

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

[Are we not, then, to regard the whole significance of the active obedience, the sufferings, the death, the ascension of the Saviour as virtually embodied in this final act of his mediatorial work, his appearing in the celestial sanctuary, there to present supplications in our name and in our behalf? Were not all the transactions of his life virtually a prayer? Many things which he did were only indirectly a prayer, it is true. Their designed influence, however, was either to qualify himself to offer effectual prayer, or to remove such obstructions as might lie in the way of the success of his prayer, or else to furnish arguments for a favorable answer to his prayer. They may be all viewed, therefore, with the strictest propriety, as one act of supplication. And what is true of the antitype, in this respect, is true of the types. The various sacrifices, comprehended in the Jewish ritual, whose nature and rites we have endeavored in the foregoing remarks to unfold, were prayers. This is in conformity with the theory, several times alluded to in these remarks, that prayers are spiritual sacrifices, and sacrifices are symbolical prayers. There is nothing connected with sacrifices which may not, on the whole, be most satisfactorily explained when it is viewed in this light.]

---

## ARTICLE II.

### EARLY EDITIONS OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE BIBLE.

BY REV. EDWARD W. GILMAN.

RECENT events in this country have directed public attention to the desirableness of securing a perfect standard text of the version of the Scriptures now in common use, and have led to many inquiries concerning the exact form in

which King James's translators committed their work to the public. The earliest editions, of course, are rare, and the opportunities of comparing them side by side, are exceedingly limited. Twenty-five or thirty years ago there was such a state of feeling in Great Britain in respect to alleged departures from the original version, that the delegates of the Clarendon press at Oxford published, in 1833, "an exact re-print, in Roman letter, of the Authorized Version published in the year 1611 in large black letter, folio;" a re-print "so exact as to agree with the original edition page for page and letter for letter; retaining, throughout, the ancient mode of spelling and punctuation, and even the most manifest errors of the press." This measure quieted the excitement then prevailing; and, while it showed that changes had crept into the text in the course of two and a quarter centuries, it gave satisfactory evidence that some of those changes were indispensable, and that no one would be satisfied to retain all the peculiarities of the earliest editions. There are, however, some points on which that republication shed no light, which will be treated in this Article.

After the translators appointed by King James had devoted to their work the labor of "twice seven times seventy-two days, and more," it was sent to London to be reviewed and perfected by a smaller committee of revision; and finally was published under the editorial care of Drs. Bilson and Smith, by whom the preface and the heads of chapters were prepared. The general principles by which the translators were to be guided in their work were laid down by the King, who prescribed the following rules among others.

1. The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.

2. The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, to be retained as near as may be, accordingly as they are vulgarly used.

3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word *church* not to be translated congregation.

4. When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent Fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith.

5. The division of the chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require.

6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot, without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text.

7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down, as shall serve for the fit references of one Scripture to another.

14. These translations to be used, when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible, viz. Tinda's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, Whitechurch's, Geneva.

The remaining rules have reference to some details of the work, and are not important for our present purpose. It will be noticed that, while provision is made here for marginal references, and for marginal explanations of terms transferred from the original tongues, nothing is said of chapter summaries, of italics to express supplementary words, or of marginal readings in cases of uncertainty as to the meaning; nor are any directions given in respect to possible variations in the Greek or Hebrew text; and while various English versions are referred to, no mention is made of the Vulgate and translations into other languages.

We have some further facts, of an early date, that come in here. Lewis, in his "History of English Translations,"<sup>1</sup> after giving these rules in full, says: "Dr. Smith was ordered to write a preface to it, the same which is now printed in the folio editions of this Bible, the first of which was, I think, at London, A. D. 1611, with the Title mentioned below in the margin. *Much the same account* of the manner of making and finishing the Translation was given, afterwards, by the English divines at *Dort*, in a paper which they delivered to the Synod, Nov. 20, 1618." On turning to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Second edition, 1739, page 323.

records of the Synod,<sup>1</sup> we find that four delegates from Great Britain were present, bearing a commission from the King. These were George Charlton, bishop of Landaff, Dr. Joseph Hall, dean of Worcester, Dr. John Davenant, professor and president of King's College, Cambridge, and Dr. Samuel Ward of Sidney College, Cambridge; the last of whom was one of the company employed in translating the Apocrypha.

Early in the session these delegates, having been called upon for advice in respect to a new translation of the Scriptures for the use of the Belgian churches, presented a written statement of the method pursued in England, and of the laws prescribed to the translators by royal authority. A copy of their statement is entered upon the Minutes. The fact of a variation between these rules and those already quoted is so important that we insert the entire paper in its original form.

“Modus quem Theologi Angli in versione Bibliorum sunt secuti.

“Theologi magnæ Britanniæ, quibus non est visum tantæ quæstioni subitam & inopinatam responsionem adhibere, officii sui esse judicarunt, præmatura deliberatione habita, quandoquidem facta esset honorifica accuratissimæ translationis Anglicanæ mentio, a Serenissimo Rege Iacobo magna, cum cura, magnisque sumptibus nuper editæ, notum facere huic celeberrimæ Synodo, quo consilio, quaque ratione sacrum hoc negotium a Serenissima ejus Majestate præstitum fuerit.

“Primo, in opere distribuendo hanc rationem observari voluit; totum corpus Bibliorum in sex partes fuit distributum; cuilibet parti transferendæ destinati sunt septem vel octo viri primarii, Linguarum peritissimi.

“Duæ partes assignatæ fuerunt Theologis quibusdam Londinensibus; quatuor vero partes reliquæ divisæ fuerunt æqualiter inter utriusque Academiæ Theologos.

---

<sup>1</sup> Acta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtii habitæ anno 1618. Lugduni Batavorum, 1620. See also, *The Annals of the English Bible*, by Christopher Anderson, Vol. II. p. 377, London, 1845; and Bishop Newcome's *Historical View of the English Biblical Translations*, Dublin, 1792, page 105.

“ Post peractum a singulis pensum, ex hisce omnibus duodecim selecti viri in unum locum convocati, integrum opus recognoverunt, ac recensuerunt.

“ Postremo, Reverendissimus Episcopus Wintoniensis, Bilsonus, una cum Doctore Smitho, nunc Episcopo Gloucestriensi, viro eximio, & ab initio in toto hoc opere versatissimo, omnibus mature pensitatis & examinatis, extremam manum huic versioni imposuerunt.

[Leges Interpretibus præscriptæ fuerunt hujusmodi:]

“ Primo, cautum est, ut simpliciter nova versio non adornaretur, sed vetus, & ab Ecclesia diu recepta ab omnibus nævis & vitiis purgaretur; idque hunc in finem, ne recederetur ab antiqua translatione, nisi originalis textus veritas, vel emphasis postularet.

“ Secundo, ut nullæ annotationes margini apponerentur: sed, tantum loca parallela notarentur.

“ Tertio, ut ubi vox Hebræa vel Græca geminum idoneum sensum admittit; alter in ipso contextu, alter in margine exprimeretur. Quod itidem factum, ubi varia lectio in exemplaribus probatis reperta est.

“ Quarto, Hebraismi & Græcismi difficiliores in margine repositi sunt.

“ Quinto, in translatione Tobit & Judithæ, quandoquidem magna discrepantia inter Græcum contextum & veterem vulgatam Latinam editionem reperiatur, Græcum potius contextum secuti sunt.

“ Sexto, ut quæ ad sensum supplendum ubivis necessario fuerunt contextui interferenda, alio, scilicet minusculo, characterè, distinguerentur.

“ Septimo, ut nova argumenta singulis libris, & novæ periochæ singulis capitibus præfigerentur.

“ [Denique, absolutissima Genealogia & descriptio Terræ sanctæ, huic operi conjungeretur.]”

In some respects this seems to be simply a statement of what was practically done; and yet it is quite possible that his majesty was consulted while the work was in progress, and was pleased to give his royal assent in such a way as

to make the rules binding. But the practice corresponds with these rules only in part. The supplementary words were expressed by a different type, corresponding to our Italics; genealogical tables and an account of the Holy Land were prefixed, and new summaries were prepared indicating the contents of chapters; but no arguments were prefixed to individual books, and very seldom indeed was there any recognition of various readings in Greek or Hebrew. In the New Testament only twelve passages were noted as having an uncertain reading, viz. Matt. 1: 11. 26: 26. Luke 10: 22. 17: 36. Acts 13: 18. Eph. 6: 9. James 2: 18. 1 Pet. 2: 21. 2 Pet. 2: 2, 11, 18. 2 John 8.

Much perplexity has been occasioned in consequence of discrepancies that have been detected in volumes purporting to be copies of the first edition of King James's Bible. It is now a settled fact, though one which men have been slow to admit, that *two* folio black-letter editions, instead of one, were published in the year 1611. Copies of the two editions are still extant, though it is still, and may always be, an open question, which of the two has priority.

The credit of discovering and proving this fact seems to belong to Mr. Thomas Curtis, a dissenting minister of England, who directed public attention to it in 1833, in a pamphlet addressed to the bishop of London, inveighing against the monopoly of printing the Scriptures, which is conferred upon four presses in Great Britain.<sup>1</sup> Before that time, there were reputed to be two editions in 1611; but the evidence was unsatisfactory, and the statement itself was founded upon a mistake. Beloe is one author who had mentioned this. He speaks of a collection of English Bibles, many of them of unexampled rarity and value, which *Dr. Combe* had collected and disposed of to the British Museum. Describing one, he says:<sup>2</sup> "This is the first edition

---

<sup>1</sup> The Existing Monopoly, an Inadequate Protection of the Authorized Version of Scripture: Four Letters to the Bishop of London, by Thomas Curtis. London, 1833.

<sup>2</sup> Anecdotes of Literature and Scarce Books, by Rev. Wm. Beloe. Vol. II. 1807, p. 318.

of King James's Bible;" and adds: "There is another edition of King James's Bible in the British Museum, of the same date. This, also, belonged to Dr. Combe. They are, word for word, the same throughout. One, however, is printed in a larger letter than the other, and makes a thicker volume; but it is impossible to determine which of these two was first printed."

The assertion that "they are, word for word, the same throughout," is to be taken with considerable allowance. On a cursory examination, they might seem to be alike; but there is no evidence that Beloé had critically compared them. Dr. Combe had been misled, as will appear from the quotations that follow from Mr. Curtis, Dr. Cotton, and the Museum Catalogue, and his error has greatly increased the perplexity of others.

Mr. Curtis, speaking of his own collection, enumerates "two very distinct folio black-letter editions of 1611; the first roman quarto (the only copy I can distinctly hear of), 1612; first separate New Testament, black, same year; first black quarto Bible, 1613; second roman quarto edition, 1615; first roman folio, 1616 (at least, I take it to be the first, in roman), and a black folio, page for page with the 1611 editions, of 1617." Also an octavo edition of 1615. He then says, page 54: "And now shall we find, my lord, that Dr. Blayney, or any of his learned friends knew the edition of 1611, to which they evidently refer as King James's Bible, to be the first or original edition? The phrase, '*the edition of 1611*,' was evidently written on the supposition of there being but one edition of that year. But I personally possess two. \* \* \* The copies of the Universities are all of one edition, I believe; but in the Archbishop's library at Lambeth, and lately in the possession of George Offor, Esq., of Tower Hill, was a *distinct* edition of 1611, answering to to my No. 1. Those of the Universities answer to my No. 2; and these editions are both in the 'large black letter.' Moreover, in the British Museum is a third, distinct edition of this date, in a smaller black letter, and having 'I EDIT.' lettered on the back, by the original direction, as it appears,

of Dr. Charles Combe, of whose library the country became the purchasers at a large sum. In Dr. Cotton's list this is described as an edition of 1611, in small black letter. True it is, with regard to this last edition, that it exactly corresponds, in various typographical errors and minute points, with a copy in Christ church, Oxford, and with another which I now have before me, belonging to the Rev. the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodists, *dated* 1613. It may be regarded, therefore, as doubtful at what period between 1611 and 1613 it was issued."

The *second* edition of Dr. Cotton's work,<sup>1</sup> published at a later date, shows that *his* opinion respecting this volume had changed in 1852. "Though there certainly are two different Bibles in that collection, bearing the date of 1611 on their title pages, there is little doubt that *one of those titles has been borrowed and affixed to a later edition.*" (Page 60, note.)

To this we are able to add, on private information from a recent inspection of the new manuscript catalogue of the Museum, that this error is there acknowledged. A note appended to the title, in the catalogue, says: "this is the edition of 1613, with the title page of that of 1611 prefixed."

This enables us to reject entirely one of the so-called editions of 1611. Some book-vender imposed on Dr. Combe by selling him a genuine title page with a volume of later date. And thus we dispose of Mr. Pettigrew's note, in his *Bibliotheca Sussexiana*.<sup>2</sup> "A second edition of this Bible appeared in the same year. It is distinguished from the first by the large size of its black-letter type. The Psalms commence on different signatures: in the first, on Kk 1; in the second, on Bbb 4." His first edition, in smaller type, seems to be that of 1613.

We now revert to the genuine folios of 1611. Mr. Curtis's claims were discredited for a long time. His pamphlet

---

<sup>1</sup> Editions of the Bible and Parts thereof, in English, from the year MDV. to MDCCCL., with an Appendix. Second edition. By the Rev. Henry Cotton, D. C. L., Archdeacon of Cashel, etc. Oxford, 1852.

<sup>2</sup> Catalogue of the Library of the Duke of Sussex, 1839, Vol. II. page 332.

on the monopoly called forth replies from Oxford and Cambridge,<sup>1</sup> and his allegations against the fidelity of the privileged presses were discussed in the *British Critic*, the *British Magazine*, the *Eclectic Review*, and other periodicals of the day. Dr. Cardwell stated, in rejoinder to Mr. Curtis, that thirteen copies of Mr. C.'s No. 2 had been examined at Oxford, and eight copies of his No. 1. Of the latter, four *had no titles* to the Old Testament, and the other four had titles dated 1613, though in each the New Testament bore the date of 1611; and that the *Lambeth* copy was made up from different editions. The conclusion drawn from this was, that Mr. Curtis was wrong in claiming that his No. 1. was published in 1611; or, as the *British Critic* expressed it:<sup>2</sup> "It appears, therefore, that there were not two editions of 1611; but one of 1611 and one of 1613; that the *Lambeth* edition is, for the present purpose, of no authority whatever; and that the delegates [in Dr. Blayney's time] had before them the Oxford original of 1611, the *only document to which any genuine authority* can be ascribed."

This opinion, seems to have been received, for a time, as conclusive. In the reprint issued from the Oxford press in 1833, it is quietly assumed that there was but one edition to be regarded, "copies of which may be seen in the British Museum, at Sion College, in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and in the University Library at Cambridge." It is admitted, however, that between these copies there are slight variations in two passages.

In 1841, the English Hexapla was published, but made no mention of more than one edition in 1611. It says (page 160): "The Authorized version is printed from a large black-letter copy of the year 1611. \* \* It will be found to differ in several minor respects, as to the punctuation and use of italics, from the modern copies in general use; and it.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Curtis's Misrepresentations Exposed. By Edward Cardwell, D. D., St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, 1833.

The Text of the English Bible Considered. By Thomas Turton, D. D., Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, and Dean of Peterborough. 1833.

<sup>2</sup> 1833, Vol. xiv. page 11.

may be necessary to state that great care has been taken to follow the original copy very exactly." It does not, however, fully agree with the reprint of 1833, in the words of the text.

In 1845, Mr. Lea Wilson's catalogue was published,<sup>1</sup> but it recognizes only one edition of 1611, and that one essentially different from the exemplar reprinted at Oxford. Describing what it calls the first edition by certain typographical peculiarities, it says: "The dedication and preface of this volume so closely resemble those of the edition of 1613; and the other preliminary leaves, as well as the text, are at first sight so very similar to the editions of 1617, 1634, and 1640, that attention to the minutiae here given is necessary for their identification; and this is particularly needed as regards this first edition, which being a most interesting and desirable volume, imperfect copies are continually made up with the prolegomena of the later editions. \* \* And with a similar fraudulent intent I have met with copies of all the four later books, to which the title of the 1611 had been put, to make apparently fine copies of the first edition." The same year, also, Anderson (*Annals*, vol. 2. Appendix, page xxii.) said emphatically: "there certainly was no second edition in 1611."

The Report of the Committee on Versions, submitted to the Managers of the American Bible Society in 1851, everywhere speaks of "the edition of 1611," as if there were but one; and the Committee seem to have had before them, in their collation, not the original, but the reprint of 1833.

Thus far the authorities on one side. On the other, it is sufficient to quote one or two only. Dr. Cotton says:<sup>2</sup> "Still I cannot but believe that two editions were actually issued in 1611; and to this conclusion I am led by the following facts. Dr. Daly, bishop of Cashel, possesses two Bibles, dated 1611; both of which agree with Mr. Lea Wilson's tests of the real edition of that year, as contradistin-

<sup>1</sup> Bibles, Testaments, Psalms, and other Books of the Holy Scriptures in English, in the Collection of Lea Wilson, Esq., F. S. A., etc. London, 1845.

<sup>2</sup> Page 60, note.

guished from those of 1613, 1617, etc. Apparently, these two copies agree perfectly with each other. But on close examination it will be found that the wood-cut initial letters are frequently different in the two; 2d, that in Genesis 10: 16, one copy reads, 'the *Emorite*;' and the other, 'the *Amorite*.' 3d, in the copy which has the misprint 'Emorite,' Exodus 14: 10 is thus printed:

1. And when Pharaoh drew nigh
2. the children of Israel lift up their eyes,
3. and behold the Egyptians marched af-
4. ter them, and they were sore afraid: and
5. the children of Israel lift up their eyes,
6. and behold the Egyptians marched
7. after them, and they were sore afraid:
8. and the children of Israel cried out un-
9. to the Lord.

"The verse occupies nine lines of text; and the catchword at the bottom of the page is the word "For," occurring in the middle of ver. 12. Whereas, in the other copy, the verse fills only six lines; and the *whole* of ver. 12 is included in the page.

"The bishop kindly pointed out to me these discrepancies. There was no appearance of a cancelled leaf; and I agree with his lordship's opinion, that the inaccurate copy is really the *first*, as undoubtedly it is the *rarer* edition. Trinity College, Dublin, has a similar copy, but not quite perfect."

To this we add some memoranda made recently in the British Museum.

"I. *First edition, 1611.*

"In the new manuscript catalogue of this library, the following note is appended to the title: 'Note. This is the first edition of this translation.' In this edition the Psalms begin on signature Bbb 4, which page contains Psalms I and II and three [two?] verses of Psalm III. The catchword of this page is — '3 But.'

"N. B. In Gen. 10: 16, this first edition reads *Amorite*.

"II. *Second edition, also in 1611.*

"It is printed in same sized type as the first edition. The

British Museum manuscript catalogue has the following note after the title: ‘*Note.* This is the second edition in the same year. It has many typographical variations from the preceding.’

“N. B. In Gen. 10: 16, the reading is *Emorite*. The Psalms, in this second edition, *begin on the same signature as in the first edition.*”

“III. *The Third edition, 1613.*”

“Manuscript note in the British Museum catalogue: ‘This is the edition of 1613, with the title page of that of 1611 prefixed.’ In this edition, the Psalms begin on signature Kk 1. The page contains Psalms I. II. and III., and the first four verses of Psalm IV. The catchword is — ‘5 Offer.’ This edition is in *smaller type* than the two preceding editions.”

These memoranda confirm the accuracy of Dr. Cotton’s conclusions respecting the first edition of the Bible. It should be noticed, however, that what Dr. C. calls the first, is here called the second; and this, rather than the other, was followed in the Oxford reprint.

There are a few copies of these early impressions in this country. Mr. James Lenox, of New York, has both the editions of 1611; and the Rev. Dr. S. H. Turner and the Astor Library, and also Mr. George Livermore of Cambridge, have copies of that first mentioned on the Museum catalogue. A partial collation has been attempted between some of these and the Oxford reprint, in order to ascertain the variations in the two editions. In comparing them, the reprint will be denoted by A; Mr. Livermore’s copy by B; and the Astor Library copy by C. The collation does not extend to the Apocrypha.

In the Old Testament, variations between A and B were found in every sheet except that with the signature Ss. In the New Testament, variations in A and B were found in signature A; also in Q and in all following it to the end. Matt. xix. John xx. and Rom. 14: 1—21, being taken as tests, agreed exactly, and no variations were noticed from B to P inclusive; the discrepancies begin with Rom. 14: 22, at

the top of Q. A B agree in printing the head-line of 2 Chron. xxix.—“ Chap. xxxix,” but this is in the signature Ss. B has *not* the error, found in A, of putting, in the head-line of Micah iv, the reading “ JOEL.”

One peculiarity, and probable inaccuracy, in the reprint A, deserves notice here: in B, the usual method of representing the name of the Supreme Being is by large capitals, **LoRD**. This usage prevails through the Old Testament. But A, while professing to retain all the peculiarities, and to represent them in roman type, gives LORD *throughout Genesis*, and then quietly falls back to LORD.

On the other hand, C was found to *differ* from A in Ss of the Old Testament and in all the sheets of the New Testament where B agrees with it. C is supposed, however, to agree with A in the sheets Y, Z, and Aa of the New Testament, but differs on the last leaf, which may have been borrowed from some other copy.

This fact implies that the sheets of the two editions of 1611 were, to some extent, interchanged; either in the original binding or subsequently. Many of the variations, however, are very trifling, and the catchwords of the pages almost always correspond exactly.

We present, here, some specimens of the variations, retaining all the typographical peculiarities, even to the division of lines, and presenting every case of variation in the passages cited, as well as in the accessories. In the passage from Revelation, however, the collation is confined to the text.

#### GENESIS, CHAP. I.

- |     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| A   | 1 | The creation of Heauen and Earth, 3 of the light, 6 of the firmament, 9 of the earth separated from the waters, 11 and made fruitfull, 14 of the Sunne, Moone, and Starres, 20 of fish and fowle, 24 of beasts and cattell, 26 of Man in the Image of God. 29 Also the appointment of food. |
| B C | 1 | The creation of Heauen and Earth, 5 of the light, 6 of the firmament, 9 of the earth separated from the waters, 11 and made   |

fruitfull, 14 of the Sunne, Moone, and  
Starres, 20 of fish and fowle, 24 of beasts  
and cattell, 26 of Man in the Image of God.  
29 Also the appointment of food.

verse 3 *Margin* A \* 2. Cor. | B \* 2. Cor. 4.  
4. 6 | C 6.

verse 5. A the euening and the morning were the  
B C the Euening and the Morning were the

The same differences are found, in the same connection,  
in verses 8, 13, 19, 23, 31.

verse 5 *Margin* A † *Hebr. and* | B † *Hebr. and*  
*the euening* | C *the Euening*  
*was, and the* | *was, and the*  
*morning was,* | *Morning*  
*&c.* | *was, &c.*

verse 6 *Margin* A \* Psal. 136 | B \* Psal. 136.  
5. ier.10.12 | C 5. iere. 10.  
and 51. 15. | 12. and 51.  
15.

verse 8 *Margin* A \* Ier. 51. 15. | B \* Iere. 51.  
C 15.

verse 10 A the drie land,  
B C the dry land,

verse 11 *Margin* A † *Heb. tender* | B † *Hebr. ten-*  
*grasse.* | C *der grasse.*

verse 13 A And the euening and the morning  
were the third day.

B C And the Euening and the Mor-  
ning were the third day.

The same variation in the *lines* is found where some of  
these words are repeated, in verses 19, 23.

verse 14 A ¶ And God said,  
B C ¶ And God saide,  
A let them be for signes and for seasons,  
B C let them bee for signes and for seasons.

*Margin* A \* Deu. 4. 19 | B C \* Deut. 4.  
psal. 136. 7. | 19 psal.  
136. 7.

- verse 15 A And let them be for lights  
B C And let them bee for lights
- verse 17 A And God set them in the firma-  
ment of the heauen,  
B C And God set them in the firma-  
ment of the heauen,
- verse 18 A and to diuide the light  
B C and to diuide the Light
- Margin* A \* Ier. 31. 35 | B \* Iere. 31.  
35.
- verse 20 A And God said,  
B C And God saide,
- verse 22 A And God blessed them, saying, \* Be  
fruitfull, and multiply, and fill the wa-  
ters in the Seas, and let foule multiply  
in the earth.  
B C And God blessed them, saying,  
\* Be fruitfull, and multiply, and fill the  
waters in the Seas, and let foule mul-  
tiply in the earth.
- verse 24 A and | B C and it  
it was so. | was so.
- verse 25 A vpon the earth, after his kinde :  
and God saw that *it was* good.  
B C vpon the earth, after his kind : and  
God saw that *it was* good.
- verse 26 *Margin* A 1. corin. 11 | B 1. cor. 11.  
7. | C 7.
- verse 28 *Margin* A † *Heb. cree-* | B † *Hebr. cree-*  
*peth.* | C *peth.*
- verse 30 A and to euery foule of the aire, and to eue-  
ry thing  
B C and to euery foule of the aire, & to eue-  
ry thing

## PSALMS I.—IV.

- A PSALME I.  
B C PSALME. I.
- verse 2 A But his delight *is* in the Law  
B C But his delight *is* in the Lawe

*Margin* A iere. 17. 8. | B C ier. 17. 8.

verse 3 A And he shalbe like a tree  
B C And he shall be like a tree

*Margin* A † *Hebr. fade.* | B C † *Heb. fade.*

A PSAL. II.

B C PSALM. II.

verse 1 A and the people † imagine  
a vaine thing?

B C and the people † imagine a  
vaine thing?

verse 4 *Margin* A \* Prou. 1. | B \* Prouerb.  
26. | C 1. 26.

verse 5 *Margin* A || *Or, trouble* | B † *Or, trouble*  
C

verse 6 *Margin* A † *Hebr. an-* | B † *Hebr. an-*  
*ointed.* | C *ointed.*  
|| *Hebr. vpon* † *Heb. vpon*  
*Sion, the hill* † *Sion, the hill*  
*of my Holi-* † *of my holi-*  
*nesse.* † *nesse.*

verse 7 *Margin* A \* Acts. 13. | B C Acts 13.  
33. heb. 1. | 33. hebr.  
5. | 1. 5.

verse 8 *Margin* A \* Psal. 72. | B C \* Psal. 72. 8.  
8.

verse 12 A and ye perish *from* the way,  
B C and yee perish *from* the way,

*Margin* A iete. 17. | B C iere 17.  
7. | 7.

### PSALM III.

verse 2. A Many *there bee* which  
B C Many *there be* which

verse 4 A and he heard me  
B C and hee heard me

verse 5 A I layd me downe and slept ;  
B C I layde me downe and slept ;

verse 8 *Margin* \* Isa. 43. | B C Isa 43. 11  
11. | hos. 13. 4.  
Hos. 13. 4. |

## PSALM IV.

verse 1 A thou hast enlarged mee  
when *I was* in distresse,  
B C thou hast enlarged mee  
when *I was* in distresse,

Margin A || *Or, bee gracious vn-* | B C *Or, be gra-*  
*to me.* | *cious vnto*  
*mee.*

verse 2 A *how*  
*long* will yee loue vanitie,  
B C *how*  
*long* will ye loue vanitie,

REV. xxii. 1—7

A **A** Nd he shewed mee a pure  
riuer of water of life, cleere  
as Chrystall, proceeding  
out of the throne of God,  
and of the Lambe.

2 In the midst of the street of it,  
and of either side of the riuer, *was there*  
the tree of life, which bare twelue man-  
ner of fruits, and yelded her fruit eue-  
ry moneth: and the leaues of the tree  
were for the healing of the nations.

3 And there shall be no more curse,  
but the throne of God, & of the Lambe  
shall bee in it, and his seruants shall  
serue him.

4 And they shall see his face, and  
his name *shall be* in their foreheads.

5 \* And there shalbe no night there,  
and they need no candle, neither light of  
the sunne, for the Lorde God giueth  
them light, and they shall reigne for e-  
uer and euer.

6 And hee said vnto mee, These  
sayings *are* faithful and true. And the  
Lord God of the holy Prophets sent  
his Angel to shew vnto his seruants  
the things which must shortly be done.

7 Beholde, I come quickly: Bles-  
sed is he that keepeth the sayings of the  
prophecie of this booke.

REV. 22: 1—7

B **A** Nd he. shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystall, proceeding out of the throne of God, and of the Lamb.

2 In the midst of the street of it, and of every side of the river, *was there* the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yeelded her fruit every moneth: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

3 And there shall be no more curse, but the throne of God, and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall serve him.

4 And they shall see his face, and his Name *shall be* in their foreheads.

5 \* And there shall be no night there, and they need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light, and they shall reign for ever and ever.

6 And he said unto me, These sayings *are* faithfull and true. And the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done.

7 Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecie of this book.

C REV. 22: 1—7

(C agrees with A in all cases, in this passage, where words are omitted.)

**A** Nd hee shewed mee a pure riuer of water of life, cleere as Chrystall, proceeding out of the throne of God, and of the Lambe.

2 In the midst of the street of it, and of either side of the riuer, *was there*

the tree of life, which bare twelue manner of fruits, and yeelded her fruit euery moneth: and the leaues of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

3 And there shall bee no more curse, but the throne (etc. as in A).

4 And they shall see his face, and his Name *shall be* (etc. as in A).

5 \* And there shall be no light there, (etc. as in A).

the Sunne, for the Lorde God (etc. as in A).

7 Behold, I come quickly: Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophetic of this booke.

It will thus appear that, while most of the variations are unimportant and undesigned, they are sufficient to establish the fact of a difference in the editions. Furthermore, each edition has obvious errata of its own, while others are common to both. In the comparisons we are now to make, still other editions will be brought into view. In the year 1612, the first quarto edition appeared printed in roman letter, and a copy of it, in the possession of the writer, will be referred to as G. The text is perfect throughout, and the genuineness of the volume is unquestionable. To the Oxford reprint in 1833 was added "a collation made with an edition of the year 1613 in *smaller black-letter folio*. \* \* \* \* That edition was selected for the purpose in preference to the *large black-letter folio* of the same year, or to the large black-letter folio of the year 1617, because no two entire copies of either of the two latter editions could be found, all the sheets of which corresponded precisely with each other. Many of these copies contain sheets belonging, as may clearly be proved, to editions of a more recent date; and even those which appear to be still as they were originally published, are made up partly from the edition printed at the time, and partly from the remains of earlier impressions." This edition of 1613 as contained in the reprint, will be referred to as H. Mr. Livermore has a copy of this edition, which will be cited by I, *where it is not known to*

*agree* with H, and in a few cases X will be used to denote the reading given in the English Hexapla. Unless it is otherwise indicated, the *orthography* of A and B will be given; and where other copies are represented as agreeing with them, reference is made only to agreement in *words*: verbal rather than literal. This is to be regarded only as a partial collection of variations.

Ex. 21: 32. In B C this verse is numbered 33; in A it is correct.

1 Chron. 25: 16. In B it is numbered 19; in A and C it is correct.

Gen. 13: 15 margin. A G 26. 4. B C 29. 4.

Numbers 21: 9 margin. A G ioh. 3. 14. B C iosh. 3. 14.

Deut. 22: 12 margin. A G Num. 15. 38. B C Num. 15. 31.

Job 37: 6 margin. A G Psal. 147. 16. & 17. B C Psal. 148. 16, 17.

Gen. 10: 16. A G I and the Emorite B C and the Amorite.

Gen. 35: 27. A G I which is Hebron B C which the Hebron.

Exod. 14: 10. A (has the printer's doublet before quoted.) | B C G H (avoid this erratum.)

Exod. 21: 26. A let him goe free | B G H, and some copies generally followed by A, let them goe free.

Exod. 38: 11. A G hoopes of the pillars | B C H hookes of the pillars.

Lev. 4: 35. A shall burnt them | B C G H shall burne them

Lev. 13: 56. A the plaine be B C G H the plague be

Lev. 17: 14. A shall not eat B C G H shall eate

Lev. 18: 3. A of land of Canaan B C G H of the land of Canaan.

Numbers 20: 7. A G Lord B C H LORD

Judges 19: 11. A turne in into | B C H turne into  
G turne in vnto

Ruth 3: 15 A G (? H) and he | B C I and she went into  
went into the citie | the citie

- 1 Sam. 27: 3 A C G and some  
copies represented by H, | B H I dwelt in Achish  
dwelt with Achish.
- 2 Sam. xxiv. *heading.* eleuen thou- | B C G H thirteen hun-  
sand. | dred thousand.
- 1 Kings 1: 52 A C G not an haire B H not a haire
- 1 Kings 3: 20. A C G shee arose B H she rose
- 1 Kings 8: 30. A C G when they | B H when thou shalt  
shall pray | pray
- 1 Kings 9: 22. A C G bondmen B H bondman
- 1 Kings 20: 3. A G *even* the goodliest B C H *even* thy  
goodliest
- 2 Kings 5: 12. A G So he turned B C H So hee re-  
turned
- 1 Chron. 2: 3. A Canaanites. And Er  
B H Canaanitess, and Er  
C Canaanitess And Er  
G Canaanitess. And Er
- 1 Chron. 4: 30. A G and at Hormah B C H and Hor-  
mah
- 2 Chron. 6: 5. A G my people Israel B C H my people  
of Israel.
- 2 Chron. 30: 6. A G and his Princes B C H and the  
Princes
- Ezra 9: 2. A G hath bin chiefe B C H haue bin  
chiefe
- Neh. 4: 14. A to rest of the people B C G H to the rest  
of the people
- Neh. 8: 10. A G vnto our LORD B C H vnto the  
LORD
- Job iv. *heading.* A excellencie of Creatures  
B C G H excellencies of Creatures
- Job 11: 16. A C G forget *thy* misery B H forget *the*  
misery.
- Job 19: 15. A G my maides B C H my maidens
- Ps. 74: 23. A C G that rise vp B H that arise vp
- Prov. 11: 20. A C G to the LORD B H vnto the LORD
- Eccl. 12: 14 A euer secret thing B C G H euery se-  
cret thing

- Cant. 2: 7. A till she please | B C G H (and some copies  
represented by A) till he  
please
- Isa. 19: 5. A G the riuer shalbe wasted  
B C H the riuers shalbe wasted
- Isa. 44: 13 A maketh it out B C G H marketh it out
- Isa. 49: 1. A G from farre B C H from afarre
- Isa. 49: 20. A G too straight for me  
B C H too straitte for mee
- Isa. 57: 10. A C G art wearied B H art wearie
- Isa. 59: 21. A mouth of the seede  
B C G H mouth of thy seede
- Isa. 60: 4. A C G from farre B H from afarre
- Isa. 61: 10. A C G and as a bride B H as a bride
- Jer. 5: 24. A G later B C H latter
- Jer. 22: 3. A the spoiler B C G H the spoiled
- Jer. 23: 6. A G The LORD etc. B C H THE LORD etc.
- Jer. 25: 15. A G at my hand B C H at mine hand
- Jer. 50: 29. A hath done vnto her  
B C G H hath done, doe vnto her
- Ezek. 5: 5 A C G This is Ierusalem  
B H Thus is Ierusalem
- Ezek. 6: 14. A C G my hand B H mine hand
- Ezek. 14: 18. A daughter B C G H daughters
- Hos. 6: 5. A G shewed *them* by the Prophets  
B C H hewed *them* by the Prophets
- Mic. 7: 7. A vnto you the LORD B C G H vnto the  
LORD
- Hab. 3: 3 A holy on B H holy one  
G holy One
- Mal. 1: 8. A G And if hee offer B C H And if yee offer
- Matt. 6: 3. A B G X thy right doeth  
H thy right hand doeth
- Matt. 8: 25. A awoke, saying B C G H X awoke him,  
saying
- Matt. 13: 4 A B G the wayes side H X the way side

- Matt. 13: 31. A B G like to a graine H X like vnto a  
graine
- Matt. 18: 30 A B G went and cast H X went out and cast
- Matt. 22: 24. A B G If a man die H X If any man die
- Rom. 10: 21. A B G I haue stretched H X haue I  
stretched
- Rom. 11: 22. A B G towards thee H X toward thee
- Rom. xvi. *postscript* A G seruant of the Church  
B C H seruant to the Church
- Heb. 10: 36. A that shall after ye  
B C G H X that after ye
- 1 Pet. 1: 22. A C G X purified your soules  
B H purified your selues
- Rev. 1: 5. A B G I vnto him that loued vs  
X vnto him that hath loued vs
- Rev. 2: 12. A B G I saith hee, which hath  
X saith hee, who hath

Though it may be impracticable to decide what edition was first given to the public by the editors of our present version, these examples of variations and of errata indicate that no copy was prepared with the accuracy which is requisite in a standard. And if it were possible to decide which sheets were first printed, it might still be urged that they should be regarded in the light of proof-sheets, from which errors and inconsistencies were to be removed as fast as they were discovered. In respect to italics, capitals, and orthography, neither of the editions has sufficient uniformity to entitle it to be followed exclusively. The usages of the age allowed far greater latitude and variety than would now be agreeable in printed works. The revision of the text by Dr. Blayney, in 1769, put a great many words into italic letters which had not been designated by a peculiar character in the early editions; but in those editions, no rule seems to have been constantly followed. E. g. in John 8: 6 we read: "But Jesus stooped down, and with *his* finger wrote on the ground, *as though he heard them not.*" This last clause has *nothing* in the Greek to warrant its in-

sertion, but it was originally printed in the same character as the first part of the verse. On the other hand, in 1 John 2: 23, the last clause was put in another character: "*but he that acknowledgeth the Sonne, hath the Father also;*"<sup>1</sup> though here the words were not supplemented to complete the sense, but *translated* from a reading which was considered somewhat doubtful. Yet in Luke 17: 36, a more doubtful reading is inserted, in *black letter*, with the marginal note: "*This 36. verse is wanting in most of the Greek copies;*" and in the *margin* of Luke 10: 22, we read: "*Many ancient copies adde these words: And turning to his Disciples he said.*" Another marked example of inconsistency is seen in comparing Matt. 20: 23 with Mark 10: 46. In the former passage, our present copies follow the earliest ones in saying: "but *it shall be given* to them for whom it is prepared of my father." In Mark, where the Greek is the same, the italicised words were originally printed in black letter. Without any apparent cause, in Mark 11: 9, 10, *Hosanna* is printed in italics in A B G I, while it is in the ordinary type in the parallel passage, Matt. 21: 9.

It is obvious at a glance, that capital letters also were used with little or no system, and that uniformity in different editions was not sought for. E. g. in the Epistle to the Galatians, A frequently gives a capital to the word Spirit, but fails to do so in 3: 2. 4: 6. 5: 5, 16, 18, 22. and 6: 8, 18; and in 5: 17 uses both forms: "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the spirit against the flesh." In all these passages B has "spirit"; in all except 6: 18, G has "Spirit;" and in all but 5: 18, I has "spirit." In John 16: 13, A B and G have: "when hee the spirit of trueth is come." In Rom. 8: 15, 26, 27, they also agree in "spirit;" but G uses a capital letter where A B have a small one in Rom. 8: 9 — "spirit of God, spirit of Christ;" 8: 11, 14 and 16 — "The spirit it selfe." In 1 John 4: 2, the three have "spirit of God;" but in the next verse: "And euery Spirit that confesseth not," and in verse 13 — "hee hath giuen vs of his

---

<sup>1</sup> B has *Eather*.

Spirit." G uses capitals more freely than A, but in Ps. 95: 3 and Gal. 4: 8 has "gods," where A B have "Gods." In Gen. 3: 5 the three have "Gods," but in many other places where the word occurs, agree in dispensing with the capital. This want of uniformity might be exemplified by other words.

The orthography of these early editions is very changeable. This is evident from the passages already copied. Such forms as *he, hee; she, shee; me, mee; shall be, shalbe; darkness, darknesse; bene, beene, bin; citie, city; carry, carrie, carie; thanks, thank; perfit* (Ps. 138: 8), *perfitte* (Job 22: 3), *perfect* (Ps. 18: 32. 1 Thess. 3: 10); *ginne* (Isa. 8: 14), *grinnes* (Ps. 140: 5. 141: 9 A B G); *sin, sinne; reigne, raigne; law, lawe; traouelling* (Isa. 63: 1), *trauailleth* (Prov. 6: 11), *traueileth* (Prov. 24: 34); *through, thorow* (2 Sam. 2: 29); *knowen, knowne; all, al; reproch, reproach; alient, aliens, aliant; mo* (Gal. 4: 27. G), *moe* (A B), *more*; are used interchangeably in the various editions, and sometimes even in consecutive verses of the same edition.

In the use of the forms *a, an; my, mine; thy, thine*; the editions are found, to a considerable extent, to agree with each other, but there is no rule which determines the form. So in A B G, we have *a hammer* (Jer. 23: 29), *an hammer* (Judges 4: 21); *a hand* (Ex. 19: 13), *an hand* (Ez. 2: 9); *a hard thing* (2 Ki. 2: 10), *an hard saying* (John 6: 60). In Isa. 30: 17 G has *an hill*; A B, *a hill*. These editions usually read *an hundred, an habitation, an hair, an half*. Our modern editions have deviated from the earliest in this particular, but without adopting and carrying out consistently a uniform rule. The revised standard, published by the American Bible Society in 1851, went so far as to reform the usage in respect to the indefinite article, by adopting the rule that "the form *an* be used before all vowels and diphthongs not pronounced as consonants, and also before *h* silent or unaccented; and that the form *a* be employed in all other cases."<sup>1</sup> But in respect to *my, mine; thy, thine*; this edition intro-

<sup>1</sup> Thirty-Sixth Annual Report of the American Bible Society, 1852, p. 32.

duced no change, but conformed to preceding ones; and in it, as in the originals, we find no established usage. E. g. before *abode*, *absence*, *acts*, we find *thy* or *my*; before *abominations*, *anger*, *adversary*, *enemies*, *thine* or *mine*; before *affliction*, both *my* and *mine*; and the same fact holds true of words beginning with *h*, a marked example of which is seen in Isa. 56:7 — *my house*, and *mine house*. But as this is not a *peculiarity* of the early editions, it need not be commented on further.

Although so much obscurity rests upon the work of the printers through whose labors the authorized version first came to light, we cannot but notice the rapidity with which successive editions were sent forth. Two editions in 1611, two probably in 1612, besides a separate edition of the New Testament alone, and two in the year following, indicate the energy with which "his majesties speciall commandment" was carried into effect.

To determine the comparative critical value of these early editions, would require careful and extended research. Enough perhaps has been said to direct attention toward the sources from which we are to learn the mind of the translators, as expressed in their work, and to show that in their day, the text, as it issued from the press, was by no means considered immaculate.