UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM
University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

Revising the King James Apocrypha

Hardy, Nicholas

DOI:
10.1163/9789004359055_009

License:
None: All rights reserved

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Hardy, N 2018, Revising the King James Apocrypha: John Bois, Isaac Casaubon, and the Case of 1 Esdras. in M Feingold (ed.), *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord: Scholarship and the Making of the King James Version of the Bible.* Scientific and Learned Cultures and Their Institutions, Brill, Leiden, pp. 266-327. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004359055_009

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

Publisher Rights Statement:
The institute employing the author may post the post-refereed, but pre-print version of that article as appearing in multi-authored books free of charge on its website. Policy see http://www.brill.com/resources/authors/publishing-books-brill/self-archiving-rights

General rights
Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
•Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy
While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 13. Oct. 2026

Revising the King James Apocrypha: John Bois, Isaac Casaubon, and the Case of 1 Esdras

Nicholas J. S. Hardy

Introduction: Isaac Casaubon and the Revision of the King James Bible[1]

When the Huguenot scholar Isaac Casaubon left Paris for England in October 1610, he hoped to fulfil several ambitions.[2] One was to protect himself, and eventually the rest of his large family, from a new wave of religious violence that he feared might break over France after the assassination of his patron and the author of the Edict of Nantes, King Henri IV.[3] Another ambition, not unconnected to the first, was to write more freely on the subject of religion, and especially the early history of the Church, than he had been able to in his Catholic homeland.[4] Casaubon's third ambition was to continue the work on classical as well as Judeo-Christian literature and history that had made him the most widely acclaimed living humanist.[5]

Prior to his arrival in England, Casaubon probably neither knew about, nor expected to participate in, the revision of the Bishops' Bible which King James I had commissioned in the wake of the Hampton Court Conference of 1604. And yet Casaubon's papers in the British Library include letters between him and John Bois, one of the members of the Cambridge Apocrypha company and the final revision committee. The Bois-Casaubon correspondence reveals how the translators dealt with a small number of specific problems with a level of forensic detail unmatched by any other document pertaining to the King James Bible. Combined with other evidence, they also show that Casaubon probably assisted in the revision of all of the apocryphal books. Seeing the King James Bible through Casaubon's eyes can thus provide new insights into the mechanics of the translation, but it can also allow us to apprehend the broader scholarly and theological factors that shaped it.

In one respect, Casaubon was an unsuitable candidate to advise on an English translation of the Bible: he barely understood the target language. Casaubon had been asked for advice about vernacular translations of the Bible before, but only in languages which he could read.[6] Casaubon spent nearly four years in England before his death in July 1614, and his efforts to learn English are witnessed by his annotated copy of Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*. The book is marked up with accents to indicate where stress was to be placed in pronouncing words, and marginal glosses translating unfamiliar terms into French, Latin, or Greek; but Casaubon apparently never achieved fluency in the language.[7] He spent much of his time in England at James's court, yet he struggled to follow vernacular sermons which he heard there, as he commented in his diary on 2 January 1611.[8]

This did not, however, disqualify Casaubon from participating in debates about the English Bible. On the same day that Casaubon sat through this largely incomprehensible sermon, the king and his bishops must have switched to Latin for a task that provided one of Casaubon's first tastes of their preoccupation with biblical translation and scholarship. Casaubon records that after the sermon, the king spent a long lunchtime examining the notes that accompanied the Catholic translation of the Latin Old Testament and Apocrypha, recently published at Douai as a follow-up to the translation

of the Rheims New Testament of 1582. James Montagu, bishop of Bath and Wells, read the notes; the king gave his (presumably not very positive) judgement on them; and Casaubon, along with Lancelot Andrewes and Richard Neile, bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, indicated their approval of what the king had said. Casaubon was impressed to find James so studious in such matters, compared with his former patron Henri IV.[9]

Except for the fact that it concerned an English translation, such a conversation was Casaubon's natural habitat. He had been brought to England partly in order to contribute to James's campaigns against his Catholic critics overseas, by lending intellectual weight to the king's defences of the Oath of Allegiance and various other features of the English ecclesiastical polity.[10] But Casaubon's effectiveness as a spokesman and controversialist rested ultimately on his reputation as a scholar of Judeo-Christian, as well as classical, texts. Sacred and ecclesiastical history, and the close, philological and critical analysis of the documents on which it was based, had become a cornerstone of inter-confessional controversy in the wake of the Council of Trent. The Roman Catholic publications against which Casaubon, James, and Andrewes pitted themselves were works of erudition as well as scholastic divinity, and they needed to be answered in kind. However, this was not the only setting in which Casaubon's scholarly talents were put to use. His participation in the King James Bible shows that not all of his activities in England were directly controversial, even though they all, as we shall see, involved theological preoccupations in one way or another.

The Date and Circumstances of the Bois-Casaubon Correspondence

What was the nature of Casaubon's contribution? At some point after Casaubon arrived in London, John Bois wrote to Casaubon about 'a few specific passages which were somewhat obscure.' Bois and his 'company' had struggled with them 'while we were translating the Apocrypha.' Two letters from Bois, and a reply from Casaubon, survive among the collection of manuscript letters addressed to Casaubon in the British Library. Their letters discuss some of these problems in great detail, and they give us a glimpse of what must have been a more extended series of exchanges about the translation that took place through conversation as well as correspondence.

The Bois-Casaubon correspondence presents a tremendous opportunity. More than any other source, it can be used to reveal the intellectual depth of some of the translators' efforts. They drew on the work of continental figures whose views, methods, and intellectual legacies are not well known among scholars of vernacular biblical translations. The role of Casaubon himself illustrates this most vividly, but he is far from the only non-English scholar whose work was an important reference point. The translators' frequent recourse to the whole gamut of contemporary biblical scholarship was necessitated by the range of philological, historical, and theological problems which they were trying to address. These went far beyond simple choices of wording or phrasing, and extended to the authorship and dating of 1 Esdras; the reliability of different textual witnesses to it; its value as a sidelight on the sections of the canonical Old Testament with which it overlapped; and the cultural context in which it was written, including its relationship to pagan as well as to Jewish texts. In considering these issues, the translators were employing historical and critical techniques of interpretation whose prominence in early modern theology and biblical scholarship has been amply

demonstrated by intellectual historians, even if scholars of vernacular translation have not yet given them much attention.[11]

Before examining what Bois and Casaubon were corresponding about, it is necessary to reconstruct the precise circumstances in which they were writing to one another. The content of the letters makes it clear that at the time of writing, Bois was involved in the final stages of revision of the King James Bible. However, given the challenges which scholars have previously faced in tracking the progress of that revision, and especially in establishing how long it might have continued into 1611, it is worth trying to date them more precisely.

The *terminus post quem* for this correspondence must be October 31, 1610: Casaubon arrived in London on October 30, but his reference to a consultation with one of Bois's colleagues 'yesterday' rules out that date for the letters.[12] As for their *terminus ante quem*, the letters must predate Casaubon's death on 12 July 1614.[13] But Casaubon's incidental remarks about his status as a mere 'visitor' in England, his separation from his own library, and his lack of material wealth or other advantages make it likely that the letters fall within the earlier part of this period.[14] Casaubon had been allowed to leave France under the assumption that he would return in a matter of months, and that if he were to stay, he risked losing the stipend he had been receiving from the French crown. When he left for England, moreover, he did not take his library with him.[15] But within a year of Casaubon's arrival, all of these problems were more or less solved. On 10 December 1610, Casaubon received permission from the Queen Regent of France to stay in England, and resolved to do so; five days later, he received notice that he would be granted two lucrative prebends; and on 15 October 1611, he received a substantial part of his library from France.[16] It therefore seems likely that Casaubon wrote his reply to Bois before any of these things had happened, in November or December 1610--but at the very least, before the arrival of his books in October the following year.

This relieves us from having to depend too heavily on the method which Ward Allen used to date Bois's New Testament notes: by determining whether Bois's citations of Chrysostom matched the edition printed in eight volumes by Henry Savile between 1610 and 1613, or earlier editions which Bois must have used before he started compiling annotations for the final volume of Savile's edition and received his own copy of it.[17] Nonetheless, applying this method to the sole citation of Chrysostom in the Bois-Casaubon correspondence would still place it closer to 1610 than 1614, since that citation matches an earlier edition, rather than Savile's.[18]

A dating of this correspondence to late 1610 or early 1611 does not jar with the little reliable information that can be gleaned from the other surviving sources concerning the final revision and printing of the King James Bible.[19] Instead, the letters confirm that serious, if not extensive, revision was still being undertaken at a very late stage of the whole process, and that this process of revision extended to the Apocrypha as well as to the canonical books of the Bible. The letters can also help to provide unprecedented insight into the passage from the early stages of drafting the translation, when the translators were divided into companies, to the finished product of 1611. This is because they happen to cover 1 Esdras, the apocryphal book that appears to have been drafted primarily by Samuel Ward.[20]

Bois's reference to problems that arose 'while we were translating the apocryphal books' suggests that his queries represent the commencement of the revision of the

Apocrypha, and that this revision took place separately from that of the rest of the Old Testament. If this is what happened, it is not surprising that the revisers should have begun that stage of the revision with 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras: in both the King James Bible and the 1602 Bishops' Bible from which the translators worked, those two books come first among the Apocrypha. The 'further questions' to which Bois alludes would therefore have been drawn from the remaining books of the Apocrypha. The notion that the 1602 Bishops' Bible determined the order of revision is given some support by the fact that Bois numbers 1 and 2 Esdras as they are numbered in that edition (which in turn reflects the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and ultimately the Latin Vulgate): as 3 and 4 Esdras, respectively.[21]

Bois asked Casaubon about six passages in total, which he numbered himself. The numbering of the passages follows their order as they are found in all editions of the Bible that feature both of the books covered, beginning with 1 Esdras 3:5 and ending with 2 Esdras 2:23. The first query is written on one side of a single leaf. At the top of the page, Bois promises to write with multiple queries, but at the bottom of the page, he asks Casaubon to write his opinion about 'this passage,' singular, on the same leaf as the first query itself.[22] Bois also expresses his hope that Casaubon will allow him to become one of his 'clients' and that, if it pleases Casaubon, he will 'knock on your door more often, and bring you many queries of this kind.'[23] Bois could have been describing a metaphorical visit, conducted through the medium of correspondence; but since he reports elsewhere that he met Casaubon several times when they were in London, this is unlikely.[24] Bois ends the letter by signing his name. Bois's remaining five queries are introduced on a separate leaf.[25] Unlike Bois's first missive, the second one introduces the remaining problems immediately, without any preamble, and ends without any valediction other than Bois's initials, as though Casaubon would have known the full name of the sender already. For reasons that will soon become clear, this is probably because the second letter was sent to Casaubon on the same day as the first one.

Casaubon's reply to all six queries alludes to the existence of two separate letters, and gives no indication that Casaubon has received any communication from Bois other than what is found in this manuscript. It occupies two sides of a single leaf, and addresses Bois's queries in the same order as Bois numbers them. Casaubon begins by explaining that he 'would have replied' to Bois's *earlier* letter' (my emphasis) if there had been somebody at his disposal who could serve as a courier for his response. Casaubon's next sentence also reads like an answer to Bois's suggestion that they meet in person: 'Indeed, I was and still am minded to visit your own residence, to hear you talk about matters like these.'[26] Casaubon was apparently responding to two letters at once: surely to the letter containing the first query, along with its preamble and valediction, and then to Bois's other letter containing the remaining five queries.

The wording and format of Bois's two letters, and the aggregation of their content into a single reply by Casaubon, suggest that Bois's letters were written within a short time of each other, and in some haste. Bois clearly hoped to receive a rapid reply to the first problem in particular, requesting an answer 'in a few words' to the first query alone on the sheet on which it was written. Casaubon's explanation for his failure to respond to the earlier letter indicates that he was aware of the need for a swift response. This is confirmed by a crucial detail that conclusively demonstrates the speed at which Bois's questions were posed and Casaubon's answers delivered. The same detail also reveals

that other queries relating to the translation of the Apocrypha were coming thick and fast to Casaubon's door, not all of them from Bois. When Bois introduces the fifth query, about the meaning of a term that occurs in 1 Esdras 9:48 and 55, he comments: 'I hear that one from my colleagues consulted you about the words...*yesterday*' (my emphasis).[27] Today, Bois hopes that Casaubon will not find it tedious to hear his own conjecture about their meaning. Casaubon's affirmation of this fact shows that he was replying to Bois on the same day as he received Bois's letter, which must also have been the same day on which the letter was written: concerning the problem in 1 Esdras 9, Casaubon says he 'can add nothing to what you yourself write, and what the outstandingly learned man outlined to me in conversation *yesterday*.'[28] Bois's letters and Casaubon's reply were, therefore, all written on the same day: that is, the day after Casaubon had been consulted about one of the passages in question by Bois's unnamed colleague.

The phrasing of 'unus e collegis meis' indicates something about the nature of the embassy undertaken by the 'outstandingly learned gentleman' whom Bois and Casaubon mentioned: more than *collega meus* or even *unus collegarum meorum*, it implies that he had been selected as a delegate from a larger group. But who was this unnamed colleague? Andrew Downes is a strong candidate, being the only translator other than Bois who is known to have been involved both in drafting the Apocrypha and in revising other parts of the translation.[29] Downes, moreover, can be shown to have discussed the Apocrypha with Casaubon soon after the latter's arrival in London, surely with the final revision of the Bible in mind.[30] Finally, Downes and Casaubon had been corresponding with each other since before Casaubon left Geneva in 1596, and they would continue to do so while Casaubon was in England.[31] Ultimately, however, the lack of definitive evidence means that it is safer to continue referring to Bois's 'anonymous colleague' rather than to any specific translator.

Were the translators' interactions with Casaubon limited to these instances? Apparently not. Whatever the identity of Bois's colleague, it is clear that Bois's letters to Casaubon formed part of a larger process of revision and consultation. We have seen that Bois's first letter offered to present Casaubon with more queries along similar lines, and Casaubon's reply indicated his willingness to do so. If this happened in person, it would explain why no more letters survive. There can be no doubt that Bois and Casaubon definitely did meet in person at some point: years later, Bois would recall that he saw Casaubon 'often' when he was in London.[32] These meetings probably pertained to Bois's work on the King James Bible, for as far as we know, Bois did not return to London after he had finished working on the translation. Another reference to Casaubon that slightly postdates the revision of the translation lends further support to this possibility: it implies personal acquaintance with Casaubon, and maybe also some sort of debt owed to him.[33] What is more, the relatively casual tone with which Bois begins his first letter to Casaubon raises the possibility that they may already have met each other before the correspondence took place.

Casaubon's own papers, most of which are now separated from his correspondence and located in the Bodleian Library, provide further evidence that he was fully involved in the revision of the Apocrypha. Most importantly, one of Casaubon's notebooks contains traces of conversations about the Apocrypha with Andrew Downes.[34] These form part of a longer series of notes on Casaubon's studies and his conversations with English acquaintances, which Casaubon began to make on 4 December 1610, soon

after his arrival in England.[35] The English figures mentioned also include another translator, John Overall, who hosted Casaubon for nearly a year in the deanery of St Paul's.[36] Casaubon and Overall's conversations covered technical questions of biblical textual criticism, chronology, and the genealogy of Christ, as well as the theological and ecclesiological issues that preoccupied both men.[37] Casaubon's conversations with Downes, concerning difficult passages in the Apocrypha, appear to have been similarly technical. Casaubon's notes on the Apocrypha cover Ecclesiasticus and 1-3 Maccabees, although the observations explicitly attributed to Downes concern only 2 Maccabees. Unlike the problems which Casaubon discussed with Overall, more than one of Downes's observations involved recommending a substantial departure from the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles that did eventually feature in the Bible of 1611.[38] This makes it possible to infer that Casaubon's conversations with Downes related in some way to Downes's ongoing involvement in the translation and revision of the Apocrypha.

While it is not clear how soon after 4 December 1610 Casaubon met Downes, there is a likely *terminus ante quem* for their discussions of 23 October 1611.[39] The range of dates within which they can be placed is therefore more or less the same as that of Casaubon's correspondence with Bois. Around the beginning of this period, moreover, Casaubon's diary, which is not always very clear about the nature of the activities which Casaubon was undertaking from day to day, records that he was spending a lot of time with Lancelot Andrewes, another translator. Some of this time was spent putting the finishing touches on Andrewes' forthcoming attack on the influential Jesuit controversialist, Cardinal Robert Bellarmine.[40] But from 6 December 1610, Casaubon begins to make tantalising references to a 'daily task the King has placed upon me.'[41] This may simply denote the assistance which Casaubon was providing to Andrewes's polemical endeavours; but it may, alternatively, allude to participation in the final revision of the Bible, in which Andrewes could also have played some part. At this point, the statements which Casaubon made to Bois about his precarious position in England would still have been valid; nine days later, two of them were no longer applicable. Casaubon's 'task' evidently involved Andrewes, but did not revolve around him entirely: Casaubon could spend a morning doing it without Andrewes, and then visit him from lunch onwards for the same purpose. The job was heavy enough to prevent Casaubon from working on anything else in earnest. Casaubon finished it at Andrewes's residence, or perhaps simply in his presence, on 21 December 1610.[42] If it is right to infer from Bois and Casaubon's correspondence that the translators began their revision of the Apocrypha with 1 Esdras, and intended to spend one or two days on each book, then the period from 6 to 21 December is about as much time as they would have taken.

Because the Bois-Casaubon correspondence is only a fragment of the discussions that appear to have taken place, it leaves a lot unsaid. In at least one case, Bois's letter constitutes not an independent treatment of a problem, but a supplement to a face-to-face discussion that had already taken place. Furthermore, the fact that these problems were still being discussed at such a late stage may indicate some disagreement among the translators about how to resolve them: the kind of disagreements that occasionally surface in Bois's notes on difficult passages in the New Testament.[43] Indeed, they may encourage us to see Bois's New Testament notes as much more subjective and provisional than many scholars had thought.[44] Rather than the final consensus of a committee, they are, like Bois's queries to Casaubon, problems that were yet to be resolved. The solutions

were, perhaps, articulated from Bois's point of view, with occasional but by no means comprehensive acknowledgement of the alternatives proposed by his colleagues. This would explain the otherwise troubling fact that the proposals in Bois's New Testament notes diverge more from the printed King James Bible than we might expect from such a late stage of revision: some of the notes, like the letters to Casaubon, are records of personal dissent rather than of group consensus.[45]

These letters, however, preserve even less evidence than Bois's New Testament notes for the counter-arguments that may have been made to the solutions which Bois and Casaubon were proposing. Except for a single reference by Bois to two competing solutions to a problem, all we have are vague hints in the wording of Casaubon's reply that he was aware of some sort of group dynamic, and the potential for disagreements.[46]

Equally, we should not assume that there was anything special about the problems presented in these letters that differentiated them from the other difficulties in the Apocrypha to which Bois alluded, except that the translators may have deemed them particularly appropriate for Casaubon's consideration. If so, they might have withheld other problems in 1 Esdras, perhaps on the grounds that they were too trivial to bother him with.

Finally, we should not expect these particular queries to contain any explicit, programmatic statements about broader questions of biblical translation, critical method, theology, or ecclesiology. Rather, Bois's letters present Casaubon with specific, local problems that demand immediate, feasible solutions. Nonetheless, it is possible to detect a submerged concern for such broader questions underpinning much of what Bois and Casaubon wrote to one another. One of the things that makes this possible is the survival of a great deal more evidence concerning Bois's work on the apocryphal books, much of which has received as little attention as the correspondence itself. Above all, there is Bois's copy of the principal edition which he used to study the Greek version of the Old Testament, and to translate and revise the King James Apocrypha.

A Sidelight on the Revision: Bois's Annotated Septuagint

The edition in question is the Sixtine Septuagint, published in Rome in 1587. Bois's copy of this book contains thousands of marginal and interlinear annotations in Bois's neat, distinctive hand, some of which can be dated to the period before the publication of the King James Bible.[47] Others certainly postdate it, but since Bois is said to have participated in the later Cambridge revision of the translation, they may still attest to an ongoing development of his thinking about the translation, as well as the Septuagint itself.[48]

There is a clear palaeographical basis for attributing the annotations to Bois.[49] Moreover, there are several striking, and at times word-for-word, parallels between the annotations and Bois's correspondence with Casaubon.[50] Most importantly, though, there is also an external witness to Bois's authorship of the annotations. The royal librarian, Patrick Young, made a partial copy of the annotations for use in an edition of the Septuagint which he was preparing.[51] Young's copy identifies Bois as the author of the annotations.[52] The copy is now in Leiden because it was acquired by Isaac Vossius, the Dutch philologist who was interested in the Septuagint rather than in English biblical translations.[53] Finally, it has been possible to construct an account of the book's provenance that explains how it left Bois's possession and reached its current location in

the Bodleian Library, Oxford: John Selden probably purchased it, along with at least one other book annotated by Bois, from the London publisher and bookdealer, Cornelius Bee, after Bois's death in 1644.[54] Selden may have bought it, along with the only other book in the Selden collection known to have been annotated by Bois, in order to assist Young with his Septuagint edition: both books bear on the textual criticism of the Greek Bible, and, unlike the Sixtine Septuagint, Selden may already have had a copy of the other title.[55] Books such as these, and any more belonging to Bois that may be found in Selden's collection, may demonstrate that Selden had a firm documentary basis for his famous and oft-quoted comment about the process by which the King James Version was produced.[56]

The most obvious reason for Bois's use of the Sixtine Septuagint is a prosaic one: it was the only substantially new edition of the Greek Old Testament that had been published since the translation of the English version which Bois and his colleagues were supposed to be revising, the Bishops' Bible.[57] As far as Bois knew, no previous English translator had made any use of it.[58] But Bois's appreciation of the Sixtine edition probably went deeper than this: it appears to have been his primary source for the Septuagint. At any rate, it was certainly the edition which Bois was using when he wrote to Casaubon, as the quotations in his correspondence reveal.[59]

Bois's specific reasons for preferring this edition remain unclear. What is clear, however, is that he was not especially constrained by his preference. This is because the margins of Bois's Septuagint bear witness to comparisons of its text with all of the other principal early modern editions. Occasionally, these editions are cited explicitly.[60] More often, however, Bois's text-critical notes are vague and promiscuous. He frequently refers to readings from 'other books,' or marks an alternative reading with the Greek letters γϱ.[61] The task of tracing the hundreds of variants which Bois cites in this manner is therefore a daunting one. It is not clear whether such marginalia refer to manuscripts -- perhaps those cited by the annotators of the Sixtine Septuagint or its 1588 translation -- or to printed editions. So although Bois only cites three other editions of the Septuagint by name, he may well have used them more often than his relatively infrequent explicit citations of them would suggest, and he may have used other witnesses to the text without giving any explicit notice of having done so.

Bois's Septuagint has many uses for the scholar of the King James Bible. One of the most important is that some of Bois's marginalia represent an earlier, more rudimentary stage of deliberation about passages which Bois would eventually discuss with Casaubon. But this book has a much bigger part to play in the story of the King James Bible than merely providing a record of the translators' deliberations about specific problems. Many of Bois's annotations in it gesture towards other elements of his study of the Bible; and when these elements are considered more closely, in combination with the other surviving records of Bois's scholarship, they reveal some of the assumptions that underpinned the specific work which he undertook for the translation.

Such an approach is not only useful and interesting; it is positively necessary because of the cryptic, lapidary nature of the other surviving documents of the translation. Bois and Casaubon's letters, for example, do not explicitly tell us everything we need to know in order to make sense of what is written in them. Parts of them would remain inert, or even appear nonsensical, if the dead letter of what the authors wrote were not animated by consideration of what they might have been *thinking*: for example, about the relationship between apocryphal Greek and biblical Hebrew; the authorship and dating of

a given part of the Bible; or the ways in which certain passages had been treated by the Church Fathers or modern theologians. Without the extensive information about such matters which is preserved in Bois's Septuagint and other writings, it would be harder to make sense of the motivations underpinning the specific queries which Bois put to Casaubon.

The pitfalls of reading the surface text of the Bois-Casaubon correspondence in isolation will be clear to anybody who has worked on the sources for poorly attested collaborative enterprises such as the King James Bible. Irena Backus has already demonstrated the value of understanding that Bois's notes on the New Testament are engaged in a conscious dialogue with the work of Theodore Beza, even when they do not cite him.[62] An even more striking and recent example is furnished by the case of Samuel Ward. A comparison of Bois's Septuagint and correspondence with Ward's notes on 1 Esdras has demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that Ward derived the content of at least two of those notes from Bois; and yet Ward's notebook, in itself, has not yielded any hard evidence of this, or any other, collaboration.[63] Gaps like the ones in Bois's New Testament notes and Ward's notebook are an inevitable result of the complexity of the subjects with which the translators were dealing; the pervasiveness of certain basic considerations in their minds; and, finally, the close, collaborative and face-to-face way in which they worked from the drafting stage through to the final revision, which meant that they did not always need to put their shared thoughts and presuppositions to paper.

The new pieces of evidence discussed in this essay, then, have far greater functions than the narrow one of establishing who was responsible for any given part of the Bible of 1611. They invite speculation about the reasons why the text took its eventual form, as well as the bare facts of how the translation came together. What follows is an attempt to reconstruct the thinking that informed Bois and Casaubon's deliberations, beginning with evidence of Bois's reading drawn from his Septuagint and related sources, and following with further evidence drawn from the Bois-Casaubon correspondence itself.

Revising 1 Esdras: The Content and Scholarly Context of the Bois-Casaubon Correspondence

1. Techniques and Motivations for Studying the Apocrypha

Because of the peculiar relationship between 1 Esdras and the canonical books of 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, some of the problems with which Bois confronted Casaubon were unique to 1 Esdras.[64] No other apocryphal book overlapped with the canonical records of sacred history to such an extent that it resembled a translation of those records. Nonetheless, Bois's queries about 1 Esdras also bear witness to some of the general preoccupations that motivated his study of the rest of the apocryphal books. Bois approached them with a set of techniques that helped him determine the original language, period, and cultural context in which a book had been composed, as well as its authority as a historical narrative. These techniques had been refined by theologians, translators and philologists. They helped scholars not only to understand and translate the Apocrypha, but also to decide whether an apocryphal book had ever belonged to the Jewish or Christian canon of Scripture and, indeed, whether it deserved to.[65]

Scholarly approaches to the Apocrypha varied depending on the theological priorities of scholars and the generic context in which they were working. John Rainolds, for instance, attacked the credibility of 1 Esdras in his famous Oxford lectures on the Apocrypha. Rainolds had been one of the translators before his death in 1607 as well as the figure who had done most to secure James's promise of an updated translation in the first place.[66] Rainolds began by addressing the reception of 1 Esdras in early Christianity.[67] But partly because of the Catholic and Protestant authors to whom he was responding, Rainolds's arguments concentrated, above all, on the book's alleged historical errors.[68]

Translators of the Apocrypha, by contrast, had to devote more attention than did Rainolds to the book's language and style, while keeping one eye on the historical problems that commanded the controversial theologian's interest. In particular, they had to determine whether peculiar features of the Greek text could be explained if it were taken to be a translation from a Semitic source, or an original composition that combined Greek idioms and literary conventions with Semitic ones. One scholar who attempted to do this was Petrus Cholinus, who translated the Apocrypha into Latin for the Zurich Bible of 1543. Cholinus prefaced his translation with a disquisition on the Hebraic background of Septuagint, apocryphal, and New Testament Greek, which informed Bois's thinking about 1 Esdras and other books.[69] As well as categorizing and listing types of Hebraism in such Greek texts, though, Cholinus also discussed their origins and distinguished between books that had been translated from Hebrew and those originally composed in Greek. Wisdom, parts of Judith, and 2 Maccabees were examples of the latter.[70] But Cholinus placed 1 Esdras in a separate category, and gave it the most extensive treatment. Aspects of its Greek could be explained by referring to the Hebrew text of Ezra-Nehemiah and seeing how it had been translated badly or obscurely. But other things could only be explained, Cholinus thought, by positing that it had been translated from a slightly different Hebrew source.[71]

Cholinus regarded these books as part of the Christian, if not the Jewish, canon, and mirrored his Zurich colleagues' reverence for the versions of the Bible that circulated in Christian antiquity by giving them the title of 'ecclesiastical' rather than 'apocryphal' books.[72] Later, however, Reformed theologians would take up his and other scholars' discussions of their language as a means of discrediting the Apocrypha, especially those books that were originally Greek compositions.[73] According to William Whitaker, for instance, Hebrew was the only language of prophecy before the time of Christ: any pre-Christian work originally composed in Greek could not, therefore, be divinely inspired.[74]

Bois and the other translators of the King James Bible must have known that they were writing at a time when the composition and reception of books like 1 Esdras were subject to careful scrutiny, and new discoveries might allow scholars to reinforce, or occasionally to redraw, the boundaries of confessional debate. Like Ward, Bois had taken a degree in divinity, and there is plenty of other evidence for his interest in such controversies.[75] Bois used Whitaker, in particular, as one of his main points of reference in this area. Although Bois's only datable references to Whitaker's anti-Bellarmine disputations on Scripture postdate 1611, there are good reasons to believe that Bois had been familiar with the views of the former master of his college since his own student days.[76]

Bois's Septuagint annotations go some way towards illustrating his own use of the procedures developed by the likes of Cholinus and Whitaker, and his concern for

questions of authorship, composition, and the hybrid Judeo-Greek nature of the Apocrypha. These annotations reveal that Bois followed Cholinus in regarding parts of 1 Esdras as a direct, albeit shaky, translation of a Hebrew source, rather than as an original Greek composition with Hebraic features. This was clearest in the genealogical lists of the returning exiles in 1 Esdras, for whose Greek text a Hebrew equivalent was often readily available in the form of the canonical books that overlapped with it.[77] Yet Bois's Septuagint further reveals that his concern with such problems animated his study of all the genres represented in the Apocrypha. It shows how he adapted his methods and criteria from one apocryphal book to the next, supplementing the basic method sketched out by Whitaker with extra layers of erudition and critique.

In books or passages that lacked any direct canonical Hebrew equivalent, for example, Bois paid attention to features that served to identify them as original Greek compositions by authors who were familiar with Greek writing and thought. Some scholars in the early seventeenth century regarded such features as manifestations of a distinctive Judeo-Greek or 'Hellenistic' corpus of literature, and even of a 'Hellenistic' language, or dialect, which was common to the authors of the Septuagint and the New Testament.[78] Bois's other writings reveal a strong interest in such theories and their implications for biblical exegesis, and he read most of the relevant contemporary commentators.[79] For Bois, one of the main purposes of this body of scholarship was to reinforce the Reformed demarcation of the canon and of the Apocrypha: throughout his notes on the Septuagint, arguments about the apocryphal status of certain books are yoked to observations about their mixed Hebraic-Hellenic style and background.

There are several examples of this tendency in Bois's annotations, and they range across more than one genre of apocryphal writing. In 2 Maccabees, a historical book that furnished Catholics with proof-texts for a number of doctrines, including intercessory prayer, Bois combined observations from Whitaker and Peter Martyr to the effect that the book recommended suicide under certain circumstances.[80] It was therefore corrupted by pagan standards of morality, and could not be part of the canon.[81] Bois added a more purely philological argument about the book's canonicity, moreover, when he used Johannes Buxtorf the Elder's treatise on Hebrew epistolography to show that the book's epistolary exordium reflected Greek conventions of letter-writing rather than Hebrew ones.[82] This buttressed the assertions of Cholinus, Scaliger, and other scholars that 2 Maccabees, unlike 1 Maccabees, was a piece of 'Hellenistic' historiography composed in Greek, rather than a translation of a Hebrew original.[83]

Similarly, at the beginning of one of the 'sapiential' writings, Wisdom, Bois recorded Augustine's statement that the Jews did not attribute canonical authority to the book, alongside a comment by Philip Melanchthon that Wisdom was often attributed to Philo of Alexandria.[84] Melanchthon connected the book's composition with the embassy which Philo undertook to the Roman emperor Caligula, and treated it as a kind of 'mirror for princes.'[85] Bois knew that Philo had served Joseph Scaliger as a paradigmatic example of Greek-speaking, 'Hellenistic' Judaism: this philosophically-minded Jewish author hailed from Alexandria and was apparently unfamiliar with the Hebrew Bible.[86]

This 'Hellenistic' framework for understanding the Apocrypha must be borne in mind when turning from Bois's Septuagint annotations to his correspondence with Casaubon about 1 Esdras. Indeed, it informs Bois's queries more than any other single theme. Three of Bois's queries -- the first, second, and fifth -- are about features of 1

Esdras which Bois seems to have regarded as evidence of its author's immersion in Greek literary culture.

2. A Greek Interpolation: Bois's First and Second Queries to Casaubon

Bois's first and second queries should be considered alongside each other because they both concern the same section of 1 Esdras. Moreover, this section was especially likely to be associated with the style and subject matter of Greek literary texts rather than the canonical history of the exiles' return from Babylon.

In 1 Esdras 3:1-5:6, three young men serving as bodyguards at the court of King Darius devise a rhetorical contest. Each of them writes an answer to the question, 'What is the most powerful thing in the world?' and places it under the king's pillow. They end up giving speeches justifying their answers in Darius's presence. One of the young men turns out to be Zerubbabel, the Jewish governor of the province of Judah, and he wins the contest with a rousing speech arguing that nothing is stronger than the truth. As a prize, Darius allows Zerubbabel to lead the Jews who had been exiled from Jerusalem to Babylon in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar back there, and finish rebuilding their Temple.

Unlike the rest of 1 Esdras, there was no precedent for the story of the three bodyguards anywhere in the canonical Old Testament. Modern scholars regard it in much the same way as Bois appears to have done: as a non-canonical import.[87] The story also raised some of the strongest objections from sixteenth-century scholars. John Rainolds wanted to debunk the story of the three bodyguards in order to defend the chronology of the Persian kings established by Joseph Scaliger. For Rainolds, therefore, the main token of the story's inauthenticity was its distortion of biblical chronology: for instance, it referred to Zerubbabel as a 'young man' during Darius's reign, whereas, by Scaliger and Rainolds's calculations, he had to be more than 100 years old when Darius took the throne.[88] The critiques presented by Protestant theologians contrast sharply with the more positive reception of the story by the Church Fathers: far from seeking to displace it from the canon on stylistic or historical grounds, their works were littered with admiring references to Zerubbabel's climactic oration.[89]

In a later diary entry, Bois would confess an ignorance of the sort of chronological technicality on which Rainolds concentrated.[90] Nor are the process or the rules of translation likely to have allowed the translators much time to discuss them, or scope to change their approach to a given book because of its chronological implications. What Bois shared with Rainolds, however, was a broader commitment to philological and historical analysis of the apocryphal books. Staying within his own competence and the remit of revising the Bishops' Bible, Bois's first query shows that he was identifying different ways of distinguishing between 1 Esdras and its canonical equivalents, based on their place in literary and sacred history.

The first query which Bois put to Casaubon about this passage concerned a glaring textual problem at the beginning of it which translators and editors had struggled to resolve. Although 'What is the most powerful thing in the world?' is plainly the implicit question that forms the subject of the contest, it is never actually posed in the text. Instead, the bodyguards make an agreement that literally reads 'Let each of us give one speech, who/which shall be strongest.' Beside the syntactical awkwardness of the construction, the ambiguity of the relative pronoun ὅς meant that the subject of 'shall be

strongest' was unclear: it could either be the winning bodyguard or the 'speech' of the previous clause. As Bois explained to Casaubon, current English translations dealt with the sentence by joining its two clauses with a conjunction and merging it into the following sentence so that it ended less abruptly. The Bishops' Bible thus read, 'Let euery one of vs speake a sentence, *and* looke who shall ouercome, *and* whose sentence may seeme wiser then the others,' (my emphasis) after which it moved immediately onto an account of the rewards which the young men imagined the victor would receive from Darius. This was not the only way the problematic verse had been dealt with. Cholinus's version, along with another Protestant Latin translation by Franciscus Junius, both gave the second clause an adjectival function, taking its relative pronoun to refer back to the word 'speech' and translating the sentence as follows: 'Let each of us offer some outstanding speech.'

Bois's own solution to these problems reveals his willingness to use conjectural emendation in the face of a text that made little or no sense. Instead of the other solutions which he had outlined to Casaubon, Bois suggested emending three letters in the text, as though it originally read: 'Let each of us give one speech: what (thing) is the most powerful?'[91] This would make not only the sentence, but the whole passage, cohere: since each of the young men's answers in the following verses took the format '[x] is the most powerful' it would now, finally, be clear that they were responding to a question which they had all agreed upon. The conjecture was supported by a meticulous comparison with Josephus, who generally was, and still is, regarded as having used 1 Esdras rather than the Septuagint version of the canonical books as his source for the relevant sections of his *Jewish Antiquities*.[92] Josephus changed the story so that the questions were set by the king, rather than by the bodyguards. This made the bodyguards' agreement redundant, so that Josephus no longer had any need for the sentence containing τί ὑπερισχύει; but when the questions and answers were proposed later on in his account, ὑπερισχύω kept recurring 'as if the whole matter hinged on [that word]' and the bodyguards were still answering the question that must have been posed in the original text of 1 Esdras.

In Bois's view, his conjecture had the further advantage of clarifying the literary sub-genre to which this scene in 1 Esdras belonged. It was a 'griphus,' or a 'problema': a riddle, or a challenging question, to be considered by a group of interlocutors in a game of wit and perspicacity. Casaubon knew all about ancient riddling: in fact, he had written a series of essays on the subject in his wide-ranging *Animadversiones* on the Greek encyclopaedic author Athenaeus. Indeed, it was from Athenaeus that Bois adduced the example from pagan literature that best corresponded with the story of the three bodyguards. Athenaeus cited a fragment by the Athenian comic poet Diphilus, in which three girls dispute exactly the same question as the bodyguards, albeit with a more salacious conclusion. The winning answer was not 'Truth,' but 'a penis.' Casaubon's chaste commentary on Athenaeus gave relatively little attention to this fragment, but he did note the striking parallel with one of the apocryphal sections of the Old Testament. However, he mistakenly attributed the passage to the additions to Daniel which were found only in the Septuagint, not in the Hebrew text, rather than to 1 Esdras.[93] Bois was certainly aware of Casaubon's commentary: while he quoted the Greek text almost verbatim, the reference he gave corresponded with the commentary rather than with any edition of Athenaeus, and he described the author to Casaubon as 'your Athenaeus.' A desire to gloss over Casaubon's error may explain why Bois did not cite Casaubon's

commentary more precisely than this. Alongside Athenaeus, Bois also mentioned Aulus Gellius, another encyclopaedic writer who loved riddles and contests of wit.[94]

With these references to Athenaeus and Aulus Gellius, Bois probably meant to indicate that his query was underpinned by a broader assumption. Bois highlighted the striking similarity between the rhetorical contest in 1 Esdras and examples in pagan literature, as well as the culturally Greco-Roman historian Josephus, precisely because it was an interpolation without any parallel in the canonical Old Testament. Bois wanted to show that this part of the book was a pagan literary graft that owed nothing to Scripture.

This impression is reinforced by Bois's second query.[95] During his oration in praise of Truth, at 1 Esdras 4:39, Zerubbabel extols Truth's blindness to διάφορα, which both the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles, as well as the Protestant Latin translations by Cholinus and Junius, had rendered with synonyms of 'difference.'[96] This was the word's original and most common meaning; but in some texts, especially from the time of Alexander the Great onwards, it took on the extra meaning of 'money' or 'remuneration.' Isaac Casaubon's 1592 commentary on an example of this in one such later Greek text, Theophrastus's *Characters*, had used it as a precedent for reinterpreting four passages where the same term occurred in the apocryphal books: two from Ecclesiasticus and two from 2 Maccabees. After reading Casaubon's commentary, Bois extended Casaubon's observation to 1 Esdras, contending that διάφορα was synonymous with χρήματα or δῶρα: 'money' or 'gifts.' Bois proudly claimed this new interpretation as his own innovation in his second letter to Casaubon.

Casaubon's commentary on Theophrastus had not said anything explicit about the ramifications of his comments for the authorship and composition of Ecclesiasticus and 2 Maccabees. Nonetheless, both Casaubon and Bois would have agreed that this use of the word διάφορα was characteristic of later Greek literature. Ecclesiasticus and 2 Maccabees were both written, on internal evidence, no earlier than the second century BCE. The other sources which Casaubon and Bois adduced were also post-classical, starting with Theophrastus, the follower of Aristotle. They belonged to the period after the conquests of Alexander and the spread of Greek across the Mediterranean, as Casaubon suggested in his reply to Bois.[97]

Casaubon and Bois may even have thought, furthermore, that the use of διάφορα in its less familiar and later sense betrayed a higher-than-usual level of acquaintance with the Greek language and literature. If Bois had consulted Conrad Kircher's ground-breaking recent concordance of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, he would have seen that it was not attested as meaning 'wealth' anywhere in the Septuagint version of the canonical books.[98] In other words, it might have served as a token of a writer who was thinking and writing in Greek and for Greek speakers, rather than simply finding the first Greek words to hand that might serve as an easy equivalent for a Hebrew original.

To identify a distinctively Greek use of a term was another way of distinguishing this story as a piece of creative embellishment by a later author influenced by linguistic and historiographical paradigms that were familiar to Greek literature, but foreign to the canonical Old Testament or even to the Septuagint version of it. In this respect, it complemented Bois's discussion of the pagan associations of the riddle devised by the three bodyguards.

Besides the interest which it evinces in the relationship between the apocryphal books and classical texts, however, Bois's observation on 1 Esdras 4:39 also bears some

of the characteristic features of his approach to translation. Considered alongside the finished text of the King James Bible, it provides some evidence of the ways in which Bois's recommendations might have influenced, or sometimes clashed with, the decisions made by the translators as a whole.

Bois often aimed to replace a vague, or even impenetrable, rendering with a more specific one, which he arrived at through comparison with a wide range of sources, profane and patristic as well as biblical. The meaning extracted from these sources was often counter-intuitive, and not obvious to someone who knew Greek only from classical sources or dictionaries, rather than from deep philological research.[99] Such proposals often had the effect of placing a given book in its historical milieu. But they also served to place individual passages within those books in a particular narrative or dramatic context. In this case, Bois replaced an almost meaningless platitude -- 'truth does not accept differences' -- with something more pointed and concrete: 'truth does not accept money.' Given the context of the passage and the parallels cited from Maccabees, moreover, Bois may have had in mind a broader reinterpretation of the passage. 1 Esdras formed part of a set of historical narratives, stretching as far as the books of the Maccabees, that condemned heathen oriental governors for confiscating διάφορα from the Jews, ostentatiously displaying their wealth before their subjects, and letting luxury affect their conduct in other ways. Given such a context, Zerubbabel had been brave to praise 'Truth' for not doing exactly these things in the presence of the Persian king. His panegyric was made bolder still by the fact that the speaker before him in the contest had argued that kings were more powerful than anything else on earth. When Bois annotated Zerubbabel's initial reaction to this argument in the margins of his Septuagint, he left further evidence that he had grasped the anti-monarchical, and even anti-Persian, bent of what Zerubbabel was saying. Zerubbabel begins his response to the previous speaker by contradicting him, declaring that 'the King is not great.' Here, Bois cited Barnabé Brisson, another scholar whom he had read prior to 1611.[100] Brisson's treatise on the Persian monarchy showed Bois that Zerubbabel was alluding to the unique epithet which Greek speakers had given to the King of Persia because of his military and financial supremacy: 'The Great King.'[101] When Bois studied Zerubbabel's oration, he turned philosophical platitudes into concrete, dramatic, and historically situated speech-acts.

In his reply to Bois, Casaubon revealed the extent of his own insight into this sort of problem by taking Bois's solution a step further. He agreed with Bois, but he also encouraged him to make his translation even more specific: 'To take διάφορα is clearly to corrupt one's judgement by receiving money and to take bribes.'[102] In saying this, Casaubon was probably drawing on another observation which he had made in his commentary on Theophrastus. For the passages which Casaubon's commentary had cited from Ecclesiasticus, his reinterpretation of διάφορα had found further support in a generic and stylistic convention of the sapiential books: those passages clearly featured a pair of similar, but subtly varying, paired aphorisms, as was common throughout both Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. Now that Bois had drawn his attention to a similar moment in 1 Esdras, Casaubon could well have thought that the same was true in the case at hand. The binding theme of 1 Esdras 4:39, expressed more clearly in its second part, was clearly truth's relationship to justice: 'But she doeth the things that are iust, and refraineth from all vniust and wicked things.' Truth does not take bribes, and she does what is just. Casaubon does not directly connect his recommendation to the generic convention which

he had previously observed, but since Bois had already shown his awareness of the relevant passage of his commentary on Theophrastus, Casaubon may have thought that there was no need to labour the point.

Ultimately, the translators accepted Bois's interpretation of the verse, while stopping somewhat short of the even more specific, and strikingly modern, interpretation offered by Casaubon.[103] In the Bible of 1611, truth spurns 'rewards' rather than 'bribes.' This choice appears intended to bridge the gap between 'bribes' on the one hand, and Bois's proposal of 'goods' or 'money' on the other. This may indicate a certain conservatism among the translators, and a preference for a more vague option when the import of a verse was not totally clear. This explanation is reinforced by the numerous other cases where a similarly precise interpretation proposed in the margins of Bois's Septuagint is answered by a woolier one in the Bible of 1611.[104] Without studying the records of translation, it is tempting to attribute such decisions to the consent of a nameless, faceless committee.[105] But Bois's letters and annotations show that at least one of the translators, partly by following Casaubon's example, was aiming for a different effect.

3. To Hellenize or to Harmonize the Apocryphal Text? The Fifth Query

Bois's fifth query exhibited a similar concern to align the language of 1 Esdras with pagan literary sources. However, it concerned a passage which was in many ways the opposite of the story of the bodyguards: rather than an interpolation without any canonical parallel, the translators were dealing with a part of 1 Esdras that closely mirrored the canonical text, but also contained challenging deviations from it.

The ninth and final chapter of 1 Esdras, like the eighth chapter of the canonical book of Nehemiah, contains an account of the first public reading of the Book of the Law, administered by Ezra the Scribe and the Levites under him, after the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple. This passage was an enduring point of controversy between Catholic and Protestant theologians. Nehemiah 8 served Bellarmine and Whitaker, among others, as a proof-text for their own conceptions of the purpose of clerical and lay interpretation of Scripture, vernacular translation, and the history of the text of the Old Testament.[106]

The precise nature of the public reading was not entirely clear. In Nehemiah 8:8, Ezra and the Levites were said to read the Book of the Law 'distinctly' and 'give the sense.' Did they read the book and then translate or paraphrase it into Aramaic, as Bellarmine suggested? Or did they, as Whitaker claimed, follow the reading of Scripture with an exposition of it? Many Christian scholars' interpretations of the passage were Jewish in origin, and used these terms to attribute the invention of various elements of the text and apparatus of the Hebrew Bible to Ezra and his colleagues, including the sub- and supra-linear marks used to indicate vowel sounds and guide readers in other ways.[107] This tradition was inverted strikingly in 1650 by Louis Cappel, who used Nehemiah 8:8 as an epigraph to his epoch-making treatise on the Hebrew text. For Cappel, the reason why the readers had to read the Law 'distinctly' and 'give the sense' was because the vowel points and other elements of punctuation were missing, and would not be written into the text until after the redaction of the Talmud in the early Middle Ages.[108]

A further potential cause of ambiguity, and therefore disagreement, in the passage was its repeated use of the Hebrew verb בִּין ('understand'), sometimes in its Hiphil, or causative form ('cause to understand').[109] The literalistic, largely word-for-word translation offered in the Septuagint version of Ezra-Nehemiah maintained a uniform correspondence between בִּין and its Greek counterpart, συνίημι: every time the former appeared in the Hebrew text, including Nehemiah 8:8, it was translated by a form of the same Greek verb, or by its cognate, συνετίζω ('cause to understand'), which translated the causative Hiphil form.

1 Esdras 9, however, differed conspicuously from the Septuagint. Its sparing, compressed prose made it harder to align any given verse with a putative equivalent in the canonical text. 1 Esdras 9 often mirrored Nehemiah 8, but it never did so in such a uniform, predictable way. Most frustratingly, it did not use the same verb as the Septuagint to translate בִּין: in two cases, instead of συνίημι ('understand'), it used ἐμφυσιόω ('infuse life into'). This difficult verb appeared first in verse 48, and it recurred in verse 55.[110] The translators struggled with verse 48 in particular: they all agreed that it had to derive from some part of Nehemiah 8, but, as we shall see, they differed when they tried to identify a particular verse as its source text.

The solution to this problem mattered because any choice made in mapping the apocryphal onto the canonical text involved deciding what the canonical text meant; or at least, deciding what the apocryphal author-translator thought it meant. Ἐμφυσιόω might therefore serve to illuminate the meaning of its canonical equivalent. But it also presented further ambiguities in its own right. One problem was the difficulty of the phrase in which the verb first appeared, in verse 48: ἐμφυσιοῦντες ἅμα τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ('infusing life into the reading together'). In the Bishops' Bible, the Levites 'were earnestly occupied together in y^e reading' of the Law; in the Geneva Bible, they 'stode also earnestly vpon the reading.' Neither translation made its readers aware that this verb appeared twice in the passage, because they rendered its second occurrence quite differently: here, where the Greek text read ἐνεφυσιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν οἷς ἐδιδάχθησαν, both versions described the crowd as 'filled with the words' they had been taught, although the Bishops' Bible offered 'inflamed' as an alternative to 'filled' in a marginal note. As well as being internally inconsistent, both versions differed conspicuously from the equivalent sections of Nehemiah 8: neither had sought to harmonise 1 Esdras 9:48 with the verb used in Nehemiah 8, which they, like the Septuagint, translated with the more sober 'understand.'

This search for points of correspondence between the canonical and apocryphal texts was not straightforward. Throughout their attempts to find a solution, the King James translators were looking for various signs -- a noun here, a pronoun there -- that might corroborate their alignment of ἐμφυσιόω with one part of the Hebrew text rather than another. Their version would eventually mark a decisive break from the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles in its resolution of these inconsistencies and ambiguities. It matched the verbs in 1 Esdras 9:48 and 55 with those of Nehemiah 8 and its Septuagint translation, and in both cases it translated them exactly the same way as the Septuagint had. In verse 48, the King James Bible presented the Levites as 'making them withall to vnderstand it,' and when the verb ἐμφυσιόω recurred a few verses later, it read 'they [the people] vnderstood.' In their translation of this verb, the translators had evidently decided to make 1 Esdras as close to the Septuagint version of the Hebrew text as possible.

Bois's own solution was quite different from the one eventually adopted by the translators. He proposed to explain the meaning of ἐμφυσιόω by aligning verse 48 with the end of Nehemiah 8:8, as his letter to Casaubon suggests.[111] This is implied by Bois's paraphrase of the Greek word for 'reading' (ἀνάγνωσιν), which makes it grammatically identical to the equivalent word at the end of that verse in the Hebrew text.[112] Bois would have found further support for this alignment in the Sixtine text of 1 Esdras 9:48, which was the unique witness to an extra clause. Without that clause, the first part of verse 48 simply read: 'they taught the law of God.' 'They taught' corresponded better with 'they caused [the people] to understand' in Nehemiah 8:7 than it did with 'they read' in Nehemiah 8:8. The Sixtine text, however, added a second clause directly after 'they taught the law of God': 'and they read the law of God to the multitude.' Because it featured the verb 'they read,' the extra clause in the Sixtine text made it easier for Bois to align the rest of verse 48 with Nehemiah 8:8, which began with the same verb: 'So they read in the booke, in the Law of God'.

Bois's alignment of ἐμφυσιοῦντες ἅμα τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν with Nehemiah 8:8 was therefore based on the presence and placement of various words in the canonical text and in 1 Esdras. But even if Bois was confident that this difficult phrase was a substitute for the end of Nehemiah 8:8, it was still hard to be sure exactly what it meant. Bois's answer to this question provided a meaning for the phrase that had no clear parallel either in the canonical text or in the Septuagint. He treated the reading of the Law as a rhetorical performance: it was read, and then explained, 'in a strained voice' as though the readers were modern-day preachers aiming to inflame their audiences' hearts, and the verb ἐμφύσιοῦντες implicitly described the gestures and expressions that accompanied such efforts. He compared the passage with examples drawn from classical rhetorical and poetic theory, the most revealing of which was a long quotation from Cicero's *Brutus* arguing that oratory is pointless if an audience fails to be inspired by the speaker's words: in such a case, the orator is like a flautist trying to play a broken instrument.[113] We do not know the English words into which Bois planned to put this interpretation, but the interpretation itself presumed a very different scene for the public reading from the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles; the anodyne imprecision of 'were earnestly occupied' and 'stode...earnestly' was replaced with a more vivid understanding of what it would have actually entailed.

Bois presumed that the author of 1 Esdras had been translating Nehemiah 8, but taking liberties with it: rather than seeking a direct and obvious substitute for Hebrew terms, as the Septuagint had, the author provided a further elaboration of his own accord, and one that did not have any clear warrant in the canonical text. But if this was Bois's explanation of the phrase, it left some things unanswered. How, for instance, had the author of 1 Esdras dealt with the awkward Hebrew phrase just before the last part of Nehemiah 8:8 ('distinctly, and gave the sense')? Had he simply overlooked it because he did not understand it? Or was ἐμφυσιοῦντες ἅμα τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν perhaps meant to substitute for the whole sequence of actions at the end of the verse, including that awkward phrase? If so, readers might be encouraged to regard the apocryphal version as a legitimate, or even necessary, illumination of those words. This was a dangerous position for Protestants to take, given their need for confidence in the perspicuity of the Hebrew original and the self-sufficiency of the canon.

Perhaps as a result of these problems, Bois himself appears to have been dissatisfied with his own solution. This was the only instance in Bois's letters to Casaubon in which he wavered between two possibilities, rather than simply outlining one. The alternative possibility must have been the same as the solution proposed by the anonymous colleague who had visited Casaubon the day before Bois wrote to him: this is the only way of explaining Casaubon's endorsement in his reply of 'what you yourself write, and what the gentleman put to me in conversation yesterday.'[114] Casaubon cannot have been accepting both Bois's first proposal and a different suggestion at the same time; he must therefore have been referring exclusively to Bois's second proposal, which he knew to be a restatement of what Bois's colleague had told him the day before.

The solution which Bois's anonymous colleague presented to Casaubon aligned verse 48 not with Nehemiah 8:8, but with Nehemiah 8:7, and the verb which was translated by the Septuagint with συνετίζοντες ('causing [them] to understand').[115] On this assumption, 1 Esdras presented a slightly different rendering of בִּין from the one found in the Septuagint. Nonetheless, it preserved most of the original text's meaning, without adding quite as much as Bois had presumed in his own, more ambitious, interpretation. If there was any difference between συνετίζω and ἐμφυσιόω, it was only that the latter was 'a bit more emphatic.'

As we have seen, this was the solution eventually followed in the King James Bible. In preferring this solution to Bois's, the translators may have been motivated simply by a combination of scripturalism and lexicographical conservatism: it was safer to align ἐμφυσιόω with a verb found in the Septuagint rather than to give it an interpretation only attested by pagan sources, as Bois had. But the translators were also motivated by a reluctance to let 1 Esdras 9:48 stand for Nehemiah 8:8: indeed, they made concerted efforts to erase any trace of this possibility by deliberately mistranslating the verse. First of all, they omitted the extra clause in the Sixtine text that had encouraged Bois to align the verbs and nouns of verse 48 with Nehemiah 8:8 rather than 8:7. But even more tellingly, they refused to translate τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ('the reading'). As a result of these omissions, verse 48 came to resemble Nehemiah 8:7 ('caused the people to vnderstand the law') more closely than 8:8 ('and caused *them* to vnderstand the reading'): without the extra clause or a word for 'reading,' the Levites simply 'taught the law of the Lord, making them withall to vnderstand it.' Evidently, the translators were trying to do more than simply find correspondences between the canonical and apocryphal texts: they were trying to produce them.

The method underpinning Bois's first proposal, by contrast, was more imaginative, but also riskier. It preserved the particularity of the verb used in 1 Esdras 9, relied on a broad survey of classical as well as biblical usage, and proposed a more concrete and distinctive interpretation of the public reading than was found in any other ancient or modern version of it. This, combined with the fact that Bois was aligning it with a phrase in the canonical text that continued to exercise scholars and controversialists, may have made it too adventurous and provocative for the translators to accept.

Historical Confusions: The Third Query

Of all the queries with which Bois confronted Casaubon, the third was perhaps the most complex, and hardest to resolve using only the tools of philology and textual criticism. It

also seems to have interested Casaubon much more than the others. It concerned the rebuilding of the Temple, and specifically its altar, in 1 Esdras 5:50, and hostility that arose between the returning exiles and the people in the land of Judah during that process. Not only did the passage lack any direct parallel in the canonical books of the Hebrew Old Testament that narrated the same events: it threw the sequence of those events into disarray by placing the erection of the new altar in the reign of Darius rather than of Cyrus, the king who had initiated the restoration of Jerusalem.[116] John Rainolds had already pointed out these discrepancies in passing in his litany of historical errors found in this book, and he noted that he had not been the first scholar to do so: the widely read medieval exegete Nicholas of Lyra had already tried to resolve them without embarrassing the book's author, by suggesting that he had deliberately narrated the reconstruction of the Temple out of the proper chronological sequence.[117]

This chronological and intertextual confusion was augmented by the vague language of the verse. The relationship between the returning exiles and their neighbours was expressed using two rare and ambiguous compound verbs, and clauses whose subject and object were unclear. Moreover, the whole sequence of events was coloured by a particularly severe rash of the parataxis that characterized the Greek translations from Hebrew sources found in the Septuagint: four successive clauses all began with the conjunction καί. It is worth providing a literal translation that calls attention to the relevant ambiguities:

> And there were joined to/gathered against them from the other peoples of the land, and they erected the altar in its/their place, because they were hostile to/hated by them. And all the peoples of the land oppressed/strengthened them, and they offered sacrifices at the times appointed...

The problems of the verse were exacerbated by the verses surrounding it, which appeared to describe the same actions in very similar, but not identical, terms.[118] Was one verse an inept repetition of the others, or should they be differentiated from each other and referred to different historical events?

There were several different sections of the canonical text that might help the translators make sense of this verse, but no one in particular that clearly held the key. Perhaps it offered a crystallised account of sectarian disputes between the exiles and the Jews who had stayed behind.[119] Otherwise, it might describe intermarriage between gentiles and Jews, and their conversion to Judaism.[120] Alternatively, it might gesture at the efforts by the Samaritans or other nations to hinder the reconstruction of the Temple.[121]

When Bois wrote to Casaubon, then, several radically different interpretations of the whole passage were in play. Bois first of all asked Casaubon a fundamental question: did the people who came from 'the other peoples of the land' in the first part of the verse refer to Jews who had remained in the area around Jerusalem, or did it refer to gentiles?[122] The possibility of the former interpretation depended on Bois's recognition that the Greek verb in that clause might mean 'joined to' rather than 'gathered against,' as Cholinus, the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles had all taken it--although Bois's contrarian suggestion may also have been prompted by Nicholas of Lyra, who suggested that the verse made a legitimate addition to canonical Scripture by narrating the return of non-exile Jews to Jerusalem after they heard that the Babylonian exiles were rebuilding the Temple.[123]

Secondly, Bois asked Casaubon: who was the agent of the 'hatred' that prompted the exiles' erection of the altar 'in its place'? Were Jews shunning gentiles, or vice versa? Thirdly, Bois asked whether the 'peoples of the land' were strengthening the exiles or oppressing them.

Any one of these possible retranslations would have a knock-on effect on the translation of the rest of the verse's constituent parts. Cholinus, whose judgement Bois said he particularly respected, had interpreted it to mean that the 'peoples of the land' were hostile to the returning exiles and harrassed them; but the exiles had gone ahead and built their altar and continued their sacrifices despite this hostility. Cholinus's interpretation took liberties with the text, rearranging the clauses and assuming that in one case the Greek conjunction καί ('and') was serving as an awkward substitute for 'but'. Here, as elsewhere, Cholinus most likely had in mind the Hebrew prefix ו, which can be conjunctive or disjunctive: the ambiguity of the passage could thus be explained by supposing that something had been lost in translation from a Hebrew original.[124]

Bois's query shows that he was prepared to reconsider almost every element of the earlier interpretations of the passage which he had before him. But Casaubon's reply put forward an even more aggressively unconventional reading of the passage than Bois or Cholinus had countenanced.[125] On the basis of contemporary Greek historians such as Polybius (whom he had recently edited) and the New Testament, Casaubon confirmed Bois's suggestion that the first verb had been mistranslated: the passage must be describing a joining together of the exiles with some other community.[126] Next, Casaubon made use of a variant reading which was unique to the Sixtine Septuagint: instead of 'they erected the altar in its own place,' Casaubon read 'in their own place.'[127] Casaubon's use of the Sixtine reading allowed him to propose that there was a separate group of non-exiles who joined the returning exile community in the rebuilding of the Temple, but only worked on a specific part of it -- 'their own place.'

Casaubon's interpretation made more sense of the next clause in the verse ('because they were hostile to/hated by them'): the establishment of a separate space for the non-exiles to work in was a result of sectarian hostility between them and the exiles. It also showed that this verse need not be a redundant or garbled doublet of an earlier verse that narrated the erection of the entire Temple, and also featured the phrase 'in its place.' The reason why there appeared to be a double narration was because in this case the word 'altar' stood synecdochically for the entire Temple. Casaubon's proposals were tentative, partly because he did not have access to his own library; and he suggested that Bois consult Josephus, who might provide a sidelight on this 'momentous' verse. We cannot be sure what made the verse so important in Casaubon's eyes, although it is worth recording that he attributed great theological significance to similar moments of sectarian tension during the Second Temple period.[128] In any case, the immediately striking feature of Casaubon's interpretation is that it offered something which was not stated explicitly in the canonical account: namely, that there was actually some cooperation between the exiles and non-exiles in the rebuilding of the Temple. Although Casaubon could not check it for himself, moreover, his interpretation actually went against the only relevant passage in Josephus: according to that author, the Samaritans initially tried to join in the rebuilding of the Temple, but were rebuffed by the exiles, and instead tried to hinder its progress.[129]

If the translators had been willing to follow Casaubon and attribute any value to 1 Esdras as an account of this period, their decision would not have been entirely unprecedented, and it would also have aligned with some modern interpretations.[130] Protestant scholars were hardly averse to using non-canonical sources, including Josephus and 1 Maccabees, to adjust their interpretation of the canonical books.[131] But to Bois and his colleagues, this might have required too much confidence in 1 Esdras, a book which English theologians thought to be dangerously unreliable in other respects. Casaubon's reply had solved the problem of chronology by dissociating this verse's 'altar' from the Temple altar whose reconstruction the Book of Ezra placed in the reign of Cyrus. But the extent to which he departed from all earlier versions, especially the Bishops' Bible, may have disturbed the translators, especially given the historical ramifications of what he was saying.

In the end, the translators did follow Casaubon's recommendation and render the first part of the verse so that, unlike the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles, it allowed for the possibility that the exiles were joined, not harrassed, by some of their neighbours.[132] But they were otherwise conservative, in the sense that they kept the rest of the verse more or less unchanged, and added nothing in the margin: no explanatory gloss, no reference to Josephus, no advertisement of the potentially alarming differences between 1 Esdras and the canonical account.

Conclusion: Scholarship, Translation and Contingency

John Bois represents only one voice among others, and his ambitious, often far-fetched suggestions did not always persuade his colleagues, or even himself. Nonetheless, Bois's correspondence with Casaubon gives us an unusually deep insight into the confessional and theological exigencies that might have influenced the translators' work; the range and complexity of the intellectual problems faced by the translators of the Apocrypha in particular; the philological and historical resources that might be used to solve those problems; and, finally, the particular sophistication of the discussions that took place when the translation was being revised.

Although Bois was a distinguished enough scholar to participate in the revision of at least the Apocrypha and New Testament, and probably the Old Testament as well, he was far from unique among the translators. Plenty of Bois's colleagues, such as Andrew Downes, Henry Savile, and Richard Thomson, had similar credentials. These men were correspondents, admirers, and imitators of Scaliger and Casaubon, in much the way that Bois was. The same is true of John Overall and Lancelot Andrewes, whose interests in contemporary scholarship and its theological applications are only beginning to be appreciated.[133] Indeed, Andrewes was the patron who commissioned the work into which Bois put perhaps more time than any other: a defence of the Vulgate version of the New Testament against the revisions of modern Latin translators from Erasmus to Beza.[134]

By seeing the King James Bible through these translators' eyes, modern scholars of it can start to unlearn some of their most cherished assumptions about the functions and significance of vernacular biblical translation. First of all, it will be possible to move beyond the tradition of scholarship that has concentrated overwhelmingly on establishing how the Bible's text was arrived at, based on a quantitative analysis of readings in the tiny surviving sample of documents of the drafting process, and a piecing together of

obscure statements in a slightly larger number of contemporary external sources.[135] It is no coincidence that the greatest representatives of this tradition have themselves been engaged in producing editions or revisions of the King James Bible; they were not, in other words, scholars of the early modern period. Now, it is possible to subordinate the type of investigation which they have pursued to the task of determining what, and how, the translators thought.

If textual histories of the King James Bible have failed to gain much purchase on it, the same could be said of literary and cultural approaches. Recent studies of vernacular biblical translations have concentrated on the surfaces of Bibles as they were printed, encompassing paratexts such as their prefaces, visual apparatus, and marginalia as well as the text itself. From this perspective, the King James Bible can be made to appear uniform and monumental. Its choice of words, use of annotation, or apologetic references to past Christian writings can all, if viewed from a great enough distance, become redolent of a certain ideal of what a Bible should be. The nature of this ideal varies. It may be theological; it may be literary; it may be confessional, reflecting, for instance, a distinctively Anglican conception of biblical hermeneutics.[136] But whatever the ideals are, and regardless of whether modern scholars celebrate, criticise, or simply describe them, those scholars all follow similar basic procedures in deriving them from the surface of the Bible itself. Such techniques can also fuel even broader misconceptions about early modern readers' experiences of the Bible: for instance, that Protestants largely rejected humanist methods for contextualising the Bible, and instead channeled all of their intellectual energies into demonstrating that it was a 'harmonious' and homogenous body of 'timeless validity.'[137]

The evidence presented here suggests otherwise. The overwhelming tendency of the translators was to disaggregate and particularise individual books and passages. The queries which Bois addressed to Casaubon were highly specific to 1 Esdras. Any given English biblical translation was a disjointed production rather than a coherent one: a series of engagements with a range of different problems, each of which might have had its own specific solutions. There is, moreover, plenty of reason to believe that contemporary readers thought about the King James Bible in a similar way to the scholars who produced it. Indeed, the Bible itself encouraged them to do so, with its paratexts addressing text-critical and other scholarly problems in ways that are still poorly understood.[138]

Appreciating the pervasiveness of scholarly and critical thinking about the Bible during the post-Reformation period can thus deepen our understanding of how contemporary non-academic readers studied and used it. It can also, finally, help us to understand what happened next, and redraw period boundaries that have traditionally separated the Bible of the 'Reformation' from that of the 'Enlightenment.'[139] Historians have already begun to highlight continuities between the intellectual cultures of these two apparently distinct periods, especially with respect to the close and enduring connection between historical scholarship and interconfessional debate.[140] In the particular case of the Apocrypha, it is worth noting that the techniques with which orthodox Protestant scholars historicised non-canonical books could easily be turned on the canonical ones, and eventually used to fuel new forms of heterodoxy and scepticism. A generation after Casaubon, the Huguenot theologian Louis Cappel, who had been in England at the time of the translation, pointed out that the canonical books of the Old Testament often

narrated the same event in different ways. Scripture itself, not only the Apocrypha, painted a blurry picture of sacred history.[141] Cappel's observations, in turn, influenced the French Catholic critic Richard Simon's radical exposé of the unreliability of the Old Testament.[142] In other words, early modern readers of the Bible were not held in spiritual or intellectual stasis. Rather, they were able to view their sacred text through a critical and, ultimately, secular lens, as well as devotional, mystical, or dogmatic ones. If we are to recover the forms which this critical reading took, we need to pay greater attention to the ways in which vernacular translations were shaped by scholars like Casaubon and Bois.

Appendix: A Transcript and Translation of the Bois-Casaubon Correspondence

Provenance

Before presenting a text and translation of the Bois-Casaubon correspondence, I find it worth considering why such an obviously relevant source as the Bois-Casaubon correspondence has never been noticed by scholars of the King James Bible. One explanation lies in its provenance and the nature of the archive in which it is located. Like most other documents that derive from Bois, none of these letters was put where it was out of a desire to record information about that translation. Rather, they form part of an archive dedicated to the memory and legacy of Casaubon, which was also meant to assist further work in the areas to which that internationally renowned scholar had devoted himself.

Bois's letters are autographs, but the letter from Casaubon to Bois is a copy. This is explained by a letter which Bois wrote in 1630, indicating that he was keeping treasured autographs of letters which he had received from eminent scholars, including Casaubon, in a single box or desk (*scrinium*): in other words, he must have kept such originals for himself while allowing other scholars to make copies of them.[143] A series of notes written on the verso pages of the leaf following each document, none of them in the hands of Bois or Casaubon, give the impression that Bois's letters to Casaubon, and possibly also the copy of Casaubon's letter to Bois, were at some point packaged together with other material written by Bois.[144] Some of that material was concerned with the material Casaubon had gathered for his treatise 'On criticism' (*De critica*), which he announced in print and to several correspondents, but never published.[145] This material may have been transferred to Casaubon's papers from some other repository in November 1626, but precisely whose repository is not clear.[146]

Two further notes link these letters to another piece of writing by Bois that concerns Casaubon's scholarship, described in both notes as his 'judgement' on Casaubon's famous commentary on the Greek encyclopaedic author, Athenaeus.[147] This must refer to an item in another volume of Casaubon's papers: a page-long copy, apparently taken from a handwritten note in a printed book, of an appraisal of Casaubon's intellectual virtues which is attributed to Bois.[148] Bois himself dates the composition of this appraisal to 15 December 1623.[149]

The best explanation of how this material ended up among Casaubon's papers is that at some point in or after November 1626, Casaubon's son, Meric, who inherited his

father's correspondence and various other papers, got hold of various materials written by Bois that concerned Casaubon, either from Bois himself or by using an intermediary. Meric had a strong interest in his father's biography and intellectual legacy: he had already published a defence of him earlier in that decade and planned further works that would continue projects which his father had left unfinished at his death.[150] Meric also shared his father's papers and annotated books with colleagues, and he may have gathered this correspondence and the material that accompanied it with such a purpose in mind.[151]

The letters' provenance makes it possible that the letters from Bois found in this volume are not the ones which Casaubon actually received. This possibility is supported by their regular cancellations and insertions. Most revealingly, Bois seems at one point to have communicated the gist of a half-remembered passage of Cicero, continued to draft the letter by adding a second reference to another author, and then looked up the passage of Cicero and quoted it verbatim immediately after the second reference.[152] A fair copy would presumably not bear such signs of revision. On the other hand, such details may simply be tokens of the fact that Bois wrote the letters in some haste, and simply failed to smooth over any changes he had made before sending them to Casaubon. It is also possible that Casaubon returned Bois's letters to him, on the assumption that they would be of use to the translators. For now, then, the question of whether the letters are drafts will have to remain undecided.

Text

What follows is a non-diplomatic transcript and translation of British Library MS Burney 363, fols. 101r-v, 103r and 105r-v. I have reversed the order of Bois's first and second letters in order to reflect the chronological order in which they must have been written. Square brackets contain my own insertions. I have silently incorporated insertions, ignored cancellations, and regularised the punctuation in each letter. Most abbreviations have also been expanded.

[fol. 103r] Rem mihi facies gratissimam, optime, doctissiméque Casaubone, nec mihi solùm sed toti credo sodalitati nostrae, si tribus verbis explicueris quid de locis quibusdam subobscuris sentias, quae nobis dum libros Apocryphos vertebamus negotii nonnihil exhibuerunt. Primus ergo locus habetur 3. Esdrae, 3. 5: ᾽Είπωμεν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἕνα λόγον, ὅς ὑπερισχύσει.Anglici interpretes quos nunc habemus, ita haec verba interpretantur ac si legeretur Graecè: Εἴπωμεν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἕνα λόγον, καὶ ὅς ὑπερισχύσει &c. Interponunt enim copulam, & ὅς referunt ad ἐκεῖνος sive οὗτος, subauditum, atque ita Graeco contextui vim quodammodò afferunt. Junius & Petrus Cholinus, distinctionem post λόγον tollunt, & uno spiritu haec legunt omnia: Εἴπωμεν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἕνα λόγον ὃς ὑπερισχύσει, ὅς nimirùm ad λόγον proximè antecedentem referentes. Sed, nec hi nec illi mihi satisfaciunt. Restat ergo ut quid mihi videatur, quibusque de causis breviter ostendam. Ego itaque coniicio, ὃς ὑπερισχύσει, vitiosè legi, pro, τί ὑπερισχύει, vel, ὃς ἂν δηλοῖ, τί ὑπερισχύει. hoc est, Dicat quisque nostrûm sententiam suam de hoc problemate: τί ὑπερισχύει: quid sit potentissimum. Coniecturae meae favet trina repetitio verbi ὑπερισχύει paulò infrà, ubi suam quisque sententiam recitat ac proponit. Inde enim colligo conceptis verbis

unum aliquod certum argumentum ac veluti thema propositum illis fuisse de quo quaererent, & quae illa verba fuerint ex responsione illorum facilè posse deprehendi, nimirùm, τί ὑπερισχύει. Huc accedit mos veterum qui soliti sunt id genus griphis sive problematis se vel seriò vel per ludum exercere, ut ex Gellio, Athenaeo, & aliis liquet. Athenaeus tuus lib. 10. dipnos. cap. 19: Τρεῖς ποτὲ κόραι Σαμίαι ἀδωνίοισι ἐγρίφευον παρὰ πότον, καὶ προὔβαλον αὐταῖς τὸν γρίφον. τί πάντων ἰσχυρώτατον; hoc est ut cum Esdra loquamur: τί ὑπερισχύει; Non est enim ovum ovo similius, quàm griphus ille apud Athenaeum huic nostro problemati. Postremò valdè pro hac opinione facit Josephus, qui etiamsi paulò aliter rem istam narret, tamen verbum ὑπερισχύει, saepiùs repetit, acsi in eo totius rei cardo verteretur. Dicam si potero planiùs. Ubicunque apud Josephum mentio sit problematis istius sive à rege propositi, sive à satellitibus declarati, ibi semper aut verbum ὑπερισχύω expressè ponitur, aut aliud aliquod verbum quod tantundem valeat. Rationibus modò allatis addi potest & 4ª, nimirùm aut hîc proponi quaestionem, de quâ deliberaturi essent, aut nusquàm per totam narrationem: nusquam autem proponi non esse verisimile. οὖλέ τε καὶ μέγα χαῖρε doctorum doctissime & me vel in clientum tuorum numerum recipe. Quòdsi haec benignâ fronte acceperis, futurum est, Deo volente ut saepius tuas fores pulsem, & ζητήματα huius generis multò plura tibi afferam. Judicium tuum de hoc loco, velim hac ipsâ chartâ tribus verbis proponas.

Tui studiosissimus Joh. Bois.

[fol. 101r] Secundo loco quaero, quid de his verbis sentias, 3 Esd. 4, 39: Καὶ οὐκ ἔστι παρ' αὐτὴν λαμβάνειν πρόσωπα, οὐδὲ διάφορα. Vulgò exponunt διάφορα distinctionem: discrimen. Junius: *Apud quam neque est acceptio personarum, neque distinctio*. P. Cholinus: *Neque est apud ipsam respectus personarum, aut discrimen*. Sic etiam interpretes Anglici. Sed quô minùs haec interpretatio obtineat, repugnat accentus. Non est enim διαφορὰ, ὀξυτόνως sed διάφορα, προπαροξυτόνως. Quocircâ censuerim, διάφορα hîc idem valere, quod χρήματα, vel, δῶρα, munera. Hoc, ni fallor, primus animadverti, aut saltem nullo docente, etiamsi non possim salvo pudore diffiteri, tuos in Theophrasti charact. commentarios, primùm me de ista τοῦ, διάφορα, significatione admonuisse.

Tertiô, rogo te ut haec verba expendas paulisper, eiusdem lib. cap. 5, v. 50: Καὶ ἐπισυνήχθησαν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν τῆς γῆς, καὶ κατώρθωσαν τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ἦσαν αὐτοῖς, καὶ κατίσχυσαν αὐτοὺς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀνέφερον θυσίας κατὰ τὸν καιρόν. Hîc, ἐπισυνήχθησαν αὐτοῖς, quomodo interpretaris? convenerunt adversus illos, scilicet gentes adversus Judaeos, an aggregati sunt ad illos scilicet Judaei hîc illîc apud gentes dispersi, ad Judaeos è captivitate reduces? Deinde, ὅτι ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ἦσαν αὐτοῖς, passivè ne, an activè accipis? passivè de Judaeis, quòd nimirùm invisi essent gentibus, an activè, de gentibus quae odio prosequerentur Judaeos? Postremò, καὶ κατίσχυσαν αὐτοὺς, oppresserunt eos, an confirmarunt? Si benè observavi, κατισχύω cum 4º casu, est confirmo, ut, psal. 89, 22 & 3 Esdrae 7. sub finem: cum secundo, praevaleo, opprimo. P. Cholinus, vir, meâ sententiâ, non contemnendi in his literis iudicii, τῷ, κατίσχυσαν, opprimendi hoc loco significationem tribuit, &, ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ἦσαν, accipit activè & ἐπισυνήχθησαν αὐτοῖς, ad Judaeorum refert inimicos. totam praetereà

sententiam in hunc modum disponit: καὶ ἐπισυνήχθησαν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ἦσαν αὐτοῖς, καὶ κατίσχυσαν αὐτοὺς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ (veruntamen, pro particulâ scilicet adversativâ) κατόρθωσαν τ. θ. ε. τ. τ. α. κ. α. θ. &c. Sensus placet sed interpretatio displicet.

Pergo, ad 4um locum, qui habetur eiusdem lib. cap. 8, v. 25: ἢ ἀπαγωγῇ. Hic ἀπαγωγὴν vertimus incarcerationem, sive in carcerem abductionem. Sic usurpari videtur haec vox Esai. 14, 17. Chrysost. hom. 16. in Matth. pag. 169; Διὸ καὶ ὁ Χριστός οὐ Γεέννης μόνον ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀλλὰ καὶ δικαστηρίου, καὶ ἀπαγωγῆς καὶ δεσμωτηρίου.& doctiss. praeceptor meus in Theophrasti charact. *Veteres* ἔνδειξιν & ἀπαγωγὴν *ita distinguunt*, &c. nosti locum.

Quintus locus restat quem reperies, eiusdem lib. cap. ultimo, v. 49 & 55: καὶ πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος ἀνεγίνωσκον τὸν νόμον τοῦ κυρίου, ἐμφύσιοῦντες ἅμα τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν: &: Ἔτι γὰρ ἐνεφυσίωθησαν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν οἷς ἐδιδάχθησαν. De verbis ἐμφυσιοῦν & ἐμφυσιοῦσθαι consuluit te heri ut audio, unus è collegis meis. Caeterùm ne pigeat te, quaeso paucis accipere, quae sit mea de iisdem coniectura. τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, accipio, pro, τὰ ἀναγνωσθέντα: ἐμφυσιοῦν autem τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν videtur esse, non simpliciter legentis, sed lecta exponentis atque accommodantis ad auditores, idque vehementiore spiritu, & cum vocis aliqua contentione ut concionatores nostri solent. Habet enim haec vox tacitam descriptionem gestus & vultus eorum qui pro concione verba faciunt, & nudae lectioni alioquî languidiori futurae quasi animam & spiritum addunt. Cicero alicubi in Bruto, ni fallor hanc rationem reddit cur scriptis praestantissimorum oratorum minùs afficiantur homines, quàm orationibus vivâ voce prolatis, quia in scriptis anima & spiritus deest; & eôdem spectare videtur Aeschinis de Demosthene elogium: *Quid si ipsam belluam audivissetis*? Apud Ciceronem in Bruto, auditores cum tibiis, & orator cum tibicine eleganter in hunc modum comparantur: *Ita se res habet, ut si tibiae inflatae non referant sonum, abiiciendas eas sibi tibicen putet: sic oratori populi aures tanquam tibiae sunt, eae si inflatum non recipiunt, aut si auditor cum illo tanquam equus non facit, agitandi finis faciendus est.*[fol. 101v] Persius tuus sat. 1a, *Scribimus inclusi, numeros ille, hic pede liber, Grande aliquid, quod pulmo animae praelargus anhelat.* Hippócrates νόμῳ: Ἔτι δὲ φιλοπονίην προσενέγκασθαι ἐς χρόνον πολὺν, ὅκως ἡ μάθησις ἐμφυσιωθεῖσα, δεξιῶς τε καὶ εὐαλδέως τοὺς κάρπους ἐξενέγκηται &c. Desidero horum verborum commodum interpretationem: Nam Jani Cornarii, & Anutii Faesii, non placet. Porrò quotiès comparo Esdram nostrum, cum authenticâ historiâ, in eam adducor sententiam ut existimem τὸ, ἐμφυσιοῦν respondere τῷ συνετίζειν, & τὸ ἐμφυσιοῦσθαι τῷ συνιέναι, sed ita tamen, ut ἐμφυσιοῦν & ἐμφυσιοῦσθαι plus aliquid significent, & aliquantò sint ἐμφατικώτερα. Nam in verbo ἐμφυσιόω duplex esse videtur significatio, contentionis primùm in φυσιόω, & deinde applicationis ad auditores, in praepositione ἐν. Sic paulò post in fine cap. ἐνεφυσιώθησαν, id foret ἔναυλα εἶχον τὰ ῥήματα, ἃ ἐδιδάχθησαν.

Sextó aveo scire, an lectio tua suppeditare queat nobis aliquid, quod illustret hunc locum 4. Esdrae, 2. 23: *signans commenda sepulchro*.videtur alludere ad ritum aliquem sepeliendi nobis incognitum, tibi verò fortassè non ignotum, qui omnia antiquitatis scrinia pervestigaris & excusseris.

J. B.

[fol. 105r] Isaacus Casaubonus Johanni Bois S. D. Respondissem ad priores tuas,

optime vir atque doctissime, si fuisset ad manum qui meas ad te deferret. quin fuit estque animus domum ad te adeundi, ut de huiusmodi rebus plenius atque uberius te disserentem audiam. nam equidem in hac αποδημία, procul a libris meis positus, et ab omnibus rebus imparatus, quid possum aliud nisi aures discendi avidissimas adferre. Tuum est, et reverendorum tuorum collegarum, τῶν εἰς ἄκρον τῆς ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐληλακότων, de his statuere, et aliis quod sequantur praescribere. Ego Dei gratia, τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ μέτρα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου novi, neque ita sum incuriosus existimationis meae, ut coram tot Rosciis mimum agendum mihi putem. Quare si id exspectas, ut τὴν ἀρέσκουσαν pronuntiem; ἄλλην δρῦν βαλάνιζε. nam mihi illa semper sententia probabitur, quam tot praestantissimis viris fuisse intellexero probatam. Sin autem id agis, ut quod repente mihi in mentem venerit, tibi exponam, magis ut tua confirmem quam ut novi aliquid οἴκοθεν afferam; age mos geratur voluntati tuae.

In III. Esd. 3. 5. perplacet tua, vir eruditissime, sententia: cui stabiliendae nihil videtur addendum; nisi quis velit lucem Soli ire foeneratum.

IIII. cap. λαμβάνειν διάφορα, plane est pecuniam ad corrumpendum iudicium accipere et δεκάζεσθαι. quum certissimum sit eius aetatis Graecos, aut qui Graece loquebantur, διάφορα usurpasse pro χρήματα et pecunia; quid causae dici potest cur hic ea significatio locum habere non queat?

Verba e cap. 5. 50. sententiam obscuram continent, de qua accuratius responderem; si inter libros meos versarer. Cholini sententia admodum est mihi suspecta. nam ἐπισυνάγεσθαί τινι aut πρός τινα, non est profecto convenire adversus aliquem. In historiis Graecorum, maxime autem Polybii, ἐπισυνάγεσθαι frequenter occurrit, pro copiis prioribus alias adiungere. non enim otiosa est praepositio ἐπὶ. quae tamen in hoc verbo non ita accipitur ut in ἐπιστρατεύειν: sed potius ut apud B. Paulum ἐπιδιατίθεσθαι priori testamento aliud addere. et apud Polybium ἐπισυνθήκαι pacta post priora pacta facta. deinde illa mihi negotium facessunt; καὶ κατώρθωσαν τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν quae aliter exponere non possum nisi ut dicantur isti, qui recens e vicinis gentibus eo convenerant separatam ab aliis stationem habuisse, et certam partem aedificii sacri quod θυσιαστήριον videtur συνεκδοχικῶς dici, curasse et [fol. 105v] pro sua virili in ea laborasse. Iam illa ὅτι ἐν ἐχθρᾷ ἦσαν αὐτοῖς, rationem nisi fallor continent praecedentium istorum, ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν: quare enim certus illis locus assignatus? quia inter Judaeos qui redierant e captivitate et istos graves simultates intercedebant: quarum quidem caussa non est obscura. κατίσχυσαν, tecum expono, firmarunt, vires adiecerunt. Cogitandum an sit aliquid apud Josephum quod illustrando huic loco faciat; qui magni momenti est.

In VIII. 25. ἀπαγωγὴ verbum est forense, quod pro loco significat rapere in carcerem; aut rapere ad necem. nam et ἀπάγειν saepe legitur, pro ad supplicium ducere.

De verbo ἐμφυσιοῦν in ultimo capite nihil possum addere ad illa quae ipse scribis, et quae heri vir excellentis doctrinae mihi verbis exposuit.

In IV Esdrae, *signans, Commenda sepulchro*, facilius intelligeremus si Graeca haberemus. vereor enim ne mala versio crucem hic lectoribus figat. fortasse erat, σημειωσάμενος, vel ἐπιστήσας, vel tale quid. ut sit haec sententia. quoties in cadaver incideris, noli illud praeterire ἀνεπιστάτως, sed attende illi, et tui officii fac tibi in mentem veniat. aut fuit fortasse ὀττευσάμενος, religioni rem habens, vel religione quadam commotus et affectus. Ni hoc sit, e ritibus Judaeorum aliquid excogitandum ad lucem illius verbi *signans*.

Translation

[fol. 103r] You would be making me most grateful, most excellent and learned Casaubon — and not just me, but, I believe, the whole of our fellowship — if you were to lay out, in a few words, what you think about a few very obscure passages that have presented us with considerable difficulty while we have been translating the apocryphal books. Now, the first passage is found in 1 Esdras 3:5: 'Let us each say one thing, who/which will be strongest.' The English translations which we have at present render these words as though the Greek read: 'Let each of us say one thing, and who will be strongest' etc. For they put a conjunction in the middle, and make 'who' refer to an unwritten 'that man' or 'this man'; and in doing so, they take a certain amount of liberty with the Greek text. Junius and Petrus Cholinus remove the punctuation mark after 'thing,' and read all of this part in one breath: 'Let each of us say one thing which will be strongest' — evidently, they take 'who/which' to refer to 'thing,' which directly precedes it. But neither these nor those translators satisfy me. It remains, then, for me to explain briefly what I think, and on what grounds. I, therefore, conjecture that 'who/which will be strongest' is a corrupt reading for 'what is strongest,' or, 'whoever shows, what is strongest.' That is, 'Let each of us declare his opinion concerning this question: τί ὑπερισχύει: what is most powerful.' My conjecture is supported by the threefold repetition of the word 'is strongest [ὑπερισχύει]' just below, where each man reads out and puts forward his opinion; this suggests to me that some one particular fixed subject and, as it were, topic has been proposed by them, with a specific verbal formula, and they are to deliberate about it; and it is easy to discern what that verbal formula was from the way in which the men respond: doubtless, it was 'what is the strongest thing.' Here it is worth noting, additionally, the custom of the ancients who used to exercise themselves with riddles or questions of this kind, whether for fun or for serious reasons. This is clear from Gellius, Athenaeus and other authors. Your Athenaeus, in book 10, chapter 19 of the *Deipnosophistae*: 'once upon a time three Samian girls were telling riddles at the Adonia festival over drinks, and one of them posed the riddle, "What's the strongest thing in the world?"'[153] That is, as we might say in the manner of Esdras, 'what is the strongest thing [τί ὑπερισχύει]?' Truly, one egg does not resemble another egg more closely than that riddle in Athenaeus resembles this question of ours. Finally, Josephus lends a great deal of weight to this opinion. Even if he narrates this scenario a little differently, he nevertheless repeats the word 'is strongest' several times, as if the whole matter hinged on it. I will try to explain what I mean in plainer terms. Wherever Josephus makes mention of that question, either when it is suggested by the King, or answered by his bodyguards, he always puts either the word 'is strongest' itself, or some other word which means the same thing. A fourth reason can be added to those I have just presented: clearly, the question over which they are to deliberate has to be proposed here, or it would not appear anywhere in the entire narration; but it seems unlikely that it would never be proposed. Hail and farewell, most learned of learned men, and please accept me, too, into the ranks of your clients. And if you receive this with a welcoming countenance, the future, God willing, will see me knocking on your door more often, and bringing you many more queries of this kind. I would like you, if you please, to set out your judgement about this passage on this very piece of paper, in just a few words.

Your most devoted admirer, John Bois.

[fol. 101r] In the second passage, I would like to know what you think about these words in 1 Esdras 4:39: 'And there is no accepting of persons with her, nor differences [διάφορα].' Most people gloss διάφορα as 'distinction' or 'differentiation.' Junius: 'With whom there is neither taking of persons, nor distinction. P. Cholinus: 'Nor is there concern for persons with her, or differentiation.' Thus, too, have the English translated it. But the accent militates against letting this translation keep its place. For it is not διαφορὰ with an oxytone, but διάφορα with a proparoxytone. As a result, my own judgement would be that διάφορα here means the same thing as χρήματα ('goods'), or δῶρα, 'gifts.' Unless I am mistaken, I am the first man to have noticed this — or at least, I did so without anyone's guidance, even if it would be shameful for me to deny that your commentaries on Theophrastus brought that meaning of διάφορα to my attention in the first place.

Third, I ask you to weigh these words a little, in the same book, chapter 5, verse 50: 'And there were joined to/gathered against [ἐπισυνήχθησαν] them from the other peoples of the land, and they erected the altar in its place, because they were hostile to/hated by [ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ἦσαν] them. And all the peoples of the land oppressed/strengthened [κατίσχυσαν] them, and they offered sacrifices at the times appointed.' Here, how would you translate ἐπισυνήχθησαν αὐτοῖς? 'They went against them' — i.e. the gentiles against the Jews — or 'they were added to them' — i.e. the Jews who were scattered here and there among the gentiles, to the Jews who were returning from the captivity? Next, do you take 'because they were hated by them' as passive or active? Passive and saying of the Jews, that they were (of course) hated by the gentiles, or active, and referring to the gentiles who persecuted the Jews in a hateful way? Finally, καὶ κατίσχυσαν αὐτοὺς: 'they oppressed them' or 'they strengthened them'? If I'm not mistaken, κατισχύω with the fourth case, is 'I strengthen,' as in Psalm 89:22 and at the end of 1 Esdras 7: with the second case, 'I overmaster, oppress.' P. Cholinus is a man whose judgement is to be respected in this field of literature, in my opinion; and in this passage he gives κατίσχυσαν the meaning 'oppress,' and takes ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ἦσαν as active, and refers ἐπισυνήχθησαν αὐτοῖς to the enemies of the Jews. Moreover, he arranges the whole sentence in this way: 'and there were gathered against them from the other peoples of the land, and all the peoples of the land oppressed them, and ('but nevertheless' — clearly, that is to say, [καὶ is used] in place of the adversative particle) they erected…' etc. The meaning makes sense, but it does not seem acceptable as a translation.

I proceed to the fourth passage, which is found in the 8th chapter of the same book, verse 25: 'or by leading away [ἀπαγωγῇ].' Here we are translating 'leading away' as 'imprisonment,' or 'taking away to prison.' This word appears to be used in this way in Isaiah 14:17. Chrysostom, in his 16th homily on Matthew, p. 169, [says]: 'Wherefore Christ called to mind not just Gehenna but also his trial, and his incarceration and prison cell.' And my most learned teacher on Theophrastus' *Characters*: 'The ancients distinguish "indictment" and "imprisonment" in this way,' etc. You know the place.

There remains the fifth passage, which you will find in the final chapter of the same book, verses 49 and 55: 'and they taught the law of the Lord to the multitude, infusing life into the reading together [ἐμφύσιοῦντες ἅμα τὴν ἀναγνωσιν]' and: 'for

they were still infused with life [ἐνεφυσίωθησαν] in the words with which they had been taught.' I hear that one from my colleagues consulted you about the words 'infuse life into [ἐμφυσιοῦν]' and 'be infused with life [ἐμφυσιοῦσθαι]' yesterday. Now, if it does not bother you, please accept my own conjecture, put briefly, about the same words. I take 'the reading' to be there as an alternative for 'the having-been-read [things]': but to 'infuse life into the reading' seems to be the act not of a simple reader, but of someone who expounds what has been read and accommodates it to his listeners, and does it with heavier breathing and some straining of his voice, as our own preachers tend to. For this word has an implicit description of the gesture and facial expression of men who are engaged in public speaking, and lend, as it were, soul and spirit to what would otherwise be a less vigorous, bare reading. Cicero, somewhere in the *Brutus*, I think, gives this rationale for why men are less affected by the writings of the greatest orators than they are by speeches delivered aloud — because writings lack a soul and a spirit; and Aeschines' eulogy on Demosthenes seems to make the same point: 'What if you had heard the beast itself?'[154] In Cicero's *Brutus*, there is an elegant comparison of listeners with pipes, and of the orator with the pipe-player, along these lines: 'Yes, that is inevitably the case. Thus, for example, if the wind instrument when blown upon does not respond with sound, the musician knows that the instrument must be discarded, and so in like manner the popular ear is for the orator a kind of instrument; if it refuses to accept the breath blown into it, or if, as a horse to the rein, the listener does not respond, there is no use of urging him.'[155] [fol. 101v] Your Persius, in the 1st *Satire*: 'We shut ourselves away and write some grand stuff, one in verse, another in prose, stuff which only a generous lung of breath can gasp out.'[156] Hippocrates in his *Law*: 'Moreover he must apply diligence for a long period, in order that learning, becoming second nature, may reap a fine and abundant harvest.'[157] I cannot find a satisfactory translation of these words, for I am not happy with Janus Cornarius's or Anutius Foesius's.[158] On the other hand, every time I compare our Esdras with the authentic history, I am led towards the aforementioned opinion, and to think that 'infuse life into' corresponds with 'cause to understand [συνετίζειν],' and 'have life infused into' with 'to understand [συνιέναι]'; but in such a way that 'infuse/be infused with life' mean something more, and are a little more emphatic. For the word 'infuse life into' seems to have a twofold meaning: first, 'infuse life' conveys a sense of straining, and then 'into' conveys a sense of directing it towards one's listeners. So, a little later, at the end of the chapter, 'they were infused' would be equivalent to this: 'they had the words which they had been taught ringing in their ears.'

Sixth, I am eager to know, whether your reading can supply us with anything to illuminate this passage, 2 Esdras 2:23: 'signing, commend them to the grave.' It seems to allude to some ancient burial rite which is unknown to us; but not unknown, perhaps, to you, who have thoroughly investigated all of the archives of antiquity, and turned them inside out.

J. B.

[fol. 105r] Isaac Casaubon to John Bois, greetings. I would have replied to your earlier letter, most excellent and most learned man, if there had been somebody to hand who could bear my letter to you. Indeed, I was and am minded to visit your own

residence, so as to hear you talk about matters like these in greater detail and depth. For my own part, during this journey, having been separated from my own books by a long distance, and without any material comforts, what else could I bring other than ears that are most eager to learn? It is up to you, and your honourable colleagues, who have ascended to the pinnacle of erudition in Greek, to make determinations regarding these things, and to lay down rules for the others to follow. I, by the grace of God, know my limits — they are linguistic ones[159] — and I am not so reckless about my own reputation as to think that I should play the mime in the presence of so many Rosciuses. So if you are expecting me to prescribe a rule for you to follow, go and shake acorns from a different oak. For I will always subscribe to an opinion when I know that it has met with the approval of so many outstanding men. But if, on the other hand, what you are getting at is that I should set out for you whatever comes immediately to mind, more in order to confirm your thoughts than to bring anything new from my own stores, then come, let us follow the path you suggest.

In 1 Esdras 3:5 your opinion seems absolutely satisfactory, most learned man. I don't think anything needs to be added in support of it, just as there is no need to provide artificial illumination in broad daylight.

In chapter 4, 'to take differences [διάφορα]' is clearly to corrupt one's judgement by receiving money and to take bribes. Since it is absolutely certain that Greeks of that era, or those who spoke Greek, used 'differences' for 'goods' and 'money'; can any reason be given as to why that meaning cannot have a place here?

The meaning of the words from chapter 5:50 is obscure. I would be able to give a more accurate answer about it if I had my books around me. I do not trust Cholinus's judgement at all. For to επισυνάγεσθαί to someone or towards someone, is not actually to gather against someone. In Greek historical writing, but above all in Polybius, ἐπισυνάγεσθαι frequently appears in the sense of joining a second army to an army that was already there. For the prefix ἐπι is not redundant. In this word, however, it does not work in the same way as it does in 'to march against [ἐπιστρατεύειν]': but rather as, in Saint Paul, ἐπιδιατίθεσθαι is to add another testament to the previous one. And in Polybius, ἐπισυνθήκαι are treaties that come after earlier treaties have been made. Next, I am having a lot of trouble with those words: 'and they erected the altar in their own place [καὶ κατώρθωσαν τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν],' which I cannot explain otherwise than by supposing that those who had recently gathered there from the neighbouring peoples are said to have had a location set apart from the others, and to have taken care of a certain part of the sacred building, which seems to be called the altar by a synecdoche, and [fol. 105v] to have worked on it as their own share. Now, those words 'because they were hated by them,' unless I am mistaken, contain the rationale for what precedes them, 'in their own place': why, that is, was a specific place assigned to them? Because serious hostilities arose between the Jews who had returned from the captivity and those people, the cause of which is obvious. Κατίσχυσαν, I interpret in the same way as you, 'they strengthened,' or 'added their strength.' It is worth considering whether there is something in Josephus that might serve to illustrate this passage, which is very momentous.

In 8:25, 'leading away' is an official judicial term, which in this case means 'to take into custody'; or 'to take to be executed.' For 'lead away' is also often used for 'bring to punishment.'

Concerning the word 'infuse life into' in the final chapter, I can add nothing to what you yourself write, and what the outstandingly learned man outlined to me in conversation yesterday.

In 2 Esdras, 'signing, commend to the grave' would be easier for us to understand if we had the Greek source. For I fear that a bad translation has created this crux for its readers. Perhaps [the source] read σημειωσάμενος ['having taken notice of/signed'], or ἐπιστήσας ['having paid attention/placed or imposed upon'], or some such. So that the meaning would be: whenever you come across a corpse, don't pass by without giving it any notice, but attend to it, and make sure that you bear your duties towards it in mind. Or perhaps it was ὀττευσάμενος ['having augured/regarded as ominous']: having concern for religion, or having been moved and affected by some religious feeling. If not this, then something has to be thought of in the rites of the Jews that might shed light on that word 'signing.'

---

[1] I would like to thank Paul Botley, James Carley, Mordechai Feingold, Thomas Fulton, and Kirsten Macfarlane for their advice and assistance with this chapter. For quotations from the King James Bible, I have used Gordon Campbell, ed., *The Holy Bible: Quatercentenary Edition* (Oxford, 2010). Biblical verses referred to outside of quotation marks have been made to correspond with this edition. For the text of the Septuagint, beside the early modern editions, I have consulted Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta*, 5th edn. (Stuttgart, 1952); and, for 1 Esdras in particular, the full *apparatus criticus* in *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Gottingensis editum*, 16 vols. (Gottingen, 1931-), vol. VIII. For the Geneva Bible, I have used *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition* (Madison, WI, 1969); and for the Bishops' Bible, *The Holy Bible* (London, 1602). Many of the issues addressed in the present chapter will be covered more fully in my forthcoming monograph on the production and reception of the King James Bible.

[2] The daily entries in Casaubon's diary record that he left Paris on 8 October 1610 and arrived in London, having passed through Canterbury, on 30 October 1610: see Isaac Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ed. John Russell, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1850), 2:766-81.

[3] For Casaubon's reaction to the assassination of Henri IV, see e.g. his letter to Claudius Salmasius, 19 May 1610, Isaac Casaubon, *Epistolae*, ed. Theodoor Jansson van Almeloveen (Rotterdam, 1709), 352.

[4] Casaubon's anti-papal treatise of 1607, *De libertate ecclesiastica*, had been suppressed royal officials and the papal nuncio in France before its printing was complete, but one of the unfinished copies was received enthusiastically by Archbishop Bancroft and other members of the English hierarchy. See Paul Botley, *Richard 'Dutch' Thomson, c. 1569-1613* (Leiden, 2016), 114-15, for its English reception; and, more generally, Nicholas Hardy, 'Religion and Politics in the Composition and Reception of Baronius's *Annales Ecclesiastici*: A New Letter from Paolo Sarpi to Isaac Casaubon', in *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in Honor of Tony Grafton*, ed. Ann Blair and Anja Goeing, 2 vols. (Leiden, 2016), 1:21-38, esp. 21-2.

[5] For Casaubon's classical scholarship and its religious implications, see Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, *'I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue': Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, MA, 2011);

Anthony Grafton, 'Protestant versus Prophet: Isaac Casaubon on Hermes Trismegistus', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 46 (1983), 78-93.

[6] For instance, Italian: see his letters to Giovanni Diodati, 1 May and 11 June 1608, Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 603, 314-15, respectively. For Diodati's translation, see T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 2 vols. (London, 1903-1911), 2:811-12.

[7] Casaubon's copy of the *Advancement* is Huntington Library, 56251. See William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2008), 13-15.

[8] *Ephemerides*, 2:809: 'Ad Aulam hodie profectus, concioni interfui cujus non multa sane, non tamen plane nihil intellexi'.

[9] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, vol. II: 'Regem inde conveni serenissimum plane Principem et sui semper simillimum. Prandenti affui, et toto prandio, quam longum illud fuit, audivi examinantem Notas appositas Versioni Anglicae S. Bibliorum quae nuper Duaco prodiit. Legebat Episcopus Bathoniensis, Rex censebat. Censuras approbabant qui aderant Episcopus Eliensis, Episcopus Coventriensis, et ego cum illis. Dominus Jesus Regem optimum magis magisque lumine suae veritatis velit illustrare. Mira certe hujus Principis in studiis sacris oblectatio, quae satis nunquam laudari poterit'.

[10] For these campaigns, and Casaubon's role in them, see Johann P. Sommerville, 'Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance' (unpublished PhD, University of Cambridge, 1981); W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997); Corrado Vivanti, *Lotta politica e pace religiosa in Francia fra Cinque e Seicento* (Turin, 1963); Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1978). For Casaubon's work with James and Andrewes's publications, see Mark Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon, 1559-1614*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1892), 347; David Harris Willson, 'James I and His Literary Assistants', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 8 (1944), 35-57, esp. 40-53. Casaubon himself produced three major publications under James's aegis: the *Ad Frontonem Ducaeum epistola* (London, 1611); his and James's *Ad epistolam illustr. et reverendiss. Cardinalis Perronii responsio* (London, 1612); and finally, the *De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes XVI* (London, 1614). For their scholarly and theological dimensions, as well as the immediate circumstances of their publication and reception, see Nicholas Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters* (Oxford, 2017), 49-151.

[11] For a survey that takes in much of the secondary literature deployed in the present chapter, see Dmitri Levitin, 'From Sacred History to the History of Religion: Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity in European Historiography from Reformation to "Enlightenment"', *The Historical Journal* 55 (2012), 1117-60.

[12] For Casaubon's arrival and the consultation with Bois's colleague, see nn. 2 and 27, respectively.

[13] Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 417.

[14] British Library, MS Burney 363, fol. 105[r]: 'in hac α π ο δ η μ ί α, procul a libris meis positus, et ab omnibus rebus imparatus, quid possum aliud nisi aures discendi auidissimas adferre'.

[15] Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 273.
[16] See, respectively, *Ephemerides*, 2:796; Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, 2:798; Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, 2:892.
[17] Although Ward Allen was mistaken about the date of the printing of the second volume of the Eton Chrysostom, his comments on Bois's use of the first volume in 1610 or 1611 remain valid: Ward Allen, ed., *Translating for King James* (London, 1970), 9-10. They were confirmed by David Norton's discovery of another, independent manuscript of Bois's New Testament notes that also contained accurate citations of Savile's first volume: see David Norton, 'John Bois's Notes on the Revision of the King James Bible New Testament: A New Manuscript', *The Library*, 6th ser., 18 (1996), 328-46, esp. 344.
[18] MS Burney 363, fol. 101^{r}. Bois's citation matches the 1602 Heidelberg edition of Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew, and not the Savile edition: *Sancti Patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi expositio in Evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (1602). Savile used this edition as the base text for the corresponding portion of his own edition: see S. L. Greenslade, 'The Printer's Copy for the Eton Chrysostom', in *Studia Patristica*, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin, 1966), 7:61. Bois wrote notes on those homilies, and various other works, which were printed as an appendix in Savile's eighth and final volume: see Henry Savile, ed., *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi opera graece*, 8 vols. (Eton, 1613), 'Notae,' 8:173-82, 217-24; although Bois is often referred to in the third person in the main sequence of notes for this volume, compiled by Savile himself. See esp. Savile, *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi opera graece*, 8:145-6. He must have had access to the second volume, containing the Homilies on Matthew, after it was printed in 1610, but before the eighth volume was printed in 1613. For these dates, see Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec: une histoire européenne (1588-1613)', in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, ed. Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle (Berlin, 2008), 316-17, n. 211. Bois is reported, moreover, to have received a copy of the entire edition in return for his services to Savile, once the printing was complete: Anthony Walker, 'The Life of That Famous Grecian Mr. John Bois', in *Translating for King James: Being a True Copy of the Only Notes Made by a Translator of King James's Bible*, ed. Ward Allen (London, 1970), 141.
[19] For the final revision and Bois's role in it, see David Norton, *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge, 2005), 17–20. It is still not known when the King James Bible was printed, or began to be sold: Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford, 2009), 71–4; David Norton, *The King James Bible: A Short History from Tyndale to Today* (Cambridge, 2011), 93.
[20] Jeffrey Alan Miller, 'The Earliest Known Draft of the King James Bible: Samuel Ward's Draft of 1 Esdras and Wisdom 3-4', in this volume. I am indebted to Professor Miller for sharing his contribution to the volume with me prior to publication. Excerpts from Ward's notes on 1 Esdras were printed as early as the nineteenth century, and described as a specimen of his work on the translation, with the conclusion that 1 Esdras 'probably was the sole part of the Apocrypha assigned to him': Henry John Todd, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Right Rev. Brian Walton*, 2 vols. (London, 1821), 1:120-1.

[21] *Articuli de quibus in synodo Londinensi anno Domini iuxta ecclesiae Anglicanae computationem M.D.LXII* (London, 1563), sigs. A3^{v}-4^{r}; and for the English version, *Articles. Whereupon It Was Agreed by the Archbysshops, and Bisshops in M.D.lxii* (London, 1563), sig. A3^{v}.

[22] 'Chartâ' probably refers to a single piece of paper, rather than a single page. For the term's meaning in humanist usage, see Silvia Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* (Rome, 1973), esp. 32.

[23] MS Burney 363, fol. 103^{r}.

[24] Casaubon himself often used the phrase 'knock on [your] door' (*fores pulsare*) in a metaphorical sense. See e.g. his letters to Philippe Canaye de Fresnes, 27 August 1592, Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 569; and to Scaliger, 12 December 1593 and 13 February 1602: *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, ed. Paul Botley and Dirk van Miert, 8 vols. (Geneva, 2012), 2:364-5, and *Correspondence*, 4:204, respectively. For Bois's meetings with Casaubon, see n. 32.

[25] MS Burney 363, fol. 101^{r-v}. This leaf has been bound so that it precedes the first letter in Burney 363, but this arrangement is hardly authoritative, given the later provenance of the letters and construction of the manuscript containing them. Other letters have evidently been arranged by somebody who was not paying much attention to their content: see e.g. the letter from Thomas Bilson to Casaubon, British Library, MS Burney 366, fol. 340^{r}, which has been misplaced because it was signed 'Thomas Winton', after the sender's bishopric.

[26] MS Burney 363, fol. 105^{r}.

[27] MS Burney 363, fol. 101^{r}.

[28] MS Burney 363, fol. 105^{v}.

[29] Allen, *Translating for King James*, *passim*.

[30] See n. 34.

[31] See e.g. Casaubon to Downes, 15 November 1595, Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 581-2; and the undated letter from Downes to Casaubon, MS Burney 363, fol. 256^{r-v}. A rough date can be established by the reference to Casaubon's *Ad Frontonem Ducaeum epistola*, which was published in late October 1611; see Casaubon's letter to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 25 October 1611, Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 435.

[32] British Library, MS Burney 368, fol. 92^{r}: 'qui hisce oculis saepe illum viderim Londini'. For further discussion of this document, see n. 148.

[33] *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi opera graece*, vol. VIII, 'Notae,' col. 39. Introducing a citation of Casaubon's commentary on Theophrastus, Bois writes: 'Obseruatum hoc idem est & eruditissimo Casaubono nostro (noster enim iam est *non vsu solùm, sed nexu*, &, vt spero, semper erit)' (my emphasis).

[34] Bodleian Library, MS Casaubon 28, fol. 4^{v}, headed 'miscellae obseruationes'.

[35] On the first page of the notebook, Casaubon gives a date of 4 December (new style), and writes as a sub-heading, 'quum essem Londini procul à bibliotheca, cepi ex iis quae legebam ὁ δ ο ῦ π ά ρ ε ρ γ ο ν hic quaedam adnotare': MS Casaubon 28, fol. 1^{r}. Casaubon's heading indicates that most of what follows would normally have been inserted into the margins of the book(s) concerned (e.g. the observations on the Apocrypha into a personal copy thereof). The note concerning John Overall's proposed

emendation of 1 Corinthians 6:4, MS Casaubon 28, fol. 2[r], is headed similarly (σ π ο ρ ά δ η ν ἄ τ τ α).

[36] For the end of Casaubon's stay with Overall, see the entry for 14 September 1611, Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, 2:880; and Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 278. For Overall's anti-Calvinism and his other continental contacts, see Anthony Milton, '"Anglicanism" by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall', in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), esp. 169-73.

[37] See Overall's proposed emendation of 1 Corinthians 6:4, MS Casaubon 28, fol. 2[r]; for chronology and genealogy, see the discussion of Acts 7:4, MS Casaubon 28, fol. 7[v].

[38] See the note concerning 2 Maccabees 5:26, MS Casaubon 28, fol. 4[v]: 'Dunaeus meus putabat et hic et alibi apud Josephum θ ε ω ρ ί α ν esse sabbatum.' The 1611 text reads 'all them that were gone to the celebrating of the Sabbath', whereas the Bishops' and Geneva versions read 'to the open plaine' and 'to the shewe', respectively. The same is true of Downes's conjectural emendation of 2 Maccabees 9:21. However, the third suggestion attributed to Downes, concerning 2 Maccabees 12:39, is not followed in the 1611 text.

[39] 23 October 1611 is the next date found in the notebook: MS Casaubon 28, fol. 14[r].

[40] See especially the entry for 24 November 1610, Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, 2:790. The work referred to is Andrewes's *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini* (London, 1610).

[41] See esp. the entry for 6 December 1610, Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, 2:795: 'Mane pensum a Rege impositum me habuit: deinde a prandio eandem ob caussam apud D. Episcopum Eliensem fuimus. Nam vix est, ut ante id negotium peractum aliud serio curare possim'.

[42] See the entry for 21 December 1610, Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, 2:801: 'Pensum apud D. Eliensem absolvi'.

[43] Perhaps the most famous example of this is Andrew Downes's objection to the proposed translation of 1 Corinthians 10:11: Allen, *Translating for King James*, 46-7.

[44] In this respect, I aim to corroborate the suggestions of Muneharu Kitagaki, *Principles and Problems of Translation in Seventeenth-Century England* (Kyoto, 1981), 87-8, who dismissed 'the possibility that Bois's notes were official ones, taken for the committee'.

[45] See e.g. Irena Backus, *The Reformed Roots of the English New Testament: The Influence of Theodore Beza on the English New Testament* (Pittsburgh, 1980), 159-60, where Bois's notes are identified simply as the decisions taken by 'the Committee,' and this identification forms the basis of a questionable argument that they reflect an earlier stage of revision than the annotated Bishops' Bible in the Bodleian.

[46] For the explicit reference, see the discussion of the fifth problem, below. For Casaubon's comments, see MS Burney 363, fol. 105[r]. He appears to suggest that specialists in Greek should have the final say in questions about the Apocrypha: 'Tuum est, et reuerendorum tuorum collegarum, τ ῶ ν ε ἰ ς ἄ κ ρ ο ν τ ῆ ς ἑ λ λ η ν ι κ ῆ ς π α ι δ ε ί α ς ἐ λ η λ α κ ό τ ω ν, de his statuere, et aliis quod sequantur praescribere.' Other comments suggest that some of the proposed reinterpretations may have met with resistance: e.g. regarding the second problem, 'quid causae dici potest cur hic ea significatio locum habere non queat?'

[47] *Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta* (Rome, 1587); Bois's copy has the shelfmark Bodleian Library, D 1.14 Th.Seld.
[48] F. H. A. Scrivener, *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives* (Cambridge, 1884), 22. See also William Kilburne, *Dangerous Errors in Several Late Printed Bibles* (Finsbury, 1659), 6; cf. John Worthington's letter to Samuel Hartlib, 21 December 1658, referring to 'Dr. Ward, Mr. Mede, & other grave & learned men' who 'took no small pains' in revising the 1638 Cambridge Bible: James Crossley, ed., *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington*, 3 vols. (Manchester, 1847-1886), 1:119-20.
[49] I have compared the annotations with several other documents written and signed by Bois at different times and in different contexts. See, in particular, the diary kept by Bois between 1627 and 1635: Cambridge University Library, MS Add. 3856 (with examples of his Latin, Greek, Hebrew and English hands); and, for a late sample, his letter to Ralph Brownrigg, 28 September 1643, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 62, fol. 322^{r} (in Latin).
[50] See Bois's comments on 1 Esdras 3:5 and 1 Esdras 4:39: MS Burney 363, fols. 103^{r} and 101^{r}, respectively; cf. D 1.14 Th.Seld., 343 and 344.
[51] For the story of this edition, see Scott Mandelbrote, 'English Scholarship and the Greek Text of the Old Testament, 1620-1720: The Impact of Codex Alexandrinus', in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, ed. Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene (Aldershot, 2006), 79-86.
[52] Leiden University Library, MS VMI 4, fols. 6^{r}-10^{r}. Bois is named in the note on 1 Esdras 8:18, fol. 7^{v}: 'Cap. 8. lin. 1. ante δ ώ σ ε ι ς supplet quaedam Boisius'; referring to the first line of D 1.14 Th.Seld., 349. Young's copy must postdate 1641, because it includes Bois's references to Hugo Grotius's gospel commentaries, the latest datable work cited in Bois's marginalia. See e.g. MS VMI 4, fol. 9^{r}. This is a copy of Bois's note on Wisdom 16:14, D 1.14 Th.Seld., 526, which refers to the comment on Matthew 10:28 in Grotius's *Annotationes in libros Evangeliorum* (Amsterdam, 1641), 205. For Young's use of Bois's notes, and his other connections to Bois, see Nicholas Hardy, 'The Septuagint and the Transformation of Biblical Scholarship in England, from the King James Bible (1611) to the London Polyglot (1657)', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England,* c. *1520-1700*, ed. Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith, and Rachel Willie (New York, 2015), 117-30.
[53] The full story of Vossius's acquisition of Young's manuscripts remains to be told. For now, see Scott Mandelbrote, 'Isaac Vossius and the Septuagint', in *Isaac Vossius (1618-1689), between Science and Scholarship*, ed. Eric Jorink and Dirk van Miert (Leiden, 2012), 89-90 n. 22.
[54] See the anonymous note about Bois's books, written by someone who knew Bois personally and was well informed about his *Nachlass*, inserted into a hitherto unstudied manuscript of Anthony Walker's life of Bois: Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 278, fol. 3^{r-v}; esp. 3^{r}, where the author records that Bois left his books and manuscripts to his daughter, and that Cornelius Bee bought Bois's 'Library, but whither hee had y^{e} MSS, non constat'. This account is partially corroborated by Bois's will, in which he gives his daughter Anne 'the Keeping and Benefit of all my Books (not otherwyse by Will disposed off) whether Printed Books, or Books and Papers written by my own hand': British Library, MS Harley 7053, 126. The book's shelfmark indicates that it was once stored in the Selden

End of what is now Duke Humfrey's Reading Room in the Bodleian Library. This does not, of course, constitute proof that this book belonged to John Selden; but the case for Selden's ownership of it is strengthened by the fact that a copy of the Sixtine Septuagint is listed in the catalogue of Selden's books made after his death and before their transfer to the Bodleian: Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 111, fol. 87^{v}: 'Septuagint Interpr. Graec: fol. Rom: 1587'. On this catalogue, and the posthumous fortunes of Selden's library, see G. J. Toomer, *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2009), 2:793-9, esp. 795.

[55] The other book purchased by Selden can be identified as Bois's only on a palaeographical basis. It is David Hoeschel, ed., *Adriani isagoge sacrarum literarum et antiquissimorum Graecorum in prophetas fragmenta* (Augsburg, 1602): Bodleian Library, AA 20 Th.Seld. Although the pages have been trimmed in order to fit the book into a Sammelband, some of the annotations are still visible. The title is listed in MS Selden Supra 111, fol. 66^{r}. The other copy with a Selden shelfmark is 4^{o} U 19 Th.Seld.

[56] See the entry for 'Bible, Scripture' in *The Table Talk of John Selden*, ed. Samuel Harvey Reynolds (Oxford, 1892), 9: 'That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue (as the Apocrypha to Andrew Downs) and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or French, Spanish, Italian, &c. If they found any fault they spoke; if not, he read on'. Selden's remarks almost certainly belong to the last few years of his life, and therefore postdate his acquisition of Bois's books: see *The Table Talk of John Selden*, ix.

[57] For a comparison of the Sixtine Septuagint with other sixteenth-century editions, see Basil Hall, 'Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries', in *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume III: The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, ed. S. L. Greenslade (1963), 56-8; and Scott Mandelbrote, 'The Old Testament and Its Ancient Versions in Manuscript and Print in the West, from c. 1480 to c. 1780', in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume III: From 1450 to 1750*, ed. Euan Cameron (Cambridge, 2016), 82-109. I am grateful to Mr Mandelbrote for sharing his chapter with me prior to its publication.

[58] Although it was published in 1609-1610, the preface to the Douai-Rheims Old Testament states that it was written 'about thirtie years since.' While it mentions that the translation has been 'conferred...and conformed' to the Clementine Vulgate, it does not mention the Sixtine Septuagint. See T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible: 1525-1961*, ed. A. S. Herbert, 2nd edn. (London, 1968), 127-28 (no. 300).

[59] There are three cases in which Bois quotes the text as it appeared in the Sixtine Septuagint, and in no other early modern edition. At 1 Esdras 4:39, Bois quotes the Sixtine reading, π α ρ ᾽ α ὐ τ ὴ ν , rather than the Aldine and Frankfurt reading, π α ρ ᾽ α ὐ τ ῇ: see, respectively, D 1.14 Th.Seld., 344; *Sacrae Scripturae Veteris, Novaeque omnia* (Venice, 1518), pt. I, fol. 161^{v}; *Divinae scripturae, nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, omnia* (Frankfurt, 1597), 792. In Bois's quotation of 1 Esdras 5:50, D 1.14 Th.Seld., 346, the second article in τ ὰ ἔ θ ν η τ ὰ ἐ π ὶ τ ῆς γ ῆς is not found in the Aldine edition or the main text or notes of the Frankfurt edition. See, respectively, *Sacrae Scripturae Veteris, Novaeque omnia*, pt. I, fol. 162^{v}; and *Divinae scripturae,*

nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, omnia, 794. Finally, Bois's quotation of 1 Esdras 9:48, D 1.14 Th.Seld., 351, includes the clause κ α ὶ π ρ ὸς τ ὸ π λ ῆ θ ο ς ἀ ν ε γ ί ν ω σ κ ο ν τ ὸ ν ν ό μ ο ν τ ο ῦ κ υ ρ ί ο υ, which is only found in Codex Vaticanus and one or two minuscules. It is not found in the Aldine edition: *Sacrae Scripturae Veteris, Novaeque omnia*, pt. I, fol. 165[r]; or in the main text or notes of the Frankfurt edition: *Divinae scripturae, nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, omnia*, 800. For Bois's quotations of these texts, see MS Burney 363, fol. 101[r]. Equally, Bois's only deviations from the Sixtine edition involve variant readings which he inscribed in the margins of that edition. Bois's quotation of the Sixtine reading of 1 Esdras 5:50, MS Burney 363, fol. 101[r], incorporates the correction which he made in the margins of his own copy, of ἐ π ὶ τ ο ῦ τ ό π ο υ α ὐ τ ῶ ν to ἐ π ὶ τ ο ῦ τ ό π ο υ α ὐ τ ο ῦ, preceded by Bois's familiar ‘ γ ρ .’ : D 1.14 Th.Seld., 346. Similarly, Bois's quotation of 1 Esdras 9:55, MS Burney 363, fol. 101[r], adopts the reading which he noted in the margin of his copy, at D 1.14 Th.Seld., 351: Ἔ τ ι γ ὰ ρ ἐ ν ε φ υ σ ί ω θ η σ α ν rather than Ὅ τ ι γ ὰ ρ ἐ ν ε φ υ σ ί ω θ η σ α ν.

[60] The Frankfurt edition of 1597 is cited explicitly once, as ‘Wech.’ (after the name of its printers, the editor's name being unknown): see the note on Baruch 2:20, D 1.14 Th.Seld., 672. The variant recorded by Bois is adopted in the 1611 text (‘as thou hast spoken by thy seruants y[e] prophets, saying’); corresponding with *Divinae scripturae, nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, omnia*, 781 (where the verse is numbered as Baruch 2:15). For the only explicit citation of the Antwerp Polyglot, see D 1.14 Th.Seld., 225 (2 Samuel 3:3-5). Explicit citations of the Complutensian Polyglot are much more frequent, especially in the text of Ecclesiasticus: D 1.14 Th.Seld., 530-56.

[61] This, like other early-modern text-critical conventions, one borrowed from ancient Greek scholarly works and scribal annotations found in Greek manuscripts. It is an abbreviation for γ ρ ά φ ε τ α ι (lit. ‘is written’), used to indicate variant readings drawn from other witnesses to a text. See Eleanor Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford, 2007), 136. The letters were used to mark variant readings found in manuscripts in the margins of Henry Savile's edition of Chrysostom.

[62] Backus, *The Reformed Roots of the English New Testament*, 109-60.

[63] For Ward's derivation of these two notes from Bois, see Miller, ‘The Earliest Known Draft’, n. 236. A full comparison of Ward's notebook with Bois's correspondence, Septuagint, and other sources will be ventured in my forthcoming monograph on the King James Bible.

[64] For an introduction to 1 Esdras, see Albert-Marie Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 2000), 1:803-13. Zipora Talshir, *I Esdras: From Origin to Translation* (Atlanta, GA, 1999) is particularly valuable among modern studies, because its treatment of the book as a free translation of a Semitic original shares affinities with early modern approaches. See also *I Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary* (Atlanta, GA, 2001), by the same author.

[65] For a book-by-book survey of questions of language, translation, and composition, see Michael A. Knibb, ‘Language, Translation, Versions, and Text of the Apocrypha’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, ed. J. W. Rogerson and Judith Lieu (Oxford, 2006), 159-83. For modern introductions to the Apocrypha, see Bruce M. Metzger, *An*

Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York, 1957); David A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2002). For a study of the reception of 2 Esdras in particular that also serves as a guide to the early modern reception of the Apocrypha more generally, see Alastair Hamilton, *The Apocryphal Apocalypse: The Reception of the Second Book of Esdras (4 Ezra) from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1999).

[66] Brooke Foss Westcott, *A General View of the History of the English Bible*, ed. William Aldis Wright, 3rd edn. (London, 1905), 108-9.

[67] See the undated lecture (no. 29), in John Rainolds, *Censura librorum apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti, adversum pontificios, inprimis Robertum Bellarminum*, 2 vols. (Oppenheim, 1611), 1:245-8. The lecture can be assigned to the year 1586 by counting from the date of the first lecture in the series: see Rainolds, *Censura*, 1:1. The next lecture in the sequence (no. 30) is dated 4 May: Rainolds, *Censura*, 1:252-62.

[68] See n. 88.

[69] *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi* (Zurich, 1543), fols. 2^{r}-4^{r} (separate foliation).

[70] See Cholinus's comments on Wisdom, which are later applied to other books: *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi*, fol. 3^{v}.

[71] *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi*, fol. 3^{v}: 'Sanè, ut apparet, totus tertius liber Esdrę uersus est à Septuaginta, aut quocunque tandem authore, ex Hebraicis parum discrepantibus ab ijs quae sunt in primo Esdrae: quanquam interpres Graecus saepe male reddidit sensum ex Hebraico, & Hebraice scienti apparet facile quae fuerit erroris causa'. Cholinus does not give any source or explanation for his suggestion that the Seventy might have been responsible for the translation of 1 Esdras.

[72] For the conservatism of other elements of this Bible, see Bruce Gordon, 'Remembering Jerome and Forgetting Zwingli: The Zurich Latin Bible of 1543 and the Establishment of Heinrich Bullinger's Church', *Zwingliana* 41 (2014), 1-33. It is worth noting that the terms 'ecclesiastical' and 'apocryphal' were not always mutually exclusive in Protestant theology, although they appear to have been for Cholinus: see Roelf T. te Velde and others, eds., *Synopsis purioris theologiae = Synopsis of a purer theology* (Leiden, 2015-), 1:98-9 (3.36).

[73] For examples, including Calvin, see Wilhelm H. Neuser, 'The Reformed Churches and the Old Testament Apocrypha', in *The Apocrypha in Ecumenical Perspective: The Place of the Late Writings of the Old Testament among the Biblical Writings and Their Significance in the Eastern and Western Church Traditions*, ed. Siegfried Meurer, trans. Paul Ellingworth (Reading and New York, 1991), 91, 94-6, 101.

[74] William Whitaker, *Disputatio de sacra scriptura* (Cambridge, 1588), sig. $D2^{r}$ (1.1.5); cf. Whitaker, *Disputatio*, sigs. $E4^{v}$-$E5^{r}$ (1.1.10, on Tobit); Whitaker, *Disputatio*, sig. $E7^{v}$ (1.1.12, on Wisdom).

[75] Bois took his BD in 1590, eight years after proceeding MA: see John Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni cantabrigienses*, 10 vols. (Cambridge, 1922-1954), vol. I.

[76] During the years 1627-1628, Bois read through several of Augustine's works in the Froben edition. While he did so, he made frequent reference to Whitaker's disputations *De scriptura* against Bellarmine and Thomas Stapleton. See the entries for 28 March 1628, MS Add. 3856, fol. 64^{r}; 24 July 1628, MS Add. 3856, fol. 89^{v}; 19 August 1628,

MS Add. 3856, fol. 96^{v}; and 2 October 1628, fol. 109^{r}. The format of these references, inserted into square brackets as supplements to statements by Augustine, suggests that these disputations were part of Bois's long-term memory: they were not something he had only come across late on in his career, but rather the first thing that came to mind when he read any theologians' comments on such matters. There are several fond reminiscences of Whitaker elsewhere in the pages of Bois's diary: see the entries for 4 December 1627, fol. 172^{r}; 17 January 1628, fol. 171^{r}; and 9 December 1630, fol. 156^{r}.

[77] See the note on 1 Esdras 5:26, D 1.14 Th.Seld., 345: next to κ α ὶ β ά ν ν ο υ , κ α ὶ σ ο υ δ ί ο υ , Bois writes: 'corruptè pro לִבְנֵי לִהוּדָה.' Presumably, Bois thought that the translator had used an unpointed text of the canonical passage (Nehemiah 7:43) and mistaken ל for ו. For Cholinus's comments, see *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi*, fols. 3^{r-v} (separate foliation).

[78] For the comments by Scaliger that instigated this trend, see Anthony Grafton, 'Joseph Scaliger et l'histoire du judaïsme hellénistique', in *La République des lettres et l'histoire du judaïsme antique: XVIe-XVIIIe siècles*, ed. Chantal Grell and François Laplanche (Paris, 1992), 51-63; Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1983-1993), 2:415-419; cf. 706. For later debates about the *lingua Hellenistica*, see Henk Jan de Jonge, 'The Study of the New Testament in the Dutch Universities, 1575-1700', *History of Universities* 1 (1981), 116-19; and, for a longer-term overview, Luigi Ferreri, 'Le dissertazioni *De lingua Hellenistica* di Pietro Lasena (1590-1636) tenute all'Accademia Basiliana', *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* 18 (2011), 290-9.

[79] For statements by Bois on the *lingua Hellenistica*, see his comment on Acts 6:1 in his *Veteris interpretis cum Beza aliisque recentioribus collatio in quatuor Evangeliis, & Apostolorum Actis* (London, 1655), 366-7; the citations of Heinsius prefacing the autograph manuscript of the *Collatio* which were not printed along with the rest of the work, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 437, fol. π 1^{r}; and his comment on Clement of Rome's first epistle to the Corinthians, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 10, fol. 121^{r}.

[80] For the debate over 2 Maccabees and prayers for the dead, see e.g. John Calvin, *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (Geneva, 1559), 241-2 (3.5.8); cf. Neuser, 'The Reformed Churches and the Old Testament Apocrypha', 98, 103-4. For Bellarmine's response to Calvin, see *Disputationes*, 3 vols. (Ingolstadt, 1586-1593), 1:53-9 (*De verbo Dei*, 1.15).

[81] Bois's note refers to the suicide of Razis in 2 Maccabees 14:37-46: D 1.14 Th.Seld., 775. He cites Peter Martyr's comment on 1 Samuel 31 in his *In Samuelis prophetae libros duos commentarii doctissimi* (Zurich, 1595), fol. 178^{r}; and Whitaker, *Disputatio*, sigs. F1^{r}-2^{r} (1.1.14), esp. F2^{r}. Whitaker was responding to Bellarmine, *Disputationes*, 1:59 (*De verbo Dei*, 1.15).

[82] D 1.14 Th.Seld., 761. Bois's two citations correspond with Johann Buxtorf (the elder), *Institutio epistolaris Hebraica* (Basel, 1629), 12-14, and not with the 1610 first edition of the same work. On Buxtorf's handbook and its genre, see Theodor Dunkelgrün, 'The Humanist Discovery of Hebrew Epistolography', in *Jewish Books and Their Readers: Aspects of the Intellectual Life of Christians and Jews in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Scott Mandelbrote and Joanna Weinberg (Leiden, 2016), 211-59. I am grateful to Dr Dunkelgrün for sharing his chapter with me ahead of publication.

[83] For Cholinus, see *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi*, fol. 3[v] (separate foliation). For Scaliger, see the discussion of the identity of the 'Hellenistic' author of 2 Maccabees and the composition of the book in Greek, rather than Hebrew, in Scaliger's *Opus de emendatione temporum*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 1598), 406. This passage was missing from the equivalent section of the first edition (Paris, 1583), 229. Scaliger added it after formulating his theory about the Jewish 'Hellenists' who were ignorant of Hebrew: see n. 78. For Scaliger's comments on 2 Maccabees and their later Protestant reception, see Jacob Bernays, *Joseph Justus Scaliger* (Berlin, 1855), 236-7.

[84] D 1.14 Th.Seld., 519: 'ὅ τ ι π ν ε ῦ μ α κ υ ρ ί ο υ , &c.] P. Melanchthon postill. parte 2[a], pag. 872: Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum &c. Ista verba sunt scripta in libro Sapientiae, qui existimatur esse Philonis. Quis fuit iste Philo? Fuit Judaeus, homo doctus, &c. Totus liber est concio de providentiâ & de poenis Tyrannorum. Videtur scriptus esse contrà tyrannidem & impietatem Romanorum imperatorum, quibus etiam minatur, inquiens: Potentes potenter tormenta patientur. Haec Melanchthon. Augustinus cap. 20, lib. 2[i] retractationum: Librum Sapientiae Judaei non recipiunt in auctoritatem Canonicam'; Bois's first reference corresponds with the following edition: Philipp Melanchthon, *Postilla*, ed. Christoph Pezelius, 4 vols. (Heidelberg, 1594-1595], 2:872. The part replaced by Bois's '&c.' reads: '...fuit cum aliis Iudaeis missus ad C. Caligulam, vt statua amouerentur ex templo Hierosolymitano'. For the second reference, see Augustine, *Opera*, 11 vols. (Basel, 1569), 1:47.

[85] On Philo's embassy, see his own *On the Embassy to Gaius*, trans. F. H. Colson (Cambridge, 1962); and Josephus, *Antiq*. 18.8.1.

[86] See Scaliger's letter to Gilbert Seguin, 11 November [1590-1592], Scaliger, *Correspondence*, 2:133-134. This letter was first printed in Scaliger's posthumous *Epistolae* (Leiden, 1627), 98-100; it is cited Bois in his *Collatio*, 367 (on Acts 6:1).

[87] Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, ed. Fergus Millar and Géza Vermès, 3 vols. (London, 2014-2015), 3/2:713; Talshir, *I Esdras*, esp. 3.

[88] The passage is 1 Esdras 4:58: see the undated lecture (no. 29) in Rainolds, *Censura*, 1:251-2, for a summary of this and other supposed chronological errors in the book; and the next lecture (no. 30) dated 4 May, Rainolds, *Censura*, 1:253-60 for the full-length analysis of this verse. Both lectures can be dated to 1586: see n. 67. For Zerubbabel's long lifespan, see Scaliger, *DET* (1583), 286; see also Rainolds's discussion of Zechariah 4:9: Rainolds, *Censura*, 1:259. I owe these references to Kirsten Macfarlane. On Rainolds's chronological scholarship and his use of Scaliger, see further eadem, 'Hugh Broughton (1549-1612): Scholarship, Controversy and the English Bible' (unpublished Fellowship Dissertation, Trinity College, Cambridge, 2016), 24-7, 64-78, 89-91, 96-9.

[89] deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 295; Schürer, *History*, 3/2:714.

[90] See the entry dated 1634, MS Add. 3856, fol. 114[r]: 'Duo ultimi libb. 8[us] & 9[us] desiderant lectorem Chronologiae peritum, & in annorum computatione benè exercitatum. Is ego non sum'. Bois is referring to Samuel Petit, *Miscellaneorum libri novem* (Paris, 1630), and in particular to the author's criticisms of Scaliger. Although this entry is not precisely dated, Bois records elsewhere that he began reading the book on 8 August 1634: MS Add. 3856, fol. 109[v]. On Bois's diary, see Norton, *The King James Bible*, 72-80.

[91] MS Burney 363, fol. 103[r].

[92] Josephus, *Antiq*. 11.3. Rainolds discussed Josephus's borrowing of the story of the bodyguards in his lectures: *Censura*, 1:260, 729. For a modern overview, see Schürer, *History*, 3:714.
[93] See Isaac Casaubon, *Animadversionum in Athenaei Dipnosophistas libri XV* (Lyon, 1600), 469-86, spanning chapters 10.15-22 of the commentary. For Casaubon's brief comment on the specific passage of Athenaeus cited by Bois, see *Animadversiones*, 479: 'Proponitur deinde problema, *Quid sit omnium rerum validissimum?* idque etiam inter griphos voluerunt censeri veteres. In fragmentis Danielis quae habentur inter libros Apocryphos, pulcherrimè disputatur hęc quaestio'. For the passage itself, see Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, ed. & trans. S. Douglas Olson, 8 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 2006-2012), 10.451b. The referencing system of this edition follows the book numbers of Athenaeus combined with the pagination of the text edited by Casaubon himself: see Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistarum libri XV*, ed. Isaac Casaubon, trans. Jacques Dalechamps ([Heidelberg], 1598).
[94] For passages of Gellius that may have come to Bois's mind, see *Noctes Atticae* 12.6 and 18.2.
[95] MS Burney 363, fol. 101[r].
[96] For Cholinus's translation, see *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi*; Darlow and Moule, *Historical Catalogue*, 2:934. Junius's translation was originally published between 1575 and 1579, but went through several new editions, including changes to the Apocrypha section, before 1611. For the most recent edition prior to the commissioning and completion of the King James translation, see Immanuel Tremellius and Franciscus Junius, trans., *Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra* (Hanau, 1603); Darlow and Moule, *Historical Catalogue*, 2:951-2, 960-1, 964.
[97] MS Burney 363, fol. 105[r].
[98] See the entries for הוֹן and מְחִיר in Conrad Kircher, *Concordantiae Veteris Testamenti graecae, ebraeis vocibus respondentes* (Frankfurt, 1607), 1:1192 and 2:54-5, respectively. Kircher does not, in general, draw examples from the Apocrypha. Kircher's findings from the canonical books are confirmed by the entry for δ ι ά φ ο ρ α in Muraoka's *Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven, 2009), which only cites Ecclesiasticus and 2 Maccabees for the meaning 'money' or similar; and by the same author's *Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Leuven, 2010).
[99] The term was glossed in the sense of 'tribute' in the fullest contemporary Greek dictionary, Henri Estienne's *Thesaurus linguae graecae*, 5 vols. (Geneva, 1572), 5:97-8, but only with reference to 2 Maccabees and not the other passages which Casaubon and Bois considered.
[100] Another citation of Brisson clearly predates notes which Bois must have written before he addressed his first query to Casaubon: see the note on 1 Esdras 3:7 on the same page of his Septuagint (D 1.14 Th.Seld., 343). Bois's references to Brisson correspond with the first edition of the *De regio Persarum principatu libri tres* (Paris, 1591; or 1590, according to some title pages), 129, rather than the second edition of 1595.
[101] See Bois's note on Zerubbabel's exordium, ο ὐ μ έ γ α ς ὁ β α σ ι λ ε ὺς, 1 Esdras 4:14, D 1.14 Th.Seld., 344: 'i. rex Persarum. vide B. Brissonium de regno Persarum, lib. 1. pag. 3'.
[102] MS Burney 363, fol. 105[r].

[103] 'Bribes' is the interpretation given in Talshir, *I Esdras*, 75, 91.
[104] See, for instance, Bois's note on Judith 15:11: D 1.14 Th.Seld., 386. As a gloss on the word ὅ λ κ ι α, Bois refers to Casaubon's *Animadversiones*, 216, where the term is identified on the basis of this and other passages not with 'vessels' in general, as found in the King James Bible, but with 'large basins shaped like mixing bowls' ('labra ampla ad instar magnorum craterum efficta'). The Geneva Bible's 'basins' approximates more closely to Casaubon's gloss.
[105] Gordon Campbell, *Bible: The Story of the King James Version, 1611-2011* (Oxford, 2010), 81.
[106] Bellarmine, *Disputationes*, 1:139 (*De verbo Dei*, 2.15); Whitaker, *Disputatio*, sigs. L4^{v}-5^{r}.
[107] Noel Malcolm, 'Hobbes, Ezra and the Bible: The History of a Subversive Idea', in *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford, 2002), 398-9.
[108] Louis Cappel, *Critica sacra, sive de variis quae in sacris Veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri VI* (Paris, 1650), sig. a1^{v}. On Cappel, see François Laplanche, *L'écriture, le sacré et l'histoire: érudits et politiques protestants devant la Bible en France au XVIIe siècle* (Amsterdam, 1986), 212-49.
[109] See Nehemiah 8:2, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 12.
[110] There was an entry in Estienne's *Thesaurus linguae graecae*, 5:264, glossing the verb simply with 'Inflor, Tumeo, Superbio' and offering no reference to its occurrences in the Septuagint or elsewhere.
[111] MS Burney 363, 101^{r-v}.
[112] Bois equated τ ὴ ν ἀ ν ά γ ν ω σ ι ν with the participial construction τ ὰ ἀ ν α γ ν ω σ θ έ ν τ α ('the having-been-read things'): this construction involved converting a passive (or Niphal) participle into a noun, by way of analogy with the word for 'reading' in Nehemiah 8:8, מִקְרָא. See MS Burney 363, fol. 101^{r}.
[113] *Brutus* 192/ch. 51.
[114] See n. 28.
[115] For this alternative solution, see the passage in MS Burney 363, fol. 101^{v}, which begins: 'Porrò quotiès comparo Esdram nostrum, cum authenticâ historiâ, in eam adducor sententiam...'
[116] For the canonical account, see Ezra 3:2-3.
[117] Rainolds, *Censura*, 1:261: 'Tertium Pseudoesdrae mendacium est è capite quinto. Ubi altaris aedificatio, fundamentorum collocatio, oblationes…& alia quamplurima, eadem & eaedem circumstantiae referuntur cum his, quae Cyri tempore gesta sunt, post primum Judaeorum reditum'. For Nicholas of Lyra, see *Bibliae iampridem renouatae*, 6 vols. (Basel, 1502), 2:fol. 273^{v}.
[118] According to 1 Esdras 5:44, for instance, the Temple, not just the altar, had already been erected 'in its place' (ἐ π ὶ τ ο ῦ τ ό π ο υ α ὐ τ ο ῦ).
[119] Potential parallels for this would include Ezra 3:3 (though this verse is itself unclear as to whether non-exile Jews or gentiles are intended) and 3:4. Cf. the vision of the 'good figs' (exiles) and 'bad figs' (including the Jewish remnant in Jerusalem and Egypt) in Jeremiah 24, and the identification of the exiles as God's 'holy seed' in Isaiah 6:13.
[120] See e.g. Ezra 6:21 and 9-10; Josephus, *Antiq*. 11.5.3-4.
[121] Ezra 4, especially 4:17; Josephus, *Antiq*. 11.4.1, 3, 9; 11.5.8.

[122] MS Burney 363, fol. 101[r].
[123] *Bibliae iampridem renouatae*, 2:fol. 273[v].
[124] See the general observations in Cholinus's preface, *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi*, fol. 2[r] (separate foliation): 'usus ferè unius coniunctionis copulatiuae, saepeque inepte uersae ab interpretibus, pro quauis coniunctione'; cf. *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi*, fol. 3[r]: 'In coniunctionibus multum permisimus nobis iuxta cuiusque loci sensum, quod sciamus Hebraeis unam coniunctionem aut paucas, ut ו, & כי multarum uice fungi'.
[125] MS Burney 363, 105[r-v].
[126] Polybius, *Historiarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. & trans. Isaac Casaubon (Paris, 1609); Albert Martin, 'L'édition de Polybe d'Isaac Casaubon (1594-1609)', *Mélanges D'archéologie et D'histoire* 10 (1890), 3-43; Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Polybius' Reappearance in Western Europe', in *Polybe: Neuf exposés suivis de discussions*, ed. F. W. Walbank and Paul Péde (Geneva, 1974), esp. 365-71.
[127] Casaubon presumably had access to another copy of the Sixtine Septuagint, perhaps belonging to another translator, such as Andrewes or his host, John Overall. For Andrewes's copy, see D. D. C. Chambers, 'A Catalogue of the Library of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626)', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 5 (1970), 105. For Overall's use (but not necessarily ownership) of the Sixtine Septuagint, see his letter to Robert Cotton, 30 January 1612, Bodleian Library, MS Smith 71, 77 (a copy).
[128] See, for instance, Casaubon, *Exercitationes*, 283-5. Casaubon refers to Josephus, *Antiq*. 13.4, which narrates the slightly later contention between Jews and Samaritans in Ptolemaic Alexandria as to whether Jerusalem was the only site for a Temple that had been ordained by divine law. For Casaubon, it served as an instance of how a mixed, partly non-Jewish sect had misunderstood and sought to appropriate the 'promises made to the Jewish people' by God.
[129] Josephus, *Antiq*. 11.4.1, 3, 9.
[130] Talshir, *I Esdras*, 29 discusses the possibility that 1 Esdras 5:50 reflects a greater openness to foreigners than the canonical account.
[131] For Scaliger's influence on Casaubon in this respect, see Grafton and Weinberg, *'I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue'*, 213-14.
[132] The King James Bible reads: 'And there were gathered vnto them out of the other nations of the land, and they erected the Altar vpon his owne place, because all the nations of the land were at enmitie with them, and oppressed them, and they offered sacrifices'; whereas the Bishops' and Geneva versions both read 'gathered against' and 'although all the nations.'
[133] See e.g. Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 2009), esp. 102-5 (on Andrewes), 126 (on Overall).
[134] Bois, *Collatio*. The autograph manuscript of this work is MS Tanner 437. Bois dates the beginning of his comments on Matthew to 16 April 1619, and the end of his comments on Acts, the last book covered, to 9 April 1625. For the progress of Bois's work, see his letters to Andrewes, 28 October 1619, British Library, MS Sloane 118, fol. 24[r]; 25 October 1621, Bodleian Library, MS Smith 73, 1-2 (a copy); and 3 November

1624, MS Sloane 118, fol. 30[r]. For a brief discussion of this work and its reception, see Nicholas Hardy, 'The *Ars Critica* in Early Modern England' (unpublished DPhil, University of Oxford, 2012), 129-33.

[135] The most distinguished example of this approach is Norton's *Textual History*. See also Scrivener, *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible*; Westcott, *A General View*. For the background to their work, see Mark D. Chapman, 'New Testament Revision Company (Act. 1870-1881)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Similarly, Alfred W. Pollard, *Records of the English Bible, the Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611* (London and New York, 1911) was intended to be a companion to a corrected anniversary edition of the King James Bible; *The 1911 Tercentenary Commemoration Bible* (London, 1911).

[136] For the last of these three views, see Katrin Ettenhuber, '"Take vp and Read the Scriptures": Patristic Interpretation and the Poetics of Abundance in "The Translators to the Reader" (1611)', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 75 (2012), 213-32; Katrin Ettenhuber, '"A Comely Gate to so Rich and Glorious a Citie": The Paratextual Architecture of the Rheims New Testament and the King James Bible', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England*, 54-70.

[137] Patrick Collinson, 'The Coherence of the Text: How It Hangeth Together: The Bible in Reformation England', in *The Bible, the Reformation and the Church: Essays in Honour of James Atkinson*, ed. W. P. Stephens (Sheffield, 1995), 96.

[138] The marginal notes made frequent and obvious appeals to variant readings from printed editions (including the Sixtine Septuagint), competing glosses drawn from different traditions of scholarship, renderings by modern Latin translators such as Junius, and even manuscript evidence and non-biblical sources. The best survey of them is still Scrivener, *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible*, 40-60. The genealogies prefixed to the Bible were similarly erudite: see Kirsten Macfarlane, "The Biblical Genealogies of the King James Bible (1611): Their Purpose, Sources and Significance," *The Library*, forthcoming. For scholarly readers and the reception of the King James Bible more generally, see Nigel Smith, 'Retranslating the Bible in the English Revolution', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England,* 98-110; discussing Robert Gell's *An Essay toward the Amendment of the Last English-Translation of the Bible* (London, 1659). I am grateful to Professor Smith for showing me a pre-publication draft of his chapter. See also the discussion of proposals to revise the King James version during the 1640s and 1650s, Scott Mandelbrote, 'The Authority of the Word: Manuscript, Print, and the Text of the Bible in Seventeenth-Century England', in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*, ed. Julia C. Crick and Alexandra Walsham (Cambridge, 2004), esp. 142-7.

[139] See, for instance, Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton, 2005), 22, where the supposed absence of scholarly marginalia from the King James Bible forms the basis of the argument that post-Reformation biblical scholarship kept 'the vernacular Bible...in stasis,' whereas 'Enlightenment' biblical scholarship brought new attention to its historicity; cf. Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible*, 4.

[140] For examples of such arguments, see Malcolm, 'Hobbes, Ezra and the Bible', 383-431; Dmitri Levitin, 'John Spencer's *De Legibus Hebraeorum* (1683-85) and

"Enlightened" Sacred History: A New Interpretation', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 76 (2013), 49-92; Eric Jorink, '"Horrible and Blasphemous": Isaac La Peyrère, Isaac Vossius and the Emergence of Radical Biblical Criticism in the Dutch Republic', in *Nature and Scripture in the Abrahamic Religions: Up to 1700*, ed. Jitse M. van der Meer and Scott Mandelbrote, 2 vols. (Leiden, 2008), 429-50. For an earlier and looser argument for continuity, see Richard H. Popkin, 'Scepticism and the Study of History', in *Physics, Logic, and History*, ed. Wolfgang Yourgrau and Allen D. Breck (New York, 1970), 209-30.

[141] The first Book of Cappel's *Critica sacra*, 1-52, dealt with variations between overlapping historical books of the canonical Old Testament. For Cappel's time in England, see Laplanche, *L'écriture, le sacré et l'histoire*, 186-7; and Cappel's letter to Casaubon, 1 July 1612, MS Burney 363, fol. 178^{r}. A similar example is provided by Spinoza's rejection of the authority of Ezra-Nehemiah on the basis of discrepancies between the genealogical lists found in each book: Jetze Touber, 'Philology and Theology: Commenting the Old Testament in the Dutch Republic, 1650-1700', in *Neo-Latin Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1400-1700)*, ed. K. A. E. Enenkel and Henk J. M. Nellen (Leuven, 2013), 484-5.

[142] See Patrick J. Lambe, 'Biblical Criticism and Censorship in Ancien Régime France: The Case of Richard Simon', *Harvard Theological Review* 78 (1985), 154, 160; and Simon's own preface to his *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris, 1678), sigs. e4^{v}-i1^{v}.

[143] Bois to John Williams (Bishop of Lincoln), 23 September 1630, MS Smith 73, 10: of a letter from Williams, Bois writes that 'Commune erit illi scrinium cum selectis quibusdam alijs epistolis, quas a Domino meo Wintoniensi [Lancelot Andrewes] modò memorato, a D. Henrico Savilio, et a D. Isaaco Casaubono accepi'.

[144] See first of all the note, with heavy cancellations, in MS Burney 363, fol. 102^{v}: 'Boisius ad <...> super ἀ π ο κ ρ . et ad Tract: de Critic. ὕ λ η , etc'.

[145] Benedetto Bravo, '*Critice* in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Rise of the Notion of Historical Criticism', in *History of Scholarship*, ed. Christopher Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin (Oxford, 2006), 162-71.

[146] MS Burney 363, fol. 104^{v}: 'Literae, etc. quae erant in scrinio 5 Nou: 1626'. Another note on the same verso page, also in an unidentified hand, has labelled the letter, but makes no reference to any other material. See MS Burney 363, fol. 104^{v}: 'Boysii Quaesita per Epist: ad Is: Casaub.'

[147] MS Burney 363, fol. 106^{v}: 'Boisii v. cl. Quaesita ad Is. C. T. <et>: eiusdem B. de Casauboni in Athen. animad. iudicium'; MS Burney 368, fol. 93^{v}: 'Boisii Quaesita, ad Casaub. et eius Responsio. Ut Boisii, viri doctiss. de Casauboni comm. in Athen. iudic.'

[148] MS Burney 368, fol. 92^{r}: 'Post Lipsii et Heinsii Elogia ad finem libri exarata ita Boisius.' The appraisal itself begins: 'Mihi etiam post perlectum haud indiligenter totum opus, veluti gratitudinis testificandae caussa, haec paucula libuit subiicere'.

[149] MS Burney 368, fol. 92^{r}: 'Haec scribebam, Decemb. 15. 1623'.

[150] Meric Casaubon, *Pietas contra maledicos patrii nominis, & religionis hostes* (London, 1621). See also Richard Serjeantson, 'Casaubon, (Florence Estienne) Meric', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; and the introduction to Meric's manuscript treatise on

'general learning': *Generall Learning: A Seventeenth-Century Treatise on the Formation of the General Scholar by Meric Casaubon*, ed. Richard Serjeantson (Cambridge, 1999).
[151] Toomer, *John Selden*, 2:739 n. 337.
[152] MS Burney 363, 101[r]. On this reference, see further n. 112.
[153] For the translation, see Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 5:159 (10.451b).
[154] Bois alludes to an anecdote found in Pliny the Younger, *Ep*. 2.3.10.
[155] Cicero, *Brutus* 192/ch. 51. For the translation, see *Brutus; Orator*, trans. G. L Hendrickson and H. M. Hubbell (Cambridge, MA, 1939), 163-5.
[156] Persius, *Sat*. 1.13-14. For the translation, see Susanna Morton Braund, trans., *Juvenal and Persius* (Cambridge, MA, 2004), 49.
[157] Hippocrates, *Law*. For the translation, see William Henry Samuel Jones, trans., *Hippocrates*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 1979-1984), 2:263-5.
[158] For the translations to which Bois refers, see, respectively, Hippocrates, *Opera quae ad nos extant omnia*, trans. Janus Cornarius (Basel, 1558), 9: 'Amplus autem & Industriam adhibere oportet: eamque ad multum omnino tempus, quo disciplina ipsa insita, feliciter & cum profectu fructus suos producat'; and *Opera*, trans. Anutius Foesius (Frankfurt, 1595), 1:2: 'Ad haec longi temporis industriam accedere necesse est, quò disciplina veluti grauidata, foeliciter & bene crescendo, maturos fructus efferat'.
[159] Casaubon's phrase (τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ μέτρα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου) leaves it unclear whether he is limited by his lack of expertise in theology or other disciplines, as opposed to languages; or rather, by his lack of fluency in English, which makes him unfit to take part in the translation.