
To appreciate the contribution of the NASB, a little historical perspective is necessary.

In 1881, the Revised Version was given to the English-speaking world. The RV, as it was promptly abbreviated, succeeded in being exactly what it purported to be: a revision of the AV of 1611. The task of the scholars had not been, therefore, to produce a new translation, but rather to update the well-loved and widely-used King James Version. Certainly the calibre of the work was excellent, and the revisers used sobriety and caution, both in the changes which they introduced into the English text, and in their judicious use of brief explanatory footnotes.

In 1901, the American edition of the revision was published, under the name American Standard Version. It had been agreed that the American revisers would refrain from such a publication until 1901; and originally their contributions and suggestions were published in an appendix to the RV. The differences between the RV and the ASV were minor in nature: “LORD” became “Jehovah”; the use of “its” for “his” and “hers” when referring to neuter objects was much more consistent; “reins” was replaced by “heart” in the Old Testament; the Hebrew word usually rendered “heart” was more accurately translated “mind”; and such like. The net result of the work was a version that came to be known as the Rock of Biblical Honesty. Probably its chief deficiency was its relatively sterile English style, certainly no match for the AV as far as majestic beauty was concerned. Against this shortcoming, nevertheless, was the care and general precision of the translation itself.

One other major difference between the AV and the RV-ASV was the general abandonment of the Textus Receptus in the New Testament. Due to the textual critical theories of Westcott and Hort arising from the discoveries of Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus and others, fairly major revisions of certain New Testament passages were introduced. Present-day scholarship of all theological stripes still stamps the majority of such changes with approval. Recently, however, a small flame of interest in the writings of J. W. Burgon has been rekindled. Burgon opposed Westcott and Hort in their day. The only point to be made here is the influence of Westcott and Hort on RV and ASV and virtually all other modern translations.

In 1952, the National Council of Churches of the U.S.A. published the Revised Standard Version, which was purported to be a revision of the ASV. The aims were noble; but the RSV suffered from the same grievous malady as the New English Bible, for example:
the scholars involved frequently demonstrated that their heterodox theology warped their sense of judgment, inevitably at the expense of both objective scholarship and revealed truth.

The NASB follows in the tradition of the RV, ASV, and RSV in that it is a revision of an established version, and in that Westcott and Hort prevail in the New Testament. Unlike the NEB, it is not purported to be a new translation: it is another revision of the ASV. Its sponsors are the Lockman Foundation, a non-profit corporation which also produced The Amplified Bible. The foreword of the NASB is refreshing: “The New American Standard Bible has been produced with the conviction that the words of Scripture as originally penned in the Hebrew and Greek were inspired by God. Since they are the eternal Word of God, the Holy Scriptures speak with fresh power to each generation, to give wisdom that leads to salvation, that men may serve God to the glory of Christ. . . .”

The NASB differs from the ASV only in details, all of which tend to increase the value of that massive effort. The sterility of the ASV has been diminished by the inclusion of more English idioms. Greater care is taken concerning the flow of English verbs translating Greek perfects, aorists, and imperfects. Jehovah once again becomes LORD, and the first letters of the pronouns of Deity are capitalized. The layout of the NASB is excellent, the printing very readable. Footnotes and references are put in outer margins, and both versification and paragraph structures are included by the simple expedient of putting the verse number at the head of a new paragraph, in bold-faced type.

In short, the NASB is an excellent study Bible of inestimable value to serious students of the Scriptures. It is not likely to receive the popular acclaim of certain racy paraphrases; but English-speaking Christians who hunger for a careful rendering of the Word of God and who are not masters of the original tongues, could scarcely do better than to study the NASB.

D. A. Carson

Richmond