

## CHAPTER X

### THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION

Were the Translators with us today, would they approve of a revision of their translation to correct errors and/or update the language?

“But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar...” (Translators’ Preface)

We may assume from statements in their Preface that the Translators would approve of any faithful English translation of the Greek Textus Receptus, just as they approved of the Tyndale, Coverdale, Geneva and Bishops’ Bibles. We can also deduce from their negative comments about the Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate that they would not recommend modern versions translated from the Nestles-UBS Text based on the corrupt Westcott-Hort Greek text. Of the corrupt modern versions they would have said, as they did of the Septuagint, that they were “not so sound and so perfect, but it needed in many places correction,” and of the Latin Vulgate, “Erasmus...found fault with their vulgar Translation, and consequently wished the same to be mended, or a new one to be made.”

The English translations of the Greek Textus Receptus in print today are the Tyndale Bible, the Geneva Bible, the King James Bible and the New King James Version. Since all translations have “some imperfections and blemishes...For whatever was perfect under the Sun, where Apostles or Apostolic men, that is, men endued with an extraordinary measure of God’s spirit, and privileged with the privilege of infallibility, had not their hand?” it behooves us to know where those imperfections and blemishes are by comparing these translations with the Greek Text itself. For God has commanded us to “Prove **all things**; hold fast that which is good.” (1 Thess. 5:21)

This is not an impossible task since many English translations, some foreign language translations, the Greek Textus Receptus as well as the Interlinear Greek-English Textus Receptus are available at: <http://www.olivetree.com/bible/> and <http://www.e-sword.net/>

A word of caution is in order concerning the Geneva Bible which is riddled with side notes of a political nature. Scrivener justly remarked of these:

“It had by that time grown intolerable, that on the self-same page with the text of Holy Scripture, should stand some bitter pithy comment, conceived in a temper the very reverse of that which befits men who profess to love God in Christ.” (Scrivener, p. 41)

The New King James Version also contains many footnotes which are explained in the NKJV Preface: “Significant textual variations, explanatory notes, alternate translations, and cross-references, as well as New Testament citations of Old Testament passages, are supplied in the footnotes. Important textual variations in the Old Testament are identified in a standard form.” The NKJV translators stated that they did not give preferentiality to the manuscripts in their footnotes but simply identified the sources:

“The textual notes in the present edition of the New Testament make no evaluation of readings, but do clearly indicate the manuscript sources of readings. They objectively present the facts without such tendentious remarks as ‘the best manuscripts omit’ or ‘the most reliable manuscripts read.’ Such notes are value judgments that differ according to varying viewpoints on the text. By giving a clearly defined set of variants the New King James Version benefits readers of all textual persuasions.” (NKJV Preface)

The NKJV translators indicated that they felt duty-bound to include variations from the Textus Receptus, however, unlike modern versions, their footnotes are at times critical of the NU-Text as unrepresentative of the majority of manuscripts extant. For instance, the footnote for Mark 16:20 states:

“Verses 9-20 are bracketed in NU-Text as not original. They are lacking in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, **although nearly all other manuscripts of Mark contain them.**”

In their Preface, the NKJV translators identified the two Greek Texts which are products of modern scholarship and which appear in footnotes as having textual variations from the Traditional Text, the Textus Receptus:

“Where significant variations occur in the New Testament Greek manuscripts, textual notes are classified as follows:

1. NU-Text - These variations from the traditional text generally represent the Alexandrian or Egyptian type of text...found in the Critical Text...of the Nestle Aland Greek New Testament (N) and in the United Bible Societies third edition (U), hence the term, ‘NU-Text.’
2. M-Text - This symbol indicates points of variation in the Majority Text from the Traditional text...

“The textual notes reflect the scholarship of the past 150 years and will assist the reader to observe the variations between the different manuscript traditions of the New Testament. Such information is generally not available in English translations of the New Testament.” (NKJV Preface)

The NKJV translators expressed their rejection of the textual theory of B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort and the Alexandrian manuscripts these revisers used for their New Greek Text. Although the NKJV translators clearly endorsed the Received Text, they unfortunately fell short of giving it recognition it as the “original Greek” text:

“The King James New Testament was based on the traditional text of the Greek-speaking churches, first published in 1516, and later called the Textus Receptus or Received Text. Although based on the relatively few available manuscripts, these were representative of many more which existed at the time but only became known later. In the late nineteenth century, B. Westcott and F. Hort taught that this text had been officially edited by the fourth-century church, but a total lack of historical evidence for this event has forced a revision of the theory. It is now widely held that the Byzantine Text that largely supports the Textus Receptus has as much right as the Alexandrian or any other tradition to be weighed in determining the text of the New Testament...

“Since the 1880s most contemporary translations of the New Testament have relied upon a relatively few manuscripts discovered chiefly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Such translations depend primarily on two manuscripts, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, because of their greater age. The Greek text obtained by using these sources and the related papyri (our most ancient manuscripts) is known as the Alexandrian Text. However, some scholars have grounds for doubting the faithfulness of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, since they often disagree with one another, and Sinaiticus exhibits excessive omission.” (NKJV Preface)

They NKJV translators observed that “the science of New Testament textual criticism is in a state of flux. Very few scholars still favor the Textus Receptus... For about a century most have followed a Critical Text...which depends heavily upon the Alexandrian type of text. More recently many have abandoned this Critical Text...for one that is more eclectic. Finally, a small but growing number of scholars prefer the Majority Text, which is close to the traditional text except in the Revelation.” Based on these facts, the

NKJV translators chose to follow the Textus Receptus for the text of the New Testament and to note variant readings from the Westcott-Hort Text (NU-Text) and Majority Text in footnotes:

“In light of these facts, and also because the New King James is the fifth revision of a historic document translated from specific Greek texts, the editors decided to **retain the traditional text in the body of the New Testament** and to indicate major Critical and Majority Text variant readings in the footnotes.” (NKJV Preface)

It is regrettable that the NKJV translators not only gave equal weight to the Critical Text and the Textus Receptus, they also contented themselves that there is 85% common agreement among all of the New Testament translations.

“Although these variations are duly indicated in the footnotes of the present edition, it is most important to emphasize that fully eighty-five percent of the New Testament text is the same in the Textus Receptus, the Alexandrian Text, and the Majority Text.”

This statement clearly minimizes the hundreds of textual variations in modern versions, ultimately based on Alexandrian manuscripts, which adversely affect fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. However, the tolerant attitude of the NKJV translators is best kept in perspective by recalling the latitude given by the 1611 Translators to a wide range of Bible translations, many not translated from Byzantine-type manuscripts. Of interest, the KJV Translators never clearly differentiated between two Greek text types, at least not in their Preface. Also, the KJV Translators considered translations from the Alexandrian manuscripts to be the Word of God. Finally, they consulted translations made from Alexandrian manuscripts and occasionally chose Alexandrian readings from the Septuagint and Vulgate against the Textus Receptus. Compare the following statements from the Translators’ Preface to the KJV with the statements from the NKJV Preface cited above:

**THE TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT OUT OF THE HEBREW INTO GREEK**

Therefore the word of God being set forth in Greek, becometh hereby like a candle set upon a candlestick, which giveth light to all that are in the house, or like a proclamation sounded forth in the market place, which most men presently take knowledge of; and therefore that language was fittest to contain the Scriptures, both for the first Preachers of the Gospel to appeal unto for witness, and for the learners also of those times to make search and trial by...”

**TRANSLATION OUT OF HEBREW AND GREEK INTO LATIN**

...But now the Latin Translations were too many to be all good, for they were infinite (Latini Interprets nullo modo numerari possunt, saith S. Augustine.) [S. Augustin. de doctr. Christ. lib 2 cap II]. Again they were not out of the Hebrew fountain (we speak of the Latin Translations of the Old Testament) but out of the Greek stream, therefore the Greek being not altogether clear, the Latin derived from it must needs be muddy. This moved S. Jerome a most learned father, and the best linguist without controversy, of his age, or of any that went before him, to undertake the translating of the Old Testament, out of the very fountain with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry, and faithfulness, that he had forever bound the Church unto him, in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness...”

**A SATISFACTION TO OUR BRETHREN**

And to the same effect say we, that we are so far off from condemning any of their labors that travailed before us in this kind, either in this land or beyond sea, either in King Henry’s time, or King Edward’s (if there were any translation, or correction of a translation in his time) or Queen Elizabeth’s of ever renowned memory, that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God, for the building and furnishing of his

Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance. The judgment of Aristotle is worthy and well known: “If Timotheus had not been, we had not had much sweet music; but if Phrynis [Timotheus his master] had not been, we had not had Timotheus.” Therefore blessed be they, and most honoured be their name, that break the ice, and giveth onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls...”

#### AN ANSWER TO THE IMPUTATIONS OF OUR ADVERSARIES

Now to the latter we answer; that we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession,... containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God...” (“Translators to the Reader”)

King James Only advocates falsely portray the 1611 KJV Translators as virtually the founders and charter members of the KJV-Only movement. One gets the impression from KJVO publications that the Translators were Fundamental Baptists who consulted *only* the Hebrew Masoretic Text, the Greek Textus Receptus and 100% “pure” English Bibles for their translation—and they would *never, ever* use corrupted Bibles, Hebrew or Greek texts, or wicked lexicons. An image of near perfection has been created for the KJV Translators, so that many KJV-Only readers believe them to be as *divinely inspired* as the Prophets and Apostles who wrote the original Hebrew scrolls and Greek manuscripts. On the foundation of a slick PR campaign and falsified textual evidence, the King James Bible has been elevated to stand alone today as the inerrant Word of God.

In stark contrast, KJV-Only purists trash the New King James Version and dump it in the garbage heap of modern versions based on the corrupt Nestles-UBS/Westcott-Hort text. It is even heard that the NKJV is the most Satanic Bible ever published, maybe even worse than Church of Satan founder, Anton LaVey’s version:

“The NEW KING JAMES VERSION is the MOST DANGEROUS BIBLE VERSION On The Market Today!! Why do I say this? I say this because it uses the name ‘King James’ in its title. It throws the non-thinking Christian off-balance—especially the one who has been used to the KING JAMES VERSION for most of his Christian life. The deceptive use of ‘KING JAMES VERSION’ in the title would lead many to think that there are only a few small incidental changes in their NEW KJV, but it is basically just the KING JAMES VERSION with a few minor changes to bring it up to date. NOTHING COULD BE FURTHER FROM THE TRUTH!! I certainly do NOT call a PERVERSION of the Bible with upwards of 100,000 CHANGES merely a ‘FEW MINOR CHANGES’! ...when the name ‘NEW KING JAMES VERSION’ is used, the uninformed observer right a way thinks that this is very CLOSE to the genuine KING JAMES VERSION, and so might buy it and use it. In actuality, it is a DECEPTIVE COUNTERFEIT of the real thing! While the NEW KJV borrows the ‘NAME’ of the KING JAMES VERSION, the similarity stops there!...

“The NEW KING JAMES VERSION Used The DIABOLICAL Method of ‘DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE’ Repeatedly While Professing A Love For ‘COMPLETE EQUIVALENCE.’ ...The editors...say how they have used ‘COMPLETE EQUIVALENCE’ and have shunned ‘DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE.’ This is a lie! As we have shown repeatedly in the evidence herein reproduced, the NEW KJV is replete with the DIABOLICAL ‘DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE’!”

(D.A. Waite, *The New King James Version Compared to the King James Version and Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts*, 1997, p. ix)

Note that D.A. Waite’s standard of comparison for the NKJV is the King James Version, not the Hebrew Masoretic Text or Greek Textus Receptus. To further impress upon Christians the “diabolical” character of the NKJV, many defenders of the KJV follow the party line (as we once did) concerning the logo originally displayed on the original NKJV cover:

**“Many people have asked about the mysterious symbol on the NKJV.**



“Thomas Nelson Publishers (publishers of the NKJV) claim, on the inside-cover, the symbol, ‘...is an ancient symbol for the Trinity.’ But Acts 17:29, clearly FORBIDS such symbology: ‘...we ought NOT to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, GRAVEN BY ART and man’s device.’ And why does *The Aquarian Conspiracy*, a key New Age ‘handbook’, bear a similar symbol? New Agers freely admit it represents three interwoven ‘6’s or ‘666’.

“Constance Cumbey, author of *The Hidden Dangers of the Rainbow* and a notable authority on the New Age Movement, said, ‘On the cover of the *Aquarian Conspiracy* is a Mobius, it is really used by them as triple six (666). The emblem on the cover of the New King James Bible is said to be an ancient symbol of the Trinity. The old symbol had gnostic origins. It was more gnostic than Christian. I was rather alarmed when I noticed the emblem...’

“The three esoteric ‘6’s separated. Plainly displaying the interlocked ‘666’.

“The same symbol (with a circle) is displayed by the rock group Led Zeppelin. Members of Led Zeppelin are deeply involved in satanism and the occult. Guitarist Jimmy Page, so consumed with satanism, actually purchased satanist Aleister Crowley’s mansion. Most believe the symbol is from the teachings of Aleister Crowley and represents 666...

**“Would God ‘mark’ His word with a symbol in the occult?”** (“New King James Version: Counterfeit,” Terry Watkins)

The fact is that the publisher, Thomas Nelson Inc., designed and printed the cover for the NKJV, just as the English printer Robert Barker added pagan headpieces, tailpieces and woodcuts to the 1611 King James Bible. Should we judge a Bible by its cover? Perhaps a reminder of David Bay’s lurid attack on the King James Bible is in order for those, like ourselves, who have been duped by the ubiquitous “NKJV occult logo” propaganda:



**“Devil’s Goats Heads, Complete Female Nudity, Neptune With His Trident, Flying Devil, And Multiple ‘6’s’ -- Are All Pictured In Either The 1611 or the 1619 King James Bibles (...)**

## “Neptune (Satan) In 1611 KJV, Woodcut

“This figure of Neptune astride his horse and lifting his trident high is the woodcut for the first letter ‘T’ appearing on the title page of the Gospel of Matthew, 1611 KJV Edition, p. 1143. Note that Neptune is nude in this 1611 woodcut, just as he appears on the right, a picture taken from Dr. Cathy Burns’ book, ‘Masonic and Occult Symbols Illustrated’, p. 252.

“Further, note that he sits astride his horse and seems to be fully in control of the entire earthly world, both land and sea. Let us now examine the Neptune writeup from Dr. Burns’ book.

“In the mythologies of Greece and Rome the thunderbolt of Jupiter was three-forked; the sceptre of Neptune was a trident ... In Hindu mythology the worshipper of Vushnu has his forehead decorated with a trident ... A Dictionary of Symbols explains that the trident is an attribute of the god of the unconscious and of sin -- Neptune, whose realm is the haunt of monsters and base forms of life. The triple character of the trident is an INFERNAL replica of the Trinity .. Neptune, the god of the sea, is also known as Poseidon, Hades (hell) and Shiva.”



## “Greek God of Sexual Lust and Orgies Is Depicted Prominently Twice In Original 1611 KJV Bible

“Historians have always debated why King James felt that Bacon needed this manuscript for one year and what Bacon did with or to the manuscript while he had it for that time. Now, however, we feel confident that Bacon used this time to plan how to coordinate the text with all these symbols -- page after page after page! His intent was to produce a ‘Rosicrucian Bible’, which contained Satanic symbols thought by occultists to pulsate with Lucifer’s power every single second. By placing these Satanic symbols on top of, and around, perfectly good text, Bacon and his Knights of the Helmet were trying to create an occult Bible which would gradually move the English-speaking world into the practice of the ‘Mystic Christianity’ of Rosicrucianism.

“In this article, we shall show the most shocking, excruciating Satanic symbol which could possibly be placed in the most sacred of books, a Bible...” Source: Cutting Edge Ministries, “Defending the KJV”

(For evidence that King James would not have given the KJV manuscripts to Francis Bacon and his “Knights of the Helmet,” see our refutation of Cutting Edge Ministries.)

Hopefully, the reader will begin to understand the nefarious plan behind the rabid attacks on the only two Bibles in general use which are based on the Textus Receptus. That agenda, as this report has tried to show, is the elimination of the Greek Textus Receptus and, ultimately, all of its translations. This plan is being skillfully executed using the dialectical process, in which the far extremes of the Bible version issue are staging an epic battle which will culminate in the elimination of the Received Text and its most popular

current translations, the King James Version and the New King James Version. (See: “The House of God on Trial,” <http://watch-unto-prayer.org>)

To this end, KJV-Only exposes of the NKJV abound with dire warnings and shocking allegations, not only about Satanic symbols, but of serious doctrinal corruption:

“The NKJV denies the deity of Christ a half dozen times.” (*New Age Bible Versions*, p. 102)

“The NKJV ignored the KJV Greek *Textus Receptus* over **1,200** times.” (Gail Riplinger)

“The NKJV also uses over 2,000 dynamic equivalencies which either add to God’s Words, subtract from God’s Words, or change God’s Words in some way.” (D.A. Waite, *Foes of the King James Bible Refuted*, 1997, p. 47)

*Dynamic equivalence* translation attempts to use words and terms that will be understood by the average fluent speaker of a language. Even the King James Translators thought that a literal word-for-word translation does not always convey the original meaning, and may even obscure the meaning of Scripture. The KJV Translators used dynamic equivalence — as thousands of *italicized* words attest — because they wished to make the meaning of the Bible perfectly clear to even the uneducated reader. The Translators acknowledged their use of dynamic equivalency in their Preface:

“Lastly, we have on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the old Ecclesiastical words, and betake them to other, as when they put WASHING for BAPTISM, and CONGREGATION instead of CHURCH: as also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their AZIMES, TUNIKE, RATIONAL, HOLOCAUSTS, PRAEPUCE, PASCHE, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to **darken the sense**, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may be kept from being understood. **But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar.**” (“Translators to the Reader”)

Do our KJV-Only advocates also “desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar”??

“The NEW KING JAMES VERSION Used The DIABOLICAL Method of ‘DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE’ Repeatedly While Professing A Love For ‘COMPLETE EQUIVALENCE.’ ...The editors...say how they have used ‘COMPLETE EQUIVALENCE’ and have shunned ‘DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE.’ This is a lie! As we have shown repeatedly in the evidence herein reproduced, the NEW KJV is replete with the DIABOLICAL ‘DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE’! This is seen in the 63 examples of ‘ADDITIONS’ (pp. 1-3); in the 856 examples of ‘CHANGES’ (pp. 3-36); as well as in the 295 examples of OMISSIONS (pp. 67-97). Because of this failing, the NEW KJV CANNOT BE TRUSTED OR RELIED UPON!!” (D.A. Waite, *The New King James Version Compared to the King James Version and Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts*, p. ix)

Although D.A. Waite has often protested dynamic equivalency in the translation of God’s Word, he generously allows for dynamic equivalence in the King James Version:

“When someone accuses the King James Bible translators of making a translation mistake, I look up the word in the Oxford English Dictionary to see **what the word meant in 1611** and I find the translation to be accurate.” (*Foes of the King James Bible Refuted*, p. 60)

Ditto for Gail Riplinger, who decries dynamic equivalency in the NKJV, but ignores its many occurrences in the KJV. Instead of recommending an updated English Bible based on the *Textus Receptus*, such as the



NKJV, Gail recommends a secular database to understand how the English words in the KJV were defined in 1611.

“The best dictionary for studying words used in the King James Bible is the online Early Modern English Dictionary Database (EMEDD), compiled by linguists from the **University of Toronto** to ‘correct the OED’ and more accurately define words as they were used between 1530 and 1657. Definitions from 16 dictionaries, many available to the KJV translators, appear instantly online when a KJV word is searched.” (*In Awe of Thy Word*, p. 64)

Dr. Waite also finds fault with the NKJV translators for using the Latin Vulgate, the Septuagint, and other ancient versions, as stated in their Preface, while he blithely ignores the KJV Translators’ use of the Vulgate and Septuagint and never mentions the Translators’ Preface:

“Dr. Farstad implied that the Masoretic Old Testament Traditional Hebrew text of the NKJV is the identical text to that used in the King James Bible. If you read the preface of the New King James you will find that they do not use **ONLY** the Masoretic Traditional Hebrew. They compare and use upon occasion the readings of the following: (1) the Latin Vulgate, (2) the Septuagint, (3) ancient versions, and (4) the Dead Sea Scrolls.” (*Foes of the King James Bible Refuted*, p. 17)

Dr. Waite holds the New King James Version to a strictly literal standard of translation...but not of the Greek Textus Receptus. Notwithstanding his strong objections to Ruckmanite false teachings, Dr. Waite’s standard of comparison is also the King James Version. In his book, *Foes of the King James Bible Refuted*, Dr. Waite stated that he compared the New King James Version to the “Hebrew and Greek that underlies our King James Bible.”

“The New King James is not a word-for-word literal type translation as much as the King James itself is... I made a verse by verse analysis of the New King James compared to **the Hebrew and Greek that underlies our King James Bible**. I found over 2,000 examples of how the New King James added to God’s Words, subtracted from God’s Words, and changed God’s Words... The King James Bible is the only English Bible that is truly ‘literal’ or ‘word-for-word’ wherever possible.” (*Foes*, p. 16)

On the same page, Dr. Waite plainly shows that he did *not* compare the NKJV with the Greek Textus Receptus:

“John Ankerberg said the New King James was based on ‘the same Greek text as the 1611.’ ... This is not completely true. I have found at least three examples of the New King James Version’s use of the Westcott and Hort type of text being used in the text itself. How many other examples of non-Textus Receptus Greek text used in the top of the pages, I cannot say. It is presumed if I found three, there might be many other examples.” (*Foes*, p. 16)

On page 45 of *Foes of the King James Bible Refuted*, which was published in 1997, D.A. Waite again admitted,

“The New King James Version claims to use the Textus Receptus, but I stumbled across at least 2 or 3 places where they used the Westcott and Hort critical text. I have not made a thorough check. There may be hundreds of other places involved!”

In 1990 Dr. Waite published a revised edition of his book, *The New King James Version Compared to the King James Version and Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts*. Note that the title is not *The New King James Version Compared to the King James Version and the Hebrew Masoretic Text & Greek Textus Receptus*. The reason for this is that Dr. Waite did not compare the NKJV to the Masoretic Text or the Textus Receptus, but



to only to the King James Version. “*Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts*” seems to mean whatever Hebrew and Greek words underlie the KJV words.

Although Dr. Waite claimed that “changes from the KJV...were compared with the MASORETIC HEBREW TEXT in the Old Testament and with the TEXTUS RECEPTUS GREEK TEXT in the New Testament” (p. v), close examination of his charts demonstrates that this was not the case. In these charts, “KJV/MT/TR READING” really means “KJV READING” only.

The deceptive way in which Dr. Waite categorized and structured the tables in this book creates the overall impression that the text of the NKJV departs from the Masoretic Text and Textus Receptus in thousands of verses. The book consists of 79 pages of verses categorized according to parts of speech which the NKJV either added to, changed or omitted from the “KJV/MT/TR READING” which, upon inspection, turns out to be the KJV reading only.

Dr. Waite has misrepresented the NKJV as having added or changed or omitted from the Masoretic Text or Textus Receptus either a noun or verb or a pronoun, or having changed a noun to a pronoun or a verb or an adjective, or vice versa, or having changed the number or person of a pronoun, or changed a prepositional phrase to a noun, or changed singular to plural, or having split an infinitive, etc. etc. For example, “to utterly slay” in the KJV was changed to “to slay utterly” in the NKJV in 2 Chronicles 20:23.

The following examples from Dr. Waite’s book are representative of about 2,000 verse comparisons which show that the KJV was the standard of comparison rather than the Hebrew Masoretic Text or the Greek Textus Receptus. Close examination of the Masoretic Text and the Textus Receptus reveals that the “NEW KJV READING” is frequently an acceptable translation option, or a more accurate translation, of the Hebrew or the Greek. The first four columns are randomly selected verses from among the 2,000+ verses analyzed in the book. The last 2 columns present the facts regarding the texts in question, facts which have been omitted or falsified by Dr. Waite.

THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION COMPARED TO THE KING JAMES VERSION & UNDERLYING HEBREW & GREEK TEXTS By Rev. D.A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D...							EVIDENCE THAT D.A. WAITE DID NOT COMPARE THE NKJV WITH THE MASORETIC TEXT OR THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS BUT ONLY WITH THE KJV	
PG. NO.	COMMENT NO. / NKJV NOTE	OT	BT	BIBLE REFERENCE	KJB/MT/TR READING NEW KJV READING	CATEGORY	READING OF THE MASORETIC TEXT OR TEXTUS RECEPTUS	TEXTUAL DATA
1	2031	NT	46	I COR. 3:3	WALK AS MEN BEHAVING AS MERE MEN	ADDS ADJECTIVE	<a href="#">Greek Textus Receptus</a> : “For yet fleshly ye are. for where among you emulation and strife and divisions [there are], not fleshly are ye, and walk according to <b>man</b> ?”	Strong’s # <a href="#">444</a> - anthropos Perschbacher #444 - anqrwpon - genitive, singular, masculine noun. <i>The NKJV put the adjective “mere” in italics to indicate it is not in the Greek text.</i>
3	2018	NT	42	LK. 6:40b	PERFECT PERFECTLY TRAINED	ADDS VERB	<a href="#">Greek Textus Receptus</a> : “...not is a disciple above the teacher of him; but <b>perfected</b> every one shall be as his teacher.”	Strong’s # <a href="#">2675</a> - katartizo - verb - perfect, passive, participle - to render, i.e. to fit, sound, complete ..to strengthen, perfect, complete, make one what he ought to be <i>The Greek word “katartizo” is a verb.</i>
3	1282	OT	25	LAM. 5:10	BLACK HOT	CHANGES ADJECTIVE	<a href="#">Hebrew Masoretic Text</a> : “Our skin is <b>hot</b> like an oven because of the burning heat of famine.”	Strong’s # <a href="#">3648</a> - kamar <i>The adjectives “hot” and “black” are both translation options of the Hebrew word.</i>
7	0937	OT	19	PSALM 49:9	CORRUPTION THE PIT	CHANGES NOUN	<a href="#">Hebrew Masoretic Text</a> : “For too costly is the redemption of their soul, and must be let alone for ever. That he should still live always, that he should not see <b>the pit</b> .”	Strong’s # <a href="#">7845</a> - shachath - 1) pit, destruction, grave 1a) pit (for catching lions) 1b) pit (of Hell) <i>The NKJV correctly translated the Hebrew word as “the pit.”</i>
16	2468	NT	52	I THESS. 2:8	OUR OWN SOULS OUR OWN	CHANGES NOUN	<a href="#">Greek Textus Receptus</a> : “Thus yearning over you, we were pleased to have	Strong’s # <a href="#">5590</a> - psuche - 1) breath 1a) the breath of life 1b) life 1c) that in

					LIVES		imparted to you not only the glad tidings of God, but also our own <b>lives</b> , because beloved to us ye have become."	which there is life 2) the soul "Souls" and "lives" are both translation options of the Hebrew word <i>psuche</i> .
31	2036	N T	47	2 COR. 7:10b	NOT TO BE REPENTED OF NOT TO BE REGRETTED	CHAN GES THEO LOGI CAL TERM	<a href="#">Greek Textus Receptus</a> : "...for the grief according to God works out repentance to salvation not to be <b>regretted</b> ; but the grief of the world works out death."	Strong's #278 - ametameletos - 1) not repentant of, unregretted The NKJV translated the verb as it is in the Greek Textus Receptus
57	2514 NU- TEXT-- PURGED SINS	N T	58	HEB. 1:3b	PURGED OUR SINS PURGED OUR SINS	NON- TEXT US RECE PTUS	<a href="#">Greek Textus Receptus</a> "...by Himself [the] <b>purification having made of our sins</b> sat down on [the] right hand of the greatness on high,"	The "Non-Textus Receptus" reading is not in the text of the NKJV, but a footnote.

In the chart above, Dr. Waite claimed the NKJV added a verb to Luke 6:40, however, the original Greek word "katartizo" *is a verb* which the KJV Translators mistranslated as an adjective! In 1 Cor. 3:3, he claimed that the NKJV added the adjective "mere" to 1 Cor. 3:3, but this is not true, for the translators of the NKJV italicized the word *mere* to indicate that it is not in the Greek Textus Receptus, just like the KJV Translators italicized words which they added to the text. (Note: The 1982 NKJV, which Dr. Waite used for his book, did italicize words supplied by the translators.) The last four verses demonstrate that the NKJV readings alleged to be mistranslations are, in fact, accurate translations of the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Greek Textus Receptus.

It is important to reiterate that the *italicized* words in the KJV were words which the 1611 Translators "added" to the Greek Textus Receptus and the Hebrew Masoretic Text. F.H.A. Scrivener criticized this unwarranted and inconsistent addition of words, not only in the 1611 KJV but also in the Bishops' and other English Bibles which preceded it. (See: Chapter 7) A brief history of this practice is presented by Scrivener who observed that the Great Bible derived these "added words" directly from the Latin Vulgate and the Old Latin versions!

"The practice of indicating by a variation of type such words in a translation of the Bible as have no exact representatives in the original is believed to have been first employed by Samuel Munster in his Latin version of the Old Testament published in 1534. Five years later this diversity of character ('a small letter in the text' as the editors describe it) was resorted to in the Great Bible, in order to direct attention to clauses rendered from the Latin Vulgate which are not extant in the Hebrew or Greek originals. A good example of its use occurs in Matt. xxv.1 where '(and the bride)' is added to the end of the verse from the Old Latin, not from any Greek copy known in that age. As the readings of the Vulgate came to be less regarded or less familiar in England, subsequent translators applied the smaller type to the purpose for which Muster had first designed it, the rather as Theodore Beza had so used it in his Latin New Testament of 1556. Thus the English New Testament published in Geneva at 1557, and the Genevan Bible of 1560, 'put to that word, which lacking made the sentence obscure, but set it in such letters, as may easily be discerned from the common text.' The same expedient was adopted by the translators of the Bishops' Bible (1568, 1572), somewhat too freely indeed in parts. It is one of the most considerable faults of this not very successful version, that its authors assumed a liberty of running into paraphrase, the ill effects of which this very difference in type tended to conceal from themselves. From these two preceding versions, then held in the best repute, the Geneva and the Bishops' Bibles, the small Roman as distinguished from the black letter (now and as early as the Bible of 1612 respectively represented by the Italic and Roman type) was brought naturally enough into the Bible of 1611, and forms a prominent feature of it, whether for good or ill...

"...Taking for granted...the right of the Translators...to resort to the italic type, and the general propriety of their mode of exercising it, the only enquiry now open to us is whether they were uniform, or reasonably consistent, in their use of it.

“And in the face of patent and well ascertained facts it is impossible to answer such a question in the affirmative. Undue haste and scarcely venial carelessness on the part of the persons engaged in carrying through the press the issues of 1611, which are only too visible in other matters..., are nowhere more conspicuous than with regard to this difference in the type. If it be once conceded that the Translators must have intended to use or refrain from using italics in the selfsame manner in all cases that are absolutely identical (and the contrary supposition would be strange and unreasonable indeed), their whole case in this matter must be given up as indefensible. There is really no serious attempt to avoid palpable inconsistencies on the same page, in the same verse : and those who have gone over this branch of their work will be aware that even comparative uniformity can be secured only in one way, by the repeated comparison of the version with the sacred originals, by unflinching attention so that nothing however minute may pass unexamined. This close and critical examination was evidently entered upon, with more or less good results, by those who prepared the Cambridge Bibles of 1629 and more especially of 1638 (for before these appeared the italics of 1611, with all their glaring faults, were reprinted without charge), and in the next century by Dr Paris in 1762, by Dr Blayney and his friends in 1769...” (Scrivener, pp. 61-63)

Regarding Matthew 25:1, we would add that the Wycliffe Bible is based on the Latin Vulgate which adds “and the bride” to the end of the verse.

Returning to Dr. Waite’s charts, inspection of many other verses reveals that the standard of comparison is NOT the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Greek Textus Receptus as stated, but the King James Version. “KJV/MT/TR READING” is a devious way to camouflage D.A. Waite’s highly distorted analysis of the NKJV and is akin to Gail Riplinger’s misleading term “KJV Greek *Textus Receptus*” of which more will be said in the next chapter. The tricky phraseology in both expressions works because the KJV-Only reader has already been indoctrinated that the KJV is a word-for-word translation of the Masoretic Text and the Textus Receptus. KJV-Only advocates state this claim in such a way as to deceive laymen, but are careful to leave a loophole in the event that scholars, who know better, decide to call their bluff:

“The King James Bible is the only English Bible that is truly ‘literal’ or ‘word-for-word’ wherever possible.” (D.A. Waite, *Foes of the King James Bible Refuted*, p. 16)

Several pages of Dr. Waite’s booklet are devoted to NKJV verses which use the word “regret” or “relent” instead of “repent.” These verses fall under the category of “CHANGES VERB” or “CHANGES THEOLOGICAL TERM” which means the NKJV did not use the “theological term” *repent* in every place it is used in the KJV. The reader is never told that *regret* and *relent* are translations of different Hebrew and Greek words, such as *nacham*, *metanoeo*, *ametameletos*, *metamellomai*. These words in the original texts have varying meanings and are not always best translated as *repent*. In most of the verses listed, the NKJV translators seem to have simply chosen another legitimate translation option in order to convey the meaning of the Hebrew or Greek word in the context of the verse. Several of the verses listed in the booklet apply to God and, according to Numbers 23:19, “God is not a man, that He should lie, Nor a son of man, that He should repent.” Therefore, a different translation option is appropriate in verses referring to God, e.g., the NKJV’s translation of the Hebrew word *nacham* in Judges 2:18 and Jeremiah 26:3, 13:

“And when the LORD raised up judges for them, the LORD was with the judge and delivered them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge; for the LORD was **moved to pity** by their groaning because of those who oppressed them and harassed them.” (Judges 2:18 NKJV)

“Perhaps everyone will listen and turn from his evil way, that I may **relent** concerning the calamity which I purpose to bring on them because of the evil of their doings...”

“Now therefore, amend your ways and your doings, and obey the voice of the LORD your God; then the LORD will **relent** concerning the doom that He has pronounced against you.”  
(Jer. 26:3, 13 NKJV)

Strong’s #5162 - nacham - to be sorry, console oneself, repent, regret, comfort, be comforted

In the New Testament, the NKJV translation of the Greek words *metanoeo*, *ametameletos*, *metamellomai* agrees with the Textus Receptus. Even so, D.A. Waite protests the NKJV’s use of any and all words other than the KJV’s *theological term* “repent”:

2 CORINTHIANS 7:8-10

King James Version (KJV)

8 For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did **repent** for I perceive that the same epistle hath made you sorry, though it were but for a season.

9 Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing.

10 For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation **not to be repented of**: but the sorrow of the world worketh death.

New King James Version (NKJV)

8 For even if I made you sorry with my letter, **I do not regret** it; though I did **regret** it. For I perceive that the same epistle made you sorry, though only for a while.

9 Now I rejoice, not that you were made sorry, but that your sorrow led to repentance. For you were made sorry in a godly manner, that you might suffer loss from us in nothing.

10 For godly sorrow produces repentance leading to salvation, **not to be regretted**; but the sorrow of the world produces death.

Greek Textus Receptus

8 οτι <3754> FOR ει <1487> IF και <2532> ALSO ελυπησα <3076> (5656) I GRIEVED υμας <5209> YOU εν <1722> IN τη <3588> THE επιστολη <1992> EPISTLE, ου <3756> μεταμελομαι <3338> (5736) **I DO NOT REGRET [IT]**, ει <1487> IF και <2532> EVEN μετεμελομην <3338> (5711) **I DID REGRET**; βλεπω <991> (5719) γαρ <1063> FOR I SEE οτι <3754> THAT η <3588> επιστολη <1992> εκεινη <1565> THAT EPISTLE, ει <1487> IF και <2532> EVEN προς <4314> FOR ωραν <5610> AN HOUR, ελυπησεν <3076> (5656) GRIEVED υμας <5209> YOU.

9 νυν <3568> NOW χαιρω <5463> (5719) I REJOICE, ουχ <3756> NOT οτι <3754> THAT ελυπηθητε <3076> (5681) YE WERE GRIEVED, αλλ <235> BUT οτι <3754> THAT ελυπηθητε <3076> (5681) YE WERE GRIEVED εις <1519> TO μετανοιαν <3341> REPENTANCE; ελυπηθητε <3076> (5681) γαρ <1063> FOR YE WERE GRIEVED κατα <2596> ACCORDING TO θεον <2316> GOD, ινα <2443> THAT εν <1722> IN μηδενι <3367> NOTHING ζημιωθητε <2210> (5686) YE MIGHT SUFFER LOSS εξ <1537> BY ημων <2257> US.

10 η <3588> γαρ <1063> FOR THE κατα <2596> ACCORDING TO θεον <2316> GOD λυπη <3077> GRIEF μετανοιαν <3341> REPENTANCE εις <1519> TO σωτηριαν <4991> SALVATION αμεταμελητον <278> **NOT TO BE REGRETTED** κατεργαζεται <2716> (5736) WORKS OUT; η <3588> δε <1161> BUT THE

του <3588> OF THE κοσμου <2889> WORLD λυπη <3077> GRIEF  
θανατον <2288> DEATH κατεργαζεται <2716> (5736) WORKS OUT.

There is also a category in Dr. Waite's booklet for "Non-Masoretic Text" readings in the NKJV. These NKJV readings usually agree with the KJV reading, however, a *footnote* in the NKJV presents the reading of the Septuagint, Vulgate, Targums, Samaritan Pentateuch, Josephus, etc. Thirty pages of Dr. Waite's booklet are devoted to "Non-Textus Receptus" readings in the NKJV which *actually agree with the KJV and the Textus Receptus*, but the NKJV *footnote* documents the NU-Text reading.

There are 9 pages of verses in which the NKJV "OMITS SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD," however, the reason for this is that the subjunctive mood is less commonly used in the English language than it was in 1611. Today, English-speaking people do not say "if he repent, forgive him" as the KJV translated Luke 17:3 but "if he repents, forgive him," as the NKJV translated the verse. Many such verses in the NKJV are more accurate translations of the Textus Receptus because the Greek verb is not in the subjunctive mood. For example, in the NKJV, 1 Corinthians 15:13 begins "if there is no resurrection of the dead" instead of "if there be no resurrection of the dead" (KJV). The KJV reading is misrepresented by Dr. Waite as the "KJV/MT/TR READING," however, in the Textus Receptus the Greek verb *estin* is the third person singular present **indicative** mood rather than the subjunctive mood.

1 Cor 15:13 - {BUT **IF**} αναστασις <386> {A RESURRECTION} νεκρων <3498>  
{OF [THE] DEAD} ουκ <3756> εστιν <2076> (5748) {**THERE IS NOT,**}  
ουδε <3761> {NEITHER} χριστος <5547> {CHRIST} εγηγεραται <1453> (5769)  
{HAS BEEN RAISED:}

Strong's #2076 - third person singular present **indicative** of 1510; v

In his introduction, Dr. Waite asserted that, in the multitude of verses listed in his study, the NKJV "chose to disregard utterly" the subjunctive mood used in "the original language":

"In the New Testament Greek, the subjunctive mood is used in these New Testament instances which are given in this study, yet the NKJV has chosen to DISREGARD UTTERLY the original language at this point. This is NOT FAITHFULNESS IN TRANSLATION. It is NOT ACCURACY IN TRANSLATION. It is NOT RELIABILITY IN TRANSLATION. It is DIABOLICAL DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCY!!" (*NKJV Compared to KJV and the Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts*, p. xv)

The same spurious allegation is made with respect to many other verses where the NKJV, in fact, accurately translated the indicative mood of the Greek Textus Receptus. For example, in Acts 25:11b the KJV reading is "if there be none" but the NKJV reading is "if there is nothing," which agrees with the Textus Receptus, again proving that D.A. Waite's misleading "KJV/MT/TR READING" is really only the "KJV READING":

Acts 25:11b - {BUT} δε <1161> {**IF**} ουδεν <3762> {**NOTHING**} εστιν <2076>  
(5748) {**THERE IS**} ων <3739> {OF WHICH} ουτοι <3778> {THEY}  
κατηγορουσιν <2723> (5719) {ACCUSE} μου <3450> {ME,} ουδεις <3762> {NO  
ONE} με <3165> {ME} δυναται <1410> (5736) {CAN} αυτοις <846> {TO THEM}  
χαρισασθαι <5483> (5664) {GIVE UP.} καισαρα <2541> {TO CAESAR}  
επικαλουμαι <1941> (5731) {I APPEAL.}

Strong's #2076 - third person singular present **indicative** of 1510; v

D.A. Waite's 1990 book, *The NKJV Compared to the KJV and Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts*, established early on in the minds of many Christians the misconception that the New King James Version is a thoroughly corrupt translation no better than modern versions based on the corrupt Westcott-Hort/NU-Text. The book is organized to confuse the reader, according to parts of speech. Moreover, the average reader could never afford the time it would take to check all of the additions, changes or omissions of verbs, noun,

pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, prepositional phrases, etc., etc. against the Masoretic Text and the Greek Textus Receptus to see if the NKJV text actually deviates from these texts in said verses. Thankfully, even a partial comparison of KJV and NKJV verses against the Textus Receptus quickly proves that Dr. Waite has done a superb job of cooking the data to make it *appear* that the NKJV is corrupt and the KJV is perfect.

We do not take the position that the NKJV is a perfect translation of the original texts. There are translation errors in the NKJV which are of concern, but there appear to be more textual and translation errors of importance in the King James Version, at least in the area of end-time Bible prophecy. For our analysis of these, please see Appendix III: “Translation Errors in the KJV Which Affect the Interpretation of Bible Prophecy”

D.A. Waite stated that the NKJV “is just another NEW TRANSLATION that came out in 1982, with more similarity to the ENGLISH REVISED VERSION (ERV) of 1881, the AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (ASV) of 1901, the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (NASV) OF 1968, or the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION (NIV) of 1978, than to the KJV of 1611!!” Dr. Waite’s books certainly do not prove his assertion, but just the opposite. Let’s see if Gail Riplinger has been able to prove that the NKJV is closer to modern versions than it is to the 1611 KJV or the Textus Receptus.

**WATCH UNTO PRAYER**

<http://watch-unto-prayer.org>