A Response to D. A. Waite's Criticism of the New King James Version

by
James D. Price, Ph.D.
September, 1995

A Response to D. A. Waite's
Criticism of the
New King James Version

D. A. Waite has written several critical attacks on the New King James Version of the Bible. Recently I received a copy of one of his attacks from a pastor who asked me to respond to certain critical allegations Waite made in a pamphlet entitled "Defects in the New King James Version" published by the Dean Burgon Society of Collingswood, NJ. The request was for a response to his conclusion #3 on page 10; his categories 1, 2, 3, and 4 on pages 16 and 17; his category 6 on page 19; and his category 9 on page 23.

After carefully evaluating Waite's allegations about the NKJV, I have come to the conclusion that everything Waite asserts is either false or inaccurate. Some of the things he says are "literally" true, but they are not significant because they depend upon a rigidly literal rendering of the Hebrew words that cannot stand the scrutiny of good translation. They depend on conditions where the conventions of Hebrew and those of modern standard English are incongruous--that is, a rigidly literal translation would result in poor English, or in misleading statements.

Waite has excellent academic credentials for making such an evaluation of the NKJV, but his poor scholarship suggests that he does not understand much of what he discusses, or else he deliberately misrepresents the conditions in order to build a case for his King James Only agenda. His faulty presentation of the evidence suggests that he does not understand (or he misrepresents) the history and identity of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; the marginal notes in the KJV and NKJV; the difference between the Word of God in the original languages and a translation of that Word of God into English; the dynamic equivalence theory of translation; the reflexive voice in Hebrew and English; translation of figures of speech and idioms; the use of pronouns in collective references, and in direct and indirect address; and, in fact, English grammar in general.

As president of the Dean Burgon Society, he claims loyalty to the traditional texts of the Hebrew and Greek. But this must be a screen for his KJV-only agenda, because a revision of the KJV, based on the very same Hebrew and Greek texts, is criticized for

differing with the wording of the KJV. While he makes allusions to the Hebrew and Greek, he never makes direct reference to any Hebrew or Greek word, grammatical form, or syntactic structure. His criticism is strictly with respect to the KJV words, grammar, and syntax. Any deviation from the KJV "standard" is labeled "diabolical." This can be nothing but King James Only in disguise.

The following material is my response to the designated criticisms, but I deal only with the material that relates to the Old Testament and Hebrew:

Page 10--Conclusion #3.

In this conclusion Waite states:

The NEW KING JAMES VERSION Old Testament Text is Based On A DIFFERENT HEBREW TEXT Than The KJV And Often Doubts Even Their Own Different Text. The PREFACE of the NEW KJV (p. vi) admitted that the KJV of 1611 was based upon the JACOB BEN CHAYYIM HEBREW TEXT whereas the NEW KJV is admittedly based upon the Hebrew Text of BEN ASHER which was followed in the "Leningrad Manuscript B19a (A.D. 1008)." (op. cit., p. vi). This is bad enough, but there is more. In the 47 examples where there is a "NON-MASORETIC TEXT" suggested in the footnotes of the New KJV (cf. pp. 17-20), there is no clear indication that the editors have an unshaken confidence even in their BEN ASHER Hebrew Text in clear preference to the other bases such as (1) The Septuagint (LXX) Greek Text; (2) the Latin Vulgate; (3) The Ancient Versions (like the Syriac or the Samaritan Pentateuch) or (4) The Dead Sea Scrolls (Cf. PREFACE p. vi and EVIDENCE on NEW KJV, pp. 17-20). As you can see from the evidence, other footnotes are based upon a few Hebrew Manuscripts, many Hebrew Manuscripts, the Qere, a Targum, Josephus, or even on speculation or conjecture. The footnotes can just as easily be followed as that which is printed in the NEW KJV text of the Old Testament. The NEW KJV editors explain this very clearly at the end of their translation on page 1235. They wrote:

"It was the editors' conviction that the USE OF FOOTNOTES would encourage further inquiry by readers. They also recognized

that <u>IT WAS EASIER</u> for the average reader <u>TO DELETE</u> <u>SOMETHING HE OR SHE FELT WAS NOT PROPERLY A</u> <u>PART OF THE TEXT, THAN TO INSERT A WORD OR</u> <u>PHRASE WHICH HAD BEEN LEFT OUT BY THE</u> <u>REVISERS</u>." ["THE HISTORY OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE," NKJV, p. 1235].

Certainly this is an encouragement for the NEW KJV reader to "DELETE" something he thought was "not properly a part of the text," and thus become his own "TEXTUAL CRITIC." It is apparent that, for the editors of the NEW KJV, the underlying original language Biblical texts are not settled, but, on the contrary, these texts are in a constant flux! Each suggested DEPARTURE from the KJV BASES casts SERIOUS DOUBT upon these sources, and every Word of God! It is most confusing to the average Christian, and remember, "GOD IS NOT THE AUTHOR OF CONFUSION"! (1 Corinthians 14:33).[1]

In addition to several incidental errors,[2] Waite's conclusion involves three separate false charges against the NKJV: (1) The NKJV revisers used a different Hebrew text than that used by the KJV translators, (2) the NKJV editors implied a lack of confidence in the Hebrew text by the use of footnotes that refer to variant readings, and

---

[1] D. A. Waite, *Defects in the "New King James Version*," (Collingswood, NJ: The Dean Burgon Society, 1988), pp. 10-12. The use of underlining and nonstandard capitalization for emphasis is his, and in his quotation from the NKJV they are not part of the original text, although he did not indicate so.

[2] An ancient version is a translation of the Bible into a language other than that of its original text. Thus the Septuagint (LXX) is an ancient version of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek; likewise the Latin Vulgate, the Syriac, and the Targum (Aramaic version) all are ancient versions. Thus his items (1) and (2) really belong in (3). On the other hand, the Samaritan Pentateuch is not a version because it is a Hebrew text of the Pentateuch written in the Samaritan script, a script much like the Phoenician script in which the older texts of the Hebrew Bible were written; thus it does not belong in item (3). In addition, the Qere are marginal notes in the Masoretic text also contained in ben Chayyim's text. All these things should be known by a qualified scholar. Sad to say, the Preface of the NKJV says nothing of speculation or conjecture, nor does it imply that the mention of any of the ancient sources in a footnote is a recommendation to the reader of their preference; these ideas were conjured up by Waite's prejudicial bias against any modern version of the Bible, even one based of the Textus Receptus of the Old and New Testaments, of which texts he supposedly is a defender. Either Waite is uninformed, or he has deliberately misrepresented these details.

(3) the textual footnotes are recommendations to the readers to accept non-Masoretic readings.

The Hebrew Text of the NKJV

Waite's first charge that the NKJV revisers used a different Hebrew text than that used by the KJV translators is false in several respects. First of all, the NKJV did follow the *Jacob Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text*. The preface to the NKJV Bible states:

> For the New King James Version the text used was the 1967/1977 Stuttgart edition of Biblia Hebraica, based on the ben Asher text, while frequent comparisons were made with the Bomberg edition of 1524-25.

Waite conveniently omitted reference to the Bomberg edition of 1524-25 which is the *Jacob Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text.* With his academic credentials he should know that, so I wonder if he was willfully withholding information that would weaken his case.

Ben Asher was the famous Jewish Masoretic scholar who standardized the Hebrew text about A.D. 900. His text is regarded as the text closest to the original autographs. The Bomberg Ben Chayyim Hebrew text is based on the ben Asher text with a few variants that had accumulated between the years A.D. 900-1525. Ben Chayyim attempted to reproduce the ben Asher text to the best of his ability with the manuscript evidence he had available to him in his day. His text is much like the Textus Receptus Greek New Testament which is of the Byzantine text tradition, but which has a few peculiar variants that differ from the standard Byzantine text. The *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1967/77) is based on manuscript Leningrad B19a which is regarded by many as the most authoritative representative of the ben Asher text. The differences between the Bomberg Ben Chayyim edition and *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1967/77) are microscopic. In the eight places where the difference had an effect on translation, the NKJV followed *Ben Chayyim*, not *Stuttgart*. Here are the eight differences:

	Stuttgart	Bomberg (KJV, NKJV)
Prov 8:16	righteousness	earth
Isa 10:16	the Lord, the LORD of hosts	the Lord, the Lord of hosts

Isa 27:2	a pleasant vineyard	a vineyard of red wine
Isa 38:14	the Lord	the LORD
Jer 34:1	Nebuchadrezzar	Nebuchadnezzar
Ezek 30:18	be held back	be darkened
Zeph 3:15	fear disaster	see disaster
Mal 1:12	Lord	LORD

So it is evident that Waite's charge is false. As former executive editor of the NKJV Old Testament, I can confidently assure you that the NKJV followed, as carefully as possible, the Bomberg 1524-25 Ben Chayyim edition that the KJV 1611 translators used--I personally made sure.

Waite, by his clever wording, gives his readers the false impression that the Hebrew text used by the NKJV is vastly different than that used by the KJV translators. Actually, it is uncertain which Hebrew text the KJV translators used. F. H. A. Scrivener, a defender of the Authorized Version and the editor of the Cambridge Paragraph Bible, an edition of the KJV, stated:

> Respecting the Hebrew text which they followed, it would be hard to identify any particular edition, in as much as the differences between early printed [Hebrew] Bibles are but few. The Complutensian Polyglott, however, which afforded them such important help in the Apocrypha, was of course at hand, and we seem to trace its influence in some places.[3]

It is commonly thought that the KJV translators used the Jacob ben Chayyim Bomberg 2nd edition of 1524/25 and the Complutensian Polyglott, thus consulting not one but two (or more) Hebrew texts. These texts are not readily available today. Only later editions are more readily accessible; and it is not known which text they followed when the texts before them differed.

The text of the Hebrew Old Testament is not like that of the Greek New Testament. There is no composite Hebrew text that corresponds exactly with the textual decisions of the KJV translators. For the New Testament it is known that the KJV

---

[3] F. H. A. Scrivener, ed., *The Cambridge Paragraph Bible of the Authorized English Version* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1873), p. xxv.

translators used four different printed Greek New Testaments, differing from one another in 131 places:

> (1) The text of Robert Stevens (1550)
>
> (2) The text of Theodore Beza (1589)
>
> (3) The text of Complutensian Polyglott (1514-22)
>
> (4) The text of Desiderius Erasmus (1516, 1519, etc.)

The KJV translators followed Beza (1589) against Stevens (1550) 81 times; they followed Stevens (1550) against Beza (1589) 21 times; they followed the Complutensian Polyglott (1514-22) against Beza and Stevens 19 times; they followed Erasmus against Beza and Stevens 7 times; and they followed the Latin Vulgate against all Greek witnesses 3 times.[4] Scrivener published a composite Greek text in 1894 that contains the Greek words actually used by the KJV translators.[5] Until the 19th Century no such Greek text existed for the KJV New Testament. Still to this day, no such composite Hebrew text exists for the Old Testament. So the NKJV editors used available editions of ben Chayyim's text to assure the authenticity of the text as carefully as possible.

Textual Footnotes

In Waite's second charge he would have his readers believe that textual footnotes will cause doubt in the mind of the ordinary Bible reader. He gives the impression that no such footnotes occurred in the KJV. These are false premises; the KJV 1611 and subsequent standard texts of the KJV Bible have numerous textual notes placed there intentionally by the KJV translators. The third rule followed by the KJV translators as indicated in their report to the Synod of Dort states:

> Where a Hebrew or Greek word admits two meanings of a suitable kind, the one was to be expressed in the text, the other in the margin. The same to be done where a different reading was found in good copies.[6]

---

[4] Scrivener, pp. c-ciii.

[5] *The New Testament in the Original Greek According to the Text Followed in the Authorized Version*, ed. F. H. A. Scrivener (London: Cambridge University Press, 1894, 1902), available through the Trinitarian Bible Society. This text is known to correspond with the KJV with but few minute differences.

So the KJV translators were required to include marginal notes, including those that noted textual variants. Yet Waite criticizes a revision of the KJV that contains the same kind of textual notes as those contained in the text they revised.

Scrivener recorded that the 1611 KJV Old Testament had 6,637 marginal notes, 4,111 of which expressed the more literal meaning of the original Hebrew; 2,156 gave alternate renderings (indicated by "Or" preceding it); 63 gave meanings of proper names; 240 relate to harmonization of parallel passages; and 67 refer to variant readings of the Hebrew text which he listed.[7] The following is a list of the places where the 1611 indicated the source of variant readings:[8]

Ref.	Text	Margin
1 Chr 1:6	Riphath	Or, *Diphath* as it is in some copies
1 Chr 1:7	Dodanim	Or, *Rodanim* according to some copies
Ezra 2:33	Hadid	Or, *Harid*, as it is in some copies
Ezra 8:14	Zabbud	Or, *Zaccur*, as some read
Ezra 10:40	Machnadebai	Or, *Mabnadebai*, according to some copies
Song 5:4	for him	Or, (as some read) *in me*
Matt 1:11	Josias	Some read, *Josias begat Jakim, and Jakim begat Jechonias*
Matt 26:26	blessed *it*	Many Greek copies have *gave thanks*
Luke 10:22		Many ancient copies add these words, *And turning to his disciples, he said.*
Luke 17:36		This 36th verse is wanting in most of the Greek copies.

---

[6] "Report on the Making of the Version of 1611 Presented to the Synod of Dort," November 16, 1611.

[7] Scrivener, pp. xxiv-xxv. Some of the notes were marked with the preceding "or" and could be confused with alternate renderings; but he identified the source of the alternate readings.

[8] These same marginal notes occur in standard editions of the Authorized Version, such as the Cambridge and Oxford editions; but many Bibles printed in the United States do not have the standard marginal notes, and some have none at all.

Ref.	Text	Margin
Acts 25:6	more than ten days	Or, as some copies read, *no more than eight or ten days.*
1 Cor 15:31	your	Some read, *our.*
Eph 6:9	your Master	Some read, *both your and their Master.*
Jas 2:18	without their works	Some copies read, *by their works.*
1 Pet 2:21	for us	Some read, *for you.*
2 Pet 2:11	against them	Some read, *against themselves*
2 John 8	wrought	Or, *gained.* Some copies read, *which ye have gained, but that ye receive.*

Some of their textual notes contain references to the ancient versions and church fathers. The following is a list of some of these:

Ref.	Text	Margin
Gen 5:12	Mahalaleel	Gr. [= LXX], *Malaleel.*
Gen 5:21	Methuselah	Gr. *Mathusala.*
Gen 5:29	Noah	Gr. *Noe.* That is *Rest*, or, *Comfort*.
Gen 41:45	Zaphnathpaaneah	Which in the Coptic signifies, *A revealer of secrets,* or, *The man to whom secrets are revealed.*
Mark 7:3	oft	Or, *diligently*, in the original, *with the fist:* Theophylact, *up to the elbow.*
Acts 13:18	suffered	Gr. etropoforhsen, perhaps for etrofoforhsen, *bore,* or, *fed them, as a nurse beareth*, or, *feedeth her child*, Deu. 1:31, acc. to the Sept. and so Chrysostom.

Acts 13:34   sure mercies
of David   Gr. ta; @ovsia, *holy*, or, *just things*: which
words the Sept. both in the place of Isa.
55:3,   and in many others, use for that which
is in the Heb., *mercies*.

So it is quite obvious that the KJV translators used marginal notes to identify variant readings in the Hebrew and Greek text, and they also referred to the ancient versions and church fathers in these notes. Usually their notes did not identify specific sources, yet Waite criticizes the NKJV for giving the same kind of marginal notes with more specific information.

In 1611, the KJV translators were criticized for providing marginal notes, much like the criticism that Waite casts against the NKJV. In the introduction to the KJV 1611 Miles Smith defended the use of marginal notes, arguing:

Now in such a case doth not a margin do well to admonish the Reader to seek further, and not to conclude or dogmatize upon this or that peremptorily? For as it is a fault of incredulity, to doubt of those things that are evident; so to determine of such things as the Spirit of God hath left (even in the judgment of the judicious) questionable, can be no less than presumption.[9]

Here it is clear that the KJV translators did not provide marginal notes to cause their readers to doubt the text, but rather to warn them not to draw hasty conclusions nor to dogmatize in places where the Spirit of God has seen fit to allow some things to be uncertain. It was not an invitation to doubt, but an exhortation to caution.

So in the Preface of the NKJV, nothing is to be construed in the wording there that invites the readers to doubt the Scripture. It states: "The notes in the present edition make no evaluation of the readings (and so terms such as "better manuscripts" are

---

[9] "The Translators to the Reader" in *The Holy Bible, 1611 Edition, King James Version: A Word-for-word Reprint of the First Edition of the Authorized Version, Presented in Roman Letters for Easy Reading and Comparison with Subsequent Editions* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1982), pages not numbered. The spelling here has been modernized for clarity of reading.

avoided), but they do clearly indicate the sources of the readings that diverge from the traditional text." By the very nature of a translation it is understood that the words in the main body of a translation represent the content of the traditional text being followed, and that the alternate words in the marginal note represent the alternate readings found in the non-traditional texts. The fact that no evaluations were made, as are made in some modern versions, indicates that the editors were not suggesting that any alternate readings were necessarily better than the readings of the traditional text. Thus they do not express nor imply any lack of confidence in the traditional text.

Waite's quotation from the "History of the King James Bible" encourages the readers to further study, not to delete or add anything to the traditional text. Yet Waite would twist the words to mean the exact opposite of what is clearly stated. What is said here about the marginal notes in the NKJV Old Testament also applies to his list of alleged recommendations of non-*Textus Receptus* readings in the marginal notes of the New Testament.

Waite Does Not Understand
the Footnotes

In Waite's list of 47 NKJV "recommendations" of non-Masoretic texts, almost all of them are mere notices of variant readings, just like those found in the KJV 1611 and the standard text of 1769. As demonstrated above they do not constitute recommendations. However, Waite lists 1 Sam 6:19--"fifty thousand and threescore and ten men"; the marginal note mentions no alternate readings in any ancient non-Masoretic source, so it cannot possibly be recommending a non-Masoretic reading; it is merely an alternate rendering of the traditional text--a note like hundreds of similar ones in the KJV itself. Likewise, he listed Neh 3:20--"Zabbai"; a marginal note also found in the KJV 1611 and later standard editions; so in criticizing the NKJV, he criticizes his own one-and-only KJV as well. These are indications of Waite's careless handling of evidence in his haste to accumulate large lists of accusations.

But this is not the most serious problem of his misunderstanding. Waite seems not to understand that the purpose of many of the textual notes was to explain to the reader why the KJV translators themselves departed from the traditional Masoretic Hebrew text (MT = Bg, BHK, and BHS)[10] in favor of a reading supported by some non-Masoretic

authority.[11] When the KJV translators were justified in doing so, the NKJV followed their decision and indicated so in a marginal note when it seemed helpful to the reader. In those cases where a note seemed appropriate, the note indicates the strong non-Masoretic authority that supports the rendering of the KJV and NKJV, and it indicates that the MT (including Bg) supports an alternate reading.

For example, in Numbers 26:23 the KJV and NKJV read *Puah* with a marginal note stating "So with Sam., LXX, Syr., Vg.; Heb. *Puvah*, Gen. 46:13; 1 Chr. 7:1." This note means that the KJV and NKJV follow the spelling of the name *Puah* as found in the Samaritan Pentateuch (Sam.), the Greek Septuagint (LXX), the Syriac version (Syr.), and the Latin Vulgate version (Vg.); rather than the spelling *Puvah* as found in the Hebrew text (Heb. = MT, Bg, BHK, and BHS); but compare the alternate way the name is spelled in Gen. 46:13 and 1 Chron 7:1.

In Judges 5:15 the KJV and NKJV read *princes of Issachar* with a marginal note stating "So with vss.; Heb. *And my princes in Issachar*." This note means that the KJV and NKJV follow the uniform witness of the ancient versions (vss.) rather than the lone witness of the Hebrew text (Heb.). There is no reason to correct the KJV in this case.

In all there are 104 similar places where the KJV translators justifiably followed some textual authority other than the Jacob ben Chayyim text.[12] It must be an

---

[10] MT represents the ben Asher Masoretic Text; Bg = Bomberg's 2nd edition of 1524-25, the text of Jacob ben Chayyim; BHK = *Biblia Hebraica* of Kittel (1935); BHS = *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1967/77); the texts are identical unless otherwise indicated. Thus MT usually represents the combined witness of Bg, BHK, and BHS.

[11] I have catalogued 232 cases where the KJV translators did not follow the traditional Hebrew or Greek texts, but rather some other authority--228 of them in the Old Testament. These departures from the traditional text are reported in an unpublished paper entitled "Textual Emendations in the Authorized Version" which I presented to the Southeastern Regional meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society on March 22, 1986.

[12] There are 58 such marginal notes in the 1988 edition of the NKJV which has the full complement of center column notes. Some editions of the NKJV have a limited set of notes that do not include all 58, and some editions have no marginal notes at all. The references where these notes occur are as follows: Gen 30:11; 36:26; 37:36; Num 26:23, 39; 33:8; Josh 5:1; 21:36-37; Judg 5:15; Ruth 3:15; 4:4; 1 Sam 5:4; 16:7, 11; 2 Sam 3:18; 12:24; 16:12; 22:33, 34, 46; 1 Kings 10:26; 2 Kings 23:19; 1 Chr 9:41; 11:11; 24:23 (twice); 2 Chr 3:1; 8:16; 10:14; 32:28; 36:2, 4; Ezra 8:17; Job 17:10; 29:6; 31:32;

embarrassment to Waite to learn that the KJV translators did not consistently follow the ben Chayyim Masoretic text. But they did not consistently follow any one printed Greek New Testament either, but selected readings from among four different ones. The textual notes in the NKJV help to identify the readings they actually followed in the Old Testament.

In addition to the 104 places where the KJV translators justifiably followed some authority other than the ben Chayyim text, there are additional places where the KJV translators wrongly deviated from the ben Chayyim text. In these places the NKJV corrected the KJV to bring it into conformance with the ben Chayyim Masoretic text.

For example, in Gen 6:5 the KJV reads *God*, whereas the NKJV reads *the LORD*, with the marginal note: "So with MT, Tg.; Vg. *God*: LXX *LORD God*." This note means that the Hebrew Masoretic text (MT= Bg. & BHK & BHS) and the Aramaic Targum (Tg.) read *the LORD*; whereas the Latin Vulgate reads *God*, and the Greek Septuagint (LXX) has the conflated reading *LORD God.* This is one of many instances where the KJV translators followed the Latin Vulgate rather than the Hebrew text. There is no reason to retain their non-Hebrew reading, so the NKJV corrected the KJV to conform with the Hebrew.

In Gen 7:22 the KJV reads *breath of life*, whereas the NKJV reads *breath of the spirit of life*, with the marginal note: "LXX, Vg. omit *of the spirit*." This note means that the Greek Septuagint (LXX) and the Latin Vulgate omit the words *of the spirit* which are contained in the Hebrew Masoretic Text (MT) and other authorities. There is no reason to omit words found in the Hebrew text, just because they are omitted by the Latin vulgate.

In all there are 144 similar places where the KJV translators wrongfully followed some textual authority other than the Jacob ben Chayyim text.[13] In all these places the

---

Psa 8:5; 22:16; 23:6; 30:3; 59:10, 15; 68:4; 89:19; 100:3; Prov 18:24; Eccl 12:6; Isa 18:7; 38:11; Jer 18:17; 50:9, 29; Ezek 16:43; 17:7; Dan 9:24; Hos 10:9; Amos 8:8; and Hab 3:19.

In addition there are 46 other places where the KJV justifiably did not follow the traditional text. These places are not noted in the NKJV because it did not seem that they would be helpful to the reader.

[13] There are 67 such marginal notes in the 1988 edition of the NKJV which has the full complement of center column notes. The references where these notes occur are as follows: Gen 6:5; 7:22; 36:24; Num 10:29; 11:25; 13:8, 16; 14:33; 21:14; Deut 1:1;

NKJV corrected the KJV to bring it into conformity with the readings of the Jacob ben Chayyim Masoretic text. Where it seemed helpful to the reader, a marginal note was provided to explain the reason for the correction. Instead of criticizing, Waite should be thankful that the NKJV has made the King James tradition closer to the traditional Hebrew text.

Finally, the NKJV translators had to correct the KJV when it did not represent a justifiable rendering of the Hebrew text. In such cases the NKJV occasionally supplied a marginal note to explain the correction. For example, Waite listed 1 Chron. 6:28a as a place where the NKJV introduces a non-Masoretic reading. Here the KJV reads "And the sons of Samuel; the firstborn Vashni, and Abiah"; whereas the NKJV reads "The sons of Samuel *were* ¹*Joel* the firstborn, and Abijah ²the second." Waite's comment reads:

<div align="center">1 Chron. 6:28a   VASHNI   NON-MASORETIC TEXT</div>

FOLLOWING LXX, SYR., ARABIC--JOE [sic] JOE [sic]

There actually are two marginal notes in this verse, not one as Waite indicates. The first note is attached to the italicized name *Joel*, and it reads: "So with LXX, Syr., Arab., cf. vs. 33 and 1 Sam. 8:2." This note means that the Greek Septuagint (LXX), the Syriac version (Syr.), and the Arabic version (Arab.) had Hebrew manuscripts from which they translated that had the name *Joel* here as the firstborn of Samuel as recorded elsewhere in the Bible, namely in verse 33 and in 1 Sam. 8:2. Thus ancient manuscripts of this text, together with other Biblical references indicate that Samuel's firstborn was Joel. The second marginal note is attached to the words *the second*, and it reads: "Heb. *Vasheni*." This note means that the Hebrew word *vasheni* means "and the second" and is not a proper name. It is very unlikely that Samuel would name his firstborn son "And The Second," and other textual and Biblical evidence indicate that his name was Joel. So the conclusion is that the Masoretic text somehow lost the name Joel here, but that the reading was preserved in the other ancient witnesses. Thus the NKJV is justified in sup-

---

Judg 3:19, 26; 1 Sam 2:25; 5:9; 2 Sam 7:22; 12:22; 1 Kings 22:38; 2 Kings 16:6; 23:10; 1 Chr 7:27; 24:15; 2 Chr 17:4; 33:19; Job 1:19; 16:14; 19:3; 21:24, 28; 22:20, 25; 32:4; Psa 68:23; 139:11; 143:9; Prov 8:30; 18:8; 19:18, 24; 24:28; 26:22; 30:31; Eccl 9:14; 10:1; Song 1:7; Isa 1:17; 9:3; 49:5; Lam 1:7, 8; 2:20; 3:65; 4:16; Ezek 19:7; Hos 4:18; 13:16; Joel 1:18; 2:6; Amos 5:26; 9:12; Mic 2:6; 6:14; Nah 1:5; 2:1; 3:8; Hab 2:6; and Mal 2:12.

In addition there are 77 other places where the KJV wrongfully did not follow the traditional text. These places also were corrected in the NKJV, but do not have marginal notes because it did not seem that they would be helpful to the reader.

plying *Joel* in italics and translating the word *vasheni* as an ordinal number rather than a proper name.

Waite confused and misunderstood these marginal notes in several ways: (1) he misrepresented the two marginal notes as one that changed the name *Vashni* to *Joe* [sic]; (2) he located the problem in the first half of the verse (6:28a), whereas it is in the last half; (3) he evidently did not understand the second note's reference to the meaning of the Hebrew word *vasheni*, even though he boasts of Hebrew credentials. All these indicate the careless way in which he handles the information he criticizes. He may object to the NKJV supplying a missing word, but the KJV translators did this frequently. Here are two examples of many instances: "Now therefore, *O God*, strengthen my hands" (Neh 6:9). "Which the kings of Israel had made to provoke *the LORD* to anger" (2 Kings 23:19).

The conclusion about Waite's conclusion #3 is that he misrepresented the Hebrew text used in the NKJV, and the purpose of the NKJV marginal notes. He also seems to have misunderstood the marginal notes, or else he misrepresented them also. In any case, his "conclusion" is false.

Pages 16-17 Categories 1, 2, 3, 4

This section of Waite's pamphlet is entitled: "C. <u>BRIEF COMMENTS On TEN Of The CATEGORIES OF TRANSLATION ERRORS In The NEW KING JAMES VERSION</u>."[14] In the material that follows I treat the individual categories separately. In each of these categories Waite makes two serious mistakes: (1) He does not distinguish the words in God's divinely inspired, authoritative, infallible, inerrant Scripture from the words in a translation of that Scripture. (2) He misrepresents the dynamic equivalence theory of translation. I deal with these two errors before responding to the individual categories.

No Distinction Between Scripture And Translation

First of all, Waite does not distinguish the words of Scripture (the Hebrew and Greek words written by the prophets and apostles) from the words of a translation of

---

14 Waite, "Defects," p. 16; unusual emphasis his.

Scripture. The commandments of Scripture against adding words to or removing words from the Scripture apply to the Hebrew and Greek texts, not to translations of those texts. They mean that the Biblical message is not to be altered. Translators, of necessity, must use more words in their translation than are in the original text. This is necessary in order to make the sense of the translation clear. In the KJV and the NKJV (and other translations) the extra words used for clarity are printed in italics. Now if, as Waite stated, the Biblical prohibition against adding to the words of God applies to translations, then all the italicized words in the KJV are a violation of that mandate. All its italicized words would have to be removed, and the KJV would lose its clarity and literary beauty.

But that is not what Waite intends. What he really means is that Revelation 22:18 applies to the English words in the KJV. If anyone adds, removes, or changes any words in the KJV text, he is corrupting God's Word. It makes no difference whether the revised text is clearer and more accurate to the message of the original text--the KJV has been changed! That is the real issue. Waite does not care about the message of the original text, all he cares about is that the words of the KJV have been changed. He has a KJV-only agenda disguised behind a pretended commitment to the traditional Hebrew and Greek text.

Misrepresents Dynamic Equivalence

In each of Waite's categories he repeats the following accusation:

> This is <u>NOT FAITHFULNESS IN TRANSLATION</u>. It is <u>NOT ACCURACY IN TRANSLATION</u>. It is <u>NOT RELIABILITY IN TRANSLATION</u>. It is <u>DIABOLICAL DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCY</u>![15]

In this accusation, Waite equates changes in the KJV text with erroneous departures from the Hebrew and with "diabolical" dynamic equivalence. Waite boasts of academic credentials in Greek, Hebrew, English, and linguistics. If he has kept up with his fields of study, then he knows what transformational grammar is and what the theory of dynamic equivalence is. But his discussion of these linguistic theories suggests that he

---

[15] Waite, "Defects," pp. 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26. The unusual use of capitalized words and underlining for emphasis is Waite's.

has not kept up with the developments in his fields of study. He speaks of any change in the wording of the KJV as though it were "diabolical dynamic equivalence." His use of the term "diabolical" is a scare tactic to prejudice his readers before they ever examine the evidence. It is a scare tactic to cover up his KJV-only agenda.

Dynamic equivalence is a theologically neutral theory of translation based on modern understanding of linguistics.[16] The theory has no necessary bias that predisposes it to produce error or heresy. It is the misuse of the theory, or the taking of some of its principles to an extreme, that may be objectionable. But that would be true of any theory of translation.

I myself prefer the theory known as complete equivalence,[17] which seems to be the theory used by the KJV translators; but there is nothing in dynamic equivalence that merits the epithet "diabolical." Intuitively one expects that the best translation would be an exact word-for-word rendering of the Hebrew words into their equivalent English words.[18] But anyone who has had experience in translating anything from one language to another knows that no two languages have an exact correspondence between the words of the one language and the words of the other language. Some words in the one language require a phrase in the other in order to provide a completely equivalent rendering. Likewise some phrases in the one language require only a single word in the other in order to provide a completely equivalent rendering. Some words in the one language have no equivalent in the other language and need not to be translated at all.[19] Whereas, some words necessarily redundant in the one language are not required to be

---

[16] For a good description of dynamic equivalence, also known as functional equivalence, see Jan De Waard and Eugene A. Nida, *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1986).

[17] For a brief description of complete equivalence see my booklet *Complete Equivalence in Bible Translation* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987).

[18] What is said here about Hebrew to English translating is also true about Greek to English translating.

[19] The Hebrew word אֵת (*'eth*) is the sign of the determinate accusative, and is used hundreds of times in the Hebrew Bible. It is never translated by an English word, but its meaning is conveyed only by word order in English.

repeated in the other in order to convey the complete message.[20] On the other hand, some words clearly implied (but lacking) in the one language must be explicitly provided in the other.[21] So in a real sense the translator must "add" words or "delete" words in the translation process in order to provide a completely equivalent rendering of the message being translated. Such necessary rephrasing of the Hebrew does not alter the message, and is not a violation of the Biblical mandate.

In addition, the word order of the phrases, clauses, and sentences of one language are often different than those of the other language. For example the order of the words in a Hebrew sentence is often verb-subject-object, whereas the order in English needs to be subject-verb-object. So a translator often must rearrange the order of the words in a phrase, and the order of the phrases in a clause, in order to provide a completely equivalent rendering of the message being translated. Such rephrasing of the Hebrew does not alter the original message.

Likewise, the types and functions of sentences of the one language do not correspond exactly with those of the other. Therefore, in those places in the message where this problem occurs, the translator must phrase the message as close to the equivalent expression as is possible in the other language. Finally, when translated literally, the idioms and figures of speech of the one language usually do not have an equivalent meaning in the other. So the translators must find an equivalent idiom or figure in the other language, or else resort to interpretive paraphrase. Such rephrasing of the Hebrew does not alter the original message, nor violate the Biblical mandate.

The use of the above principles of translation are necessary in order to provide a complete and faithful rendering of the original message, even though the process involves "adding," "deleting," "rearranging," and even "paraphrase." They are a part of correct

---

[20] Such redundancy in English may imply emphasis that is not actually meant by the original message, or produce unnecessarily awkward expressions.

[21] The KJV translators did this frequently, as the italicized words of the text indicate. Scholars do not always agree as to when italicized words should be used or not, because some Hebrew words require an English phrase as a translation, and because sometimes a thought clearly implied by the Hebrew text must be explicitly stated in the English text for completeness and clarity. So the use of italicized words in the KJV is not consistent.

translation, and they cannot be condemned--they do not alter the original message. All theories of translation must employ these principles, and the use of all of them is observed in the KJV. When these principles are observed in a "dynamic equivalence" translation, they are no more "diabolical" than when observed in the KJV.[22] The following are a few examples of the many instances where the KJV translators and revisers used these principles:

Add Words for Completeness

Often the KJV translators added words that were clearly implied in the Hebrew text but necessary for completeness in the English. These usually are indicated by the use of italicized words:

Ref.	Literal Hebrew	KJV Rephrasing
Gen 24:60	be thou thousands of millions	be thou *the mother of* thousands of millions
Exod 12:36	they lent unto them	they lent unto them *such things as they required*
Lev 24:16	the name	the name *of the LORD*
1 Sam 16:7	not what man seeth	*the LORD seeth* not as man seeth
2 Kings 23:19	provoke to anger	provoke *the LORD* to anger
2 Chr 3:1	which was seen by David	where *the LORD* appeared unto David

---

[22] The misuse of these principles in dynamic equivalence may occur because the theory permits the translator the freedom to change sentence types and structures, and to more freely paraphrase. This is permitted in order to improve understandability, readability, or literary style of the translated message. Improvement of these features of the translation is usually acquired at the expense of degradation of accuracy. When this freedom is exercised moderately no serious degradation occurs--certainly not that worthy of the term "diabolical." Principles that are common to all theories of translation are not unique to any. Only those principles (or special applications of them) that are unique to dynamic equivalence are specifically characteristic of that theory. If Waite does not like dynamic equivalence, he should criticize its unique characteristics, not those shared with all other theories.

| Est 9:25 | when she came | when *Esther* came[23] |
| Isa 38:16 | by these they live | by these *things men* live |

Omit Unnecessary Words

At times the KJV translators omitted words that were redundant in the Hebrew text, or not necessary in English:

Ref.	Literal Hebrew	KJV Rephrasing
Gen 25:8	Then he gave up the ghost and he died Abraham	Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died
Gen 45:4	whom you sold me into Egypt	whom you sold into Egypt
Exod 3:5	the place which you are standing on it	the place whereon thou standest
Num 22:30	your donkey which you have ridden on me	thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden
Judg 21:11	known a man by lying with a male	lain by man

Word to Phrase

Often the KJV translates a single Hebrew word by an English phrase:

Ref.	Hebrew Word	KJV Phrase
Gen 25:8	*sabea'*	full *of years*
Judg 2:12	*yak'isu*	provoked to anger
1 Sam 24:8	*yishtachu*	bowed himself
Ezek 1:4	*mithlaqqachat*	infolding itself

Phrase to Word

Often the KJV translates a Hebrew phrase by a single English word:

Ref.	Hebrew Phrase	KJV Word

---

[23] Occasionally, as in this case, the KJV translators supplied the antecedent of a pronoun that otherwise would be ambiguous or likely to be misunderstood.

Gen 8:3	going and returning	continually
Gen 13:8	men brethren	brethren
Gen 29:17	nice of form	beautiful
Gen 33:11	all things	enough
Gen 34:3	to the heart of	kindly
Gen 37:19	master of dreams	dreamer
Ref.	Hebrew Phrase	KJV Word
Gen 42:7	hard things with	roughly
Gen 44:1	him that is over	steward
Gen 45:16	was good in the eyes of	pleased
Gen 48:17	was evil in the eyes of	displeased

Change Word Order

Very often the KJV translators changed the order of the words in a Hebrew phrase, clause, or sentence in order to provide the correct order in English:

Ref.	Literal Hebrew Phrase	KJV Rephrasing
Gen 25:8	old age good	good old age
2 Sam 11:2	good of appearance very	very beautiful to look upon
Gen 25:8	Then he gave up the ghost and he died Abraham	Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died

Paraphrase

Often the KJV translators paraphrased an awkward Hebrew expression into a good complete equivalent expression in English:

Ref.	Hebrew Expression	KJV Expression
Gen 32:10	I am less than all	I am not worthy of the least of all
Gen 33:9	be that to thee that is thine	keep that thou hast to thyself
Gen 33:14	according to the foot of the work that is before me and according to the foot of the children	according as the cattle that goeth before me and the children be able

Gen 37:1	of his father's sojournings	wherein his father was a stranger
Gen 37:14	see the peace of thy brethren	see whether it be well with thy brethren
Num 4:23	to war the warfare	to perform the service

Interpret Idioms

Often a Hebrew idiom would make little or no sense in the literal translation of it into English, so the KJV translators had to interpret the Hebrew and provide an exact idiom in English:

Ref.	Hebrew Idiom	KJV English Idiom
Gen 29:1	lift up his feet	went on his journey
Gen 29:6	Is there peace to him?	*Is* he well?
Gen 30:30	at my feet	since my coming
Gen 31:2	as yesterday and the day before	as before
Gen 31:20	the heart of Laban	unawares to Laban
Gen 32:24	ascending of the morning	breaking of the day
Gen 34:26	mouth of the sword	edge of the sword
Gen 35:16	a little piece of ground	a little way to come
Gen 38:14	the door of eyes	an open place
Gen 47:8	How many are the days of the years of thy life?	How old art thou?

Obviously the KJV translators used all the above principles frequently. Yet Waite defends the KJV as a translation that has not altered the message of the Hebrew text. So he cannot legitimately criticize other translations that use the same principles and do not alter the message.

Revising the KJV

When an existing translation, such as the KJV, is revised, as in the case of the 1769 revision by Benjamin Blayney[24] or the NKJV of 1982, the revisers must use

essentially the same principles. None of these principles degrade the accuracy and literary style of the old translation, but rather improve them without altering the original message. The use of these principles should not be erroneously labeled "diabolical dynamic equivalence." The following is a list of the necessary revising principles, with a few examples used in the 1769 revision:

(1) **Change one word for another:** a word in the old translation must be changed in the revision whenever the old word is obsolete, archaic, or has changed meaning in the passage of time. Also the old word must be changed when evidence indicates that it was an unjustifiable rendering of the original message.

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
Gen 6:5	God	GOD[25]
Gen 39:16	her lord	his lord
Num 6:14	lambe	ram
Josh 3:15	at	all
Josh 7:26	the place	that place
Ruth 3:15	he	she
1 Sam 10:23	the shoulders	his shoulders
1 Kings 8:61	your	our
2 Chr 32:5	prepared	repaired
2 Chr 28:11	God	the LORD
Psa 69:32	good	God
Jer 49:1	God	Gad
1 Cor 15:6	And	After

(2) **Add a word for completeness of thought:** a word must be added to provide the complete content of the Hebrew message. It may be required because of the shift in meaning of English idiom since 1611, or because the KJV originally left something out.

---

[24] The current editions of the KJV are of the Benjamin Blayney 1769 revision, not that of 1611.

[25] The word *God* with only the first letter capitalized is the rendering of the Hebrew divine name *Elohim*, whereas the word *GOD* with all capital letters is the rendering of the Hebrew divine name *Yahweh*, the sacred tetragram, sometimes rendered *JEHOVAH*.

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
Ex 15:25	made	made for them
Ex 21:32	sheckels	sheckels of silver
Ex 35:11	[lacking]	his boards
1 Sam 18:27	David arose	David arose and went
1 Kings 9:11	Solomon	king Solomon
2 Kings 11:10	temple	temple of the LORD
Eccl 8:17	[lacking]	yet he shall not find *it*
Isa 34:11	[lacking]	But
Jer 38:16	the king	Zedekiah the king
Dan 3:15	a fiery furnace	a burning fiery furnace
Mal 4:2	shall go forth	ye shall go forth

(3) **Delete a word:** a word in the old translation may be deleted if it is redundant and unnecessary for the completeness of the message, or if it was inaccurately added by the KJV translators.

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
Ex 37:19	made he	made
2 Sam 11:1	that after the year	after the year
Jer 40:5	all the cities	the cities
Zech 11:2	all the mighty	the mighty
1 Cor 12:28	helps in governments	helps, governments
Heb 12:1	unto the race	the race

(4) **Replace a word with a phrase:** a word in the old translation must be changed to a phrase in the revision whenever the old word no longer expresses the complete meaning of the original message.

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
Jer 31:14	goodness	my goodness
Jer 35:13	inhabitants	the inhabitants
Amos 1:11	kept	he kept

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
Matt 6:3	right	right hand
1 Cor 15:41	moon	glory of the moon
1 Tim 1:4	edifying	godly edifying

(5) **Replace a phrase with a single word:** a phrase in the old translation may be replaced by a single word in the revision that expresses the complete meaning of the original message. This is important especially where literary style or clarity are involved.

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
2 Kings 13:24	the king	king
Prov 10:23	a sport	sport
Isa 28:4	seeth it	seeth

(6) **Replace a phrase with another phrase:** as in the case of words, a phrase in the old translation must be changed in the revision whenever the old phrase is obsolete, archaic, or has changed meaning in the passage of time. Also the old phrase must be changed when evidence indicates that it was an unjustifiable rendering of the original message.

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
Mark 5:6	he came	he ran
Mark 10:18	no man good	none good

(7) **Rearrange word order:** the order of the words in a phrase, or the phrases in a clause of the old translation must be changed whenever the old order is archaic, or not part of current standard English idiom. Also the word order may be changed in order to correct awkward style.

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
2 Kings 23:21	this book of the covenant	the book of this covenant
Job 4:6	confidence; the uprightness of thy ways and thy hope?	confidence, thy hope, and the uprightness of

		thy ways?
Dan 6:13	the captivity of the	the children of the
	children	captivity

(8) **Interpretive paraphrase:** whenever an idiom or figure of speech in the old translation has become obsolete, archaic, or has changed meaning in the passage of time, then the reviser must employ interpretive paraphrase in order to provide the complete equivalent expression in the revision.

Ref.	KJV 1611	KJV 1769
1 Kings 6:1	fourscore	eightieth
1 Kings 15:14	Asa his heart	Asa's heart
Est 3:4	Mordecai his matters	Mordecai's matters

Since the KJV translators and their subsequent revisers employed these principles, it is inconsistent for Waite to criticize the NKJV revisers for using the same principles. In the discussion of Waite's categories that follow, I refer to these principles as part of the explanation of what actually happened in the NKJV in contrast to Waite's false categories of addition, subtraction, and change.[26] In addition, footnotes are used for more detailed explanation as needed.

Category #1

In Waite's Category #1 he states:

THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION ADDS WORDS [Cf. DOCUMENTATION, p. 1]. There are 13 illustrations of the NKJV's ADDING to the Words of God. The "ADDING" of words to the WORDS OF GOD is prohibited throughout the Bible. Revelation 22:18 is

---

[26] Waite's categories refer to additions, subtractions, and changes of the KJV (1769) text, but his examples do not represent additions, subtractions, and changes of the original message. His reference to the underlying Hebrew text is with respect to a rigidly literal rendering of the text. In most of his examples the Hebrew is somewhat idiomatic and cannot be translated in a rigidly literal fashion.

especially appropriate. Yet, the NKJV <u>ADDS</u> nouns, prepositional phrases, pronouns, and verbs. Words are <u>ADDED</u> such as "family," "Moses," "God," "Jewish," "Jesus," "open your hearts," "Jews," "at the mouth," "with her head," "supports," "aroused," and "broke." Not a one of these ADDED WORDS is in the Hebrew or Greek text that underlies the KJV![27]

Misrepresents Rephrasing

Almost all of Waite's examples of adding words are really rephrasing of old phrases into better phrases.[28] At times the new phrase has less words than the phrase it replaces so it is hard to imagine how Waite perceives an addition in those cases. The new phrase is an equally clear expression of the original message, and sometimes better; and, contrary to Waite's allegations, the new phrases do indeed represent the underlying Hebrew text. The following is the list of Waite's examples of "adding" adjectives, I deal only with those from the Old Testament:

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Judg 20:13	children of Belial	perverted men[29]	8

---

[27] Waite, "Defects," p. 16; unusual emphasis his.

[28] Waite essentially admitted this in his introductory remarks: "All the former 585 examples of the category known as 'PARAPHRASE' were changed into either ADDITIONS, SUBTRACTIONS, or CHANGES" ("The New King James Version Compared to the King James Version and the Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts," Revised Edition, October 15, 1987, p. iv; the capitalization of words for emphasis is his). All of Waite's examples to which I respond are taken from this document. His later revision must have reduced the number of "additions," because he mentions only 13 here, but this document lists several more--more evidence of his vacillation. He changed the names of his category because the examples are not really due to paraphrasing but to rephrasing, which is not forbidden in the Bible. So he renamed them with names that fit into the Biblical prohibition. But none of his examples are genuine additions or subtractions. Waite uses this scare tactic as a screen to hide his KJV-only agenda.

[29] The phrase "children of Belial" is an idiom in Hebrew that is not easily understood in English. It needs an explanation by the "preacher." The NKJV provides an phrase in English easy to understand and consistent with the Hebrew idiom. Idioms must be rephrased.

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Judg 19:22	sons of Belial	perverted men	8
2 Kings 4:16	according to the time of life	about this time next year[30] 8	
1 Chr 16:23	shew forth	proclaim the good news[31]	6
2 Chr 2:1	house for his kingdom	royal house[32]	6
2 Chr 2:11	father	master craftsman[33]	4
2 Chr 4:16	father	master craftsman	4
Psa 30:4	holiness	holy name[34]	4
Psa 97:12	holiness	holy name	4
Ezek 44:25	sister that hath no husband	unmarried sister[35]	5

---

[30] The phrase "according to the time of life" in this context is a Hebrew idiom that refers to the nine month period of gestation. It is not a common expression in English, and requires an explanation by the "preacher." The NKJV provides a phrase in English easy to understand and consistent with the Hebrew idiom.

[31] The Hebrew verb *bisser* means to proclaim good news. The KJV *shew forth* misses the sense of the Hebrew here. It misses the reference to verbal proclamation and the good nature of the news. The NKJV has made the text closer to the message of the Hebrew text.

[32] The expression "house of his kingdom" is a Hebrew idiom for "royal house." The idiom is not clear in English. The NKJV provides the complete equivalent idiom in English.

[33] The reference should be 2 Chr 2:13 also 4:16. The KJV text implies that Huram was the natural father of the King of Tyre. However 1 Kings 7:14 states that his mother was a widow of the tribe of Naphtali and his deceased father was a man of Tyre. Thus the word "father" is used in an idiomatic sense which, according to the Hebrew Lexicon, means in this context an artificer or "master craftsman" (BDB, 3.8). The NKJV provides in English the complete equivalent of the Hebrew idiom.

[34] The context refers to the Lord's character as manifest by his name, so the word *holiness* includes the concept of the Lord's name.

[35] The NKJV provides a simpler phrase that is faithful to the Hebrew message.

The following is the list of Waite's examples of "adding" adverbs:

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Num 31:17	known man by lying with him	known a man intimately[36]	5, 8
Num 31:18	known a man by lying with him	known a man intimately	5, 8
Num 31:35	known a man by lying with him	known a man intimately	5, 8
Judg 21:11	lain by man	known man intimately	5, 8
Judg 21:12	lying with any male	known a man intimately	5, 8

Waite listed only one example of "adding" a conjunction:

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Gen 29: 30	he went in	Jacob also went in	2, 7

The NKJV legitimately changed numerous conjunctions, but this is not an example. As usual Waite carelessly handled the evidence. He misquoted the KJV which reads "he went in also," so the NKJV did not omit a conjunction. Possibly he meant to classify this as "adds a noun," because the NKJV did provide the antecedent of the pronoun "he." However, this was necessary, because otherwise the antecedent may be confused with Laban (vs. 29) which is the most recently mentioned masculine noun in the immediate context. Surely Waite does not want to defend a reading that might be confused to erroneously report a case of incest!

The following is the list of Waite's examples of "adding" nouns:

---

[36] These are five examples of the same Hebrew idiom which literally is "know a man by lying with a male." The KJV translated this idiom three different ways, in three instances by substituting the pronoun *him* in place of "a male," and twice by mild paraphrase in which the word "lying" is omitted, and where once the word "male" is omitted (Judg 21:11), and once the word "man" is omitted (Judg 21:12). Waite should criticize the KJV translators for violating the criterion by which he judges the NKJV. The NKJV rendered the idiom consistently with the current equivalent idiom in English that is well understood and that does not alter the original message. Note also Waite's inconsistency: he misquoted the KJV in Num 31:35, and he misquoted the NKJV in Judg 21:11.

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle	
Num 36:2	my lord to give	my lord Moses to give[37]	2	
Judg 4:10	at his feet	men under his command[38]		8
Judg 13:2	bare not	had no children[39]	6	
Judg 13:3	bearest not	have borne no children		6

------

[37] The word "lord" is ambiguous here without the explanatory modifier "Moses." The identity of the "lord" as Moses is in the broader context which many readers may not recognize. Waite failed to note that the added NKJV word is in italics following the standard practice the KJV used when it adds words for clarity.

[38] Waite falsely gives the impression that the NKJV added the word "men," but the KJV text reads "men at his feet." The Hebrew idiom "at his feet" in this context is used to refer to the men under his command who were following him. In English the idiom conveys the idea of prostration before someone (1 Sam 25:24; 2 Kings 4:37; Est 8:3; Matt 5:22; Mark 7:25; Luke 17:16, etc.). So the Hebrew idiom needs to be replaced by its complete equivalent idiom in English.

[39] The Hebrew word *yaladah* means *to have or give birth to a child.* The KJV *bare* has a variety of possible meanings. The NKJV rendering is more explicitly faithful to the Hebrew. Waite is wrong is saying that the NKJV rendering is not found in the underlying Hebrew. The same is true of the next example in Judg 13:3.

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
2 Sam 14:26	head	hair of his head[40]	4
1 Chr 16:23	shew forth	proclaim the good news[41]	6
Est 9:25	had devised	Haman had devised[42] 2	
Job 9:4	he is wise	God is wise[43] 2	
Job 15:16	he puteth no trust	God puts no trust	2
Job 24:22	he draweth	God draws	2
Psa 40:9	I have preached	I have proclaimed the good news[44]	4
Eccl 7:21	words that are spoken everything people say[45] 6		

[40] Waite erroneously gives the impression that the words "hair of his" are added. Actually the KJV reads "polled his head." The common meaning of the English word "poll" is to take a vote. Its less common meaning "cut the hair" is not widely uses and understood today. The NKJV replaced the uncommon word with its complete equivalent phrase that is well understood.

[41] Waite previously classified this same example as an addition of an adjective. See the explanation already given there.

[42] The name *Haman* was supplied as the antecedent of the pronoun "he" which is ambiguous in this text. A reader might misunderstand the antecedent as King Ahasuerus, the most recently mentioned masculine noun in the preceding context. This would erroneously attribute the wicked plot to the king instead of Haman. Waite criticizes the NKJV for supplying an antecedent of a pronoun in the very verse where the KJV also supplied the antecedent Esther for the pronoun "she." Also Waite failed to note that the name *Haman* is in italics.

[43] Like the preceding example, in this and the next two examples the NKJV supplied the antecedent of an ambiguous pronoun. In each case the pronoun could refer to a previously mentioned man.

[44] The Hebrew verb *bisser* means to proclaim good news. The KJV "*preached*" misses the full sense of the Hebrew here. It misses the good nature of the news proclaimed. The NKJV has made the text closer to the Hebrew text.

[45] Waite failed to include all the pertinent KJV words which should be "all words that are spoken." Literally the Hebrew text says here: "To all the words that they speak do not set your heart." The KJV translators paraphrased the Hebrew "set your heart" as "take heed," and they paraphrased the active voice in the phrase "all the words that they speak" as though it were passive "all words that are spoken." The NKJV is closer to the literal

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Lam 3:28	he hath borne	God has laid[46]	2

The following is the list of Waite's examples of "adding" a prepositional phrase:

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Ex 12:11	loins girded	with a belt on your waist[47]	6
Josh 7:3	they are but few	the people of Ai are few[48]	2
Judg 17:5	house of gods	shrine[49]	5
Ezek 16:46	left hand	to the north of you[50]	6

Hebrew, and it supplies the obvious antecedent "people" for the ambiguous pronoun "they." Waite is wrong in saying that the NKJV wording is not found in the underlying Hebrew text. I wonder if he really looked at it.

[46] As in previous examples, the NKJV has supplied the antecedent for an other wise ambiguous pronoun, just like the KJV did in verse 26--*a man.*

[47] In modern English parlance, the Hebrew verb *chagar* means to gird oneself with a belt or sash. In Bible times the expression "gird up your loins" was an idiom for getting ready for action such as work, travel, or war. Today the loins may be understood as the reproductive organs. The KJV expression may be confused for "put on a loin cloth." The NKJV provides the complete equivalent in modern English idiom.

[48] This is another example of the NKJV providing the antecedent for an otherwise ambiguous pronoun. Waite did not note that the NKJV words *the people of Ai* are in italics, nor that the KJV added the word *but* in italics.

[49] Waite erroneously classified this example as one that added a prepositional phrase. Perhaps the reader can find the invisible phrase. Waite is wrong in saying this rendering is not found in the underlying Hebrew text. What he means is that it is not a rigidly literal rendering of the Hebrew words. Actually the word *shrine* is an accurate rendering of the Hebrew idiom.

[50] In this and the next example, Waite erroneously gives the impression that the words *of you* are added by the NKJV. The complete KJV quotation is "at thy left hand" and "at thy right hand." So no words were added. The phrase "of you" is the complete equivalent of "thy," and the preposition "to" is the complete equivalent of "at" in this context. The Hebrew expressions "left hand" and "right hand" are idioms for north and

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Ezek 16:46	right hand	to the south of you	6

In conclusion, Waite's examples of "adding" words are merely cases of rephrasing of difficult words or phrases in the KJV which fail to clearly represent the Hebrew message. The NKJV, far from departing from the Hebrew text, actually provides phrasing that is closer to the meaning of the Hebrew message.

Category #2

In Waite's Category #2 he states:

THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION CHANGES NOUNS TO PRONOUNS [Cf. DOCUMENTATION, pp. 2-4]. There are 25 illustrations of the NKJV's CHANGING OF NOUNS TO PRONOUNS. This is in addition to four other "CHANGES" (p. 2). When God says "MOSES" took the blood, the NKJV has no right to change this NOUN into the pronoun, "HE" took the blood. The same goes for when the NKJV CHANGES "priest" to "he"; "son" to "one"; "soul" to "yourself," "myself," "me," "him," "I," "you," "himself," "ourselves," "yourselves," or "themselves." Not a one of these CHANGED WORDS is in the Hebrew or Greek text that underlies the KJV![51]

Misrepresents the Reflexive

In this category, Waite misunderstands or misrepresents the Hebrew idiom for the reflexive voice. In Hebrew, the word נֶפֶשׁ (*nephesh* = soul) is

_____

south in this context. The NKJV provides a clearer rendering of the actual Hebrew message.

[51] Waite, "Defects," pp. 16-17; unusual emphasis his.

translated in the KJV by 27 different English words,[52] and it frequently expresses the concept of *self*[53] or it expresses the reflexive (BDB 660, 4.b). In this reflexive sense, the KJV translators rendered the word as a reflexive pronoun 21 times.[54] In addition, the KJV translates the word with personal pronouns several times, evidently with respect to the reflexive idiom.[55] So Waite criticizes the NKJV for doing exactly the same thing as the KJV translators did, only in additional places where current English idiom does not use the word *soul* as the expression of the reflexive. All the examples below that involve the word *soul* are instances of the self or the reflexive voice which more accurately should use a pronoun or reflexive pronoun. They involve principle (1) on the basis of replacing an outmoded word with a more accurate one. So I do not comment on the individual examples that involve the word *soul*.

The following is the list of Waite's examples of "changing" nouns to pronouns:

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Exod 30:15	souls	for yourselves	1

---

[52] According to Young's Concordance, the word is translated *any* 4 times, *appetite* 2, *beast* 2, *body* 7, *breath* 1, *creature* 9, *dead* (body) 8, *desire* 5, *ghost* 2, *heart* 15, *life* 119, *lust* 2, *man* 3, *mind* 15, *one* 1, *own* 1, *person* 30, *self* 19, *soul* 428, *thing* 2, *will* 4, *fish* 1, *hearty* 1, *mortal* 1, *will* (vb.) 1, *would have it* 1, and 7 times with another Hebrew word translated as a single English word.

[53] According to Young's Concordance, 19 times.

[54] Himself (1 Kings 19:4; Job 18:4; 32:2; Jer 51:14; Amos 2:14, 15; 6:8; Jon 4:8); herself (Isa 5:14; Jer 3:11); myself (Psa 131:2); yourselves (Lev 11:43, 44; Deut 4:15; Josh 23:11; Jer 17:21; 37:9); themselves (Est 9:31; Isa 46:2; 47:14) and thyself (Est 4:13).

[55] According to Strong's Concordance it is translated *he, she, me, and them*; but the number of times and the references were not provided.

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Lev 8:23	Moses took of the blood	he took some of its blood[56]	2
Num 5:21	priest shall say	he shall say[57]	3
Deut 4:9	soul	myself	1
1 Chr 29:5	service	himself[58]	6

---

[56] Waite did not give the complete context here. He leads his readers to believe that the NKJV excluded Moses from the verse by replacing his name with a pronoun. However, the KJV reads: "And he slew *it;* and Moses took of the blood . . ."; where as the NKJV reads: "and Moses killed *it.* Also he took *some* of the blood . . ." The NKJV did not remove Moses from the verse. This involves the proper identity of the antecedent of the pronoun in this context. The KJV rendering implies the possibility that Aaron killed the ram of consecration and that Moses took the blood; that is, the first pronoun is ambiguous. But this event was the consecration of Aaron and his sons for their ministry in the tabernacle. Aaron was not qualified to kill sacrifices until after his consecration. So the NKJV supplied the antecedent for the ambiguous pronoun. This made the redundant repetition of the name Moses unnecessary. The NKJV unambiguously renders the Hebrew text closer to the intent of the original message. The same situation exists also in verses 15 and 19 which Waite did not mention. This is like what the KJV translators did in Gen 25:8, where the literal Hebrew reads: "Then he gave up the ghost, and Abraham died," whereas the KJV renders the text: "Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died."

[57] This example is similar to the one in Lev 8:23 above. Waite gives the false impression that the NKJV omits the priest from the verse. However, the KJV reads: "Then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of cursing, and the priest shall say unto the woman . . ."; whereas the NKJV reads: "The priest shall put the woman under the oath of the curse, and he shall say to the woman . . ." The NKJV did not omit the priest from the verse, but rather deleted an unnecessarily redundant word from the text that is perfectly clear without it. This is similar to the practice of the KJV translators of omitting redundant or unnecessary words in other places. See examples listed earlier.

[58] Waite failed to represent the complete statement so as to give his readers the impression that the NKJV replaced a legitimate Hebrew word with a pronoun. The complete KJV statement is "consecrate his service" the two principle words of which are not in the Hebrew text which literally says "fill his hand." This is a Hebrew idiom which means *to consecrate oneself* to a task. The KJV interpreted the idiom, and so did the NKJV. However, the NKJV is closer to the original message. The word service is interpreted from the context, which in this case needs no interpretation.

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Neh 3:8	son of	one of[59]	6
Job 9:21	soul	myself	1
Job 15:2	belly	himself[60]	1
Job 40:7	gird up thy loins	prepare yourself[61]	1
Psa 3:2	soul	me	1
Psa 6:4	soul	me	1
Psa 7:2	soul	me	1
Psa 7:5	soul	me	1
Psa 22:20	soul	me	1
Psa 22:29	soul	himself	1
Psa 35:13	soul	myself	1
Psa 49:18	soul	himself	1
Psa 109:31	soul	him	1
Prov 11:21	hand join in hand	though they join forces[62]	6

---

[59] Waite failed to give the complete statement. The literal Hebrew text reads "the son of the perfumers." KJV reads: "son of *one of* the apothecaries," whereas the NKJV reads "one of the perfumers," with a footnote reading "the son." The word *son* is not used in its literal sense here, otherwise the name of the father would have been supplied. Instead, it means *one who practices the trade of* the named profession. The KJV tried to resolve the problem by adding the words *one of,* whereas the NKJV rendered the word *son* according to its figurative meaning in this context. The KJV, missing the professional intent of the word *son*, renders the text as though the person was a son of a perfumer, but not necessarily a perfumer himself. The NKJV is closer to the intent of the original Hebrew message.

[60] The Hebrew word is used figuratively to refer to the self. The word is obviously used figuratively here. One does not literally fill his belly with the east wind.

[61] This Hebrew idiom is usually used figuratively to mean *to prepare oneself* for a task. Here it is best interpreted, because the occasion is not a normal task, but that of being interrogated by God.

[62] The literal Hebrew idiom, as the KJV renders it, is not understood in current English usage. The NKJV provides the complete equivalent English idiom that accurately expresses the intent of the original message without altering it.

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Prov 31:17	loins	herself[63]	1
Eccl 6:2	soul	himself	1
Song 1:7	soul	I	1
Song 3:1	soul	I	1
Song 3:2	soul	I	1
Song 3:3	soul	I	1
Song 3:4	soul	I	1
Isa 51:23	soul	you	1
Jer 9:9	my soul be avenged	shall I not avenge myself[64]	1, 6
Jer 26:19	souls	ourselves	1
Jer 51:45	soul	himself	1
Ezek 14:7	face	him[65]	6
Ezek 14:14	souls	themselves	1
Ezek 18:27	soul	himself	1

---

[63] "Girding the loins with strength" is a figurative use of the term *loins*. The figure refers to the person, the self, not the waist. One cannot literally wrap strength around one's waist. The NKJV provides the complete equivalent figure in current English usage. It does not alter the intent of the original message.

[64] Literally the Hebrew reads: "Shall not My soul avenge itself?" The verb is reflexive, not passive as the KJV renders it; and the word *soul* is used idiomatically as a reference to self. It is a matter of who does the avenging, God or man. The reflexive verb makes it clear: God avenges Himself; He needs no other avenger. Contrary to Waite's false accusation, the NKJV is a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew text.

[65] Waite did not present the complete expression. He gives his readers the false impression that the NKJV changed a significant Hebrew word into a pronoun, but the Hebrew expression contains the pronoun used in the NKJV. The Hebrew words involved are פָּנָיו נֹכַח (*nokach panaw*) which literally means "before the face of him." But the word "face" is used in conjunction with many prepositions to signify various nuances of "before" or "in front of," and so is actually part of the English preposition "before" as rendered in the NKJV. Thus the NKJV does not omit the word *face*, nor does it replace it with the pronoun *him*, as Waite erroneously alleges. In this context, the emphasis is not on the idolater's face, but on the position of prominence given to his idol. The NKJV puts the emphasis in the place consistent with the original Hebrew message.

In conclusion regarding Waite's category #2, his examples do represent changes of nouns to pronouns, but they are necessary changes due to the idiomatic use of the nouns that refer to self. The rigidly literal translation of the Hebrew words produce non-idiomatic expressions in modern standard English.

Misunderstands Figures of Speech

Waite listed a number of examples of "changing" nouns to verbs. Most of these consist of changing the KJV word *ears* to the NKJV word *hearing*.[66] With his credentials in English, Waite should know that the word *hearing* is not a finite verb, as his allegation implies, but it is a participle which often functions as a substantive, that is, as a noun. So his allegation is technically wrong. Furthermore, in all the references listed, the word *ears* is used figuratively, not literally. The figure of speech is known as metonymy--the use of the name of an organ or instrument for the function of it. The figure does not mean that the thing spoken was spoken directly into a person's ears, but rather spoken so that the person could hear it. This figure of speech could easily be misunderstood by contemporary English readers, so the NKJV rendered the figure according to its actual meaning of the original Hebrew message.

Category #3

In Waite's Category #3 he states:

> THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION CHANGES THE NUMBER OF PRONOUNS [Cf. DOCUMENTATION, pp. 4-5]. There are 22 illustrations of the NKJV's CHANGING THE NUMBER OF PRONOUNS. Though there are other examples, this includes the NKJV's CHANGING of "he" to "they"; "him" to "them"; "his" to "their"; "it" to "they"; "me" to "us"; "my" to "our"; "them" to "him"; "them" to "it"; and "they" to "he". Not one of these CHANGED PRONOUN NUMBERS is in the Hebrew or Greek text that underlies the KJV![67]

---

[66] The references are: 2 Sam 3:19; 2 Kings 23:2; Isa 22:14; Jer 2:2; Jer 28:7; Jer 29:19 [sic, 29]; Jer 36:10, 13, 14, 15 twice, 20, 21 twice.

[67] Waite, "Defects," p. 17; unusual emphasis his.

Misunderstands Collectives

In this category, Waite demonstrates that he misunderstands or misrepresents the role of the number attribute in translation, particularly with respect to pronouns. The laws of pronouns differ from one language to another--that is, a pronoun must agree with the number, gender, and person of its antecedent. But the way one language views number, gender, and person is somewhat different than the way another language does. For example, Hebrew has only two genders (masculine and feminine) whereas English has three (masculine, feminine, and neuter). What English refers to as *it* Hebrew must refer to as either *he* or *she*, regardless of the actual gender of the entity.

Likewise, the way one language views collective nouns differs from one language to another. Hebrew may refer to the collective action of a group such as a nation or tribe in the singular, whereas current English idiom usually requires the plural. After all, it is not the nation or tribe as an entity that eats, besieges, or destroys, but its citizens. So an English translation must follow the conventions of contemporary standard English usage and agreement of the pronouns, not that of literal Hebrew or even those of 1611--the English language has changed for some of these conventions.

The following is the list of Waite's examples of "changing" the number attribute of pronouns:

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Deut 28:51a	he shall eat	they shall eat[68]	1

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Deut 28:51b	he have destroyed thee	they have destroyed you	1
Deut 28:52a	he shall besiege thee	they shall besiege you	1
Deut 28:52b	he shall besiege thee	they shall besiege you	1

---

[68] The antecedent of this pronoun (as well as that of the other examples from Deut 28) is a nation (vs. 49). English no longer refers to a nation with the pronoun *he,* but with *it.* However, the action attributed to the nation--eating, destroying, besieging-- must be that of its citizens, not of the nation as an entity. The NKJV follows current English convention by having the pronoun agree with the plural citizens of the nation.

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle	
Josh 17:14a	me	us[69]	1	
Josh 17:14b	me	us		1
Judg 1:19	he drave out	they drove out[70]		1
Judg 1:33	he dwelt	they dwelt[71]	1	
Judg 11:19	my place	our place[72]		1
1 Sam 30:16	them	him[73]		1
1 Kings 16:7	him	them[74]		1
Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle	
Job 27:15	his widows	their widows[75]		1

[69] Similar to the Deuteronomy 28 examples, the antecedent of the pronoun is *the children of Joseph*. So the NKJV correctly uses the plural to refer to the plural antecedent.

[70] Similar to the above examples, the antecedent of this pronoun is Judah, the tribe, not the patriarch. So the NKJV correctly uses the plural to refer to the members of the tribe.

[71] Like the above examples, the antecedent of this pronoun is Naphtali, the tribe, not the patriarch.

[72] Like the above examples, the antecedent of the pronoun is Israel. The KJV reads here: "Let us pass, we pray, through thy land into my place." Although the KJV and the Hebrew are inconsistent in this verse, the NKJV renders the pronouns consistently according to current English convention.

[73] The KJV and NKJV have the same pronouns in this verse. No change was made.

[74] From the context, the antecedent of the pronoun is *the house[hold] of Jeroboam* that he killed (15:29). The Hebrew pronoun is singular as it frequently is when referring to a collective entity. However, the singular pronoun *him* in the KJV implies that the LORD judged Baasha for killing only Jeroboam. But the LORD judged him not for one murder, but for the slaughter of a whole household. Thus the NKJV uses the pronoun *them* to properly convey the intent of the original Hebrew message according to contemporary English convention.

[75] From the context, the antecedent of the pronoun must be "those who survive him." They are the ones who are said to die and be buried, so it must be their widows who will not mourn their death. However, the NKJV had a marginal note indicating that the literal Hebrew reads *his*.

Isa 53:9	he made his grave	they made his grave[76]	1
Jer 18:8	them	it[77]	1
Ezek 44:21	they enter	he enters[78]	1
Micah 7:12	he shall come	they shall come[79]	1
Micah 7:15	him	them[79]	1
Zech 9:17b	his beauty	their beauty[80]	1
Zech 9:17a	his goodness	their goodness[80]	1

In conclusion regarding Waite's category # 3, the NKJV did change the number attribute of some KJV pronouns. But this was necessary to maintain consistency of the number attribute according to current English convention regarding collective nouns and their pronouns of reference.

Category #4

In Waite's Category #4 he states:

---

[76] The context seems to imply that the antecedent of the pronoun is Messiah, but Messiah did not select his Own grave site. The Romans planned to bury Him with the criminals, but after His death, they granted Joseph of Arimathea permission to bury Him in his tomb. So the NKJV uses a plural pronoun here, but with a marginal note reading "Lit. *he* or *He.*"

[77] The pronoun refers to the nation as an entity. The NKJV uses the pronoun consistent with current English usage for such a reference.

[78] The antecedent of the pronoun is "any priest" (KJV), so the pronoun that refers to any priest should be singular.

[79] The antecedent of the pronoun is the captives. So the NKJV uses the plural following current English convention, with a marginal note reading: "Lit. *him*, collective for the captives."

[80] The antecedent of the pronoun is the crown. So current editions of the NKJV read *its* according to current English convention, with a marginal note reading: "Lit, *his*." The first edition of the NKJV read "their" referring to the jewels in the crown, with the same note.

THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION CHANGES THE PERSON OF
PRONOUNS [Cf. DOCUMENTATION p. 6]. There are 8 illustrations of
the NKJV's CHANGING THE PERSON OF PRONOUNS. This includes
the NKJV's CHANGING of "her" to "your"; "his" to "your"; "me" to
"you"; "thee" to "him"; "their" to "our"; "them" to "your"; "they" to "I";
and "you" to "them". Not a one of these CHANGED PRONOUN
PERSONS is in the Hebrew or Greek text that underlies the KJV![81]

Misunderstands Direct Address

   In this category, Waite misunderstands or misrepresents Hebrew idiom in direct
discourse. Often in direct discourse, Hebrew idiom shifts from second person to third
without a change in reference. Likewise, often in indirect discourse, Hebrew idiom shifts
from third person to second without a change in reference. Contemporary English usage
does not permit such switches; they create the impression that the referent has changed
when it has not. In most of the examples Waite lists, the context is clear that the referent
has not changed, otherwise the text would be self contradictory. The NKJV has made the
pronouns consistent with contemporary English convention in order to avoid the false
impression that the reference has changed in the discourse. Thus the NKJV more
accurately renders the intent of the original Hebrew message.

   The following is the list of Waite's examples of "changing" the person attribute of
pronouns:

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Neh 1:5	love him and observe	love you and observe	
	his commandments	your commandments[82]	1
Jer 34:14	thee	him[83]	1

---

[81] Waite, "Defects," pp. 17-18; unusual emphasis his.

[82] The person of address is the LORD, and it is obvious the speaker is not
referring to loving someone else, nor to observing the commandments of someone else.

[83] The discourse here is indirect, and contemporary English convention requires
the pronouns to remain in the third person, whereas Hebrew idiom may switch to second
person.

Jer 42:21	me unto you	you by me[84]	1
Ezek 11:19	you	them[85]	1
Hos 10:10	they shall bind themselves	I bind them[86]	1
Micah 2:6	them	you[87]	1

---

[84] Waite erroneously alleges that the person of the pronouns have been changed. This is a matter of improved translation. The Hebrew can be translated either way, and the NKJV renders the text more consistent with itself. The prophet rebuked the remnant of Judah for not obeying the voice of the LORD, nor the commandments he had sent to them by the prophet.

[85] This is direct discourse, but the antecedent of the pronoun is third person, so the pronouns should be consistently third person. The context clearly indicates that the reference does not change.

[86] Either rendering is possible from the Hebrew as the marginal note in the KJV indicates. However, the context suggests that God is both the chastener and the binder. It is very unlikely that people could or would tie themselves up.

[87] The discourse is direct, so the pronouns should be consistently second person. There is no evidence of a change of reference. However, the Hebrew is difficult, as marginal notes in both the KJV and NKJV indicate.

Reference	KJV	NKJV	Principle
Micah 7:19	their sins	our sins[88]	1
Nahum 2:13	her chariots	your chariots[89]	1
Zech 8:17	his neighbor	your neighbor[90]	1

In conclusion regarding Waite's category #4, the NKJV did change the person of some KJV pronouns. This occurred where the Hebrew pronouns changed according to permissible Hebrew convention, but where English convention does not permit it. Waite should know these conventions and not object to the NKJV making the pronominal references consistent, thus avoiding confusion.

Page 19--Category #6

In Waite's Category #6 he states:

THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION CHANGES PRONOUNS TO NOUNS [Cf. DOCUMENTATION pp. 8-16]. There are 114 illustrations of the NKJV's CHANGING PRONOUNS TO NOUNS. This includes the NKJV's CHANGING of "they" to "people"; "it" to "curse"; "he" to "Jehoiachin"; "this" to "commandments"; "he" to "Saul"; "he" to "king Ahaz"; "he" to "man"; "he" to "Amalek"; "he" to "Joseph"; "he" to "Mordecai"; "he" to "Cornelius"; "he" to "Ezra"; "he" to "king"; "he" to "Ahaziah"; "he" to "God"; "he" to "Eli"; "he" to "David"; "he" to "Jabin"; . . . Not one of these CHANGES FROM PRONOUNS TO NOUNS is in the Hebrew or Greek text that underlies the KJV![91]

---

[88] The antecedent of the pronouns in this verse is first person plural. There is no evidence of a change of reference, so the pronouns should be consistently first person according to contemporary English convention.

[89] The discourse is direct here, and there is no evidence of a change of reference.

[90] As above, the discourse is direct, and there is no evidence of a change of reference.

[91] Waite, "Defects," pp. 19-20; unusual emphasis his.

Misunderstands Antecedent Supply

In this category, Waite misunderstands or misrepresents the need to supply the antecedent of an ambiguous pronoun. When the antecedent of a pronoun is not clear from the immediate context, the translator often supplies the antecedent in place of a pronoun. This avoids confusion on the part of the unsophisticated reader. The translator, who is much more familiar with the flow of thought and the intent of the original Hebrew message, is able to accurately identify the antecedent from the broader context. This is not interpretation, as Waite asserts, but clarification. After all, the purpose of a pronoun is to stand in place of its antecedent in a narrative. So the message is not altered if, in some cases, an antecedent is restored.

It is not as though this principle is new with the NKJV; it was practiced by the KJV translators, as demonstrates earlier, and repeated here.

Ref.	Literal Hebrew	KJV Rephrasing
Gen 23:1	the years of the life of Sarah	*these were* the years of the life of Sarah
Est 9:25	when she came	when *Esther* came
Isa 38:16	by these they live	by these *things men* live

For this category, I do not respond to the individual examples.[92] Each example is a case where the pronoun is ambiguous and could be misunderstood unless supplied by the informed translator. In most cases the NKJV provides a marginal note indicating what the literal Hebrew reads. Surely Waite should not object to the NKJV's use of the KJV principle of supplying antecedents in order to clear up ambiguity.

---

[92] Waite's examples are found in the following references: Gen 29:9, 23, 30; 30:29; 31:1; 33:12, 13; 39:23; 48:10; Exod 4:25; Lev 8:15, 23; 21:7; Num 10:31; 11:14; 13:18; 24:24; 25:4; Deut 19:6, 14; Josh 7:3; 19:9; Judg 3:24; 4:3; 18:8; 20:34; 1 Sam 4:18; 15:27; 17:35; 20:2; 2 Sam 3:13; 20:5, 11;1 Kings 3:27; 5:3; 12:28; 19:21; 22:19; 2 Kings 1:17; 5:4; 6:18; 19:35; 23:29, 34; 24:17; 25:14, 29, 29; 1 Chr 4:17; 5:16; 2 Chron 6:12; 10:16; 18:18; 28:22; 32:30, 30; 36:10; Ezra 7:8; Neh 3:2; 4:21; 9:1; Est 2:6, 7; 9:17, 18, 30; Job 9:4; 10:16; 13:28;15:15; 19:24; 24:22; 28:27; 31:18; 33:19; Prov 29:9; Eccl 6:5; Song 7:9; Isa 27:7; 37:9, 36; Jer 21:2; 33:7; 36:23; 40:5, 58; Lam 3:28; 4:16; Ezek 16:33; 22:10; 38:21; Dan 7:25; Hos 10:6; Joel 2:16; Jon 1:13; Micah 3:2; Zech 1:21; 5:4; 7:2; 14:10; and Mal 2:7.

The conclusion for this category is that Waite seems not to be interested in clearing up remnant ambiguities in the KJV. Rather, he is interested only in promoting his KJV-only agenda, even to the expense of perpetuating known, but unnecessary ambiguity or confusion.

Page 23--Category #9:

Concerning his category #9, Waite states:

THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION OMITS THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD [Cf. DOCUMENTATION pp. 80-97]. There are 227 illustrations of the NKJV's OMITTING THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD. There were also about 150 instances which were left out of this study because of a lack of space on the computer disks. The English language, along with the Spanish, French, Latin, Greek, and many more languages has at least three MOODS: (1) indicative; (2) imperative; and (3) subjunctive.

THE COMPACT EDITION OF THE OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY, Volume II, P-Z, pp.661-662, has this to say about the subject of the "SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD":

"SUBJUNCTIVE" . . . 1. Gram. . . . b. Designating a MOOD . . . the forms of which are employed to denote an action or a state as CONCEIVED (and NOT as a FACT) and therefore used to express a WISH, COMMAND, EXHORTATION, OR A CONTINGENT, HYPOTHETICAL, OR PROSPECTIVE EVENT. . . ."

The SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD is used when there is a doubt in the mind of the speaker that some event will take place. (This is a "CONTINGENT, HYPOTHETICAL, or PROSPECTIVE EVENT"). Though there are many rules for the use of the SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD, one of the strictest rules is that you are to use the SUBJUNCTIVE in a clause beginning with "IF" which is contrary to fact or which is in doubt. The same is true for the words "before," "except," unless," and some others. Yet repeatedly (if not IN 100% OF THE CASES) the NKJV refuses to use the SUBJUNCTIVE mood, but, instead, uses the INDICATIVE mood. This is a serious error in English grammar! Illustrations of the NKJV's OMITTING THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD include: "before the cock crows" (instead of "before the cock crow"); "if . .

. is of men" (instead of "if . . . be of men"); "if . . . comes" (instead of "if . . . come"); "if I am lifted up" (instead of "if I be lifted up"), and scores of others as you can note from the DOCUMENTATION, pages 80-97. The SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD is NOT merely a usage in the days of the KING JAMES BIBLE. Its use is one of the marks of an educated and cultured speaker and/or writer of the 1980's as well! 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.[93]

Misunderstands Modern
English Grammar

Waite boasts of academic credentials in English, but in this allegation he denies what authorities in English affirm. John C. Hodges, Mary E. Whitter, and Francis X. Connolly, accepted authorities in Modern English, stated:

> Distinctive forms for the subjunctive occur only in the third person singular of the present tense. . . . Although the subjunctive mood has been largely displaced by the indicative, it is still regularly used (1) in *that* clauses of motions, resolutions, recommendations, orders, or demands and (2) in a few idiomatic expressions.[94]

However, they did notice that "Many writers prefer the subjunctive in contrary-to-fact conditions and in expressions of doubts, or regrets."[95] Thus as early as 1962, the use of the subjunctive was greatly limited in Modern English. This is confirmed by George S. Wykoff and Harry Shaw who stated:

---

[93] Waite, "Defects," pp. 23-24; unusual emphasis his.

[94] John C. Hodges, Mary E. Whitten, and Francis X. Connolly, Harbrace College Handbook (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962), p. 82.

[95] Hodges, Whitten, and Connolly, p. 82.

> Distinctive subjunctive verb forms in current English have disappeared or are disappearing in favor of more commonly used indicative verb forms.[96]
>
> . . . . .
>
> Only rarely, however, can you find such main-verb subjunctive forms, third person singular, present tense, in current writing. Instead, both subjunctive and other nonindicative mood and nonimperative mood ideas are expressed by the use of auxiliary verbs.[97]

So by 1969 the use of the subjunctive verb forms was almost extinct in modern English. Thus it appears that Waite has not kept up with current English conventions. The Executive Review Committee of the NKJV had as a member a professional English authority who carefully scrutinized every verse for grammar, spelling, syntax, and vocabulary. His judgment regarding standard Modern English is to be trusted far above Waite's outdated ideas.

If Waite wants to be scrupulous about English grammar, let him explain the following grammar irregularities in the current KJV,[98] the one and only version he regards as flawless:

(1) Irregular verb forms:

    Exod. 9:31--"the flax and barley was smitten"

    2 Chr 1:12--"wisdom and knowledge *is* granted"

    Mark 9:3--"no fuller . . . can white them"

    Luke 1:19--"Gabriel, that stand"

    John 11:57--if any man knew where he were"

    Acts 1:15--"the number of names together were . . ."

    Acts 6:7--"a great company . . . were obedient"

---

[96] George S. Wykoff and Harry Shaw, *The Harper Handbook of College Composition*, 4th ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p, 520.

[97] Wykoff and Shaw, p. 521.

[98] The source for these irregularities is: Scrivener, pp. lii-liii. These known irregularities remain in the KJV text because it has been standardized and so is uncorrectable. The editions of the American Bible Society are an exception.

Acts 23:15--"or ever he come near"

1 John 5:15--"if we know that he hear us"

Rev 18:17--"so great riches is come"

(2) Irregular antiquated singular forms:

Judg 14:12, 13--"thirty change of garments"

1 Kings 10:17--"three pound of gold"

Ezra 2:69--"five thousand pound of silver"

Neh 7:71--"two hundred pound of silver"

Neh 7:72--"two thousand pound of silver"

Luke 9:28--"an eight days"

(3) Irregular use of an adjective for an adverb:

2 Chr 2:9--"wonderful great"

2 Pet 2:6--"live ungodly"

(4) Irregular use of double superlative:

Mark 10:44--"chiefest"

Acts 26:5--most straitest"

(5) Irregular suppression of the sign of the genitive:

Rev 18:12--"all manner vessels" (twice)

This concludes the response to Waite's criticism of the NKJV. It is evident from an evaluation of the evidence that some of his allegations are false and others are grossly inaccurate. They are not a commendation to his aca-demic credentials, but rather an evident but unsuccessful attempt to support his King James Only agenda.

James D. Price, Ph.D.

Former Executive Editor,

New King James Old Testament

September, 1995