

Renaissance and Reformation Renaissance et Réforme



The Battle of Two Bibles: When and How Did the King James Bible Gain Its Popularity over the Geneva Bible?

Hsing-Hao Chao

Volume 46, numéro 2, printemps 2023

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1109438ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v46i2.42289>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (imprimé)

2293-7374 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Chao, H.-H. (2023). The Battle of Two Bibles: When and How Did the King James Bible Gain Its Popularity over the Geneva Bible? *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 46(2), 71–105. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v46i2.42289>

Résumé de l'article

Cet article répond à deux questions : quand la Bible du roi Jacques a-t-elle gagné en popularité parmi les Anglais et comment la Bible de Genève a-t-elle perdu sa popularité au profit de la Bible du roi Jacques ? En passant en revue les éditions de ces deux versions de la Bible postérieures à 1611 et en examinant les textes de la prédication de la Croix de saint Paul et les sermons parlementaires de 1612 à 1643, nous constatons que la Bible du roi Jacques était déjà plus en vogue que la Bible de Genève en 1620, et que la montée en popularité de la Bible du roi Jacques était devenue irréversible en 1630. En 1640, la bataille des deux Bibles était terminée depuis longtemps. Nous réfutons également l'hypothèse selon laquelle l'interdiction de la Bible de Genève par les autorités politiques aurait entraîné sa chute. Nous soutenons plutôt que la diminution de la demande des consommateurs pour les notes exégétiques a conduit à la disparition de la Bible de Genève.

© Hsing-Hao Chao, 2024



Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>

The Battle of Two Bibles: When and How Did the King James Bible Gain Its Popularity over the Geneva Bible?*

HSING-HAO CHAO

National Taichung University of Education

This article addresses two questions: “When did the King James Bible gain a foothold of popularity among the English people?” and “How did the Geneva Bible lose its popularity to the King James Bible?” By reviewing the post-1611 printing of these two versions of the Bible and examining the texts of the Paul’s Cross sermons and the parliamentary sermons between 1612 and 1643, I find that the King James Bible was already more popular than the Geneva Bible by 1620, and that the rising trend of the popularity of the King James Bible had become irreversible by 1630. By 1640, the battle of the two Bibles was long over. I also refute the assumption that the political authorities’ suppression of the Geneva Bible caused its defeat. Rather, I argue that the decrease in consumer demand for exegetical notes led to the demise of the Geneva Bible.

Cet article répond à deux questions : quand la Bible du roi Jacques a-t-elle gagné en popularité parmi les Anglais et comment la Bible de Genève a-t-elle perdu sa popularité au profit de la Bible du roi Jacques ? En passant en revue les éditions de ces deux versions de la Bible postérieures à 1611 et en examinant les textes de la prédication de la Croix de saint Paul et les sermons parlementaires de 1612 à 1643, nous constatons que la Bible du roi Jacques était déjà plus en vogue que la Bible de Genève en 1620, et que la montée en popularité de la Bible du roi Jacques était devenue irréversible en 1630. En 1640, la bataille des deux Bibles était terminée depuis longtemps. Nous réfutons également l’hypothèse selon laquelle l’interdiction de la Bible de Genève par les autorités politiques aurait entraîné sa chute. Nous soutenons plutôt que la diminution de la demande des consommateurs pour les notes exégétiques a conduit à la disparition de la Bible de Genève.

The King James Bible has been the most influential English Bible throughout history. After its first publication in 1611 (DMH 309),¹ no new versions of the English Bible were published until 1881. Gordon Campbell calls it “the most celebrated book in the English-speaking world,”² and Alan Thomas holds that

* The author would like to acknowledge funding support from the National Science Council of Taiwan (NSC 100-2410-H-142-021).

1. In this article, the Bible catalogue numbers are based on A. S. Herbert’s *Historical Catalogue*, revised and expanded from Darlow and Moule’s 1903 edition. This catalogue is hereinafter referred to as DMH.

2. Campbell, *Bible*, 1.

“[n]o book has had greater influence on the English language.”³ But before the appearance of the King James Bible, the Geneva Bible was “the household Bible of Elizabethan English Protestants.”⁴ This article thus addresses two questions: “When did the King James Bible gain a foothold of popularity among the English people?” and “How did the Geneva Bible lose its popularity to the King James Bible?”

First, a brief history of the sixteenth-century English translations of the Bible will facilitate my discussion of the battle of the two Bibles to follow. The lineage of the King James Bible can be traced back to William Tyndale, who from 1525 to 1535 published his English translation of the New Testament⁵ and parts of the Old Testament.⁶ The first complete English Bible was published by Miles Coverdale, a friend of Tyndale’s, in 1535.⁷ In 1537, John Rogers, also a friend of Tyndale’s, published a complete English Bible in Antwerp under the cover name of Thomas Matthew. The Matthew Bible is a compilation of the Tyndale Bible and the Coverdale Bible.⁸ In 1538, the Church of England issued the Second Royal Injunctions for the clergy to set up “the holy bible of the

3. Thomas, *Great Books*, 110.

4. McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 100. Also see Westcott, *General View*, 93; Butterworth, *Literary Lineage*, 163.

5. The earliest extant copy of Tyndale’s translation of the Bible is the Gospel of Matthew, printed in Cologne in 1525 (DMH 1). The first complete edition of Tyndale’s New Testament was published in Worms in 1526 (DMH 2). A revision of the New Testament was published in Antwerp in 1534 (DMH 13), and a revised version of the 1534 edition was also printed in Antwerp in 1535 (DMH 15). For details, see Daniell, *Bible in English*, 143–52.

6. Tyndale’s English translation of the Pentateuch was published in 1530 (DMH 4), and a slightly revised version of the 1530 Pentateuch was printed in 1534 (DMH 8). His Book of Jonah was published in 1531 (DMH 6). All three versions were published in Antwerp. For details, see Daniell, introduction to *Tyndale’s Old Testament*, ix–xi.

7. DMH 18. It was very likely published in Antwerp (Daniell, *Bible in English*, 179). The Pentateuch, Jonah, and the New Testament of Coverdale’s Bible were revised from Tyndale’s translations. As for the other books, Coverdale consulted the Vulgate, Luther’s Zurich Bible, and/or Erasmus’s Latin version (Greenslade, “English Versions,” 148–49).

8. DMH 34. The Pentateuch and the New Testament are taken from the Tyndale Bible (1534 editions), and the books from Ezra to Malachi are Coverdale’s. The books from Joshua to 2 Chronicles are presumably Tyndale’s, though not previously published. For details, see Daniell, introduction to *Tyndale’s Old Testament*, xxv–xxvi.

largest volume in English” in every parish.⁹ In 1539, Coverdale produced the “Great” Bible by revising the Matthew Bible.¹⁰ The Great Bible was the first “authorized” Bible; on the title page of the second edition published in April 1540 appeared the words: “the Bible appointed to the use of the churches.”¹¹

In 1560, the Marian exiles published a complete English Bible in Geneva.¹² The Geneva New Testament is a revision of William Whittingham’s 1557 edition, also published in Geneva.¹³ As far as the Geneva Old Testament is concerned, the books from Genesis to 2 Chronicles were based on the Great Bible,¹⁴ while the other books “were translated from the Hebrew into English by no one else before 1560.”¹⁵

In 1561, Queen Elizabeth granted John Bodley an exclusive patent to print the Geneva Bible for seven years, provided it be in the edition approved by the bishops of Canterbury and London.¹⁶ However, Archbishop Matthew Parker disliked the marginal notes of the Geneva Bible, denigrating them as “prejudicial” and “bitter.”¹⁷ Parker thus undertook a project of revising the Great Bible, instructing the bishops responsible for the translations to consult the Hebrew and Greek originals.¹⁸ In 1568, the first issue of the version known as the Bishops’ Bible was published¹⁹ and succeeded the Great Bible as the “authorised” Bible for official use in the Church of England.²⁰

9. Church of England, *Injunctions for the Clergy*. In this article, all early modern English spellings have been modernized.

10. DMH 46.

11. DMH 53.

12. DMH 107.

13. DMH 106.

14. Daniell, *Bible in English*, 296–97.

15. Daniell, *Bible in English*, 314.

16. The licence is reprinted in Pollard, *Records*, 284–85.

17. See Parker’s letter to Queen Elizabeth on 5 October 1568 and “Observations respected of the Translators,” both reprinted in Pollard, *Records*, 295 and 297, respectively.

18. Pollard, *Records*, 297.

19. DMH 125.

20. The title page of the 1574 folio edition has “Set forth by authority” (DMH 137). The title page of the 1584 folio edition has “authorised to be read in Churches” (DMH 185). After 1585, all folio editions of the Bishops’ Bible bear the following on the title page: “authorised and appointed to be read in Churches” (DMH 188, 198, 209, 227, 271).

Shortly after Parker's death in May 1575, Christopher Barker acquired a patent from the Privy Council to print the Geneva Bible, which he began to publish in England.²¹ In 1577, Barker purchased a portion of the Office of the Royal Printer²² so he could print both the Geneva Bible and the Bishops' Bible, but the statistics show that the Bishops' Bible was not as popular as the Geneva Bible. From its first printing in 1576 to the appearance of the King James Bible in 1611, eighty-one editions of the complete Geneva Bible were published in England, while only eleven editions of the complete Bishops' Bible were printed during that same period.²³

When the Hampton Court Conference was convened in 1604, John Reynolds, the leader of the Puritan representatives, proposed to King James that a new translation of the Bible be produced.²⁴ The king agreed and assigned Richard Bancroft to oversee the translation project, hoping that the "whole church to be bound unto [the new translation], and none other."²⁵ Bancroft commanded that the translation be a revision based on the Bishops' Bible.²⁶ In 1611, the first edition of the King James Bible was off the press.²⁷ It is noteworthy that the King James Bible was not officially "authorized," even though it has been generally referred to as the "Authorized Version."²⁸

When did the King James Bible gain its popularity over the Geneva Bible?

It has been suggested that the popularity of the King James Bible (KJB) did not come easy. Alister McGrath claims that when the King James Bible first appeared, "people preferred to use an English translation from fifty years

21. King and Pratt, "English Printed Bibles," 80.

22. Daniell, *Bible in English*, 453.

23. My calculations are based on DMH, and I follow Ian Green in counting what DMH terms "another edition" or "variety" as separate editions (Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 674).

24. Barlow, *Sum and Substance*, 45.

25. Quoted in Barlow, *Sum and Substance*, 46.

26. Scholars have generally agreed that the 1602 Bishops' Bible (DMH 271) was the base text for the 1611 King James Bible (Daniell, *Bible in English*, 443; Nicolson, *God's Secretaries*, 151).

27. Published by Robert Barker, who held the Office of the King's Printer at the accession of James I in 1603. Robert Barker inherited his father's (Christopher Barker) printing house upon his death in 1599 with an exclusive patent to print all the Bibles in English (including the Geneva Bible). For details, see Daniell, *Bible in English*, 453.

28. Daniell, *Bible in English*, 428–29; Norton, *History*, 93; Ryken, *Word of God*, 50.

earlier—the Geneva Bible.”²⁹ Hannibal Hamlin and Norman Jones state that “the KJB was not particularly well received in 1611 or for some decades thereafter,”³⁰ and Dean Lampros maintains that the Geneva Bible “remained the Bible used in most English-speaking households” long after the appearance of the King James Bible.³¹ To evaluate the theory of the “slow” acceptance of the King James Bible, I will first survey the history of the publication of the two Bible versions after 1611 and then inspect the scriptural quotations in the printed sermons of early Stuart England.

Post-1611 printing of the Geneva Bible and the King James Bible

After 1611, only six editions of the complete Geneva Bible were printed in England—a folio in 1612, a quarto in 1614, three quartos in 1615, and a folio in 1616.³² In the same period, twenty-one editions of the complete King James Bible were published.³³ The figures above support Graham Rees’s argument: “after 1611 [the King James Bible] quickly superseded the Geneva Bible, the fall of the latter coinciding with the early and most intense phase of KJB production.”³⁴

The King’s Printers stopped printing the Geneva Bible after 1616. Yet, some scholars believe that the Geneva Bible remained popular in England after 1616 because the Dutch printers continued to issue large quantities of the Geneva Bible and successfully imported them back to England.³⁵ Nevertheless, according to DMH, only ten or eleven editions of the Geneva Bible were published in Holland after 1616.³⁶ In contrast, 135 editions of the complete King

29. McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 278.

30. Hamlin and Jones, introduction to *King James Bible*, 7.

31. Lampros, “New Set of Spectacles,” 33–34.

32. DMH 312, 330, 340–42, 348.

33. DMH 313–16, 319–26, 331–35, 339, 343, 347, 349.

34. Rees, “King’s Printers’ Bible Monopoly,” 20.

35. See, for example, Daniell, *Bible in English*, 458.

36. In addition to three Geneva editions bearing an Amsterdam imprint—DMH 473 (1633), 545 (1640), and 579 (1644)—some seven or eight 1599 Geneva editions carry a false London imprint. The Short Title Catalogue (STC) identifies seven variant editions of this 1599 edition (STC 2174–80), but DMH identifies eight editions (DMH 248–55). DMH suggests that the “nominal date, 1599, is probably untrue in almost every case” (Herbert, *Catalogue*, 115). Concerning the seven editions identified by the STC, A. E. Johnson proposes that six of them (STC 2174–79; DMH 248–49, 251–54) were printed in Holland

James Bible were printed in England between 1617 and 1644.³⁷ Accordingly, it is fair to conclude that demand for the Geneva Bible dramatically shrank soon after the appearance of the King James Bible.³⁸ Moreover, it is also reasonable to suggest that the importation of the Geneva Bible from Holland mainly accounted for the replacement of old worn copies rather than the accumulation of new ones.

If the Geneva Bible was the household Bible of Elizabethan England, the household Bible of Stuart England was the King James Bible. Between 1611 and 1644, 157 editions of the complete King James Bible were printed in England, averaging 4.62 editions per annum—as much as twice the figure of the complete Geneva Bible (averaging 2.25 editions per annum) printed between 1576 and 1611.³⁹ Of the 157 editions, only twelve were folios,⁴⁰ which indicates that household demand accounted for the majority of the printing of the King James Bible because folio bibles were mainly placed in churches, while smaller bibles were used by individuals.

Scriptural quotations in early Stuart sermons

Some critics have argued that the Geneva Bible still enjoyed considerable popularity after the appearance of the King James Bible on the grounds that the Geneva text is found in sermons preached after 1611. The most frequently

after 1628 by J. F. Stam, the printer of DMH 473, and that the other (STC 2180; DMH 255) was printed by a printer who copied Stam or vice versa (Johnson, “J. F. Stam,” 192).

37. The figure does not include eight editions published in Scotland (DMH 476–77, 494, 510–12, 522, 578) nor seven editions possibly printed in Holland (DMH 399, 528–32, 582).

38. Crawford Gribben claims that “[o]ver sixty editions of the Geneva translation (some of the New Testament only) were published after the [Authorized Version] first appeared” (Gribben, “Deconstructing the Geneva Bible,” 3–4), but, unfortunately, he does not specify how he comes up with this figure. In fact, as indicated in notes 32 and 36 above, no more than seventeen editions of the complete Geneva Bible were printed between 1612 and 1644. Moreover, only four editions of the Geneva New Testament were printed after 1612 (DMH 327, 329, 346, 351). DHM identifies no. 371 (published in 1619) as a Geneva New Testament, but Naseeb Shaheen identifies DMH 371 with STC 2918.7, which is not a Geneva version but a Bishops’ New Testament (Shaheen, *Biblical References*, 13). In contrast, forty-eight editions of the King James New Testament were published between 1612 and 1644.

39. $81 \div 36 = 2.25$.

40. Forty-four quartos, eighty-one octavos, and twenty duodecimos.

mentioned example is Randall Davidson's study.⁴¹ Davidson claims that he examined Biblical quotations in more than fifty sermons preached between 1611 and 1630 and concludes that "[i]n twenty-seven of these sermons the preacher takes his text from the Genevan Version, and in five from the Bishops' Bible. Of the remainder, only about one half quote from the Authorised Version."⁴² In other words, over 50 per cent of the sermons use the Geneva Bible, while less than 25 per cent use the King James Bible.

Davidson's statement has been uncritically accepted by many later scholars.⁴³ However, Davidson does not specify the sermons he surveys, so it is difficult to evaluate his conclusion, which is, in my opinion, questionable. The first question is about Davidson's sampling method. Davidson states that "[a]mong those who preach from the Genevan Version are the following: Bishop Andrewes (in 1618–22–23–24); William Laud, then Bishop Designate of St. David's (in 1621); Bishop Carleton, of Chichester (in 1624); Bishop Hall (in 1613 and 1624); [and] Dean Williams, of Salisbury (in 1619)."⁴⁴ But we do not know why these preachers were selected or how many of their sermons were inspected. Selection bias might have occurred if the preachers under study were not randomly selected. Another question is about the trend of the use of a specific version. It is reasonable to expect an upward trend in the use of the King James Bible during the two decades in question, but Davidson does not provide any information about that trend.

I intend to reinvestigate Davidson's findings by using the Paul's Cross sermons preached in the same period as a sample group. Established in the thirteenth century, the open-air pulpit outside St. Paul's Cathedral known as Paul's Cross had been a bustling public space. It became "London's pulpit of pulpits,"⁴⁵ or even a "national pulpit,"⁴⁶ during the Reformation, and the Paul's Cross sermon can be seen as an "occasion for the gathering of the nation in

41. Davidson, "Authorisation," 436–44.

42. Davidson, "Authorisation," 441. Davidson does not define the "text," but it most likely refers to the sermon epigraph (Feingold, "Birth and Early Reception," 12).

43. Berry, introduction to *Geneva Bible*, 19; Daniell, *Bible in English*, 295; Danner, "Later English Calvinists," 502; Greenslade, "English Versions," 168; Pollard, *Records*, 66; Westcott, *General View*, 107.

44. Davidson, "Authorisation," 441.

45. Kirby, "Public Sermon," 6.

46. Collinson, *Birthpangs*, 20; McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 1; Morrissey, *Politics*, 68.

microcosm.”⁴⁷ Thus, I believe that the Paul’s Cross sermons serve as a good, representative sample of the English sermon in the early Stuart period.

Drawing on Millar MacLure’s register of the Paul’s Cross sermons,⁴⁸ I manage to find ninety printed sermons from Early English Books Online (EEBO) as my data source: forty-five from 1612 to 1620 and forty-five from 1621 to 1630. It should be noted that a preacher is not bound to quote from a specific English Bible version throughout a sermon. Sometimes a preacher quotes from different versions in a sermon, including non-English versions (the Vulgate as well as the Hebrew or Greek originals), and sometimes he does not follow any existing versions. In order to compare my findings with Davidson’s, I will focus on the scriptural epigraphs affixed to the sermons, for Davidson’s calculation is probably based on the sermon epigraphs, as mentioned above.⁴⁹

As far as the forty-five sermons preached between 1612 and 1620 are concerned,⁵⁰ seven sermon epigraphs do not match the texts of the Geneva

47. Wall, “Virtual Paul’s Cross,” 77.

48. Although MacLure’s listing is incomplete, “the omissions are random and do not detract from its representative character,” as Nicholas Tyacke notes (Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 248).

49. MacLure takes the sermon epigraph as the “text.” Alison Knight’s study of Lancelot Andrews’s use of Scripture in his sermons is also based on an analysis of the epigraphs (Knight, “(Mis)quoting Scripture,” 448).

50. Between 1612 and 1620, there are sixty-nine entries listed in MacLure’s register, but only fifty-three of them are printed sermons. (Sixteen of them are references to sermons preached but lost or not printed, including George Warberton’s sermon of 3 April 1618, which is incorporated into Daniel Featley’s rehearsal sermon of 12 April 1618.) I do not include John Hoskins’s 1614 rehearsal sermon (STC 13841), for it is incomplete, nor do I include Thomas Walkington’s *Rabboni* (1620, STC 24970), for it only notes John 20:16 as its text but does not quote the verse. I exclude five sermons printed many years after their delivery, for the texts were possibly edited much later and do not necessarily represent those used by the preachers at the time when they were delivered: Gryffith Williams’s *The Resolution of Pilate* (delivered in 1614 but printed in 1635, STC 25718), Daniel Featley’s “The Angel of Thyatira Endited” (delivered in 1614) and 1618 rehearsal sermon “The Spouse Her Precious Borders,” both of which are included in *Clavis Mystica* (1636, STC 10730), John Donne’s Accession Day sermon of 1617 (included in *XXVI Sermons*, 1661, Wing D1872), and John Fosbroke’s *England’s Warning by Israel and Judah* (delivered in 1617 but printed in 1633, STC 11100). Nathaniel Bownd’s *Saint Pauls Trumpet* (1615, STC 3435.6) is not included in this article, for I do not find it in EEBO. I also do not include the sermons printed in this period but with uncertain years of delivery. Nathaniel Kitchener’s sermon on 10 July 1614 (STC 14948) does not include an epigraph, and, according to MacLure, the title page extract (Luke 21:28) is the text. For the complete results of my analysis, see Appendix 1 below.

Version⁵¹ or the King James Version.⁵² Of the remaining thirty-eight epigraphs, eleven can be unmistakably identified as quotes from the Geneva Version; twelve are epigraphs quoted from the King James Version; three are epigraphs that follow the Geneva Version with a slight variation (difference in only one or two words); and five are epigraphs that follow the King James Version with a slight variation. In other words, fourteen epigraphs are taken from the Geneva Version with no or little variation, and seventeen are taken from the King James Version with no or little variation. As for the other seven epigraphs, the texts of the two versions are identical, so I proceed to examine the scriptural extracts on the title page. I find that one is from the Geneva Version, two are from the King James Version, one is from the King James Version with a slight variation, and three are without title page scriptural extracts. Therefore, my analysis of the sermon epigraphs and the title page scriptural extracts concludes that fifteen sermons (33.33 per cent) follow the Geneva Version with no or little variation, twenty (44.43 per cent) follow the King James Version with no or little variation, seven (15.56 per cent) follow neither the Geneva Version nor the King James Version, and three (6.67 per cent) are undetermined. In other words, the texts from the King James Version are used 1.33 times more often than those from the Geneva Version.⁵³ Consequently, my evidence reaches a conclusion opposite to that of Davidson: the King James Version was already more popular than the Geneva Version in the sermons by 1620.

Using the same research method to analyze the forty-five printed Paul's Cross sermons preached between 1621 and 1630,⁵⁴ I find that six sermons

51. There are three Geneva versions: the original Geneva version, the Geneva–Tomson version, and the Geneva–Tomson–Junius version. My analysis is based on the original Geneva Bible, for it was the most popular Geneva version (King and Pratt, “English Printed Bibles,” 86).

52. My analysis is based on the 1611 version (DMH 309).

53. $20 \div 15 = 1.33$.

54. According to MacLure's register, there were fifty printed sermons preached between 1621 and 1630, including John Grent's *The Burthen of Tyre* (1627, STC 12360), which, according to MacLure, was preached in the 1620s (MacLure, *Register of Sermons*, 143). I find that the text for Robert Sanderson's 1624 sermon is 1 Timothy 4:14, not 1 Peter 2:16, as MacLure notes (MacLure, *Register of Sermons*, 126), and the text for his 1627 sermon is Genesis 20:6, which is not noted by MacLure. (Both sermons are printed together in *Two Sermons* in 1628, STC 21709.) I exclude four sermons printed many years after their delivery: a sermon by an anonymous bishop (preached on 16 April 1625 but printed in 1653, Wing S2631) and three sermons by John Donne (preached on 5 November 1622, 6 May 1627, and 22 November 1629, all of which are included in *Fifty Sermons*, 1649, Wing D1862). I do not find

(13.33 per cent) follow the Geneva Version with no or little variation, twenty-six (57.78 per cent) following the King James Version with no or little variation,⁵⁵ three (6.67 per cent) following neither of the two versions, and ten (22.22 per cent) are undetermined.⁵⁶ The texts from the King James Version are 4.3 times more numerous than those from the Geneva Version.⁵⁷ My research indicates that the King James Version already led the Geneva Version by a significant margin in the battleground of the Paul's Cross sermon by 1630.⁵⁸

The Paul's Cross sermon after 1630, however, lost its popularity.⁵⁹ Only fourteen sermons preached between 1631 and 1640 survive in print, around a third of the figures of the 1610s and 1620s.⁶⁰ Of the fourteen sermon epigraphs, three follow the King James Version verbatim, three follow the King James Version with a slight variation, one follows the Geneva Version verbatim, and seven are undetermined (one follows neither of the two versions, and six

Henry Goodcole's *The Good Treasurer* (1623, STC 12009.5). For the complete results of my analysis, see Appendix 2.

55. The number includes the two sermons—nos. 35 (STC 6607.5) and 36 (STC 12514)—whose epigraph texts are identical in both versions but whose title page scriptural extracts are from the King James Version.

56. There are twelve sermons whose epigraph texts are identical in both versions, and two of them use the King James Version in the title page scriptural extracts, as mentioned in the previous note. The remaining ten sermons are undetermined, for the title page scriptural extracts of two of them—nos. 14 (STC 18321) and 41 (STC 5676)—are taken from neither of the two versions, and eight sermons have no title page scriptural extracts.

57. $26 \div 6 = 4.3$.

58. My findings also correspond to Daniel Featley and William Gouge's testimony of the massive popularity of the King James Bible in 1630. In their prefatory remarks to Clement Cotton's *Complete Concordance* (1630, STC 5844), Featley and Gouge claim that the King James Bible "is publicly read in Churches, and in all families" (sig. A5v) and "is now most in use" (sig. A6v).

59. Mary Morrissey suggests two reasons for the decline of the status of the Paul's Cross sermon in the 1630s: the diminishment of the calibre of the preachers and the transfer of the sermons into the choir of the cathedral in 1634 due to the renovation of the cathedral (Morrissey, *Politics*, 34, 223).

60. I include William Evans's *The Christian Conflict and Conquest* (1636, STC 10595) on the grounds that, according to its title page, it was delivered on 19 July 1635, though MacLure believes it was preached before 1637 with uncertain date (MacLure, *Register of Sermons*, 145). I do not count the two sermons printed many years after their deliveries: William Laud's Accession Day sermon of 1631 (printed in 1645, Wing L579) and John Hales's "Of Dealing with Erring Christians" (preached c. 1637 but included in *Golden Remains*, 1659, Wing H269). I also exclude John Gore's *The Oracle of God* delivered on 20 December 1635 (STC 12071), for it was preached in the cathedral.

are identical in both versions). I further examine the title pages of the seven undetermined sermons and find only three scriptural extracts: one follows the King James Version, one follows the Geneva Version with a slight variation, and one follows neither of the two versions. Accordingly, as far as the epigraphs and title page extracts of these fourteen sermons are concerned, seven follow the King James Version with no or little variation, two follow the Geneva Version with no or little variation, and five are undetermined.⁶¹

Then, I proceed to examine the scriptural quotations in the remaining five sermons to determine what versions were used by their respective preachers.⁶² It is noteworthy that a preacher is not bound to use a specific version throughout his whole sermon, as mentioned earlier. I find that three sermons use the King James Version but not the Geneva Version, one uses the Geneva Version but not the King James Version, and one uses both versions.⁶³ Considered together, of the fourteen printed Paul's Cross sermons preached between 1631 and 1640, ten sermons use the King James Version, three use the Geneva Version, and one is undetermined. The occurrence of texts from the King James Version are 3.3 times more numerous than those from the Geneva Version.⁶⁴

After the demolition of Paul's Cross, the most important pulpit in London moved to Parliament. According to John Wilson,⁶⁵ more than 200 sermons preached to members of Parliament between 1640 and 1653 survive in print. In view of the fact that the last edition of the Geneva Bible was published in 1644, I choose the parliamentary sermons preached between 1640 and 1643 from Wilson's list as my data source.⁶⁶ Of the seventy-eight parliamentary sermons preached during that period, sixty-four sermon epigraphs are taken from the King James Version with no or little variation, only one sermon epigraph is taken from the Geneva Version,⁶⁷ ten are identical in both versions, and three follow neither of the two versions. Then I proceed to examine the title page

61. For the complete results of my analysis, see Appendix 3A.

62. I only count verbatim quotes.

63. For the complete results of my analysis, see Appendix 3B.

64. $10 \div 3 = 3.3$.

65. See Appendix 2 in J. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament*, 255–74.

66. I exclude the two non-sermon speeches delivered by Alexander Henderson and Philip Nye on 25 September 1643 for the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant. For the complete results of my analysis, see Appendix 4.

67. No. 47: W. Bridges's *Joab's Counsel* (Wing B4483A).

scriptural extracts of the undetermined thirteen sermons and find that one sermon uses its epigraph as the title page extract, six sermons do not contain title page extracts, and the other six sermons' title page extracts are all taken from the King James Version with little or no variation. In conclusion, the battle between the Geneva Version and the King James Version was already over by 1640.

To sum up, my examination of 182 printed sermons preached between 1612 and 1643 has shown that the King James Version had gained the upper hand in its battle against the Geneva Version by 1620. The King James Version continued to extend its lead in the next two decades: it had gained a foothold of popularity by 1630, and its victory had been secured by 1640. My analysis of the use of the Geneva Bible and the King James Bible in the early Stuart sermons also corroborates my conclusion drawn from the survey of the publication of the two versions of the same period: the King James Version's acceptance by the general public was by no means "slow."

How did the King James Bible defeat the Geneva Bible?

Some people believe that the King James Bible won the battle against the Geneva Bible by sheer merit. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch acclaims the literary achievement of the King James Version (KJV) as "one of the greatest in [English]; nay, with the possible exception of the complete works of Shakespeare, the very greatest."⁶⁸ William Lyon Phelps is "confident that the Authorised Version was inspired" and argues that it "is even better than the original Hebrew and Greek." It is "the best Bible in the world" and "the most beautiful monument ever erected with the English alphabet."⁶⁹ H. L. Mencken praises the King James Bible as "the most beautiful of all the translations of the Bible" and "probably the most beautiful piece of writing in all the literature of the world."⁷⁰ Charles Allen Dinsmore maintains that the King James Version "is unlike any other book in [English] and in charm and power is above them all."⁷¹ Leland Ryken claims that "[s]tylistically, the KJV is the greatest English Bible translation

68. Quiller-Couch, *Art of Reading*, 163.

69. Phelps, *Human Nature*, xi.

70. Mencken, *Treatise on the Gods*, 243.

71. Dinsmore, *English Bible as Literature*, vi.

ever produced,” and that “the excellence of the KJV allowed it to supplant the popular Geneva Bible within three or four decades of its appearance.”⁷²

However, the impressionistic take on the “beauty” and “excellence” of the King James Version is dubious. In fact, in terms of translation, the Geneva Bible and the King James Bible are very similar. It is estimated that the similarity percentage between the two versions is about 86 per cent regarding both the Old and New Testaments.⁷³ Gerald Hammond observes that the language of the Geneva Bible was “so good that it might reasonably have stood as the definitive English version, in the way that the Authorized Version was destined to do for three hundred years.”⁷⁴ Furthermore, another fact also reveals that the King James Version did not owe its popularity to its “better” text. As far as the New Testament is concerned, the King James Bible resembles the Bishops’ Bible more than the Geneva Bible. The similarity percentage between the King James New Testament and the Bishops’ New Testament is estimated to be about 90 per cent, while the similarity percentage between the King James New Testament and the Geneva New Testament is estimated to be only about 86 per cent.⁷⁵ Thus, if the text of the King James Bible is really “better” than the Geneva Bible, then the Bishops’ New Testament would have beaten the Geneva New Testament before the King James Bible joined the battle. However, from 1575⁷⁶ to 1611, editions of the Geneva New Testament significantly outnumbered those of the Bishops’ New Testament by over two to one: thirty-four editions of the Geneva New Testament were published,⁷⁷ while only fifteen editions of the Bishops’ New Testament were printed.⁷⁸ Consequently, I suggest that the textual difference played no significant role in the battle between the two versions.⁷⁹

In fact, multiple scholars argue that the King James Bible won the battle with the aid of the political authorities’ suppression of the Geneva Bible. They

72. Ryken, *Word of God*, 51.

73. Chao, “Most Immediate Predecessor,” 197.

74. Hammond, *Making of the English Bible*, 137.

75. Chao, “Most Immediate Predecessor,” 197.

76. The Geneva New Testament was first published separately in England in 1575 (DMH 141).

77. DMH 141, 146–47, 152–53, 156, 166–68, 175, 180, 189, 192–93, 196, 203–4, 207, 213, 216–17, 231, 239–40, 242, 246, 260, 267, 272, 278–79, 299, 305, 311.

78. DMH 142, 157, 163, 172, 176, 228, 232, 241, 245, 259, 282–84, 288, 297.

79. Lampros and Norton also hold that most readers did not care much about the textual differences between the two versions (Lampros, “New Set of Spectacles,” 33; Norton, *History*, 92).

maintain that the Geneva Bible did not lose the war so much to the King James Bible as to the authorities. This view can be best summarized by David Norton, who claims that “in fair competition [the King James Bible] would probably have lost, but its supporters had foul means at their disposal.”⁸⁰ What follows is divided into two parts: first, I will reassess the suppression theory, and then I will propose my own theory of the demise of the Geneva Bible.

The suppression theory

It has been contended that the publishing of the King James Bible was politically motivated in the first place. Christopher Hill maintains that “[t]he decision to have an ‘Authorized Version’ was consciously political.”⁸¹ David Daniell holds that “the inception [...] of the 1611 KJV was a political act by reactionary bishops against Geneva Bibles.”⁸² Alister McGrath contends that the king’s “secret agenda was to destroy, discredit, or displace” the Geneva Bible.⁸³ David Norton proposes that “[t]he Church and the State were not so much for the KJB, or ever for a uniform Bible, as they were against the Geneva Bible.”⁸⁴ Their arguments are primarily based on the king’s condemnation of the Geneva Bible’s marginal annotations at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604. The king specifically commanded that “no marginal notes should be added” to the new translation, for he complained that some of the Geneva Bible’s notes were “very partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous, and traitorous conceits.” He gave two examples to explain his concerns: “*Exod.* 1.19. where the marginal note alloweth *disobedience to Kings*. And *2.Chron.* 15.16. the note taxeth *Asa* for deposing his mother, *only*, and *not killing* her.”⁸⁵ Thus, it has been argued that the king suppressed the printing of the Geneva Bible in England⁸⁶ even though the injunction has not been found.⁸⁷

80. Norton, *History*, 91.

81. Hill, *English Bible*, 63.

82. Daniell, *Bible in English*, 294.

83. McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 129.

84. Norton, *History*, 93.

85. Quoted in Barlow, *Sum and Substance*, 46–47.

86. See Pollard, *Records*, 73; Lampros, “New Set of Spectacles,” 33; McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 280; Nicolson, *God’s Secretaries*, 228; Molekamp, “Legacies of Reading Practices,” 21–22.

87. Fincham, “King James Bible,” 94.

However, James's comments on the "seditious" nature of the Geneva Bible's notes are peculiar in two respects. First, the king's antipathy toward the Geneva marginalia was nowhere to be found except at the Hampton Court Conference. It is curious that James did not express his aversion to those seditious notes at the 1601 General Assembly of Scotland, where he "earnestly" urged a new translation of the Bible. At that assembly, James mentioned "sundry escapes" in the Geneva translation, especially the "faults of the meter" of the translation of the Psalms, yet made no comments on its notes.⁸⁸ Moreover, if James really hated those notes, why did he not order the royal printing house to stop printing the Geneva Bible right after the completion of the King James Bible? Kenneth Fincham in a recent article argues that the king's enthusiasm in producing a new English version did not last long.⁸⁹ By 1611, "James I's attention had switched to other, more pressing matters," contends Fincham.⁹⁰ In conclusion, it seems that the Geneva notes did not bother James that much.

Second, the association of the Geneva Bible's notes with anti-royalist propaganda is questionable. The fact that some of the Geneva Bible's marginal notes are characterized with anti-monarchism does not make it an anti-authoritarian document. Many of the Geneva Bible's anti-royalist notes were also incorporated into the Bishops' Bible.⁹¹ For example, both versions' notes to the two verses mentioned by James at the Hampton Court are strikingly similar: they both praise the midwives' disobedience to the pharaoh⁹² and upbraid Asa for sparing Maachah's life.⁹³ In other words, the Geneva Bible is no more anti-monarchical than the Bishops' Bible. Consequently, if James really resented the two notes in the Geneva Bible, he should have also expressed the same

88. Spotswood, *History*, 465.

89. Fincham insists that Richard Bancroft was the key figure for seeing the translation through to completion, and that "his death in 1610 may account for the absence of an official requirement that parishes buy the [King James] Bible" (Fincham, "King James Bible," 82).

90. Fincham, "King James Bible," 82.

91. In this article, I use the 1602 Bishops' Bible (DMH 271), for it was the latest Bishops' Bible Version when James called the Hampton Court Conference.

92. Exod. 1:19. The Geneva Bible: "Their disobedience herein was lawful." The Bishops' Bible: "It was better to obey God than man."

93. 2 Chron. 15:16. The Geneva Bible: "Herein he shewed that he lacked zeal, for she ought to have died both by the covenant, and by the Law of God." The Bishops' Bible: "Herein he shewed that he lacked zeal, for she ought to have died both by the covenant and law of God."

animosity against the Bishops' Bible. In fact, the concept of disobedience to kings lies not so much in the marginal notes as in the scriptural texts. Therefore, I agree with Gerald Hammond, who holds that "James's comments were a misrepresentation. In essence the Geneva Bible's notes [...] seldom glance at anything which could be considered seditious."⁹⁴ As Daniell contends, "That the Geneva marginal notes are 'bitter' and 'regrettable' is plain wrong."⁹⁵

Moreover, it has been pointed out that most of the Geneva notes are not politically charged. According to Daniell, "[a]bout three-quarters of the notes to the Old Testament, and half to the New, are simple definition."⁹⁶ Ian Green also observes that most of the Geneva notes are "exegetical rather than controversial."⁹⁷

If the association between the Geneva notes and anti-monarchism is questionable, then the widespread belief that radical Puritans favored the Geneva Bible because of its anti-royal notes should be re-evaluated. One of the most frequently mentioned examples is the Pilgrims of Plymouth Colony.⁹⁸ John Robinson's "farewell address" to the Pilgrims before they left Leiden has been used as proof of the Geneva Bible being the "Puritan Bible."⁹⁹ However, I have found that Robinson used the King James Bible as early as 1615 and continued to

94. Hammond, *Making of the English Bible*, 94.

95. Daniell, *Bible in English*, 306.

96. Daniell, *Bible in English*, 304.

97. Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 74.

98. The idea that the separatists of Plymouth Colony used the Geneva Bible exclusively can be traced to John Shea ("Bible in American History," 136), who is cited by Paris Simms (*Bible in America*, 90), who is then cited by Lloyd Berry (introduction to *Geneva Bible*, 22), who is later cited by Harry Stout ("Word and Order," 29), who is subsequently cited by Brian Wilson ("KJV in the USA," 262). Shea states that "that the Genevan version prevailed exclusively in New England for many years is evident from the early sermons and treatises in which the quotations are from the Genevan" (Shea, "Bible in American History," 136). Unfortunately, Shea does not provide any evidence to support his statement.

99. Simms, *Bible in America*, 90. The only reference of the address's epigraph (Ezra 8:21) is in Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, 59. It is unclear whether Robinson really read these words or Bradford retrospectively reported them in indirect discourse. (For the problems concerning the authenticity of the address, see Fenn, "John Robinson's Farewell Address.") But this verse cannot serve as the sole proof to argue that Robinson or the Pilgrims used the Geneva Bible exclusively, even if Robinson did use it in that sermon.

use it until his death in 1625.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, I have also found that the King James Bible was used in Robert Cushman's sermon preached in Plymouth in 1621.¹⁰¹ My findings support Maurice Betteridge's assertion that the Geneva Bible was "hardly the badge of any narrow party loyalty."¹⁰² Furthermore, the dominance of the King James Version's in the parliamentary sermons demonstrated in the previous section also indicates that the anti-royalists did not have to look to the Geneva notes for justification of revolution.

Did James I successfully suppress the Geneva Bible even though the tie between the Geneva marginalia and radicalism was flimsy? I opine that political suppression of the Geneva Bible could not lead to the victory of the King James Bible. For instance, Matthew Parker tried to prevent the Geneva Bible from being printed in England, but the demand for the Geneva Bible drove Christopher Barker to bring it to the English market shortly after Parker's death. Suppose James banned the printing of the Geneva Bible after 1616—what would the stationers do after the king's death in 1625? They would make every effort to bring the Geneva Bible back to the market as long as consumer demand remained strong when the suppression was lifted.

Another figure usually associated with the suppression theory is William Laud. Appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, Laud was arrested on 18 December 1640 and stood trial in 1644.¹⁰³ In the trial, the House of Commons held Laud responsible for the Star Chamber Decree of 1637¹⁰⁴ that "divers old printed Books were prohibited to be reprinted, imported; as the *English Geneva Bible* with marginal Notes."¹⁰⁵ According to the Parliament's testimony, it was not James but Laud who suppressed the Geneva Bible:

the *English Bible* with the *Geneva Notes*, was not only tolerated but printed and reprinted among us in *England*, *Cum Privilegio*, during

100. For example, Isa. 35:8 on page 2 of *Manumission to a Manuduction* (1615, STC 21111), Acts 2:23 and 4:27–28 on page 4 of *Defence of the Doctrine* (1624, STC 21107), and Ps. 22:6 on page 6 of *Just and Necessary Apology* (1625, STC 21108).

101. Cushman's *Danger of Self-Love* (STC 6149) is the oldest extant sermon delivered in North America. The King James Bible's texts are used on pages 3 (1 Cor. 11:28) and 7 (1 Sam. 8:19).

102. Betteridge, "Bitter Notes," 50.

103. Laud, *Troubles and Trial*, 49, 60, 220.

104. *Decree of Star-Chamber concerning Printing* (STC 7757).

105. Prynne, *Canterbury's Doom*, 513.

Queen *Elizabeth's* and King *James' Reigns*; and in 15 *Jacobi* there was an Impression of them printed here by the King's own Printer; since which time, the *new Translation* without Notes being most vendible (the King's Printers forbearing to print them for their private lucre, not by virtue of any public restraint) they were usually imported from beyond the Seas, and publicly sold without any inhibition or punishment, till this Archbishop's time, who made it no less than an *High Commission crime*, to vend, bind or import them.¹⁰⁶

However, the Parliament's accusations are questionable. The importation of the Geneva Bible had already been illegal before Laud's archbishopship. For example, Richard Blagrove in April 1632 was "imprisoned for having taken in his house many new Bibles of the Geneva print with the notes."¹⁰⁷ Moreover, if the House of Commons really cared about the Geneva Bible, why did they not reprint it in England or legalize its importation after the arrest of Laud?¹⁰⁸

In fact, not only the Geneva Bible but all the imported bibles were illegal. Michael Spark, a London bookseller who testified against Laud in the trial, was arrested in February 1631, for "divers Bibles printed beyond seas were seized and taken from [him]."¹⁰⁹ The bibles were probably the King James Version, for the warrant granted to Robert Barker, the King's Printer, "to search for prohibited books"¹¹⁰ was issued by the Privy Council in July 1630 to answer Barker's complaint that "some persons have of late secretly printed and imported many English bibles [...] of right belonging to him."¹¹¹ Moreover, Spark noted that some London stationers were "punished in the High Commission for buying Latin Bibles from *Holland*, a year before ever any were printed in *London*."¹¹²

106. Prynne, *Canterbury's Doom*, 515.

107. *Reports of Cases*, 274.

108. In fact, the House of Commons allowed the Dutch-printed King James Bibles to be sold in England soon after the opening of the Long Parliament in 1640. See John Fussell's petition to King Charles II in September 1674 (*Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles II, 1673–5*, 351). *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* is hereinafter referred to as CSPD.

109. CSPD: *Charles I, 1629–31*, 510.

110. CSPD: *Charles I, 1629–31*, 485.

111. CSPD: *Charles I, 1629–31*, 306.

112. Spark, *Scintilla*, 4.

Laud claimed that the High Commission's "restraint was not for the Notes only: For by the numerous coming over of Bibles, both with and without Notes from *Amsterdam*, there was a great and a just fear conceived, that by little and little, Printing would quite be carried out of the Kingdom."¹¹³ In other words, the suppression did not specifically target the Geneva Bible. The authorities intended to suppress all forms of economic competition to protect the commercial interests of the King's Printers, so the commercial rivalry is not between the English King James Bible and the Dutch Geneva Bible but between the King's Printers and other bookdealers.

Nevertheless, the Star Chamber Decree of 1637 did not succeed in keeping the Geneva Bible out of England completely. In 1638, Matthew Symmons reported to the English authorities that "many Bibles in [quarto] and [folio] with notes" printed in Holland were imported into England in November 1637.¹¹⁴ The fact that at least two editions of the Geneva Bible were printed in Amsterdam after 1637 also attests to a certain amount of demand for the Geneva Bible in the market.¹¹⁵ Michael Spark even accused the King's Printers of selling the Geneva Bibles they seized.¹¹⁶ In short, the consumer demand for the Geneva Bible would be satisfied one way or another, despite the authorities' suppression, as long as the demand remained in the market.

In summary, it has been asserted that the authorities suppressed the Geneva Bible for political and commercial reasons and that the authorities' suppression caused its demise.¹¹⁷ The Geneva Bible had to be stopped, for it contained politically seditious notes, and the authorities had to suppress the Geneva Bible to protect the commercial interests of the King's Printers. However, I have demonstrated that the Geneva notes cannot be labelled as anti-royalist. Also, suppression cannot be the determining factor for the defeat of the Geneva Bible, for neither James's death nor Laud's arrest brought the Geneva Bible back to the printing houses in England. Moreover, the Star Chamber Decree of 1637 did not lead to the downfall of the Geneva Bible, which had already lost its popularity to the King James Bible by 1630. Furthermore, protecting the King's

113. Laud, *Troubles and Trial*, 350.

114. CSPD: *Charles I*, 1637–8, 365–66.

115. DMH 545 (1640), 579 (1644).

116. Spark, *Scintilla*, 3.

117. Norton, *History*, 91; Daniell, *Bible in English*, 319.

Printers' commercial interests is not tantamount to suppressing the importation of the Geneva Bible, for all imported bibles would have to be suppressed. Finally, the authorities' suppression did not result in eradicating the Geneva Bible from England entirely, for some of the seized bibles still ended up on the bible market in England. To conclude, the suppression theory does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the triumph of the King James Bible over the Geneva Bible.

The Geneva Bible faded away with the decline in its consumer demand

The suppression theory assumes that the Geneva Bible would have defeated the King James Bible had the former not been suppressed by the authorities. However, this assumption does not hold when we examine the Biblical quotations used in Holland, where the Geneva Bible was not suppressed. As mentioned above, John Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers in Leiden, used the King James Version.¹¹⁸ Moreover, I have found that the King James Version was generally used by nonconformist Puritan ministers in Holland in the 1630s. For example, John Forbes, the minister of the Merchant Adventurers Church,¹¹⁹ used the King James Version in his sermons of 1632.¹²⁰ Also, John Paget, John Davenport, and William Best all used the King James Version in the "Davenport–Paget Controversy" tracts published in 1634–36.¹²¹ Furthermore, before returning to England to preach to Parliament, Thomas Goodwin, William Bridge, and Jeremiah Burroughs already used the King James Version

118. See note 100 above.

119. First at Middelburg (1612–21), then at Delft (1621–33). See De Jong, "John Forbes," 19–21.

120. Six of his sermons were printed in three books: one in STC 11133 (1632), another in STC 11135 (1632), and the other four in STC 11129 (collected by Stephen Offwood in 1632 but published in 1635). The King James Version is used in all of the sermon epigraphs (John 6:27, 1 Tim. 2:4, and 1 Tim. 6:13–15).

121. Paget was the minister of the English Reformed Church at Amsterdam from 1607 to 1637; Davenport was an associate minister of Paget's church from November 1633 to October 1634; Best was twice a deacon of that church (Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism*, 92–113). The King James Version was used in the tracts concerning the controversy over infant baptism: the title pages of Best's *Reply to Paget* (STC 1973.5; 1 Thess. 5:21 and Ps. 119:128) and Davenport's *Just Complaint against Paget* (STC 6311; Matt. 23:13, Song of Sol. 2:15, and Gal. 5:12), *Protestation* (STC 6312; Prov. 26:17 and Matt. 10:16–17), and *Apological Reply* (STC 6310; Prov. 18:17), and page 4 of Paget's *Answer to William Best and John Davenport* (STC 19097; Ps. 58:1).

in their sermons of 1639–40 while they were still in Holland.¹²² To sum up, the above evidence contradicts the suppression theory, for the King James Bible was commonly used by the English/Scottish dissenting exiles, who had free access to Dutch-printed Geneva Bibles.

If the ministers in both England and Holland chiefly used the King James Version in their sermons after 1630, how do we account for the market demand for the Geneva Bible? As demonstrated above, the Geneva Bible differs from the King James Bible not so much in its texts as in its notes. Thus, I deduce that the marketability of the Geneva Bible after 1630 came from the consumer demand for its notes, not for its text, and the demand for the Geneva notes could be satisfied by the supply of either the complete Geneva Bibles¹²³ or the King James Bibles with the Geneva notes.¹²⁴

Furthermore, I argue that the demand for the Geneva notes did not arise so much from the demand for anti-royalist notes as from the demand for exegetical aids. As the annotators of *Annotations upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament* (1645) held in their preface, “the people complained, that they could not see into the sense of the Scripture, so well as formerly they did, by the Geneva Bibles, because their spectacles of Annotations were not fitted to the understanding of the new Text, nor any other supplied in their stead.”¹²⁵ In the 1640s and 1650s, six editions of “annotations” were published as separate volumes without the Biblical text to meet the readers’ requirements for explanatory notes, and those annotations were not anti-royalist.¹²⁶

122. Goodwin’s *Aggravation of Sin and Sinning against Knowledge and Mercy* (STC 12035), Bridge’s *True Soldier’s Convoy* (STC 3732), and Burroughs’s *Sea Man’s Direction in Time of Storm* (STC 4129.5) were all printed in Holland in 1639–40, and the King James Version is used in all of the sermon epigraphs (Rom. 7:13, 1:21, 2:4–5; Num. 10:35; Ps. 148:8).

123. See note 36 for the ten or eleven editions of the Dutch-printed Geneva Bibles.

124. Between 1642 and 1649, three editions of the English Bible containing the King James text and the Geneva notes were published: two in Amsterdam—DMH 564 (1642) and 571 (1643)—and one in London—DMH 620 (1649).

125. Wing D2062 (hereinafter referred to as *English Annotations*). Thomas Fuller in 1655 also noted that “Yea, some complained, That they could not see into the sense of the Scripture for lack of the spectacles of those Geneva Annotations” (Fuller, *Church-History of Britain* 10:58).

126. The six editions of annotations without the text are three editions of the *English Annotations* (1645, Wing D2062; 1651, Wing D2063; 1657, Wing D2064), two editions of Giovanni Diodati’s *Annotations* (originally published in 1607, translated into English and published in 1643 [Wing D1510]

To sum up, the consumer demand for English exegetical notes was satisfied by the ten or eleven editions of the Geneva Bible printed in Holland before 1644, the three editions of the hybrid version printed between 1642 and 1649, and the six editions of annotations without the text printed between 1643 and 1657. In other words, there are only about twenty editions of notes with or without the text printed over more than two decades. Yet in contrast, fifty-eight editions of the complete King James Version without notes were printed in the 1640s alone.¹²⁷ Accordingly, only *some* people complained “that they could not see into the sense of the Scripture” for lack of notes, and it would be misleading to suggest that consumer demand for explanatory aids was great.

Conclusion

In the first part of this article, I refuted the theory of the “slow” acceptance of the King James Bible by reviewing the post-1611 printing of the Geneva Bible and the King James Bible, and by examining the scriptural quotations in the epigraphs and the title page extracts of the Paul’s Cross sermons and the parliamentary sermons between 1612 and 1643. I found that the King James Bible had already been more popular than the Geneva Bible by 1620, and that the rising trend of the popularity of the King James Bible had become irreversible by 1630; the battle of the two Bibles had long been over by 1640.

In the second part of the article, I challenged the so-called suppression theory, which claims that the English political authorities’ suppression of the Geneva Bible caused its defeat. I have shown that the assumption that the Geneva notes are seditious was questionable, for they are no more anti-monarchical than the Bishops’ Bible notes. Moreover, neither King James’s death in 1625 nor Archbishop Laud’s arrest in 1640 diminished the popularity of the King James Bible. Furthermore, I have demonstrated that the exiled English/Scottish ministers predominately used the King James Bible in their sermons in the 1630s in Holland, where the Geneva Bible was not suppressed. I maintain that a product would find its way to market if consumer demand remained in the market. I infer that there was a demand for explanatory notes from some

and 1648 [Wing D1506]), and one edition of the *Dutch Annotations* (originally published in 1637 and translated into English and printed by Theodore Haak in 1657 [Wing H162]).

127. DMH 543–44, 546–48, 552–55, 561–63, 565–67, 572–74, 578, 580–601, 604–16, 618–21.

Bible readers, and about twenty editions of annotations with or without the accompanying Biblical text were printed after 1616 in Holland and England to meet this consumer demand for exegetical aids. But the majority of Bible readers could “see into the sense of the Scripture” without any notes. Thus, the decrease in consumer demand for its notes led to the demise of the Geneva Bible.

Appendix 1: Bible versions used in the epigraphs or title page extracts of the Paul’s Cross sermons between 1612 and 1620

(G: Geneva Version; g: Geneva Version with little variation; K: King James Version; k: King James Version with little variation; B: identical in both versions; N: neither version)

No.	Preacher	STC no.	Epigraph	Version	Title page extract (version)
1	Thomas Adams	117	Isa. 21:11–12	G	
2	Thomas Draxe	7184	Rom. 8:21–23	k	
3	William Hull	13937	Joel 2:12	N	
4	Thomas Sutton	23500	Hosea 4:1–2	G	
5	Nathanael Cannon	4576	Isa. 58:1	G	
6	Thomas Adams	131	John 12:6	K	
7	Joseph Hall	12673	1 Sam. 12:24–25	G	
8	Miles Mosse	18209	James 2:19	N	
9	Thomas Baughe	1594	Job 31:14	N	
10	Abraham Gibson	11829	Jer. 23:10	G	
11	Thomas Myriell	18322	Song of Sol. 5:2	G	
12	Sampson Price	20333	Rev. 3:15–16	K	
13	William Pemberton	19569	1 Tim. 6:6	K	
14	John Boys	3464	Ps. 150:1	N	
15	John Rawlinson	20777	1 Sam. 10:24	B	None
16	Henry Greenwood	12336	Isa. 30:33	G	
17	Nathanael Kitchener	14948	Luke 21:28	B	None
18	Charles Richardson	21017	1 Thess. 4:6	g	
19	Thomas Sutton	23502	Rev. 3:15–16	G	

20	John White	25392	1 Tim. 2:1–2	B	Prov. 24:21 (k)
21	John Whalley	25294	Ps. 81:10	B	Exod. 17:6 (K)
22	Gabriel Price	20306	Jer. 4:14	B	Isa. 1:16 (G)
23	Anthony Hugget	13909	2 Cor. 7:1	N	
24	Thomas Adams	125	Ps. 118:27	K	
25	William Jackson	14321	Hosea 10:12	G	
26	Sampson Price	20330	Rev. 2:5	K	
27	William Worship	25995	Matt. 15:22–28	k	
28	Charles Richardson	21018	Ps. 101:8	g	
29	Samuel Ward	25035	Heb. 13:18	g	
30	Immanuel Bourne	3419	2 Cor. 5:17	K	
31	Charles Sonnibank	22927	Acts 8:26–28	G	
32	Charles Richardson	21015	Matt. 20:28	K	
33	Immanuel Bourne	3418	Gen. 9:13	G	
34	Nathanael Delaune	6550.5	Matt. 14:31	B	None
35	Edward Chaloner	4936	Acts 17:23	K	
36	Robert Sybthorpe	22527	Jer. 5:7	k	
37	Michael Wigmore	25618	Prov. 4:14	k	
38	Roger Ley	15569	1 Cor. 15:24–25	K	
39	Stephen Denison	6607	Ezek. 18:31	B	2 Cor. 5:17 (K)
40	Francis White	25386	Mic. 6:9	K	
41	John King	14983	Isa. 38:17	k	
42	Jeremiah Dyke	7413	Luke 12:15	K	
43	John King	14982	Ps. 102:13–14	K	
44	Michael Wigmore	25615	Rev. 4:2–3	N	
45	John Andrewes	591	John 3:14	N	

Appendix 2: Bible versions used in the epigraphs or title page extracts of the Paul's Cross sermons between 1621 and 1630

No.	Preacher	STC no.	Epigraph	Version	Title page extract (version)
1	Samuel Buggs	4022	2 Sam. 24:14	K	
2	Thomas Bedford	1788	1 John 5:16	G	
3	Roger Ley	15568	Luke 11:21–23	K	
4	Henry King	14969	John 15:20	k	
5	Gryffith Williams	25716	Rom. 1:7	N	
6	Humphrey Sydenham	23567	Rom. 9:18	k	
7	Thomas Ailesbury	1000	Luke 17:37	K	
8	Robert Harris	12831	Ps. 136:1	G	
9	Daniel Donne	7021	Luke 3:9	N	
10	Samuel Purchas	20502	2 Sam. 22:51	B	None
11	Richard Sheldon	22398	Rev. 14:9–11	k	
12	John Donne	7053	Judg. 5:20	K	
13	Elias Petley	19801	Isa. 38:2–3	K	
14	Thomas Myriell	18321	2 Chron. 15:2	B	1 John 4:4 (N)
15	Robert Johnson	14694.7	Luke 16:19–23	g	
16	Barten Holyday	13615	Ps. 18:48–49	K	
17	Thomas Adams	106	Luke 13:7	K	
18	John Lawrence	15325	Luke 19:41	N	
19	Humphrey Sydenham	23559	John 8:58	B	None
20	Thomas Adams	129	2 Cor. 6:16	B	None
21	Robert Vase	24594	Jon. 4:9	K	
22	William Proctor	20405	Isa. 29:1–2	K	
23	Robert Bedingfield	1792	Rom. 6:23	B	None
24	John Gee	11705	Rev. 3:11	k	
25	Robert Sanderson	21709	1 Tim. 4:4	K	
26	Gryffith Williams	25719	Rom. 6:23	B	None
27	Barten Holyday	13616	Ezek. 37:22	K	

28	Thomas Fuller	11467	Ps. 107:17–21	k	
29	Thomas Ailesbury	999	1 Cor. 2:8	B	None
30	Antony Fawcner	10718	Job 19:21	B	None
31	Matthew Brookes	3837	Rom. 16:17–18	K	
32	William Hampton	12741	Deut. 28:49–51	G	
33	Matthew Brookes	3836	Matt. 16:18	K	
34	Henry Valentine	24576	Ps. 122:6	K	
35	Stephen Denison	6607.5	Matt. 7:15	B	1 Tim. 1:3 (K)
36	John Gumbledon	12514	Isa. 53:6	B	1 John 2:1–2 (K)
37	Robert Sanderson	21709	Gen. 20:6	K	
38	John Gaule	11691	Mark 7:37	B	None
39	William Foster	11204	Rom. 6:12	G	
40	Richard Farmer	10699	Luke 21:34	K	
41	Richard Cooke	5676	Heb. 13:4	B	Eph. 5:3 (N)
42	Edward Boughen	3408	1 John 4:1–3	g	
43	John Jones	14722	Jer. 7:12	K	
44	Isaac Craven	6031	Rom. 2:16	K	
45	John Grent	12360	Isa. 23:7–9	K	

Appendix 3: Bible versions used in the Paul's Cross sermons between 1631 and 1640

A. Texts of the epigraphs or title page extracts identified as either the Geneva Version or the King James Version

No.	Preacher	STC no.	Epigraph	Version	Title page extract (version)
1	Robert Sanderson	21710	1 Pet. 2:16	K	
2	John Gore	12083	2 Chron. 26:5	k	
3	Giles Fleming	11052	Luke 7:5	K	
4	William Evans	10595	Eph. 6:12–13	K	
5	James Conyers	5657	Rev. 1:5–6	G	
6	Thomas Drant	7164	1 John 1:5	B	Ps. 119:105 (g)
7	Oliver Whitbie	25371	Hosea 6:1–2	N	Luke 19:41 (K)
8	John Gore	12072	Ps. 73:25	k	
9	Henry King	14970	Jer. 1:10	k	

B. Bible versions used in the scriptural quotations of the sermons whose texts of the epigraphs or title page extracts remained undetermined

No.	Preacher	STC no.	Version
1	John Robinson	21117	K
2	John Gore	12080	G
3	John Lynch	23120	K
4	William Wats	25129	B
5	Thomas Bedford	1790	K

Appendix 4: Bible versions used in the epigraphs or title page extracts of the parliamentary sermons between 1640 and 1643

No.	Preacher	Wing no.	Epigraph	Version	Title page extract (version)
1	Cornelius Burges	B5671	Jer. 50:5	k	
2	Stephen Marshall	M776	2 Chron. 15:2	B	2 Chron. 15:2 (B)
3	John Gauden	G362	Zech. 8:19	B	None
4	Samuel Fairclough	F109	Josh. 7:25	K	
5	Thomas Wilson	W2947	Ps. 69:9	K	
6	William Bridge	B4448	Rev. 14:8	k	
7	Thomas Case	C846	Ezek. 20:25	K	
8	Thomas Case	C845	Ezra 10:2–3	K	
9	Joseph Symonds	S6358	1 Chron. 28:10	K	
10	Nathaniel Homes	H2570	2 Pet. 3:13	K	
11	Thomas Ford	F1515	Zeph. 1:1	B	Prov. 15:23 (k)
12	Henry Burton	B6162	Ps. 53:6	K	
13	William Sedgwick	S2388	Isa. 9:6	K	
14	Sidrach Simpson	S3826	Prov. 8:15–16	K	
15	Jeremiah Burroughs	B6119	Isa. 66:10	B	Ps. 147:2 (K)
16	Stephen Marshall	M766	Ps. 124:6–8	k	
17	Cornelius Burges	B5668	Ps. 76:10	N	None
18	Edmund Calamy	C236	Jer. 18:7–10	K	
19	Stephen Marshall	M770	2 Kings 23:25–26	k	
20	James Ussher	U228	Luke 13:5	K	
21	John Marston	M817	Joel 2:12–13	k	
22	Edmund Calamy	C253	Ezek. 36:32	K	
23	Stephen Marshall	M762	Judg. 5:23	K	
24	Cornelius Burges	B5688	Jer. 4:14	K	
25	Simeon Ash	A3949	Ps. 9:9	K	
26	Thomas Goodwin	G1267	Zech. 4:6–9	K	

27	Joseph Caryl	C790	Rev. 2:2–3	k	
28	Robert Harris	H875	Luke 18:6–8	K	
29	Obadiah Sedgwick	S2372	Jer. 4:3	K	
30	William Gouge	G1397	Neh. 5:19	K	
31	William Sedgwick	S2392	Isa. 62:7	K	
32	Thomas Cheshire	C3781	Gen. 3:8	k	
33	Thomas Hill	H2031	Prov. 23:23	K	
34	Edward Reynolds	R1256	Hosea 14:2	K	
35	William Carter	C679A	Judg. 20:26–28	K	
36	Thomas Hodges	H2314	Ps. 113:5–6	K	
37	Thomas Wilson	W2948	Heb. 11:30	B	None
38	Thomas Case	C830	Ps. 68:1–2	k	
39	Thomas Temple	T634	Ps. 2:6	K	
40	Matthew Newcomen	N907	Neh. 4:11	k	
41	Charles Herle	H1561	Zech. 8:19	B	None
42	Richard Vines	V546	Num. 14:24	K	
43	Edward Corbert	C6241	1 Cor. 1:27	B	None
44	Thomas Valentine	V26	Zeph. 3:8	k	
45	John Arrowsmith	A3773	Lev. 26:25	K	
46	Jeremiah Whittaker	W1712	Hag. 2:7	k	
47	W. Bridges	B4483A	2 Sam. 19:5	G	
48	John Ellis	E592	Mic. 5:5	k	
49	John Lightfoot	L2053	Luke 1:17	K	
50	John Ley	L1879	Jer. 4:21–22	k	
51	William Greenhill	G1848	Matt. 3:10	K	
52	Francis Cheynell	G3816	Zech. 2:7	K	
53	Andrew Perne	P1557	Mic. 4:5	B	Jer. 6:16 (K)
54	Stephen Marshall	M789	Rev. 15:2–4	k	
55	Obadiah Sedgwick	S2374	Esther 9:1	k	
56	Edmund Calamy	C260	Josh. 24:15	K	
57	Charles Herle	H1556	Ps. 95:1	N	Isa. 33:11 (K)
58	Thomas Carter	C668	Exod. 32:9–10	k	
59	Herbert Palmer	P242	Esther 4:13–14	k	

60	Oliver Bowles	B3884	John 2:17	B	Gal. 4:18 (K)
61	Matthew Newcomen	N911	Isa. 62:6–7	K	
62	Thomas Hill	H2404	Rev. 12:11	K	
63	William Spurstowe	S5094	1 Sam. 7:6	k	
64	Sidrach Simpson	S3825	Isa. 4:5	B	None
65	John Conant	C5689	Jer. 30:7	K	
66	Thomas Coleman	C5050	Jer. 8:20	K	
67	Anthony Tuckney	T3210	Jer. 8:22	K	
68	Anthony Burges	B5643	Mark 1:2–3	K	
69	Humfrey Chambers	C1915	Zech. 7:5–7	k	
70	Thomas Coleman	C5052	Jer. 30:21	K	
71	Joseph Caryl	C782	Neh. 9:38	N	Ps. 2:2–4 (K)
72	Arthur Salwey	S522	1 Kings 18:21	K	
73	Henry Wilkinson	W2220	Zech. 1:18–21	k	
74	William Bridge	B4465	Zech. 1:18–2:1	K	
75	William Mewe	M1950	Isa. 42:24–25	k	
76	Stephen Marshall	M794	Mic. 7:1–2	K	
77	Alexander Hender- son	H1439	Ezra 7:23	K	
78	John Strickland	S5970	Isa. 10:12	K	

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- Annotations upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament*. London, 1645. Wing D2062.
- Barlow, William. *The Sum and Substance of the Conference [...] at Hampton Court*. London, 1604. STC 14565.
- Bradford, William. *History of Plymouth Plantation*. Boston, 1856.
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I, 1629–31*. Edited by John Bruce. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1860.
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I, 1637–8*. Edited by John Bruce. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1869.
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles II, 1673–5*. Edited by F. H. Blackburne Daniell. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904.
- Church of England. *Injunctions for the Clergy*. [London], 1538. STC 10087.
- Cotton, Clement. *A Complete Concordance to the Bible of the Last Translation*. London, 1630. STC 5844.
- A Decree of Star-Chamber concerning Printing*. London, 1637. STC 7757.
- Fuller, Thomas. *The Church-History of Britain*. London, 1655. Wing F2416.
- Laud, William. *The History of the Troubles and Trial*. London, 1695. Wing L586.
- Prynne, William. *Canterbury's Doom*. London, 1646. Wing P3917.
- Reports of Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission*. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. London: Camden Society, 1886.
- Spark, Michael. *Scintilla, or a Light Broken into Dark Warehouses*. London, 1641, Wing S4818B.
- Spotswood, John. *The History of the Church of Scotland*. London, 1655. Wing S5022.

Secondary Sources

- Berry, Lloyd E. Introduction to *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition*, 1–28. Edited by Lloyd E. Berry. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Betteridge, Maurice S. "The Bitter Notes: The Geneva Bible and Its Annotations." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 14, no. 1 (Spring 1983): 41–62. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2540166>.

- Butterworth, Charles C. *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340–1611*. New York: Octagon Books, 1971.
- Campbell, Gordon. *Bible: The Story of the King James Version, 1611–2011*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Chao, Hsing-hao. “‘To Make a Good One Better’: The Most Immediate Predecessor of the King James Bible.” *Lingual, Literary, and Cultural Translation* 13 (2016): 175–203.
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. London: Macmillan, 1988. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-19584-8>.
- Daniell, David. *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1dszxtb>.
- Daniell, David. Introduction to *Tyndale’s Old Testament: Being the Pentateuch of 1530, Joshua to 2 Chronicles of 1537, and Jonah*, ix–xxix. Edited by David Daniell. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851593X00133>.
- Danner, Dan G. “The Later English Calvinists and the Geneva Bible.” In *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, edited by W. Fred Graham, 489–504. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.
- Davidson, Randall T. “The Authorisation of the English Bible.” *Macmillan’s Magazine* 44 (1881): 436–44.
- De Jong, Chris. “John Forbes (c. 1568–1634), Scottish Minister and Exile in the Netherlands.” *Dutch Review of Christian History* 69, no. 1 (1989): 17–53. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24009193>.
- Dinsmore, Charles Allen. *The English Bible as Literature*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.
- Feingold, Mordechai. “Birth and Early Reception of a Masterpiece: Some Loose Ends and Common Misconceptions.” In *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord: Scholarship and the Making of the King James Version of the Bible*, edited by Mordechai Feingold, 1–29. Leiden: Brill, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004359055>.
- Fenn, William Wallace. “John Robinson’s Farewell Address.” *The Harvard Theological Review* 13, no. 3 (July 1920): 236–51. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1507747>.
- Fincham, Kenneth. “The King James Bible: Crown, Church and People.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 71, no. 1 (January 2020): 77–97. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046918001318>.

- Green, Ian. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198208600.001.0001>.
- Greenslade, S. L. "English Versions of the Bible, 1525–1611." In *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, edited by S. L. Greenslade, 141–74. Vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Gribben, Crawford. "Deconstructing the Geneva Bible: The Search for a Puritan Poetic." *Literature and Theology* 14, no. 1 (March 2000): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1093/litthe/14.1.1>.
- Hamlin, Hannibal, and Norman W. Jones. Introduction to *The King James Bible after 400 Years: Literary, Linguistic, and Cultural Influences*, 1–24. Edited by Hannibal Hamlin and Norman W. Jones. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511779800>.
- Hammond, Gerald. *The Making of the English Bible*. Manchester: Carcanet, 1982.
- Herbert, A. S. *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of the English Bible, 1525–1961*. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1968. Revised and expanded from the edition of Thomas H. Darlow and Horace F. Moule, 1903.
- Hill, Christopher. *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*. London: Penguin, 1994.
- Johnson, A. F. "J. F. Stam, Amsterdam, and English Bibles." *The Library* s5-IX, no. 3 (September 1954): 185–93. <https://doi.org/10.1093/library/s5-IX.3.185>.
- King, John N., and Aaron T. Pratt. "The Materiality of English Printed Bibles from the Tyndale New Testament to the King James Bible." In *The King James Bible after 400 Years: Literary, Linguistic, and Cultural Influences*, edited by Hannibal Hamlin and Norman W. Jones, 61–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511779800.006>.
- Kirby, Torrance. "The Public Sermon: Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1534–1570." *Renaissance and Reformation* 31, no. 1 (Winter 2008): 3–29. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v31i1.9544>.
- Knight, Alison. "The 'Very, Very Words': (Mis)quoting Scripture in Lancelot Andrewes's and John Donne's Sermons on Job 19:23–27." *Studies in Philology* 111, no. 3 (Summer 2014): 442–69. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sip.2014.0020>.

- Lampros, Dean George. "A New Set of Spectacles: The *Assembly's Annotations*, 1645–1657." *Renaissance and Reformation* 19, no. 4 (1995): 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v31i4.11705>.
- MacLure, Millar. *Register of Sermons Preached at Paul's Cross, 1534–1642*. Revised and augmented by Jackson Campbell Boswell and Peter Pauls. Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989.
- McCullough, Peter E. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- McGrath, Alister. *In the Beginning: The Story of the King James Bible and How It Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture*. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Mencken, H. L. *Treatise on the Gods*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930.
- Molekamp, Femke. "The Geneva and the King James Bibles: Legacies of Reading Practices." *Bunyan Studies* 15 (2011): 11–25.
- Morrissey, Mary. *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558–1642*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199571765.001.0001>.
- Nicolson, Adam. *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible*. New York: HarperCollins, 2003.
- Norton, David. *A History of the English Bible as Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511612251>.
- Phelps, William Lyon. *Human Nature in the Bible*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.
- Pollard, Alfred W., ed. *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525–1611*. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.
- Quiller-Couch, Arthur. *On the Art of Reading*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1920.
- Rees, Graham. "The King's Printers' Bible Monopoly in the Reign of James I." In *Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Books*, edited by Pete Langman, 15–28. Surrey: Ashgate, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315248226>.
- Ryken, Leland. *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2002.
- Shaheen, Naseeb. *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011.

- Shea, John Gilmary. "The Bible in American History." *The American Catholic Quarterly Review* 3 (1878): 131–50.
- Simms, Paris Marion. *The Bible in America: Versions That Have Played Their Part in the Making of the Republic*. New York: Wilson-Erickson, 1936.
- Sprunger, Keith L. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016. First published 1982 by Brill (Leiden).
- Stout, Harry S. "Word and Order in Colonial New England." In *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, edited by Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll, 19–38. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Thomas, Alan G. *Great Books and Book Collectors*. London: Spring Books, 1988.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1640*. New York: Clarendon, 1987.
- Wall, John N. "Virtual Paul's Cross: The Experience of Public Preaching after the Reformation." In *Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1520–1640*, edited by Torrance Kirby and P. G. Stanwood, 61–92. Leiden: Brill, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004262812>.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. *A General View of the History of the English Bible*. New York: Macmillan, 1916.
- Wilson, Brian C. "KJV in the USA: The Impact of the King James Bible in America." In *The Critique of Religion and Religion's Critique: On Dialectical Religiology*, edited by Dustin J. Byrd, 261–78. Leiden: Brill, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004419049>.
- Wilson, John F. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640–1648*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400878710>.