



Scriptures and Doctrine :: nkjv or nasb

nkjv or nasb - posted by farshort (), on: 2008/9/28 20:20

In the Bible study I attend, we have people with both. I prefer the nasb, others prefer the nkjv. We have observed that sometimes the nasb is more exactly the same as the Greek, and a few times when the nkjv is. All I am interested in is the truth, whether it challenges my opinions or not. If you do not have truth, you have nothing. All else is useless.

Re: nkjv or nasb, on: 2008/9/29 8:07

Quote:

-----All I am interested in is the truth, whether it challenges my opinions or not.

If that's what you want, then may I recommend you use neither of these versions... and get ya a copy of the Authorized Version (KJV).

Krispy

Re: nkjv or nasb - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/9/29 15:24

(<http://www.kjvonly.org/>) KJV-Onlyism

Re:, on: 2008/9/29 15:47

Interesting link. Are you trying to tie me to the KJV-Onlyism crowd? Can't do it, my friend, even if you really really want to really bad.

Krispy

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2008/9/29 15:54

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Interesting link. Are you trying to tie me to the KJV-Onlyism crowd? Can't do it, my friend, even if you really really want to really bad.

Krispy

Nope! :-) Trust me, I've been in enough threads about that to know what you believe, Krispy. It was in reply to the original post. I don't really care if you believe that or not.

Re: nkjv or nasb - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/9/29 15:55

it is wrong to try compare NKJV and NASB, since in a sense they are two different bibles. They come from two different sources.

Your problem is not NKJV or NASB, what you need to study and decide on, is which source you prefer.

A good start would be this

(http://wiki.biblebase.com/index.php?title=The_Bible:_Inspiration_and_Interpretation) "Which Bible?" Ron Bailey and Bob Oakley

Re:, on: 2008/9/29 15:57

Been a long time since I posted this, but I think it needs to be posted again... Instead of actually discussing the issue, those who are ignorant just want to paint me and other supporters of the KJV as belonging to a cult. To be sure, as with any topic, there are those who take an extreme position. As a result they can be cult-"ish". But there is a reasonable, intelligent and well thought out position that does come down on the side of the KJV.

So rather than post a link to some obscure website to "prove" everyone wrong, why not explain and discuss your position?

Anyway... reposting this for those who care to understand where I am coming from on Bible versions. **Krispy**

During my time here on the SI forum I have been involved in numerous conversations concerning the KJV vs. Modern Versions. As a result of these conversations I have been labeled "King James Only", and informed that I am part of a cult. (I also want to state clearly that I have also made several good friends on this forum who have debated this issue with me, and disagreed with me)

I found the following article today, and I believe this is an excellent explanation of my own position. I agree with this article completely and it states clearly where I stand on the issue of the King James Bible. It is well balanced and wise.

So... for anyone who is interested in knowing precisely where I stand on the KJV, please read the following!

Krispy

There is a lot of debate and confusion surrounding the man-made term "King James Onlyism." This term has been popularized in recent years by men who claim they are concerned about an alleged dangerous and cultic view of the King James Bible. Rarely do they carefully define this term, though, and as a result a wide variety of Bible-believing men are lumped together and labeled with a term the meaning of which is nebulous.

The term "King James Only" was invented by those who oppose the defense of the King James Bible and its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts. It was intended to be a term of approbation, and it is usually defined in terms of the extremism.

I have been labeled "King James Only" because of my writings on the subject of Bible texts and versions and my defense of the King James Bible. To set the record straight, let me explain what I believe. I know from decades of experience and extensive travels that this is also what a large number of other King James Bible defenders believe.

I WILL ACCEPT THE LABEL OF "KING JAMES ONLY" IF IT MEANS THE FOLLOWING:

If "King James Only" defines one who believes that God has given infallible Scripture in the original Greek and Hebrew writings and that He has preserved that in the Hebrew Masoretic and Greek Received Text underlying the King James Bible and other Reformation Bibles and that we have an accurate translation of it in the English language in the Authorized Version, call me "King James Only."

If "King James Only" defines one who believes modern textual criticism is heresy, call me "King James Only." I have spent hundreds of dollars to obtain the writings of the men who have been at the forefront of developing the theories underlying modern textual criticism, and I have read them. They are not dependable. They refuse to approach the Bible text from a position of faith in divine preservation. Most of them are unbelievers, and I refuse to lean upon their scholarship. I am convinced they do not have the spiritual discernment necessary to know where the inspired, preserved Word of God is located today.

If "King James Only" defines one who believes that God has preserved the Scripture in its common use among apostolic churches through the fulfillment of the Great Commission and that He guided the Reformation editors and translators in their choice of the Received Text and that we don't have to start all over today in an attempt to find the preserved text of Scripture, call me "King James Only." The theories of modern textual criticism, on the other hand, all revolve around the idea that the pure text of Scripture was not preserved in the Reformation text but that the Reformation editors, because of their alleged ignorance and or lack of resources, rejected the pure text and chose, instead, an inferior text. In fact, modern textual criticism is predicated upon the theory that the best text of the New Testament (the Egyptian or Alexandrian) was rejected in the earliest centuries and was replaced with a corrupt recension that was created through the conflation of various manuscript readings (the Byzantine or Traditional text) and that the corrupt text became the dominant text

throughout most of church history (for 1,500 years) until the best text was rediscovered in the 19th century. You are free to accept such views if it suits you. I, for one, believe this is absolute nonsense, and if that is "King James Only," count me in.

Similarly, if "King James Only" defines one who rejects the theory that the "preserved" Word of God was hidden away in the Pope's library and in a weird Greek Orthodox monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai (a monastery which has a room full of the skulls of dead monks) for hundreds of years, call me "King James Only."

If "King James Only" defines one who believes it is important to have one biblical standard in a language as important as English and who believes that the multiplicity of competing versions has created confusion and has weakened the authority of the Word of God in this century, call me "King James Only."

I WILL NOT ACCEPT THE LABEL OF "KING JAMES ONLY" IF IT MEANS THE FOLLOWING:

If "King James Only" defines one who believes that the KJV was given by inspiration, I am not "King James Only. The King James Bible is the product of preservation, not inspiration. The term "inspiration" refers to the original giving of the Scripture through holy men of old (2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:20-21). At the same time, I agree with the Pulpit Commentary when it says, "We must guard against such narrow, mechanical views of inspiration as would confine it to the Hebrew and Greek words in which it was written, so that one who reads a good translation would not have 'the words of the Lord.'" To say that the King James Bible is the inspired Word of God in the English language because it is an accurate translation of the preserved Hebrew and Greek is not the same as saying that it was given by inspiration.

If "King James Only" defines one who believes the English KJV is superior to the Hebrew and Greek texts upon which it was based, I am not "King James Only." In fact, I believe such an idea is pure nonsense, as it would mean the preserved Word of God did not exist before 1611.

If "King James Only" defines one who believes the English Authorized Version is advanced revelation over the Hebrew and Greek text that God gave through inspiration to holy men of old, I am not "King James Only."

If "King James Only" defines one who believes that we do not need to study Greek and Hebrew today or that it is not proper to use lexicons and dictionaries, I am not "King James Only." God's people should learn Greek and Hebrew if possible and use (with much caution and wisdom) study tools. When the Bible says that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," we know that the words they spake were Hebrew and Greek words. I encouraged my youngest son to begin studying Greek in high school, and he is scheduled to have four years of Greek and two of Hebrew when he graduates from Bible College. But foundational to the study of the biblical languages is a thorough understanding of the textual issue. We must study the right Greek and Hebrew, and we must also be careful of the original language study tools, because many of them were produced from a rationalistic perspective and with great bias against the Received Text.

If "King James Only" defines one who believes the preserved Word of God is available only in English, I am not "King James Only." The Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament and Greek Received New Testament translated properly into any language is the preserved Word of God in that language, whether it is German, Spanish, French, Korean, or Nepali.

If "King James Only" defines one who believes that translations in other languages should be based on English rather than (when possible) Greek and Hebrew, I am not "King James Only." (I also believe that a good translation can be made directly from the King James Bible when necessary if it is done by men who are capable in the use of dictionaries so that they understand the somewhat antiquated language of the KJV properly.)

If "King James Only" defines one who believes that a person can only be saved through the King James Bible, I am not "King James Only." It is the Gospel that is the power of God unto salvation (Rom. 1:16), and even a Bible that is textually corrupt contains the Gospel.

If "King James Only" defines one who believes that the King James Bible's antiquated language is holy or who believes that the KJV could never again be updated, I am not "King James Only." I doubt the KJV will ever be replaced in this apostate age, but to say that it is wrong to update the language again after the fashion of the several updates it has undergone since 1611 is not reasonable, in my estimation. Having dealt constantly with people who speak English as a 2nd or 3rd language, I am very sympathetic to the very real antiquation problem in the King James Bible. At the same time, I am not going to trade an excellent Bible with a few problems due to old language for a Bible filled with error due to a corrupt text.

and/or a corrupt translation methodology.

If "King James Only" defines one who believes he has the authority to call those who disagree with him silly morons, and jacklegs, and to treat them as if they were the scum of the earth because they refuse to follow his peculiar views, I am not "King James Only."

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/9/29 16:14

its a good one krispy, i prefer KJV, because it is a good translation from the original. I do also read much from NKJV. You lose the THEE and THOU but since these are used still in my native tongue i dont lose that. Since I read both :-)

the real issue is the text source. We do not have many from in my opinion the better texts, KJV, NKJV and Tyndales NT. Maybe there are some more?

then we have 80% from the Text NASB is translated from. That text seem hard to translate :-P

the problem, or one of them is. if the alexandrian text is better, then we had a corrupt bible, or a faulty Gods word until 1881 or when they made the first translation.

dont get me wrong, i think one can feed from NASB or whatever version one chooses, all important doctrines can be found. But as Ron points out in a sermon in the link above, it is almost impossible to teach regeneration from these new translations, unless you say "this really means this in greek"

i really recommend brother rons teachings in the link above, he really shows in a good way some very important things to consider when choosing what bible we should use.

Re:, on: 2008/9/29 16:20

Quote:
-----dont get me wrong, i think one can feed from NASB or whatever version one chooses, all important doctrines can be found. But as Ron points out in a sermon in the link above, it is almost impossible to teach regeneration from these new translations, unless you say "this really means this in greek"

I agree with what you wrote, bro... especially the part I quoted above. I dont break fellowship with someone over Bible versions, unless someone is convinced that "The Message" is the best version... LOL (at which point we have *nothing* in common!). Fortunately I've never met anyone who ever thought that.

But yea, it's interesting that there are now over 90 versions from the Alexandrian Text since 1881. I wonder when they'll get it right? Truth is it's a copyright issue... each of those 90 versions have a copyright, therefore it puts \$\$ in the pockets of the publishers. And thats a fact.

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/9/29 16:38

I do use the living bible at times, and have been blessed. But i dont think a paraphrase should be your "main" meal. I do confess i have a hard time with KJV in the OT. I lose the "plot" so to speak. That is why i read some in NKJV also. If someone is thinking why that swedish guy just cant read a swedish bible? then that is because we do not have one single version from the "better" text. But a whole line-up from the other, so i prefer the Textus receptus, sadly we have none in swedish yet.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/9/29 16:50

Quote:

-----sadly we have none in swedish

Christian, why don't you follow in the tradition of Luther and Tyndale? Start with translating some books of the NT into Swedish yourself, using the TR as a guide. If you don't have translation from the Greek directly into Swedish, use the Stephens 1550 interlinear and maybe a YLT on the side. Translate the English equivalent directly into Swedish the best you can. Use your acquired English skills and a Strong's Concordance to get the best word choice in Swedish and just have a go at it. See where God takes it. You never know what will happen brother.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/9/30 16:00

Quote:

PaulWest wrote:

Quote:

-----sadly we have none in swedish

Christian, why don't you follow in the tradition of Luther and Tyndale? Start with translating some books of the NT into Swedish yourself, using the TR as a guide. If you don't have translation from the Greek directly into Swedish, use the Stephens 1550 interlinear and maybe a YLT on the side. Translate the English equivalent directly into Swedish the best you can. Use your acquired English skills and a Strong's Concordance to get the best word choice in Swedish and just have a go at it. See where God takes it. You never know what will happen brother.

It would be an interesting project :-)

I have found some difficulties, i think all translators come up against this problem, some words do not exist in the new language.

For example, in almost all places where Paul greets in his letters he says often "Grace and mercy" and ect.

In Swedish we do not have the word Grace. In almost every case, the translators have used the word "peace".

And also, in Swedish there is no word for wicked. And many more. But I believe we need stick as close to the original without lose its content and meaning.

anyhow, some people are working on a translation in Swedish, i look forward to it. It is some "like-minded" people, and they do it on their free time and from own income so it is quite taking some time. But it would be a interesting thing to do anyway, i know the things i translated from English has always stuck deeper in me then when just reading it. So there is great benefits in projects like this.

It is very interesting to see how different some languages are. For me i often times feel English is a very powerful language. Swedish often times lack that "edge". My wife speaks Finnish and she says she feels the same way when she read the Finnish bible, it is a bit more power in it. I feel the Swedish translators if given a choice in translation, always go with the "less" offensive so to speak, the less powerful.

Also, i have found some books in Swedish from the 1800s, Spurgeons commentary on the psalms translated into Swedish. How wonderful they are! to have such a treasure in my own language, its very old style Swedish and probably much more archaic the kjv for Englishmen, but still its precious to me. I hope you English speaking people rightly value and appreciate what is given you in literature way. You have so MUCH of value for the soul. A lot of trash to.... but if one goes through history you have so much it is beyond logic.

I when i lived in sweden i almost wept one time, i found a used book on David Brainerds life from early 1900 in Swedish! not as thick as the english version but still. And later found some other good books.. and price from around 1 dollar to about if high price 5 dollars.

And if browsing some christian online bookstore, i see you can get so much for so cheap. Most people in the world, most christians can never have a commentary and would probably be lucky if they read two biographies.

And we swim in them, may we have a right sense of value of what we have. And when thinking of the sermons right here, the men, their life. At our fingertips. Their walk, their suffering, their revelations. We have so much.

Truly, we are a blessed generation, thinking that i would consider it a blessing if anyone, sat under ONE of these mens ministries. Sparks, Tozer, Ravenhill ect.... sitting under one such man would be a great privilege. And we have them by the hundreds.

i am drifting off here.

Christian

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/10/3 12:01

Quote:

-----In Swedish we do not have the word Grace. In almost every case, the translators have used the word "peace".

Very interesting post, Christian.

About the word "Grace". This is a word used very little in English apart from the Scriptures. It is used most often in contemporary situations when one is discussing the tardiness of paying your credit card/loan bill on time: Do you have a grace period in which to pay without incurring any penalties?" Apart from a similar situation, it is used very little.

However, if the Swedes would define "grace" as peace, is this not redundant? Consider 1 Corinthians 1:3: Grace to you and peace..." So, grace would have to convey a meaning different from 'peace'. So what is 'grace'? If you were to define it as "an enabling power from God to do his will" would this not be more powerful? would this definition not be more in line with the context? Many times context would define the meanings of uncertain words, or words that do not occur in another language. This is one reason why stories are so helpful: helps one to understand the concepts taught philosophically.

When sharing with people of different religions, e.g. JW's, Catholics, I will refrain from using theological terms, opting instead to use common English words, even if it means using two dozen words to describe what could easily have been done with one. The reason is because some will give these words different meanings than what is commonly understood. So, I would guess it would be with Bible translation. The rule is to communicate accurately the exact word, if possible, and if that isn't possible, use several words that will convey that meaning.

I have friends who are fluent in German. They prefer the German Bible over the English - the KJV! They say its meanings are clearer!

Yes, I know that to translate from one language to another has its problems. I am also bi-lingual. There are some poems, stories told in this language that you just cannot translate to the English with the same punch. In the other language one is left laughing - hard. In the English - it falls flat and the English wonder what is so funny about that?!

My thoughts,
ginnyrose

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/10/3 13:04

in swedish bible, it is translated that verse from 1 Cor 1:13 like this "mercy and peace"

sometimes it is translated like mercifulness. but there is not a translation for grace, so they substitute this word , and the closest word is merciful.

Re: Language and translation - posted by JoanM, on: 2008/10/4 7:02

No word for grace in Swedish! I have read, here and there, similar grief expressed about other languages. We lost a lot at the Tower of Babel.

I, for one think that Hebrew is the best of the **broken languages** that man has (speaks) to convey God, the Word of God , as He reveals himself in the Old Testament. I also think, with rare exception, Greek is the best of the broken languages that man has (speaks) to convey God, the Word of God, as He reveals himself in the New Testament.

What you point out about Swedish is true about English. I give an example from the night God revealed Himself to me as His Word, Jesus the Christ. I was struggling to translate "logos" into English. I had already learned that in Greek, when you "give/speak" logos, you give "the thing itself." Logos is not rhema. Logos was what was what I was trying to bring over, into English in translating John 1: 1. Anyway in English, logos is not one word (one rhema). It is at least three words: reason, Word and ratio. As I meditated and struggled on how I could bring those three, rather different words, over into English and into ONE English word, I had no idea what I was in reality trying to do. God must have because He revealed Himself to me as His Word, Jesus the Christ, the Son of God.

I look always for the logos of a person's testimony. There is resurrection power there. Maybe you have noticed this in testimony? Very often people identify a specific Word of God that "dawned" on them (light dispelling darkness). Consider Revelation 12:11 "And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb and the LOGOS of their testimony and they loved not their lives unto the death."

Preaching. I also think that when God anoints His Word that is preached in any language, the Holy Spirit of God, repairs/supplies (it's hard to find the right English word for this) what was lost to man at that Tower. May the way to say it is that the brokenness of language in the world is bridged/covered. Light and a dawning occur. We lost more than the ability for all man to communicate with man.

We lost something of our ability to communicate the Word of God to our fellow man. It looks like our language(s) shows this. How many reports we have from individuals that God has used mightily, that the actual message they gave was not different from what they had given in times past. They say God anointed His Word or God, the Holy Spirit, was there.

We all know that the use, **for evil**, of the unity of man (Gen.11: making a name for ourselves, and nothing restrained from man in his imaginations that lift themselves up against the knowledge of God) was a horrible attack on God, exposing the nature of man in our condition.

When we pray that God anoint the preaching of His Word, how important it is that there be NO making of a name for ourselves and NO imaginations that lift themselves up against the knowledge of God (with both the one who preaches and the one who prays).

Reading the Bible in any language translation. I am thinking that when we ask God to "open His Word to our understanding," in our daily time with Him, it is the same thing. The indwelling Holy Spirit in a sense "restores what we lost at the Tower" in an internal way and it pierces what we call in English both our heart and mind. The Spirit of God, takes the Word of God, and shows it unto us. He speaks what He hears, Christ, and feeds us the exact bread we need that day, appointing what pleases God, tailor-made food, just like His grace is tailor-made. Again the same thing: How important it is that there be NO making of a name for ourselves and NO imaginations that lift themselves up against the knowledge of God as we seek to hear from God in His Word. OK, I am saying things that everybody knows. I think this explains the deadly poison of "proof texting" riddled throughout "name-it-and-claim-it" thinking (imaginations, never able to come to the knowledge of God).

What translation of the Bible? Of course we all want the very best (truest) translation from the very best (truest) original/most original texts. HOWEVER, a moment's meditation on the absolute sovereignty of God and His care for His Word

brings a flood of true facts to mind. Like what translation did God use with Luther. The “Catholic Bible?” Was it Latin? Was it a corrupt text? Man speaks many languages and they are all broken.

There is no word for grace in Swedish. My heart weeps at the thought of that. If I were an evangelist in Sweden, I would preach on Grace, every message and pray to communicate in preaching Grace, “the thing itself,” because there is grace and Great Grace for Sweden and all those that speak that language.

I am so sorry this is long. IN SHORT, I only meant to point out that what is true of Swedish is probably true of every language (remembering the Tower). And to point out the absolute sovereignty of God and the power and work of His Holy Spirit in restoring communication (communion) in any translation. I find that the KJV is good for me along with the Hebrew and Greek (via lexicon) when I am led into it. I am not basically smart (Ds, Fs and some Cs in high school), so surely there are tons of theologically wrong and wrongly written things in this. I would love to have a list of the words that different languages lack that have been discovered by those that God has called to translate the Bible. I think I recall that Love was a word missing in one language! Where is the seminary student that needs a subject for a paper? And I guess finally, I don’t really want the best translation or text. What I am really after is hearing Him, face to face, when I see Him. Isn’t that what is behind all our efforts after translation? (Hummm, translation...I must say I rather like the English language). But I long for the time we will speak to one another as He speaks. What a Revival that will be!

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/10/4 11:13

Hi ginnyrose...

Quote:
-----I have friends who are fluent in German. They prefer the German Bible over the English - the KJV! They say its meanings are clearer!

Interesting!

My wife reads the Bible in Spanish. I also tend to refer to a Spanish translation from the TR (that predates the KJV) in order to see how they translated certain portions of Scripture. Like our brother's example of Swedish, there are certain words that are simply difficult to find an exact replicate in English (or Spanish, for that matter). Thus, I tend to see how some of these words were translated into Spanish in the late 16th Century.

As for the broader sense of this question (NKJV or NASB...and KJV): Didn't we just go through this a couple of months ago? Perhaps the original poster could check through the previous thread for our thoughts and insight?

May the Lord bless and keep you all!

:-)