

# STRAINING AT GNATS

*Rick Norris' facts from 400 years of KJB editions reviewed*

English, reference, royal folio, with Apocrypha - - -	4to. Royal, Pica - - -
Ditto - ditto (inferior) -	Apocrypha to ditto -
	Psalms to ditto - -
Ditto - ditto, medium folio, with Apocrypha - - -	4to. Demy, Small Pica - -
Ditto - ditto (inferior) -	Apocrypha to ditto -
	Psalms to ditto - -
Pica reference, with Apocrypha - - -	4to. Demy, Small Pica - -
Ditto - ditto - - -	Apocrypha to ditto -
	Psalms to ditto - -
Small pica, 8vo, medium -	8vo. Royal, Small Pica -
Ditto - ditto, common -	Psalms to ditto - -
Ditto, small medium, common - - -	8vo. Royal, Brevier - -
	Psalms to ditto - -
Minion, crown 8vo - - -	8vo. Demy, Brevier, with re- } ferences - - - }
Ditto (2d quality) - - -	Apocrypha to ditto -
Ditto, copy, 8vo (school edition) - - -	Psalms to ditto - -
	8vo. Demy, Brevier - -
Nonpareil, 12mo, demy - - -	12mo. Demy, Nonpareil, with } references - - - }
Ditto, common - - -	Psalms to ditto - -
Ditto, crown (school edition) - - -	
Nonpareil, 16mo (school edition) - - -	12mo. Crown, Nonpareil -
Ditto (inferior) - - -	Psalms to ditto - -
Pocket, minion, 24mo (fine) - - -	24mo. Royal, Nonpareil, with } references, fine - - }
Ditto - - -	Psalms to ditto - -
Ditto (school edition) - - -	24mo. Royal, ditto ditto, common
Pearl, 24mo (fine) - - -	24mo. Nonpareil - - -
Ditto (common) - - -	Psalms to ditto - -
Pearl, 24mo, royal - - -	24mo. Pearl - - -
Ditto - ditto (2d quality) - - -	Psalms to ditto - -
Ditto (school edition) - - -	
Ditto (ditto, inferior) - - -	

Version 1.2 Copyright 2013

**Matthew Verschuur**

[www.bibleprotector.com](http://www.bibleprotector.com)

# PART ONE: A GENERAL VIEW

## INTRODUCTION

In 1611 the King James Bible (KJB) was first printed. Eventually even Puritans were recognising it as the best translation in the world. The King James Bible, also known as the Authorized Version, was used by all manner of sound, accepted and orthodox English-speaking Protestant denominations. The year 2011 was the 400 year anniversary of the Bible that millions of Christians have used, and that is still loved.

In 2007 I launched my Bible Protector website. However, it was not until 2 April that year that Rick Norris posted at the Bible Versions Discussion Board, 1900 *"Pure Cambridge Edition" of the KJV*. Rick Norris posted there under the name "logos1560". I have reproduced the post here:

Below are some quotations by Matthew Verschuur from the following web address [www.bibleprotector.com](http://www.bibleprotector.com)

I do not know the person who has this site. He seems to hold to a KJV-only view. Someone sent me an email yesterday that referred me to this site.

---

Matthew Verschuur wrote:

"Plainly, there have been changes in all editions since 1769, and there are variations in Cambridge Bibles, such as the Victorian text (circa 1830 to circa 1900), the Pure Cambridge Edition (circa 1900 to circa 1970s) which is also printed in many Collins editions, and the Concord text (circa 1970s to circa 2000)."

Matthew Verschuur wrote:

"There has been a great ignorance of the fact that a final purification took place in the history of the King James Bible. Those who have studied the history of the King James Bible in depth would have been aware of the major purifications that took place, such as the editions of 1629, 1638 and 1769. There was also a proper purification that took place circa 1900, which has resulted in the final text of the King James Bible, which is in all ways the definitive presentation of the King James Bible, and should not be altered."

[By the way, these two statements are found in the article at the link at this site under the following heading and at the end of the second line:]

Over subsequent years I have debated with him on various bulletin board forums around the internet. The crux of the debate centres around several ideas.

My view: The King James Bible is the exact text and absolutely accurate translation in English, making it supersessionary to other copies of the Scripture, whether in the originals, in old versions or in new translations.

Rick Norris' view: The preserved Scriptures in the original languages has the greater authority.

My view: Just as there has been a gathering into one final English Bible, so also has the outworking of editions been toward an exact presentation of the Scripture in English, meaning that all typographical errors have been entirely eliminated, that there is a standardised Biblical form of the English language being used which is being employed, and that total editorial regularisation has been achieved meaning that the English wording and lettering is fully reliable. This perfection is measured by the doctrinally-based and self-consistent view that God has outworked by His providence to achieve a certain promise in history.

Rick Norris' view: That no edition of the King James Bible is exactly accurate on editorial grounds (besides the fact that other translations, such as, the Geneva Version, or else, the New King James Version, may be more accurate at places), and that editions are to be measured themselves by determining "standard English" and faithfulness to the preserved Scriptures in the original languages.

#### NORRIS' PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS

Instead of beginning from the Scripture, Norris begins from "science falsely so called" and then adds in Scripture to bolster his view.

The underlying assumptions for arguing for the perfection of the King James Bible are that the Bible itself is true, and the Scriptures themselves point to a model of God's outworking, which is then recognised in history.

Norris, however, begins with a worldview that does not require God's specific hand in preservation. By this, he does not deny that God has preserved, but He does deny the power of God's preservation. According to his view, God has only preserved inaccuracy, divergence and variation and has not outworked for a perfect standard, nor for a method by the Church of attaining to a perfect standard.

Furthermore, Norris takes the assumption that one needs to go back to the same language in which inspiration first took place, which seems to be a misunderstanding of a Reformation doctrine, because he applies this as if it is still true today. In other words, that the full truth, full accuracy and full reliability cannot ever be attained in a translation, making a translation a secondary portal at best which points back to the somehow divinely blessed words in the extant copies in the original languages. Basically, he has assigned a greater value (i.e. a mystique) to the Greek and Hebrew languages than English.

Since no Scripture points to Hebrew and Greek being themselves superior languages, or that translations are secondary, Norris then attempts to interpret Scriptures to fit his purpose, for example, he might quote, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." (John 13:16). He will interpret this to mean that the original language is the master, and English translation the servant. The problem with this

is that he is merely reading into a verse his own doctrine which that verse was never explicitly teaching. But even the principle itself cannot count, since another verse states, “Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.” (John 15:15). Therefore, the proper view is that the translation in English can and should be equal to the originally inspired Greek.

In summary, the debate is between a position of absolute versus relativity. My view is absolute, for example, King James Bible is perfect, the Pure Cambridge Edition is perfect, the exact lettering is perfect.

Whereas, Norris’ view is one of relativity. By this, I do not mean his statements like, there is no perfect English translation, there is no perfect edition, there is no exact lettering attainable. I mean that his position is built on relativity, because there is no exact perfect standard of the Scripture in the original languages — he has never pointed to a perfect Greek New Testament, so how can he reliably discern what is or is not right in English — after all, what is the correct text, and what is the standard for knowing the exact meaning in English of those words anyway?

Again, he states that he is judging English in KJB editions by what is acceptable “standard English”, but this is highly relative, because the opinions of Webster differ from the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and none of these are infallible sources anyway.

#### KING JAMES ONLY

For many years there has been a debate about which Bible version is the best. It seems that in the 1980s, the position to retain the KJB was being advocated by a vocal minority, while the majority went over to using modern versions for a variety of reasons.

Since then, the internet opened up the debate onto a new level, where the information from both sides could come into the public eye, allowing much wider and greater access to research.

In the 1980s one of the main questions asked in debates was that if the KJB was right, which edition should be taken, since there were differences between editions. This was left largely unanswered by the likes of Edward Hills.

Two positions were advocated in the 1980s, one by a whole range of people, including D. A. Waite, who argued that relatively few changes had taken place; the other position taken by a few followers of Peter Ruckman was that all editions were acceptable, and that differences between them could be concurrently true.

D. A. Waite attempted to show the changes between 1611 and the present (i.e. the 1917 Scofield Reference Bible). He and David Cloud were technically Textus Receptus onlyists, and their research was afterward exposed as lacking by Rick Norris. Waite had first claimed that there were only a few hundred differences in editions. Norris questioned this low number of 421. Eventually Norris was

able to persuade him to change the number to about a thousand. But here again, Norris was able to show exceedingly more differences between 1611 and the 1917 Scofield than that.

When Norris went on to catalogue larger numbers of editions, this research seemed to have grown out of a desire to “contradict” the position being put forward by King James Bible onlyists, that there were only a few changes between 1611 and the popular Scofield Bible.

The main view, as put forth by various people, such as Peter Ruckman, Gail Riplinger, D. A. Waite and even ardent anti-King James Only author, James White, was that the Cambridge edition was preferred.

Furthermore, Sam Gipp wrote his *Answer Book* using an article by David Reagan claiming that there had been no revisions of the KJB, just alterations in spelling and correction of typographical errors. Because of various technical and factual errors in these types of materials, Rick Norris was able to imply with ease that the entire King James Bible only view was wrong (e.g. his book *The Unbound Scriptures*).

## BIBLE PROTECTOR

The aims of the Bible Protector ministry included building on the King James Bible only position, to give accurate information about the fact that there had indeed been many variations in many editions of the KJB, but to also show that there was a proper line of editing leading to the present time.

As an elder of an independent Pentecostal church in Australia, I found that some Baptist King James Bible onlyists did not want to be seen to be openly agreeing with me, because of their suspicion of Pentecostalism.

On my website I advocated a standard edition of the KJB which was termed the “Pure Cambridge Edition”. I wrote in length and argued extensively for the propriety of this position, and also produced electronic copies of it free from any typographical errors. In fact, it was a world first not only to claim this, but to have general public examination of the same, with it being found (without any standing counterclaim) that it is indeed an accurate presentation of the KJB. Thus, it was consequently used by publishers and Bible software companies.

The facts from 400 years of King James Bible (KJB) editions show:

1. The text (the readings) and the translation of the KJB have not really changed since the first printing of 1611 to the standard edition of today.
2. Editing has taken place in many editions, particularly in a line of seven main editorially important revisions, culminating in the Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE).
3. There have been many minor changes, which fall into three main categories,
  - a. the correction of typographical errors from 1611 (and other years),
  - b. the standardisation of the spelling and grammar, and

- c. other editorial regularisation, including work on italics.
4. Readers have a standard and correct presentation today, which renders other attempts at further changes as needless, and at worst, dangerous.

People who look at editions can show thousands of other exceedingly minor variations in punctuation, spelling and so on.

One reason that people could claim many more differences is because plenty of older Bibles had a few little printing or typographical errors in them. These are innocent variations which are usually obvious, and often corrected straight away.

There have been a lot of print runs of the KJB, but it has only been in the time of computers where it has been possible to eliminate all variations and typographical errors.

The KJB continues to be a common, worthy translation that Christians rely upon. The PCE is considered to be the correct and accurate edition, which links back through the accepted and legitimate editions of 1769, 1638, 1629, 1613, 1611 “she” and the first edition, the 1611 “he” Bible. (These, with the PCE, are the seven editions of major importance when examining and analysing this issue.)

My extensive research and examination of others’ lists has shown the kinds of legitimate, acceptable differences that are to be found in the editorial history of the KJB. Examination of my lists, tables and analysis will confirm that there are no significant changes, and that the good old faithful Bible lives on today.

#### RICK NORRIS’ BACKGROUND ON THE ISSUE

This letter, published by Timothy Morton at [www.biblebelievers.com](http://www.biblebelievers.com) shows how Rick Norris entered into the mainstream of the debate:

March 12, 1996

Dear Bro. Morton,

I have read and examined your booklet WHICH TRANSLATION SHOULD YOU TRUST? I am sure that your motives were good and that you think your information is correct. I have also been studying the Bible translation issue. I have read most of the KJV-only books presently available, including books by Hills, Fuller, Ruckman, Gipp, Waite, Burgon, Ray, Burton, Evans, Grady, McClure, Paine, Cummons, Carter, Riplinger, etc.

I would recommend that you examine for yourself the earlier English Bibles which the KJV was based on. Reprints of several of them are still available. Major university libraries may have copies of all of them on microfilm. I have obtained reprints of Tyndale’s 1526 and 1534 New Testaments, Tyndale’s Old Testament (the portion he translated before being killed), Matthew’s Bible New Testament, a photocopy of 1535’s Coverdale’s Bible, 1557 Whittingaham’s [sic] New Testament, an edition of a whole Geneva Bible, and a New Testament Octapla which contains Tyndale’s N.T., Great Bible

New Testament, Geneva Bible N.T., Bishops' Bible N.T., KJV etc. also have a reprint of the four gospels from Wycliffe's Bible and have examined a reprint of an entire Wycliffe's Bible. I have also examined other editions of these Bibles at major libraries and some of them on microfilm.

Enclosed are eight pages of information based on my study of these older Bibles for your consideration. I have also made a comparison of over 150 verses in these early English Bibles, the KJV, John Wesley's 1755 New Testament, a 1842 revision of KJV by Baptists, 1862 American Bible Union New Testament, and several present-day translations. These facts would contradict several of the claims in your booklet. Please check the evidence for yourself.

Yours in Christ,  
Rick Norris

In the year 2000, Norris was being published on the strongly anti-King James Bible only website, [www.kjvonly.org](http://www.kjvonly.org), which shows that Norris was following in the spiritual footsteps of Doug Kutilek, one of the most cunning anti-King James Bible onlyists in the 1990s.

From the bibliographic information there, we find that Rick Norris graduated from Tennessee Temple University (B. A. with major in Bible) and Temple Baptist Theological Seminary (M. R. E.). This instruction was uncredited at the time Norris did his study. Norris serves as a deacon in an independent fundamental Baptist church and is on the Christian school board for the church's school. He previously taught in Christian schools for ten years, and home schooled for several more. He has been involved over the years in various church ministries at independent Baptist churches including bus ministry, Sunday School teacher, church clerk, church treasurer, choir and Awanas (a children's ministry).

Norris has spent the years since about 1992 in research and study of the KJV-only and Bible translation issue. He has authored the 544 page book, *The Unbound Scriptures: A Review of KJV-only Claims and Publications* (2003). He has also produced several smaller booklets, and during 2013 referred to his extensive research on the variations of editions of the KJB.

Norris' articles and writing have focussed on several areas:

1. Finding apparent and factual contradictions in the statements, research and writing of King James Bible only believers, and using these problems as a means for rubbishing the doctrine of King James Bible only in general.
2. Documenting the differences between the KJB and former English Bible versions, and then comparing these kinds of differences with the New King James Version, with the two-fold object of showing how that the KJB itself improved upon former English versions, and how he thinks the Geneva or else the NKJV may be superior for whatever reason at certain places.
3. Presenting massive detailed lists of differences between editions of the KJB, particularly in regard to showing the differences between the 1611, 1769 and present editions with the object of implying

that there have been both deliberate and accidental changes, and that no edition can be relied upon, in that editions today may contain either uncorrected errors or deliberate changes which may have been against the original translators' intents.

4. Examining various editions which exhibit unusual and extensive editing, such as, Webster's, the American Revisers', Scrivener's and Norton's, and arguing for many facets of these as valid in the face of the dominant, continuing traditional editions.

5. Attempting to show inconsistencies in translation, italics use, grammar, spelling and so on in various editions of the KJB, with the aim of showing the KJB to be merely a human work.

6. Questioning various aspects of the KJB's history, such as, the motives of why it was made by Episcopalians, to what extent they effected their bias in the translation work, errors which the translators themselves may have made (in line with David Norton's views), the identity of various translators and editors (e.g. the 1762 editor), the relative importance of certain editions, Blayney's motives in also producing his own translation of several Bible books, etc.

7. Pointing out supposed deficiencies in the KJB in comparison to Norris' standard, which is his understanding of the authority of the preserved words given by inspiration of God to the prophets and apostles.

#### NORRIS' STYLE

Rick Norris writes in a methodical style which is very pedantic and monotonous. His method consists of several idiosyncrasies:

1. The use of large lists of quotes or large amounts of references to particular editorial variations in various copies of the Bible. The psychological effect of this is to overwhelm the reader with a barrage of information which creates the illusion of unanswerableness.

2. The asking of questions, often rhetorical, and often loaded. This means that something can be tainted or undermined without it being directly condemned.

3. The continual appealing to the unknown as being an analytical basis for uncertainty, that is, if something cannot be stated as empirically certain, it can be then made appear false.

4. The use of words such as "may", "probably", "could" and so on. This is not to make his own opinion appear tenuous, but to discount the certainty of an absolute statement contradicting his own view.

5. The quotations of others who voice Norris' own view, rather than stating a view in certain terms.

6. He makes no secret, however, of his rejection of KJBO, and will always use direct negative language or connotations in relation to that belief. He will editorialise when describing such beliefs



or the arguments of people who hold that belief, by using emotive descriptors which variously belittle or diminish those positions.

Norris' methodology therefore seems more passive and reasonable to the outside reader, because he hopes to disprove ideas by vast quantities of information which seem to overwhelm the reader, rather than by simple, coherent statements.

He employs a heavy-handedly rhetorical style which is thick with overweening besmirchment. Here is an instructional example:

Bibleprotector, according to your inconsistent, subjective, faulty reasoning, are you actually claiming that having a rendering that would be wrong or an error according to you would not nullify an edition from being a so-called PCE.

As can be seen from the example, Norris habitually editorialises in the way he explains or presents other views. If he agrees with the idea, he carefully crafts his language to uphold the legitimacy of it. The method he employs of severe objection is to frame the person who disagrees with him as entirely subjective and opinionated. This tactic of loaded questions means by addressing the statement, the person is essentially cast as being the anti-intellectual. Some people would think they would not have a chance after that much innuendo and aspersions were cast on them.

It certainly takes dedication for Norris to keep up the barrage of “so-called” and “supposed” and all his repeated phrases. Although I don't think he has a template for his oft-repeated phrases such as “subjective, faulty reasoning”, he certainly does employ a cut-and-paste from an enormous reservoir of quotations and data, which I assume are the electronic file copies of his books and articles and work in progress. Thus, if some issue arises, he can give quotes from six different people on some or other subject.

From this we can learn that Norris is an independent, solitary figure who must be methodical and organised, or he would never be able to do with such dedication what he does. But he also does not deal with these issues in a judicial, impartial way, but is lopsidedly committed against the perfection of the King James Bible, rather than the equitable, neutral presentation of mere facts.

## NORRIS' MOTIVES

Norris obviously views King James Bible only (KJBO) as severely erroneous and anti-intellectual, and therefore continues to steadily oppose the idea that the KJB is perfect, and that it should be used exclusively. Norris is essentially an amateur scholar who has taken on the role as a front line propagandist for the negative side in the King James Bible only debate.

Norris' data that he has collected is fairly useful, and is quite accurate. The problem is that his interpretation of the data is often in opposition to the traditional view of the history of the KJB, and is in some respects unsound and improper, due to his underlying assumptions — that is, that he is doing the research with the specific object of potentially undermining the KJB, rather than merely a neutral examination of the issue.

He has not expended all these efforts in collecting all this data and done all this writing for no reason, but with the view that he might be able to dissuade King James Bible onlyists from that belief.

As a “minister” for this cause (which I believe is ignoble), Norris seems to have had some success. Several former KJBOs have testified to this effect, and several prominent Textus Receptus supporters have changed their views due to Norris’ information.

Norris is motivated more by ideas than by personalities, and therefore is able to appear serious and calm, whether addressing those low or high in the King James Bible only beliefs. On his own side, he appears more mechanical than human, and therefore seems to be strange to have been in children’s ministry work.

## NORRIS’ BIASES

While I have already highlighted some major motives and methods which Norris deliberately uses, it is instructional to know several of Norris’ biases, which explain what foundation he builds upon, and why.

Norris, as a Baptist and an American, seems to hearken back along a certain Puritan tradition. This unfortunately leads him to be biased against the old Established Church, and consequently, helps him legitimise to himself the Geneva Version and the New King James Version in preference to the KJB.

This streak of antiauthoritarianism also comes through when looking at editions of the KJB. Rather than having any loyalty to the received tradition, he insists on the validity of the most radically altered editions of the KJB, and upholds the motives of the modernistic editors (commending the idea of relatively extensive changes) rather than staying with the propriety of the accepted lineage.

Norris therefore seeks the widest disparity, or the worst possible scenario or the greatest possible differences in his analysis. He does not, as such, overstate or exaggerate, but uses such information in a way to make things appear as drastic, uncertain and unsettled as possible.

This is because another of Norris’ fundamental and core beliefs is in the lack of any supernatural agency in the perfecting of the Scripture in English, and that the Bible in English is always subject to change, and is never fixed, nor entirely accurate.

This is a common view in the world, that states that human efforts cannot ever resolve what actually is the Scripture in English, but that large efforts (take Rick Norris’ mammoth and Herculean project of listing variations in hundreds of editions as an example) may only highlight the lack of consistency in these matters, and serve to reinforce the inability of Christians to come to any finality.

Moreover, if any information or historical event may somehow cast something to do with the KJB in a bad light, it seems a statistically proven law that Norris and others who hold similar views will join with that side. For example, around 1830, Thomas Curtis was arguing against some of the editing that was taking place in the KJB. It seems that whether or not Curtis was actually right or wrong is beside the point, but that Norris would certainly quote from such a historical personage as to attempt to show the history of the KJB in a less than stellar light.

On a personal level, Norris also disagrees with my Pentecostalism, and used this (it seems) to attempt to drive a wedge between myself and other non-Pentecostal KJBs. However, Norris was thwarted from sustaining this attack. I liken Norris to the kinds of Presbyterians who also were against Oliver Cromwell as Norris seems to exhibit the same spirit as they did, especially by a kind of inflexible persistence in a partisan view.

### MODERNIST REVISERS

In the late eighteenth century, continental Protestants had turned to a rationalistic view of the Scripture. Granville Sharp, who otherwise appeared to be a progressing evangelical, charged the KJB with having translation errors. This excited a number of others to begin to come out, calling for revision to the venerable version. If revision of the English was needed, then how much so? It was coming to light that there were indeed variations between editions. The conservative Christopher Wordsworth himself thought that some revision was needful.

Around 1830, Thomas Curtis, a dissenter, wrote a booklet entitled, *The existing monopoly an inadequate protection of the Authorized Version of the Scripture*. In it he accused the Universities of making a great number of what he thought were deliberate and unauthorised changes. He thought that a difference in comparison to the 1611 Edition could mean an error, and complained that there was no apparent mechanism for the proper maintenance of the KJB. In response to this, the Universities wrote booklets justifying the correctness of the presentation of the KJB. At the same time, a Parliamentary select committee also investigated in this area, the discussions showing that there had been necessary editorial work, and the concept of “purity” was invoked. Oxford University Press said, “If a given mistake of the Translators had already been corrected before his time, if the public opinion had concurred, either avowedly or tacitly, in the change, he might reasonably hope that the general acknowledgment of the truth would relieve him from the obligation of returning into error.” Cambridge, by the pen of Thomas Turton, wrote, “Let me take this opportunity to state, as my deliberate opinion, that the Text of 1611 is, in consequence of its incorrectness, quite unworthy to be considered as the Standard of the Bibles now printed; and to express my conscientious belief, that to revert to that Text, as the Standard, would be productive of serious evils.”

Curtis went on to refuting the principle of modern editing, but upheld the printing of 1611 as the real “version of King James”. He even went as far as to call contemporary editions, “the Common English Versions”, as though they were entirely different to that of 1611. And that “where any modern editions differ at all, critically, from that of King James, the only correct course ... is, to abandon all such differences and adhere to the original edition.”

Noah Webster, in 1833, confessed to having his faith in the Bible shaken by not believing what it said about historical facts. He alleged a large amount of grammatical “errors” in the KJB, and proceeded to “correct” them. His changes included bowdlerising terms like “womb” to contemporary sensibilities. He claimed, “I have attempted to remove, in a good degree, this objection to the version. It was my wish to make some further alterations in this particular; but difficulties occurred which I could not well remove.”

Things went from bad to worse with the American Bible Society, which had begun attacking the word “baptize”, and altering it to “immerse”. In 1847, the American Bible Union began to work on a revision of the KJB. This revision was made on the mistaken principle of looking at the various current editions of the KJB, and selecting what they thought was the best reading whenever there was a difference between them. But further to this, there were actual translation changes made on the basis of their understanding of the Hebrew and Greek, such as changing the word “she” to “he” in some places. Changes were also made in spelling which in some cases changed the meaning of words, such as “ought” to “aught” (Genesis 39:6), or the changing of “throughly” to “thoroughly” (Genesis 11:3).

F. H. A. Scrivener, in 1874, produced an edition by which he went back to the second edition of 1611, and claimed it was the first one, and then proceeded to use the “he” Bible (the actual first edition) to reverse the changes that had actually been made in the second edition, the “she” Bible. And so, at a verse like Ruth 3:15, Scrivener had “he”, where the great consensus all the normal editions since 1611 had all had “she”. (Scrivener’s position was exposed as a grave mistake by W. Aldis Wright.)

Scrivener’s book on his work, called *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, catalogued the types of changes he discovered in various old KJB editions, and his method of adopting changes. Thus, the words, spelling, italics, marginal notes and layout were quite different from ordinary KJB editions, since he adopted many anachronisms (old spellings) while, at the same time, tried to make it as modern as possible. This meant that he not only was eliminating legitimate revisions and purifications from the text, but was also attempting, as much as possible, within the bounds of past Bibles, to introduce as many modernisms as possible, such as the italicisation of 1 John 5:7, 8, to cast doubt on its authenticity.

The product was errant on many levels. He held that some of the Apocrypha might be inspired. He did much to reverse Benjamin Blayney’s 1769 Edition, implying that it was poor and unscholarly, saying, “The editors of 1762 and 1769 bestowed much evil diligence”, and called them “painful modernisers”. He even attempted to change the actual translation itself, such as at Matthew 23:24 and Hebrews 10:23. Dore, at least, called Scrivener’s work on the italics, “The climax of absurdity”.

Around 1994 Cambridge University Press engaged David Norton to edit a new edition, following in the steps of Scrivener. He also produced a book about his edition, in which he accused the translators as being “inconsistent” and random. His view of the textual history of the KJB was that

there was no standard text, and that from a scholarly perspective, it was beset by problems and doubts, from the authorising of King James to the providence of God in maintaining the text.

Norton admitted to grappling with issues concerning older and newer spelling of words, and called editing the punctuation a nightmare. He questioned whether the spelling should be “flotes” or “floats”, and modernising the spellings of words and grammatical forms. When it came to changes in “you” and “ye”, he had special struggles, because he believed that both the historic and modern editions were haphazardly executed. And worse, he took typographical errors from the 1611 Edition, and put them into his new text. One example is the word “hewed” in Hosea 6:5, which had been printed that way in almost every KJB edition, which he turned to the erroneous typographical error of “shewed”, from the First 1611 Edition, though he modernised it to “shown”.

Norton’s theory was that a certain manuscript, known as the Bodleian Manuscript, which was a copy of the 1602 Bishops’ Bible with various annotations, was one of the drafts of the translators. (In reality, Westcott, Wright, Eadie and others held that this volume was in fact a collation of later information.) Norton’s view was that partial, incomplete non-final drafts could be used to “correct” the KJB. He therefore made quite a number of changes to the KJB on this tenuous basis.

In debates the disturbing pattern is always repeated: Rick Norris is always partial to these and other modern day scholars who disparage the KJB and its history (subtly or overtly), including David Daniell, Adam Nicholson and other such sceptical historians.

## HISTORICAL REVISIONISM

In his zeal to calumniate, to cavil and to find or make an hole in the Authorized Version, Norris repeats any claim found in any source which might diminish the KJB. An obvious example already mentioned is how David Norton turned to several supposed draft copies (something which is scholastically untenable for any real help) and altered the KJB accordingly. Norris, whether by furious agreement with the misapplication or wishful thinking by ignorance, upholds the conceit as if it is unassailable fact.

It is reported (by secondary sources) that Archbishop Bancroft made some last minute adjustments to the work in 1610. Although it is not known what exactly Bancroft did, Norris seems to think — in line with his doctrinal prejudices — that it was words like “bishop” that were forcibly reinserted. Norris speculates at these changes, and has argued that basically that there was an Anglican conspiracy.

Cambridge writers such as Michael Black, David McKitterick and David Norton have all put forward the view that the editor of the 1762 Cambridge Edition was F. S. Parris. However, it was the 1743 Edition which was edited by F. S. Parris of Sidney Sussex College. He was in charge of printing the Bible in Welsh for the Society of the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (SPCK), and attained the office of Vice-Chancellor at Cambridge. Historical scholars and University writers referred to Thomas Paris of Trinity College (with Henry Therond) as the editor of the 1762 Edition. Norris seems to deny the existence of Thomas Paris.

## CATALOGUING BIBLES

There are a number of eminent and authoritative publications which list printings of the KJB, such as in *A Century Of Bibles, Darrow and Moule* and other antiquarian catalogues. Rick Norris' listing is nothing like these, nor does it approach this for historical authenticity.

Instead, Norris has examined a huge amount of copies, a proportion of which might be euphemistically be called "mass market budget editions", that is, "dime bookstore paperbacks", all the way to every Study Bible he could get his hands on. Furthermore, trawling the internet for scanned and electronic texts has further bolstered his collection.

I am not suggesting that this is wrong, but it does mean that Norris' listings are over simplistic. In one year, a publisher may have produced a number of different editions in a number of different formats. Instead of saying 1769 Oxford, one would actually have to list which of the several Oxford printed Bibles of 1769 was being referred to.

Norris has expended huge efforts in order to examine hundreds of different editions of the KJB. Certainly, for most people, the task of turning to hundreds of references in hundreds of copies would indeed be tedious and mind numbing. As to the information which Norris has made available without charge, we may be truly appreciative. Since the area of study is rather irrelevant to almost the absolute majority of Christians, it is only the handful which should find any real use for this exhausting labour. Having myself examined plenty of editions and catalogued variations, it does qualify me to discuss in detail Norris' work, as he has with me in our robust discussions on these issues. I would not have willingly taken it upon myself to attempt what Norris has done.

## THE HUGE NUMBER OF EDITIONS

Rick Norris earnestly repeats that he has made an examination of many editions of the KJB. By the end of 2009, he was listing differences between 40 editions. By March 2010 it was over 100 editions. In June 2011 his list was over 200. And by late 2012 he was over 300.

Now, the reality is that there are literally thousands of editions of the KJB, and Norris is not going to be able to ever see them all. But nor has he examined every edition in every place. I am sure that he himself would admit that there are a few mistakes in his research, which are to be expected when documenting something technical in such an extensive manner.

The information does give a good insight into variations, but is not the total picture. We may be safe in concluding that by a scientific approach, we might be able to reasonably estimate what we should expect in all the editions which have not been examined in this way. There is, then, no problem with doing the research, nor with tabulating and providing the data, as Rick Norris has done.

But it would be a mistake for someone to rely upon human reasoning and say that this data shows something conclusively, when the fact remains that it is not itself exhaustive. Especially where

conclusions like, “there is no standard King James Version edition” or “there are multiple King James Versions” start to come forth.

The data is just data, and must still be examined, and conclusions must be justifiably drawn from it. It would be dishonest, for example, to imply that someone’s interpretations about the badness of the KJB should be supported, just because a large number of editions have been examined. In other words, there is no correlation between massive research and coming to a correct view on the subject, where personal agendas and *a priori* assumptions dominate how the information is used.

## THE CRITICAL VALUE OF THE EDITIONS

In textual criticism, it is usual that value would be assigned to the sources being examined. That is, that the body of historical evidence would be best understood especially by regarding traditional authoritative and notable editions.

However, Norris’ listing is augmented by a large amount of near and contemporary editions and their variations, much of which may arise from minor defective printing or arbitrary modern copy-editing (or lack thereof) and not reflective of anything of actual significance.

Collecting a quantity of low quality mass-market editions might result in hundreds of typographical errors being detected and listed. These hundreds of unique errata cannot be considered to be of real value in any kind of meaningful analysis other than to show that printing mistakes do exist in books. (To use this to amplify the number of “differences” in editions is ultimately meaningless.)

This can be taken further. Consider this example: in Matthew 3:6 in a certain printing of the Bible, there is a typographical mistake where a dot has been placed instead of a comma. This is found in four examples, which are apparently different editions, being,

1. HarperCollins “1500” with dark blue board covers.
2. HarperCollins black paperback printed in China with the ISBN 0007103077.
3. HarperCollins popular black leather printed in China with ISBN 0007103085.
4. Collins black leather printed with a different inset page in China with the ISBN 9780007259762.

Four editions could therefore be listed as having some kind of “variant”. Yet, in reality, these four different printings are really based on the same print masters (Popular, Iona Clear-Type Text), even though they were printed at different times in different places and bound with different bindings.

Another example of this same edition, also with blue board covers, and with illustrations, which is from before 1970 according to a handwritten inscription (1957 according to the licence page), does not have the typographical error, even though the page layout seems identical. This indicates that the later examples were actually a resetting at print which followed the former layout, but was of a lower editorial quality. Also, it shows how a mistake, such as the second instance of “Lord” at 1 Peter 3:12 was perpetuated as the incorrect “LORD”, as mistakes of this sort slipped through the copying and editorial processes.

These few examples alone explain how numbers of editions can all have one thing (for copying from a common origin) while other editions have something else.

But unless a careful reading was made of every single printing, not every idiosyncratic difference would be found. But really it would be needless to do so, which shows on one side Norris giving a general indication of variations in editions, but on the other, not every variation in those editions. Indeed, the same reason why a typesetter might make a mistake, or a copy editor miss picking it up is the same reason why Norris himself might not discover it. It would be foolish then to place Norris' research on too high of a pedestal.

Considering that some petty printer may obtain one or other electronic file from the internet, and proceed to use it as the basis of his own printing, it seems that various editions have very little critical value, considering that even Project Gutenberg hosted two different electronic texts of the KJB, which were not identical in every single place. (It seems that most publishers do not really assess the relative critical value or merits of one or other electronic source text, other than to know that it is not plagued by typographical errors.)

So when Norris is claiming to have examined an exorbitant number of editions, it must actually be taken with a grain of salt, in that not inconsiderable sources are merely variations and perpetuations of minor problems in publicly sourced editions, which in the end do not have critical value, but need to be measured against a present standard. (Rather than Norris' intent of showing a myriad of haphazard editions with plenty of examples of slapdash copy-editing.)

#### NORRIS DOES NOT LIST EVERY EDITION AT EVERY PLACE

It is possible to give information in such a way as may mislead, for example, it might be possible to examine a verse, and list fifty editions which have it one way, and list twenty which have it another. By this it could be implied that the fifty outweighs the rest. However, in reality, because all the information was not given, in fact, nearly 250 editions altogether read the same way as the twenty, while the fifty were actually in minority.

The problem is that in many examples, much of the information is omitted or not given. There is no definite list of every edition in every place. Whereas, in regards to importance, one would think that knowing what the 1611, 1629, 1638 and 1769 had at every example might quite useful information. But, sad to say, the information is less focussed on that — and perhaps for legitimate reasons, since we do not expect that Norris has very easy access to a great number of early editions, nor the time to do something so thorough where practicality completely dominates usefulness.

#### THE PURE CAMBRIDGE EDITION

I have a shelf full of Bibles. Those Bibles are all different in appearance, but they are all King James Bibles. This means that they are the same text and translation. I will go one step further. I have another shelf full of Bibles. They are also King James Bibles. And they are all different sizes, colours and formats from some different publishers. But they are all the same Edition.



And this is what needs to be understood: just because all of the examples are all individual books from different print runs and are different sizes, what are called “different editions”, yet all bear a striking resemblance in their editorial choices, that is, that they all agree in every place, except for where a few typography errors might exist, or else a very few of other exceedingly minor points.

It is evident that these have all been printed from a common origin, and that this is known as the “Pure Cambridge Edition”.

There are twelve tests which are used to know the Pure Cambridge Edition of the King James Bible. These twelve tests are useful because they provide a good basis for teaching about the correct editing of the King James Bible.

1. “or Sheba” not “and Sheba” in Joshua 19:2

The King James Bible when it was printed in 1611 read the right way, but for whatever reason, there are plenty of editions which read differently. The city is part of a list of thirteen cities, not fourteen, and it makes sense when comparing to the names of wells that Beer-sheba and Sheba are the same place.

2. “sin” not “sins” in 2 Chronicles 33:19

The same verse has “trespass” not “trespasses”, so it follows that sin is correct.

3. “Spirit of God” not “spirit of God” in Job 33:4

There are examples throughout the history of the King James Bible where the word “Spirit” has been altered, and it should properly be “Spirit” in this place, since it is the “Almighty” being spoken of in this verse.

4. “whom ye” not “whom he” in Jeremiah 34:16

The verse is speaking to “ye”, and “he” is a known printing mistake.

5. “Spirit of God” not “spirit of God” in Ezekiel 11:24

There is a difference between the Holy Ghost and an angel in this passage.

6. “flieth” not “fleeth” in Nahum 3:16

A typographical error which resulted in changing the word, where correctly the flying insects fly away.

7. “Spirit” not “spirit” in Matthew 4:1

The context and parallel passages show that it is the Holy Ghost.

8. “further” not “farther” in Matthew 26:39

The distinction here is proper grammar. Farther is where the choice is being between two points, further is where relative distance is measured. So “further” is proper.

9. “bewrayeth” not “betrayeth” in Matthew 26:73

The modernising trend for supposedly difficult words invariably leads to loss of concepts, as the alteration of the proper and distinct word “bewray” would be if it were changed to the completely different word “betray”. Bewray means to inadvertently reveal something secret, betray means to sell someone out.

10. “Spirit” not “spirit” in Mark 1:12

This is another example like Matthew 4:1.

11. “spirit” not “Spirit” in Acts 11:28

The distinction here is that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets, meaning that prophets have consciousness and know what they speak, rather than just being automations of the Holy Ghost.

12. “spirit” not “Spirit” in 1 John 5:8

The witness of God in the born again man is called “spirit”, which is perfectly consistent with many New Testament scriptures. Those who insist on “Spirit” do so by the shallow view that they think the word means the Holy Ghost and should be capital.

Norris has several examples himself of this edition, which he analyses as individual witnesses. Norris will use any difference, e.g. the one listed for 1 Chronicles 2:55 below, to imply that these are not agreeing testifiers, even though these editions are agreeing together in every other place, and even are agreeing against almost all other editions of the KJB in Ezra 2:26 with the spelling “Geba” (not “Gaba”).

None of the following variations in some printed editions of the Pure Cambridge Edition of the King James Bible undo the fact that they are all Pure Cambridge Editions. The fact is that when these things are examined, they are quite explainable within the long history of printing PCEs, and are also resolved now in the standard electronic text of the PCE.

Genesis 41:56

And Joseph — Pitt Minion, Minion, Brevier, various Cambridges, Bible Protector (standard Oxford)

and Joseph — Cameo, Sapphire, various Cambridges, Collins (standard London)

Genesis 46:12

Zerah — Pitt Minion, Cameo, some Collins, Bible Protector

Zarah — Some Collins

Joshua 17:11

Endor — Cameo, Sapphire, Collins, Bible Protector (standard London)

En-dor — Pitt Minion, Minion, Brevier (standard Oxford)

1 Chronicles 2:55

Hemath — Cameo, Minion, Sapphire, Collins, Bible Protector (standard Oxford and London)

Hammath — Pitt Minion, Ruby, Brevier

1 Chronicles 14:10

and wilt — Cameo, Pitt Minion, Collins, Bible Protector

And wilt — Collins

Song of Sol. 6:12

Amminadib — Cameo, Sapphire, Pitt Minion, Collins, Bible Protector

Ammi-nadib — Minion, Ruby

Amos 6:14

Hemath — Cameo, Minion, Sapphire, Collins, Bible Protector

Hamath — Ruby, Pitt Minion, Brevier

Matthew 27:46

Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani — Cameo, Minion, Collins, Bible Protector

ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTHANI — Pitt Minion, Brevier

Mark 5:41

Talitha cumi — Cameo, Minion, Collins, Bible Protector

TALITHA CUMI — Pitt Minion, Brevier

Mark 7:34

Ephphatha — Cameo, Minion, Collins, Bible Protector

EPHPHATHA — Pitt Minion, Brevier

Mark 15:34

Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani — Cameo, Minion, Collins, Bible Protector

ELOI, ELOI, LAMA SABACHTHANI — Pitt Minion, Brevier

1 Corinthians 4:15

instructors — Cameo, Pitt Minion, Collins, Bible Protector

instructors — some Collins, such as, Clear Type 8vo, Fontana 16mo refs. has the “e” look different, i.e. it was changed in the printing plate later

Norris, in typical fashion, will not see the forest for the trees. He might point to any one difference from above and proclaim that these differ from the PCE, and therefore ignore the fact that at every other place, on an editorial level, these two copies he is looking at really agree. These are, essentially, two different copies exhibiting the same Edition. In jot-and-tittle terms, they share a common master or recent ancestor.

If one out of, say, twenty, examples has “two-edged” instead of “twoedged”, he will certainly highlight that, regardless of the fact that the other nineteen agree. It seems unthinkable to Norris that this misplaced hyphen did not stop the perfection of the King James Bible.

### NORRIS’ STANDARD OF “CONSISTENCY”

On issues of spelling or editorial variations Norris likes to ask if such forms are consistent. His measure of consistency is, of course, a relative standard. These “standards” seem very authoritative, but when appeal to one might not lead to anything, he is liable to switch to comparison to another.

His standards are:

1. The preserved scriptures in the original languages.
2. The dictionary (presumably Webster’s) and common, contemporary American usage.
3. Pronouncements made by scholars, especially by Webster, Scrivener, Norton and the like.
4. Hypothetical constructs of what appears to be similar at different references, or where the rule of one place is attempted to be applied to another, that is, personal opinion, which may be framed conjecturally.

On a whole range of issues, such spelling, grammatical forms and so on, Norris will invoke these measures. In response, each of these “standards” have pitfalls and flaws.

#### **1. The preserved scriptures in the original languages.**

There are two main problems when examining this issue, the first is that modern scholars do not agree what exactly is the correct set of readings, and second, there are great disputes over the actual meanings of the words.

A great deal of the various manuscripts are incomplete or partial, and they, along with all the different printed editions, differ from each other. There is no settled, perfect text in the original languages.

And likewise, there are many disagreements in lexicons and among translators, so that there is no certainty among them as to what various words might mean.

These two factors lead scholars to conclude that they have the knowledge of the actual scriptures in originals to roughly a 98% level of accuracy.

And yet, Rick Norris wants to use this uncertain, imperfect and unsettled “standard” as the measure of whether or not an edition of the KJB, or whether the KJB itself, is right.

It does not take much to see that this method will always find “problems” with the KJB, and that same mindset will not be able to accept that there is a correct edition.

This is Rick Norris’ ultimate position, and there are numerous examples of where he has questioned and criticised the KJB in some place on the basis of what he thinks the originals state. One of his assumptions is that if he thinks the same original word is at two different places, that the English in both those places should be identical. This is one of his greatest mistakes in the way he treats the KJB, as it was an avowed object of the translators to vary the English according to the variations of the meaning, and not to be chained to some sort of slavish and wooden translation method.

In the end, the modern “using” of the original languages is really an exercise in relativity and personal opinion, it is not authority, but what one imbues to it.

This means that Norris has no real respect for the English, nor regard for how God has actually communicated with the KJB, but consistently attacks the beauty, excellence and glory of it with disparaging deprecation.

## **2. The dictionary (presumably Webster’s) and common, contemporary American usage.**

There is no final human standard of “proper” or “consistent” language use. However, the Bible itself exemplifies a high order of English use, that is, Biblical English. Biblical English is above normal English in the complexity of its precision, but it is not improper nor incomprehensible.

Norris may invoke the Webster’s dictionary, which is not recognised as the best, that place belonging to the full Oxford English Dictionary. But even with the OED, this is merely a human work, and itself is not fully exhaustive, nor should be treated as prescriptive or final authority.

In the general sense, the appeal to what is considered the common or standard usage is liable to fail as it is but personal opinion. Therefore, appealing to these things as some sort of standard against the KJB is extraordinarily weak, and enforces absurdities.

## **3. Pronouncements made by scholars, especially by Webster, Scrivener, Norton and the like.**

What is worse is to fall back on the speculative opinions of fallible men. Norris would cite these as “authorities” over and above what the KJB actually contains, because there is no real sanctity with the words to him, but an eagerness to invoke the words of any who speak contrariwise to them.

#### **4. Hypothetical constructs of what appears to be similar at different references, or where the rule of one place is attempted to be applied to another, that is, personal opinion, which may be framed conjecturally.**

This arises from a desire to see or make differences rather than them actually existing. This includes purposely ignoring or disregarding rules or conventions of usage in order to make a case so. For example, Norris brought up the issue about the word “Lord” and “LORD”, and remarked upon Psalm 90:1. Where in reality the standing tradition of the KJB is to present the first word of a chapter (or psalm) with all capitals, i.e. “LORD”, Norris quibbled that this was not delineating any difference between “Lord” or “LORD”, and has confused some (who do not use small capitals) that “LORD” was identical with “LORD”.

These points all work together, and Norris uses them to create his cases of imagined faults and (by now, in this advanced stage) great insurmountable errors of the KJB.

#### WHERE PEOPLE GO FROM HERE

Once the door is opened by Rick Norris’ conclusions, and various cracks are made in that “noble monument”, the KJB, the criticisms, attacks and downright nasty lies against it seem to spew forth. I never heard much before 2012 of people belonging to the opposition, who progressed forward from saying that there were different KJB editions and revisions, to the greater lie, that there were different King James “Versions”.

They want to say this, even though the fact is that all the editing in the KJB has not amounted to the creation of a different version, nor to a different translation. No proof has ever been forthcoming for this, but what is suggested in the most misleading terms. Therefore, the following are offered as their “proof” of supposed “real” differences:

1. The printing mistakes and editing.
2. Differences in italics.
3. The Apocrypha being removed, and perhaps also, marginal notes being removed.

This sequence gets more and more ludicrous, yet is very real. For years people would point to printing errors in 1611, for example, where sensational claims are made, like “seeke good” versus “seek God” (Psalm 69:32), or “inherit God” versus “inherit Gad” (Jeremiah 49:1). These were clearly typographical errors in 1611. It is absolutely nonsensical that these should be treated as some kind of serious changes in the KJB, yet there are those who do present these very examples.

As for italics, these never change whether or not a word is present in the Scripture. Those who argue down this avenue (as does Rick Norris) will attempt to demote the value of italicised words, as though they are not really Scripture. This is because he takes the totally unrealistic view that if there is not a one-to-one correlation of English words to the original languages, then there is something wrong with the English (conveniently ignoring that to communicate the proper sense in English, that the Bible cannot be transliterated, but must be translated).

Further to this, since Benjamin Blayney specifically spoke about referencing the original languages in his improving of the use of italics, Rick Norris implies that the original languages must have been the authority in all editing. (Which is both unattested to, and unrealistic, since consultation of the original languages would not be a norm in copy-editing.) The suggestion that Blayney may have used a different Greek text than what the translators did is neither here nor there. It has had no actual effect on the scripture as presented in the KJB, because the KJB translators used multiple editions of the Textus Receptus anyway.

As to the wild claim that the Apocrypha being removed somehow constitutes a real and drastic change to the KJB may easily be dismissed, since the Apocrypha is not Scripture, and is no more scripture than the front matter printed or not printed in various editions of the Bible.

Norris, I think could be charged with dealing with a level of deception because he has to some degree perpetuated the false myth of “Real disagreements between the KJV and the KJV”, and he has certainly entertained and not refuted those who along side him push that agenda. I do not mean that his actual facts are the reason for this charge. Nor should he be blamed just because others have pointed to his research as somehow instrumental for their “case” that there are different King James Versions. Facts do not create lies. The problem is that Norris has allowed others to say these things with no rebuttal, and never makes any reservation concerning the possibility of that conclusion. In other words, he seems to be fine with seeing others draw these conclusions even if he does not overtly articulate them himself.

My avowed desire would be that Rick Norris had a road to Damascus experience. It would be very gladdening to see him repent of his acerbic anti-King James Bible perfection. “But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all *men*, as theirs also was.” (2 Timothy 3:9).

# PART TWO: A SPECIFIC VIEW

## INTRODUCTION

In examining Norris' specific listings, several examples will be given, refuting his incorrect implications.

## DOETH AND DOETH

Genesis 4:7 [If thou do well--1560 Geneva, 1602 Bishops] [see Deut. 8:19--if thou do]  
[see Num. 10:32--if thou go] [see Ezek. 33:8--if thou dost]

If you do well (EB) [NKJV]

If thou do well {1611, 1613, 1614, 1616, 1617, 1634, 1640, 1644 London} (1843 AFBS)

If thou dost well (1675, 1720 Oxford) {1735 London} (1760 Edinburgh)

If thou doest well (1769 Oxford, SRB) [1629, 1769 Cambridge, DKJB]

There are three accusations here:

1. That editions and editors have not had their act together, changing the usage over the years.
2. That the differences do not resolve which is correct.
3. That the usages may be interchangeable.

In 1611, the language (in general) being used at the time was not so precisely rendered (especially in regards to spellings) like what was known in the 1760s. This is a constant feature of English, which means that over all, forms of words were much more precisely employed for the exact clarity after circa the advent of Johnson's *Dictionary* than before it.

On this basis, we might expect a printing mistake or the unstandardised usage of "doth" in 1611 at some place, where "doeth" was required, or where that meaning is was intended. This means that a person cannot rely on the jots and tittles of a 1611 edition as final authority for precise Bible grammar.

In regards to the proper usage, there needs to be exact correctness, because there is a relationship between grammar and sense. The grammatical forms of the relationships of singular/plural, subject/object and time (past, present, future, etc.) are necessary for communicating the exact sense. This is the beauty of the King James Bible.

Norris' seeking of what appears to be identical wordings yet with different uses are not examples of errors, but are in fact right and proper, if he actually admitted to the precision of the sense being communicated by the grammatical differences:

"If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" (Genesis 4:7).

And, "if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way" (Ezekiel 33:8).



These are two examples where obvious grammatical differences reflect a different sense. The word “doth” is always used with some sort of activity or action, such as, “lend”, “inquire”, “dwell” or “speak”. The word “doeth” means to do, and may be described with a quality, e.g. “well”.

Norris does not limit his incorrect analysis of the data to the King James Bible either, but in the above example listed the Geneva, Bishops’ and the New King James Version (NKJV).

In the end, Norris does not present what actually is the correct grammar in this case, for he is too busy attempting to show the difference and to make the case appear unsettled, rather than on being able to properly discern what is the correct grammar. (If and when he does decide what is “correct”, there is a high probability that it will not match what actually is correct according to the proper and consistent pattern of Biblical usage.)

## DOUBLE

1 Timothy 3:8 [see James 1:8, James 4:8, Titus 2:6]

double tongued (1778, 1783 Oxford) [1778, 1790, 1817 Cambridge] {1611, 1617 London} (1820 Edinburgh) (1791 Thomas) (1818 Holbrook)

double-tongued (1715, 1728, 1747, 1754, 1765, 1768, 1771, 1772, 1773, 1774, 1777, 1784 Oxford) [1629, 1637, 1683, 1743, 1756, 1760, 1762, 1765, 1767, 1768, 1769, 1824, 2005 Cambridge] {1634, 1672, 1711, 1747, 1750, 1760, 1764, 1767, 1795 London} (1722, 1766, 1793, 1842, 1858 Edinburgh) (1782 Aitken) (1791 Collins) (1819, 1829, 1843, 1853, 1894, 1954, 1957, 1963, 1971, 1988, 2008 ABS) (1827 Smith) (1968 Royal) (1975 Open) (1976 TN) (CSB) (RRB) (1984, 1991 AMG) (WMCRB) (LASB) (2006 PENG) (1833 WEB) (1842 Bernard) (1851 Cone)

doubletongued (1769 Oxford, SRB) [DKJB]

James 1:8 [see also 1 Thess. 5:14, Titus 2:6]

double-mined (1747 Oxford)

doubleminded [1790 Cambridge] (1853, 1868, 1894, 1902 ABS)

double-minded (1715, 1728, 1754, 1758, 1765, 1768, 1773, 1774, 1777, 1778, 1784 Oxford) [1629, 1637, 1638, 1683, 1743, 1747, 1758, 1760, 1762, 1768, 1769, 1778, 1817, 1822, 1824, 2005 Cambridge] {1634, 1672, 1711, 1747, 1750, 1760, 1763, 1764, 1767, 1795, 1879 London} (1722, 1766, 1769, 1789, 1791, 1793, 1820, 1842, 1858 Edinburgh) (1866 Glasgow) (1791 Collins) (1813 Carey) (1816 Albany) (1818 Holbrook) (1819, 1829, 1843, 1954, 1957, 1963, 1971, 1988, 2008 ABS) (1827 Smith) (1832 PSE) (1846 Portland) (1924 Hertel) (1968 Royal) (1975 Open) (CSB) (RRB) (1984 AMG) (WMCRB) (LASB) (2006 PENG)

double minded (1769 Oxford, SRB) [DKJB]

When words are compound, they are a different word, that is, “doubletongued”, which would therefore not be the same as “double tongued”, two words. And so, “double minded” are two words, with two meanings, placed together in a sentence to make a meaning. Conceptually, it appears that “doubletongued” means division, as in, a forked tongue. Whereas, to double anything is multiplication, to have two, so, “double minded” means two minds.

## ITALICS

Norris shows that various editions use italics differently. He thinks that on some occasions, some editions are more consistent or correct than the PCE in their use of italics. He also points out that the PCE differs from the 1611 Edition in italics.

There are two main points of refutation in his analysis. The first is that he omits to say that editions like the 1769 Edition are the same as the PCE in his examples. The second is that he gives a large list of editions which show the rendering at variance to the 1769 and the PCE, whereas, a massive list of editions could easily be given that have the standard, accepted usage. It appears that this omission is deliberate, to give the appearance that there is a prevailing counter-opinion.

The real problem is that Norris is presenting his case as if the English should be presenting by a word-for-word correlation to the original language wording, so where additional English words are required in translation, they should be rendered in italics. Of course, in reality, there are a number of rules describing how italics are used, and by conveniently ignoring them, Norris then claims that there are “inconsistencies” with his straw-man simplistic rule.

Isaiah 36:3 [same as Isa. 36:22 and 37:2--*was over*]  
*was over* (1675, 1709, 1715, 1747, 1754, 1758, 1762, 1765, 1768, 1770, 1771, 1772, 1773, 1777, 1778, 1783, 1804 Oxford) [1629, 1637, 1638, 1683, 1743, 1747, 1756, 1760, 1762, 1763B, 1765, 1767, 1768, 1817, 1873 Cambridge] {1611, 1616, 1617, 1634, 1640, 1644, 1660, 1672, 1684, 1711, 1735, 1741, 1747, 1750, 1759, 1760, 1764, 1767, 1772 London} (1755 Oxon) (1638, 1722, 1760, 1764, 1766, 1769, 1787, 1791, 1793, 1820, 1842, 1858 Edinburgh) (1700 MP) (1746 Leipzig) (1782 Aitken) (1802, 1813 Carey) (1803 Etheridge) (1804 Blomfield) (1804, 1828 MH) (1807 Johnson) (1814, 1832, 1835 Scott) (1816 Albany) (1816 Collins) (1818 Holbrook) (1818, 1819, 1827, 1829, 1843, 1851, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1858 ABS) (1818, 1826 Boston) (1827 Smith) (1831 Brown) (1832 PSE) (1843, 1856 AFBS) (1846 Portland) (1845, 1854, 1876 Harding) (1924, 1958 Hertel) (2000, 2002 ZOND) (TPB) (HPB) (2008, 2010, 2011 HEND) (NHPB) (1842 Bernard)  
*was over* (1769 Oxford, SRB) [1769 Cambridge, DKJB]

In this analysis, Norris looked at Isaiah 36:22 and 37:2 for what he claims is the same. His sameness may be in regard to either English or to Hebrew, or else to both. And while this superficially appears to be correct on empirical grounds, there are in fact several important factors to consider.

The exact same English is not employed in his examples, meaning that there is a difference in underlying meaning, and if a difference in meaning, a difference in how words are rendered also are then possible, Isaiah 36:3 “which *was*”, 36:22 “that *was*”, 37:2 “who *was*”. On this basis, the one Hebrew word being made two English words in 36:3 “which *was*” would not be the same as how the additional English words were placed according to the sense in the other two examples, that is, that it is possible to imply sense in Hebrew without using words which words are required to be stated in English, as Blayney wrote, “words not expressed in the Original Language, but which our Translators have thought fit to insert in italics, in order to make out the sense after the English

idiom, or to preserve the connection.” Scrivener himself wrote of the “extreme compactness of the Hebrew language”.

In the case of Luke 10:30, the so-called PCE puts “man” in italics, implying that it is not found in the Greek text when the Greek text actually has a word for man.

Norris’ narrow rule and oversimplification omits that there are other reasons why italics are used. One of them is that italics also bear record of issues or variations which exist in the underlying language, such as minority readings. The issue comes back to what is “the Greek text”, as there is no perfect single Greek text, but a variety of Greek texts which all differ to each other.

All the arguing about what Greek actually means of course is relative, unless a standard is referred to. In this case, we have an English standard. It is possible that all kinds of arguments could be made up, whether the Greek literally correlates to “certain” and not “man”, etc., but in the end, it is because we have the end result, rather than the specific practice of how the rules are exactly employed, that is the answer. People do not need to know every rule and how every word is right in every place in order to know that what they have is correct.

## CONCLUSION

And this leads back to the philosophical basis which differs from the proper perfection view of the King James Bible. The perfection view says that people should receive the Word of God as true without needing to know whether or not every place is correct and why. Whereas, the philosophic opposite is that it cannot be exactly perfect, because either:

1. every place has not been examined, so it cannot be known to be perfect, or
2. that since it is assumed to be imperfect, analysis of words on a case by case example will soon exhibit errors — in other words, Norris hunts for examples of errors, not because they are errors, but because he thinks they are errors because he assumes they are there and he has the ability to find them.

Whereas, in reality, a minute examination of the King James Bible, and of the Pure Cambridge Edition of it, is finding only perfection and exactness right down to the very last detail.