

of the KJV spoke of Ruth going into the city and it spoke - it spoke of Boaz going into the city and said he went into the city. The next two editions of it said she went into the city. So if you get a copy of the original KJV from 1611, it can be very expensive today to get, immediately they will say this is a great "he" Bible, or this is a great "she" Bible, and that means whether it says Ruth went into the city, or Boaz because there is that difference. The Heb. MSS are half and half. We don't know which it is. I think in the context "he" is what it should be, but now I believe they print it "she"; there is slightly more evidence in MSS for she than he. ~~where~~

Where it says the dogs licked up his blood about Ahab, one publication says "the dogs liked his blood" instead of the dogs licked up his blood."

One error where the Greek word is to filter, they speak of filtering something. They make of good translation of filter as strain out. But the printer got it "strain at", and so he says, you strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Now there is a misprint in the first publication of the KJ Bible that has been copied to the present day, though it is purely a misprint from the ~~XIX~~ first issue. The Greek is definitely to strain out, ~~for~~ for to filter. But it says, you strain at a gnat and swallow a camel, which is quite a different idea. But that misprint that came in, has just been copied as proof readers have compared a new ~~edition~~ ^{edition} with the old to try to get rid of mistakes before they ran it off on the press, they just copied it exactly, and this original misprint is here today. That just shows how ~~a~~ very difficult it is to copy -- even to make a printed book that is