

Examining KJV-only argumentation

Introduction

The KJV-only debate is riddled with false accusations, hyperbole, scandalous statements, errors, exaggerations, poor scholarship, partisanship and a general lack of love between people who should know better. In the light of this unnecessary mess, the only way forward is to be strictly truthful and academic about the issues involved. This means being critical (in the literal sense of the word)¹ regarding statements made.

Therefore, it is necessary to make a defence of the NKJV to help confused but sincere believers in the face of plain lies by certain parties. A number of pamphlets have been issued by well-known preachers castigating the NKJV. However, when the spotlight is turned on these papers they are shown to be full of errors. To make this point I will examine one attack on the NKJV, by a KJV-only apologist, and show how poor the argumentation is. The serif font [Georgia] is the original pamphlet; the sans-serif face in square brackets [Arial] is used for my comments. This may not appear on downloaded documents, hence the added brackets.

The NKJV is not perfect translation, just like every other Bible version; but it is a good one, based upon the best manuscript evidence, and it is by far preferable to every other version available today. It has far fewer errors than the KJV for instance. Bible students can rest assured that the claims of its attackers are mostly false and read a NKJV Bible with confidence.

¹ Expressing or involving an analysis of the merits and faults of a work of literature.

The New King James Bible Examined

By M. H. Reynolds
 Fundamental Evangelistic Association
 Box 6278, Los Osos, CA, 93412, USA

http://cnview.com/on_line_resources/new_king_james_version.htm

With added comments exposing problems in this paper by Paul Fahy

Understanding Ministries

WHAT ABOUT THE NEW KING JAMES BIBLE? In this article, we want to share with God's people some of the important facts which led us to reject the NKJV and warn others about it. We do not believe that the "NKJV makes the KJV even better" as its publishers claim. To the contrary, our study leads us to conclude that the NKJV vitiates the original, reliable, accurate KJV in a most deceptive manner. While claiming to have "preserved the authority and accuracy" of the original KJV, the actual result is a hybrid text which incorporates many changes identical with or similar to the corruptions found in other modern Bible versions.

Why the New King James Bible? Its publisher, Thomas Nelson Company, says its purpose is "To Preserve the Integrity of the Original in the Language of Today"- "To preserve the authority and accuracy . . . of the original King James while making it understandable to 20th Century readers"- "To update with regard to punctuation and grammar; archaic verbs and pronouns"; and "Up-to-date accuracy with regard to words whose English meaning has changed over a period of 3 1/2 centuries." The completed NKJV text is said to be "Beautifully Clear" and "Highly Readable." Thomas Nelson Publishers has spent millions to convince Christians that the NKJV is "the" Bible of the present and the future.

Why do we recommend rejection of the NKJV? Space limitations preclude a full discussion of every reason, but we do urge a careful consideration of the following facts. It is essential to know that many of the word changes between the original KJV and the NKJV are not changes which result from removing archaisms, etc. Instead, many are changes which clearly reveal that, contrary to their agreed basis, the NKJV translators departed from the original KJV and its underlying Greek text, the Textus Receptus, in favor of the very same wording found in versions translated from corrupted Greek texts.

[Fahy - Just because the translators use words that may be similar to some used in modern versions, it does not mean they are using the underlying texts used by these versions. Even the Trinitarian Bible Society applauds the NKJV for using the same manuscript family as the KJV. This is a false statement.]

The instances in which the NKJV breaks with the original KJV by substituting wording identical to that of corrupted modern Bible versions are too numerous to be considered coincidence. And, since Nelson tells us that the NKJV scholars spent "months of prayer, research, and discussion over the handling of a single word," we must conclude that these changes were neither coincidental nor accidental.

The following references are listed as examples of the way the translators inserted erroneous words and meanings from corrupted modern Bible versions into the NKJV text:

Titus 3:10-KJV reads, "A man that is an *heretick*...reject." NKJV and NIV change "*heretick*" to "*divisive man*"; RSV and NASV to "*factious*" man. (The one who holds to heresy is to be rejected, not the one who exposes false doctrine. The new versions confuse who is in mind here).

[Fahy - Many Hebrew and Greek words have a wide variety of meanings. It is perfectly acceptable to translate a word with the meaning that makes the most sense in the context. Here the word *ai`retiko.n*, *hairetikon*, which appears in the GNS² and the GNT,³ means 'divisive'.]

Acts 4:27-KJV reads, "Thy holy child, Jesus." NKJV, NASV and RSV change "holy child" to "holy servant."

[Fahy - *e;crisaj* in GNS but *pai/da*, in GNT, however both are from the same root word *pai/j pais* which means both child and servant.]

Acts 8:9-KJV reads, "bewitched the people." NKJV and NASV change "bewitched" to "astonished." NIV and RSV change "bewitched" to "amazed."

[Fahy - again both texts use slightly different forms of the same root word *evxi,sthmi existemi*; this means 'to astonish, be amazed, confused' literally meaning to remove something from a place - hence to lose one's composure, to be astonished. The NKJV is a better translation.]

Romans 1:25-KJV reads, "changed the truth of God into a lie." NKJV, NASV and NIV read "exchanged the truth of God for the lie" or "a lie."

[Fahy - both texts have *tw/*], which means 'the'. The NKJV is a better translation. This is actually an important doctrinal matter and refers to the original and continued satanic lie that man can be as God. Something completely missed by the KJV.]

Romans 4:25-KJV reads, "Who was delivered *for* our offenses and was raised again for our justification." NKJV and NASV change "for" to "because of." (Even the NIV and RSV use the correct word, "*for*").

² The Scrivener 1881 - Beza 1589 text, i.e. essentially the *Textus Receptus*; based upon the Byzantine family of manuscripts. This is the basis of the KJV and the NKJV. The formal TR was originally a text printed some years after the publication of the KJV (1611) in Holland in 1633. Stephen's text ('Estienne' or 'Stephanus') was substantially the same as Erasmus' later text (1527). Beza used Stephen's text of 1550-51 as the basis for his own editions and it generally came to be regarded as a standard text. Beza's text of 1598 is reprinted with a few alterations in Scrivener's reconstruction (1881) of the text underlying that version, in which all departures from Beza are marked. This is the text most commonly used by scholars following the Byzantine text today. So, the basic text underlying the KJV is that of Erasmus. The basic text underlying the NKJV is Scrivener, containing a number of corrections (over 100).

³ *The Greek New Testament*, i.e. the Nestle-Aland / United Bible Societies modern (UBS4-NA27); based upon the Alexandrian family of manuscripts. This underlies almost all modern versions excepting the KJV, the NKJV and the World English Bible.

[Fahy - Both texts have the preposition *dia.*, which has a variety of meanings: 'through, by means of, with; during, throughout, among, because of, on account of, for the sake of; therefore, for this reason, because'. The context shows clearly that 'because of' is the best translation. Interestingly, Reynolds' point in these examples is to show that the NKJV follows modern versions. In fact most modern versions have 'for' here e.g. ASV, RSV, NIV, Darby, BBE. This example is thus disingenuous. Young's Literal has 'because of'.]

2 Corinthians 10:5-KJV reads, "Casting down imaginations." NKJV, NIV and RSV change "imaginations" to "arguments."

[Fahy - both texts have *gnw,sewj*; this word means: 'reasoning, judgment' hence a hostile argument. The NKJV is a better translation.]

Colossians 3:2-KJV reads, "Set your affection on things above." NKJV, NASV, NIV and RSV change "affection" to "mind."

[Fahy - both texts have the verb *fronei/te* which means: 'to think, have in mind, to direct one's mind'. Thus again the NKJV is a better translation. It is not the affections (emotions) but the mind that is in view here.]

1 Thessalonians 5:22-KJV reads, "Abstain from all appearance of evil." NKJV, NASV and RSV change "appearance" to "form."

[Fahy - Both texts have *ei;douj*; which means 'visible appearance, outward form'. In context 'form' is a better translation; every version of evil is what is in mind here.]

2 Timothy 2:15-KJV reads, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God." NKJV and NASV change "study" to "be diligent." NIV and RSV change "study" to "do your best."

[Fahy - both texts have *spou,dason*; which means, 'to work hard, do one's best, be diligent'. The NKJV is a better translation.]

Old Testament examples include:

Psalm 79:1-the word "heathen" in the KJV is changed to "nations" in the NKJV, NASV and NIV.

[Fahy - 'heathen' is *yAG* meaning: 'nation, people'; even the KJV translates the word as 'nations' 374 times, while it translates it as 'heathen' 143 times. The NKJV is a better translation.]

Isaiah 11:3-the entire phrase, "And shall make Him of quick understanding" in the KJV is eliminated in the NKJV, NASV, NIV and RSV.

[Fahy - the reason why this clause is omitted is that it is not in the Hebrew manuscript (WTT-BHS 4th Edition).]

Isaiah 66:5-the wonderful phrase, "But He shall appear to your joy" in the KJV disappears without explanation from NKJV, NASV, NIV and RSV.

[Fahy - again it is omitted as the Hebrew does not phrase it like that. Young's Literal has: 'Hear a word of Jehovah, Ye who are trembling unto His word, Said have your brethren who are hating you, Who are driving you out, for My name's sake: "Honoured is Jehovah, and we look on your joy," But they are ashamed.']

Daniel 3:25-the fourth person who was in the fiery furnace with Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, was identified as "the Son of God." The same identification is given in the text of the NKJV but a footnote reads "or, a son of the gods," and both NIV and NASV actually have the latter reading in their texts.

[Fahy - this is ludicrous, Reynolds complains despite the NKJV agreeing with the KJV. Actually, Young's Literal has 'a son of the gods'. Remember this is a pagan Chaldean (Nebuchadnezzar) speaking, and the word he uses is Aramaic (Chaldean), i.e. Hl'a/ 'el^{ahh}, which was used of God and of heathen gods, even in the KJV 16 times. The NKJV is better and more accurate as it gives a marginal note which shows that the word is not the normal Hebrew word for God.]

[Fahy - the consistent problem of Reynold's argument is that he is really complaining that sometimes different words are used from the KJV, but says that *wrong* words are used. The above demonstrates that not only is this entirely reasonable since the original words have various meanings, in very many cases the NKJV word is more accurate and more literal than the KJV.]

In other Old Testament portions, the word "evil" in the KJV is replaced by several different words-doom, disaster, calamity, catastrophe, trouble, adversity, terrible, harm, wild. In four different places in 1 and 2 Kings, "sodomites" is changed to "perverted persons."

[Fahy - The Hebrew word for evil ([r' ra') means many things. For instance: 'bad, evil, disagreeable, malignant, unpleasant, displeasing, worse than, worst, sad, wicked, distress, misery, injury, calamity, adversity, injury, or wrong'. The KJV itself translates it as: 'evil' 442, 'wickedness' 59, 'wicked' 25, 'mischief' 21, 'hurt' 20, 'bad' 13, 'trouble' 10, 'sore' 9, 'affliction' 6, 'ill' 5, 'adversity' 4, 'favoured' 3, 'harm' 3, 'naught' 3, 'noisome' 2, 'grievous' 2, 'sad' 2, misc 34. To complain that the NKJV uses different words is a nonsense; so does the KJV.

In these verses (1 Kg 14:24, 15:12, 22:46; 2Kg 23:7) vdeq' *qadesh* means a male temple prostitute, just as *qadeshah* hv'deq. means a female temple

prostitute or harlot. To use 'sodomite' would imply merely 'homosexual', but that is not what the Hebrew is referring to. Some translations use 'cult prostitute' or 'temple prostitute', which is preferable. The NKJV is not afraid to use the term 'sodomite' (despite the implication) as seen in 1 Cor 6:9 and 1 Tim 1:10.]

The NKJV does not deserve its respected name. It is a perverted version.

[Fahy - This is sheer exaggeration, scare-mongering and very unscholarly. His whole case rests on the simple matter that the NKJV uses different (almost always better) word translations than the KJV. This is fleshly, preferring a work of men than the truth. To then call the NKJV 'perverted' is unjustifiable slander.]

Additional examples of significant changes would include the following: Matthew 4:24; 6:13; 7:14; 20:20; Mark 4:19; John 14:2; Acts 17:29; Romans 1:18; Philippians 2:6; 1 Thessalonians 5:23; 1 Timothy 6:5, 10, 20; Hebrews 2:16; 10:14; James 1:15; 1 Peter 1:7.

A striking word change involves changing "corrupt" to "peddling" in 2 Corinthians 2:17. The KJV correctly says, "For we are not as many, which corrupt the Word of God...." But the NKJV, NASV, NIV and RSV, change "corrupt" to "peddling." Is there any great difference between peddling (selling, or making a gain of) the Word of God and corrupting (adulterating) it? Of course there is, and one does not have to be a Greek scholar to decide which word is correct. When this warning was given in the 1st Century, was there any way for people to peddle (make a gain of) God's Word? Of course not-they were suffering for it. The warning clearly refers to corrupting God's Word, something that was common then as it is now. Only in our day has it ever been possible to peddle (make a gain of) the Bible. With its huge profits from the sale of many different Bible versions, the Thomas Nelson Publishers is both corrupting and peddling God's Word.

[Fahy - Yes it does take a Greek scholar to decide which is correct, and it is not Reynolds. The text uses the word kaphleu,ontej *kapeleuo*; this means: 'to be a retailer, to peddle, to make money by selling anything, to get sordid gain by dealing in anything'. The NKJV is the correct translation, the KJV is plain wrong. Paul's meaning is not just to make financial gain, but to treat the Gospel as something to be hawked, made into an offer, peddled like some common thing. Churches do this all the time and it happened then.]

Dr. Jerry Falwell, a member of the NKJV overview committee, gives this new Bible his unqualified endorsement, stating that "It protects every thought, every idea, every word, just as it was intended to be understood by the original scholars." This simply is not true! As already pointed out, words have been changed and with those changed words have come changed thoughts and ideas.

Some will argue that the changes noted do not affect any fundamental Bible doctrine. We strongly disagree. Is not the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures a fundamental doctrine? Is not every word of the Bible important? Jesus Christ said, "*Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God*" (Matt.4:4). He also said, "*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away*" (Matt. 24:35). Since Christ is concerned about every word, we should also be concerned about

every word and raise a voice of protest whenever scholarly sleight of hand is discovered in any modern version, including the NKJV.

[Why are there no complaints about the very many cases where the KJV uses the wrong word?⁴ No translation is perfect and the KJV has many instances (some are noted above) where the translation is plain wrong in whole clauses and verses.⁵ It also uses wrong texts in Revelation and wrongly addresses God.⁶]

In raising strenuous objections to the changed words of the NKJV text, we are not referring to those changes which update old English verb forms without changing the meaning, i.e., removing "est" or "eth" from verb endings. Neither do we refer to updating the old English pronouns "thee," "thou" and "thine" where they refer to individuals. We do consider it a tragic mistake to eliminate the use of "Thee," "Thou" and "Thine" where these refer to Deity. There is a disturbing trend toward stripping God of His Majesty both in word and deed. The substitution of the common pronouns 'You' and 'Yours' for "Thee," "Thou" and "Thine" which have historically been used to refer to Deity both in the Scriptures and the Hymns of the Church, only helps pave the way for further attempts of sinful men to bring God down to their level rather than exalting Him in every way possible.

[Fahy - this is just ludicrous. It is not irreverent to use normal English language to refer to deity. It may be actually more irreverent to impose a false form of language and thus make it harder for modern people to understand God. How can using the proper syntax 'strip God of his deity'? This is sacerdotalism;⁷ it is also arguing that old English words (e.g. 'thee') are inspired. How can using the word 'You' respectfully be less holy than using 'Thou'?)

The NKJV translators claimed it was one of their purposes to update words where the meaning of a particular word had changed over the last 375 years. In 2 Thessalonians 2:7, they updated "letteth" to "restraineth"; in Psalm 4:2, "leaseth" is updated to "lying"; In 1 Thessalonians 4:15, "prevent" is updated to "precede"; in Matthew 19:14, "suffer" is updated to "let" (meaning *allow* or *permit*).

⁴ For example: Jdg 5:2 - 'avenging' really means 'leaders'. Gen 12:6 - 'the plain' means 'terebinth tree'. Ex 34:13 etc - *Asherah* was the name of a Phoenician (Babylonian/Canaanite) goddess of fortune. The common noun refers to the poles, images or pillars set up in her honour. So the word is not 'grove'. 2 Kg 22:14 - 'college' really means 'second quarter' (of the city). Hos 3:1 - 'flagons of wine' = 'raisin cakes'. The KJV mistranslates this four times. Song 7:5 - 'galleries' should be 'tresses' or 'locks of hair'. Isa 19:10 - 'All that made sluices and ponds for fish' = 'all that work for hire are sad at heart' or 'all who work for wages will be grieved'. Nah 2:3 'torches' is really 'steel'. The Greek titles of NT books do not contain the word 'saint', as in *The Gospel of Saint Matthew*.

⁵ Isaiah 11:3, *And shall make Him of quick understanding*. This clause is not in the Hebrew manuscript. Acts 9:6, The KJV adds half a verse found nowhere except in the Vulgate - *And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him?* How serious is this? The KJV adds a long section only found in a translation that is the basis of Roman Catholic Bibles.

⁶ The cursive 12th c. manuscript used by Erasmus for the book of Revelation, was scarcely legible in places, and lacked the final leaf containing the last six verses of the book, which he translated into Greek from the Latin Vulgate. In various other places in the Apocalypse he followed the readings of the Vulgate in opposition to the Greek, as he did in a few cases elsewhere. The KJV refers to the Holy Spirit repeatedly as 'it' (e.g. Jn 1:32; Rm 8:16; 1 Pt 1:11). Earlier versions also got this right in most verses, such as Cranmer's, Coverdale's, the Geneva or even the Romanist Rheims NT of 1582. The KJV thus introduces a mistake which half the previous versions had corrected.

⁷ Giving spiritual power to an inanimate object or office.

[Fahy - these are examples where reading the KJV gives someone a completely false understanding of the text. How can a modern reader know that 'letteth' actually means the opposite of what it sounds like?]

In other instances it is difficult to understand how the NKJV scholars thought they were updating and clarifying the KJV as, for example, when they substituted "minas" for "pounds" in Luke 19:13; or, "satraps" for "princes" in Daniel 3:3; or, "black cummin" for "fitches" in Isaiah 28:27.

[Fahy - It is a good rule of translation that where there is not an English equivalent, using the original or a transliteration (like 'baptism') is the best option. 'Minas' is better than 'pounds' since the items were not pounds. Neither is a 'satrap' a 'prince'. As for 'fitches',⁸ who on earth would know what that meant?]

Many Christians today are purchasing NKJV Bibles for three reasons: (1) Many pastors and Christian leaders are highly recommending it. (2) They have been assured by translators and publishers that the NKJV is based upon the same Hebrew and Greek texts used by the KJV translators. However, as already mentioned, such a claim is simply not true [Fahy - this is a lie, as even the TBS admit; the basis of translation is the same source texts. How can telling obvious lies make a Christian argument?] and can be easily documented by comparing the wording of the NKJV with the NIV, NASV, RSV and other versions whose translators admittedly used other Hebrew and Greek texts. (3) The NKJV is supposedly easier to read and understand but its impurities actually make it doubly deceptive and dangerous.

The duplicity of the NKJV publishers, translators and endorsers greatly increases the possibility of believers being deceived. [Fahy - this is a serious and false slander. What will lead to deception is lying.] The word duplicity is used advisedly. [Fahy – then the advice was wrong.] Webster's Dictionary defines duplicity as, "Deception by pretending to feel and act one way while acting another." The following duplicity can be fully documented:

The duplicity of the Thomas Nelson Publishers is clearly evidenced by their supposed concern and stated desire to "preserve the authority and accuracy...of the original King James" Bible. Yet, Nelson is the largest publisher of Bibles in the world and publishes eight of the nine modern versions including the iniquitous Revised Standard Version, copyrighted by the apostate National Council of Churches. If the Thomas Nelson Publishers were genuinely concerned about the purity of the Scriptures, would they continue printing the RSV and other corrupted modern Bible versions?

[Fahy - I am not an apologist for Nelson Publishers, but their claim to preserve the value of the KJV can only be applied to the NKJV. Their other translations have different underlying principles. It is not a sin for Christians to want to use the RSV or other versions; no matter what we think.]

⁸ Clearly not the KJV translators since it means the spice cummin in Isa 28:25 and Isa 28:27. It means spelt in Ezek 4:9 (a wheat-like crop used to make a type of bread). So the KJV translates two different things by the same word.

The duplicity of the NKJV scholars is also a matter for concern. Although each scholar was asked to subscribe to a statement confirming his belief in the plenary, divine, verbal inspiration of the original autographs (none of which exist today), the question of whether or not they also believed in the divine preservation of the divinely inspired originals was not an issue as it should have been. Dr. Arthur Farstad, chairman of the NKJV Executive Review Committee which had the responsibility of final text approval, stated that this committee was about equally divided as to which was the better Greek New Testament text-the Textus Receptus or the Westcott-Hort. Apparently none of them believed that either text was the Divinely preserved Word of God. Yet, all of them participated in a project to "protect and preserve the purity and accuracy" of the original KJV based on the TR. Is not this duplicity of the worst kind, coming from supposedly evangelical scholars?

[Fahy - Greek scholars have to work on the basis of the stated principles of the job they are doing at the time. They may have various views; but as professionals they would not let these enter into affecting their current work. To accuse these men without knowing them, or the facts, is slander. Slandering translators is not good argumentation. Does Reynold's not know that one of the KJV translators was an alcoholic? The words 'speck' and 'plank' come to mind. Good men, for rational reasons choose to prefer Alexandrian texts; I do not, but that does not mean that these men are deceived, deluded or non-Christian. Many good Christian scholars have used an NASB; I have no right to condemn them for this.]

Further duplicity is revealed in the preface of the NKJV and in a 16-page history of the KJV printed at the end. On page VI of the preface, NKJV readers are given the following erroneous information: "There is only one basic New Testament used by Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Orthodox, by conservatives and liberals." This is simply not true! **There are two basic New Testament texts-the Divinely preserved Textus Receptus from which the original KJV was translated and the satanically corrupted Westcott-Hort Text (and its revisions) which form the basis of all other modern Bible versions.**

[Fahy - This is terrible scare-mongering and loose language, not worthy of a paper claiming to be scholarly. I don't like (or use) the Alexandrian text family either, but to call fellow believers who choose to as following a 'satanically corrupt' version, and thus are being satanically corrupted themselves is a slander against sincere brothers and sisters in the image of Christ. The NKJV claim is merely that there is basic agreement in the texts. Over 95% of the textual material is the same. No doctrine is seriously damaged by these differences.]

NKJV readers are further misinformed as to why there are so many differences between the original KJV and all the modern versions. On page VI of the preface, NKJV readers are assured, **"...That the most important differences in the English New Testament of today are due, not to manuscript divergence, but to the way in which translators view the task of translation."** This simply is not true. Many important differences in the English New Testament of today are indeed due to manuscript divergence (over 5700 differences exist between the TR and WH Greek texts) in addition to the divergent views of the scholars who produced the various translations.

[Fahy - yes it is true. The worst errors are those found in translations that are paraphrases. The NKJV is a literal translation; formal equivalence, not dynamic equivalence like the NIV. Textual differences means that there are

slightly different words used and occasionally a sentence. Paraphrases end up giving a completely subjective view of page after page, or even the whole book. The majority of the differences between the Alexandrian and Byzantine texts are trivial. Some are more important, but we must not give the impression that there are 5,700+ serious differences.]

On page VII of the preface is another very significant statement concerning the NKJV footnotes: "Significant explanatory notes, ***alternate translations***, and cross references, as well as New Testament citations of Old Testament passages, are supplied in footnotes. *Important textual variants* in the Old Testament are footnoted in a standard form. The textual information in the New Testament footnotes is a *unique provision* in the history of the English Bible. Terms in the footnotes such as 'better manuscripts' are avoided. The footnotes in the present edition make no evaluation of the readings, but do clearly indicate the manuscript sources of readings which diverge from the traditional text. Thus, a clearly defined presentation of the *variants* is provided for the benefit of interested readers representing *all textual persuasions*."

[Fahy - What's his point; this is a good thing?]

As a crowning climax of duplicity and inconsistency, the editors of the NKJV make the following incongruous statements on pages 1,234 and 1,235 of the King James history printed at the conclusion of the NKJV text:

"The tendency of recent revisers has been to remove words and phrases from the text of Scripture, based on the most recently discovered extant manuscripts. In using the Greek text underlying the King James Bible, these words and phrases were retained. And, in those few places where the majority of the manuscripts did not support a word or phrase, that fact could best be indicated in a footnote. (The New Testament of the New King James Version shows in its footnotes those places where the major textual traditions differ from the language of the King James Bible.)

"It was the editors' conviction that the use of footnotes would encourage further inquiry by readers. They also recognized that it was easier for the average reader to delete something he or she felt was not properly a part of the text, than to insert a word or phrase which had been left out by the revisers."

Will the next modern Bible be the "Do It Yourself" version? This would be a distinct possibility if the advice of the NKJV editors in the two preceding paragraphs were to be followed. In effect, they are saying, let each reader decide for himself what portions, verses, phrases and words should be included in God's Holy Word." NKJV footnotes, far from being helpful, are an invitation to disobey the plain command of God not to add to or take from His Word. Deuteronomy 4:2; Revelation 22:18,19.

[Fahy - this is stupid. It is better to have more information than less. The Textus Receptus, being originally based on the texts of the humanist unbeliever Erasmus, used the Latin Vulgate for portions of Revelation, and even Acts 9:6, since at that time there were insufficient manuscripts available. Erasmus translated the Latin version of Jerome into Greek and published his text. But most KJV readers don't even know this. More recent manuscripts have now supplied the lack. For this reason alone the NKJV is better. The point is that sometimes there are several choices for a word even amongst Byzantine manuscripts. The idea that there is one pure

Greek manuscript is a fantasy and completely untrue. Translators have to make choices, and the better translators explain these choices and show options.]

The preservation of God's divinely inspired Word is clearly set forth in Psalm 12:6,7, "*The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever.*" God has fulfilled His promise through the Textus Receptus and the King James Version. Those who replace the KJV with the NKJV will have been duped into accepting a Bible which still bears a respected name but one which has placed "readability" above purity.

[Fahy - God's actual words are the original autographs which are now lost. The KJV is not inspired. What about translations in foreign languages, are they bad translations too or must foreigners first learn English and then use the KJV before than can know the truth? What about people before 1611? What about the Puritans who preferred the Geneva Bible and complained about the KJV being a modern invention?

If, '*God has fulfilled His promise (the words of the Lord are pure words) through the Textus Receptus and the King James Version*', then why are there so many mistakes in the KJV? Why was it hated by the godly Puritans as an unwanted political compromise?⁹ Why did God later supply manuscripts to fill in the blanks that Erasmus did not have? Why did God allow later versions to be published? Why was it necessary for the 1611 KJV to be revised several times in its history if it was pure?]

The translators of the original King James Bible had a distinct advantage. They were able to use their vast knowledge of ancient languages and translation abilities prior to the time when the deadly virus of so-called "Higher Criticism" infected the whole field of scholarship. [Fahy - Actually, while I have great respect for the scholarship of the AV translators, there is a huge amount about the original languages that was not understood at all in those days. For instance, the difference between the *Koine*, or common Greek, used in the NT which differed from the Classical Greek known to the AV translators.] False teachers boldly dissected God's Word with the "tools of scholarship" in order to reconstruct it according to their own speculations and presumptions. [Fahy - the NKJV does not follow this procedure and is not based upon the Alexandrian text, so why deliberately confuse people into comparing it with these versions?] The result is a pseudo-intellectual aura in which no one can be sure of anything. It's time to get back to the pure Word of God where faith prevails and doubt is vanquished! [Fahy - the AV is not the **pure** word of God. The original autographs are. The KJV is the work of uninspired men, no matter how good they are.]

Believers who will take the time to compare the KJV with the NKJV and then with other modern versions will see for themselves why the NKJV should be exposed and repudiated as **a polluted version**. [Fahy - exaggerated language again to scare people. Very unscholarly.] And, those who will take time to carefully look at the NKJV footnotes will be doubly concerned and will join in warning others about it.

⁹ The king hated the Geneva Bible for its hard Calvinism but the people hated the Bishop's Bible. The AV (as it was originally called) was a compromise between the two to bring religious peace to the country. In fact, the KJV was a revision of the 1602 edition of the Bishop's Bible.

Our plea to God's people is to reject the NKJV Bible and continue preaching, teaching, memorizing and meditating upon the pure, unadulterated, Divinely preserved milk and meat of God's Holy Word-The King James Authorized Version of 1611 upon which God has placed His stamp of approval over a span of nearly four centuries. Nothing is more important than the purity of God's Holy Word. [Fahy - again claiming that the KJV is virtually inspired and that for 75% of church history men did not have God's 'pure. Unadulterated, divinely preserved' word. This is scandalous and scurrilous nonsense.]

M. H. REYNOLDS, EDITOR, FOUNDATION MAGAZINE
Fundamental Evangelistic Association
Box 6278 Los Osos CA 93412 USA

[Fahy - This is propaganda of the worst kind. By all means let's have a discussion on translations, but we must do so on the basis of truth, not exaggeration and falsity. This article is an appalling appeal to tradition, fear, and superficial reasoning. The very examples he lists all show that the NKJV is actually better and more accurate than the KJV. His scare-tactics are an example in how not to argue and are not worthy of a believer. We must focus on the truth and not our preferred shibboleths.

A good case can be made that the NKJV is a better translation than the KJV, but based on the same family of Byzantine texts. It is certainly a more readable version. It does not follow the errors of modern versions that are based upon the Alexandrian textual family. To criticise believers for using this version is a scandal and ungodly. This is merely pandering to fleshly tradition and personal emotional preference. God is dishonoured by this behaviour.]

Paul Fahy Copyright © 2007/2012

Understanding Ministries

<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>