

HAVE I FOUND THE KING JAMES BIBLE?

(December 2015)

“WORDS, LETTERS, JOTS, AND TITLES”

Of the many things I have discovered since writing the “Where Is The King James Bible?” article in January, the most disturbing may be the fact that there are not as many King James Only advocates as I thought who adhere to true King James Only doctrine. Please forgive my naiveté. I just assumed the majority of King James Only proponents maintained the following five truths:

1. The eternal **word** of God is settled in heaven (**Psalm 119:89**).
2. That eternal word of God is comprised of the specific **words** of God (**Exodus 24:4; Joshua 24:26; Jeremiah 30:2; II Chronicles 34:21; Proverbs 30:5; Luke 4:4**).
3. Those specific words of God are comprised of the specific **letters, jots, and tittles** of God (**Matthew 5:18**).
4. Those specific words, letters, jots, and tittles of God have been progressively revealed from heaven to man through **inspiration** of God (**II Timothy 3:16**) and **purification** on earth (**Psalm 12:6**) via the Original Manuscripts, the Transcribed Copies, the Hebrew Masoretic Text, the Greek Majority Text, the Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew’s, Great, Geneva, and Bishops’ purification translations, and the King James Bible – the seventh purification translation in the universal language of English (**Zephaniah 3:9**) – as illustrated below in **John 1:1-5**:

1526 Tyndale

IN the begynnynge was that worde / ad that worde was with god: and god was thatt worde.
The fame was in the begynnynge wyth god.
All thyngf were made by it / and with out it / was made noo thige / that made was.
In it was lyfe / And lyfe was the light of me /
And the light fhyneth i darcknes / ad darcknes copreheded it not.

1535 Coverdale

IN the begynnynge was the worde, and the worde was with God, and God was y worde.
The fame was in the begynnynge w God.
All thinges were made by the fame, and without the fame was made nothings that was made.
In him was the life, and the life was the light of men:
and the light fhyneth in the darkneffe, and the darkneffe comprehended it not.

1537 Matthew’s

IN the beginnyng was the worde / [&] the worde was with God: and the worde was God.
The fame was in the beginnyng wyth God.
All thinges were made by it / and wythout it / was made nothyng that was made.
In it was lyfe / [&] the lyfe was the lyght of men /
[&] the lyght fhyneth in y darcknes but the darcknes comprehended it not.

1540 Great

IN the begynnynge was the worde, and the worde was wyth God: and God was the worde.
The fame was in y begynnynng wyth God.
All thinges were made by it, [&] wythout it, was made nothyng that was made.
In it was lyfe, and the lyfe was the lyght of men,
and the lyght fhyneth in darcknes, and the darcknes comprehended it not.

1560 Geneva

- 1 IN the begynnyng was the Worde, and the Worde was with God and that Worde was God.
- 2 The fame was in the begynning w God.
- 3 All things were made by it, & without it was made nothing that was made.
- 4 In it was life, and the life was the light of men.
- 5 And the light fhineth in y darkenes, & the darkenes comprehended it not.

1568 Bishops'

- 1 IN the begynnyng was the worde, [&] the worde was with God: and that worde was God.
- 2 The fame was in the begynnyng with God.
- 3 All thynges were made by it: and without it, was made nothyng that was made.
- 4 In it was lyfe, and the lyfe was the lyght of men,
- 5 And the lyght fhyneth in darkeneffe: and the darkneffe comprehended it not.

1611 King James

- 1 IN the beginning was the Word, [&] the Word was with God, and the Word was God.
- 2 The fame was in the beginning with God.
- 3 All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.
- 4 In him was life, and the life was the light of men.
- 5 And the light fhineth in darkneffe, and the darkneffe comprehended it not.

(Note one of the examples of purification in the passage above – the 1526 Tyndale reads “IN the begynnyng was that **worde**... All thyngf were made by **it**...”, the 1560 Geneva purifies that lower case “**worde**” in verse 1 to capital “**Worde**”, and the 1611 King James purifies that “**it**” in verse 3 to “**him**”, manifestly identifying that Word as Christ – confirming the doctrinal truth clearly stated in verse 14 of the same chapter.)

5. Hence, that inspired and purified King James Bible containing those specific words, letters, jots, and titles of God **is** that eternal word of God that is settled in heaven – establishing it as the supreme authority over all of its earthly predecessors, including the Hebrew and the Greek.

Of course, the issue I addressed in “Where Is The King James Bible?” is the fact that, contrary to what I believed for most of my Christian life, that progressive revelation of that eternal word of God from heaven to man was not completed in 1611, as the following few examples clearly illustrate:

Reference	1611 King James Bible	Current King James Bibles
Leviticus 26:40	confesse the iniquitie	confess their iniquity, and the iniquity
Ecclesiastes 8:17	out, yea	out, yet he shall not find it; yea
Ezekiel 3:11	vnto thy people	unto the children of thy people
Daniel 3:15	a fierie furnace	a burning fiery furnace
Mark 5:6	he came and worshipped	he ran and worshipped
I Corinthians 4:9	approued to death	appointed to death
I Corinthians 14:23	into fome place	into one place
I Timothy 1:4	rather then edifying	rather than godly edifying
II Timothy 4:13	with thee, but	<i>with thee, and the books, but</i>
Hebrews 12:1	with patience vnto the race	with patience the race

This personally devastating realization immediately brought to mind how many times I believed my fellow independent fundamental Baptist preachers when they held up their Bibles at revival meetings as that “good ol’ 1611 King James Bible”. Yea, how many times I believed myself when I held up my Bible to my people as that “good ol’ 1611 King James Bible”, when the truth of the matter is anyone claiming that their current King James Bible is that “good ol’ 1611 King James Bible” is either ignorant or lying. Of course, if one neither espouses the five truths

listed above nor realizes the text of the King James Bible has changed over the years as shown above, it would be quite difficult to convince that person that, of the many editions of the King James Bible containing different words, letters, jots, and tittles, only one can be that eternal word of God that is settled in heaven. But for those of us whose eyes are open to the truth, there can be no other conclusion. For example, Jack Hyles (whom I personally regard as one of the greatest preachers of all time) firmly stated, *“If God has preserved His words, then only one set of words can be the preserved ones... Two things that don’t agree cannot both be right. If one book says, ‘2+2=4,’ and one book says, ‘2+2=5,’ one book is right; and one book is wrong. Both books cannot be right... If man lives by every word of God, then there has to be a Book which contains every word of God... ‘I believe in tittle inspiration’... God is saying, ‘Not one word, not one accent mark, not one punctuation mark shall pass away... God has preserved His words for us in the King James Bible.”* (THE NEED FOR AN EVERY WORD BIBLE, pgs. 14, 23, 137, 158, 51) – all of which is absolutely and obviously true. Yet, to my knowledge, he never identified which of the many editions of the King James Bible containing different “words”, “tittles”, “accent marks”, and “punctuation marks” he was referring to. Was Bro. Hyles unaware of the fact, as I was for so long, that the text of the King James Bible had changed since 1611? Was he unaware of the fact, as I was for so long, that at the very time he was preaching those truths from the pulpit of First Baptist Church there were multiple editions of the King James Bible in print that contained different “words”, “tittles”, “accent marks”, and “punctuation marks”? I have to believe so, for it seems to me if Bro. Hyles had been aware of these facts he certainly would have identified which edition he was referring to, no?

As for those who claim the changes made to the text of the King James Bible over the years have merely been printing error corrections that have no effect on meaning, please explain to me how the difference between “approued” and “appointed” at **I Corinthians 4:9** represents a printing error correction that has no effect on meaning. Even a quick look at the thousands of textual differences between the 1611 and current King James Bibles reveals not only printing error corrections and orthographic modifications, but also a number of word differences that clearly do have an effect on meaning. I also find it troubling that the same folks who claim the changes from the 1611 to current King James Bibles are merely printing error corrections also argue that those changes are not as “bad” as the changes from the 1611 to the Alexandrian-based English perversions like the RV, ASV, NIV, NKJV, etc. Almost as though they depend on this argument to justify the differences between the 1611 and current King James Bibles. I guess my question is, why? Does **Psalms 12:6** not provide sufficient justification for the differences between the 1611 and current King James Bibles? Is it that difficult to understand that **Psalms 12:6** purification took place both from Tyndale thru 1611 as well as 1611 thru a pure edition? Do they really need that “1611” in their church bulletin and on their church website enough to propagate deceit for it? Folks, the question is not whether or not the changes made from the 1611 to current King James Bibles are as “bad” as the changes made from the 1611 to the Alexandrian-based English perversions – for we all know the RV, ASV, NIV, NKJV, etc. are flawed, corrupted, blasphemous books authored by Satan himself. The question is, which edition of the King James Bible contains every word, letter, jot, and tittle of that eternal word of God that is settled in heaven – for all of them, being different one from another, obviously cannot!

VERSCHUUR AND RIPLINGER

So as I explained in “Where Is The King James Bible?”, I started searching for that pure edition. And as one might expect, I began by seeking out those reputed to be authorities on the subject, only to be tragically disappointed with what I found:

Jewel Smith is highly respected among King James Only advocates, yet reading **Hebrews 11:35-38** out of his 1611 at Bro. Hyles’ Pastor’s School in 1996 he told the congregation, “...*it reads the same as yours.*” – despite the fact that if he had read just three more verses to **Hebrews 12:1**, that congregation would have found out that his did not read the same as theirs (as shown in the chart above)...

Al Lacy is a well-known defender of the King James Bible, yet at that same Pastor’s School on that same Wednesday evening he held up his current King James Bible and called it “...*the perfect, infallible, inerrant, inspired word of God – the old AV 1611 King James Bible.*” – despite the fact that the book he was holding up contained thousands of different words, letters, jots, and tittles than the 1611 Jewel Smith had read from just moments earlier...

Peter Ruckman has spent more years than I have been alive standing for the King James Bible, yet persists in asserting the fallacy that his Gideon Bible and the 1611 are the same book – “*When you get to sticking up for the King James Bible, you always have some smart aleck ask: ‘Which edition do you mean?’ The one I have in my hand! And usually the one I’ll have in my hand will be a Gideon Bible because I’ve got about twenty of them in my house. The King James Authorized Version of 1611 – this year it’s 400 years old. That’s ‘the old, old Book.’*” (*Happy Anniversary KJV*, pg. 118) – despite the fact that his Gideon Bible contains thousands of different words, letters, jots, and tittles than the 1611...

Gail Riplinger is a sincere King James Only proponent who has devoted her life to the cause, yet claims “*No one will be mislead by any Cambridge / TBS Bible...*” (*SETTINGS OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE*, pg. 14) – despite the fact that the various Cambridge / TBS settings contain different words, letters, jots, and tittles among themselves...

Matthew Verschuur identifies one Cambridge setting as that pure edition, but is a traditional Pentecostal who bases a number of his arguments on Pentecostal doctrine he claims “...*is contained in the Pure Cambridge Edition.*” (*GUIDE TO THE Pure Cambridge Edition OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE*, pg. 540)...

Certainly you can understand my disappointment and frustration. Nevertheless, after reading and consulting a number of our independent fundamental Baptist “authorities” along with various other researchers not in our independent fundamental Baptist camp (i.e. David Norton, Rick Norris, etc.), in my personal opinion (for whatever the personal opinion of a simple unknown preacher at a small country church in the middle of nowhere is worth) thus far I have found Matthew Verschuur and Gail Riplinger to be the most reliable contemporary sources of

information on the subject. This due, in part, to the fact that they have both conducted and published extensive research on the textual history of the King James Bible while professing and demonstrating their exclusive faith in, love for, and loyalty to that precious Book they have researched.

PCE VS. LPTE

So where is that pure edition? Well, history reveals notable changes were made to the text of the King James Bible in the second printing of 1611, the 1613 and 1616 London Editions, the 1629, 1638, and 1762 Cambridge Editions, and the 1769 Oxford Edition. And the truth of the matter is my question would have already been answered had what so many of our independent fundamental Baptist “authorities” claim been accurate – that all current King James Bibles are the 1769 Oxford Edition – but they are not, as the following few examples clearly illustrate:

Reference	1769 Oxford Edition	Current King James Bibles
Genesis 49:26	bleffings of thy progenitors	blessings of my progenitors
Judges 11:7	the children of Gilead	the elders of Gilead
II Chronicles 4:12	<i>were</i> on the pillars	<i>were</i> on the top of the pillars
Psalms 18:47	the people unto me	the people under me
Psalms 107:16	the gates of iron	the bars of iron
Zechariah 11:2	mighty is	mighty are
John 14:6	and the truth	the truth
Romans 11:23	not in unbelief	not still in unbelief
I Corinthians 4:13	the earth	the world
Revelation 18:22	at all...any more (omitted)	no more at all...any more in thee

So where is that post-1769 pure edition? Well, if we assent to the conclusions drawn by Verschuur and Riplinger, it is clearly a Cambridge edition. Verschuur identifies the main purification line as 1.) the first printing of 1611, 2.) the second printing of 1611, 3.) the 1613 London Edition, 4.) the 1629 Cambridge Edition, 5.) the 1638 Cambridge Edition, 6.) the 1769 Oxford Edition, and 7.) the Pure Cambridge Edition (*GUIDE...*, pgs. 184, 570), while Riplinger states, “...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.” (*SETTINGS...*, pg. 10). So then, the question becomes which Cambridge edition is that post-1769 pure edition? Well, further agreement with Verschuur and Riplinger brings us to a decision between the Pure Cambridge Edition, or PCE, which Verschuur regards as the exclusive pure text – “*God’s Word was pure in Heaven, and was available in the past, but the complete purification of the Word of God, for it to be in one place and at one time in purity, was finally manifested in the appearance of the Pure Cambridge Edition.*” (*GUIDE...*, pg. 240) and the Large Print Text Edition, or LPTE, which Riplinger regards as the best representative text – “*After several years of collation, my personal choice is the Cambridge Large Print Text Only edition.*” (*SETTINGS...*, pg. 19). Verschuur tells us that the PCE was edited by Henry A. Redpath (1848-1908) and was first published circa 1900, while a representative in the Bible Department at Cambridge University Press told me that the LPTE was “linked to” the Cameo Edition of the 1920s and was first published in the 1980s. With these things in mind, guided by catalogues published by Verschuur and Riplinger, I compiled the following catalogue of variants among Cambridge editions and used this catalogue to compare the PCE (published digitally by Bible Protector) with the LPTE (currently available at

AV Publications). The highlighted references in the catalogue are the only six variants I found between the two, with the highlighted PCE rendering listed in the first column and the highlighted LPTE rendering listed in the second column:

(Noteworthy here is the fact that there are two other discrepancies between the PCE and the LPTE which Cambridge University Press admits are typos in the LPTE – “skekel” instead of “shekel” in **Nehemiah 10:32** and “LORD GOD” instead of “Lord GOD” in **Jeremiah 49:5**.) (Gail Riplinger, *SETTINGS...*, pg. 17)

Reference	PCE / LPTE Rendering	Variant Cambridge Rendering
Genesis 10:7	Sabtecha	Sabtechah
Genesis 24:57, etc.	inquire	enquire
Genesis 25:4	Abida	Abidah
Genesis 41:56	: And Joseph	: and Joseph
Genesis 46:12	Zerah	Zarah
Exodus 23:23	<i>and</i> the Hivites	the Hivites
Numbers 6:5, etc.	razor	razor
Deuteronomy 32:8	most High	Most High
Joshua 10:1, 3	Adoni-zedek	Adoni-zedec
Joshua 13:18	Jahazah	Jahaza
Joshua 17:11	Endor	En-dor
Joshua 19:2	or Sheba	and Sheba
Joshua 19:19	Hapharaim	Haphraim
Joshua 19:19	Shion	Shihon
I Samuel 2:13	priests' custom	priest's custom
I Samuel 31:2	Malchi-shua	Melchi-shua
II Samuel 5:14	Shammua	Shammuah
II Samuel 15:12, etc.	counsellor	counsellor
II Samuel 18:29, 32	<i>Is</i> the	Is the
II Samuel 21:21	Shimea	Shimeah
II Samuel 23:37	Naharai	Nahari
II Kings 19:26	housetops	house tops
I Chronicles 1:38	Ezer	Ezar
I Chronicles 2:47	Geshan	Gesham
I Chronicles 2:49	Achsa	Achsa
I Chronicles 2:55	Hemath	Hammath
I Chronicles 5:11	Salchah	Salcah
I Chronicles 7:1	Shimron	Shimrom
I Chronicles 7:19	Shemida	Shemidah
I Chronicles 7:27	Jehoshua	Jehoshuah
I Chronicles 14:10	and wilt	And wilt
I Chronicles 23:20	Michah	Micah
I Chronicles 24:11	Jeshua	Jeshuah
II Chronicles 20:36	Ezion-geber	Ezion-gaber
II Chronicles 33:19	sin	sins
II Chronicles 35:20	Carchemish	Charchemish
Ezra 2:2	Mispar	Mizpar
Ezra 2:26	Geba	Gaba
Ezra 4:10	Asnappar	Asnapper
Ezra 6:4, 8	expences	expenses
Nehemiah 7:30	Geba	Gaba
Job 30:6	clifts	cliffs
Psalms 148:8	vapour	vapours
Ecclesiastes 8:17	further	farther
Song of Solomon 6:12	Amminadib	Ammi-nadib
Isaiah 9:6	Counsellor	Counsellor
Isaiah 37:27	housetops	house tops
Jeremiah 32:5	prosper?	prosper.
Jeremiah 34:16	ye had	he had
Ezekiel 47:3	ancles	ankles
Amos 2:2	Kerioth	Kirioth

Amos 6:14	Hemath	Hamath
Nahum 3:16	flieth	fleeth
Matthew 26:39	further	farther
Matthew 27:46	Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani	ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTHANI
Mark 1:19	further	farther
Mark 2:1	Capernaum, after	Capernaum after
Mark 5:41	Talitha cumi	TALITHA CUMI
Mark 7:34	Ephphatha	EPHPHATHA
Mark 15:34	Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani	ELOI, ELOI, LAMA SABACHTHANI
Acts 3:7	anle	ankle
Acts 11:12	spirit	Spirit
Acts 11:28	spirit	Spirit
Romans 4:18	nations; according	nations, according
Romans 4:19	Sara's	Sarah's
Romans 9:9	Sara	Sarah
I Corinthians 4:15	instructors	instructors
I Corinthians 15:27	saith, all	saith all
I John 5:8	spirit	Spirit
Revelation 2:6, 15	Nicolaitans	Nicolaitanes
Revelation 21:20	chrysolite	chrysolite

I then compared these six variants among the six pre-1611 purification translations (Tyndale thru Bishops') and a cross section of 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and 21st century King James Bible editions and presentations, compiling the following catalogue (the main catalogue along with separate catalogues for the three historical guardians of the text of the King James Bible – London Royal Printers, started printing KJBs in 1611; Cambridge University Press, started printing KJBs in 1629; and Oxford University Press, started printing KJBs in 1675) with the LPTE renderings highlighted throughout:

MAIN CATALOGUE

Source	Ge 41:56	I Ch 2:55	Am 6:14	Ac 11:12	Ac 11:28	I Jo 5:8
PCE	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
LPTE	: and	Hammath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1526 Tyndale NT	-	-	-	fprete	fprete	fprete
1535 Coverdale	NA	Hamath	Hemath	fprete	fprete	fprete
1537 Matthew's	NA	Hemath	Hemath	fprete	fprete	fprete
1540 Great	. And	Hemath	Hemath	fpyrite	fprete	fprete
1560 Geneva	NA	Hammath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1568 Bishops'	: and	Hemath	Hemath	fprite	fprite	?
1568 Geneva	NA	Hammath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1594 Geneva	NA	Hammath	Hamath	Spirit	fpirit	fprite
1606 Geneva	NA	Hammath	Hamath	Spirit	fprite	fpirit
1611 King James (1 st Printing)	; and	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	Spirit
1611 King James NT (2 nd Printing)	-	-	-	fpirit	fpirit	Spirit
1629 Cambridge	?	?	?	Spirit*	spirit*	spirit*
1637 Cambridge	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1638 Cambridge	?	?	?	Spirit*	spirit*	spirit*
1646 London	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1653 London	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1660 Cambridge / 1659 NT	: And	Hemath	?	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1660 London	, and	Hemath	?	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1661 London	, and	Hemath	?	fpirit	Spirit	fpirit
1663 Cambridge	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1668 Cambridge / 1666 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1674 Cambridge	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1675 Oxford	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1676 London / 1671 NT	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit

1678 Edinburgh	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1685 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1689 London	: and	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	Spirit
1695 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1698 London	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	?
1708 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1709 London	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1712 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1717 London	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1719 Oxford NT	-	-	-	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1724 London OT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	-	-	-
1727 Oxford / 1726 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1730 Amsterdam	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1735 London	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1736 Oxford OT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	-	-	-
1741 Dublin / 1739 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1743 London	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1746 Oxford / 1745 NT	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1750 London	: And	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1755 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1756 Cambridge / 1758 NT	: and	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	Spirit	fpirit
1760 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1763 London	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1765 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1767 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1768 Cambridge	: And	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1769 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	?	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1769 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1770 Edinburgh	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1772 London / 1771 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1773 London / 1772 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1773 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1774 Winchester	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1775 Cambridge / 1776 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1777 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1777 Shrewsbury	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1778 Cambridge / 1777 NT	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1784 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1786 Cambridge NT	-	-	-	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1788 Birmingham	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1789 Cambridge	: And	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1794 Cambridge / 1795 NT	: and	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1795 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1796 Cambridge / 1798 Isa.-Rev.	: and	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1796 Edinburgh	: And	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1797 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1800 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1802 London NT	-	-	-	spirit	spirit	spirit
1817 Oxford	?	?	?	spirit**	spirit**	spirit**
1819 Cambridge	?	?	?	Spirit*	Spirit*	Spirit*
1828 London	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	spirit	spirit
1830 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
1850 American Bible Society	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
1852 London	: And	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
1864 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
1865 Oxford NT	-	-	-	spirit	spirit	spirit
1868 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
1879 American Bible Society	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
1886 Oxford	?	?	?	spirit**	spirit**	spirit**
Post-1901 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1903 Thomas Nelson	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
1918 American Bible Society	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
Post-1945 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
Pre-1952 World	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1965 Royal	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
1973 Regency	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit

Pre-1977 World	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1979 Holman	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
1986 Christian Heritage	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1987 Thomas Nelson	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1989 Tyndale House	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1994 Zondervan	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
1995 World NT	-	-	-	spirit	spirit	spirit
1996 Cambridge (Concord Wide Margin)	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1996 Holman	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
2000 Holman	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
2000 Zondervan	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
2003 Thomas Nelson	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit
2009 Zondervan	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
2011 Hendrickson	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit

NA – Not Applicable.

? – Text either not legible or not available in the copy cited.

* – 1629, 1638, and 1819 Cambridge renderings according to a catalogue published by Riplinger (*SETTINGS...*, pg. 16).

** – 1817 and 1886 Oxford renderings according to a catalogue published by Verschuur (*GUIDE...*, pgs. 532, 534).

LONDON SOURCES

Source	Ge 41:56	I Ch 2:55	Am 6:14	Ac 11:12	Ac 11:28	I Jo 5:8
1611 King James (1 st Printing)	; and	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	Spirit
1611 King James NT (2 nd Printing)	-	-	-	fpirit	fpirit	Spirit
1646 London	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1653 London	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1660 London	, and	Hemath	?	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1661 London	, and	Hemath	?	fpirit	Spirit	fpirit
1676 London / 1671 NT	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1689 London	; and	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	Spirit
1698 London	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	?
1709 London	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1717 London	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1724 London OT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	-	-	-
1735 London	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1743 London	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1750 London	: And	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1763 London	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1772 London / 1771 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1773 London / 1772 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1802 London NT	-	-	-	spirit	spirit	spirit
1828 London	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	spirit	spirit
1852 London	: And	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	spirit

CAMBRIDGE SOURCES

Source	Ge 41:56	I Ch 2:55	Am 6:14	Ac 11:12	Ac 11:28	I Jo 5:8
PCE	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
LPTE	: and	Hamath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1629 Cambridge	?	?	?	Spirit*	spirit*	spirit*
1637 Cambridge	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1638 Cambridge	?	?	?	Spirit*	spirit*	spirit*
1660 Cambridge / 1659 NT	: And	Hemath	?	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1663 Cambridge	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1668 Cambridge / 1666 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1674 Cambridge	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1756 Cambridge / 1758 NT	: and	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	Spirit	fpirit
1760 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1765 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1768 Cambridge	: And	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1769 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	?	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1775 Cambridge / 1776 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1778 Cambridge / 1777 NT	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1786 Cambridge NT	-	-	-	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1789 Cambridge	: And	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1794 Cambridge / 1795 NT	: and	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1795 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1796 Cambridge / 1798 Isa.-Rev.	: and	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1797 Cambridge	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1819 Cambridge	?	?	?	Spirit*	Spirit*	Spirit*
1996 Cambridge (Concord Wide Margin)	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit

OXFORD SOURCES

Source	Ge 41:56	I Ch 2:55	Am 6:14	Ac 11:12	Ac 11:28	I Jo 5:8
1675 Oxford	; and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1685 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1695 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1708 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1712 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1719 Oxford NT	-	-	-	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1727 Oxford / 1726 NT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1736 Oxford OT	: And	Hemath	Hemath	-	-	-
1746 Oxford / 1745 NT	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1755 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	fpirit	fpirit
1767 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1769 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1773 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1777 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
1784 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hamath	Spirit	Spirit	fpirit
1800 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hamath	fpirit	fpirit	fpirit
1817 Oxford	?	?	?	spirit**	spirit**	spirit**
1830 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
1864 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
1865 Oxford NT	-	-	-	spirit	spirit	spirit
1868 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	spirit	spirit	spirit
1886 Oxford	?	?	?	spirit**	spirit**	spirit**
Post-1901 Oxford	: and	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit
Post-1945 Oxford	: And	Hemath	Hemath	Spirit	Spirit	Spirit

I then applied two main criteria in each of these six instances to determine the pure rendering at each text – 1.) the scriptural context of each text, and 2.) the historical witnesses for each text as revealed by the catalogue, especially among the main purification editions. The following are my conclusions:

1. **“: And” vs. “: and” at Genesis 41:56** – Certainly one might argue that the lower case “: and” rendering is the standard rendering throughout scripture, but there are three other instances where the capital “: And” rendering occurs in the Bible – **Genesis 31:11**, **Numbers 5:22**, and **Psalms 18:ss** (all three of which I have confirmed to be sufficiently supported by the sources in the catalogue) – and in each of these three instances capital “: And” begins a clause that is, as Verschuur states, “...an independent action as a response...” (*GUIDE...*, pg. 546). The same being true in **Genesis 41:56** certainly provides support for capital “: And” at this text.

Furthermore, the catalogue reveals that the colon presentation at this text, though only sporadic from Tyndale thru the 17th century, actually became standard from the 18th century on. This clearly eliminates the 1611 from consideration for the pure rendering at this text due to the fact that it contains the semicolon presentation. And though lower case “: and” does appear throughout the London, Cambridge, and Oxford editions over the centuries, it does so without any apparent significant consistency. Hence, the previously mentioned contextual support for capital “: And” coupled with the fact that the 1769 Oxford purification edition contains capital “: And” indicates to me that capital “: And” is the pure rendering at this text, as found in the PCE.

2. **“Hemath” vs. “Hamath” at I Chronicles 2:55** – The pure rendering at this text is quite obvious due to the fact that the word “Hamath” only appears one time in the entire Bible – at **Joshua 19:35** as a city of Naphtali. **I Chronicles 2:55** clearly refers to a person, the father of the house of Rechab, almost invariably rendered “Hemath” in all editions and presentations of the King James Bible.

In fact, the only source in the catalogue the LPTE can claim as a witness for “Hamath” is the Geneva, which itself contains more than one idiosyncrasy (such as “Passover” at **Acts 12:4**). And while Verschuur does mention the fact that Pitt printed PCEs contain “Hamath” (*GUIDE...*, pg. 549), clearly the standard “Hemath” is the pure rendering at this text, as found in the PCE.

3. **“Hemath” vs. “Hamath” at Amos 6:14** – While it is true that “Hamath” is the dominant spelling for this region throughout scripture (first appearing in **Numbers 13:21**), there are two instances where “Hemath” is the spelling used for this region in the Bible – **I Chronicles 13:5** and the text in question, **Amos 6:14**.

And though the catalogue does show that a small minority of sources support the LPTE at this text, again following the Geneva, the clear majority of sources support the PCE including the 1611 and the 1769 Oxford purification edition. This indicates to me that “Hemath” is the pure rendering at this text, as found in the PCE.

4. **“spirit” vs. “Spirit” at Acts 11:12** – Concerning the case of “S” in the word “Spirit”, it appears the most important issue is where it is rendered capital “Spirit” – for lower case “spirit” can refer to man’s spirit (as in **Proverbs 20:27**, **I Corinthians 2:11**, etc.) or the

Holy Spirit (as in **Exodus 31:3**, **Isaiah 11:2**, etc.), but capital “Spirit” only refers to the Holy Spirit. Therefore capital “Spirit” excludes the text at which it appears from referring to man’s spirit, and that clearly affects doctrine.

At **Acts 11:12**, context seems to allow for either – lower case “spirit” as Peter’s spirit responding to the prompting of the Holy Spirit in **Acts 10:19-20** or capital “Spirit” as Peter’s parallel recounting of the events in **Acts 10:19-20**. However, it is important to note that in **10:19-20** the “Spirit said”, but in **11:12** the “spirit bade”. This supports the notion of Peter’s spirit bidding him to go (in **11:12**) in response to the Holy Spirit telling him to go (in **10:19-20**). This, in conjunction with the fact that the 1611 and the 1769 Oxford purification edition both contain lower case “fpirit”, indicates to me that lower case “spirit” is the pure rendering at this text, as found in the PCE.

5. **“spirit” vs. “Spirit” at Acts 11:28** – Once again it appears context allows for either at **Acts 11:28** – lower case “spirit” as Agabus signifying the coming dearth through the conduit of his own spirit or capital “Spirit” as Agabus delivering the prophecy of the dearth as a direct message from the Holy Spirit (as in a similar instance recorded in **Acts 21:10-11**). However, the fact that the catalogue provides majority support for lower case “spirit”, coupled with the fact that the 1611, the 1629 and 1638 Cambridge purification editions, and the 1769 Oxford purification edition all contain lower case “fpirit”, indicates to me that lower case “spirit” is the pure rendering at this text, as found in the PCE.
6. **“spirit” vs. “Spirit” at I John 5:8** – While context does allow for either at **I John 5:8** – lower case “spirit” as man’s spirit bearing witness of Christ (as in **Acts 18:5**) or capital “Spirit” as the Holy Spirit bearing witness of Christ (as in **John 15:26**), parallel to His bearing witness of Christ alongside the water and the blood in verse 6 of the same chapter – the catalogue overwhelmingly supports lower case “spirit” (with an approximate 81% majority). And though the 1611 contains capital “Spirit”, it cannot be construed to do so for the purpose of identifying the Holy Spirit as it also capitalizes “Water” and “Blood” (clearly a manifestation of the Germanic roots of the English language in the capitalizing of nouns). Further noting the fact that the 1629 and 1638 Cambridge purification editions as well as the 1769 Oxford purification edition all contain lower case “fpirit” indicates to me that lower case “spirit” is the pure rendering at this text, as found in the PCE.

CONCLUSION

So, if my conclusions are correct, the pure word of God – every word, letter, jot, and tittle of that eternal word of God that is settled in heaven – is the Pure Cambridge Edition published digitally by Bible Protector. What an indictment against our independent fundamental Baptist movement. I understand that God used Protestants to give us His word during the Middle Ages while our Baptist forefathers were being slaughtered by both Catholics and Protestants alike. But in a day when we independent fundamental Baptists, especially in America, have both access to the resources and liberty to research them, God was unable to find one of us willing to do what an Australian Pentecostal was zealous to do – that is, identify the pure edition of the

King James Bible in these last days? Shame on us! Nevertheless, it is important to remember these conclusions were drawn by a simple unknown preacher at a small country church in the middle of nowhere. If anyone reading this article has any information that can point me in the right direction where I have gone in the wrong direction, please contact me. You can find my information below. I am truly just seeking what we all need to know – the answer to the question, “Where is the King James Bible? – so as we read it, study it, and teach it, we are feeding ourselves and nourishing others on every word, letter, jot, and tittle of that eternal word of God that is settled in heaven!

Scott A. DeGiorgio, Pastor
Faith Baptist Church
P.O. Box 272
Petersburgh, NY 12138
fbcpetersburgh@yahoo.com
518-658-0991