them to a certain extent, but for the most part I want people to get off their butts and find this stuff out for themselves.

You've done that... you've drawn a different conclusion. I disagree with your conclusion, but I agree with most of what you've written here. So, that's cool with me.

Most Christians are ignorant about the text issues. Some come on here and say ignorant things like "The NIV is just the KJV in modern language". I admit I don't have much patience for comments like that... but I try to get people like that to actually consider that they have much to learn concerning this.

Hopefully I've been successful at it.

Krispy

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/9/16 15:18

I will just post the differences in the NASB vs the KJV, since this posting is : "What about the NASB?."

Gen 1:5

NASB "And there was evening and there was morning, one day."

KJV "And the evening and the morning were the first day."

Gen 11:2

NASB "they journeyed east"
KJV "they journeyed from the east"

Isaiah 14:12 Rev 2:26/28 and Rev 22:16
Who is the morning star?

NASB

How you have fallen from heaven, O star of the morning, son of the dawn!

He who overcomes...I will give him the morning star.

I, Jesus...I am the root and the descendant of David, the bright morning star."

KJV

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning"

he that overcometh...I will give him the morning star

I Jesus ...I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.

1 John 5:7-8

NASB "For there are three that testify: the Spirit and the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement."

KJV "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."

Lots more. Let me know or send me a private message if you want to know more. I'll take the time and type them out if you are interested.

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/9/16 17:11

Dear letsgetbusy,

Quote:

-----"No Bible translation is perfect."

I don't want to stir up trouble, but with that statement, you are basically saying that we don't have an accurate translation today.

That would mean either God cannot preserve His Word, or chose not to. By saying it is even 99.5% pure, is saying it is .5% corrupted. I believe God to be a God of absolutes.

Everyone in the world is learning English. I was just in Korea where the locals will go out of their way to have a conversasion with an English speaking person.

Disagree if you will, but it seems reasonable to me that God would purposely have a translation ready for a world that is moving toward a particular lan guage. Many families from other cultures don't even teach their children their native language, in hopes that the children would be accepted in the Engl ish-speaking 'business' world.

I believe God has preserved His Word, and my faith is not in the translators, the men that funded the translation, or any other person, but God only. An d if he were giving us a roadmap to live by, shouldn't it be 100% trustworthy.

Matthew 4:4 "But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

I could be wrong in everything I say. So could you. So could all of us. Jesus died for sinners. We are not God. We are sinners. Only God is good. Only God is perfect. All men are bad. Even the writers of the bible were corrupt. God didn't write the bible. Men wrote the bible. No man that ever walked the earth was God in flesh, except for Jesus Christ.

That is the whole point.

You are right to say there is one truth. You are right to say God is a God of absolutes. Why else would He send His son to die if He didn't believe in His own absolute law?

The whole point though is this: Jesus is the truth. Jesus Christ is the absolute. The only absolute there is in the universe, the only God there is.....Jesus Christ. He is Lord over the universe and earth. Jesus is supreme.

Only God is perfect and good. If we say the bible is perfect and call it God's Word, then we are saying the bible is of God. By this, we are saying the bible is God. Do you believe this? Do you believe the bible is God?

In John 1, it says the Word became flesh. Jesus is the Word. By this we are saying Jesus is God. He is of God and is God. Do you believe Jesus is God?

"And if he were giving us a roadmap to live by, shouldn't it be 100% trustworthy."

The law became flesh. The law became flesh and was hung on the cross. We are to be Christ-like. We are to mimic Christ. The standard by which all things will be judged is Jesus.

When we go to Heaven, God isn't going to whip out a bible and say, "See this scripture right here. You didn't follow it." Rather, you will be judged by the standard of Jesus. Do you have Jesus or not? When God looks upon your heart, is it covered by the blood of Jesus?

Shouldn't the bible be 100% trustworthy? I used to believe this. I used to believe the bible had no error whatsoever. However, people have proved that wrong to me. There are many scriptures that contradict. Just last week I read a scripture where Paul called himself the "father" of the Corinthians. Jesus said specifically there was only one father and that was God. So who is right, Paul or Jesus?

When Jesus taught, He often used parables. He used imaginary stories to teach people about life. These parables were not true stories, they were imaginary. They were made up stories. Through these stories, He was able to deliver a message to the people. Those that listened heard what He had to say and took it in. They learned from imaginary stories.

The bible is the same way (important note: I am not saying the bible is imaginary). The bible bears an important message (just like the stories). God has painstakingly preserved this message. The bible bears this message and has been preserved. However, it is made true, not because of pen and paper. It is made true by the Holy Spirit. We call the bible living and alive not because we sit back and watch it get up and walk around. (At least, I hope you have never seen a bible walk around.) It is made alive by the Holy Spirit.

A distant non-Christian friend asked me once why all Christians turn to the bible. It didn't make any sense to her. She had read the bible many times and it seemed like an outdated text.

When I read the bible though, it is like God speaking to me. It just doesn't have the same effect for her. It makes my heart sing. It stirs my thoughts and grabs my attention. Why? Is it because the bible is 100% accurate?

No. It is because of the Holy Spirit that lives in my heart. It rejoices to hear the message of Christ. The bible doesn't bear truth. The Spirit of Truth, the Holy Spirit, is inside me. And when the bible is read, it stirs the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit reveals truth to me. The bible may be true, but it is not Truth. Only Jesus is Truth. (I know this may be a bit confusing. I will try to explain.)

The bible is a guide. It is good for teaching and instruction. It is like a road map or a tour guide. However, it is not law. It is not authority. There is a difference between a road map, and a driver. The driver has authority. The driver takes you places whether you want to go there or not. A road map is suggestive. It says, "This is a good path." But it's not absolute.

We need the bible as a road map. Additionally, we need God to be the driver of the car reading the road map. Whenever we try to read the map without God, and drive ourselves places, what happens? We end up lost.

God did not give us a 100% perfect bible. This is important. Why? Because God did not want us to base our faith on a book. He wants us to put all our faith in His son, Jesus Christ. If the bible were perfect, then we could base our faith on the

e bible, and we wouldn't need Jesus. We could easily place every argument and belief on the bible. (That is what the Jehovah's Witnesses do. They believe in the bible and give the bible authority but deny Jesus. They deny Jesus because nowhere in the bible does it say, "Jesus is God." So, they don't believe Jesus is God. They think Jesus is a Lord, but not The Lord.)

Please do not mistake my words. I am not saying the bible is worthless. God uses more than the bible to speak to people. If we said the bible was worthless, we would have to say all His believers are worthless too. The bible is good for teaching and instructing. It is a guide. It is helpful and very useful.

However, the bible is not law. The bible is not absolute. The bible is not God. Jesus is God and Lord.

If you disagree with me, then I respect that. As I said, I could be wrong. But that's the whole point: Only Jesus is right.

I am not an authority on the bible or anything else for that matter.

In love,

Blake

Re: - posted by tom74, on: 2005/9/16 18:19

Blake

Having read your posting on the authority of scripture and your beliefs on these matters i certainly would agree with you on a number of points.

1. Jesus Christ is right.
2. The Holy Spirit reveals all truth.

Although as i read your posting i was reminded of the early Fathers of the Protestant Church two of the reasons for them no longer to stay within the Catholic Church were:

1. Justification by Faith (Alone) Romans 5v1
2. The Absolute authority of the word of God.

When we look even at those who wrote the scriptures Christ's disciples:

Matthew,Mark,luke,John,Peter,James everything they wrote was under the authority of God.

The Lord Jesus tells them in John 14verse 26

BUT THE COMFORTER, WHICH IS THE HOLY GHOST, WHOM THE FATHER WILL SEND IN MY NAME, HE WILL TEACH YOU ALL THINGS, AND BRING ALL THINGS TO YOUR REMEMBRANCE WHATSOEVER I HAVE SAID UNTO YOU.

When we look at the Apostle Paul who by "revelation" wrote the epistles, he tells us that he is a preacher of Christ not by teaching but by Revelation(Galatians 1)

Jude a servant of Jesus Christ is prophetic under the direction of the Holy Spirit in the few verses that he wrote.

So brother we see in the New Testament, that it is Holy Spirit inspired and revealed by revelation.

I know that men have tried to tamper with Scripture over the years and others have tried to remove the authority of it. I myself am no authority when it comes to scripture but i know

You can rely on God's word.

Rev. 22 v18,19.

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2005/9/16 20:25

Quote:
-----The bible is a guide. It is good for teaching and instruction. It is like a road map or a tour guide. However, it is not law. It is not authority.

Blake, you are a precious brother in Christ but I believe that you do err in this matter.

Allow me to quote from an article on biblical inerrancy...

The authority of Jesus Christ and of Scripture are one. As our Prophet, Jesus testified that the Scriptures cannot be broken.

en. As our Priest and King, He devoted His earthly life to fulfilling the law and the prophets, even dying in obedience to the words of messianic prophecy. Thus as He saw Scripture attesting Him and His authority, so by His own submission to Scripture He attested its authority. As He bowed to His Father's instruction given in His Bible (our Old Testament), so He requires His disciples to do--not, however, in isolation but in conjunction with the apostolic witness to Himself that He undertook to inspire by His gift of the Holy Spirit. So Christians show themselves faithful servants of their Lord by bowing to the divine instruction given in the prophetic and apostolic writings that together make up our Bible.

By authenticating each other's authority, Christ and Scripture coalesce into a single fount of authority. The Biblically-interpreted Christ and the Christ-centered, Christ-proclaiming Bible are from this standpoint one. As from the fact of inspiration we infer that what Scripture says, God says, so from the revealed relation between Jesus Christ and Scripture we may equally declare that what Scripture says, Christ says.

Here is a link to the full article (<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/history/chicago.stm.txt>) Biblical Inerrancy

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/9/17 9:09

Dear Tom and Ron,

When Jesus walked the earth, the scriptures as we know them were law. They were the law as given by God unto the Israelites. The scriptures were also well preserved. The ten commandments were considered Holy and locked in an Ark. The other scriptures were kept at the center of the temple where only the most high priests could come into their presence. By this, God showed their authority.

Then Christ came. He upheld the law. He fulfilled the law. He also represented the law and the law died with Him on the cross. By this, we were set free from the law, and "scriptures" as they stood at the time of Jesus.

When Jesus walked the earth, the Pharisees used the law toward their own benefit. Despite the fact that all law was based on the principle of love, they upheld law as being absolute, and then used it toward their own selfish benefit.

Jesus, however, rebelled against them and their usage of the law in this manner. They tried to use the law selfishly to bring out error in Christ. One such case was when Christ was accused of breaking the Sabbath. Christ's disciples broke and ate grain on the Sabbath. On another Sabbath, Christ healed a man. (Matthew 12:1-13, Mark 2:18-28, Luke 6:1-11)

Christ's response to them was simple: "I am master even of the Sabbath."

Christ is above the law. He is master of the law. He has been given all authority.

As Christians, we are accused of breaking old testament laws and sinning. If scriptures cannot be broken, then all Christians are living in sin by eating pigs and shaving our beards. However, Jesus rose above the law and set us free from it.

New testament scripture is not law. It was written as a guide for us. It is not authority. Jesus is the authority even over the bible.

If what Ron has quoted is true, then in essence what this person is saying is that the bible is a part of God. We then have a four part God: Son, Holy Spirit, Father, and the bible. It does not make sense. The bible is not God. It bears no authority.

"bowing to the divine instruction given in the prophetic and apostolic writings that together make up our Bible."

I am also sorry, but I bow down to no one other than Christ. He is my master. He is my God. I believe in one God, and He is Jesus.

Thank you Ron for the link. I have read "THE CHICAGO STATEMENT ON BIBLICAL INERRANCY."

I used to think that if the bible had any error in it that it was no good. If the bible had but one error, then we should throw the whole thing out the window. But then, someone said this to me, "God speaks through men, and they are wrong and faulty." If God can use men who often make mistakes to speak his Word, why then should we assume the bible is without error?

If the bible were perfect, it would be Holy. And if it were Holy, then we (imperfect man) could not be in the presence of such a Holy text. The ten commandments were considered Holy and thus God sealed them away in an ark.

The bible as we know it has not been preserved in such a way. The earliest scriptural texts that we have are not the originals. Not to mention, we do not know which greek and hebrews texts we do have are the most accurate. There is a great debate going on this thread alone about which one is most accurate. However, no one has enough proof to make us all say, "Yes, that text is correct and accurate." Rather, we all debate.

I used to be a die hard bible inerrancy believer. I would argue against people saying the bible bears no fault. My mentality was this: if there was a fault in it, then how can I believe it.

We can believe it because of Jesus. He speaks to our hearts through the bible. Just as Jesus speaks to our hearts through preachers and faulty men.

We are not followers of the apostles who wrote the bible. We are followers of Christ. To say the bible is without error and perfect is to say the bible is God. It is to give deity to the apostles. It is to say, "I am a follower of the bible."

I am sorry, but I follow Christ, and Christ alone.

The bible is a book passed on by God in order to help us worship Jesus. The bible was written to help us, not to rule us. There is a difference. It is not our master. Just as each of us are brothers and sisters who help each other, but our God and master is Christ.

I do hope this helps you see my point.

In love,
Blake

Re:, on: 2005/9/17 9:33

Could someone tell me, was there a "basic tenent of faith" that we had to subscribe to, to be a member here ?

It was over 2 months that I signed on and I can't really remember that far back, but somewhere I had to pop a yes or no into some statement of faith thing.

Thanks if someone could answer and if there was one ... could you point me to it.

Thanks you all.
Love,
Annie

Edit to add:
Krispy, have you seen this e-book -
<http://www.gnpcb.org/assets/products/excerpts/1581346433.1.pdf>

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2005/9/17 14:30

Quote:

----- If God can use men who often make mistakes to speak his Word, why then should we assume the bible is without error?

You might want to seek out a better argument to defend your position that the Bible contains errors. This argument you are using contradicts itself for if we apply its logic to your own words then you are in error, for you are a man, who make s mistakes.

Quote:

----- There are many scriptures that contradict. Just last week I read a scripture where Paul called himself the "father" of the Corinthians . Jesus said specifically there was only one father and that was God. So who is right, Paul or Jesus?

I assume you were reading 1 Cor 4:15. This seems hardly a contradiction to any words of Jesus, not even a difficulty really. Paul was indeed a spiritual father to those who were born of the Spirit through his ministry. It's a wonderful look into Paul's heart to see that he considered his relationship with the Corinthians in a paternal light and not just as some kind of ruler. In the very next verse Paul exhorts them to follow his example, exactly what any good father should do with his children. All Christians, all ministers, all fathers, should live so that their people may follow their example.

Let's look for a moment at just what is necessary to transfer a "difficulty" into the category of contradiction. First, we must be certain we have read the passage in context and understood correctly the sense in which it uses words. Second, we must possess all available knowledge on the matter. Third, that no further light can be shed on it by advancing knowledge, textual research, archaeology, etc...

Difficulties do not make objections. As Robert Horn has said in *The Book That Speaks for Itself*, "Difficulties are to be grappled with and problems are to drive us to seek clearer light; but until such a time as we have total and final light on any issue we are in no position to affirm, "here is a proven error, an unquestionable objection to an infallible Bible."

In light of these criteria for establishing contradictions, please expand on your statement, "there are many Scriptures that contradict".

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/9/17 20:59

Dear Ron,

My goal here is not to destroy the bible or make it seem useless. Quite the contrary, I love the bible. It is an awesome book with an awesome history.

However, it is not a book of law by which people can use to judge and condemn others. It is not a book that people may use to keep others from the work God has called them. It is not a book that people can use to justify evil actions or to force laws upon others. The bible is not God. It has no authority apart from God. And it is not the Truth. It bears witness to the Truth. However, itself is not the Truth. (As a Christian, I bear witness to Christ. However, I am not Christ.)

This is important. We are followers of Christ. Or at least, if we call ourselves Christians we should be. Shouldn't we? We should always place Christ first above all things. Should we not?

However, people have elevated the bible as the authority on God. It seems to me that God would be the authority on the bible, don't you think?

You are right by what you say. If I say the bible bears mistakes, then I am saying that I also bear mistakes. By this, I am saying that I am wrong. I am. I'll admit that. I am completely wrong. If a person read my words and did not pray over them, would they not be foolish? I don't want people to agree with me. I wish for people to claim Christ as their Lord.

The question is, how do we know truth when we hear it? How do we know truth when we find it?

For those of us who are Christian, we know truth. It is in our heart. Christ lives inside of us. We just need to turn to Him. How do we do that? We pray. We keep the communication lines open and be ready and willing to accept whatever Christ may reveal to us. God will never change. However, we will. And just because we think we know something, does not mean we actually do.

I accept the possibility that every word I say is wrong. I trust that Jesus will guide my path for He is my King. The one thing I know is true is Jesus Christ. By this, I know that He is my savior, my judge, and my Lord. By this, I know that I need not worship any other than Christ, including the bible. I also know that when I do make a mistake, it is Christ who corrects me and sets me straight.

That's the whole point though. For Christians, we are followers of Christ. We are not followers of the bible. Christ lives inside of us. He doesn't live inside the bible.

Quote:

-----please expand on your statement, "there are many Scriptures that contradict".

To say there are many contradictions I suppose is a bit extreme. I will admit. I do not know of many contradictions. And it is true that many contradictions come from misinterpretation.

Misinterpretation is a large part of my point though. I will explain this as best as I can.

In order to read the bible, a person must interpret it. They read the text. It comes into their mind and flows through something called perception. This part of the brain interprets information that it collects.

When we say the bible is "authoritative," we are not just giving authority to a book, we are giving authority to ourselves. How so? A book is just a book. It is nothing unless it is read. Sitting in a cave somewhere, it does nothing. However, when a person reads it, then it has meaning. Then it becomes alive.

If I read it, then I am adding to it. I am adding my perspective or interpretation. I cannot help this. What I read must pass through my perception. And so, scripture is always victim to my own perception (and hence, my free will).

Let's say then, I read a scripture and take it to another Christian. I say, "You must do this because this is what the bible says." By this, the bible is being used as law and authority. It is being used to enforce a rule upon someone.

Who has the authority? Some might say it is God because God wrote the bible. God did not write the bible, men did. So I will say, "Yes but the bible has been inspired by God." This is true, however, to be inspired by God and written by God are two different things.

And so, God inspired the bible. Who then has the authority? Well, it is not God, because God is not exercising authority. He may have inspired the bible, but God is not the one coming to the man and judging him. The man reading the bible is exercising God's authority on another man. The man is saying, "This is what you must do as this is what the bible says."

The man is giving himself authority to enforce the bible as law upon another man. He is holding that man to the standard of the bible. And not just any standard, his own interpretation of the bible. He is saying, "This is my interpretation of the bible, and this is what the bible says you must do."

When a man gives authority to the bible, he is giving himself authority. He is acting just like the Pharisees did in the time

of Jesus. They would constantly approach Jesus and say, "This is what the law says." And Jesus would have to correct them by showing how they misinterpreted the law.

Then Jesus gave His life to bring mercy and grace upon everyone. Paul had a thorn in His side. God did not take it away. Rather, He told Paul, "My grace is sufficient." Jesus is sufficient. Jesus is good enough for Paul. Despite the law, Jesus is good enough for Paul. Is Jesus good enough for you, me, and everyone else?

God made sure the bible was not made authoritative. God made sure no person could say, "This bible is the authority." How? Simply this, He did not preserve the original texts. They have disappeared. They were not made Holy and locked in a sanctuary somewhere. There are many bibles in many languages. Which bible is the right bible? They don't all agree. Which language is the Holy language? Which one is the most authentic? Which one can we say without a doubt has the exact words of God? Which one is the right one?

There are over 212 books of the bible. Only 66 made it into the bibles we use most. There is even a book of revelations by Paul the apostle, and a gospel according to Thomas. The gospel of Thomas was found with the dead sea scrolls along with the book of Isaiah. So what about these books?

No bible is right, because only Christ is right. The bible is not a law. It is not a tool to tell people what clothing they can wear to Church, or to tell them what Music they can listen, or how to live their life, or how to worship God. We follow Christ and He is our leader. Christ tells us all these things.

The bible is a tool for encouragement and uplifting. It is a guide to help us draw closer to God. Not by force, but by love.

Often times, people will box the bible into a book of law. "This is what it says. It can say no more or no less." This mentality is harmful. A friend of mine may read something different in a scripture than I do. He may take a totally different interpretation than me. So who is right and who is wrong? Neither. It just depends on how God is speaking to us. By saying it is only one way limits God. There is only one God. However, this one God loves variety. He never creates two things exactly the same.

Some people fear this talk because if they can't use the bible as a book of law by which to judge, then they feel out of control. They feel like they have no standard or direction. This is all the better for it is in this time we draw closer to Christ and truly walk with Him.

People also worry that if you can't cram the bible down other people's throats then they will go out and do whatever they want to do. Of course they will. And those that are Christian will be corrected, directed, fathered, and shepherded by Christ. Don't you think? Do you think Christ will be faithful to His people? Or do you think we need to be the father and shepherd God's people for Him?

That is why I do not like what Paul said about being the father of the Corinthians. I understand what you saying in your response. He was like a father over the Corinthians. However, I disagree with Paul. He may have acted like a father figure, but who is he to tell anyone to follow him? He is a brother, not the father? Should he not have told his fellow Christians to follow Christ?

1 Corinthians 4:15 (NLT)

For even if you had ten thousand others to teach you about Christ, you have only one spiritual father. For I became your father in Christ Jesus when I preached the Good News to you.

Matthew 23:9 (NLT)

And don't address anyone here on earth as 'Father,' for only God in heaven is your spiritual Father.

1 Corinthians 4:16 - (NLT)

So I ask you to follow my example and do as I do.

1 Corinthians 11:1 - (NLT) And you should follow my example, just as I follow Christ's.

I am certainly not going to follow Paul's example. I did that once and it got me in trouble. I am going to follow Christ's example. I do not follow Paul, I follow Christ.

I know Paul was a follower of Christ, however, he was still a man and a sinner. He had a thorn in his side. Should I follow the sinful ways of Paul too? Christ was the only man who did not sin. And so, I can never go wrong following Christ's example.

This also presents another problem. Why would God tell Paul to write such things? It doesn't make sense. Why? Because God did not tell Paul to write such things. Paul was a man and a sinner just like me and all other men. He was just a man. And we all are wrong. We all are less than God. Just as every preacher inserts his own thoughts, Paul did the same. And so did Peter, and so did John, and so did Matthew and so did Luke.

That explains why we encounter this contradiction:

Matthew 28:2 (NLT)

Suddenly there was a great earthquake, because an angel of the Lord came down from heaven and rolled aside the stone and sat on it.

Luke 24:4 (NLT)

They were puzzled, trying to think what could have happened to it. Suddenly, two men appeared to them, clothed in dazzling robes.

Was it one angel or two? I have heard many arguments on this scripture including the one established in the book, "The Case for Faith."

They all try to pass this off as nothing. "They still agree. There was one angel and two."

Neither Matthew or Luke was there. Rather, it was Mary and Mary. This means that Matthew and Luke had to hear the story from one of the Marys. Most likely, Luke and Mark got the story right, they just mixed up a few details.

This brings me to my last discussion. The bible bears witness to the truth. The bible bears a message. The message of the bible has been preserved by God through the Holy Spirit residing in men. The bible has been inspired by God. He did not write it, however, He did inspire it. Because of this, the bible is good for teaching, edifying, guiding, encouraging, and even for fun.

However, the bible is not a law and cannot be. It does not agree even in details. If the bible were meant to be a law, it would be preserved in an ark in a Holy Temple where no man could touch it. Rather, the bible is written in many languages and many versions to address the needs of all people across all cultures. It is a wonderful book full of wisdom, counsel, and advice. It helps us and guides us.

The bible does not rule us. Christ is our King. May He always be our King, Lord, Savior, and God. All Hail Christ!!!! Jesus Christ is Lord!!!

I know this is long, and you may want to skip over some parts. Please don't skip over parts as you may miss the overall message.

If you still disagree, then I respect that and you're still cool by me.

Your brother,
Blake

Re:, on: 2005/9/18 0:59

I glanced over your post Blake and you mentioned 'contradicting scriptures'.

Here is a MUSLIM link that I consider to be 'challenging' because it lists numerous 'different' verses of 'contradictions'. Most sites I see that 'contradict' make me laugh cause they are pure idiots in their posting. But this one, I think, to a degree (at least in my walk and my knowledge of the Word) this link is a CHALLENGE to show you 'do you really know what the Word says?'

http://www.themodernreligion.com/comparative/christ/bible_inconsistencies.htm

General Topics :: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)?

Re: - posted by tom74, on: 2005/9/18 7:14

I took a look at the muslim link page and YES it does make considerable reading, and yes it does show incredible inconsistencies in the ENGLISH scriptures, yet if we looked at the original Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek New Testament, we see many words used in these which can lose their original value in translation.

Now I am not for a second saying that anyone reading the Bible should be fluent in Greek and Hebrew but if you are going to tear apart the Word of God like these muslim Christ rejecters then you should know what you are talking about.
e.g.

in Matt. 11:28 the rest that the Lord Jesus is talking about is not a sleeping rest, (koimesis) neither is it (katapausis) classical greek a causing to cease, but (anapausis) meaning refreshment. this rest is Salvation, healing, deliverance. This is only one small example and I am sure that you could probably find more.

Brethren I would never force my opinion onto anyone because my word is insignificant but My God's word is Paramount. Let the Muslim's and others tear our bible to pieces and let us retaliate in praying that the Lord would reach and save their precious souls. Also it is worth adding that Donald Morgan who posted that "inconsistency in the Bible" is a sworn atheist and someone that we as believers should not be giving any place, he also says he is an agnostic (greek word) which translated to latin is ignoramus.

your brother in Christ

tom

Re: What about the New American Standard Bible (NASB)? - posted by Isleander (), on: 2012/8/16 19:25

Dean Burgon addresses the role of the 1881 Revision (Critical Text), in his Revision Revised. If you can get your hands on a copy you will find it a great benefit.

Are you aware that Westcott and Hort, who created their Greek Text from Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus (used for the Revised Version) were spiritualists and involved with Madame Blavatsky?

Les Garrott is the man with information on this.

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5LTmFdKO2w8>

Re: , on: 2012/8/16 20:29

The NASB was used by Brother David Wilkerson.

Does that authenticate it? Absolutely not.

But if a godly man like him has no trouble using it and he lived his life using it and preached using it, can't be too much wrong with it.

m2c