

The Printing Errors Ploy

What About Those Printing Errors and "Revisions" of the 1611 King James Holy Bible?

People who do not believe that any Bible or any text in any language IS right now, today, the inspired, inerrant and complete words of God often raise this objection. They ask us Which Revision of the King James Bible is the inspired word of God?

The simple fact is, the King James Bible has never been "revised". There have been different editions of the King James Bible, in which the Gothic type was changed to Roman type, the spelling of various English words was updated, some minor punctuation changes were made, and several minor printing errors were corrected, but the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts have never changed at all.

Spelling and punctuation have been updated. In 1611 and even much later in the history of the English language, the rules of spelling were not as fixed as they are today. People would even spell their own last names several different ways. Even today there are differences in spelling many words in the English of England and that of the United States. In old English there was an "e" after the verb, as in - feare, blinde, sinne, borne. The old English also had a "long s" in places. The long s looked more like an "f". Thus the word "also" looked more like "alfo" in the early editions of the KJB. The old English had a "u" for the "v" so words looked like "euil" (evil) and "vnderstood" (understood). But the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts have never been changed.

This is sharp contrast to such modern versions like the NKJVs, NIVs, NASBs, ESVs, etc. that DELIBERATELY keep changing both their English texts and even the underlying Hebrew and Greek from one edition to the next. ALL these modern versions continue to intentionally change their texts. The 1995 NASB has omitted some 7000 words that were in the 1977 NASB. The ESV 2001 has already been revised in 2007 where they changed over 300 verses from the previous ESV and now in 2010 the NIV has once again been revised and they tell us they have changed about 10% of the verses from the way they read in the 1984 NIV edition, and they change not only the English text but in some places also the underlying Greek and Hebrew.

The ESV

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/theesv.htm>

The NASB

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/everchangingnasbs.htm>

The NKJV

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nkjvwordchanges.htm>

What about the "new" NIV 2011?

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/whatabouttheniv2011.htm>

Even the American Bible Society, no friend to the King James Bible, had this to say about the "revisions" of the King James Bible. The American Bible Society wrote, "The English Bible, as left by the translators (of 1611), has come down to us unaltered in respect to its text..." They further stated, "With the exception of typographical errors and changes required by the progress of orthography in the English language, the text of our present Bibles remains unchanged, and without variation from the original copy as left by the translators" (Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers, American Bible Society, 1852).

What Revisions Really Look Like

The RSV, itself a revision of the American Standard Version of 1901, came out with the N.T. in 1946 and the O.T. was completed in 1952. Then it was revised in 1962, where they made several textual changes, and then more fully revised again in 1971. In 1971, the RSV Bible was rereleased with the Second Edition of the New Testament. Whereas in 1962 the translation panel had authorized a handful of changes, in 1971 they gave the New Testament text a thorough editing. The most obvious changes were the restoration of Mark 16.9-20 (the long ending) and John 7.53-8.11 (in which Jesus forgives an adulteress) to the text (in 1946, they were put in footnotes). Also restored was Luke 22.19b-20, containing the bulk of Jesus' institution of the Lord's Supper. In the 1946-52 text, this had been cut off at the phrase "This is my body", and the rest had only been footnoted. Luke 22.43-44, which had been part of the text in 1946-52, was relegated to the footnote section; in these verses an angel appears to Jesus in Gethsemane to strengthen and encourage Him before His arrest and crucifixion. Many other verses were rewritten.

Then came **the New RSV** in 1989 and it changed many of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the everchanging RSVs. Just one example of the many ridiculous changes the NRSV made is in the Messianic Psalm 22 verse 16 where we read: "They PIERCED MY HANDS AND MY FEET." (Geneva Bible, RV, ASV, RSV, ESV, NIV, NKJV, NASB) to now read in the NRSV "My hands and my feet HAVE SHRIVELED."! Then the NRSV was revised again in 2001 to become **the ESV** (English Standard Version) - now the new rage - which itself has already been revised once again in 2007 where they have changed over 350 verses from the previous ESV done just 6 years before!

You can read more about the ever changing ESVs here:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/theesv.htm>

The NKJV - If you look at the NKJV, you will see it came out in three stages. The New Testament was published in 1979, the Psalms in 1980, and the full NKJV Bible in 1982. I have a copy of the 1979 NKJV New Testament and its English text differs from the 1982 New Testament wording in hundreds of places. You can see some of these changes in the latter part of this study here:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nkjvwordchanges.htm>

The NIV first came out with its N.T. in 1973 and the full bible in 1978. Then it was revised somewhat in 1984. I have a copy of the 1977 NIV and the wording was changed in scores of places in the 1984 NIV. If you have a 1977 NIV compare places like Matthew 4:24; Matthew 13:20, 22; Matthew 17:15; Luke 18:12; Luke 22:32, John 1:18; 14:15; 19:26; James 1:12 and James 4:5. A **major revision and update** was announced on September 1, 2009 and is due out in 2011. It is now here and they themselves tell us that they have changed about 10% of the English text. I have examined parts of this new perversion and they have actually changed far more than 10% and they have changed both the Hebrew and the Greek texts in places from what the "old" NIV was like.

The NIV is a very loose paraphrase of the wrong Greek texts and it (along with versions like the RSV, NRSV, ESV, Holman Standard, NASB) often rejects the Hebrew texts.

For proof of this, see -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nivnasrejectthebrew.htm>

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/nivnasrejectthebrew2.htm>

The NASBs. The NASB, itself another revision of the ASV of 1901, has been revised several times with many changes to both its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts as well as its English wording. The N.T. came out in 1963 and the whole bible in 1971. Since then it has changed hundreds of words in each succeeding edition (1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977 and its latest incarnation in the Updated 1995 NASB has omitted almost 7000 words that were found in the previous 1977 NASB edition. The NASB keeps on changing its Hebrew and Greek foundation from revision to revision. Here are some concrete examples of what they are doing.

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/everchangingnasbs.htm>

However when we get the the Authorized King James Holy Bible and you open it up to the front, you won't find any such varying copyright dates nor revisions. Why? Because it has never been "revised"; the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts have never been changed. Only the spelling and punctuation has been modernized to some extent and various minor printing errors that have occurred in its long history have been corrected. The "No Bible is infallible" crowd then asks us "Well, how do you know that something is a printing error or not? Which KJV do you use and which one is the infallible words of God?" They don't ask these questions because they are seeking a complete and infallible Bible, but are trying to destroy our faith that one actually exists. Faith looks for answers; Unbelief looks for doubt.

God has given us a "double-check system" whereby we can be absolutely sure of what His inspired and preserved words are and what they mean. Modern versions proponents (NIV, ESV, NASB, NKJV, Holman, NET, etc.) have no such "double check system" simply because they often reject the clear Hebrew readings and they are constantly changing not only their English translations, but their own underlying Hebrew and Greek texts from one edition to the next. They have NO settled text in "the original languages" and they know it. On the other hand, we King James Bible believers maintain that the God of history, the ruler of the nations, has acted in time to use a group of men to give us both the correct underlying Hebrew and Greek texts (after all, only God knows for sure which words are His and which are not) and the correct English meaning of these same texts. If we are not sure something is a printing error or not, all we have to do is take a look at the specific underlying Hebrew or Greek texts that God used in bringing forth the greatest Bible ever printed, and these underlying texts have never changed in 400 years now. If I want to know what is the correct meaning of the underlying text, I simply read and believe the English translation found in the infallible King James Holy Bible. Pretty simple really, but of course the Bible doubters will never accept this. Don't worry about it; they still don't have an infallible Bible and we do.

We will see examples of some of these unintentional printing errors in the rest of this article. Pastor David F. Reagan has written an excellent article about The Myth of Early Revisions of the Authorized King James Holy Bible. In his article he discusses the conditions of the printing process in 1611, and shows how the so called revisions are actually only examples of updating the spelling of words and the correction of minor printing errors.

His article can be seen here - <http://av1611.com/kjbp/faq/revisions.html>

Pastor Reagan rightly says: "We need to establish one thing from the out-set. The authority for our preserved English text is not found in any human work. The authority for our preserved and infallible English text is in God! Printers may foul up at times and humans will still make plenty of errors, but God in His power and mercy will preserve His text despite the weaknesses of fallible man."

Brother Herb Evans, another strong King James Bible believer, briefly answers this typical objection to the King James Bible being the pure words of God. " If God supervised the translation process so that the KJV is 100% error free, why did God not extend this supervision to the printers?"

Brother Evans answers: "Probably because He did not extend His supervision to the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts that we have. None of them are without errors and none are even complete. We can't expect more of the KJB Bible printers than we can of the Hebrew and Greek printers, now can we? Don't you make any distinctions between textual errors and typographical errors? In the English? In the Greek also? "- Herb Evans

Dr. Donald Waite also has written a booklet titled The Authorized Version 1611 Compared to Today's King James Version. In this booklet Dr. Waite discusses the "thousands of changes", and he clearly shows that the vast majority of the changes have to do with changing the printing type from Gothic print to Roman, and updating the spelling of such words as "Sonne" to "Son", and "sinne" to "sin", "blesse" to "bless", "weepe" to "weep" and "owne" to "own".

In the first printing of the 1611 Holy Bible there were hundreds of very minor printing errors such as omitting or duplicating a word, or the misspelling of a simple word. None of these printing errors seriously affected the sense of the passage nor introduced any false doctrines. The printing process was laboriously done by hand, backwards! and one letter at a time. It was very common in all printed works of that day to contain "typos". These are things like "the shearer" to "his shearer" Acts 8:32; "sacrifice" to "sacrifices" 1 Peter 2:5 ; "made a" to "made thee a" Isaiah 57:8; "the field" to "thy field" Lev. 33:22; "Bozra" to "Bozrah" Genesis 36:33; "Jabok" to "Jabbok" Lev. 21:24, and "while the feast" to "while their feast" Judges 14:17.

The King James Bible contains 791,328 words. Since the first King James Bible rolled off the press in 1611 to the King James Bible you buy off the shelf today, NOTHING HAS BEEN CHANGED in the English text aside from these minor corrections of printing errors nor in the underlying Greek and Hebrew texts that were used in the making of this magnificent Holy Bible. The total number of printing errors that have been corrected or the spelling updates would amount to no more than a maximum of one-tenth of one percent. Among these changes are the following examples:

TOWARDS has been changed to TOWARD 14 times.

BURNT has been changed to BURNED 31 times.

AMONGST has been changed to AMONG 36 times.

LIFT has been changed to LIFTED 51 times.

The nature of the other so called "revisions" have been of the type of "thy people" to "the children of thy people" in Ezekiel 3:11 (easily a printing error of skipping three words); "wayes" to "ways" 2 Kings 22:2; "wee shall" to "for we shall" Romans 14:10. All of these are easily explained as minor printing errors, but THE TEXT itself has never changed.

In the first printing of 1611, the words "of God" were accidentally left out of 1 John 5:12. These

two words are in the Greek texts and in all previous English Bible versions including Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568 and the Geneva Bible 1587. (Remember? Our 'double check' system.) 1 John 5:12 reads: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." This minor printing error was soon discovered and corrected in 1629. If you can find one of these 400 year old King James Bibles that has this misprint in it, it would be worth a lot of money today just because of its historical peculiarity.

Another one the bible agnostics bring up is 2 Kings 11:10 where the first printing of 1611 accidentally omitted the words "of the LORD" from the phrase "in the temple of the LORD." This printing error was soon discovered and corrected in 1638. It would have been very easy for a hard working printer to overlook this phrase in the midst of a chapter that refers to "the house of the Lord", the "temple of the Lord" and "the house" in verses 3, 4 (twice), 5, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 (twice) and 20. Not even the meaning of the verse is lost by the accidental omission of these words; but it was soon caught and corrected. No other Bible in history has been so carefully compared and examined as has been the Authorized King James Holy Bible. The biggest printing error occurred in Exodus 14:10 "and...afraid" where 21 words were accidentally omitted due most likely to the printer's eyes having skipped from one "and" to the next "and".

In every case, the underlying Greek and Hebrew texts remained the same and only minor printing errors occurred, all of which were soon caught and corrected to read as they now stand in the King James Bible.

Even Scrivener, who worked on the English Revised Version of 1881, and documented every one of the printing errors in the 1611 printing, (I have his book too) admitted that the Cambridge printers had simply reinstated words and clauses overlooked by the 1611 printers and amended manifest printing errors. According to a study which he wrote 72% of the approximately 400 textual corrections in the King James Bible were completed by the time of the 1638 Cambridge edition, only 27 years after the original printing! (Not in 1769)

All the "printing errors" were of a minor nature and were nothing in comparison to the wholesale deliberate omissions of literally thousands of God inspired words in such contradictory versions as the NASB, ESV, RSV, NIV, NKJV, Holman etc., and every one of these modern versions continue to change their own underlying Greek and Hebrew texts and their English text from one edition to the next.

They change literally hundreds of words from their own versions to the next one every few years. The NASB has now gone through some 9 different editions, with the latest one omitting some 7000 words that were in the previous 1977 NASB. The NIV continues to change its texts (both the English and the underlying Hebrew and Greek) from edition to edition and so does the

NKJV.

The ESV omits even more whole verses than the NIV or NASB and a whole lot more than the NKJV, and all of them reject up to hundreds of Hebrew readings and not even in the same places. The ESV just came out in 2001, and already in 2007 they have come out with another "revision" that either changes the English text, corrects "printing errors" and even change the Greek and Hebrew readings in more than 350 verses. You can see these changes for yourself at this site:

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/esv2007.html>

So what do the Bible agnostics try to do to convince you that there never has been and is not now any Bible in any language that is or ever was the perfect words of God? They tell us that the printing errors in the history of the King James Bible printings are on the same level as their modern version's wholesale and DELIBERATE changes. This way they think they can justify their own perversions that not even they believe are the complete and infallible words of God.

This is what is happening folks, and the majority of present day Christians no longer believe in the Inerrancy of Scripture. They have swallowed Satan's lie and believed the first question found in the Bible - "Yea, hath God said....?"

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

At a Bible club I belong to, one Christian brought up two examples he thought were textual changes rather than spelling errors. He said to me: "Brother Kinney, if you will continue to look at Dr. Waite's excellent booklet you will notice on page 20, item numbers 0144 and 0177 where "GOD" was changed to "LORD" twice. (Once in 2 Chronicles 28:11, and again in Isaiah 49:13) On page 21, item number 0067 where "LAMBE" was changed to "RAM." (Numbers 6:14) I am sure you do not dismiss those as corrections of printer's errors. They are actual word changes. How do you address those actual word changes in view of your position on the perfect nature of the KJV?"

To which I answered: "These two examples are really quite easy to explain. I believe they are simple printing errors. The words God, Lord, GOD, LORD, are found with what a printer might consider monotonous regularity throughout those passages. It would have been quite easy for a tired and weary printer to skip over or misread the word God and put Lord instead, or vice versa. The fact is that out of the thousands of times the words "Lord, LORD, God, and GOD" occur in the Old Testament, only twice did this easily explained printing error occur."

"As for the second example, the verse in question - Numbers 6:14- actually contains three printing errors. I will highlight the printing errors in capital letters. Also notice the old style spelling of some words, which later were updated, and which the critics love to number among their "thousands of changes". In the reprint of the original 1611 Bible, put out by Thomas Nelson Publishers, it reads: "And he shall offer his OFFRING unto the LORD, one hee lambe of the first

yeere without blemish, for a burnt offering, OFFERING, and one ewe lambe of the first yeere without blemish, for a sinne offering, and one LAMBE without blemish for peace offerings." You will notice here the three printing errors in this one verse. The printer misspelled offering once as "offring", he also repeated the word "offering, offering", and instead of reading "lamb", "lamb" and "ram", he accidentally printed "lamb, lamb, lamb". The word "lamb" occurs twice already in Numbers 6:14, and the third time the original 1611 misprinted the word "lamb" for "ram", which is in the Hebrew and in the present day KJB editions. This mistake would have been quite easy to do for the printer who was hand setting the type. He most likely saw the word "lamb" twice already and mistook "ram", which shares both the "a" and the "m", with the word "lamb".

As you can see, there is no deliberate change in the text or meaning from 1611 to the present. To compare these extremely minor changes in spelling and accidental printing errors to the thousands of deliberate changes in texts, meaning and translation that occur in the modern versions is totally unjustified.

Modern Bible versions such as the NASB, NKJV, NIV are constantly and deliberately changing their own English texts in literally hundreds and even thousands of places. The NASB made almost 7000 changes in their own text from the 1977 to the 1995 editions. Likewise the NKJV 1982 edition has changed thousands of words from that of their 1979 edition, and the NIV, and the ESV continue to do the same from one edition to the next. These are not minor printing errors in the NASB, NKJV, ESV and NIV, but deliberate alterations of both the underlying Greek and Hebrew texts as well as the English translation.

Throughout the history of Bible publishing there have been some rather humorous examples of printing errors . It should also be noted that there have been printing errors, even with today's advanced technology, in the NASB, NKJV, and NIV as well. Here are a few of the printing errors that have occurred in various King James Bible editions.

A 1631 edition became known as the "Wicked Bible" because the seventh commandment read, "thou shalt commit adultery." The printer was fined 300 pounds.

The printer of the "Fool Bible" had to pay 3,000 pounds for this mistake in Psalm 14:1: "The fool hath said in his heart there is a God."

In 1653, there was a misprint in I Corinthians 6:9 that read, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God" and one in Romans 6:13 that read, ""Neither yield ye your members as instruments of righteousness unto sin." This Bible became known as "the Unrighteous Bible."

In 1716, the "Sin On Bible" commanded, "Go, and sin on more" in John 8:11.

In 1717, there was a misprint in a heading for the "parable of the vineyard," which called it the "Parable of the vinegar." This Bible was called "the Vinegar Bible."

In 1801, Jude 16 stated, "these are murderers" instead of "murmurers", and Mark 7:27 stated, "let the children first be killed" instead of "filled." This Bible was nicknamed "the Murderers Bible."

In 1820, Jesus says, "Who hath ears to ear, let him hear" in Matthew 13:43, and this was called "the Ears to Ear" Bible.

In 1823, Genesis 24:61 states "Rebekah arose, and her camels", instead of "her damsels," in "Rebekah's Camels Bible."

The cause for all of these defects may be found in "the Printers' Bible" (1702), which states in Psalm 119:161, "printers have persecuted me" (instead of "princes." have persecuted me). If ever there was a misprint that carried a lot of legitimate meaning, this is it. "Printers have persecuted me."

The whole "Printing Error" complaint the Bible doubters and biblical relativists bring up is really a non issue. What I mean by this is that if every single copy of the King James Bible that has ever come off the presses read exactly the same with no minor printing errors at all found in any of them, it still would not change their opinion that the KJB is not the inspired, inerrant word of God. It is brought up as a smokescreen and is not a serious issue concerning the ultimate truth of Scripture and its preservation.

Most people who reject the King James Bible as being the inerrant, preserved words of God in English, do so for other reasons than printing errors. They have done so because they went to a seminary where they were taught that no Bible in any language and no text, be it Hebrew or Greek, is the inspired words of God. Or they visited some anti-KJV only website where they were told something like: "The KJV is not based on the best texts", "God forbid" is wrong, or "1 John 5:7 does not belong in the Bible." They most likely assumed that all KJB Bibles read the same since the very beginning. It wasn't till later they learned of the minor printing errors issue and now they toss this up as a smokescreen. Like I said, if someone is convinced the KJB is not the inspired word of God, no matter if all copies in its long history read exactly the same, his mind would not be changed by this fact. The alleged "revisions" and "hundreds of printing errors" is a non-issue of no real significance.

Another member at one of the internet Bible clubs brought up this very common objection. He asked: "Why did God guide the hands and minds of the KJV translators to produce a perfect Bible, only to have it corrupted by printers? I'll await your answer."

To which I answered: Hi..., excellent question. Here is what I believe about this. The production of the KJB mirrors exactly what happened in the case of the originals and all good copies of the correct texts.

God inspired the originals. Scribes then copied these originals into other manuscripts but all of the correct line of good copies introduced "printing errors", inversion of word order, slight omissions, and such like. God's word was not lost but needed some degree of purification as a result of human error.

God has preserved His inerrant words Providentially, not miraculously. He did not keep every copyist from making "printing errors", but He guided in such a way as to purify the text and bring it back to its original state.

It seems you would have to admit that the stated purpose of modern scholarship is to accomplish this same end. They believe they need to examine the evidence, purge the texts of errors and false readings, and try to restore the texts to their original state.

Yet their results are exceedingly flawed, and some even admit it is hopeless. Witness the textual differences between the ESV, NASB, Holman Christian Standard, and the NIV. Literally hundreds of words from the texts themselves are different between the ESV, Holman, and the NASB.

The scholars today, all of whom have the same training and access to the same information, all come up with very different conclusions, and the multiple, conflicting bible versions reflect these differences.

I think God has allowed the issue of "printing errors" to act as a stumbling block to blatant hypocrites. It is hypocritical to claim a Bible or text of any kind needs to be free of all scribal or printing errors in order to meet the Standard of being "inerrant and inspired". This man-made Standard then turns on the one who makes it, because it then invalidates his own claim to any Bible or any version as being the infallible word of God. His own favorite bible version(s) also fail to meet the Standard he has set up. By bringing up the issue of "printing errors" the Bible critic cuts his own throat.

If one adopts the view that the correction of printing errors in the history of any Bible version or Hebrew or Greek text disqualifies it from being the word of God, then you end up with no inspired, inerrant Bible anywhere on this earth. That too is carrying the argument to its logical conclusion. Guess who wants you to think this way?

Without exception, every person I have encountered who raises this objection about "printing errors and revisions" in the King James Bible's history, himself has no Bible and no text that he considers to be the inspired, complete and inerrant words of God. If he insists on raising this petty and hypocritical objection to the King James Bible as being the perfect word of God, then God will allow him to stumble over this pebble in the road. He will reap the bitter fruits of his own unbelief in the promises and ways of God who covenanted to preserve His words in a Book till heaven and earth pass away.

My belief is that God has kept His promises to preserve His inerrant words, and He has already providentially guided certain chosen men through this same "scholarly process" to select both the correct texts and the correct meaning for those texts. After all, it is only God who really knows which readings are His and which are not. The King James Bible believer first looks to God and His promises to preserve His words, and believes that God has done what He said He would do. The "No Bible is Inspired" group, or the "reliable but flawed versions" promoters, seem to think that they and their colleagues are capable "restoring" what God never lost, and deny that God has already preserved His inerrant words in any Bible on this earth.

This is the fundamental difference in our approach to the doctrines of inspiration and preservation. We King James Bible believers are convinced God has done what He said He

would do. The Bible of the Month Club member thinks it is still an ongoing process and his results are getting more confused and divergent as time goes by.

The Nestle-Aland, UBS Greek text, upon which most modern versions are based, continues to change every few years, and the modern versions have introduced a multitude of textual variations into the Old Testament Scriptures. They often reject the Hebrew readings in favor of the alleged pre-Christian Septuagint, Syriac, Samaritan Pentateuch, or Vulgate texts. Just look at the differences between the KJB, NASB, NIV, Holman Standard, and the ESV in this regard. God alone sees the end from the beginning and He knew very well that the battle for the Bible would intensify in the latter days. God gave us His holy and true words in the Bible that He knew would be used far more effectively than any other in history - the Authorized King James Holy Bible. Those who cavil and complain about the minor printing errors in the history of this great Book of books are stumbling over pebbles and straining at gnats to swallow a camel.

The "Probably Close Enuf" side ends up with no inspired, complete, inerrant, sure words of God, and maximum uncertainty. = "Yea, hath God said...?"

The King James Bible believer is convinced he has the inerrant words of God and enjoys maximum certainty and rest in the fulfilled promises of Almighty God. = "Thus saith the LORD".

The King James Bible we have today is the same as the one in 1611.

I hope this helps you to better understand the nature of the so called "thousands of changes" that have occurred in the King James Bible since 1611 to the present.

If you care to read it, here is a well done and short article dealing with the so called "revisions" of the King James Bible, and the printing errors issue.<http://www.scionofzion.com/revisions.htm> When it comes to the question the Bible agnostics often toss in the King James Bible believer's face - Which King James Bible are you reading, the 1611 edition or the 1769 edition? - here is a 30 minute video that covers this topic with a lot of factual material. It is a You Tube video and can be seen here -

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cs4Fns_yXyE&feature=player_embedded#at=29

Will Kinney

Some more thoughts on the 'printing errors' thingy.

It is interesting to me how those who object to a perfect Bible in any language deal with the issue of past printing errors in the various editions of the King James Bible. At one of our Bible clubs, a man called Aaron said he had read my article about the past printing errors twice, and he still objected to my position that the King James Bible is the only true Bible.

Here is his stated position. He said: "If it had printing errors in it, then it can't be the perfect words of God. I can be just as true to the Bible and disagree with verbal- plenary-inerrant-preservation-in-a-single-text-version-manuscript-and/or- group-of- manuscripts idea. At this point you will say, well if I can't point to a single version or text that leaves me with no final

authority and thus how can I even know if I'm true to the Bible? To that I will reply that to 90% of the text of the Bible there is no doubt. That 10% that is in doubt is mostly minor except for a few major ones we are all familiar with. I can speak of THE Bible without needing to point to a particular version as THE ONE. THE Bible, first of all, is forever settled in heaven. It exists. It will never pass away. THE Bible, secondly, exists in the multiplicity of manuscripts and versions we possess today. Somewhere in there is the true Word of God."

Can you see how badly this man has stumbled over the minor pebble of "printing errors"? The printing errors issue bothers this man so much that he has rejected the doctrine of a pure and perfect Bible in any language here on this earth. Yet he turns right around and tells us that "only ten percent" of the Bible text is "in doubt" but this is only a "minor" consideration. We also have a few "major" ones, but he still thinks he can refer to "The Bible", even though it's not something in print. Instead he says it is settled in heaven, (though he has never seen it), and "SOMEWHERE" the true words of God are in the multiplicity of manuscripts and versions. This is like saying the true words of God are found in Webster's unabridged dictionary - all mixed up with thousands of words that are not Scripture and out of order, but, Hey, there in there somewhere." The printing errors issue is blown way out of proportion, and his 10% of textual uncertainty is only "minor". This is the broke-down logical conclusion of all Bible Agnostics. They don't know where "the Bible" is to be found, or what "the Bible" might or might not say, but the only thing they all agree upon is that it is NOT the King James Bible.

Another example of alleged changes and differences in the King James Bible is often brought up by people like Doug Kutilek, or Rick Norris who themselves do not believe ANY Bible or ANY text IS NOW the inspired and inerrant words of God. These are a very few minor differences between the Cambridge and the Oxford editions. The Oxford editions still have three or four very minor printing errors in them that they have never corrected.

Ruth 3:15 he or she?

Frequently those who claim the King James Bible is riddled with errors and has changed in thousands and thousands of places since it first came out in 1611, bring up Ruth 3:15 as an example of contradiction and confusion. This supposed error is one of Doug Kutilek's favorites. He has no final authority but his own mind and he seems to take great delight in pointing out alleged errors in the KJB.

Mr. Kutilek says: "It should be unnecessary to say much about variations which have always existed among various printings and editions of the KJV. They do exist, and have from the beginning (the two editions printed in 1611 differ in over 2,000 places, perhaps the most famous being "he" or "she" at Ruth 3:15)."

Actually, I know of a few more places where the KJB Cambridge edition differs from the Oxford KJB edition. One is in Jeremiah 34:16 where the Cambridge KJB reads: "whom YE had set at liberty" while the Oxford edition says: "whom HE had set at liberty", and Song of Solomon 2:9 where the Cambridge KJB edition says: "that ye stir not up, nor awake my love, till HE please",

while the Oxford KJB says "nor awake my love, till SHE please." Another one that exists in SOME, but not all, Oxford editions is found in Joshua 19:2 where the original 1611 and the Cambridge editions correctly say: "Beersheba, OR Sheba, and..."

We will examine each of these and compare them with other Bible versions.

An excellent study of these "thousands of changes" showing that the vast majority of them were changes in spelling, as Sonne to Son, and yeeres to years, can be found at this site.

<http://www.av1611.org/kjv/kjvupdt.html>

Ruth 3:15. The Cambridge edition, which I use, says: "Also he said, Bring the vail that thou hast upon thee, and hold it. And when she held it, he measured six measures of barley, and laid it on her: and SHE went into the city."

There was a discrepancy between the edition published in 1611 and the one published in 1613. The verse in question was Ruth 3:15. In the 1611 edition, it read, "HE went into the city," referring to Boaz. In the 1613 edition, it read, "SHE went into the city," referring to Ruth. These two editions became known as "the Great He Bible" and "the Great She Bible," respectively. This printing error was soon discovered and changed back to the reading of "she" went into the city.

Mr. Kutilek and those like him have no infallible Bible. They continue to promote the modern versions which differ from one another in both text and meaning in hundreds of verses. The NASB, NIV and ESV often reject the Hebrew Masoretic texts and follow the Greek Septuagint, Syriac, Samaritan Pentateuch, Dead Sea Scrolls or the Vulgate in scores of instances and often not in the same places as the others. Yet this is the confused Bible of the Month club babel that Mr. Kutilek would recommend to overthrow the time tested KJB.

There still continue to be differences among the many versions even in Ruth 3:15. Those versions that read: "And HE went into the city" are the NIV, Revised Version, American Standard Version, Darby, Young's, the Jewish 1917 translation, the 1998 Complete Jewish Bible translation, the World English Bible, New Century Version 1991, New Living Translation, the New Revised Standard Version 1989, and the 2005 TNIV (Today's NIV).

The versions that read: "And SHE went into the city" are the KJB, NKJV, NASB, Revised Standard Version, Coverdale, Bishop's, Douay, Bible in Basic English, Geneva bible, 1936 Jewish translation, Holman Standard, New English Bible 1970, Douay 1950, New Jerusalem Bible 1985, and the 2001 English Standard Version. Notice in the case of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, each of which is a revision of the other, that the RSV went with "he", then the NRSV read "she", and the latest ESV has now gone back to "he" again.

We even get conflicting footnotes in some of these versions. The NKJV which reads SHE, just as the KJB and NASB, has a footnote which says: "Masoretic text reads HE; some Hebrew manuscripts, Syriac, and Vulgate read SHE."

However the NIV, NRSV, both of which still say HE, have footnotes telling us: "Most Hebrew manuscripts read HE, but many Hebrew manuscripts, Vulgate and Syriac read SHE."

So, the multitude of modern versions not only continue to disagree among themselves in their textual reading, but also in the reasons they give for their differences. Mr. Kutilek wants us to come to the same conclusion he has, that is - "There is no inerrant and inspired Bible on this earth."

#2 - Song of Solomon 2:7 "O ye daughters of Jerusalem, by the roes, and by the hinds of the field, that ye stir not up, nor awake my love, till HE please."

In the original AV 1611 a printer's error occurred and it read: "till SHE please". It was soon discovered and changed to read as it stands today in both the Oxford and Cambridge editions - "till HE please".

Here is how other Bible versions render this verse. "till IT please" - Revised Version, NIV, NKJV, ESV.

"till SHE please" - NASB, Geneva Bible, Young's, NIV Spanish edition (Nueva Versión Internacional) - "hasta que ella quiera despertar.", Rothterham's Emphasized bible 1902, Wycliffe 1395, the NEB 1970 (New English Bible) and the New Jerusalem bible 1985.

"till HE please" - American Standard Version 1901, King James Bible (Oxford and Cambridge editions), Webster's 1833 translation, the KJV 21st Century version 1994, Darby, the English translation of the so called Greek Septuagint 4th Zondervan printing 1977 "till he please", and the Third Millennium Bible 1998.

Holman Standard - until the appropriate time.

The Message - don't stir it up, until the time is ripe—and YOU'RE ready.

The modern Jewish translation called the Ancient Roots Translinear Bible reads like the King James Bible.

"Daughters of Jerusalem, swear by the gazelles or by the hinds of the field, ||that you will never awaken|| my love, until HE pleasures.

<http://www.ancientrootsbible.com/textsearch.html>

The Hebraic Transliteration Scripture online also translates the verse like the King James Bible.

I charge you, O ye daughters of Yerushalayim, by the roes, and by the hinds of the field, that ye stir not up, nor awake [my] dod (love), till he please.

<http://www.messianic-torah-truth-seeker.org/Scriptures/Tenakh/Shir-HaShirim/Shir-Hashirim01.htm>

Another Hebrew translation called the Hebrew Interlinear Bible goes with the “she” rendering.

<http://www.scripture4all.org/OnlineInterlinear/OTpdf/can2.pdf>

“you are rousing up the love until SHE is desiring”

John Gill comments that the Hebrew can be read either as “till HE please” or as “till SHE please”.

The Hebrew word in question is # 2654 ghah-phehtz and is a verb which generally means “to desire, to please, to delight, to favour, or to will”. Whether there is a subject pronoun or not seems to be implied by the context, and all bible translations variously translate it as “I, you, thou, he, they or she please”. They ALL change the subject pronoun depending on what they think the context is.

The Hebrew phrase is found only three times in the Song of Solomon in the Hebrew Bible and in all of them the King James Bible translates it as “till HE please” - See Song 3:5 and 8:4 for the other two instances. However the other bible versions go back and forth between “till SHE please” (NASB, NEB) and “till HE please” (KJB and others) or “till IT please”. (NKJV, ESV)

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown comment: “**my love**--in Hebrew, feminine for masculine, the abstract for concrete, Jesus Christ being the embodiment of *love* itself (So 3:5; 8:7), where, AS HERE, THE CONTEXT REQUIRES IT TO BE APPLIED TO HIM, NOT HER.”

Matthew Henry relates: “not to *stir up, or awake, her love until HE please*, now that HE is asleep in her arms, as she was borne up in his, Song of Solomon 2:6.”

John Wesley comments: “*Nor awake* - That you do not disturb nor offend HIM.”

#3 - Jeremiah 34:16 "But ye turned and polluted my name, and caused every man his servant,

and every man his handmaid, whom YE had set at liberty at their pleasure, to return, and brought them into subjection..."

The original 1611 said "YE" as does the Cambridge edition today, but the Oxford KJB edition says "whom HE had set at liberty".

Other Bible Versions in Jeremiah 34:16 - "whom YE (or YOU) had set at liberty" - Wycliffe, Coverdale, Bishops's Bible, the Geneva Bible, the ASV, RV, NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, Rotherham's Emphasized bible 1902, the 1917 Jewish translation put out by Jewish Publication Society, and the Third Millennium Bible 1998.

"whom HE had set at liberty" - NKJV, Youngs, 1936 Jewish translation put out by the Hebrew Publishing Company of New York, Lamsa's 1936 translation. The NIV Spanish translation has made it a singular instead of the Hebrew plural as found in the NIV English translation. The Spanish Reina Valera's read as does the KJB with "que habíais liberado" (whom ye had set at liberty) but the NIV Nueva Versión Internacional has made it a singular with "que había liberado." (whom he had set at liberty).

The Holman Standard, on the other hand, reads like no other. It says: "EACH has taken back HIS male and female slaves WHO HAD BEEN FREED to go wherever they wanted, and YOU have again subjugated them to be YOUR slaves." This version uses several pronouns and doesn't even tell us "who" set them at liberty.

Mr. Kutilek is all worked up about a little printing error he thinks he has found in the KJB, and he recommends we use the modern versions, yet they all continue to disagree with each other! That people like Mr. Kutilek have to resort to such petty arguments as this against the King James Bible, only shows how weak their case is and how desperate they are to find any error at all in God's Book.

Joshua 19:2 How many cities? Error in many bible versions.

In Joshua 19:1-6 we read of the lots being cast for the inheritance of the children of Simeon. Notice the number of the cities mentioned - 13 - and then number of cities listed in such versions as the NASB 1972-1977, Geneva, Bishops' bible, Coverdale, Wycliffe, RSV, NRSV, ESV and the Catholic Douay version.

The ever changing NASB has gone through 9 or 10 revisions so far, and each time they change textual readings of both the Old and New Testament, as well as their English translation. The 1972 and 1977 editions of the NASB say: "Beersheba AND Sheba, and....", but in 1995 the latest NASB has now corrected its previous blunder in this verse and now reads "Beersheba OR Sheba...".

To see more about the ever-changing 'literal' NASB, see -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/everchangingnasbs.htm>

In the King James Bible we read: "And they had their inheritance Beer-sheba, OR Sheba, and Moladah, and Hazarshual, and Balah, and Azem, and Eltolad, and Bethul, and Hormahn, and Ziklag, and Beth-marcaboth, and Hazarsusah, and Bethlebaoth, and Sharuhen; THIRTEEN CITIES and their villages."

If you count the number of cities mentioned in the King James Bible, and correctly take the reading of "OR Sheba" to mean that the town of Beer-sheba was also known as Sheba, then we end up with exactly 13 cities mentioned.

The Hebrew word Beer simply means a well or a pit, and it often formed a prefix for a more complete name. We can see this in names of other cities like the one mentioned in Ezra 2:24 and comparing this with Nehemiah 7:28. In Ezra we read a list of cities and the people who came from each. "The children of Azmaveth, forty and two" but in Nehemiah the same group is called "the men of BETHazmaveth, forty and two." In both cases it is the same city, but in the one example we have the additional "Beth" but not in the other.

However such versions as the NASB 1968-1977, RSV 1952, NRSV 1989, ESV 2001, Geneva bible, Bishops', Coverdale, Darby, Young's, Green's MKJV, and the Jehovah witness New Word Translation all read: "And they had in their inheritance Beersheba, AND Sheba, and Moladah....THIRTEEN cities." Yet a simple count from these wrong bible versions shows that they list FOURTEEN cities and not thirteen.

Good ol' Dr. Daniel Wallace, of Dallas Theological Seminary, with his ongoing scholarly disaster called the NET bible version simply omits the word altogether saying: "Their assigned land included Beer Sheba,(3) Moladah,..." Then in a revealing footnote Wallace tells us that he has "emended" the text (i.e. changed it at his own will) and that: "The MT has "and Sheba" listed after "Beer Sheba." The LXX suggests "Shema." The HEBREW TEXT APPEARS TO BE CORRUPT, since the form "Sheba" duplicates the latter part of the preceding name. If Sheba (or Shema) is retained, the list numbers fourteen, one more than the number given in the concluding summary (v. 6)."

This is so typical of today's "Blinded Scholar's Syndrome". These men with all their education are judicially blinded by God in their proud unbelief. Rather than accept a simple and reasonable explanation as to why God's preserved words are true, they prefer to believe that "the Hebrew text is corrupt", when in fact it is their own minds that are corrupt and not the words of God. John Gill comments on the passage saying: "Or, Beersheba, that is, Sheba; for so the particle "vau" is sometimes used, and must be so used here; or otherwise, instead of thirteen, it will appear that there are fourteen cities, contrary to the account of them, (Joshua 19:6); so Kimchi and Ben Melech make them one city."

Agreeing with the reading found in the King James Bible of "Beersheba, OR Sheba, and Moladah..." are the following Bible versions: the Revised Version 1881, the American Standard Version of 1901, the NKJV "Beersheba (Sheba) and...", the NIV 1982, TNIV 2005, Holman

Standard 2003, the NASB 1995 edition (but not all the previous NASBs) and even the Message. The King James Bible is always right.

The example here in Joshua 19:2 presents us with an interesting case of "printing errors". When the original 1611 Bible came out, it read as do the Cambridge editions today - "Beersheba, OR Sheba, and...". However some later Oxford editions changed this to: "Beersheba, AND Sheba, and...". This printing error is easily explained. A later printer could have been proof reading the text and noticed that Joshua 19 is listing a series of cities followed time and again with the word AND. He could easily have thought that the word OR was a printing error, when in fact it was not. So he "corrected" what he thought was a printing error, and instead created one himself. Later editions merely repeated this error.

There is no copyright law that is now binding on the publication of King James Bibles. You can print one up in your own basement if you wish. My wife has a KJV from World Press and in Deut. 33:6 it reads: "is not he thy father that hath BROUGHT thee?" instead of "thy father that hath BOUGHT thee?". Others have told me they have KJB bibles that read things like "the God of my LITE" instead of "the God of my LIFE". Are we to toss out the doctrine of an inerrant Bible solely on the basis of an occasional printing error that can easily be corrected by comparing the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts of the KJB? I think not.

One such Bible critic who continues to harp on the printing errors ploy in order to promote the idea that there does not exist now any Book that can truthfully be called the inspired and inerrant words of God is Rick Norris. Mr. Norris has written a book called 'The Unbound Scriptures'. Rick's "inspired original languages" (which he never identifies for us) is so Unbound that they can't even be found in a loose-leaf notebook. He will NEVER tell you what any of these "inspired original languages" actually SAY for any given verse, and they are not found in any book in print that he can recommend to anyone else. In his book he continues to attack the King James Bible in numerous ways as being incorrect and flawed. Every one of his points has been shot down as having no proof or validity at all. You can check out my Response to The Unbound Scriptures here -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/unboundscriptures.htm>

The last shallow foxhole Rick has taken refuge in is the printing errors issue. He keeps telling us that if a book has had printing errors in it, then it cannot be the perfect words of God. Actually, what his argument goes to prove is that there never was a complete Bible and there isn't one now in any language, including the Hebrew and the Greek. All his efforts are ultimately to try to prove that there is no inerrant Bible on the earth today. Never once in his entire book about the Bible does Rick ever tell us where we can get a hold of a tangible Bible in any language that he believes are the very words of God. Rick has no answers, but lots of questions - all along the lines of the first question recorded in Holy Writ, namely Satan's first words- "Yea, hath God said...?"

Try asking people like Rick Norris if his "inspired original languages" have printing errors in

them or not. He doesn't know. Why? Because they don't exist in print anywhere on this earth. Ask Rick if his "inspired original languages" read "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen" in Matthew 6:13, or if 1 John 5:7 and the witness to the Trinity is Scripture or not, or if 2 Chron. 22:2 reads 42 years or 22 years, and Rick will not tell you.

Believe me, I have tried many times, and Rick never tells anyone what the Bible really says for any passage of Scripture. Yet he is absolutely sure the King James Bible is not the true and inspired words of God. How does he know this? Well, it's his OPINION, of course, and we should just believe him because he is such a renowned scholar, and he has shown us that there have been occasional printing errors in the various editions of the King James Bible.

If you want to follow the reasoning of men like Rick Norris and Doug Kutilek and many others who deny the King James Bible is the very words of God, go right ahead. God takes the wise in their own craftiness. But realize that when you follow the reasoning of these men, you end up having no Bible to believe in, and each and every one of these men will have their own individual "bible" that differs in texts and meanings in hundreds if not thousands of ways from everybody else's "bible", and not even they themselves believe theirs is the complete and inerrant words of God. "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes." Judges 21:25

The examples listed above are just printing errors and they still can be found in some KJB, NKJV, NASB, and NIV editions today even with our modern high-tech presses. Don't let people like Doug Kutilek rob you of God's pure words and convince you we have no infallible Bible we can hold in our hands and believe. Bible relativists and KJB debunkers are only straining at gnats and swallowing camels.

Will Kinney

Return to Articles - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>

Notes from the internet clubs -

Gary Lehman posts: " What happened to inspiration? Did it stop when it arrived at the printers?"

Gary, it is God's words that are inspired, not the printing process. There are still typos in today's modern bibles and books even with advanced technology. So, to follow your argument to its logical end, we would have to conclude that there never was and is not now such a thing as a complete and 100% true Bible. Oh, wait... That IS what you believe already. What WAS I thinking? Silly me.

The underlying Hebrew texts (which the KJB always follows and your ESV does not) and the Greek text behind the KJB has never changed in 400 years.

The KJB is based on the Traditional Greek text still used today by the Orthodox Greek churches, and your ESV Textus Corruptus is the new one the Catholic/evangelical combine has created as

the new "interconfessional" N.T. text which NOBODY seriously defends as the infallible words of God.

The foretold apostasy and predicted falling away from the faith is well under way now and nobody is going to stop it.

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matthew 11:15

More Notes from the Internet

On Jan 4, 2012, at 11:32 AM, Dr. Ken Matto wrote:

Will,

Here is a blog which is for the sole purpose of stating the differences between the 1769 and 1611 KJV's. I don't know if you are aware of it but it was sent to me by a man who is concerned about his KJV.

Ken

<http://rickbeckman.org/blog/2007/03/24/kjv-1611-vs-kjv-1769/>

(2 Th 3:13 KJV) But ye, brethren, be not weary in well doing.

Visit Scion of Zion Internet Ministry - www.scionofzion.com

Friends don't let friends read the NIV, NASV, ESV, RSV, NKJV, HCSB, etc.

www.scionofzion.com/translations.htm

Hi brother Ken. I have seen this list many times and to me it is just plain obvious that they are nothing more than printing errors that were soon caught and corrected. But the bible agnostics and Bible critics will hang on to this excuse and pretext for dear life. It is the ONLY thing they still have going for them in an effort to "prove" that no Bible in any language is or ever was the complete and infallible words of God. Not one of these people has anything in the way of a complete and 100% true Bible in any language to give us in the place of the King James Bible, and they know it. They stubbornly and pridefully refuse to submit to God's final written authority and sovereignty in history in giving us the King James Bible as His Final Authority of Written Truth. I run into these guys on the internet all the time. They have run out of arguments and examples of alleged "errors" in the Book, so this is their last ditch effort to hang on to their Biblical agnosticism. That is how I see it.

Thank you for your continued stand for God's Book - the Authorized King James Holy Bible.

God bless,

Will Kinney

A Bible critic and bible agnostic named Rick Beckman, who himself does not believe that ANY Bible in ANY language IS or ever was the complete, inspired and 100% historically true words of God, has written a blog claiming that we King James Bible believers who maintain that the text of the King James Bible has not changed in 400 years except for print type from Gothic to Roman, spelling and “printing errors” are “liars”. He writes:

KJV 1611 vs KJV 1769 by Rick Beckman on March 24, 2007

I have heard this enough in varying places that I wanted to post this just to help others not be duped by the statement: The only changes made since the 1611 translation of the KJV until now have been changes of spelling or printing only. That statement is a lie, and people who love Jesus & the Bible should not make such a claim even if they do have the best of intentions in doing so! So here is a list of significant changes (i.e., changes which affect meaning) made to the KJV text since 1611. The 1611 reading is first, followed by the 1769." (End of statements by this Bible agnostic with no infallible Bible himself to give to you or anyone else)

I will include the list he gives us and address each example.

1 Corinthians 12:28 helps IN governments vs. helps, governments

According the Scrivener’s book, The Authorized Edition of the English Bible 1611, It’s Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives, this printing error was caught and corrected in 1629.

KJB 1611 - And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps IN gouernmets, diuersities of tongues.

KJB today - And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.

Bishops’ Bible 1568 - And God hath ordayneid some in the Churche, first Apostles, secondarely, prophetes, thirdeley teachers, then them that do miracles: after that, the gifteis of healyng, helpers, gouernours, diuersitie of tongues.

Geneva Bible 1587 - And God hath ordained some in the Church: as first Apostles, secondly Prophetes, thirdly teachers, then them that doe miracles: after that, the gifteis of healing, helpers, gouernours, diuersitie of tongues.

Joshua 3:11 Arke of the Covenant, EVEN the Lord vs. ark of the covenant OF the Lord

Scrivener says this was changed in the 1629 printing

KJB 1611 - Behold, the Arke of the Couenant, EVEN the Lord of all the earth, passeth ouer before you, into Iordan.

KJB today - Behold, the ark of the covenant OF the Lord of all the earth passeth over before you into Jordan.

Bishops' Bible 1568 - Beholde, the arke of the couenaunt OF the Lorde of all the world, goeth before you into Iordane.

Geneva Bible 1587 - Beholde, the Arke of the couenant OF the Lorde of all the worlde passeth before you into Iorden.

JPS 1917 - Behold, the ark of the covenant of the Lord of all the earth passeth on before you over the Jordan.

2 Kings 11:10 in the Temple vs. in the temple of the LORD

Scrivener says reading was caught and corrected in 1638.

KJB 1611 - And to the captaines ouer hundreds, did the Priest giue king Dauids speares and shields, that were in the Temple.

KJB today - And to the captains over hundreds did the priest give king David's spears and shields, that were in the temple OF THE LORD.

Coverdale 1535 - And the prest gaue the captaynes speares and shyldes which had bene kynge Dauids, and were in the house of the LORDE.

Geneva Bible 1587 - And the Priest gaue to the captaines of hundreths the speares and the shieldes that were King Dauids, & were in the house of the Lord.

JPS (Jewish Publication Society) 1917 - And the priest delivered to the captains over hundreds the spear and shields that had been king David's, which were in the house of the LORD.

Isaiah 49:13 for God vs for the LORD

Scrivener says this was caught and corrected in the 1638 edition.

KJB 1611 - Sing, O heauen, and be ioyfull, O earth, and breake forth into singing, O mountaines: for GOD hath comforted his people, and will haue mercy vpon his afflicted.

KJB today - Sing, O heavens; and be joyful, O earth; and break forth into singing, O mountains: for the LORD hath comforted his people, and will have mercy upon his afflicted.

It's hard to see how this is "a significant" difference in meaning. Even the NASB translates the word Jehovah as God 315 times and as LORD 6399 times. Of much greater significance is the fact that God Himself in numerous parallel passages interchanges the two words, using God in one and in the exact same passage in another places uses LORD.

An interesting fact about both the King James Bible and the Hebrew Scriptures themselves is that the words for Jehovah, translated in many Bibles as LORD (#3068 Jehovah) in capital letters and sometimes as GOD in capital letters are interchangeable with the word for God (#430 el-o-heem). There are many whole sections of Scripture found in Samuel, Kings, Chronicles and Psalms that relate the same events, yet in one the Hebrew text uses the word Jehovah and in the other it uses the word eloheem. Here is just one section of Scripture out of the many that do this. The same events are recorded in 2 Samuel 5:17 - 25 and in 1 Chronicles 14:8-17, yet we see the word Jehovah being used in 2 Samuel while Eloheem is used in 1 Chronicles, and at the same time Jehovah is used in both accounts. 2 Samuel 5:19 says: "And David inquired of the LORD" (Jehovah) but in 1 Chron. 14:10 the same verse reads: "And David enquired of God". In 2 Samuel 5:20 "and David smote them there, and said, The LORD hath broken forth upon mine enemies" yet in 1 Chron. 14:10 "The David said, God hath broken in upon mine enemies"; in 2 Samuel 5:23 "And when David inquired of the LORD" yet in 1 Chron. 14:14 "Therefore David enquired again of God"; in 2 Samuel 5:24 "for then shall the LORD go out before thee" but in 1 Chron. 14:15 "for God is gone forth before thee" and in 2 Samuel 5:25 "And David did so as the LORD had commanded him" while 1 Chron. 14:16 has: "David therefore did as God commanded him." Though the 1 Chronicles 14 passages often use "God" instead of "the LORD" yet we see "the LORD" being used in verses 14:10 and 17.

Jeremiah 31:14 - with goodness vs. with MY goodness.

Again, Scrivener says this was corrected in the 1629 edition. Not even Scrivener calls these

things “revisions” but merely “editions”.

KJB 1611 - And I will satiate the soule of the priests with fatnesse, and my people shall be satisfied with goodnesse, saith the Lord.

KJB today - And I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with MY goodness, saith the LORD.

Bishops’ Bible 1568 - I wyll powre plenteousnesse vpon the heartes of the priestes, and my people shalbe satisfied with MY goodnesse, saith the Lorde.

Geneva Bible 1587 - And I wil replenish the soule of the Priests with fatnesse, and my people shalbe satisfied with MY goodnesse, saith the Lord.

Jeremiah 51:30 burnt THEIR dwelling places vs. burned HER dwellingplaces

Scrivener says this was corrected in the 1629 edition. But even today the multiple bible versions continue to disagree among themselves. Those that read “HER dwelling places” are the ASV, the JPS 1917, RSV, ESV, NIV and NKJV

And those that read “THEIR dwelling places” are Coverdale, the NASB and Green’s literal.

KJB 1611 - their might hath failed, they became as women: they haue burnt THEIR dwelling places: her barres are broken.

KJB today - Their might has failed, They became like women; They have burned HER dwelling places, The bars of her gate are broken.

Bishops’ Bible 1568 - they shalbe lyke women, their dwellyng places shalbe burnt vp, their barres shalbe broken.

Geneva Bible 1587 - The strong men of Babel haue ceased to fight: they haue remayned in their holdes: their strength hath fayled, and they were like women: they haue burnt her dwelling places, and her barres are broken.

Ezekiel 6:8 that HE may vs. that YE may

Scrivener says that this was changed in the 1613 edition.

KJB 1611 - Yet will I leaue a remnant, that HE may haue some, that shall escape the sword among the nations, when ye shalbe scattered through the countreys.

KJB today - Yet will I leave a remnant, that YE may have some that shall escape the sword among the nations, when ye shall be scattered through the countries.

Bishops' Bible 1568 - that you may haue [some] that shall escape the sworde

Geneva Bible 1587 - that you may haue some that shall escape the sword

Ezekiel 24:5 let HIM seeth vs let THEM seethe

Scrivener says this was changed in the 1638 printing

KJB 1611 - Take the choice of the flocke, and burne also the bones vnder it, and make it boyle well, and let HIM seethe the bones of it therein.

KJB today - and make it boil well, and let THEM seethe the bones of it therein.

Most bible versions out there today simply omit both “them” and “him” altogether and say something like the NASB, ESVs with “boil it well; seethe also its bones in it.”

Ezekiel 24:7 poured it upon the ground vs. poured it NOT upon the ground.

Scrivener says this was caught and corrected to “poured it NOT upon the ground” in 1613. A very simple and easy to make printing error. Nothing mroe.

KJB 1611 - For her blood is in the middest of her: she set it vpon the toppe of a rocke, she powred it vpon the ground to couer it with dust:

KJB today - For her blood is in the midst of her; she set it upon the top of a rock; she poured it NOT upon the ground, to cover it with dust;

Bishops' Bible 1568 - vpon a hygh drye stone hath she powred it: and NOT vpon the grounde, that it myght be couered with dust.

Geneva Bible 1587 - and powred it NOT vpon on the ground to couer it with dust

Ezekiel 48:8 which THEY shall vs. which YE shall

Scrivener says this was changed in the 1638 edition

KJB 1611 - shall be the offring which THEY shall offer of fiue

KJB today - shall be the offering which YE shall offer of five and twenty thousand reeds in breadth

Daniel 3:15 a fierie furnace vs. a BURNING fiery furnace

Again, a simple printing error very easy to explain.

KJB 1611 - but if yee worship not, ye shall be cast the same houre into the midst of a fierie furnace, and who is that God that shall deliuer you out of my handes?

KJB today - But if you do not worship, you shall be cast immediately into the midst of a BURNING fiery furnace. And who is the god who will deliver you from my hands?"

Bishops' Bible 1568 - if ye worship it not, ye shalbe cast immediatly into the mids of a HOT firie fornace

Geneva Bible 1587 - ye shall be cast immediatly into the middes of an HOTE fierie fornace

Matthew 14:9 the othes sake vs. the oath's sake

KJB 1611 - And the king was sorie: neuerthelesse for the othes sake, and them which sate with him at meate, he commanded it to be giuen her:

KJB today - And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded it to be given her.

All this is was a change in punctuation and the KJB is right. It is many modern versions that are wrong. There was only one oath, and versions like the NKJV, NIV, NASB, ESV have the plural "oaths" which is wrong. See my article on this verse here:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/castinteethoathsake.htm>

Bishops' bible 1568 - Neuerthelesse, for the othes sake

Geneva Bible 1587 - neuerthelesse because of the othe

1 Corinthians 15:6 AND that vs. AFTER that

Scrivener says this was changed in the 1616 edition. A very simple and easy to make minor printing error that was soon corrected.

KJB 1611 - AND that hee was seene of aboue fiue hundred brethren at once:

KJB today - AFTER that He was seen by over five hundred brethren at once,

Bishops' Bible 1568 - AFTER that, he was seene of mo then fiue hundred brethren at once

Geneva Bible 1587 - AFTER that, he was seene of mo then fiue hudreth brethren at once:

1 John 5:12 the Sonne, hath vs. the Son OF GOD hath

Again, as simple printing error that does not even change the meaning of the verse in context and was caught and corrected in 1629.

KJB 1611 - Hee that hath the Sonne, hath life; and hee that hath not the Sonne, hath not life.

KJB today - He who has the Son has life; he who does not have the Son of God does not have life.

Bishops' Bible 1568 - He that hath the sonne, hath lyfe: and he that hath not the sonne of God, hath not lyfe.

Geneva Bible 1587 - He that hath that Sonne, hath yt life: and he that hath not yt Sonne of God, hath not that life.

The Bible agnostic critic continues: "Additionally, even today there are two versions of the KJV in use: the Oxford and the Cambridge editions. Some of the differences in them affect the

meaning of the text as well. For example, here are a couple Cambridge passages vs. their Oxford counterparts.

Jeremiah 34:16 “whom YE had set at liberty” vs. “whom HE had set at liberty”

Note: I have dealt with this one earlier in this article.

2 Timothy 2:2 “heard FROM me” vs. “heard OF me”

Note: The Greek texts here are the same and can legitimately be translated both ways. They have the same meaning! These printing error fellas are really getting hard up for examples.

1611 KJB first printing - And the things that thou hast heard OF mee among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithfull men, who shall be able to teach others also.

KJB today (Cambridge, Holman, World, Zondervan, National Publishing Company, Thomas Nelson publishing companies)

“And the things that thou hast heard OF me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.”

Geneva Bible 1587 - “And what things thou hast heard OF me, by many witnesses, ye same deliuer to faithfull men, which shalbe able to teache other also.”

Bishops’ Bible 1568 - “And the thynges that thou haste hearde OF me by many witnesses”