Sunday, January 16, 2022— Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever* Lesson 163 The work-in-progress Documents: Analyzing the Pre-1611 Evidence for The Text, Part 2

Introduction

- In <u>Lesson 161</u> we sought to establish a general timeline for how the various companies of translators conducted their work. We reviewed this last week in <u>Lesson 162</u>. In general, we established the following general working timeline.
 - Stage 1 (1604-1608)—Six companies produce draft translations.
 - Lambeth Palace MS 98 represents the state of text during Stage 1.
 - Bod. 1602 bridges the gap between MS 98 and what was reviewed at the General Meeting(s).
 - Stage 2 (1609-1610)—General Meeting(s) review the company drafts and establish the text to be printed.
 - Notes of John Bois bear witness to this process.
 - Stage 3 (1611)—Two men, Thomas Bilson and Myles Smith, work with the King's printer Robert Barker to see the text through to the press.
 - Two printings of the 1611 bear witness to the final decisions of the translators.
- Having established this general working timeline, last week in Lesson 162 we began considering the three work-in-progress documents in greater detail. While we have mentioned these in our studies thus far, they are each worthy of their own consideration. Once again, the three documents are 1) MS 98, 2) Bod. 1602, and 3) the notes of John Bois. I stated that, over the next couple Lessons, we would be considering each of the three primary work-in-progress documents in terms of the following points:
 - Scholarly Awareness & Published Access
 - Physical Description & Contents
 - o Impact on the readings found in the King James Bible
- We only had time in Lesson 162 to look at point one i.e., "Scholarly Awareness & Published Access" for MS 98 and Bod 1602. In summation we observed the following:

- MS 98—logged in the Lambeth Palace Library by 1647
 - Scholarly Awareness—discovered by E.E. Willoughby in 1955. Briefly described and discussed in his 1956 monograph *The Making of the King James Bible: A Monograph with Comparisons from the Bishops Bible and the Manuscript Annotations of 1602, With an Original Leaf from the Great "She" Bible of 1611.*
 - Published Access—in 1977 Ward S. Allen published Translating the New Testament Epistles 1604-1611: A Manuscript of King James's Westminster Company for Vanderbilt University Press. Allen's work is a full collation of MS 98 against both a 1602 Bishops Bible and a 1611 Authorized Version. Today, one can view select pages of MS 98 on the Lambeth Palace Library website.
- Bod 1602—the Annals of the Bodleian Library Oxford edited by William Dunn Macray notes receipt of the volume in 1646.
 - Scholarly Awareness—19th century British scholars B.F. Westcott (1863) and Nicolas Pocock (1888) wrote about the document but missed its true significance. Once again, it was E.E. Willoughby in 1955 who realized that Bod 1602 comprised the draft work of the translators themselves.
 - Published Access—in 1975 Edward Craney Jacobs wrote an essay for *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* titled "An Old Testament Copy Text for the 1611 Bible" that outlines some of the details of the Old Testament portion of Bod 1602. A second, academic paper by Jacobs also needs to be noted here. In March 1980 "Two Stages of Old Testament Translation for the King James Bible" was published for *The Library*. Later in 1995 Jacobs coauthored *The Coming of the King James Gospels: A Collation of the Translators' Work-in-Progress* for the University of Arkansas Press with Ward S. Allen. This important volume provides a complete collection of Bod. 1602 with the 1611 text for the gospels.
- For the rest of this Lesson, I would like to continue looking at these work-in-progress documents by considering "Scholarly Awareness & Published Access" from the Notes of John Bois.

Scholarly Awareness & Published Access

Notes of John Bois

• The third work-in-progress document that garners our attention is the notes of John Bois. This story is best told by Ward S. Allen, the discoverer of the document, in the Preface to this 1969 publication *Translating for King James: Notes Made by a Translator of the King James's Bible.*

o "The story of the publication of John Bois's notes is a simple one. Some years ago, I learned through Dr. F.H.A. Scrivener's book, *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible* (1611) (Cambridge: the university Press, 1884), that John Bois, one of the translators of the Authorized Version, had made notes while the company of review of which he was a member, prepared the final edition of their translation at Stationers' Hall during the years 1610-1611. Bois, and he only, had made notes as the company deliberated over the final version. From time out of memory the notes have been lost.

For one who had beguiled leisure hours in puzzling over the revision that the translators of the Authorized Version had formed in their edition out of previous translations the dream of recovering the lost notes floated as an unbodied joy. Dr. Scrivener nourished that dream with the conjecture that some day lost notes would perhaps turn up in a private collection.

Long after I had abandoned hope of glimpsing the notes for ever, it happened that they fell my way, full-bodied. A photograph and some remarks on John Bois and his notes in Gustavus S. Paine's book, *The Learned Men* (New York: Thomas, y. Crowell, 1959), gave me hope that a true copy of the notes rested in the Bodleian Library. Mr. T.H. Aston, the librarian of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, was kind enough to furnish me with a photographic copy of the manuscript which Mr. Paine had described. A close study has convinced me that MS. C.C.C. 312 exhibits substantially a section, at least, of the notes which John Bois made at Stationers' Hall. The notes appear on thirty-nine manuscript pages, 61'-80', and are concerned with problems of translating biblical passages from Romans through Revelation, with addenda covering First Corinthians through Revelation.

I published a preliminary description of these notes in the *Renaissance News*, Winter 1966, with the hope that if any scholars doubted the authenticity of the notes, they would make their doubts known. Several scholars, biblical, literary, and classical, were kind enough to write to me expressing their conviction that the notes which I had described and argued were, indeed, a good copy of the lost notes. The introduction to this book adds to the evidence in that article an elaborate study which has as its single end to demonstrate that the notes which are reproduced in this book are a good copy of those notes which John Bois made at Stationers' Hall." (Allen, vii-viii)

- A second, copy of Bois' Notes was discovered in the mid-1990s by Dr. David Norton. Norton wrote about it in his 1996 essay for *The Library* titled "John Bois's Notes on the Revision of the King James Bible New Testament: A New Manuscript."
- The notes and transcription found in Allen's 1969 publication are based upon a transcribed copy of Bois' notes done by William Fulman (1633-1688). A note found at the end of the copy furnished by Allen reads as follows:

- o "Transcribed out of a Copie taken by some unskillfull hand, very confused, and faulty, especially in the Greek." (Allen, 112-113)
- Professor Norton believes that this statement does not apply to Bois' work in notetaking or his
 understanding of Greek but to the copy of his notes that Fulman used to make his transcription.
 (Norton, 328)
 - o "This does not diminish the general authenticity of the notes in that they clearly are Bois's notes taken during the revision of the latter part of the New Testament, but it does create more doubts about their accuracy than if they were taken direct from Bois's own manuscript. These doubts can only partially be laid to rest by the quality of the detail, so well demonstrated by Allen, in the notes. The discovery of Bois's original autograph notes would be a real coup." (Norton, 329)
- All of this implies the existence of more than one copy. This is precisely what Norton found in the British Library.
 - o "In the absence of the original, the next best thing is another copy. There is one in the British Library, MS Harl. 750, fols 3r-i6r. It is the second item of a collection made by the cleric, eventually Bishop of Dunblane, James Wedderburn (1585-1639)... What I take to be Wedderburn's hand begins on the same folio as the last of the notes, this copy dates from, at the latest, 1639, and is substantially older than Fulman's copy." (Norton, 329)
- Norton goes on to discuss how this implies the existence of at least three copies of Bois' notes.
 - "Though MS Harl. 750 could be described as unskillful, confused and faulty, a comparison of the manuscripts shows that it was not the copy Fulman used.
 Consequently, there must have been at least three copies made, MS Harl. 750, Fulman's, and the one Fulman used. So there remain at least two versions still to be found, this last, and the original itself." (Norton, 329)
- It was while looking for other notes related to the King James Bible that Norton discovered the heretofore uncatalogued copy of Bois's notes in MS Harl. 750.
 - o "The circumstances of finding this copy of the notes are worth noting because they relate to the proliferation of copies suggested here. MS Harl. 750 is one of five (at least: there may be others) manuscripts in the British Library that contains a copy of 'An Order agreed upon for translation of the Bible'. Like three of the others (Add. 42.54 is the exception), this is followed by 'The Rules to be observed in Translation'. These are central records of the KJB; it was in the course of checking them that I noticed, in the same hand, the uncatalogued copy of Bois's notes beginning on the next folio." (Norton, 329)

- Using the extant clues, Dr. Norton believes that the copy of Bois' notes in MS Harl. 750 were made from Bois' own copy between 1626 and 1636.
 - "What these several manuscripts show is a seventeenth-century interest in preserving and copying material relating to the KJB. MS Harl. 750 and Fulman's manuscript extend this interest to the one other major document, Bois's notes. And MS Harl. 750 goes further. On the same leaf as the last of Bois's notes there begins, in Wedderburn's hand, a copy of Bois's *Veteris Interprets cum Beza aliisque recentioribus Collatio in Quatuor Evangeliis, & Apostolorum Actis*. Since this was not published until 1655, Wedderburn must have copied from a manuscript. That manuscript was probably Bois's own, for the two men certainly knew each other. Wedderburn was made Canon of Ely some time before Christmas 1626, by which time Bois had been Prebend of Ely for more than a decade. That Wedderburn should have kept someone else's copy of the list of translators and their instructions, and of Bois's notes, and that he should have added to them his own copy of Bois's further work, indicates an interest in both the KJB and his senior at Ely.

The Ely connection (and the fact that Fulman contains nothing of substance that is not also found in MS Harl. 750) makes it probable that the copy of Bois's notes in MS Harl. 750 was made from Bois's own copy and came into Wedderburn's hands at Ely. From the man himself he added the *Callatio*. It also allows one to guess that this addition was made between 1626 and, at the latest, 1636, when Wedderburn became Bishop of Dunblane. The notes themselves must, of course, have been copied earlier." (Norton, 330)

- Despite believing that the notes found in MS Harl. 750 were a "first-hand copy of Bois's original," Dr. Norton addresses why the Fulman copy reproduced by Allen will continue to be "the primary source for Bois's notes."
 - o "The probability (which I assume as a fact) that MS Harl. 750 is a firsthand copy of Bois's original would seem to give it more authority than Fulman's copy of a faulty copy. Comparisons, however, tend to favor Fulman: his Latin and, particularly, his Greek is better than that of the MS Harl. 750 copyist. Overall, there are few variants where MS Harl. 750 is more likely to be right than Fulman. Consequently, the primary effect of MS Harl. 750 is to confirm the value of Fulman's work: without further discoveries, his copy will remain the primary source for Bois's notes." (Norton, 330-331)
- Norton's essay contains six pages of discussion noting the primary variants between MS Harl.
 750 and the Fulman/Allen manuscript. For our purposes in this Lesson, a couple of summary observations will suffice.
 - o "The extent of the two manuscripts is identical, but MS Harl. 750 supplies a small amount of material not found in Fulman. There are innumerable minor variants, usually of spelling, punctuation and Greek accentuation, and there is one significant difference of format: MS Harl. 750 gives the references to the verses under discussion in the margin

whereas Fulman gives them at the beginning of the note (see Figs 1-2). There are several reasons for thinking that MS Harl. 750 reflects Bois's original format. Occasionally it misplaces the references and a line is drawn from note to reference. Since the references are in the same hand and so not somebody else's later addition, it seems likely that Bois too gave the references in this way. Either his lineation was not always clear or the MS Harl. 750 copyist sometimes added the references separately. Fulman probably checked and revised the references since there are a number of instances where he supplies references omitted in MS Harl. 750 (very occasionally MS Harl. 750 gives a reference omitted in Fulman). Also, Fulman's marginal letters indicating where the additional notes at the end of the manuscript fit in with the rest of the notes are not present in MS Harl. 750; presumably these are Fulman's addition. The clearest evidence that MS Harl. 750 represents Bois's own arrangement is at 1 Tim. 1:6 and 18. Fulman has placed the division between the two notes in the wrong place and consequently failed to understand the significance of what he takes to be the end of the first note. The presentation in MS Harl. 750 (see the table of variants for these verses) sufficiently explains Fulman's mistake." (Norton, 331)

- Prior to presenting a "Table Of Principal Variants" between HS Harl. 750 and Fulman, Dr. Norton concludes his essay with the following words:
 - "As well as helping to prove that Fulman did not work from either MS Harl. 750 or Bois's original, these examples show the kind of insight that can be gained from putting the two manuscripts together. Moreover, they are a reminder of the importance of Bois's notes as a whole for appreciation of the scholarship of the translators and the care with which they weighed the words of the original and of its most important translation in the English language." (Norton, 338)
- The following is a summary of the Notes of John Bois like the ones provided above.
 - O Notes of John Bois—had been lost to history. Scrivener noted in his 1884 book *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)* that Bois and he alone had taken notes at the General Meeting at Stationers Hall during the years of 1610-1611. Gustavus Paine also included a photograph and some remarks on John Bois and his notes in his 1959 work, *The Learned Men*.
 - Scholarly Awareness—Ward S. Allen in the mid-1960s working with the librarian of Corpus Christi College, Oxford was able to locate and confirm a copy of Bois' lost notes. Allen published a preliminary description of the document in the Winter, 1966 edition of the *Renaissance News*.
 - Published Access—in 1969 Allen granted public access to the document via the publication of *Translating for King James: Notes Made by a Translator of the King James's Bible*. Allen's book contained images of the document along with an English translation of its entirety. In 1996 Professor David Norton announced

the discovery of a second copy MS Harl. 750 in the British Library in his piece for *The Library* titled "John Bois's Notes on the Revision of the King James Bible New Testament: A New Manuscript."

• We will consider what else can be gleaned from Allen's work on the notes of John Bois in a future lesson. For now, suffice it to say that yet another primary work-in-progress document was not known or studied by early articulators of what has become known as King James Onlyism in the United States.

Works Cited

Allen, Ward S. Translating The New Testament Epistles 1604-1611: A Manuscript from King James's Westminster Company. Vanderbilt University Press, 1977.

Norton, David. "John Bois's Notes on the Revision of the King James Bible New Testament: A New Manuscript" in *The Library*. 6th ser., 18 1996.

Fulman Transcript

The following is an image of the Fulman Transcript utilized by Ward S. Allen in his 1969 book *Translating for King James: Notes Made by a Translator of the King James's Bible*.

Cap. 13. 1. Telagretray] 202 ev Scholia. Beza, ordinata.

i. e. per gradus disposita et distributa. Versionem proto.

Explicationem et glossema non proto. 1. D. the abuiliments of light.

Cap. 14. 5. J. S. Muniquisqua certam sibi seientiam paret ex Weba Dei. ut since dubitatione intelligat qua sit voluntas Dei.

Joi. ut since dubitatione intelligat qua sit voluntas Dei.

Joid. u. 17. 15 not sating and drinking. 1. D.

Cap. 15. 31. That my service to the Saints may be acceptable the.

TW Sew, wel wage to Sey A. D. et Gr. Scholia. negat proprie et mosorballe valiquid dici debene, nisi quest.

Deo acceptam sit. Gr. Scholia insuper addunt, nisi sia austilia pela regulupias si enzaperias d'ésovias to ravio cust.

Cap. 1. 2. our lord, both theirs, and ours.

1. Covinth.

Cap. 2. 2. 4. in revosi j. e. revolunos, personsite. of the Spirit and power, vide 1. Thest is.

Joint v. 13. As accipiendo, our experionoles pro our experional.

also que to revoluntas est neutrini generis.

Cap. 4.

Cap. t. 6. ύτερ ο΄ γερευτίας] i. e. Supra, initio kujus Capitis, et fine præcedentis. remittit Corinthios non ad id quod ab aliis, fed quod a femetipfo Saulo Scriptum fuit. γερευτίας ful. ύτ μως, ίνα μη ετε. that for feme one ye be not pulfed up, i. e. new nis ύτερ σ'ενασχάλου, ότ Who maketh than to excell above "For υπο others r Logaritur ad eos qui Doctorum officio fungelantur, et doctrina excellebant.

Ifid. υ. g. εχάλως απενευξεν ως επεναναδίως] fol. Scalig. in Sphær. Barbar. Manilii, p. 417. quos græci εφίδρως, Latini in lude Gladiatorio fequutores vocant. Veteres Gloffe εφεδρον etiam Terriarium vertunt, quod nimirum altero interfecto tertius sufficeretur, sequitur ergo et suppositivus idem out hpost. 1. Cor. 4.9. Δοχώ soj ότι etc. et non dicit

MS Harl. 750

The following is an image of the second known copy of the Notes of John Bois discovered in 1996 by Dr. David Norton. The document is in the possession of the British Library and discussed in Dr. Norton's essay "John Bois's Notes on the Revision of the King James Bible New Testament: A New Manuscript".

