

Sunday, February 27, 2022— Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*
Lesson 169 The Pre-1611 Evidence for The Text: MS 98 Impact on King James Readings, Part 3

Introduction

- In [Lesson 166](#) we looked at the Physical Description and Contents of MS 98.
- More recently in Lessons [167](#) and [168](#) we considered how MS 98 impacts the readings found in the King James Bible. This was accomplished by conducting a collation of a 1602 Bishops Bible, MS 98, and the 1611 AV for Romans 1 and I Corinthians 13. Please see the conclusion of [Lesson 168](#) for a discussion of our summative takeaways.
- In [Lesson 166](#) we ran across Ward Allen’s discussion of Colossians 2:12 in MS 98 which led us into a conversation related to the irksome subject of printer errors in the AV. I suggested, based upon the evidence furnished by MS 98, that we should not be too quick to call differences in the various editions of the AV printer errors. Consider the following summary of our discussion with respect to Colossians 2:12.

Colossians 2:12

1602 Bishops	MS 98	AV (1611)	AV (1769)	Comments
Buried with him in baptism, in whom ye are also risen again through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.	q	Buried with him in Baptism, <u>wherein also you are risen with <i>him</i></u> through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.	Buried with him in baptism, wherein also <u>ye</u> are risen with <i>him</i> through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.	Blank in MS 98. At some point it was marked with a “q” for query. Bishops’ clause “in whom ye are also risen again” is revised in the AV to read “wherein also you are risen with <i>him</i> ”. 1769 AV reads “ye are risen” as opposed to “you are risen” in the 1611 AV. Change was made as early as 1748 .

- The same phenomenon also occurs in Romans 1:11, a verse that was discussed in detail in [Lesson 168](#). Our focus below is on the words “ye” and “you” in the printed history of the text.

Romans 1:11

1602 Bishops	MS 98	AV (1611)	AV (1769)	Comments
For I long to see you, that I might bestow among you some spiritual gift, that <u>ye</u> might be established,	For I long to see you that I might impart unto ^r you some spiritual gift to the end <u>you</u> may ^o be established.	For I long to see you, that I <u>may</u> ^r impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end <u>you</u> may be established,	For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end <u>ye</u> may be established;	<p>The 1602 Bishops read “ye might be.”</p> <p>MS 98 revised it “you may be.”</p> <p>The 1611 accepted MS 98’s revision “you may be.”</p> <p>Standard 1769 text reads “ye may be.” It was changed in 1762, according to Lawrence Vance. (196)</p>

- In Paul’s Epistles alone there are 42 verses where more recent printings of the AV such as the 1762 and/or 1769 read “ye” where the 1611 originally read “you,” see pages 196-198 in Vance. Furthermore, in all 42 cases, there is evidence when comparing MS 98 against a 1602 Bishops and a 1611 AV, that the choice of “you” was the intentional choice of the translators. In many of these 42 cases, the 1602 Bishops Bible read “ye” in instances where the translators amended the text to read “you” in MS 98 and/or the AV. On other occasions, the AV moved the Bishops reading of “you” forward into both MS 98 and the 1611 without alteration. In either case, the outcome is the same, the King James translators chose “you” as the correct reading.
 - Romans—1:11; 13:6; 14:1
 - I Corinthians—4:15; 6:8; 7:5, 35; 9:1; 10:13; 11:2, 17; 14:9, 18; 15:1, 58; 16:3
 - II Corinthians—1:7, 11, 13, 14, 15; 2:4, 8; 5:12; 7:3, 15; 8:11, 13; 9:4; 11:1, 7; 12:19
 - Galatians—1:6; 3:1; 4:15, 17; 5:10
 - Ephesians—2:2
 - Colossians—2:12; 3:8; 4:6
 - I Thessalonians—2:11
- So how should we view these 42 verses in the face of the evidence furnished by MS 98? Were they all printer errors or later editorial changes? While inconvenient for some, the following fact

is inescapable, readers of the standard 1769 text in the 21st century are not reading the original translational choices of the translators in at least 42 verses in Paul's epistles.

- This of course is an irksome subject for some because it stands in direct opposition to standard King James Only talking points. It is commonly repeated by King James advocates that the only differences between a 1611 and 1769 edition are 1) spelling, 2) punctuation, and 3) correction of printer errors.
- A prime example of this kind of reasoning is Dr. Peter S. Ruckman's 1983 publication *Differences in the King James Version Editions*. In this short 25-page booklet Dr. Ruckman takes critics of the pro-King James position to task over their insistence that "genuine updating and the genuine revision work done on different editions of the AV should justify the replacing of its Greek text." (Ruckman, 1) The following statements from the pen of Dr. Ruckman are indicative of the common thinking on the matter within the King James Only movement.
 - "The variations are divided into three classes: manifest errors of the typesetter in the copy of 1611, manifest typesetting problems in the 1613 edition, and other variants from 1611.

In the first class, there are such things as a capital "L" put into *Lord* in Exodus 14:10. "Shall burnt them" has been corrected to "shall burn them" in Leviticus 4:35. A woman that "travelleth" has been altered to a "woman that travaileth" in Isaiah 13:8 and 21:3; "Sons nor daughter" has been altered to "sons nor daughters" in Ezekiel 14:18; "shwed them by the prophets" has been corrected to "hewed them by the prophets" in Hosea 6:5; "And if ye offer" has been omitted in Malachi 1:8 and has been reinserted in the 1613 edition.. "That you remember me" has been altered to "that ye remember me" in I Corinthians 11:2.

. . . You are to think that since typographical errors in one text were corrected, and better spelling were set up for that one text, that gives some apostate fool the liberty to get rid of the right Greek text (the Receptus) and then get rid of the right English text (the AV of 1611). . .

The typographical errors of the 1611 edition were brought right back into line with the 1613. . . Thus, there was not only no departure in writing from the text of 1611, but there was a return to it if any signs of departure showed up in the printing press." (Ruckman, 7-9)

- "The results of God-honored, God-blessed revision of the original 1611 text are as follows: "That the edition of 1611, although prepared with very great care, was not free from typographical errors; and that, while most of these were corrected in the edition of 1613, others in much greater number were nevertheless then introduced, which have since been removed. That the revision of Dr. Blaney made by collating the then current editions of Oxford and Cambridge with those of 1611 and 1701 had for its main object to restore the text of the English Bible to its original purity; and that this was successfully accomplished." (Ruckman, 14)

- “As we have seen, any and all revisions were corrections of press errors, where the typesetter had not followed the text of 1611. These were revised back into subsequent editions, and then printer’s errors were corrected until a pure text was arrived at in 1613, which conformed to the original intent of the AV translators.” (Ruckman, 16)
- “We have learned that of some 20,000 supposed “changes” in the AV text between 1611 and now, at least 19,000 of them had to do with the spelling of English words that were already in the text and correcting the mistakes of the lithographers and linotype operators; not the translators of 1611.” (Ruckman, 21)
- Ruckman’s thinking is correct in the following manner. The revision work that occurred on the AV text between 1611 and 1769 is not even remotely the same thing that occurred between 1870 and 1881 with the Revision Committee and their release of the Revision Version and the publication of the Westcott and Hort Greek text. The Modern Critical Text and its resultant Modern Versions differ substantively in their doctrinal content from the Received Text and its principal English translation the AV.
- That said, it is certainly not true that the only differences between a 1611 AV and the now standard 1769 text are 1) spelling, 2) punctuation, and 3) correction of printer errors. MS 98 and other primary work-in-progress documents such as Bod 1602 illuminate this reality in ways that Ruckman was unaware of in the early 1980s. Once again, Ruckman and other leading lights in the King James Only movement were largely unaware of these primary source documents when they enunciated their position.
- Now, in the light of further evidence furnished by the work-in-progress primary source documents, this topic needs to be revisited. Over the next couple Lessons, we want to use MS 98 to look at the question of printer errors and intentional choices in an objective and evidentiary manner. In doing so, we will be looking at two different categories of examples.
 - Category I—when readings found in MS 98 and the 1611 AV agree against later editions.
 - Category II—when readings found in MS 98 and later editions of the AV agree against the 1611.

Types of Evidence

- According to Professor David Norton there are two kinds of pre-1611 evidence for the text of the King James Bible.
 - “There are two main kinds of pre-1611 evidence for the text of the KJB: the sources, and the written or printed versions directly, physically involved in the making of the translation. The sources are, of course, the original language texts (Hebrew and Greek), the ancient translations (particularly the Vulgate and the Septuagint), modern translations (including Luther’s German and the Latin of Tremellius and Junius) and the earlier English translations. These contribute intellectually (and of course crucially – without them there would be no KJB) but not physically to the KJB. Crossing the line between an intellectual and a physical source is the Bishops’ Bible of 1602. In a sense Bois’s notes

also cross the line, for they are evidence of the intellectual process that led to the text. MS 98 and the annotations in Bod 1602 are physical sources. Though they contain no direct evidence of the thinking that led to particular readings, they show the particularities of the text being established.” (Norton, 29)

- Since MS 98 and Bod 1602 were either wholly unknown, inaccessible, and/or unstudied until the middle portion of the 20th century, at the earliest, they have only recently been utilized to evaluate how they might inform our understanding of the printed history of the King James text when it comes to the question of printer errors verses the intentional choices of the translators.
 - “Until now these physical sources have not been used for editorial work on the text: whatever they might tell about why the 1611 text reads as it does has been ignored. On the other hand, the chief intellectual sources, the original language texts, have been treated as direct evidence for how the text of the KJB should read. This is a natural way of working: errors in the printed text of 1611 may be discovered by reference to the originals. But it is also a dangerous way of working because there are two basic kinds of error to be found in a translation: mechanical and intellectual. The former are usually errors of transcription and printing, the latter are errors of translation. If we accept that the text of the KJB should present the translators’ understanding of the originals as they meant to express it, then only mechanical errors can be corrected – errors where an accident of some sort has led to a misrepresentation of the translators’ understanding or expression. Intellectual errors must stand unless one is making a new version.” (Norton, 29)
- Unlike Dr. Norton, I do not believe that the King James translators made any intellectual/translational errors. I believe that the King James Bible contains all the correct readings and that the translators accurately expressed in English the substantive doctrinal content of the preserved originals. That said, I cannot continue to repeat wrong information about the printed history of text in the face of the factual evidence.
 - “Attention to the physical sources shows that editorial development of the text has not distinguished between accidental errors and ‘errors’ of translation, that is, readings that have been judged to be errors but that were deliberate creations of the translators. Working from the intellectual sources, the original-language texts, editors have corrected both kinds of error. Nor have they always kept themselves to matters that are clearly errors. Sometimes they have, by their lights, *improved* the text.” (Norton, 29-30)
- In 2005, for the first time, Dr. Norton compared the 1611 printing of the AV against later changes to the King James text with MS 98 to ascertain the original intentions of the translators in a handful of readings.
 - “I want now to explore – within specific limits – the kind of information the physical sources give for the text. The principal limit is this: I have confined myself to places where there is some variation between the first printing and the text as we now have it (with attention to some of the variations that have come in but have been discarded from modern editions). The question of whether these manuscript materials might give

evidence for changes to the 1611 text that have never yet been made has not been broached.” (Norton, 30)

- This brings us to our first category up for discussion.
 - Category I—when readings found in MS 98 and the 1611 agree against later editions.

Category I: Examples

- Dr. Norton believes that in places where MS 98 and the 1611 agree together against the 1602 Bishops and more recent editions of the AV one must view these amended readings found in MS 98 as the intentional choices of the translators. Consider the following explanation from the pen of Professor Norton:
 - “The readings that differ from the Bishops’ Bible of 1602 and are identical with 1611 are the most important. Unless the same mistake was made twice, that is, unless MS 98 accidentally changed either the 1602 text or the translators’ annotation, and then the printer made the same accidental change (which is unlikely but not impossible), these readings confirm that what appears in the printed text was the creation of the translators. We might speculate that some of the readings were created accidentally, but this makes little difference in practice: they entered the text at an early stage of its composition and survived several reviews by the translators before being printed, so becoming in effect deliberate parts of the work. Now, if a later edition makes a change to these, either that change is itself an error or it comes from the editor presuming to know better than the translators.” (Norton, 31)

II Corinthians 8:21

Verse	1602 Bishops	MS 98	AV (1611)	AV (1769)	Comments
II Cor. 8:21	Making provision for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men.	Providing for honest things not only in the sight of the Lord but in the sight of men.	Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but in the sight of men.	Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but <u>also</u> in the sight of men.	MS 98 removes the word “making.” MS 98 omits “also” from the Bishops text. The AV follows MS 98 in omitting the words “making” and “also” thereby indicating the

					intentional choice of the translators. The word “also” was added back in by a later editor.
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Since “making” and “also” are omitted in both MS 98 and the 1611 AV, Professor Norton believes these omissions to be the intentional choice of the translators.
 - “Without the evidence of MS 98 several such readings might be taken as printer’s errors. 2 Cor. 8:21 is a case in point. 1611 gives ‘but in the sight’ instead of its predecessors’ ‘but also in the sight’ for *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον*. MS 98 has 1611’s reading, proving that the omission is the work of the translators: since ‘also’ was in the 1602 text, they must have struck through it there.” (Norton, 31)

Ephesians 6:24

Verse	1602 Bishops	MS 98	AV (1611)	AV (1769)	Comments
Eph. 6:24	Grace be with all them which love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. <u>Amen.</u>	Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.	Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.	Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. <u>Amen.</u>	MS 98 omits “Amen” from the end of verse. The AV follows suit and omits the “Amen.” A later editor added the word “Amen” back in.

- Unless the same mistake was made twice, in both MS 98 and the 1611 AV it seems that the intention of the translators was to omit the “Amen” at the end of Ephesians 6:24.

I Peter 5:10

Verse	1602 Bishops	MS 98	AV (1611)	AV (1769)	Comments
I Pet. 5:10	But the God of all grace himself , which hath called us	But the God of all grace which hath called us <u>into</u>	But the God of all grace <u>who</u> hath called vs <u>into</u>	But the God of all grace, who hath called us <u>unto</u> his	MS 98 omits “himself” from the first clause.

	<p>unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a little affliction, make you perfect, settle, strengthen, and stablish you.</p>	<p>his eternal glory by Jesus Christ, after that ye have suffered a light affliction, <u>himself</u>, make you perfect, settle, strengthen, and stablish you.</p>	<p>his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, <u>stablish</u>, strengthen, <u>settle</u> you.</p>	<p>eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you.</p>	<p>MS 98 changes the Bishops “unto” to “into.”</p> <p>MS 98 inserted “himself” into the second half of the verse.</p> <p>The 1611 AV changed “which” to “who” in the first clause and retained MS 98’s change to “into.”</p> <p>The AV removed “himself” from the second half of the verse and removed the word “and.”</p> <p>The AV also repositioned “stablish” and “settle” in the text by swapping their order.</p> <p>The 1769 text changed “into” as in MS 98 and the 1611 AV back to “unto” as in</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

					the 1602 Bishops.
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------

- “MS 98 shows that the translators deliberately changed all of their predecessors’ ‘unto’ to ‘into’ at I Peter 5:10, giving: ‘who hath called us into his eternall glory.’” (Norton, 31) A comparison between MS 98 and the 1602 Bishops text and the 1611 reveals multiple stages of revision yet the word “into” was retained in the AV thereby indicating intentionality on the part of the translators. Yet, the verse reads “unto” in modern printings of the AV.

Romans 12:2

Verse	1602 Bishops	MS 98	AV (1611)	AV (1769)	Comments
Rom. 12:2	And be not ye fashioned like unto this world: but be ye changed in your shape, by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.	And be not <u>transformed</u> like unto this world: but be ye changed in your shape, by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is <u>that</u> good, <u>that</u> acceptable and perfect will of God.	And bee not <u>conformed</u> to this world: but be ye <u>transformed</u> by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, that acceptable and perfect will of God.	And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, <u>and</u> acceptable, and perfect, will of God.	MS 98 contains three changes when compared to the Bishops. First, “fashioned” is changed to “transformed.” Second, “the good” is changed to “that good.” Third, “and acceptable” is changed to “that acceptable.” The 1611 changed “transformed” to “conformed” in the first clause. Likewise, MS 98’s “changed in your shape”

					<p>is changed to “transformed.”</p> <p>The rest of MS 98’s revisions are retained in the AV.</p> <p>The 1769 text changed “that acceptable” back to “and acceptable.”</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Once again, we see multiple stages of revision when comparing MS 98 with the AV text of 1611. Yet, the reading “that acceptable” introduced in MS 98 is retained in the AV. This does not seem like a printer error but the intentional choice of translators. Regarding this verse professor Norton states the following:
 - “Where 1611 reverts to a reading from one of its predecessors and the possibility of inferring a printer’s error is slighter, MS 98’s evidence is less important: it does no more than fill out the picture of what happened. At Rom. 12:2 the 1602 Bishops’ Bible reads: ‘that ye may proue what is the good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God’. 1611 has two changes: ‘that ye may proue what is *that* good, *that* acceptable and perfect will of God’ (changes italicized). In 1629 the second ‘that’ was changed back to ‘and’, giving the reading that remains in the text: ‘that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God’. Here the 1629 editors have observed that the Greek reads *καὶ εὐάρεστον*, literally, ‘and acceptable’. They have therefore corrected the English by the Greek. Without MS 98 we might have guessed that 1611’s reading was deliberate. It restores an older reading, Tyndale’s; this looks like choice, not accident. The result is that ‘acceptable and perfect’ appears as an elaboration of what is meant by ‘good’. MS 98 confirms that the rejection of the literal reading is deliberate, and locates the change in the first period of revision. Here the translators placed other considerations ahead of word-for-word fidelity.” (Norton, 31-32)
- Dr. Norton concludes his comments on this category of examples with the following summative statements.
 - “In each of these cases later editors have decided 1611 was wrong and have restored the old readings. Perhaps the old readings were better, perhaps not: MS 98 proves (or confirms, as in the last example) that the KJB translators judged that they were not. The later editors, perhaps unknowingly, have undone the translators’ work.” (Norton, 32)
- In readings where MS 98 and the 1611 AV agree against later wording changes, it is best to view these readings as the original intent of the translators rather than printer errors. In these cases, MS 98 serves to confirm the choices of the translators as exhibited in the 1611. Put another way,

unless the translators made the same mistake twice, once in MS 98 and again in the 1611, while accepting the other revisions of MS 98 into the AV, in the same verses, the most charitable interpretation of the evidence is to view readings in this category as the intentional choices of the translators, not printer errors.

- This of course means that modern readers of the standard 1769 text are reading an edited text and not solely the original wording choices of the translators. While this might be an inconvenient truth for the historic King James Only position, it is a textual and historical reality nonetheless.
- In the next Lesson we will consider Category II, i.e., when readings found in MS 98 and later editions of the AV agree against the 1611.

Works Cited

Norton, David. *A Textual History of the King James Bible*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Ruckman, Peter S. *Differences in the King James Version Editions*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1983.

Vance, Laurence M. *The Text of the King James Bible*. Orlando, FL: Vance Publications, 2020.