

# A Review of : ‘Is the “New King James Bible” The Word of God?’

by David A. Duncan

This is a review of the tract written by Robert J. Sargent, entitled “Is the ‘New King James Bible’ the Word of God?”. It is assumed that the reader will have access to the original tract and the section headings herein are taken from that tract. At the time of this writing, the tract was available from “The Peoples Gospel Hour” (Box 1660, Halifax, N.S., B3J 3A1) on their website at: [www.tpgh.org](http://www.tpgh.org) under “Booklets on Current Issues”.

## **Which is the real Word of God?**

Mr. Sargent begins with the argument that the NKJV is “more than mere ‘realignment to a transitory language’ (i.e. English), but that it is in many places quite different to the AV, not a few times significantly so.” He then argues that since the NKJV is different from the AV, then there are 3 possibilities: (1) The NKJB is the Word of God, (2) Only the Hebrew and Greek are truly the words of God, or (3) The AV is the real word of God and the NKJB only ‘contains’ the Word of God, but is NOT the Word of God.

The basis for this argument is the stated belief by “The Peoples Gospel Hour” that the KJV is the only valid translation and it alone is the inspired Word of God. Dealing with this argument requires a separate writing. Here they will be dealt with only cursorily.

**Proposal #2** (Only the original languages contain the word of God), is untenable since a result of this would condemn Jesus and the Apostles for false teaching. The original language of the vast majority of the Old Testament was Hebrew. A translation from the Hebrew to Greek was created somewhere between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> centuries B.C., and referred to as the Septuagint. According to the Catholic Encyclopedia,

“C. The Jews made use of it long before the Christian Era, and in the time of Christ it was recognised as a legitimate text, and was employed in Palestine even by the rabbis. The Apostles and Evangelists utilised it also and borrowed Old Testament citations from it, especially in regard to the prophecies.”

According to many writers, Jesus’ quotes sometimes agree more nearly to the proto-masoretic text, and sometimes more nearly to the Septuagint. The indications then are that Jesus and the Apostles used the Septuagint as a valid translation and refers to both it and the Hebrew text as the “Word of God”.

**Proposal #3** (The AV is the real word of God) is untenable since it argues for the AV as being the word of God in exclusion to other translations. The PGH (Peoples Gospel Hour, Halifax,

## IS THE “NEW KING JAMES BIBLE” THE WORD OF GOD?

By Robert J. Sargent

The New King James Bible of 1979 is promoted as an “updated” King James Version (1611 A.D.). Its revisions are said to be no more than those which occurred in 1613 A.D. when the 1611 A.D. work underwent a few minor grammatical and spelling changes. Thus the New King James Bible (henceforth designated NKJB) is to all extents and purposes the old King James Version (AV), with its archaic (obsolete English) words changed into modern English along with the absence of all Elizabethan pronouns and verb endings.

Because the AV has been uniquely blessed of God for well over 300 years, and because the last 100 years has seen the rise of many persuasions, it is wise for God’s people to be



hesitant in their acceptance of any new translation. Nevertheless, our acceptance or rejection of anything ought not to lie with inbred reactionary or progressive motives, but with careful and prayerful study of the facts in the light of Scripture itself. This article is the result of such a study. Its point of view is from the heart of one who loves the Word of God, esteems it to be far above all counsels of men,

and values it more than any other worldly possession. Its confidence lies in an Almighty God, Who is abundantly able to preserve His written Word beyond the passing of heaven and earth.

The writer freely confesses he neither owns nor uses a copy of the NKJB. For the purposes of settling the issue in his heart and mind, borrowed copies have been used, and these have not been fully read through—merely perused and compared with the Bible long accepted as the infallible, inspired, inerrant Word of God, namely the AV.

The conclusion reached is that the NKJV is more than mere “realignment to a transitory language” (i.e. English), but that it is in many places quite different to the AV, not a few times

N.S.) have argued this in numerous tracts. In the time of Christ, both Hebrew texts and a Greek translation (Septuagint) was in common usage. Since Jesus and the Apostles quote from both and use them equally as the “Word of God”, it is clear that it is not a particular language, or translation that makes it the “Word of God” – it is the message that makes it the Word of God.

**Proposal #1** (The NKJB is the Word of God) As in the first century where both the Hebrew scriptures and the Greek translation (Septuagint) were referred to as the “Word of God”, so also today, translations from the original languages can be referred to as the “Word of God”. No translation can be said to be the Word of God exclusively.

### ***A Corrupt Text***

A major criticism of the NKJV (pg 4) is the charge that the translators showed some deference to the Critical Text (Westcott-Hort Text), and thus this is evidence that the NKJV translation is corrupt. Two of the three facts offered as proof have to do with footnotes in the NKJV which reference differences between the NKJV text and the Nestle (NU) text. It is charged that with 150 variant readings and 190 omissions, “One can only wonder at what such footnotes will do to a Christian’s confidence in the Word of God.”

### **Response to item #1 (Pg 4) – Massive Differences**

Sargent says, “In the Introduction to the New Testament of the NKJB, when discussing the two textual families, the following statement is made. ‘Although there are not massive differences between the two textual foundations of the New Testament, the net effect of the Westcott-Hort type of text is to delete many words, phrases, and verses that are found in the Authorized Version.’ Not massive differences!! The very first correction of the AV, based upon the corrupt text (RV 1881), contained 36,000 changes!”

One of the criticisms is that the Westcott-Hort text (RV 1881) contained 36,000 changes (with respect to the AV text). This criticism is made without context in order to present a large number for shock value. David Daniell in his book “The Bible in English: Its History and Influence” adds some perspective:

“The revisers, who had so fully bid out their intentions, and procedures in their Preface to the New Testament, in the end made over 36,000 changes, many thought to be unnecessary, like the change in the Lord’s Prayer from ‘Lead us not. . .’ to ‘Bring us not...’ ”

Although the number 36,000 sounds immense, when you realize that the vast majority of these have to do with word choice (i.e. Lead vs. Bring) in the English translation with equivalent meaning, this criticism based on number has no real validity.

### **Response to item #3 (Pg 4) – 1 John 5:7**

Sargent argues, “A footnote in the NKJB rendering of 1 John 5:7 casts some doubt on the authority of the verse. This is a standard trinitarian verse which is naturally missing from all corrupt Greek texts and modernistic perversions passed off as Bibles”

(From "How We Got Our Bible", by Neil R. Lightfoot pg 57) “The textual evidence is all against I John 5:7. Of all the Greek manuscripts, there are only two which contain it. These two manuscripts are of very late dates, one from the fourteenth or fifteenth century and the other from the sixteenth century. Both clearly show this verse to be translated from the Latin. [contained in the late Latin copies]”

History records that the inclusion of 1 John 5:7 into Erasmus' text was mostly by pressure from those in power – not evidence or scholarship. “The Trinitarian formula (known as the *Comma Johanneum*) made its way into the third edition of Erasmus' Greek NT (1522) because of pressure from the Catholic Church. After his first edition appeared (1516), there arose such a furor over the absence of the *Comma* that Erasmus needed to defend himself. He argued that he did not put in the *Comma* because he found no Greek manuscripts that included it. Once one was produced (codex 61, written by one Roy or Froy at Oxford in c. 1520),<sup>3</sup> Erasmus apparently felt obliged to include the reading.”<sup>1</sup>

David Daniell, in his book “The Bible in English: Its History and Influence” says, “The intrusive sentence at the ‘Johanne comma’, making KJV’s I John 5:7 ‘For there are three that bear record in heaven’, was omitted altogether, without marginal note. One can understand the strong feelings that were raised. Yet Westcott was undoubtedly right, that the revisers had ‘placed the English reader far more nearly than before in the position of the Greek scholar’” (Page 695).

## **Response to item #2 (Pg 4) – Doubts in the footnotes**

A major criticism of the NKJV is the use of footnotes to document differences between the NKJV text and the NU text. This criticism is also used against most modern translations on the basis that it creates doubt in the mind of the readers. Truth does not fear investigation and real, unshakable faith does not rest on ignorance. If the only way to keep a Christian’s confidence is to hide the truth from him, then you have a cult religion – not a true religion. Since the original autographs are not available, valid, scholarly attempts to get as close as possible to the original wording are to be valued, not demeaned. Since it is also true that these attempts will lead to differences of opinion, making these opinions known is not irresponsible. Those who argue against the footnotes, do so on the basis of arguing that there is only one valid Greek text and that it is without variation, and thus footnotes are unnecessary. It is the variation that is at issue then, not the footnotes. Since many scholars argue for the NU text, it is reasonable to document the differences for the reader.

## **The NKJV Omits Key Words from the AV**

Several arguments are made against the NKJV beginning on page 5:

### **a. Matthew 20:20**

At issue is that the AV translates the action of the mother of Zebedee’s children as ‘worshipping’, while the NKJV has ‘kneeling’. Sargent says, “Even the Greek says ‘worship’ is the correct word”

The Greek word is ‘proskuneo’, which means:

Strong’s Greek Dictionary: “to fawn or crouch to, i.e. (literally or figuratively) prostrate oneself in homage (do reverence to, adore):--worship.

Moulton’s Greek Lexicon says: “to do reverence or homage by kissing the hand; in N.T. to do reverence or homage by prostration, Mat 2.2,8,11;20.20; Lu. 4.7; 24.52; to pay divine homage, worship, adore, Mat. 4.10; Jno. 4.20,21; He. 1.6, et al.; to bow on’s self in adoration, He 11.21”

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.bible.org/page.php?page\\_id=1186](http://www.bible.org/page.php?page_id=1186)

Vines: “to make obeisance, do reverence to is the most frequent word rendered to worship. It is used of an act of homage or reverence (a) to God... (c) to a man, Matt. 18:26...

It is easily seen from these sources that what is being referred to by this word is the physical actions of crouching, or bending to kiss the hand and thus showing reverence or worship. Is it reverence or worship? When rendered toward a man, it is validly translated (in accordance with the above mentioned authorities) to refer to the physical actions associated with reverence. In the case of Matthew 18:26, the various translations say:

NKJV: “The servant therefore fell down before him...”

NASB: “So the slave fell to the ground and prostrated himself before him...”

KJV: “The servant therefore fell down, and worshipped him...”

In this case, it is clear from the context, that the reason for the servant falling down, or prostrating himself was to seek, or to beg a favor.

Likewise, the context for action of the mother of Zebedee’s children was to seek favor for her children. Modern translations are correct in rendering the meaning of proskeneo in Matthew 20:20 as kneeling or falling down before and are consistent with both Matt. 18:26 and Matt. 20:20. In this they are consistent with the meaning as given by the leading Greek authorities (i.e. the Greek word carries the meaning of obeisance, and reverence).

The KJV (AV) is consistent in always rendering proskeneo as “worship” without regard for whether it is directed toward men or God. This also is appropriate based on the meaning of the English word “worship”. Webster’s New Twentieth century dictionary lists the first two meanings as: (1) to adore or pay divine honors to as a deity; to reverence with supreme respect and veneration; as, to worship God. (2) to respect; to honor; to treat with civil deference.

So, both the Greek and the English words allow for meanings that are appropriate with regard to actions toward God and man. It is the context that must be used to the ultimate meaning. In the context of Matthew 20:20, there is no indication that the mother meant anything between reverence when asking for favor from Jesus, and thus the NKJV translation is correct. Sargent’s statement that ‘Even the Greek says “worship” is the correct word’ is invalid – the Greek does not require it and leading Greek authorities agree and cite the usage in Matthew 18:26 as an example of this action being appropriate toward a man.

## **b. 1 Thessalonians 5:22**

AV: “Abstain from all appearance of evil”

NKJV: “Abstain from every form of evil”

The criticism that Sargent makes here is that the NKJV is “weaker.. because the word ‘appearance’ includes things which look wrong as well as are wrong—whereas the word ‘form’ tends to mean only those things which are wrong.”

The Greek word here (translated ‘appearance’ in the KJV) is ‘eidos’, which means:

Strong’s: a view, i.e. form (literally or figuratively):--appearance, fashion, shape, sight.

Moulton’s: form, external appearance, Lu. 3.22; 9.29; Jno. 5.37; kind, species, 1 Thes 5.22; sight, perception, 2 Co. 5.7.

Both Strong and Moulton list “form” as a valid meaning – and actually list this meaning first. Moulton is a little more verbose and lists “kind, species” as the meaning in 1 Thes. 5:22. What the text is saying is that we should abstain from every form or type of evil.

Many have argued that the text is saying that we should even things that ‘look’ evil (i.e. the appearance) – and used this verse as the justification. However the Greek does not support that argument – it is a flawed argument. This is exactly the argument that Sargent makes above and is demonstrated to be wrong by examining the Greek.

The NKJV version translation is better here than the AV – not weaker – since it adheres to the meaning of the Greek word as demonstrated by the Greek authorities listed above.

## ***The NKJB Changes the Meaning of Many Verses in the AV***

### **a. II Timothy 2:15**

AV: “Study to shew thyself approved unto God”

NKJV: “Be diligent to present yourself approved of God.”

The charge is made that “study” and “diligence” are not the same meaning and therefore the NKJV is wrong.

A quick look at any Greek Lexicon will show this argument to be flawed:

Strong’s Greek Dictionary: (4704 spoudazo) to use speed, i.e. to make effort, be prompt or earnest:--do (give) diligence, be diligent (forward), endeavour, labour, study.

Moulton’s Lexicon: to hasten; to be in earnest about, be bent upon, to endeavour earnestly, strive

Actually the English word “study” (as given in Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary) says under “study”: a busying oneself about a thing, zeal, study, application to learning, and under definition #6 says, “an earnest effort” – which does agree with what Strong and Moulton say about the Greek word used in this passage.

### **b. II Corinthians 2:17**

AV: For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God

NKJV: For we are not, as so many, peddling the Word of God

Sargent argues, “Corrupt means to make impure; peddle means to sell. No dictionary says otherwise. English hasn’t changed that much”

Strong’s: (2585 kapeleuo) from kapelos (a huckster); to retail, i.e. (by implication) to adulterate (figuratively):--corrupt.

Moulton: a retailer, to huckster; to peddle with; to deal paltrily with, or, to corrupt, adulterate.

The NKJV rendering is in concert with the meaning of the Greek word as explained in the Greek Lexicons. Strong’s lexicon says that the meaning of adulteration or corruption is a figurative usage. Today we might use a phrase about a used car salesman. By implication the trade has a bad reputation due to corrupt practices. In a similar way, a “peddler” must have had a reputation of corrupting things in order to sell it or to increase his profit, and thus the word acquired this usage. As Moulton says to “peddle” is to deal paltrily with, and so either translation carries the

meaning of dealing with the word of God in a manner so as to trivialize it by making merchandise of it (peddling it) or corrupting it (as part of the sales process).

Which one is better translation? The NKJV agrees better with the meaning as described by the Greek Lexicons, but either one gives a reasonable meaning.

### **c. James 5:16**

AV: Confess your faults one to another

NKJV: Confess your trespasses to one another

Sargent argues, “Here the NKJB comes close to the ecumenical RSV and its Roman Catholic reading...” All Christians have ‘faults’ which are not necessarily sins or trespasses.”

The first statement is an attempt to indicate fault by association. The idea is that if it is close to the “Roman Catholic” reading, then it must be wrong like the Roman Catholics are. This presupposes that Catholics are wrong about everything and is a really poor argument presented without any evidence.

The second statement “all Christians have ‘faults’ which are not necessarily sins or trespasses” may be true, but has no bearing on which of this two readings is better. For this, look in your Greek Lexicon:

Strong’s: (3900 – paraptoma) a side-slip (lapse or deviation), i.e. (unintentional) error or (wilful) transgression:--fall, fault, offence, sin, trespass.

Moulton’s: a stumbling aside, a false step; in N.T. a trespass, fault, offence, transgression

Thus the Greek agrees with both the KJV and the NKJV – both faults, and trespasses are consideration in the meaning of this Greek word. The context says that Christians should confess their faults for a purpose – “and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.” Since healing is what is desired, it is evident that the meaning of “paraptoma” in this passage is better rendered as a “trespass” or “transgression” – not a fault which is not a sin.

### ***The NKJB Actually Reverses the Meaning of Some Verses***

The principle charge here by Sargent is that the NKJV proceeds “to change the syntax to give reverse meanings to well known verses.”

### **a. Romans 1:18,25**

Sargent argues, “In both these examples, the choice of verbs has changed the meaning of the AV. Suppressing the truth and holding the truth are two different actions, as are changing and exchanging.”

#### **Romans 1:18**

AV: who hold the truth in unrighteousness (Rom 1:18)

NKJV: who suppress the truth in unrighteousness (Rom 1:18)

The Greek word translated “hold” (AV) or “suppress” (NKJV) is “katecho”

Strong’s: (2722) to hold down (fast), in various applications (literally or figuratively):--have, hold (fast), keep (in memory), let, make toward, possess, retain, seize on, stay, take, withhold.

Moulton's: to hold down; to detain, retain, to hinder, restrain, to hold downright, hold in a firm grasp, to have in full and secure possession.

This word's complete meaning is somewhat dependent on the context. It's primary focus is on "holding" or "grasping", but the intent of the grasping depends on the context. As both Strong and Moulton indicate, it can mean to hold in order to retain or possess, or to hold in order to withhold or restrain. In the context of this passage a charge is made against "ungodliness" who "hold" the truth of God. It is obvious that those who are not Godly do not "hold" in order to "retain" or to "posses", but rather that they "hold" in order to "restrain" or "suppress" the truth of God. The NKJV actually is clearer and easier to read, but the KJV is also correct since to "hold the truth in unrighteousness" is to hold the truth in order to commit unrighteousness – and this is obviously a suppression of the truth.

### **Romans 1:25**

AV: who changed the truth of God into a lie (Rom 1:25)

NKJV: who exchanged the truth of God into a lie (Rom 1:25)

The Greek word translated "changed" (AV) or "exchanged" (NKJV) is "metallasso"

Strong's: (3337) to exchange:--change.

Moulton's: to exchange, change for or into, transmute, Ro. 1.25,26

Both Greek scholars have "exchange" as the first meaning, but to exchange the truth for a lie, or to change the truth into a lie is the same meaning, and thus this argument is without merit.

### **b. Philippians 2:6**

AV: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God"

NKJV: Who, being in the form of God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped

Sargent argues, "The reversal of words here is significant. The AV is clear that the Lord Jesus Christ is equal with God – a position which did not involve robbery. The rendering in the NKJB is weak, and easily suggest that Jesus did not hold onto His equality with God. The reading of the NKJB follows that of modern perversions."

The final statement is a "guilt by association" argument – if you agree in a reading with any translation that the author deems a perversion, then you are wrong. This is an argument without evidence.

Here is the KJV with the Greek words inserted:

"who <hos>, being <huparcho> in <en> the form <morphe> of God <theos>, thought it <hegeomai> not <ou> robbery <harpagmos> to be <einai> equal <isos> with God <theos>"

The word meaning for "harpagmos" (robbery in AV):

Strong's: plunder (properly concrete):--robbery.

Moulton's: rapine, robbery, eager seizure; in N.T., a thing retained with an eager grasp, or eagerly claimed and conspicuously exercised, Phi. 2.6

Thayer: 1. the act of seizing, robbery, 2. a thing seized or to be seized, booty: to deem anything a prize, -- a thing to be seize upon or to be held fast, retained, Phil. ii.6;

on the meaning of this pass. see [reference to another greek word – which says] root signifying ‘to lay hold of’ – Phil. ii.6 – this whole passage (as I have shown more fully in the Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. for 1873, p. 33 sqq., ...) is to be explained as follows: who, although ... he bore the form (in which he appeared to the inhabitants of heaven) of God, yet did not think that this equality with God was to be eagerly clung to or retained, but emptied himself of it so as to assume the form of a servant, in that he became like unto men.

Thayer, as does Harold K. Moulton specify that the principle meaning is that of seizing in order to hold fast or to retain. Robbery is a valid translation, but also is that of seizing to lay hold of as a prize. Both translations are with merit, and the context shows them both to hold equivalent meaning. If it was “not robbery” for Christ to “be equal” with God, then by inference it was something that belonged to Christ (i.e. you cannot be guilty of robbery to take what belongs to you). Likewise, to say that Christ was in the “form of God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped..” -- is to say that equality with God was something that he possessed, but chose not to “grasp” it or to “retain” it, but rather took on the form of a servant.

To argue against the NKJV here is without evidence and is based on personal preference, not scholarship.

### **c. I Timothy 6:5**

AV: supposing that gain is godliness

NKJV: who suppose that godliness is a means of gain

Sargent merely says, “This is clear reversal of meaning”

This argument is basically a statement that the NKJV has changed the word order and by so doing has changed the meaning (i.e gain is godliness vs. godliness is gain).

From the context it is evident that the writer is not arguing that “those who seek gain” are the same as “those who act godly”. The focus here is on those who view the equivalency of gain and godliness — these are “destitute of the truth”. It is not reasonable in the context to think that some see money-getting as a way to increase godliness. Rather it is apparent that they view godliness as a way to get money. The NKJV is easier to follow, and has the same meaning as the AV. If you simply substitute the meaning of the Greek word for “gain” (which according to Strong’s is “furnishing (procuring), i.e. (by implication) money-getting (acquisition):--gain.”), you have:

...supposing that [money-getting] is godliness...

Although it sounds awkward (as does a number of the KJV word constructions), it has the same meaning as the NKJV – these people thought that “money-getting” was the same as godliness – they saw no difference, so that a primary motivation to being or acting ‘godly’ is to think that there is some monetary gain from it.

### ***The NKJB Shows Some Doctrinal Weaknesses***

Sargent argues that some of those translating the NKJB were Arminian theologians, and thus accuses some of the verse translations to “have Arminian flavour”. Four examples are cited.

(Background: Arminianism, according to the “Catholic Encyclopedia” is a school of thought based on the work of Jacobus Arminius, b. 1560 and characterized by a rejection of Calvinism and declares that it is opposed to “Predestination in its defined form; as if God by an eternal and

irrevocable decision had destined men, some to eternal bliss, others to eternal damnation, without any other law than His own pleasure.)

### **a. Hebrews 10:14**

AV: For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified  
NKJV: For by one offering He has perfected forever those who are being sanctified

Sargent argues, “The term ‘being sanctified’ would be favourable to the Holiness movement, whereas in fact the believer IS sanctified”

The Greek word here translated in the NKJV as “being sanctified” is in the “accusative plural masculine participle present passive” (Moulton’s Greek Lexicon).

*ἁγιαζομένων*, acc. pl. masc. part. pres. pass. .

The English “present participle” is used with the verb 'To Be' to indicate an action that is incomplete (i.e. being sanctified). The NKJV is correct here.

### **b. Jude 24**

AV: Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling  
NKJV: Now to Him who is able to keep you from stumbling

Sargent argues, “Stumbling and falling are two dissimilar words. The revision would be more favourable to those who believe a Christian can fall from grace (i.e. Arminians).”

The Greek word here for “falling” (AV) is “aptaistos” and means:

Strong’s: not stumbling, i.e. (figuratively) without sin:--from falling

Moulton’s: free from stumbling; met. [metaphorically] free from moral stumbling or offence; irreprehensible, Jude 24.

According to the Greek Lexicons, “not stumbling” is a correct translation. One who is free from stumbling does not fall, so that the meaning is not changed.

### **c. Galatians 5:4**

AV: Christ is become of no effect unto you  
NKJV: You have become estranged from Christ

Sargent argues, “The rendering of the NKJB suggests those who seek justification through the law were at one time not strangers to Christ (i.e. they lost their salvation). The AV makes it clear such people were never saved!”

Sargent is not using good logic. To say that Christ “is become” means that the situation has changed. Christ cannot “become” without effect unless he first was in a position to be effective. In the context, this is about change based on the action of some seeking to be justified by the law.

In the context, the write says immediately after this, “you are fallen from grace” (AV). The word “fallen” (Greek: ekpipto) means (Strong’s) “to drop away; specially, be driven out of one’s course; figuratively, to lose, become inefficient:--be cast, fail, fall (away, off), take none effect.”

So, to fall away means to “to drop away, be driven out of one’s course”. This is literally saying that those who sought justification by the law were “dropping away from God’s grace”, or were being “driven out of “ God’s grace. This is plainly speaking of a change in state. Sargent’s

argument is thus without merit. The NKJV does not justify his position, but the KJV does not either. Use either translation, and his position is untenable. (You don't even need to go to the Greek to see this).

#### **d. I Thessalonians 5:23**

AV: be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ

NKJV: be preserved blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ

Sargent argues, "Without going into the interpretation of this verse, the prepositions "unto" and "at" indicate different time sequences.

The Greek word here translated "unto" (AV) is "en" and means:

Strong's: a primary preposition denoting (fixed) position (in place, time or state), and (by implication) instrumentality (medially or constructively) , i.e. a relation of rest (intermediate between 1519 and 1537); "in," at, (up-)on, by, etc.:--about, after, against, + almost, X altogether, among, X as, at, before, between, (here-)by (+ all means), for (... sake of), + give self wholly to, ... [truncated -- a very long definition]

So, the meaning is that the Christian will be preserved blameless to a "fixed position(in place, time or state)". The NKJV uses the preposition "at" which means a "fixed position" and is in accordance with the meaning of the Greek word.

### **Conclusion**

Sargent argues that, "If the NKJB is simply an updated AV then an honest comparison of the two ought to give rise to no changed meanings, no reversed meanings, and no additions or omissions. Because the above has not been the case, the only conclusion is that we have two different Bibles."

This argument is based on the notion that the KJV is "perfection" and thus any change is something other than perfection. However, as has been noted above, most of the "differences" Sargent attempts to assert are not really differences at all, and where they are somewhat different, the NKJV actually provides a rendering which is closer to the meaning listed in the Greek Lexicons.

Sargent further argues, "Truly, the NKJB contains the Word of God (e.g. John 1:1), but it is NOT the Word of God (e.g. II Timothy 2:15)."

This argument attempts to place one translation above another as a standard of perfection and is simply wrong. There is no evidence for this. The Peoples Gospel Hour does assert that the KJV is the ONLY version that is the "Word of God" (see their tract entitled, "God Has Only One Bible" -- <http://www.tpgh.org/GHB.htm> ). This assertion will be dealt with separately. Sargent has failed to prove his assertion that the NKJV is not the word of God. His arguments are wholly without merit as has been demonstrated herein.

