

The Society of Biblical Literature

Chapter Title: The King James Bible Apocrypha: When and Why Lost?
Chapter Author(s): Andrew E. Hill

Book Title: The King James Version at 400
Book Subtitle: Assessing Its Genius as Bible Translation and Its Literary Influence
Book Editor(s): David G. Burke, John F. Kutsko, Philip H. Towner
Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature . (2013)
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hjgtt.26>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The King James Version at 400*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE KING JAMES BIBLE APOCRYPHA: WHEN AND WHY LOST?

Andrew E. Hill

The program title for this paper reads as follows: “The King James Bible Apocrypha: When and Why Lost?” I have alternatively titled the paper: “Now You Read Them, Now You Don’t! Whither the Apocrypha in the King James Bible?”

INTRODUCTION

In this paper I will first set the English Bible translation context for the King James Bible (KJB); review the making and early publication history of the KJB with respect to the Old Testament Apocrypha; examine the reactions to the KJB by the English Puritans and Scottish Presbyterians; survey the publication history of the later editions of the KJB with respect to the Apocrypha; rehearse the British and Foreign Bible Society controversy over the place of the Apocrypha in the KJB; comment on the more recent history of the place of the Apocrypha in the KJB; and finally draw conclusions by way of summary.

I recognize that for two streams of the Christian tradition, the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, the books under discussion are deemed deuterocanonical. Since the subject of this paper is the place of the Old Testament Apocrypha in the King James Bible, the Protestant term for the collection, *Apocrypha*, will be used throughout.

THE APOCRYPHA IN THE SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH CONTEXT

Martin Luther’s translation of the Bible into German in 1534 was a significant achievement for numerous reasons. Perhaps lesser known among

these reasons is what the twentieth-century Bible translator E. J. Goodspeed has noted as “Luther’s striking innovation in gathering the Apocrypha out of the Old Testament and putting them by themselves” at the end of the Old Testament.¹ Luther’s view of the Old Testament Apocrypha is well known and often quoted. Following Jerome and based on the principle of Hebrew canon verity, Luther titled the collection “Apocrypha—that is, books that are not held equal to the Holy Scriptures and yet are good and useful to read.”² Luther’s decision to place the Apocrypha as a separate block between the Old and New Testaments set the precedent for all Protestant English Bibles that followed. Likewise, a preface qualifying the authority of the collection, which Owen Chadwick says “was already becoming established as a warning,” became the standard.³

Notable among the English translations of the Bible printed in the sixteenth century are:

1. The Miles Coverdale Bible (1535), which placed the Apocrypha (minus Baruch and the Prayer of Manasseh) in a separate appendix at the end of the Old Testament (following Luther). Coverdale’s preface to the appendix recognizes that the books of the Apocrypha are not of like reputation with the other Scriptures and are not to be used to confirm ecclesiastical doctrine, but are profitable for reading.⁴

2. William Tyndale died in 1536 before completing his translation of the Old Testament. F. F. Bruce conjectures that Tyndale’s Old Testament would have followed the canonical order of Luther (since this is the case with the NT), and that he probably would have translated the Apocrypha and included it as an appendix to the Old Testament, located directly after it and before the New Testament.⁵

3. Matthew’s Bible (1537) was a reworking of both the Coverdale and Tyndale translations. The Apocrypha was placed as an appendix to the Old Testament and positioned between the two Testaments.

4. Taverner’s Bible (1539), a reworking of Matthew’s Bible (produced largely by Edmund Becke), placed the Apocrypha (including 3 Maccabees) in an appendix to the Old Testament and positioned between the Testaments with an explanation that these books were profitable to read but were not to be considered inspired Scripture.

5. The Great Bible (commissioned by King Henry VIII and published in 1539) was intended to function as the Authorized Version for the Church of England. The books of the Apocrypha were collected in an appendix to the Old Testament and included a preface echoing the sentiments of Jerome as to the status of the books.

6. The Geneva Bible (1560) placed the books of the Apocrypha (minus the Prayer of Manasseh) in an appendix at the end of the Old Testament, and included a preface that these books were not to be read or expounded publicly in church and could only prove doctrine inasmuch as they agree with the Protocanon (OT and NT). The 1560 edition came to be known as the Breeches Bible for its rendering of Gen 3:7: “Adam and Eve made breeches for themselves out of fig leaves.”

7. The Bishops’ Bible (1568) was a revision of the Great Bible made under the authority of Elizabeth and necessitated by the publication and popularity of the Geneva Bible. The treatment of the books of the Apocrypha in the Great Bible was retained.

8. The Douai-Rheims Bible (1582–1610) became the vernacular Bible for English Roman Catholics. The Douai-Rheims Bible was translated from the Latin Vulgate and followed the canonical ordering of the later editions of the Vulgate with the books of the Apocrypha inserted appropriately by genre within the Old Testament. The Douai-Rheims Old Testament was published in two volumes in 1609 and 1610.

So then, the historical context for Protestant English translations of the Bible out of which the KJB would emerge was one that included placing the books of the Apocrypha as a separate collection at the end the Old Testament. Typically, the Apocrypha had some kind of prefatory note echoing the assessments of Jerome and Luther, to the effect that those books were not of the same reputation or like quality of divine inspiration as the rest of the Scriptures, and were not used generally to confirm Bible doctrine, although they were profitable reading for the church.

THE KING JAMES BIBLE

Article 6 of the Church of England’s Thirty-Nine Articles (1563) distinguishes the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments from the “other books” (following the precedent of Jerome). This article authorizes the reading of these “other books” (the Apocrypha), stating, “the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.”⁶ Naturally, the KJB translators assigned one of the six translation committees to translate the Apocrypha.⁷ Of interest is the comment by King James himself in 1599 that, “as to the Apocriphe bookes, I omit them because I am no papist.”⁸ Later, in 1616, King James made a fuller statement on the inspiration and worth of the Apocrypha:

As for the Scriptures, no man doubteth I will believe them. But even for the Apocrypha, I hold them in the same accompt that the Ancients did. They are still printed and bound with our Bibles, and publicly read in our churches. I reverence them as the writings of holy and good men. But since they are not found in the Canon, we accompt them to be *secundae lectionis or ordinis* (which is Bellarmine's own distinction) and therefore not sufficient whereupon alone to ground any Article of Faith, except it be confirmed by some other place of Canonical Scripture; concluding this point with Rufinus (who is no Novelist, I hope) that the Apocryphal books were by the Fathers permitted to be read, not for confirmation of doctrine, but only for instruction of the people.⁹

Seven years after the Hampton Court Conference commissioned a new translation of the English Bible, the King James Bible of 1611 was published. And indeed, the King James Bible included the Apocrypha collected as an appendix between the Old and New Testaments. F. C. Medford notes that the KJB “omits any preface to the ‘bookes called Apocrypha,’ but they are marked by a running headline ‘Apocrypha’ at the top of the page. These books are also included in the table of Old Testament lessons given in the front matter of the book.”¹⁰ Curiously, there is some ambiguity concerning the issuing of the first edition of the King James Bible. John Brown suggests, “There seem to have been two impressions of the first edition of 1611, probably due to the impossibility of one printing office being able to supply in the time allotted the 20,000 copies required.”¹¹ These impressions became known as the “He” and “She” editions based on their readings of Ruth 3:15 (that is, whether “he” [Boaz] or “she” [Ruth] returned to the village in the morning after the night spent at the threshing floor). David Norton, however, is of the opinion that the “She” Bible can authentically be identified as a second rather than first edition of the KJB, even though one of its varying forms may date from as early as 1611.¹² In the first three years, the KJB was produced in fourteen editions in various formats. The volume and haste of this production schedule understandably resulted in the introduction of many printers’ errors.¹³ It would take fifty years for the KJB to overtake the popularity of the Geneva Bible. The competition for Bible sales in the English market should be noted here. The imported Geneva Bible was cheaper, less bulky, and better produced than the early printings of the KJB. The final known edition of the Geneva Bible was published in 1644, and “As a result, the King James Bible enjoyed new commercial success.”¹⁴

Copies of the Geneva Bible excluding the books of the Apocrypha were printed as early as 1599, primarily in the Low Countries of Europe. This leads Bruce Metzger to conclude that “it would seem that the practice of issuing copies of the Bible without the Apocrypha continued.”¹⁵ This practice accounts for the edict issued in 1615 by George Abbot, the archbishop of Canterbury, that forbade the publication of Bibles without the Apocrypha, at the threat of one year in prison. According to G. G. Michuta, since smaller Bibles were cheaper to produce, “economic incentives proved stronger than the threats of the Archbishop, and editions without the Deuterocanon were sporadically produced.”¹⁶ Metzger previously had made a similar observation, noting that in the case of editions of both the Geneva Bible and the KJB issued without the Apocrypha, the work was apparently that of the binders or printers “who perhaps wished to satisfy an increasing demand for less bulky and less expensive Bibles.”¹⁷ Early editions of the KJB excluding the books of the Apocrypha included those dated to 1619, 1626, 1629, 1630, 1632, and 1633.¹⁸ Of interest here are the vestiges of the Apocrypha in those editions of both the Geneva Bible and the KJB that omitted the books of the Apocrypha. For example, a 1599 edition of the Geneva Bible omitted the books of the Apocrypha, but not their pages, which were left blank and unnumbered between the Old and New Testaments.¹⁹ Similarly, for nearly a century after its publication in 1611, editions of the KJB issued with or without the Apocrypha retained the 113 margin references to the Apocrypha books. According to Metzger, during the 1700s, “when the margins came to be crowded with references, all references to the Apocrypha were omitted.”²⁰

REACTIONS TO THE KING JAMES BIBLE

The first edition of the KJB published without the Apocrypha appeared in 1619, and another in 1626, less than twenty years after the introduction of the Authorized Version. This was largely due to influence of the English Puritans and Scottish Presbyterians. Numerous objections against the Apocrypha were raised, among them the principle of Hebrew verity (i.e., the books of the Apocrypha are not found in the Hebrew Bible), increasing antipapal and anti-Roman Catholic sentiments among several of the Protestant groups, antiroyalist sentiments among the English Nonconformists, matters of divine inspiration and the doctrine of Scripture, and the practical concern that these books “were for the most part so sensational in character and on so low a moral and religious level.”²¹

One of the early critics of the KJB was the distinguished but widely disliked Hebrew scholar, Hugh Broughton, who had been snubbed by the KJB translation and revision committees, despite his erudition in the biblical languages. Before his death in 1612, Broughton sent a critique of the KJB to one of the king's attendants lamenting that the new Bible was so ill done and calling for it to be burned.²² Later in 1643 and 1645, in sermons delivered before the House of Commons, John Lightfoot denounced the apocryphal books as the "wretched Apocrypha" and a "patchery of human invention."²³ Lightfoot called upon Parliament to review the translation of the KJB and remove anything amiss therein (including the printing of the books of Apocrypha between the Old and New Testaments). At issue was the growing influence of Puritanism and the dissatisfaction with the authority of the KJB and the monarchy it represented. The outbreak of the English Civil War in 1642 gave the Puritans an opportunity to demand a revision of the KJB or even a new Bible translation commissioned by Parliament. E. C. Bissell comments: "Providentially, it was not left to the government of England to interfere in the matter, but without any special official act these books [i.e., the Apocrypha] came, as by common consent, to be omitted from new editions of the Authorized Version."²⁴

The Westminster Confession of 1648 reflects the sentiments of those opposed to the inclusion of the Apocrypha in English Bibles:

Chap. 1. Article III. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the Canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.

LATER EDITIONS OF THE KJB

Ongoing tensions between the Church of England, on one side, and the Puritans, Presbyterians, and all other Nonconformists, on the other, led to the KJB being printed repeatedly without the Apocrypha. Chadwick reports that during the parliamentary period, the two decades between the beginning of the English Civil War in 1642 and the restoration of the monarchy with the installation of Charles II in 1660, "hardly any Bibles were printed which contained the Apocrypha."²⁵ Indeed, in Chadwick's estimation, after 1630 Bibles without the Apocrypha were so widely in use that this was "all that most ordinary citizens needed or wanted."²⁶ That changed, however, when Charles II was restored to the English throne.

John Field published an edition of the KJB at Cambridge that included the Apocrypha and dedicated the work to the new king. Alister McGrath observes, "With Charles II restored to the English throne, and a growing public backlash developing against the excesses of the period of the Puritan Commonwealth, the earlier Puritan opposition to the King James Bible virtually guaranteed that it would be the established translation of the new administration."²⁷

The Savoy Conference of 1661 was a liturgical discussion between representatives of the Church of England and representatives of the Puritan and Presbyterian dissenting factions, ostensibly for the purpose of revising the Book of Common Prayer. The conference failed to reach any significant compromise, prompting the Protestant dissenters to essentially split from the Church of England. The Act of Uniformity was enacted in 1662 after the ill-fated Savoy Conference. It required the use of all the rites and ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 in church services. As a result of these developments, "the Puritans renewed their onslaught upon the use of apocryphal writings in the church."²⁸ Chadwick cites further examples from the period illustrating the controversy over the inclusion of the Apocrypha in the Bible, including the publication of a pamphlet in 1689 entitled *A Letter on the Present Convocation*, which said that the clergy were being forced to read "ridiculous things to people instead of the Word of God—Tobit and his dog, and Bel and the Dragon." Chadwick notes that a rejoinder was issued that asked whether the Scripture readings from books like Chronicles or Ezra or Nehemiah were more edifying to the people than readings from Wisdom or Ecclesiasticus. And the publication in 1740 of an *Essay on the Books Commonly Called Apocrypha*, written anonymously by "A Lover of Truth," called for legislation that would make it illegal to bind the Apocrypha between the Old and New Testaments.²⁹ Worth mentioning here is the extent to which the Old Testament apocryphal books were included in the lessons of the Book of Common Prayer. The 1662 Book of Common Prayer lists 56 readings from seven books of the Apocrypha in the Table of Lessons (Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon). The 1789 iteration of the Book of Common Prayer lists 82 readings from seven books of the Apocrypha in the Table of Lessons (2 Esdras, Tobit, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Song of the Three Children, and 1 Maccabees).

By way of summary, according to one source, between 1632 (when one of the early editions of the KJB without the Apocrypha appeared) and the decision of the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) in 1826

to withhold funding from Bible societies that produced Bibles with the Apocrypha, 579 editions of the KJB were published in England. A total of 227 of those editions, or approximately 40 percent, were published without the Apocrypha. These statistics would indicate, however, that despite the opposition of the Puritans and Presbyterians, there was still a strong presence of the Apocrypha in the KJB for about two centuries after its initial publication in 1611.³⁰

Harold Scanlin breaks down the percentages of non-Apocrypha Bibles published during this time period more precisely, noting: 14 percent (15 of 110 editions) of the KJV and Geneva Bibles published between 1611 and 1639 lacked the Apocrypha; 65 percent (48 of 73 editions) of the Bibles published between 1639 and 1660 lacked the Apocrypha; and the percentage of non-Apocrypha Bibles published between 1660 and 1700 only dropped to 60 percent. Scanlin's statistic for non-Apocrypha Bibles published for the period immediately subsequent to the publishing of the KJB (1611–1700) is 62 percent.³¹

The increasing separation of the books of the Apocrypha from the Old and New Testaments in the publication of the KJB is mirrored in the reduction of reading lessons from the Apocrypha in the Church of England Lectionary across the same time period. The reading lessons of the 1549 Lectionary included 108 readings from the Apocrypha for 54 days of the church year (or 74 percent of the total chapters in the books of the Apocrypha). By contrast, the revised Church of England Lectionary of 1871 included 42 readings for 21 days of the church year (or 22 percent of the total chapters in the books of the Apocrypha).³² The Irish Church removed all readings from the Apocrypha from its Scripture lessons after becoming independent of the Church of England in 1871.³³

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY CONTROVERSY

The British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) was founded in 1804. The circles that founded and financed the society mostly belonged to the so-called evangelical party within the state church, or they were Nonconformists.³⁴ Both groups strictly rejected Bibles with the Apocrypha. At issue was the interpretation of the society's trust deed, which called for the raising of funds to print the Holy Scriptures. A majority of the society agreed that the books of the Apocrypha were not part of the Holy Scriptures and should not be published in English Bibles. So essentially from its founding, BFBS did not issue English Scriptures with the Apocrypha.

More controversial was the issue of whether BFBS should finance the publication of foreign Bibles that retained the books of the Apocrypha or any national Bible society that engaged in the circulation of such Bibles. BFBS resolved in 1813 to let the foreign Bible societies determine for themselves what made up the "Holy Scriptures," since the production and distribution of Bible with the Apocrypha was not prohibited in the BFBS bylaws. BFBS "acted pragmatically ... in order not to endanger the young Bible Society movement."³⁵ In 1819 the Scottish Presbyterian evangelist Robert Haldane pressured BFBS to reverse its decision of 1813 and withdraw all support of foreign Bible societies producing and distributing the Apocrypha. A compromise decision was reached in 1822 providing funds from BFBS to foreign Bible societies only for the printing of Bibles without the Apocrypha. The resolution was unsatisfactory for Haldane and the Scots, who threatened to separate from BFBS.³⁶ So the debate continued, and culminated in a vehement two-year battle from 1824 to 1826, after which BFBS adopted a policy in 1826 and 1827 that forbade participation in the circulation of the Apocrypha and disallowed financial aid to any society engaging in the circulation of Bibles that included the Apocrypha. The American Bible Society (ABS) followed the lead of BFBS and adopted a similar policy in 1828.³⁷ For some, the BFBS regulations adopted in 1826 mark the end of the KJB Apocrypha controversy.³⁸ As an aside, the debate over the Apocrypha was so heated that in 1825 BFBS took action to strike all discussion of the topic from the society's records dating back to 1811.³⁹

The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury decided to take up the work of revision of the Authorized Version in 1870. The English Revised Version (RV) of the New Testament appeared in 1881 and the RV of the Old Testament appeared in 1885. For some, the recognition of the RV of 1885 by the archbishop of Canterbury as the Bible for the Church of England marked the effective removal of the Apocrypha from the KJB. Though some had hoped that this would constitute once and for all the end of the Apocrypha as a part of the KJV tradition, this hope was belied when the RV revision of the Apocrypha was published ten years later in 1895.

TWENTIETH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT DAY

Since the BFBS decisions of 1826 and 1827 restricting the publication and distribution of Bibles containing the Apocrypha, most editions/reprintings of the KJB omitted the Apocrypha. Ross has noted, "By the end of the [nineteenth] century it was unusual for the Apocrypha to be printed with

any English Bibles except those intended for pulpit or lectern use.⁷⁴⁰ The publication of editions of the Revised Standard Version (RSV) with Apocrypha (1957) sparked new interest in these. The RSV was the authorized revision of the American Standard Version of 1901, a translation that had never included the Apocrypha.

The American Bible Society lifted its restrictions on the publication of Bibles with the Apocrypha in 1964. BFBS followed suit in 1966. Since then these Bible societies have published and distributed some editions of the KJB and other versions of the Bible with the books of the Apocrypha.

The New English Bible (1970) and the New Revised Standard Version (1989) have published editions of the Bible that include the Deuterocanonicals/Apocrypha. King James Bibles with Apocrypha, including 400th anniversary and 1611 facsimile editions, have been and remain available from several publishers. Perhaps it is fitting, ironically so, that one publisher is currently offering two anniversary editions of the 1611 King James Bible, one with the Apocrypha and one without! At one level, the marketplace still drives Bible translation, revision, and publication.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the Apocrypha were never entirely lost from the King James Bible during its nearly four-hundred-year publication history. The Apocrypha were indeed separated from the KJB in many of its editions, beginning quite early in its publication history. That the Apocrypha were persecuted by the Puritans, as Frederic Kenyon claimed, or exiled by the Protestants, as Michuta bemoans, is only part of the story behind the separation of the Apocrypha from the KJB.⁴¹ Clearly, the decisions of BFBS and ABS in the early nineteenth century not to support the publication of Bibles with the Apocrypha had a dramatic influence on the place of the Apocrypha in the KJB.

But like most historical developments, the outcome is both event and process, the result of a complex combination of human and circumstantial factors, in this case including: the economic realities of Bible publishing, competing and conflicting political loyalties of the age (royalists versus parliamentarians), the principle of Hebrew verity with respect to the canon of the Hebrew Bible, the long-standing tradition of using the Apocrypha in the church liturgy, theological conviction related to the biblical teaching of the inspiration of Scripture and the limits of the biblical canon (especially among the English Puritans and Scottish Presbyter-

rians), and the growing factionalism among Protestants in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—all this and more contributed to the story of the separation, but not the complete loss, of the Apocrypha from the King James Bible.

NOTES

1. E. J. Goodspeed, *The Story of the Apocrypha* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), 5.

2. As cited in E. C. Bissell, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1880), 54.

3. Owen Chadwick, "The Significance of the Deuterocanonical Writings in the Anglican Tradition," in *The Apocrypha in Ecumenical Perspective* (ed. Siegfried Meurer; trans. Paul Ellingworth; United Bible Societies Monograph Series 6; New York: United Bible Societies, 1991), 116.

4. See the complete text of Coverdale's preface to the Apocrypha in F. F. Bruce, *History of the English Bible* (3rd ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 60–61.

5. F. F. Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 102–3.

6. The delineation of these "other books" known as the OT Apocrypha in the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England includes: The Third Book of Esdras, The Fourth Book of Esdras, The Book of Tobias, The Book of Judith, The Rest of the Book of Esther, The Book of Wisdom, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Baruch the Prophet, The Song of the Three Children, The Story of Susanna, Of Bel and the Dragon, The Prayer of Manasses, The First Book of Maccabees, The Second Book of Maccabees.

7. The "second" Cambridge translation company was assigned the books of the Apocrypha (see S. L. Greenslade, "English Versions of the Bible, 1525–1611," in *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* [vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of the Bible*; ed. S. L. Greenslade; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963], 164–65). This company included John Duport, John Bois, William Branthwaite, Andrew Downes, Jeremiah Radcliffe, Robert Ward, and Samuel Ward. See further B. F. Westcott and W. A. Wright, *History of the English Bible* (3rd ed.; London: Macmillan, 1905), 112–14, 343–50; and Adam Nicolson, *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), 251–59. Greenslade has assessed the translation of the apocryphal books as "the weakest part of the Authorized Version" ("English Versions," 170).

8. "King James' View of the Apocrypha." Online: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus:text:1999.03.0071&query=page%3D%23116>.

9. "King James' View of the Apocrypha." Online: <http://www.fordham.edu/hall-sall/mod/1616james1.html>.

10. F. C. Medford, "The Apocrypha in the Sixteenth Century: A Summary and Survey," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 54 (1983): 353.

11. John Brown, *The History of the English Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 109.

12. David Norton, *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 65.

13. *Ibid.*, 62–64.

14. Alister McGrath, *In the Beginning: The Story of the King James Bible and How It Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture* (New York: Random House, 2001), 284.

15. B. M. Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), 197.

16. Gary G. Michuta, *Why Catholic Bibles Are Bigger* (Wixom, Mich.: Grotto, 2007), 285.

17. Metzger, *Introduction to the Apocrypha*, 197.

18. See Chadwick, “Significance of the Deuterocanonical Writings,” 120; and Metzger, *Introduction to the Apocrypha*, 197.

19. Michuta, *Why Catholic Bibles Are Bigger*, 283.

20. Metzger, *Introduction to the Apocrypha*, 188.

21. Goodspeed, *Story of the Apocrypha*, 6.

22. Bruce, *History of the English Bible*, 107. Nicolson (*God’s Secretaries*, 227) describes Broughton as “a cantankerous and aggressive Puritan Hebrew scholar” who was barred from the KJB translation committee “because of his incivility.”

23. Bissell, *Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, 56.

24. *Ibid.*

25. Chadwick, “Significance of the Deuterocanonical Writings,” 121.

26. *Ibid.*

27. McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 287.

28. Chadwick, “Significance of the Deuterocanonical Writings,” 121.

29. *Ibid.*

30. See W. Gundert, “The Bible Societies and the Deuterocanonical Writings,” in Meurer, *Apocrypha in Ecumenical Perspective*, 136 (as cited in S. Amsler, “La politique d’édition des Sociétés bibliques au XIXe siècle et le canon de l’Ancien Testament,” in *Le canon de l’Ancien Testament* [ed. Jean-Daniel Kaestli and Otto Wermelinger; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1984], 318). By way of comparison, Herbert records eighty editions of the KJB issued in England between 1826 and 1960. Only nine of those editions, or 8.88 percent, included the books of the Apocrypha (see A. S. Herbert, *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible, 1525–1961* [London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1968]). Further statistical analysis by Jack P. Lewis (“Some Aspects of the Problem of Inclusion of the Apocrypha,” in Meurer, *Apocrypha in Ecumenical Perspective*, 161–207) reveals that between the years 1800 and 1957 there were 1,114 Bible issues in the United States, including, but not restricted to, the KJB. A total of 189 of those Bible issues included the Apocrypha/deuterocanonical books, or 17 percent of the Bibles published during that time period. Lewis’s statistics are based on the work of Margaret. T. Hills, *The English Bible in America* (New York: American Bible Society, 1971).

31. Harold P. Scanlin, “Authority, Canon and the Bible Societies,” in *Text, Theology and Translation: Essays in Honour of Jan de Waard* (ed. S. Crisp and M. Jinbachian; New York: United Bible Societies, 2004), 182. Scanlin adds this explanatory note: “almost all of the non-Apocrypha Bibles are either octavo or duodecimo, undoubtedly

preferred by private owners. Almost all folio and quarto Bibles included the Apocrypha. The Anglican Church would require pulpit Bibles to include the Apocrypha, especially since the Lectionary included readings from the Apocrypha throughout almost all of the Church's history"

32. "A New Daily Office Lectionary." Online: <http://39articles.com/samples/001-fry-lectionary.htm>.

33. See Chadwick, "Significance of the Deuterocanonical Writings," 123.

34. See *ibid.*, 122.

35. Gundert, "Bible Societies and Deuterocanonical Writings," 136–37.

36. See further *ibid.*, 137–38.

37. Lewis, "Some Aspects," 163.

38. For example, Gundert, "Bible Societies and Deuterocanonical Writings," 136.

39. Bissell, *Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, 567.

40. J. M. Ross, "The Status of the Apocrypha," *Theology* 82 (1979): 190; see also Metzger, *Introduction to the Apocrypha*, 202.

41. Frederick Kenyon, as cited in Goodspeed, *Story of the Apocrypha*, 6; see Michuta, *Why Catholic Bibles Are Bigger*, 287ff.

QUESTION: Didn't the King James Bible when first printed contain the Apocrypha? ANSWER: Yes. EXPLANATION: Many critics of the perfect Bible like to point out that the original King James had the Apocrypha in it as though that fact compromises its integrity. The King James translators therefore placed it between the Old and New Testaments for its historical benefit to its readers. They did not integrate it into the Old Testament text as do the Alexandrian manuscripts - but at least it was there. Why is the apocrypha such an IMPORTANT part of Jewish history and politics? To read it, with knowledge of the Jewish religion and customs, is to have one's mind blown wide open. HERE mentioned is the history of the descendants of Nephthali! The King James Version Bible (KJV) was authorized by King James I and is sometimes referred to as the "Authorized Version". It was translated by the Church of England and was first published in 1611. The KJV New Testament was translated from the Textus Receptus. However, the majority of the book of Revelation seems to have been translated from the Latin Vulgate. The KJV Old Testament was translated from the Masoretic Hebrew text, and the Apocrypha was translated from the Greek Septuagint. Several versions of the King James Bible (KJV) were produced in 1611, 1629, 1638, 1762, and 1769. The 1769 Holy Bible King James Version with Apocrypha: KJV 1611 Original Edition (Old Testament + Apocrypha + New Testament). by King James and God | Jun 15, 2020. 3.2 out of 5 stars 7. Paperback. The Bible: Authorized King James Version with Apocrypha: Published by Oxford University Press; ISBN: 0192835254 (Pub. Date: July 1998). KJV Standard Reference Edition With Apocrypha: Published by Cambridge Univ Pr (Bibles); ISBN: 0521509467; Slipcase edition (Pub. Date: August 1997). 1611 Edition: a reprint of the 1611 KJV With Apocrypha, Published by Nelson Bible; ISBN: 0840700415; Reissue edition (Pub. Date: June 1, 1982). The "Apocrypha" was officially removed from the English printings of the KJV by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1885 leaving only 66 books. There was a Preface written for the original King James Bible, which is mysteriously missing from that work: The Translator's Preface. Apocrypha KJV (King James Version) from the 1611 King James Version of the Bible, provided as reference. Keep this in mind when reading the following apocryphal books. Martin Luther said, "Apocrypha--that is, books which are not regarded as equal to the holy Scriptures, and yet are profitable and good to read." (King James Version Defended page 98.)