

*S*ETTINGS

OF THE

KING

JAMES BIBLE

A Review with Recommendations

On Its 400th Anniversary



G.A. RIPLINGER

SETTINGS OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE:

A Review with Recommendations

On Its 400th Anniversary

There exists on the market today a variety of King James Bibles. Some have good historic, linguistic, and Biblical support for their orthography. **Generally speaking, the British publishers (Cambridge, the Trinitarian Bible Society [TBS]), Oxford, and our American church-based Local Church Bible Publishers [LCBP] in Lansing, MI have produced the historically faithful settings.** On the other hand, American Publishers, such as Zondervan, Nelson, and the American Bible Society have introduced modernizations and Americanizations of spelling and have introduced careless and original capitalization in words, such as ‘Spirit’ and ‘Lord.’ I will address these problems first and then discuss the wonderful settings that Cambridge and the Trinitarian Bible Society provides.

The Unacceptable American Spelling

Reams of paper could be used, documenting variants in printings by American printers. In fact, I have an entire office devoted to this subject alone, with walls of books and a seeming mile of files. Trying to distil the essence of what I have found during several years of research will be virtually impossible.

As Britain colonized much of the English-speaking world, they brought with them their British spelling, which now covers the globe. Ethnocentric American publishers are ignorant of this and have introduced American spelling into the King James Bible. Of today’s over two billion English-speakers, whether as a first or second language, certainly a good percentage are not American and have never seen American spelling. American publishers are also unfamiliar with the fact that some of the words in the KJB have almost strictly Biblical usage and spelling and therefore cannot be secularized. This can be verified by examining the Bible’s words in the twenty volume *Oxford English Dictionary*. It demonstrates that numerous Bible words are not, in fact, archaic, but actually are much later in origin and have almost exclusively been used in the Holy Bible. The word ‘holpen’, for example, has had Biblical usage, almost exclusively, and is not an archaic form of ‘help,’ which is a much older word.

The following are samples of secular or American spelling that has been carelessly introduced by American Publishers, beginning with the American Bible Society, as early as 1856. Zondervan, publisher of the NIV, as one might expect, is the worst offender. Nelson, publisher of the NKJV, has editions which change the spelling of many words. They even give a list in the front material of *some* editions. These new version (NIV, NKJV) publishers have a vested interest in making the KJB appear as unstable as possible, to foment the ‘glories’ of their corrupt new versions. One example will paint a clear picture:

The following is an explanation of ‘why’ ‘musick’ cannot be spelled ‘music’ in an English (not American) Bible.

The English Bible is English. Read that again. It is not American. It is English, that is, from England. You’ve heard of English tea, English furniture, and English riding saddles. The Bible was written in England, in English. Noah Webster was adamant about Americanizing this to show America’s independence. His dictionary of 1828 set about to do just that. What he and many fail to realize is that the English have reasons for spelling as they do. Remember, they are the progenitors of English. The Saxons, who adopted the Roman alphabet, used ‘c’ with its hard sound, like that of ‘k’. But after the Norman invasion and conquest, ‘c’ before ‘e’, ‘i’, and ‘y’ took the sound of ‘s’. It became necessary to change this letter in words where it was necessary to retain the ‘k’ sound before vowels. This created problems, so our ancestors introduced ‘k’ from the Greek, after ‘c’. In syllables beginning with ‘i’ and ‘e’, ‘k’ is added to ‘c’. We see this in words such as ‘musick’. Early English writers took both letters, the ‘c’ from the Romans, and the ‘k’ from the Greeks, to solve the problem. Or should we teach sight-reading instead of phonics? The former has left millions of students unable to read? Generations ago, many learned to read from the King James Bible. It still works.

A missionary to Kuwait in the Middle East told me the following story. He taught at an ‘English’ speaking school, which drew students from every corner of the world, brought there by their parents, who were employed in the oil industry. All of the students spelled the word ‘music’ as ‘musick.’ He marked it wrong on all of their papers and was met by angry parents from every nationality and continent, European, Asian, African, and etc. He quickly learned that the entire globe, except for America, speaks and spells ‘British’ English.

Spelling changes normally do not change theology. Remember the word ‘word’ is spelled as ‘woort’ in Dutch and ‘wort’ in German. It has been spelled historically in southern Europe as palabra, parole, parolle, palavra, palaoulo, parola, and pled. These are not theological differences. God has not abandoned his word to heresy. But international English must be maintained worldwide. It would be similar to the U.S. creating their own time, longitude, and latitude, instead of following the worldwide Greenwich, England time, longitude and latitude. We think of British English as ‘old fashioned’ but it is in fact quite modern in all the other countries of the world. The 1200 page book, *In Awe of Thy Word*, explains this in complete detail (G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of Thy Word: Understanding the King James Bible*, Ararat, VA: A.V. Publications, 2003).

The following are just a few examples of one Zondervan Bible and how they change the spelling of words and show innovation and carelessness in other ways. A few are differences seen in good Cambridge or even Oxford editions, but most are simply Americanized or secular spellings, typos, misplaced commas, or innovative and careless errors. Generally speaking, the left column is Cambridge or Oxford; the right column is Zondervan.

Abraham
After that, the sons
always
an cle
Ammiel
And he will cut wood
and his sons
And if thou
and land
answered them
any thing
Appii forum
round
asswage
at Mizpah,
awl
Babylon
baken
Baptist
bason
basons
Bath-shemesh
behoved
Beth-Jeshimoth
bewrayeth
bide
broided
burnt offerings,
cast four anchors
Chelup
cieled
clift
cloke
crookbackt
cuckow
daughter in law
drink offering
dwelling place
Elam and
enclose
enquire
ensample
enquired
enquiry
Ephron dwelt
evildoers

Abraham,
after that the sons
always
ankle
Ammiol
And we will cut wood
and his sons,
For if thou
and the land
answered them,
anything
Appiiforum
around
assuage
at Mizpah
awl
Babylon,
baked,
Baptist,
basin
basins
Beth-shemesh
behooved
Beth-jeshimoth
betrayeth
abide
braided
burnt offerings
cast forth anchors
Chelub
ceiled
cleft
cloak
crookbacked
cuckoo
daughter-in-law
drink offerings
dwellingplace
Elam, and
inclose
inquire
example
inquired
inquiry
And Ephron dwelt
evil doers

eye sight	eyesight
Ezion-gaber	Ezion-geber
farther	further
father in law	father-in-law
father's	fathers'
fatherless	fatherless,
fats	vats
fetcht	fetchd
fine	refine
finer	refiner
fining	refining
first fruits	firstfruits
firstbegotten	first begotten
feet	foot
for ever,	for ever
free will	freewill
fulness	fullness
garlick	garlic
Gentiles,	Gentiles
graff	graft
graffed	grafted
hand breadth	handbreadth
hand weapon	handweapon
havock	havoc
He, that	He that
her's	hers
heretick	heretic
highway	high way
him,	him
hinder part	hinderpart
his Spirit	his spirit
hoised	hoisted
holes	holds
holpen	helped
holy Spirit	holy spirit
house top	housetop
Howbeit	Howbeit,
hungred	hungered
I bear you record	I bear your record
idle	idol
inclosed	enclosed
intreat	entreat
intreated	entreated
Jerusalem,	Jerusalem
jubile	jubilee
Juda	Judah

Judaea,	Judaea
knop	knob
land of Naomi	hand of Naomi
lentiles	lentils
lien	lain
lookingglasses	looking glasses
lords	lords,
lothe	loathe
loveth	loved
lowring	lowering
lunatick	lunatic
maidservant	maidservant,
marishes	marshes
Micah	Michah
mixt	mixed
morter	mortar
moth eaten	motheaten
mother in law	mother-in-law
musick	music
Nebuchadnezzar	Nebuchadnezzar,
nessings	sneezings
Nicolas	Nicholas
Nicolaitanes	Nicolaitans
night	night,
no thing	nothing,
Now the queen	Now the queen,
old time saying	old time, saying
ought	ought
Pannag	pannag
payed	paid
Perizzites	Perizzites,
plains of Moab,	plains of Moab
plaister	plaster
plaistered	plastered
platted	plaited
plough	plow
pluckt	plucked
pourtray	portray
pourtrayed	portrayed
practise	practice
pransing	prancing
prayeth	prayed
pressfat	pressvat
priests of the Levites	priests the Levites
pruninghooks	pruning hooks
publick	public

publicly	publicly
repayed	repaid
rereward	rearward
revenges	revengers
Sabtechah	Sabtechs
Sara	Sarah
selfwilled	self-willed
serjeants	sergeants
shew	show
shewbread	showbread
shewed	showed
shewed	shown
shewedst	showedst,
shewest	showest
shewing	showing
sith	since
sodering	soldering
son in law	son-in-law
sope	soap
Spirit of God	spirit of God (8 times)
Spirit of the LORD	spirit of the LORD (20 times)
spue	spew
spued	spewed
spunge	sponge
stablish	establish
stript	stripped
strowed	strewed
subtil	subtle
subtilly	subtly
supplications	supplication
suretiship	suretyship
sweet smelling	sweetsmelling
sycamore	sycamore
Syria and Cilicai	Syria, and Cilicai
Syriack	Syriac
that I purpose,	that I purpose
the king	the king,
the LORD: and	the LORD and
the river	the river
therefore,	therefore
throughly	thoroughly
to day	today
to morrow	tomorrow
to night	tonight
together,	together
traffick	traffic

travel	travail
utter	outer
wailing	Wailing
wast	was
watch tower	watchtower
well favoured	well favoured
well pleasing	wellpleasing,
were	were,
whom he had	whom ye had
whose soever	whosoever
willing hearted	willinghearted
winefat	winevat
wise hearted	wisehearted
Zebadiah	Zevadiah

Other non-Cambridge or non-Oxford KJBs may exhibit changes, such as the following: Some change ‘darkness’ to ‘blindness’ in 1 John 2:11. Some change chesnut to chestnut, labour to labor, Saviour to Savior, vapour to vapor, clamour to clamor, colour to color, armour to armor, behaviour to behavior, odour to odor, rigour to rigor, rumour to rumor, endeavour to endeavor, neighbour to neighbor, favour to favor, succour to succor, astonied to astonished, Sion to Zion, Stoicks to Stoics, cockatrice’ to cockatrice’s, grisled to grizzled, and houghed to hocked. Again, such is American spelling, which will be unrecognizable by the majority of ‘English-speaking’ people in India, Africa, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Scotland, Ireland, and the Orient, not to mention the European countries who are now using ‘English’ (not American) as their common language.

Thomas A. Nelson’s King James Bibles often make most of the aforementioned spelling changes. They also change afterwards to afterward, appalled to appaled, armoury to armory, brasen to brazen, with the corresponding omission of the built-in definition of ‘brass’. They Americanize the spelling to caterpillar, embroidered, defense, distill, inclosed, forbade, fullness, furbished, grizzled, knob, lentils, marveled, offense, paid, rebukable, recompense, repaid, reprovable, savor, scepter, sepulcher, Zion, steadfast, streaked, succorer, traveler, unblamable, outer, willfully, withes, and worshiped. They introduce non-historical New Testament spellings for Hosea, Isaiah, Jonah, Elijah, Zechariah, Balak, Jeremiah, Josiah, and Timothy. They randomly put ‘Lord’ in all caps, as LORD, in the New Testament (e.g. Acts 19:5, 10, 18:8, 9, 25, 17:24, 27, John 20:13, 18, 20, 25, 28).

Nelson joins Zodhiates’ KJBs by sometimes changing ‘Jesus’ to ‘Joshua’ in Acts 7:45 and Heb. 4:8. This is an oddity, since the word in every Greek text is the same Greek word translated ‘Jesus’ throughout the New Testament. Misrepresenting ‘the Greek’ is D.A. Waite’s *The Defined King James Bible*, which places ‘Joshua’ in the margin, thereby denying the pre-incarnate Christ. Nelson changes ‘thoroughly’ to ‘thoroughly’ in 2 Tim. 3:17. Such changes are manifestly compounded by Nelson’s notes which invariably charge the KJB with error and suggest corrections which match their own New King James Version. Bullinger’s Companion Bible, published by Kregel, and the Classic Note Bible, now published by Jack Schaap, also take liberties with the KJB’s

spelling. Each American Bible Society KJB must be examined individually. Some completely Americanize the spelling on every line. Others use a more correct orthography. Check Romans 1.

In addition to the KJB editions which update spelling (Nelson, Zondervan, some ABS, etc.) there are versions, which call themselves KJB, but which are actually modern updates, changing words entirely! In other words, they are little better than the NKJV. These include the Evidence Bible by Ray Comfort, the Jimmy Swaggart KJB, and the Easy Reading KJB, edited by D.A. Waite, Jr., and published by The Global Bible Society and a group in Goodyear, Arizona. There are other unreliable versions, which call themselves KJB, but are clearly not. These include David Norton's *New Paragraph Cambridge Edition* from Cambridge and F.H.A. Scrivener's Paragraph Bible.

The Historic Cambridge (TBS) and Oxford Settings

The good news is that there are those who have preserved the settings of the Holy Bible which have historic merit, that is, whose orthography can be traced back at well over two hundred years. There have been microscopic spelling and orthographic varieties evident in the English Bible for centuries. For example, the reading in Josh. 19:2 "or Sheba" occurred in the 1611, 1612, and 1613, while "and Sheba" occurs in the Geneva, Bishops', KJB 1616, 1629, 1638 and 1769 editions. Since Joshua 19:6 limits the number of cities to thirteen, "or Sheba" seems correct. If "and Sheba" were correct, that would be fourteen cities. Genesis 26:33 sheds more light saying, "And he called it Shebah: therefore the name of the city is Beer-Sheba unto this day." Such varieties have remained for centuries because: 1.) They introduce no actual errors into the Bible, as the correct understanding can be deduced from either reading or the usage throughout the Bible. 2.) Old Hebrew, Greek, and vernacular editions give no definitive resolutions or the word could be translated either way, giving generally the same sense (e.g. Isa. 44:20 "on ashes" or "of ashes" seen in 1611, 1638, and 1701. 3.) The spelling or capitalization of a word has varied within the Bible itself, among British Bible publishers, as well as in British culture. The word 'gray' for example, has been spelled in England as both 'gray' and 'grey' for centuries. Neither is patently wrong. But is one more Biblical than the other? Such questions remain to be thoroughly researched.

The 1611 edition of the King James Bible used *both* spellings of a number of words whose spelling is in question today. In the case of some words, such as 'ensample' and 'example,' both spellings were used in 1611 and both are needed today. In other cases, both spellings of words were used in the 1611 edition and today's printers seem to be choosing one or the other spelling, not both. The 1611 used both 'cloke' and 'cloak', 'intreat' and 'entreat,' 'inquiry' and 'enquiry', 'mortar' and 'morter', 'thoroughly' and 'thoroughly' (Gen. 11:3) and 'vail' and 'vale'. The question remains for us today: 'Did they have a reason for this in each case, or was it done because spelling was used to justify line length? Dictionaries are inconclusive. With the advent of 'spell check,' today's printers are unwisely making global changes in spelling. Yet differences in spelling may be important. For example, the spelling 'cloke' brings up the phoneme 'oke' which brings to mind the words 'choke' and 'yoke' – all words related to the neck, where a cloke is tied. (We won't mention modern words which 'grab' the throat, like a cloke, such as 'smoke' and 'toke.')

More research is needed on the subject of sound as it relates

to ‘sense’ in the area of Bible words. Oxford and Cambridge have each settled on using one or the other spelling, not both. Neither reproduces the 1611, which uses both spellings. Therefore, in a few cases, one publisher cannot claim that the other publisher is in error.

However, there are a number of differences between the Cambridge/TBS and Oxford settings, which, when researched, weigh heavily in favor of the settings by TBS and Cambridge University Press. Although one cannot claim that Cambridge/TBS is ‘right’ and Oxford is ‘wrong,’ the evidence weighs very strongly in favor of Cambridge and the TBS. The following examples show most of the differences between the Cambridge and Oxford settings, with the TBS and Cambridge reading having the strongest case every time. (Rarely, some Cambridge settings match the Oxford in these examples, as will be discussed later in this paper.) *Generally* speaking, the first reading is the Oxford; the second is the Cambridge. The asterisk shows when the Cambridge 1819 reading matches the Oxford, which demonstrates that the Cambridge and Oxford readings have mixed over time.

Genesis 15:13

their's

theirs

Genesis 26:20

our's

ours

Genesis 46:12

Zarah*

Zerah

Deuteronomy 11:24

your's

yours

Joshua 13:18

Jahaza*

Jahazah

Joshua 19:2

and Sheba

or Sheba

Joshua 19:19

Haphraim*

Hapharaim

1 Samuel 31:2

Melchi-shua*

Malchi-shua

2 Samuel 21:21

Shimeah*

Shimea

1 Kings 8:56

Lord

LORD

2 Chronicles 33:19

sins

sin

Ezra 2:2

Mizpar*

Mispar

Ezra 4:10

Asnapper*

Asnappar

Psalms 107:27

wit's end*

wits' end

Psalms 148:8

vapours

vapour

Proverbs 20:25

enquiry

inquiry (Cambridge/TBS Lg. Print, PCE)/enquiry (Windsor/Concord)

Proverbs 20:29

grey

gray

Ecclesiastes 8:17

farther

further

Jeremiah 34:16

whom he

whom ye

Amos 2:2

Kirioth*

Kerioth

Naham 3:16

fleeth*

flieth

Matthew 2:7

enquired

inquired

Matthew 4:1

spirit

Spirit

Mark 1:19

farther*

further

Luke 6:20

your's

yours

1 Corinthians 4:15

instructors

instructors

Revelation 2:6

Nicolaitanes*

Nicolaitans

Revelation 21:20

chrysolyte

chrysolite

There are some other differences between Cambridge/TBS and Oxford settings; a few examples include:

- 1) In Exodus 34:23 the Cambridge/TBS text spells “men children” as two words, and the Oxford text spells “menchildren” as one word.
- 2) In 2 Kings 19:26 the Cambridge/TBS text spells “housetops” as one word, and the Oxford text spells “house tops” as two words.
- 3) In Matthew 26:39 the Cambridge/TBS text says “further” and the Oxford text says “farther.”

The weakness of the Oxford settings is magnified in some of their Scofield settings, which are a unique (careless) variety of the Oxford setting. The following are some of the variants unique to *some* Scofield settings, when compared to other Scofield and Oxford settings.

1. Leviticus 14:36 in the Scofield text reads “and all that” and the Oxford text reads “that all that.”
2. Deuteronomy 22:3 in the Scofield text reads “lost things” and the Oxford text reads “lost thing.”
3. The Scofield text adds “And” before “When thou dost” in Deuteronomy 24:10.
4. 1 Samuel 17:48 in the Scofield text reads “hastened” and the Oxford text reads “hasted.”
5. 2 Samuel 16:15 in the Scofield text reads “people of the men” and the Oxford text reads “people the men.”
6. Romans 8:33 in the Scofield text reads “anything” as one word and the Oxford text reads “any thing” as two words.
7. Revelation 18:14 in the Scofield text reads “lusteth” and the Oxford text reads “lusted.”
8. The Scofield text hyphenates some words that are not hyphenated in the Oxford text.
 - * Genesis 50:10 in the Scofield text reads “threshing-floor.”
 - * 2 Samuel 12:31 in the Scofield text reads “brick-kiln.”
 - * Mark 14:14 in the Scofield text reads “guest-chamber.”
 - * Throughout the Scofield text, sacrifices are made into hyphenated words, such as burnt-offering, sin-offering, peace-offering, freewill-offering, etc..

Cambridge University Press and the Trinitarian Bible Society

Cambridge University and TBS wins hands down in its faithfulness to preserve the most historic spellings and settings. However, within the Cambridge/TBS family of Bibles, there exist some very microscopic orthographic (spelling or punctuation) varieties. These exist because there are no definitive answers as to which is correct. To the uninitiated, this may seem odd. Why not simply compare them to a 1611 printing? Recall that there were hundreds of typos in the first setting of the KJB. It was set by hand, letter by letter, before the invention of prescription glasses or electric lights. It took many years to discover all of the tiny typos. Some *unwisely* consult F.H.A. Scrivener's *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611) Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*. According to *all* scholars, Scrivener confused the first setting of 1611 with the second setting of 1611 and therefore his analysis is not authoritative, nor is David Norton's, *A Textual History of the King James Bible*, which sometimes followed Scrivener's choices. No serious Bible-reading Christian would ever accept Norton's 'new' KJB text, as seen in his *New Cambridge Paragraph Bible*, which even he often admits is "speculative" (e.g. *A Textual History of the King James Bible*, p. 42).

Additionally, the 1611 setting still exhibited the tendency of Germanic languages to capitalize substantives. This changed soon, but the capitalization of words, such as 'Spirit,' exhibits some variety as time went on. This variety was evident in earlier English Bibles also, which seems to indicate that just as 1 Corinthians 2:11, 12 and 6:17 indicate, the Holy Ghost is referred to as both the spirit and the Spirit. The context is the determining factor.

The 1769 edition, done by Blayney, also had its own typos, approximately 116. The name '1769' is frequently and wrongly applied to digital editions on the internet, which are simply a digitization of the Cambridge Concord edition, a singular variety of the Cambridge text. No one has digitized the actual 1769 and it would be pointless to do so. Much spelling and orthography was finalized in this 1769 edition. Further modernizations are uncalled for and begin to move the KJB from Biblical and solemn to the orthography of a common newspaper. Examples might include the change from 'Counsellor' to 'Counsellor,' 'rasor' to 'razor' and a few other modernizations in the Concord setting.

Within the Cambridge family there are, generally speaking, three types of settings: 1.) the Cambridge Concord, which has been digitized by Online Bible. Its creator, Larry Pierce, generously allows anyone to use it and therefore it is seen in many modern reference Bibles and several great text-only Bibles, such as the Windsor, available at avpublications.com. (Pierce's placement of paragraph marks, notably after Acts 20:36, is not standard, however.) 2.) Most of the other editions (Turquoise, Cameo, Large Print etc.), and 3.) the Standard text.

A fourth variety has been presumptuously named the 'Pure Cambridge Edition' (PCE). It is an generally out-of-print Cambridge setting, determined to be 'pure' by Mr.

Verschuur, a young Pentecostal man from Australia. His research is fairly exhaustive, and he is to be commended for his zeal for a pure Bible. He is a good friend of the King James Bible, in an era of too many enemies. But his final conclusions, that the Cambridge setting he uses is in *all points* superior to other Cambridge settings, cannot be defended, at *every* point. On these points he relies on his ‘Pentecostal’ experiences to defend them, as described in his book. Such non-scriptural and non-historical ‘accidents’ are inadmissible in this debate. No one will be misled by any Cambridge/TBS Bible and none of the setting variants within the Cambridge family can be dismissed unquestionably. Those who are adamant about such things are generally basing their conclusions upon a narrower collection and collation of Bibles than those who are less adamant. The righteous rigor with which King James Bible users have defended the KJB cannot be carried forward onto a debate between the orthography of one or two words (i.e. Spirit and Geba), which have seemed to defy historical and theological resolution for centuries.

The following are the differences in current Cambridge editions. (There seems to be no point in collating out-of-print editions, except to trace history). This list may not be exhaustive. (When I say ‘except the Standard,’ I mean the setting sold by Cambridge and referred to as the Standard Text. It seems to be unique among Cambridge editions and would require its own collation, which I have not done.)

Gen. 24:57 etc. etc. uses ‘enquire’ (Concord/Windsor) and ‘inquire’ (PCE and all other Cambridge settings, except the Standard text). The original KJB used *both* ‘enquire’ and ‘inquire’ in various places, generally using ‘enquire.’ Neither the Cambridge Bibles, nor any other modern printer makes these fine distinctions. So finger pointing is ‘pointless.’ Therefore the penchant for ‘inquire’ by the PCE is rather weak.

Further research is needed as to the age of the Concord’s spelling and whether Biblical orthography is repressed by it in the following words.

Numbers 6:5 etc, etc. razor (Concord/Windsor) and ‘rasor’ (PCE and all other Cambridge Bibles, except the Standard text). The oldest spelling is ‘rasor’ which gives it more weight. One generally wants to avoid modernizations and Americanizations. This is one of the very few instances in which the Concord has a more modern spelling than the 1611. However, modern is a relative word, as the spelling ‘razor’ is seen in 1819 in a Cambridge edition in my collection.

Isa. 9:6 etc. ‘Counsellor’ (Concord/Windsor) and ‘Counseller’ (PCE and all other Cambridge editions, except the Standard text).

Ezekiel 47:3 etc. ‘ankles’ (Concord/Windsor) and ‘ancles’ (PCE and all other Cambridge editions, except the Standard text).

Ezra 6:4 etc. ‘expenses’ (Concord/Windsor) and ‘expences’ (PCE and all other Cambridge editions, except the Standard text).

A few slight textual varieties exist among the Cambridge editions. Run to a variety of Greek and Hebrew editions and you will find few if any definitive answers.

Exodus 23:23 “the Hivites” (1612, 1613, Concord/Windsor) and “and the Hivites” (1616, 1629 Cambridge, 1638, PCE, and all other Cambridge texts, except the Standard).

2 Sam. 18:29 “Is the” (Concord/Windsor) and “*Is* the” (PCE and all other Cambridge texts, except the Standard).

Ezra 2:26 “Gaba” (Concord/Windsor) and “Geba” (PCE and all other Cambridge texts, except the Standard).

A few variants in punctuation exist in the Cambridge family. For example:

Jeremiah 32:5 has ‘prosper.’ (Concord/Windsor) and ‘prosper?’ (PCE and all other Cambridge texts, except the Standard).

Mark 2:1 has ‘Capernaum after’ (Concord/Windsor) and ‘Capernaum, after’ (PCE and all other Cambridge texts, except the Standard).

1 Corinthians 15:27 has “saith all” (Concord/Windsor) and ‘saith, all’ (PCE and all other Cambridge texts, except the Standard).

The chart to follow shows Cambridge variants, and compares them to the settings which were done when the KJB translators were still alive. Because of the translator’s involvement with the settings of the 1616, 1629, and 1638 (Boyce, Ward, et al.), these settings carry the translator’s authority. The historical Cambridge readings become fairly obvious by looking at the chart.

Cambridge should examine the slight typographical anomalies which deflect from their historical text and correspondingly make all of their settings uniform. Thankfully, Cambridge has been quite agreeable about fixing such things. But remember, their tiny variants can be multiplied by the scores and scores when an Oxford, Scofield, Nelson, Hendrickson, Holman, or Zondervan edition is examined. I have found enough non-sensical and original orthography in the Scofield, Nelson, Hendrickson, Holman, and Zondervan settings to fill a thick file folder, not a small chart.

Tiny Variants in the Cambridge Settings

	1611	Cambridge 1616	Cambridge 1629	Cambridge 1638	PCE (temporarily available from LCBP as item #180)	TBS /Cambridge LG Print Text Only available from avpublications.com	TBS /Cambridge Concord (Available in the Windsor and Giant print from avpublications.com and all first-generation settings from LCBP .
Gen. 24:57, etc.	enquire	enquire	enquire	enquire	inquire*	inquire*	enquire
Ex. 23:23	the Hivites	and the Hivites	and the Hivites	and the Hivites	and the Hivites	and the Hivites	the Hivites*
Num.6:5, etc.	rasor	rasor	rasor	rasor	rasor	rasor	razor*
2 Sam. 18:29	Is the	Is the	Is the	Is the	Is the	Is the	Is the*
Ezra 2:26	Gaba	Gaba	Gaba	Gaba	Geba	Geba	Gaba*
Ezra 6:4, etc.	expences	expences	expenses	expenses	expences*	expences*	expenses
Isaiah 9:6	Counseller	Counseller	Counseller	Counseller	Counseller	Counseller	Councillor*
Jer. 32:5	prosper.	prosper.	prosper?	prosper?	prosper?	prosper?	prosper.*
Ez. 47:3, etc.	ancles	ancles	ankles	ankles	ancles*	ancles*	ankles
Mark 2:1	Capernaum after	Capernaum after	Capernaum, after	Capernaum , after	Capernaum , after	Capernaum, after	Capernaum after
Acts 11:12	spirit	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit	spirit	spirit	Spirit*
Acts 11:28	spirit	spirit	spirit	spirit	spirit	spirit	Spirit*
Rom. 4:18	nations:	nations:	nations;	nations;	nations;	nations;	nations,*
1 Cor. 15:27	saith all	saith all	saith all	saith all	saith, all*	saith, all*	saith all
1 John 5:8	Spirit	Spirit	spirit	spirit	spirit	Spirit	Spirit*

*The Cambridge 1819, as represented by the asterisk, has a mix of Cambridge readings.

In the previous chart, I have marked in **bold** those renderings which seem weaker or unique, perhaps, but are not necessarily wrong. Again, a more exhaustive timeline could, in fact, prove some correct. The question often remains unanswerable: Was there a typo in the 1611, or was it in the 1616, 1629, or 1638, the latter three being serious attempts by original translators themselves to address typos in the 1611? The PCE and

Cambridge Large Print Text Only have four questionable orthographic spots. The Concord/Windsor also has four questionable orthographic renderings. This leaves neither a clear favorite from an orthographic view, although the Large Print and PCE are definitely stronger in all four places where the Concord is marked in bold. A few of the differences will require further investigation to resolve them. The question about Geba vs Gaba stems, in part, from the other usage of the word in Neh. 7:30. It appears that the typo in the 1611 (Geba) was not caught until 1638 (Gaba). (Both Cambridge, Oxford and all printers have spots which all concerned *admit* are typos. Such places are not a part of the chart and the perennial discussion. For example, the actual typos in the Cambridge Large Print and LCBP '180' series are their use of skekel for shekel (Neh. 10:32) and LORD GOD for Lord GOD (Jer. 49:5). Such typos are small compared to other settings.)

Spirit or spirit

The capitalization of Spirit varies widely throughout the history of the English Bible. It also varies widely in Bibles of other languages. For example, in 1 John 5:8 'Spirit' is capitalized in half of the world's old pure Bibles, according to a collation done for me by Dr. Nico Verhoef of Switzerland. A quick random examination shows that 'Spirit' is capitalized in the French Martin (1855), the Italian Diodoti (1641/1825), the Spanish Valera (1909), the Spanish Reina (1569), the Romanian 1916, the Urdu (1870), the German Luther of 1565 and 1760, the Dutch of 1587, the Statenbijbel of 1637, the Zurcher of 1531, and the Piscatar of 1684. This mix of Germanic and Romance language Bibles demonstrates that capitalization in this verse is not based entirely on a Germanic element.

One must remember that the Hebrew language had no lower case letter; Greek only developed a lower case many years after the New Testament was written. So evidently God is able to communicate his word by using the context, *without* upper and lower case letters.

1 John 5:8 has 'Spirit' (Concord, Windsor, and most Cambridge Bibles, including the large print) and 'spirit' (Standard text, and PCE). The context tells the reader what 'spirit' is being referenced. In this case, verse 6 is a direct parallel and has always been capitalized. A study done "line upon line," while "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" will answer most questions. For example, Mat. 4:1 should capitalize 'Spirit,' as does its parallel verse in another gospel. (See also Acts 11:12, and 11:28 for varieties of capitalization for Spirit among Cambridge editions). I examined every usage of the word 'spirit' and 'Spirit' in the entire Bible, throughout history, in both English Bibles and in other languages. My conclusion is that God seems to have allowed latitude in this area, perhaps not in every case, but sometimes.

1 John 5:8

Cambridge Large Print Text Only and the Windsor Text Only: "Spirit"
Sundry other printers, including Verschuur's PCE: "spirit"

Both are correct. English is of West Germanic origin. Even today modern German still capitalizes substantives (nouns). They have 'Cat,' not cat.' This was seen clearly in the 1611 edition with its capitalization of several words which are no longer capitalized today. It capitalized all three words, 'Spirit,' 'Water' and 'Blood' in 1 John

5:8. Subsequent Bibles began to drop the Germanic capitalization of certain words. Subsequent Bibles show a variety here, some capitalizing none of these three words and some only capitalizing Spirit. At our juncture in the history of the English language, I personally feel more comfortable with ‘Spirit’, because it matches verse 6, the perfectly parallel verse. Those who have read *In Awe of Thy Word* will see the familiar pattern of parallel verses which contain parallel words.

1 John 5:6 “This is he **that** came by **water and blood**, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by **water and blood**. And it is **the Spirit** that **beareth witness**, because the Spirit is truth.

1 John 5:8 “And there are three **that bear witness** in earth, **the Spirit**, and the **water**, and **the blood**: and these three agree in one.”

Verse 7 begins with ‘For’ and verse 8 begins with “And,” thereby showing the connection between verses 6, 7, and 8. Now wasn’t that simple. One did not need to get, as I did, some \$100,000 worth of antique and rare Bibles to store at the bank; one simply needed to look at the context. God often repeats himself as a double check. Romans 8:16 is a good cross reference. It says, “The **Spirit** itself **beareth witness** with our spirit, that we are the children of God...”

Unfortunately, Mr. Verschuur (PCE) insists that lower case ‘s’ is correct in 1 John 5:8. In his discussion of 1 John 5:8, he states that his choice is based upon what he calls ‘Pentecostal doctrine,’ which doctrine, he says, is contained in his ‘Pure’ Cambridge Edition.” His misunderstanding of the usage of the word ‘spirit’ and ‘Spirit’, based upon his Pentecostal theology, causes him to be adamant about his decision here. Having looked at Bibles worldwide and back through time, I can confirm that both lower case and capital ‘S’ can be correct. Neither is an error.

The Bible clearly uses both ‘spirit’ and ‘Spirit’ to refer to the Holy Spirit. 1 Corinthians 2:11, 12 says, “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God...”

As I did with each variant, I spent months looking at Bibles from the Gothic (1st century), to the Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthews, Geneva, Bishops. Each pure antique version of the French, Italian, German, Spanish and other worldwide Bibles were examined by myself or Dr. Verhoef of Switzerland. I concluded that the use of lower case or upper case in 1 John 5:8 verse was a head-on draw. The capital ‘S’ went over the top in my investigation, but only very slightly. This leads me to conclude that both are acceptable in 1 John 5:8.

I examined the capitalization of ‘S’ for Spirit in its almost every occurrence in the Bible, in most of these aforementioned editions. I concluded that God had allowed varieties, so apparently, if it varied, it was a linguistic and orthographic element, not a

theological element. However, I do feel strongly that Gen. 1:2 and Mat. 4:1 should be a capital ‘S.’ There are other instances like this.

The Solution

Prayer is the missing ingredient in this debate. Some years ago, I noticed that a few Cambridge editions did not capitalize ‘S’ in 1 John 5:8. So I prayed daily for many years that they would fix it. I *never* contacted Cambridge, nor discussed it with anyone else, as I did not want to influence the issue. I wanted God to have his way. Cambridge fixed it when someone I did not know contacted them. For those who would squabble vehemently about such inconsequential things as the spelling and orthography of words, I would suggest we have a praying competition, and see what the Lord does. I say inconsequential, because the two days previous to writing this article, I was collating the existing Swahili Bible. These dear folks have not had anything but a Westcott-Hort text since 1883. If you can help us restore their 1879 New Testament, we would be tickled (<http://www.holybiblefoundation.org>). Their Swahili Union Bible says in Eph. 3:9, “God who created all things.” Our KJB (by ANY printer) says, “God who created all things by Jesus Christ.” The spelling of ‘inquiry’ seems rather immaterial, when millions (billions?) have nothing but a lacerated Westcott-Hort Bible. I recommend keeping whatever KJB one has, until it falls apart. Hopefully, you will wear out a Bible every few years, as I do. If you cannot wait to replace your Bible, mail the old one to A.V. Publications, P.O. Box 280, Ararat, VA 24053 and they will mail it to Ethiopia. A missionary to that country told us that he spoke to a Bible college there and told them about the omissions in the NIV. They all began crying, since the NIV is the only bible they have. Any KJB will be an improvement.

If you are like me and like things to be either black or white, you must remember that all variants in the Cambridge/TBS family are, in the main, white, whichever setting one chooses. (*The New Paragraph Cambridge Bible* is not acceptable.) Believe me, I entered this two year examination, expecting to find a simple and clear ‘winner.’ At its conclusion, I can not make it as simple as I would have liked to make it, with all of the resources of the Holy Bible Foundation and my own huge antique Bible collection (1616, 1629, 1638, etc, etc..

After several years of collation, my personal choice is the Cambridge Large Print Text Only edition. It is available at <http://www.avpublications.com>. I quickly can check any Bible and look for a few tell-tale spots: I look for a capital ‘S’ in Gen. 1:2, Mat. 4:1, and 1 John 5:8. Holman does not capitalize ‘spirit’ in the latter two. Hendrickson capitalizes all three correctly, but spells ‘broided’ as ‘braided’ in 1 Tim. 2:9. Does the Bible teach that it is wrong to braid one’s hair? However, to ‘embroider’ decorative elements throughout the fabric of the hair is a costly and time-wasting vanity. The Cambridge Text Only Large Print has orthography that is tops. It is the PCE (*so-called* Pure Cambridge text) except that it correctly, I believe, capitalizes ‘S’ in 1 John 5:8. The PCE with a lower-case ‘s’ is temporarily available from Local Church Bible Publishers, among their wide selection (Item 180). As I said before, neither ‘s’ is ‘right’ or ‘wrong,’ in this verse, as the Lord has allowed both in a wide variety of languages.

Notes vs Text Only

The Text Only TBS/Cambridge Bibles, which include the Large Print, the Windsor, and the Giant Print (all available at avpublications.com) have none of the horrible notes which perch in the margin, waiting to bite and devour your faith. Text-only Bibles give only the text. I avoid any Bible that has marginal notes, most notably those which purport to tell what the Greek (Gr.) or Hebrew (Heb.) say, since they inevitably follow the *corrupt* Greek text and lexicons and therefore generally match the new versions. For example, *The Defined King James Bible*, from The Bible for Today, sometimes matches new versions in its definitions, as even KJB critics have observed (e.g. <http://a-voice.org/discern/dkib.htm>). For example, Waite's *Defined KJB* defines "begotten" as 'uniquely related,' a similar rendering to that of the new versions, corrupt foreign editions, and lexicons (e.g. 1 John 4:9, John 3:16 et al.). 'Unique,' the new version word, does not mean the same thing as 'only.' If I had purple hair, I would be 'unique.' 'Unique' can mean special or odd, not necessarily singular. 'Related' does not confer the immediate sense of the physical generation of the Son of God. An aunt is related to a niece. A step-father might be called 'uniquely related' to his step-son. The words 'only begotten' say enough and can easily be distorted by man-made definitions. The context defines the words. The Bible's previous use of the words "only" and "begotten" clearly define the word for Bible readers.

Even Bibles from Cambridge with notes, such as the Concord and the Cameo, follow the corrupt manuscripts when they reference Greek or Hebrew. For example, in the note next to "the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" in 2 Peter 1:1, all Cambridge noted Bibles, such as the Concord and the Cameo edition, challenges the KJB saying, "Gr. *of our God and Saviour.*" Such a note represents *only* the critical text; the *Textus Receptus* does *not* read that way, but says "the righteousness of God and our Saviour" (i.e. Elziver and Scrivener, see Berry's T.R. note G, p. 602). Jesus Christ is "God," but he is not everyone's "Saviour," hence the word "our" must attach itself to the word "our Saviour Jesus Christ," as has historically been seen in English Bibles, such as the Geneva and the Tyndale. Conflicts in Greek texts can often be solved by following typical Biblical usage. The phrase "the righteousness of God" (not "our God") is seen in the Bible five times. In his book, *Selecting a Translation of the Bible* (p. 78) Lewis Foster, a member of both the NKJV and NIV committees, confesses that the new versions' construction in both Titus (2:13) and Peter was chosen by "liberal" translators to bolster their case that Paul and Peter did not actually write these books. What point are notes, which the "unlearned" may believe? (2 Peter 3:16).

In fact, an entire book could be written about the faith-killing notes in the Scofield Bible, which falsely claim that the KJB is wrong in numerous places (e.g. 1 John 5:7). How many know that some printings of the current "Old" Scofield have added cross-references from the failed 'New' Scofield board of editors? Image — a dispensational Bible, with references added by non-dispensational five-point Calvinists, who were on new version committees (e.g. NIV). An ad for *The KJV Old Scofield Study Bible, Standard Edition*, in the latest Christian Book Distributors catalogue says, "original notes — newly augmented..." (March/April, 2011, p. 20). If it is "augmented," that is, 'added to,' then it is not 'Scofield's.' I hope no one ever offers my books and calls them "newly augmented." The latest and most heinous development, regarding the printing of the

Scotfield Bible, is the editorship and take-over by John R. Kohlenberger III. He has been employed by the NIV's owners for many years as a developer of NIV study Bibles and concordances. I debated Kohlenberger many years ago on a west coast radio station. We each presented our case separately — his, for the new versuibs, and mine for the KJB. He has been the main speaker for the Christian Booksellers' annual meeting, giving talks on 'how to draw customers away from the KJB'! The ad for his *Scotfield Study Bible* says the original Scotfield notes only "form the core" of his re-work. He is one of those black t-shirt type of evangelical liberals, hardly what one expects to find editing a Bible, historically noted for its conservatism. If John Kohlenberger's name is on a book, we conservatives do not want it. No knowing the details, Scotfield's critics uncharitably bring up Scotfield's divorce and remarriage ninety days later, all *while* he was a saved pastor. This obviously did not affect the usefulness of his writings (Joseph M. Canfield, *The Incredible Scotfield*, Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1988, pp. 90, 100 et al.).

A second book could be written about the cross-references in many Bibles. Some references teach the amillennial point of view, baptismal regeneration, liberal-minded theology, and that the church replaces Israel. I believe that apostasy *begins* in a noted Bible. Some are excellent, as reference books. But for ones daily Bible reading, mixing the voice of fallible men on the same page as the voice of our holy God is courting danger in some cases.

Urgent Action Needed

A foreboding move may be at hand. Cambridge charged David Norton to examine the Cambridge text and determine one uniform text for them to print. His liberal bend is evident in the massive and idiosyncratic changes and modernizations he introduced. It is no longer even remotely related to the historic Cambridge text, in my opinion. It omits "of God" in 1 John 5:12, "godly" in 1 Tim. 1:4 and many other words. It denies the Sonship of Christ in Mat. 12:23, just like the new versions. It even follows the critical Greek text on occasion (e.g. Norton, *A Textual History of the King James Bible*, p. 336). Norton created this text, at the direction of Cambridge, with the goal of using it to replace all other Cambridge settings. It is imperative that concerned Christians make their voices heard, so that the pure historic Cambridge settings continue to be printed, with no modernized spelling and orthography (after the eighteenth century) and none of Norton's emendations. Such an uncertain development by Cambridge makes the support of local churches who are printing this setting so important. We cannot rely on 'the world' to provide Bibles to Christians. Cambridge is printing the Koran also. Cambridge is still providing their historic settings now, but our voices must be heard so that they will continue to do so.

Summary

In summary, if you are looking for a simple answer to this somewhat perplexing problem of what setting to select, the answer is 'TBS and Cambridge,' particularly the Large Print Text Only setting. A.V. Publications could sell scores of King James Bibles if making money was their goal. However, they sell only a few Bibles: the TBS/Cambridge Large Print, the Windsor, and the Giant Print. Why sell only a few Bibles? These are the only Bibles that I can recommend and which I have examined word for word. All of them are text-only, of course. The price for the TBS/Cambridge Large Print Text Only is the

cheapest available. Ideally, the local church should print the Bible, as a ministry of their church. If you would like a missionary representative from a local church who does this to visit your church and bring a wide variety of styles of leathers and sizes, contact Stephen Shutt at stephenshutt87@gmail.com. This church's bindings and bindings from the TBS/Cambridge (and Windsor) available at avpublications.com are actually stronger and better than the Cambridge bindings.

This paper was written with the hopes that Bible publishers (Nelson, Zondervan, Hendrickson, Holman, ABS, and even Oxford etc.) and distributors will wake up to the lax attitude now evident in their unique or contemporary King James Bible settings, and 1.) follow a Cambridge text, as recommended in this paper, in their printings and 2.) distribute Bibles that follow such a standard, so as not to foment the confusion. No orthographic variant in the Cambridge tradition diminishes the integrity of the meaning communicated by the Holy Bible (excluding their *New Cambridge Paragraph Bible*). That statement *may* be true of *most* of the variants of other printers. Errors by a few printers do not negate God's inspired words, which are still available widely. Our Bible's inspiration and preservation is in no way dampened, because it is the words, which are inspired, not their spelling or orthography. Spelling changes normally do not change theology. Remember the word 'word' is spelled as 'woort' in Dutch and 'wort' in German. It has been spelled historically in southern Europe as palabra, parole, parolle, palavra, palaoulo, parola, and pled. These are not theological differences. But God is not the author of confusion and confusion is manifest by those printers who swerve from the norm with their settings. The public is becoming justly alarmed and their voice should be heard. Those providing faithful international editions will join those acclaimed by the Lord.

“The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it.”
Psalm 68:11