

Sunday, May 15, 2022— Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*  
 Lesson 178 Pre-1611 Evidence for the Text: Final Thoughts on the Impact of Bod 1602 on the King James Bible

### **Introduction**

- Since Lesson 171 we have been looking at the connection between the document known as Bod 1602 and the Authorized Version of 1611. All told, we considered the following on this topic:
  - The Work-In-Progress Documents: Analyzing The Pre-1611 Evidence for The Text (Lesson [162](#) covered Scholarly Awareness of Bod 1602)
  - The Pre-1611 Evidence for The Text: Bod 1602 Physical Description & Contents (Lesson [171](#))
  - The Pre-1611 Evidence for The Text: Bod 1602 Impact on King James Old Testament Readings (Lessons [172](#), [173](#), & [174](#))
  - The Pre-1611 Evidence for The Text: Bod 1602 Impact on King James New Testament Readings (Lessons [175](#), [176](#), & [177](#))
- Having spent eight Lessons investigating various aspects of the connection between Bod 1602 and the King James Bible, I think we can appreciate the veracity of Dr. David Norton's statement in *A Textual History of the King James Bible*:
  - "There is one complete 1602 Bishops' Bible with annotations by the translators, Bodleian Library Bibl. Eng. 1602 b. 1. It is the most important evidence for the KJB text outside the first printings because it is the nearest we can get to the translators' master copy." (Norton, 20)
- This, of course, means that we have established beyond reasonable historical doubt that the King James translators followed Rule 1 and used the Bishops Bible as their base text. Literally writing their translational choices onto the pages of a 1602 Bishops Bible.

### **Further Thoughts on Bod 1602 from Dr. Norton**

- Dr. David Norton believes that the Bod 1602 stands out as the greatest evidence we have for the text created by the King James translators. Please consider the following statements to this end:
  - "... This makes it highly probable that the relationship of Bod 1602 to 1611 is paternal or grand-paternal rather than avuncular, for the reading descends directly from a scribal peculiarity of Bod 1602.

Examples of this sort show that the annotations in Bod 1602 are highly important as evidence for the text of the KJB and have a status that all the other evidence lacks. . . ."  
 (Norton, 37)

- “The unique importance of Bod 1602 as evidence for the text is clear. It sounds a warning against over-presumption of error in the first printed text because it sometimes shows that what would otherwise look like an error is the deliberate work of the translators. None of the other evidence does this.” (Norton, 39)
- Dr. Norton provides II Chronicles 32:5 as an example of this phenomenon.

| 1602 Bishops   | 1611 King James   | 1769 King James   |
|--|---|---|
| And Hezekia went to lustily, and built up the wall where it was broken, and made the towers, and another wall without, and repaired Millo in the city of David, and made many darts and shields. | Also he strengthened himself, and built up <u>all</u> the wall <u>that was</u> broken, <u>and raised it up to the towers</u> , and another wall without, and <b>prepared</b> Millo in the city of David, and made darts and shields <u>in abundance</u> . | Also he strengthened himself, and built up all the wall that was broken, and raised it up to the towers, and another wall without, and <u>repaired</u> Millo in the city of David, and made darts and shields in abundance. |

- Regarding this example, Dr. Norton states the following:
  - “Only the last two phrases appear untouched, yet the translators did revise ‘repaired Millo’: they inserted p at the beginning and deleted the i, creating ‘prepared Millo’. In 1616 ‘repaired’ found its way back into the text, and has remained there ever since. The crucial point is this: a later edition gives a reading that the translators had explicitly rejected, and this rejected reading has become our received reading. The evidence of Bod 1602 makes it impossible to take ‘prepared’ as an accident, so an editor must now choose whether to follow the translators or tradition – knowing that the traditional or received reading comes from the understanding of someone in Barker’s printing house.

Again an explanation can be hazarded as to the reasons for the change and for its reversal. [Hebrew characters] is now usually translated, ‘and strengthened Millo’ (Revised Version, etc.). The difference in sense from ‘repaired’ is that ‘strengthened’ does not imply previous damage. ‘Prepared’ similarly omits the suggestion of damage, and this sense of the meaning presumably prompted the translators. They avoided repeating ‘strengthened’ from earlier in the verse, either because this was a way of marking that there the Hebrew uses a different form of the same verb, or simply for variation – in the words of their preface, not tying themselves to an identity of words, but using another word no less fit as commodiously. One might well argue that ‘prepared’ is indeed ‘less fit’, that it is a vague, unsatisfactory word to have used here, and then be puzzled as to why it is used at all since nowhere else is מִלּוֹ translated as ‘prepare’. Certainly, somebody involved with the printing of the 1616 edition failed to discern the translators’ motive and meaning, and so restored the Bishops’ Bible’s word.” (Norton, 40-41)

- Norton provides a second example in II Chronicles 6:27.
  - “One more typical example: 2 Chr. 6:27 now reads ‘and send rain upon thy land, which thou hast given unto thy people for an inheritance’. This is also how it read in the 1602 Bishops’ Bible, with ‘upon thy land’ translating [Hebrew] literally. The KJB originally read, ‘upon the land’, and Bod 1602 shows the translators rejecting what has become the

received reading. They struck through ‘thy’ and substituted ‘the’. Then, trying the text by the Hebrew (one presumes), the editors of the Cambridge edition of 1638 observed that ‘the land’ was not literally accurate, and so ‘corrected’ it to ‘thy land’. The translators’ original reasons for the non-literal translation had ceased to be apparent to their successors. We may guess at the original reasons – the translators may have considered ‘thy’ redundant in context and justified the decision from the Vulgate, which also omits the possessive (‘*da pluviamvterrae, quam dedisti populo tuo ad possidendum*’) – but the crucial point is that Bod 1602 shows that the translators deliberately rejected the reading the later editors recreated.” (Norton, 41)

- Norton goes on to note twenty-four more similar instances on two tables on pages 41-42 along with the following explanation.
  - “There are at least twenty-four instances of this sort where later editions have restored a Bishops’ Bible reading that the translators rejected, and a further eleven that involve the spelling of names. ‘Prepared Millo’ is the only one where the translators’ understanding of the text is lost. All the others are either neutral as far as the reading of the original is concerned or involve some degree of apparent deviation from literal translation. I list them here arranged by date of restoration; in each case the 1602 and modern KJB readings represent the original literally:

| Ref.         | 1602 and modern KJBs             | 1611                           | Date restored |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| 2 Chr. 32:5  | repaired Millo                   | prepared Millo                 | 1616          |
| Amos 1:1     | two years                        | two yere                       | 1616          |
| Mal. 4:2     | and ye shall go forth            | and shall goe foorth           | 1617          |
| Deut. 20:7   | lest he die in the battle        | lest he die in battell         | 1629          |
| Deut. 26:1   | the LORD thy God                 | the LORD                       | 1629          |
| 1 Sam. 28:7  | And his servants said            | And his seruant said           | 1629          |
| 1 Chr. 3:19  | and the sons of<br>Zerubbabel    | And the sonne of<br>Zerubbabel | 1629          |
| 1 Chr. 11:15 | to the rock to David             | to the rocke of Daudid         | 1629          |
| Esther 1:8   | for so the king had<br>appointed | for the king had<br>appointed  | 1629          |
| Ps. 113:9    | <i>and to be</i> a joyful mother | to be a ioyfull mother         | 1629          |

| Ref.        | 1602 and modern KJBs                  | 1611                        | Date restored |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Song 4:6    | to the mountain of myrrh              | to the mountaines of myrrhe | 1629          |
| Dan. 3:18   | the golden image                      | thy golden image            | 1629          |
| Joel 3:13   | their wickedness                      | the wickednesse             | 1629          |
| Num. 6:14   | and one ram                           | and one lambe               | 1638          |
| Josh. 3:15  | all the time                          | at the time                 | 1638          |
| 2 Kgs 20:13 | shewed them all the house             | shewed them the house       | 1638          |
| 1 Chr. 7:5  | valiant men of might<br>[1602: warre] | men of might                | 1638          |
| 2 Chr. 6:27 | thy land                              | the land                    | 1638          |
| Ps. 105:30  | Their land                            | The land                    | 1638          |
| Eccles. 1:5 | his place                             | the place                   | 1638          |
| Ezek. 3:11  | the children of thy people            | thy people                  | 1638          |
| Amos 8:3    | the songs of the temple               | the songs of the<br>Temples | 1638          |
| 1 Chr. 7:35 | And the sons                          | And the sonne               | 1701          |
| Ezek. 1:17  | turned                                | returned                    | 1769          |

(Norton, 41-42)

- Regarding discrepancies in the spelling of names Norton states the following:
  - “These are the eleven names, given in their 1611 spelling, which were restored to their 1602 spelling by later editions: Caldees (Gen. 15:7 etc.), Maarah (Josh. 15:59), Shahazimath (Josh. 19:22), Baalah (Josh. 19:44), Zoar (1 Chr. 4:7), Gidor (1 Chr. 8:31), Elpalet (1 Chr. 14:7), Nephushim (Ezra 2:50), Michmash (Neh. 7:31), Hodiah (Neh. 10:18), Siloe (Luke 13:4; here the translators made and then rejected a later change).” (Norton, 42)
- While some of Norton’s explanations are speculative as to why a certain choice was made by the translators, the evidence furnished by Bod 1602 reveals some level of intentionality on the part of the translators.
  - “Explanations of the sort just given are of course speculative; to some extent, they are also beside the point, for we do not have to understand the translators’ motive and meaning when faced with clear evidence of their deliberate decisions. At the other end of the scale from ‘prepared Millo’ is ‘the Lord’ at Deut. 26:1. The Hebrew is \*אֱלֹהִים ‘the Lord thy God’, as the Bishops’ Bible and modern KJBs have it. Without the evidence of Bod 1602, 1611’s omission of ‘thy God’ would appear to be a simple omission by the

printer. But the translators struck through ‘thy God’. If this ‘blunder’ was a deliberate action, its rationale is unrecoverable. Nevertheless, we cannot presume that there was no rationale, and therefore should not presume to correct the translators.

Four of the twenty-four restorations of rejected readings are matters of English that appear not to involve how the original is understood. The translators deleted ‘and’ from ‘he maketh the barren woman to keepe house, and to be a ioyful mother of children’ (Ps. 113:9); it was restored in 1629. They changed ‘turned’ to ‘returned’ in ‘they turned not when they went’ (Ezek. 1:17; restored 1769), ‘two years’ to ‘two year’ (Amos 1:1; restored 1616), and they deleted ‘ye’ from ‘and ye shall goe foorth’ (Mal. 4:2; restored 1617). The rest all involve some degree of perceived inaccuracy in that each departs from a literal reading of the text. I guess that the translators’ motives must have been stylistic since the Hebrew involved is not difficult and they already had the ‘right’ answer in front of them.

Two more things are worth noting here. First, save for ‘Siloe’ at Luke 13:4, the examples all come from the OT and, being spread through it, seem to have no special connection with the work of a particular company of translators. Second, all but two were restored to their original readings by 1638, that is, within a time-frame in which the Bishops’ Bible readings could have influenced the decisions. This is not enough to show that the various editors, scholars and printers involved in the work through to 1638 tested the KJB by the Bishops’ Bible and consequently restored a few of the latter’s readings, but some such testing is not impossible. Of all the changes, perhaps only ‘repaired’ for ‘prepared’ argues with any strength for the influence of the Bishops’ Bible: all the others are logical responses to the original.” (Norton, 42-43)

- Norton warns against making Bod 1602 the final arbiter of the text and provides some counter examples for our consideration.
  - “One or two of these examples may show slips of the scribal pen influencing the text of the KJB, but overall they testify to the importance of the annotations in Bod 1602 as evidence for the text, and they enforce a greater respect for the detail of the first printed text than editors have hitherto granted it. But we should be wary of going too far, either making Bod 1602 into the final arbiter on the text wherever it affords evidence, or ascribing infallibility to the first edition. Half a dozen counter-examples stand against those just examined. In these Bod 1602 shows the translators creating readings eventually brought in by a later editor but not found in the 1611 text. At Lev. 11:3, the translators changed ‘chaweth cud’ to ‘cheweth the cud’, but the first edition has ‘cheweth cud’; ‘cheweth the cud’ first appeared in 1629. What one will never know here is whether the printer overlooked ‘the’ or whether there was a decision subsequent to the annotation in Bod 1602 to omit the article because it is also missing from the Hebrew (in contrast to the next verse, where the Hebrew has the article, it is again inserted by the Bod 1602 scribe, and it does appear in the first edition).

The same problem – was a decision revoked or accidentally ignored? – is present in all six examples. Since in each case both readings are possible, the question becomes this: does one trust the first edition against manuscript evidence and the decision of later

editors? The answer must be that one does because to do otherwise would be unacceptably problematic in that it would open up the possibility of revising the text solely on the basis of Bod 1602. One example enforces this conclusion, ‘a silver bowl’ (1602 and 1611) or ‘one silver bowl’ (Bod 1602 annotation and 1638; Num. 7:61). Here we could reinforce the evidence of the Bod 1602 annotation by observing that twice elsewhere in this chapter Bod 1602’s ‘a’ for dk0 is deleted and ‘one’ substituted, and that this change remains in the printed text (vv. 31, 55). It is, then, very possible that 1611’s ‘a’ is a copying or printing error. But the real difficulty comes in v. 43, where the identical change is recorded in Bod 1602 but 1611 has ‘a’, and this has never been altered. The 1638 edition appears to have been remiss in not changing this also. There are two points here. First, it is unlikely that the same error of transmission should be made twice, in which case the 1611 reading appears to be deliberate. Second, if v. 43 were to be changed, as consistency would seem to demand, a new area of revision would be opened up, namely the possibility of revision at every point where the evidence in Bod 1602 gives a different reading from the first edition. Changes might therefore be made not only where later editors had collectively agreed that the 1611 reading was satisfactory, but where the translators themselves had made decisions subsequent to those recorded in Bod 1602. In short, the principle I go on is this: variant readings in the printing history alone are allowed to raise questions about the text. Bod 1602 may provide the most important evidence for deciding a reading but I do not allow it to raise questions as to readings.” (Norton, 43-44)

### **Vance on the Making of the King James New Testament**

- Dr. Lawrence M. Vance also addressed the topic of Bod 1602’s impact on the King James Bible in his 2015 publication *The Making of the King James Bible New Testament*. Regarding the indisputable connection between the 1602 Bishops Bible and the AV of 1611, Dr. Vance states the following:

- “There are two ways we know that the 1602 Bishops’ Bible was the basis of the Authorized Version.

First, there is the internal evidence, the sheer number of verses in the Authorized Version that match verbatim the text of the 1602 Bishops’ Bible. This will be seen in the collation of the New Testament of the 1602 Bishops’ Bible and the 1611 Authorized Version in the next section of this book.

And second, the external evidence: a 1602 Bishops’ Bible used by the King James translators currently cataloged in the Bodleian Library as “Bibl. Eng. 1602 b.1.” The Bodleian Bishops’ Bible, as it is called, is a 1602 Bishops’ Bible with annotations of the King James translators that indicate change to be made to the Bishops’ Bible. It is “the only known survivor” of “40 large church bibles” that were supplied by Robert Barker to the King James translators. Together with a manuscript (MS 98) the Lambeth Palace Library that records the translators’ work on the New Testament Epistles, it shows the translators at work as they transformed the Bishops’ Bible of 1602 into the Authorized Version of 1611. These two things are more fully discussed in the analysis section of this book.” (Vance, 51-52)



- Having investigated both the Old and New Testament portions of Bod 1602 as well as MS 98, prudence dictates that we consider some summative takeaways. To accomplish this task, we will be looking at the “Analysis” section of Dr. Vance’s 2015 work. Prior to the “Analysis” at the back of the book Dr. Vance provides a complete collation of a 1602 Bishops Bible with a 1611 AV for the entirety of the New Testament.
  - “The collation of the New Testament of the Authorized Version of 1611 with the Bishops’ Bible of 1602 yields the following results. Of the 7,957 verses in the New Testament, the Authorized Version reads exactly with the Bishops’ Bible in 2,102 of them (26.4%). Thus, it read different in 5,855 of them (73.6%). Of these verses that differ, 2,225 of them (38%) have only one simple change, 1,602 of them (27.4%) have two simple changes, 919 of them (15.7) have three simple changes, 423 of them (7.2%) have four simple changes, 191 of them (3.3%) have five simple changes, 85 of them (1.5%) have six simple changes, 65 of them (1.1%) have seven or more simple changes, and 336 of them (5.7%) have complex changes. Total changes come to 12,812. In those verses with changes, the average number of changes per verse is 2.19.” (Vance, 247)
- On page 249 of his book, Vance presents the following data table cataloging the results of his collation.

| Book        | <i>Total<br/>For</i><br>Verses | <i>#<br/>Unchanged</i><br>Un Δ | <i>%<br/>Unchanged</i><br>Δ% | 1Δ    | 2Δ    | 3Δ  | 4Δ  | 5Δ  | 6Δ | 7+Δ | <i>Complex<br/>Changes</i><br>Com. Δ | TotalΔ | <i>Average<br/>Changes<br/>Per Verse</i><br>Δ/Verse | BB/AV |
|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|--------------------------------------|--------|---|-------|
| Matthew     | 1,071                          | 402                            | 38%                          | 302   | 187   | 112 | 35  | 9   | 2  | 3   | 19                                   | 1,272  | 1.90  | 94%   |
| Mark        | 678                            | 156                            | 23%                          | 207   | 163   | 76  | 33  | 16  | 6  | 3   | 17                                   | 1,067  | 2.04  | 92%   |
| Luke        | 1,151                          | 311                            | 27%                          | 323   | 259   | 136 | 60  | 21  | 13 | 2   | 26                                   | 1,761  | 2.10  | 92%   |
| John        | 879                            | 325                            | 37%                          | 289   | 148   | 63  | 13  | 9   | 0  | 4   | 28                                   | 980    | 1.77  | 94%   |
| Acts        | 1,007                          | 287                            | 29%                          | 295   | 202   | 99  | 43  | 16  | 14 | 2   | 49                                   | 1,462  | 2.03  | 92%   |
| Romans      | 433                            | 74                             | 17%                          | 101   | 86    | 69  | 37  | 23  | 15 | 14  | 14                                   | 975    | 2.72  | 88%   |
| 1 Corin     | 437                            | 109                            | 25%                          | 140   | 85    | 52  | 27  | 11  | 3  | 1   | 9                                    | 679    | 2.07  | 92%   |
| 2 Corin     | 257                            | 33                             | 13%                          | 45    | 52    | 28  | 28  | 22  | 8  | 10  | 31                                   | 682    | 3.04  | 82%   |
| Galatians   | 149                            | 38                             | 26%                          | 43    | 28    | 15  | 11  | 3   | 2  | 3   | 6                                    | 253    | 2.28  | 89%   |
| Ephesians   | 155                            | 38                             | 25%                          | 36    | 30    | 24  | 13  | 5   | 1  | 1   | 7                                    | 287    | 2.45  | 88%   |
| Philippians | 104                            | 21                             | 20%                          | 28    | 21    | 13  | 4   | 8   | 0  | 2   | 7                                    | 197    | 2.37  | 87%   |
| Colossians  | 95                             | 29                             | 31%                          | 28    | 15    | 12  | 5   | 2   | 0  | 0   | 4                                    | 136    | 2.06  | 91%   |
| 1 Thess.    | 89                             | 20                             | 22%                          | 28    | 17    | 12  | 5   | 5   | 0  | 0   | 7                                    | 141    | 2.04  | 87%   |
| 2 Thess.    | 47                             | 7                              | 15%                          | 12    | 12    | 5   | 3   | 1   | 1  | 1   | 5                                    | 95     | 2.38  | 87%   |
| 1 Timothy   | 113                            | 16                             | 14%                          | 32    | 17    | 22  | 8   | 4   | 0  | 4   | 10                                   | 262    | 2.70  | 84%   |
| 2 Timothy   | 83                             | 23                             | 28%                          | 17    | 20    | 7   | 9   | 3   | 0  | 0   | 4                                    | 139    | 2.31  | 90%   |
| Titus       | 46                             | 7                              | 15%                          | 12    | 9     | 7   | 2   | 1   | 0  | 0   | 8                                    | 81     | 2.08  | 85%   |
| Philemon    | 25                             | 12                             | 48%                          | 7     | 2     | 1   | 1   | 0   | 1  | 0   | 1                                    | 27     | 2.08  | 93%   |
| Hebrews     | 303                            | 38                             | 13%                          | 71    | 68    | 51  | 27  | 13  | 2  | 3   | 22                                   | 650    | 2.45  | 86%   |
| James       | 108                            | 24                             | 22%                          | 34    | 20    | 17  | 3   | 2   | 1  | 1   | 6                                    | 177    | 2.11  | 89%   |
| 1 Peter     | 105                            | 10                             | 10%                          | 19    | 18    | 15  | 13  | 4   | 5  | 5   | 16                                   | 310    | 3.26  | 79%   |
| 2 Peter     | 61                             | 4                              | 1%                           | 8     | 14    | 9   | 6   | 3   | 1  | 3   | 13                                   | 173    | 3.04  | 80%   |
| 1 John      | 105                            | 19                             | 18%                          | 34    | 21    | 15  | 4   | 1   | 1  | 2   | 8                                    | 175    | 2.03  | 90%   |
| 2 John      | 13                             | 2                              | 15%                          | 4     | 4     | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 21     | 1.91  | 92%   |
| 3 John      | 14                             | 5                              | 38%                          | 4     | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1  | 0   | 0                                    | 24     | 2.67  | 92%   |
| Jude        | 25                             | 0                              | 0%                           | 4     | 6     | 3   | 3   | 2   | 1  | 0   | 6                                    | 76     | 3.04  | 75%   |
| Revelation  | 404                            | 92                             | 23%                          | 102   | 97    | 52  | 29  | 11  | 7  | 1   | 13                                   | 710    | 2.28  | 93%   |
| Total/avg.  | 7,957                          | 2,102                          | 26%                          | 2,225 | 1,602 | 919 | 423 | 191 | 85 | 65  | 336                                  | 12,812 | 2.19  | 91%   |

- The following explanation accompanies the table.
  - “To get an approximate percent of the text in each book of the Authorized Version New Testament that basically reads as the Bishops’ Bible, we can take the number of words in each book of the Authorized Version and subtract the number of changes from the Bishops’ Bible (since most change involved just one word) along with the number of words affected by complex changes.

The results by book are summarized in the chart which follows [Above in these notes.]. The chart indicates, for each book of the New Testament, the total number of verses, the number of verses that are unchanged, the percentage of verses that are unchanged, the number of verses with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 or more simple changes, the number of verses with complex changes, the total number of changes, the average number of changes per verse in those verses that exhibit changes, and the approximate percentage of the text of the Authorized Version that basically reads as the Bishops’ Bible.

... The approximate percentage of the text of the Authorized Version New Testament that basically reads as the Bishops’ Bible is 91 percent.

There are two things that directly record the King James translators at work as they transformed the Bishops’ Bible of 1602 into the Authorized Version of 1611: a Lambeth Palace Library manuscript [MS 98] and a Bishops’ Bible in the Bodleian Library [Bod 1602].” (Vance, 248-250)

### **Works Cited**

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

Vance, Lawrence. *The Making of the King James New Testament*. Orlando, FL: Vance Publications, 2015.