

Scriptures and Doctrine :: NET Bible

NET Bible - posted by alanrepent, on: 2006/1/26 19:29

Wondering if anyone had looked into the NET much. Not of extreme importance to me. Every translation I've read so far tells me obedience to the word of Jesus Christ is the only way to know the Father, but you might check this out....

(<http://www.bible.org/netbible>) NET Bible

At least if you don't understand why something was translated a certain way, you can check the footnotes and find out. And it impresses me that these guys have such a liberal copyright policy... sheds a lot of light on their motives since they aren't making even a fraction of the money they could make. It's things like that that make me lean toward a translation more than scholarly credentials.

Also, I notice the chapters are divided by context, not by where divisions were added in the 13th century or so. ie: 1 John 1 & 2

Just thought the thing might edify someone cause it's so natural to read. This post isn't another discussion about which translation is superior or what not, only a reference for those who might want to check it out.

don't sin today.

love, alan

Re: NET Bible - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/27 5:29

The NET bible is highly regarded by many. Although it is based on the Nestle-Aland 27th Edition Greek text, which is not the Byzantine, textform family there is some very valuable information. I have a friend working underground in a Central Asian republic translating the scriptures into a people group language who constantly uses and contributes to the NET programme.

There are free downloads for users of both PC, Mac and handheld computers.

Re: NET Bible great resource - posted by sheepshear1, on: 2006/1/31 16:01

alanrepent:

i found the net bible to be a great resource. while i agree that the chapters were added in the 13th century i do not think that they are inspired. they were just the work of one man who helped many others study the bible without being overwhelmed. I think the reason that the net people did not use the conventional way of dividing was because john's train of thought carried through 1john 2:2. john carries the overall idea all the way through the book, but in my opinion i like the break at the end of 1john 2:2. 8-)

Re: - posted by alanrepent, on: 2006/1/31 16:21

Quote:

I think the reason that the net people did not use the conventional way of dividing was because john's train of thought carried through 1john 2:2. john carries the overall idea all the way through the book, but in my opinion i like the break at the end of 1john 2:2. 8-)

Yep, I really appreciate it being separated like this. I actually made a program that takes out all of the chapter, verse, and footnote numbers and paragraph titles from the entire NET Bible... so letters read as letters, histories read as histories, etc. Just a little easier for me to digest than reading it with a religious preconception and not as it was intended to be read.

DO NOT read this post as an implication that for all people, the chapters and verses cause them to read the Bible with a

wrong perception. The chapters and verses are an excellent tool for studies and reference if used with wisdom, without pride, and without partiality to certain phrases in relation to others.

Love, alan.

Ignore the devil. If you have need to rebuke him, don't rail, but rebuke him with the authority of the Lord. He's too crafty for us to try to reason or quarrel with him.