

## **Hugh Broughton and the King James Bible, Revisited**

Kirsten Macfarlane

*Keble College, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK*

Email: [kirsten.macfarlane@keble.ox.ac.uk](mailto:kirsten.macfarlane@keble.ox.ac.uk)

Mailing address: Keble College, Oxford, OX1 3PG

Acknowledgements: The author would like to thank Joanna Weinberg, Nicholas Hardy, Mark Rankin and the two anonymous peer reviewers for their invaluable feedback on drafts of this article.

## Hugh Broughton and the King James Bible, Revisited

Hugh Broughton (1549-1612) is best known today as the eccentric puritan who, having been excluded from the translation committees of the King James Bible, published a vicious attack on the final product. While this has been enough to guarantee Broughton a passing mention in most histories of the topic, there remain few systematic analyses of the complex and shifting reasons behind his strong dislike of the new translation. This article expands our understanding of Broughton's attitude to the English Bible through the analysis of four previously unknown manuscript sources, preserved in British Library MS Sloane 3088 and Egerton 791. After introducing the sources and giving an overview of their provenance, the article highlights some of their most remarkable features and explains their significance both for our knowledge of Hugh Broughton in particular as well as for studies of vernacular translation more broadly.

Keywords: English Bible, Hugh Broughton, translation, King James Bible, Hebrew

The English Hebraist Hugh Broughton (1549-1612) has long played a cameo role in scholarship on the English Bible. After all, despite his omission from the King James Bible translation committees, Broughton had campaigned incessantly for a new translation for over two decades from the late 1580s, and in the process had produced several of his own English renderings of Old Testament books.<sup>1</sup> In many ways, he was the ideal translator: he had

---

<sup>1</sup> Hugh Broughton, *Daniel his Chaldie visions and his Ebrew: both translated after the original* (London: Richard Field for William Young, 1596); Hugh Broughton, *A comment vpon Coheleth or Ecclesiastes* (London: W. White, 1605); Hugh Broughton, *The Lamentationes of Ieremy, translated with great care of his Hebrew elegancie, and oratorious speeches: wherin his sixfold alphabet stirreth all to attention, of Gods ordered providence in kingdomes confusion* (Amsterdam, 1606); Hugh Broughton, *Iob. To the King. A Colon-Agrippina studie of one moneth, for the metricall translation: but of many yeres, for Ebrew difficulties* (Amsterdam: Giles Thorp, 1610).

learned Hebrew as a Cambridge undergraduate under the great Huguenot Hebraist Antoine Chevallier, and his Greek was proficient enough for him to be offered Sir Walter Mildmay's lectureship in Greek two years after his BA graduation in 1570.<sup>2</sup> By the mid-1580s, Broughton's linguistic skills were so advanced that he translated the entire Hebrew prophets into Greek, patronised by Henry Hastings, 3rd Earl of Huntingdon.<sup>3</sup> His absence from the translation committees was no reflection on his abilities, but because his expertise was not enough to outweigh the virulent controversies he had become embroiled in from the time of his first publication (a short chronological pamphlet in 1588/9) to his last (an unsparing critique of the King James Bible in 1611). Broughton's misjudged interventions into multiple hot topics of theology, above all the meaning of Christ's descent into hell in the 1590s, earned him public derision and saw him pitted against many rising stars of the English ecclesiastical establishment.<sup>4</sup> Two of these stars (Richard Bancroft and William Barlow) even penned a biting satire of Broughton's works, writing anonymously but scarcely concealing their hand.<sup>5</sup> By the time of the Hampton Court conference in 1604, Broughton had been living in unofficial exile on the European continent for just under fifteen years, and had gained a reputation for his incessant, hastily-written missives to court, often advocating aggressively for his various schemes, including not just a new English Bible but also a massive missionary

---

<sup>2</sup> G. Lloyd Jones, 'Broughton, Hugh (1549-1612), divine and Hebraist', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed July 2, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3585>.

<sup>3</sup> Hugh Broughton, *A Seder Olam, that is: Order of the Worlde: or yeeres from the fall tot eh restoring* (London: Gabriel Simpson and William White?, 1594), sig. C3v.

<sup>4</sup> For Broughton and the debate over Christ's descent into hell, see Dewey Wallace Jnr, "Puritan and Anglican: the Interpretation of Christ's Descent into Hell in Elizabethan Theology", *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 69 (1978): 248-87.

<sup>5</sup> [Richard Bancroft and William Barlow], *Master Broughtons letters, especially his last pamphlet to and against the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, about sheol and hades, for the descent into hell, answered in their kind* (London: F. Kingston and John Wolfe, 1599). Broughton knew immediately who had written and supported the work, given that it cited private letters he had sent to Whitgift, William Cecil (then deceased) and Thomas Stallard; for his knowledge see London, British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 28r. The authorship of the pamphlet seems to have been clear from its style: a copy of *Master Broughtons letters* in Washington DC, Folger Shakespeare Library STC 3864 2/8/43 has the comment 'Stilus similis Barlowj Episcopi of Lincoln' at sig. A2v.

enterprise to convert the Jewish communities of the Ottoman empire.<sup>6</sup> Often these letters contained importune political remarks, such as his comment to Thomas Egerton, 1st Baron Ellesmere, shortly after the Gunpowder plot, that the position of England's bishops on Christ's descent into hell 'might desere to have y<sup>e</sup> Parliamente house blowne up, but y<sup>i</sup> the Kinge & Nobles knew not how y<sup>e</sup> case stood.'<sup>7</sup> More often they simply contained desperate pleas for money, which Broughton was perennially lacking.

Thanks to this unusual biography, much of the reputation Broughton developed in his time has persevered to our own, and scholars of biblical translation have long used Broughton's withering comments about the King James Bible to underpin his reputation as an angry, embittered puritan outsider.<sup>8</sup> Where his criticisms of contemporary translations have been studied in more detail, scholars have highlighted those aspects of his practice which corroborate this reputation, such as his insistence on harmonising chronological and genealogical inconsistencies, his prickly impatience with error, and his unyieldingly literal approach to translation.<sup>9</sup> Such characterisations accurately reflect the most striking qualities

---

<sup>6</sup> Some of which were published, e.g. Hugh Broughton, *An epistle to the learned nobilitie of England* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1597); Broughton, *To the right honorable: the lords of his maiesties most honorable Privey Counsell* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1609); Broughton, *A most humble supplication unto the King, for present performance of long purposed allowance, to open the law in the letters and tongue of Adam* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1609); Broughton, *A petition tho the lordes chancelours of both univiesities, & to all the noble LL. of Albion & Ierne* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1609); Broughton, *A petition to the King to hasten allowance for Ebrew institution of Ebrewes* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1610); Broughton, *A petition to the king for authority and allowance to expound the Apocalyps in Hebrew and Greek, to shew Iewes and Gentiles: that Rome in Caesars and Pope, is therin still damned* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1611).

<sup>7</sup> London, British Library Harley MS 787, fol. 94r.

<sup>8</sup> "Tell his Maiest. that I had rather be rent in pieces with wilde horses, then any such translation by my consent should bee vrged vpon poore Churches", Hugh Broughton, *A censure of the late translation for our churches: sent vnto a right worshipfull knight, attendant vpon the King* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1611).

<sup>9</sup> David Norton, "English Bibles from c. 1520 to c. 1750," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 3, *From 1450 to 1750*, ed. Euan Cameron (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 305-45; Hannibal Hamlin, "The Noblest Composition in the Universe or Fit for the Flames? The Literary Style of the King James Bible", in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c. 1530-1700*, ed. Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith, and Rachel Willie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 470; Jeffrey Shoulson, *Fictions of Conversion: Jews, Christians and Cultures of Change in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 84; Rocío Sumillera, "Hugh Broughton's Censure to the King James Bible", in *Into Another's Skin:*

of Broughton's work to modern eyes. However, in focussing on these alone, we risk missing the more complex theological and philological features of his ideas, features which are at once peculiar to Broughton and revealingly representative of contemporary approaches to vernacular translation.<sup>10</sup> This article will illuminate such features by introducing four previously unstudied sources relating to Broughton and the English Bible. Two of these sources shed new light on Broughton's evolving attitude towards the King James Bible from its conception to just before its completion, and the other two heavily revise our understanding of his dislike of the Bishops' Bible, which cannot be captured by simply stating that he thought it contained "errors". These revisions are valuable not just for what they tell us about Broughton, since many problems in previous analyses of his attitude to translation have emerged specifically from the limitations and blindspots of modern notions of translation as applied to the early modern Bible. As such, this article will use Broughton to offer a parallel re-assessment of the field of 'English bible scholarship' as a whole, and in particular to examine to what extent the categories of 'English Bible' and 'biblical translation' are still appropriate, helpful, and capacious enough to describe the most ambitious work in this field over the past ten to fifteen years.

## **The Manuscripts**

All four sources can be found in two manuscripts preserved in the British Library, Sloane 3088 and Egerton 791.<sup>11</sup> While neither are Broughton autographs, they represent an

---

*Selected Essays in Honour of María Luisa Dañobeitia*, ed. Mauricio D. Aguilera Linde, María José de la Torre Moreno, and Laura Torres Zúñiga (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2012), 47-57.

<sup>10</sup> For the complexity of Broughton's approach to translating the New Testament, see Kirsten Macfarlane, "Translating the 'Hebraeo-Hellenic Apostles': Hugh Broughton and the Scholarly Context of the English New Testament", *The Review of English Studies* 68, no. 286 (2017): 689-707.

<sup>11</sup> London, British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 111r-113r, fol. 114r-115r, fol. 115v-116r; London, British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 23r-39r.

interesting phenomenon, as both were made by the same (largely anonymous) group of godly young people living in London around the 1610-1620s. This group had an unusual attachment to the works and person of Hugh Broughton, buying up his printed books and pamphlets, circulating these amongst themselves, annotating and interleaving their copies, and creating extensive, communally-produced manuscript anthologies of his works, of which both Sloane 3088 and Egerton 791 are examples.<sup>12</sup> These activities were undertaken largely for the purposes of educating themselves in biblical scholarship, to which Broughton's English-language pamphlets gave unusually extensive (and affordable) access. This education was intended to further their growth in godliness and piety by deepening their understanding of scripture. The story of this devoted and autodidactic circle deserves attention in its own right, but for the purposes of this article, it is most important to establish what this provenance means for the reliability of the works by Broughton that survive solely in this group's records.<sup>13</sup>

In general, the "London Broughtonians", as we might call them, were carefully observant of matters of preservation and copying: one of their core identifiable members, the New England immigrant Edward Holyoke (1585-1660), was even drawn in to help the English Hebraist John Lightfoot gather information for his 1662 edition of Broughton's *opera omnia*.<sup>14</sup> This vigilance is apparent throughout the first manuscript, Sloane 3088. Written in six hands, the compilers of this anthology of Broughtoniana constantly reflect on the nature, dates and authority of the texts they are transcribing, suggesting a highly self-

---

<sup>12</sup> Both manuscripts can be attributed to this circle through their references to group members who helped compile them: in Sloane 3088, to Caleb Rawlins (1573-1645), and in Egerton 791, to Mrs Baynard, who is Tabitha Baynard née Rawlins (1574-1643), Caleb's younger sister; British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 69v; British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 21v.

<sup>13</sup> This circle of Hugh Broughton devotees and their exceptional activities will be the subject of my second book, *Amateur Divines: Lay Learning and the Bible in the Seventeenth-Century Atlantic World*.

<sup>14</sup> John Lightfoot, preface to *The works of the great Albionean divine: renown'd in many nations for rare skill in Salems & Athens tongues* (London: Nathaniel Ekins, 1662), 1: sig. b2r.

aware set of copyists.<sup>15</sup> The foremost contributor, whom I would tentatively identify as Holyoke himself, even designed a key that would enable readers to distinguish between more and less accurate copies: using a symbol of decorated concentric circles, Holyoke designated which copies were “imperfect” and “not to be published under his [Broughton’s] name”.<sup>16</sup> Two of the three Sloane sources under discussion here are copied in Holyoke’s hand with this cautionary symbol prefixed. While this means we cannot place any weight on the wording, form and presentation of these texts, the content is undeniably Broughton’s, as it is evident from the significant overlap with material present in his published works (as will become clear below).

By contrast with Sloane 3088, Egerton 791 is written in one as yet unidentified hand throughout, excepting a set of poems at the close of the manuscript, which appear to be later additions.<sup>17</sup> The manuscript does not show the same level of self-consciousness as Sloane 3088, although there is internal evidence to suggest a copyist carefully transcribing a text by Broughton, diligently correcting errors, omitting indecipherable words, and adding marginal clarifications where Broughton was obscure or imprecise.<sup>18</sup> The impression of reliability this gives is strengthened by the fact that the text copied displays Broughton’s distinctive laconic yet colourful prose style, which is less apparent in the more regular, bland prose of the two “imperfect” Sloane sources. In other words, we have good reason to trust that at least two of

---

<sup>15</sup> British Library Sloane MS 3088, see for instance the compilers noting when they copied from a printed text or a Broughton autograph (fol. 84v, fol. 110r, fol. 157r; fol. 159r); and on occasion noting the dates on which the copies were made, the earliest being August 1615 (fol. 101v) and latest, March 1622 (fol. 69r).

<sup>16</sup> The symbol consists of two concentric circles, the annulus speckled with dots, with lines radiating away from the outermost circumference; British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 174v.

<sup>17</sup> This hand could belong to Edward Holyoke, although as yet I cannot make this identification with confidence: the poems in a different hand and ink are British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 53r-59v.

<sup>18</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791: some corrections are revealing, such as at fol. 27v where the copyist writes “Bishop” only to cross it out and replace it with “Buyshop” (Broughton’s sarcastic way of referring to Bancroft); see fol. 32v for an example of where the copyist has left spaces for words to be filled in later; and for an example of marginal clarification, see fol. 26v, where the main text refers ambiguously to “the prophecy” and a marginal note reads “(see *what* ps. It is I think 87)”.

the four sources discussed in this article reflect something close to Broughton's original composition, and that the remaining two reflect the propositional content of his work, if not his exact wording.

### **Sloane 3088: One Letter and Two Critiques**

The first and earliest source is a copy of a letter from Broughton to James I, written between James' accession and the end of 1604.<sup>19</sup> Unlike the other two sources we will discuss in Sloane 3088, it is not marked with Holyoke's concentric circle, meaning that its wording can reliably be attributed to Broughton. This is corroborated by the letter's prose style, which is extremely cryptic and confused, making it more authentically Broughtonian than the smoother, more spacious prose of the two sources marked by Holyoke as imperfect. The same spiky quality, however, makes it unlikely that the letter was ever actually sent to James (or, if it was, almost certainly never read).

The letter, titled "Of Amending the Genevan translation" by Holyoke, begins by describing a movement in the 1580s to emend the Geneva Bible, led by Henry Hastings, John Aylmer, Bishop of London, and before his death, Anthony Gilby, one of the Geneva's original translators. Broughton claims that he was originally asked to take on this venture, which is plausible enough, given that Henry Hastings was one of Broughton's major patrons during this period, which was also before the bitter controversies that would ruin his reputation and force him out of the country.<sup>20</sup> Broughton records that he was planning to

---

<sup>19</sup> British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 114r-115r. The letter's *terminus ante quem* is given by its reference to Broughton's *An advertisement of corruption in our handling of religion* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1604) being complete but not yet in print, with James' accession offering the *terminus post quem*.

<sup>20</sup> Henry Hastings funded Broughton's studies throughout the 1580s, even commissioning a translation of the entire Hebrew Bible into Greek, for which see the dedication to London, Lambeth Palace MS 2, fol. 1r. In a letter from 1593, Broughton also mentions being asked long ago to work on a new translation; London, British Library Lansdowne MS 75, no. 4.



undertake this project following six critical “canons”, which contravened the then-received wisdom in biblical scholarship.<sup>21</sup> These canons would not be surprising to anyone familiar with Broughton’s work. For instance, he insisted on the need for a translator to uphold that the vowel points were given to Moses on Mount Sinai by God, neither invented by Ezra nor by later grammarians, both of which were common opinions among Broughton’s coreligionists, but which he believed undermined the divinity of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>22</sup> Likewise, he argued that the Masoretic tradition known as “qeri and ketiv” (lit. *what is read* and *what is written*), which preserved variant readings to the traditional consonantal Hebrew text, did not mean that the Hebrew Bible was corrupt, as Christians like Edward Lively had argued. Rather, it simply offered an exposition of the text for “the simple...till they see more.”<sup>23</sup> In addition to these theologically fraught “canons”, Broughton also included more general methodological points, such as the need for a translator of the Old Testament to use a range of resources from the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds to the Targumim to the Jewish Arabic translation of the Pentateuch. Individually, none of these points was especially

---

<sup>21</sup> At first, two of the six canons appear incomplete, but it seems clear that they have been integrated into the text of the previous page, probably in error (although whether the error is Broughton’s or the copyist’s is unclear), British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 114r-115r.

<sup>22</sup> Elijah Levita’s suggestion of a late dating and non-divine origins for the vowel points was followed by many Protestants, including major reformers such as Luther, Calvin and Zwingli; see Christian Ginsburg, introduction to *The Massoreth ha-massoreth of Elias Levita: being an exposition of the massoretic notes on the Hebrew Bible, or, the ancient critical apparatus of the Old Testament* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1867) 48-51. It was only in the seventeenth century that reformed opinion about the age of the vowel points coalesced around an earlier dating, largely in response to Catholic attacks on the authority of the Hebrew Bible; thus the relative rigidity of Broughton’s position was out of step for his time. See Richard A. Muller, “The Debate over the Vowel Points and the Crisis in Orthodox Hermeneutics”, in *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Nicholas Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 308-34.

<sup>23</sup> British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 114r. For the *qeri* and *ketiv*, which were printed in the standard edition of the Hebrew Bible at the time, see Stephen Burnett, “The Strange Career of the Biblia Rabbinica among Christian Hebraists 1517-1620”, in *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars, and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Bruce Gordon and Matthew McLean (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 63-85; Bertram Eugene Schwarzbach, “Les éditions de la Bible hébraïque au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle et la création du texte massorétique”, in *La Bible imprimée dans l’Europe moderne XVI<sup>e</sup>-XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, ed. Bertram Eugene Schwarzbach (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1999), 16-67.

unique: Broughton was fond of creating lists of rules to guide translators, and variants can be found scattered throughout his works.<sup>24</sup> More tantalising is his concluding comment, in which he contrasts his competence in “these Cannons mentioned” with the “bare Latine studies” of Richard Bancroft, and urges that if James “meane to have the Bible in truth”, he should treat each scholar accordingly.<sup>25</sup> Given the timing, it is tempting to wonder whether this letter might have been hurriedly written in response to news of the Hampton Court conference, reminding James I of earlier attempts to produce a revised English Bible, of Broughton’s involvement in and qualifications for such a venture, and taking a not-so-subtle swipe at the man chiefly in charge.

This must remain speculation, given that Broughton had long disliked Bancroft, had long campaigned for a new English Bible, and so did not need the stimulus of the Hampton Court conference to write such a letter. Indeed, it is possible that Broughton's motivation was simply to use James's accession to drive a wedge between the new King and his old enemy: Broughton was conscious of the fact that Bancroft had insulted James in the past, and his letter even explicitly referred to Bancroft's 'scoffing' as an experience he shared with James.<sup>26</sup> In any case, if this first source shows Broughton’s continued interest in a new translation around the time of the commissioning of the King James Bible, the remaining two sources of Sloane 3088, especially the second, reveal more about his scholarly method. Both sources are criticisms of contemporary English Bibles, singling out the Bishops’ Bible, although often applying equally to the Geneva. Both are marked as “imperfect” by Holyoke, using his concentric circle, and both are undateable. The first, “Great disceptation is from some that our English translation needed not amendment”, offers seven illustrations of problems in the

---

<sup>24</sup> British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 114r-115r; for instance, in Broughton, *Our Lordes familie and many other poinctes depending upon it opened against a lew, Rabbi David Farar* (Amsterdam: 1608), sig. H3v-H4v.

<sup>25</sup> British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 115r.

<sup>26</sup> British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 115r; See for this and Bancroft, Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 192-194.

Bishops Bible. These are not especially exciting, covering only Broughton's most foundational complaints, such as that it contained marginal notes that "denyeth the text to be pure", and was at points "translated from Latin, and not from the fountains", without due attention to features of the Masoretic Hebrew text such as the vocalisation and accents.<sup>27</sup> It is the second source, "Errors of unspeakable grossnesse, disturbing all religion, or shaking all Godes truth", that truly reveals the range of techniques, ideas, and sources which Broughton applied to vernacular translation. This source critiques the rendering of four verses in the Bishops' Bible Genesis, as well as Exodus 28.<sup>28</sup> One of the richest examples of these critiques is that of Genesis 4:26, which runs as follows:

Cap. 4. 26. Then men began to make invocation on the name of the Eternall. It is ~~pleane~~ contrary: as Kimchi telleth the best consent: Then was corrupted the calling upon the name of the Eternall. Therefore Seth called his son sorrowful Enosh. Moses drift was to shew, how since the earth was cursed, man hastened the floud *without* falling amendement. And so all the Talmud and Midras Rabba, and all *commonly* place the first apostacie in the days of Enosh.

With the aid of Broughton's published work, we can unpack the complexities of this terse paragraph. The problem was how to understand the end of Genesis 4:26, **אז הוחל לקרא בשם יהוה**, then **huchal** to call upon the name of the Lord. Here, the verb הוחל, the hofel (causative passive) of חלל, literally meant "was begun", making the verse depict the beginning of the invocation of God's name in worship, but could also be understood as "was profaned", making it start of the corruption of the same activity. Every single English Bible of the

---

<sup>27</sup> British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 115v-116r. There is not enough information to establish the precise edition of the Bishops' Bible Broughton used, although his criticism of the 'wicked table prefixed afore St Matth:' indicates that it must have been after 1572 (fol. 111r-113r).

<sup>28</sup> British Library Sloane MS 3088, fol. 111r-113r.

period, including the Geneva, the Bishops and eventually the King James Bible itself, opted for the former, and in this respect they were unremarkable.<sup>29</sup> The Christian tradition had for centuries understood this verse to mean the start, rather than the corruption of worship, thanks not least to the influence of the Septuagint translation, which rendered הוֹחֵל as οὗτος ἡλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, "*this one* [i.e. Enosh, the immediate antecedent] *hoped to call* upon the name of the Lord", a reading clearly incompatible with the interpretation of הוֹחֵל as "was profaned".<sup>30</sup>

Broughton, however, mooted for the alternative interpretation, and his references ("Kimchi...all the Talmud and the Midras Rabba") show why: because he had noticed that many rabbinic and postbiblical Jewish sources saw the verse as the start of apostasy and idolatry in the generation of Enosh, to the extent that (as he put it in a printed discussion of this verse), the "Cataloge of their testimonies would occupie much paper".<sup>31</sup> These Jewish sources included many of Broughton's favourite texts, such as the Aramaic paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible, the Targumim (both of Onkelos and Jonathan); the Midrash Rabbah; Rashi; Maimonides in his Mishneh Torah, and even more recent texts such as Abraham Zacuto's early sixteenth-century genealogical-chronological work, *Sefer Yuhasin*.<sup>32</sup>

Immersed in these sources, Broughton not only decided that Genesis 4:26 should be read negatively as "was profaned", but also adopted wholesale the broader rabbinic

---

<sup>29</sup> "Then began men to call vpon the Name of the Lord", *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2012); "then began menne to make invocation in the name of the Lorde", *The holie Bible conteyning the olde Testament and the newe [The Bishops' Bible]* (London: Richard Jugge, 1572); "then began men to call vpon the Name of the LORD", *The holy bible, conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: newly translated out of the originall tongues [The King James Bible]* (London: Robert Barker, 1611).

<sup>30</sup> Steven Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Post-biblical Interpretation* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984), 5-11.

<sup>31</sup> Broughton, *An Advertishment of corruption*, sig. L3v.

<sup>32</sup> See Targum Onkelos and Jonathan at Genesis 4:26; Bereshith (Genesis) Rabbah 23:6-7; Rashi on Genesis 4:26; Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Sefer Madda, Avodat Kochavim 1:1-2; Abraham Zacuto, *Sefer Yuhasin* (Krakow, 1580-81), fol. 134v. I would like to thank Joanna Weinberg for bringing the reference to Zacuto to my attention.

historical-chronological narrative of decline in this period. His 1590 work of chronology identified Enosh's birth as the moment at which "religion is sorrowfully corrupted", and at other points he even demonstrated awareness of the rabbinic expression דור אנוש (*dor Enos*) to denote, as Broughton described, "the men of *Enos* time in the first Apostasie."<sup>33</sup> But beyond these general features, there are hints that Broughton absorbed even the smaller details of his Jewish sources. For instance, it seems possible that behind Broughton's idea of man's corruption hastening the flood lies the rabbinic concept of an initial, small-scale pre-Noachide flood caused by the sins of the generation of Enosh, an idea which Broughton would have found in the Midrash Rabbah on Genesis, one of the sources cited in Sloane 3088.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, one of the major reasons behind the rabbinic interpretation of Genesis 4:26 would have been enormously appealing to Broughton: the need to protect the verse from accusations of error given that men prior to Enosh, particularly Adam, had already "made invocation" upon the name of the Lord: a point Broughton explicitly raised in his published work.<sup>35</sup> This was a problem other reformed exegetes like David Pareus noticed, and tried to avoid by arguing that Genesis 4:26 represented the start of public as opposed to private invocation, but which the rabbinic interpretation more neatly sidestepped.<sup>36</sup>

But Broughton's absorption of rabbinic readings of this verse did not stop there. It also seems likely that Broughton was aware of the particular way in which some rabbinic exegetes supported their interpretation of הוהל. For the very text Broughton mentions prominently in Sloane 3088, the Midrash Rabbah, had reached its interpretation of הוהל in

---

<sup>33</sup> Broughton, *A concent of scripture* (London: Gabriell Simson and William White, 1590), sig. B2v; Broughton, *An advertismet of corruption*, sig. L3v.

<sup>34</sup> For a more precise expression, see Broughton, *An advertismet of corruption*, sig. L4r, "where the corrupt invocation brought the deluge"; for the rabbinic concept, see Bereshith (Genesis) Rabbah 5:6, 23:7.

<sup>35</sup> "it is vntrue that vntill *Enos* birth men called not vpon the name of God in 235. yeres", Broughton, *An advertismet of corruption*, sig. L4r.

<sup>36</sup> Pareus had translated Genesis 4:26 as "tunc coeptum est invocari nomen Iehovae", David Pareus, *In Genesin Mosis commentaries* (Frankfurt: Jonas Rhodius, 1609), 704-6.

Genesis 4:26 by reading it through Genesis 6:1, where the same verb occurred more clearly in the sense of rebellion or profanity (and it came to pass, *when men rebelled* (כִּי-הָחֹל)).<sup>37</sup> It is probably not a coincidence that Broughton himself explicitly highlighted Genesis 6:1 as an exposition of Genesis 4:26 that justified reading it as the start of corruption.<sup>38</sup> Finally, Broughton's gloss of Enosh as meaning "sorrowful" was in sympathy with the same texts, implicitly deriving the name from the root אָנַשׁ (*anash*) literally meaning weakness/sickness, but often used metaphorically to mean melancholy, such as at Jeremiah 17:16.<sup>39</sup> Similarly negative readings of the name Enosh, from אָנַשׁ and sometimes elaborated by wordplay, abounded in the sources Broughton was reading, and these of course sat naturally within the historical and exegetical framework of corruption and degeneration built around Genesis 4:26.<sup>40</sup>

However, these were not the only texts informing Broughton's exegesis. For just as in the rabbinic tradition, Christian readings of Genesis 4:26 spawned a highly developed historical and eschatological framework, against which Broughton was working. I have already mentioned that Christians generally translated and interpreted this verse as the start or restoration of worship of the Lord. Following from this, most held a positive view of Enosh and his generation. Relying on the idea of Enosh *hoping* to call on the Lord, as in the Septuagint Genesis, early Christian commentators viewed him as the ideal man (ἀληθὴς ἄνθρωπος), contrasted to the common man, Adam (in the Hebrew Bible, as well as names of individuals, both *enosh* and *adam* are generic words for "man").<sup>41</sup> Early moderns very much emulated their predecessors in this respect, often noting the derivation of Enosh's name from אָנַשׁ (weak/sick), but placing him in a line of righteous and pious men that would, eventually,

---

<sup>37</sup> Bereshith (Genesis) Rabbah 23:7; more specifically, using *gezerah shavah* to read the חָחֹל in 4:26 via חָחֹל in 6:1, although Broughton does not seem to recognise this common hermeneutic technique.

<sup>38</sup> Broughton, *An epistle to the learned nobilitie of England*, 44.

<sup>39</sup> Broughton, *An advertishment of corruption*, sig. L3v-L4r.

<sup>40</sup> Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation*, 49-85.

<sup>41</sup> Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 7:8; Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 15:21.

end in Jesus. Indeed, the major intra-Christian dispute concerned not the quality but the nature of the invocation Enosh began, after the Jesuit Robert Bellarmine claimed it for the beginning of monasticism.<sup>42</sup>

Broughton's interpretation represented a complex compromise with this tradition. He preserved a positive view of Enosh and the parallels between Enosh and Christ by turning to the metaphorical meaning of אנשׁ, and comparing the sorrow of Enosh for his sinful generation to the sorrow of Christ for the "negligence of the Jews".<sup>43</sup> Even beyond the Christian gloss, this view of Enosh as an exception to the sins of his contemporaries represented a change from the majority of Jewish commentators, who viewed him not just as complicit in but as an instigator of corruption.<sup>44</sup> But Broughton merged this Jesus-facing, positive view of Enosh with the rabbinic narrative of corruption and profanity during this period, building it into his account of biblical history as the first apostasy. He even suggested in his printed works that those few Jewish scholars who had taken up the Septuagint-Christian interpretation of Genesis 4:26 (such as Abraham ibn Ezra) did so precisely because they recognised its anti-Christian potential, not just because of the way it threatened biblical harmony, but also because denying that men called upon God until the time of Enosh undermined reformed belief that "they who beleevved that the Eternall word would be made flesh, were from the beginning."<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Robert Bellarmine, "Secunda controversia generalis: De Monachis", in *Disputationum Roberti Bellarmini...de controversiis Christianae fidei, adversus huius temporis haereticos opus* (Ingolstadt: Adam Sartorius, 1601) 2: 432 (Book 2, Chapter 5); as recognised (and worried about) by Protestants such as André Rivet, *Theologicae et scholasticae exercitationes CX in Genesin* (Leiden: Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir, 1633), 236, "Bellarminus...conatur hoc eodem loco [Genesis 4:26] abuti ad probandas institutions Monasticas".

<sup>43</sup> The evidence for this assertion lies in an anonymous tract made by the London Broughtonians from Broughton's papers: *The times, places and persons of the holie scripture, otherwise entituled the generall view of the holy scriptures* (London: Richard Ockould, 1607), 32; revised and expanded as *The general view of the holy scriptures: or, the times, places, and persons of the holy scriptures* (London: Henry Ockould, 1640), 34-5.

<sup>44</sup> Those who wanted to preserve Enosh's piety tended to be influenced by the Septuagint, for instance Philo of Alexandria. See Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation*, 19-25.

<sup>45</sup> Broughton, *An advertishment of corruption*, sig. L4r.

These decisions around Genesis 4:26 had ramifications across multiple points in the Bible. In particular, Broughton's acceptance of the rabbinic narrative of Enoshic corruption saw him partially reverse the early Christian dichotomy of Enosh/Adam to understand the two words for "man", *enosh* and *adam*, as designing the sorrowful apostate man and righteous elect man respectively.<sup>46</sup> This again was derived from a Talmudic distinction, but it led Broughton to produce sensitive and precise translations of verses that were otherwise blurry and indistinct in English renderings. For instance, at Job 36:25, what English translations, including the King James Bible, gave as "every man (*adam*) may see [God's magnificence]; man (*enosh*) may behold it afar off", Broughton rendered as "all of Adam see it: they of Enosh behold a far off", drawing out a contrast, lost in earlier versions, between the righteous man who sees God's magnificence up close and the unrighteous who views it only at a distance.<sup>47</sup> All in all, then, the case of Genesis 4:26 is remarkable for its illustration of how behind Broughton's curt prose and seemingly odd exegetical decisions often lie much more profound engagement with a range of Jewish sources and scholarship. It is also an apt illustration for how minor choices – such as the reinterpretation of a single verb in a single verse – could have rippling effects across the translation of the whole Bible, as well as for how one understood the entire narrative of biblical history and chronology. We might also note that while Broughton was working against the grain of Christian thought, he was not totally isolated in his understanding of this verse. Such authorities as Immanuel Tremellius, in the first edition of the Junius-Tremellius Bible, followed the rabbinic interpretation (later editions reverted to the usual Christian reading), and there was a general undercurrent of awareness among the most learned early modern Christians of it as an alternative tradition,

---

<sup>46</sup> Broughton, *Daniel his Chaldie visions*, note at Daniel 5:21, sig. C3r.

<sup>47</sup> Broughton, *Iob*, 74.



even if they did not accept it.<sup>48</sup> We might also note that while Broughton's reading of Genesis 4:26 remained marginal in his lifetime, scholarly opinion would later turn rapidly in favour of it, including famous Hebraists like John Selden.<sup>49</sup>

The significance of this analysis of the Sloane sources is twofold. Firstly, it helps illuminate why Broughton might have thought himself exceptionally qualified to undertake a new English translation, and what he might have meant when he compared his own skills favourably to Bancroft's "bare Latine studies". It also shows how many of his "canons" described in the first two sources could have played out in practice, particularly in the range and depth of literature he believed needed to be consulted. But while several of Broughton's canons are clearly peculiar to Broughton (such as his belief in the Mosaic origin of the vowel points), the best recent work on the English Bible has shown that the basic concerns and methods behind his approach to translation were shared by the most learned and sophisticated translators of the King James Bible. Like Broughton, men such as John Bois, Isaac Casaubon and Richard Kilbie understood their task not just in the narrow terms of accuracy and avoiding error, but as the vernacular, public-facing tip of a much deeper, longer-term project to reconstruct the intellectual and cultural world of the ancient Hebrews, how this world changed over the course of biblical history, as well as how the messy and multiple surviving

---

<sup>48</sup> More specifically, Tremellius translated following both readings, albeit with the rabbinic clearly at the forefront: "tunc coeptum est profanari in invocando nomine Jehovah", Immanuel Tremellius and Franciscus Junius, eds., *Testamenti veteris Biblia sacra sive libri canonici priscae Iudaeorum ecclesiae a Deo traditi* (London: Henry Middleton, 1580), 5. Note also that Tremellius preserved a similar distinction to Broughton at Job 36:25, "*Quod omnes homines viderunt; mortalis intuetur e longinquo*". Awareness of the rabbinic interpretation is shown in, for example, the interlinear Hebrew-Latin volume 6 of the Antwerp Polyglot, which following Santes Pagnino's translation, noted הוּחַל with "inuocari nomen, *vel* pollui", see Benito Arias Montano, ed., *Biblia hebraica. eorundem Latina interpretatio Xantis Pagnini Lucensis, recenter Benedicti Ariae Montani Hispal. & quorundam aliorum collato studio, ad Hebraicam dictionem diligentissimè expensa* (Antwerp: Christopher Plantin, 1584), 4.

<sup>49</sup> See John Owen's survey of scholarly opinion on this verse: John Owens, "Of Theologie", trans. Lucy Hutchinson, in *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson*, vol. 2, *Theological Writings and Translations*, ed. Elizabeth Clarke, David Norbrook, and Jane Stevenson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 428-32.

sources – in languages from Hebrew to Latin - testifying to these times ought best be deployed to illuminate the scriptural past.<sup>50</sup> Indeed, it is notable that while the King James Bible did not adopt the radical rabbinic reading of Genesis 4:26, at least one of the translators was likely aware of it, as Joanna Weinberg’s ground-breaking study of Richard Kilbie suggests.<sup>51</sup>

### **Egerton 791: Alternative Rules for the King James Bible**

However, despite all of this, we must note that Broughton’s problems with the King James Bible were not purely scholarly; they were not even purely theological. They were also deeply personal, bound up in the intricacies of Broughton’s relationships with individual appointed translators. It is this feature of Broughton’s objections that the final document, preserved in Egerton 791, best illustrates.

Entitled “Rules concerning the BB. translation of the Bible”, this document was written between late 1609 and late 1610, in direct response to the ongoing work of the King James Bible committees, as an alternative set of rules to guide the translators.<sup>52</sup> It is worth quoting from the introduction in full:

---

<sup>50</sup> See Nicholas Hardy, “Revising the King James Apocrypha: John Bois, Isaac Casaubon, and the Case of 1 Esdras”, in *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord: Scholarship and the Making of the King James Version of the Bible*, ed. Mordechai Feingold (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 266-327; Joanna Weinberg, “The Hebraic Explorations of the English Mercier: Richard Kilbie (1560/61-1620)”, in Feingold, *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord*, 160-86; Anthony Grafton, “Edward Lively, Cosmopolitan Hebraist”, in Feingold, *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord*, 82-104.

<sup>51</sup> Weinberg, “The Hebraic Explorations of the English Mercier”, 178-9.

<sup>52</sup> The *terminus post quem* is given by its reference to Bancroft’s angry response to Broughton’s *A defence of the booke entitled A concent of scripture* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1609), and the *terminus ante quem* by Bancroft’s death in November 1610, British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 23r-39r. For the actual rules, see David Norton, *The King James Bible: A Short History from Tyndale to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 86-90.

The king M. bade the E. of Pembroke speake to one to shewe y<sup>t</sup> our translations must be amended: & y<sup>t</sup> was done: & he meant that he who best know the faultes, should take the cause in hand. B. D. Bancroft wold overrule: & mocke w<sup>th</sup> God & the K. to appoint workemen according to his vnlearned choise. To teach him y<sup>t</sup> God will not be mocked these theoremata or rules shall be layd downe: shewing what learning a translater ought to haue: w<sup>ch</sup> yf D. Bancroftes actoures haue not, Phaeton must be holden a flame to our little world: who desired a chariot which he could not rule.<sup>53</sup>

This fiery opening sets the tone for the rest of the document, which consists of 21 numbered sections, some subdivided into further points. While these begin as “rules” or rather general principles of translation and criticisms of contemporary renderings, they quickly degenerate into an unrestrained attack on Bancroft, using his past comments about translation as well as his tolerance for the Bishops’ Bible to “predict” the problems that would arise in a translation overseen by him.<sup>54</sup> This supports Kenneth Fincham’s recent argument that Bancroft was the central figure in bringing the King James Bible to completion from c.1607 onwards; certainly, Broughton perceived the project to be entirely under Bancroft’s control, holding Bancroft pre-emptively responsible for the whole undertaking.<sup>55</sup> Other figures with whom Broughton had bickered also received heavy criticism: first Edward Lively, who had published in 1597 against Broughton’s chronological work; second Thomas Bilson, with whom Broughton had clashed over the meaning of Christ’s descent into hell in the 1590s; and finally William Barlow, who co-authored the 1599 satire against Broughton’s works.<sup>56</sup> But

---

<sup>53</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 23r.

<sup>54</sup> Moving, for instance, from general headings of “Of Ain for G” (fol. 23r) and “of the holy double readings” (fol. 25r) to the more polemical “Of Bancrofts Generall apostasie vnto Iudaisme” (fol. 28r), all in British Library Egerton MS 791.

<sup>55</sup> Kenneth Fincham, “The King James Bible: Crown, Church, and People”, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (2018): 1-21.

<sup>56</sup> Edward Lively, *A true chronologie of the times of the Persian monarchie, and after to the destruction of Ierusalem by the Romanes* (London: Felix Kingston, 1597); Hugh Broughton, *A replie*

these men were ultimately deemed minor players in comparison to Bancroft, dangerous only because of the manner in which Bancroft had permitted and promoted them.<sup>57</sup>

Rule no. XV neatly illustrates how the personal and the scholarly intertwined in this document. The ostensible aim of this section was to analyse the meaning of “Bishop” on the basis of its origins in the Hebrew פקיד (*paqid*, overseer/officer) and Greek ἐπίσκοπος, which Broughton noted as the most common translation for פקיד in the Septuagint.<sup>58</sup> Within this discussion, Broughton focussed on reconstructing the personal qualities required in Bishops. The classic text cited for these traits was 1 Timothy 3, which described the character of an ἐπίσκοπος, a “Christian officer”. But to expound this verse, Broughton turned back to another, similar list in Exodus 18:17-26, in which Moses described to Jethro the qualities required from the judges of Israel in the Sanhedrin. Broughton justified this move by identifying Exodus as the source of Paul’s list in Timothy, since “S. Paul spake in Iewes sense”. And so, to expound Moses’s words in Exodus, extract this Jewish sense and thereby expound Paul, Broughton turned to look to the evidence of “the Thalmudiques in Sanedrin [and] Maimony”, sources which, as Broughton explained, stressed above all that the foremost criterion of being a judge was being learned, “lerned to teach the law: in the tongue of the law”.<sup>59</sup>

Lying behind this exposition of Paul’s “Jewish” sense of ἐπίσκοπος, as well as his linking of Exodus 18 to 1 Timothy 3, was Broughton’s Erastian conception of church government. By likening the office of bishop to that of a judge in the Sanhedrin, and giving

---

*upon the R. R. F. Th Winton for heads of his divinity in his sermon and survey* (Amsterdam: 1605); [Bancroft and Barlow], *Master Broughtons letters*.

<sup>57</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, Lively’s “notes Bancroft alloweth”, fol. 28v; Bancroft also erred “by allowing D. Bilsons writings”, fol. 33v; and “conspired...in his Libels”, fol. 27v.

<sup>58</sup> “Pakid in Ebrew is a man of Charge, as ouer y<sup>e</sup> kings army, or as Eleazar the sacrifice: or any ways. Episcopus infinitely in the Greke translation.” British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 31r. The Septuagint translated פקיד with ἐπίσκοπος at e.g. Judges 9:28; Nehemiah 11:9, 14, 22.

<sup>59</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 31r; Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, *Sefer Shoftim* (Book of Judges), Sanhedrin 2:1, 7; Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin, fol. 17a-17b.

to both the power to “look[...] to the peoples doctrine & carriage”, Broughton was implicitly arguing for an Erastian model of church government, and rewriting the office of bishop as one that, following Broughton’s analysis of the essentially civil constitution of the Sanhedrin, did not require ordination, but had control over doctrine and law by virtue of its learning and erudition.<sup>60</sup> But this was not why Broughton had raised the point here. Rather, he raised it seemingly solely to point out how Bancroft was not qualified to be a bishop, on account of his lack of knowledge in Hebrew and the Talmud.<sup>61</sup> Furthermore, Broughton drew out other evidence concerning Bancroft’s unsuitability for a bishopric from Maimonides, since Maimonides made it clear that a true Bishop would not “practise stateliness over the congregation: & haughtiness of spirit, but he must be mild & tender”, neither “shew[ing] contempt” nor “tread[ing] vpon the heads of the people” – both of which standards Bancroft clearly failed, in Broughton’s eyes.<sup>62</sup>

The reason why Bancroft failed to meet these standards was even more egregious: because, in a comment which I have been unable to corroborate, Broughton believed Bancroft was guilty of simony, having bribed his way into the Bishopric of London and Archbishopric of Canterbury.<sup>63</sup> This is also why Broughton, throughout the document, often referred sarcastically to Bancroft as a “Buy-shop” rather than Bishop.<sup>64</sup> The details of this apparently unfounded accusation are fleshed out in a contemporary work printed in Middelburg, where Broughon claims that Bancroft paid Penelope Blount, Countess of Devonshire, Henry Cuffe and Gilly Merrick to campaign for his 1597 appointment, with (one

---

<sup>60</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 31r; for Broughton’s Erastianism see Charles Gunnoe, *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 398.

<sup>61</sup> “And that [Bancroft] cannot be a Bishop, the first proprietie διδακτικός telleth him: Lerner. And that is not he.” British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 31v.

<sup>62</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 32r; Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, *Sefer Shoftim*, Sanhedrin 25:1-2.

<sup>63</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 31r.

<sup>64</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 31v.

assumes) a similar process alleged for the 1604 appointment.<sup>65</sup> Broughton wove this accusation almost seamlessly into his scholarly reasoning, even bringing Maimonides in his Mishneh Torah as evidence to show that by Jewish law, the judgements of those who obtained their office by bribery were not lawful.<sup>66</sup>

This is a fascinating mix of intellectual and ad hominem argumentation, and is characteristically Broughtonian in the way it begins with a sharp analysis of the Jewish meaning behind Paul's words using Maimonides and the Talmud, hinting at before swerving rapidly away from the expected Erastian conclusion, directly into quite serious calumny, before returning again back to Maimonides, and the same Jewish sources, in further pursuit of the same ad hominem attack, without acknowledgement of the very strange direction the argument has taken in the meanwhile. It is also characteristic of this particular source as a whole, which reiterated many of the well-established complaints Broughton had about chronology, genealogy, and the English interpretation of Christ's descent into hell, yet all twisted towards Bancroft personally, who was blamed alternately for criticising Broughton's work on these topics, and for "allowing" the work of his opponents.<sup>67</sup>

A similar mixture of the scholarly, the personal, and the borderline fantastical is evident in another prominent feature of Broughton's "Rules". For Lively, Barlow and Bilson were not the only people to feature in Broughton's complaints. In 1608, Broughton held a public debate with David Farar, a converso physician from Portugal who had settled in Amsterdam and was heavily involved in the life of the local Beth Jacob congregation.<sup>68</sup> Their

---

<sup>65</sup> Hugh Broughton, *Querelae de quodam scoparcha: qui commemorationem promissorum regalium regis magnae Britannia[e] ad illustranda S. Biblia iniuriosam et mendacem fuisse praedicat, turbasque mouet* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1610), sig. +2r-v.

<sup>66</sup> Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Sefer Shoftim, Sanhedrin 3:8-9; British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 31v.

<sup>67</sup> See sections IX, X, XVI, XVIII in British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 25v -27v, 32r-36v.

<sup>68</sup> For Farar's biography, see Marc Saperstein, "Your Voice like a Ram's Horn": *Themes and Texts in Traditional Jewish Preaching* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1996), 370-98. For Farar and Broughton's debate see L. Hirschel, "Een godsdienstdispuut te Amsterdam in het begin der 17de eeuw", *De Vrijdagavond* 6, no. 4 (1929): 179; Yosef Kaplan, "Between Calvinists and Jews in

debate was prompted by the aggressive missionary printing campaign Broughton had begun in Amsterdam only a few years earlier, and broadly covered the traditional topics of Christian-Jewish polemics, as can be gathered from Broughton's account, printed the same year as their exchange.<sup>69</sup> This published account (unsurprisingly) already shows many distortions of Farar's words, but in the 1609/1610 "Rules", written only a year or two later, Broughton takes this a step further. For throughout Egerton 791 Broughton uses points allegedly made by Farar to criticise Bancroft, either by showing how Farar's arguments against Broughton aligned with Bancroft's (so accusing Bancroft of "Judaising") or by showing how Bancroft's promotion of various aspects of English divinity and tolerance of inadequate biblical translations had enabled Farar to make valid criticisms of English Protestantism, and thereby score points in his debate with Broughton.

For instance, in their extensive debate over the legitimacy of the two contrary ancestries of Jesus given in Matthew and Luke, Farar (according to Broughton) pointed out a serious problem in the Bishops' Bible translation of Luke 3. The original Greek of Luke's genealogy connected each name in the text with τοῦ, genitive of the definite article (lit. Matthat, *of* Levi, *of* Melchi etc.). The Bishops' Bible, however, had implicitly supplied ὁ υἱός (lit. *being the son*) from Luke 3:23, and translated "whiche was the sonne of Matthat, whiche was the sonne of Leui, which was the sonne of Melchi etc."<sup>70</sup> The problem was that few of these men were actually sons to those who preceded them: rather, Jesus was loosely "son" to all of them, an interpretation preserved with the ambiguity of the Greek τοῦ but lost

---

Seventeenth Century Amsterdam", in *Conflict and Religious Conversation in Latin Christendom: Studies in Honour of Ora Limor*, ed. Israel Jacob Yuval and Ram Ben-Shalom (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014): 277-303.

<sup>69</sup> Hugh Broughton, *Our Lordes familie*.

<sup>70</sup> *The holie Bible [The Bishops' Bible]*, fol. xxxiir-v; the Geneva Bible's rendering "*the sonne of Matthat, the sonne of Leui...*" did not satisfy Broughton either, who preferred a more ambiguous literal translation "of Matthat, of Leui, of Melchi" etc. See Broughton's emendations to the Geneva as preserved by Edward Holyoke in New York Public Library 8-\*KC 1610 (Bible, N.T. English. 1610. New Testament) Copy 2, fol. 54v-55r.

thanks to the excessive precision of the Bishops translation. Farar, Broughton claimed, noticed this problem and used it to undermine Broughton's defence of Jesus's genealogy.<sup>71</sup> And this, Broughton thought, was entirely Bancroft's fault, for he had allowed the continued circulation of the Bishops' Bible despite being in a position to have it amended, and tried to suppress Broughton's own genealogical work, despite the fact that it righted the wrongs of the common translation.<sup>72</sup>

This, however, was not an isolated occurrence. Farar also "caught Bancroft as an allower of our wicked translation and notes" to Daniel 2, where Broughton believed the Bishops' interpretation of Daniel's four kingdoms again undermined Christianity in support of Judaism.<sup>73</sup> Likewise, "Farar the Jew caught Bancroft as Archb. & allower of our editions in this Athean vilanie of fastening a corruption upon the N.T."; in other words, Farar noticed that the Bishops' Bible's marginal notes sometimes identified errors or corruptions in the New Testament that seemed to undermine its divine status.<sup>74</sup> There is a significant and perhaps irresolvable difficulty here in ascertaining whether these were actually arguments Farar made, and to what extent Broughton twisted Farar's comments to fit his own preoccupations and old gripes with the English Bible and Bancroft. Without a doubt, such topics as Jesus's genealogy, Daniel's four kingdoms, and the divinity of the New Testament would have been discussed (these were historic cruxes of Jewish-Christian debate), and these are all topics that appear in Broughton's published account. But it seems a stretch to think that Farar perused a Bible so closely in a language we have no evidence he could read, and the overlap with Broughton's commonly-expressed criticisms of contemporary translations

---

<sup>71</sup> "A Jew caught our translation denying all this...", British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 29r.

<sup>72</sup> "Bancroft allowing our wicked translation being in place to haue amended it: is caught in the same athean vilanie of Judaisme. And further, by raving against a right opening of the cause", British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 29r.

<sup>73</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 30v.

<sup>74</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 36v; for instance, at Acts 7:16, "here appeareth an errour", *The holie Bible [The Bishops' Bible]*, fol. lxxv.



seems too close to be coincidental. The point here is, however, less whether Farar's arguments as reported by Broughton were more real than imagined (though the latter seems likelier), and more to note how Broughton used them as a stick with which to beat Bancroft, evidently assuming that there was some real rhetorical power in being able to produce criticism of an English bishop from a contemporary Jewish source. It is also to note the continued strangeness of the way in which Broughton combined the scholarly, personal and theological in his attack on Bancroft, weaving his experiences with Farar (with much creative licence) neatly into the otherwise familiar outline of his criticisms of contemporary translations and theology. The palpable anger and desperation that underlines this document, evident not least in the confused, frantic style of Broughton's prose (unusually muddled even for Broughton), is perhaps clearest in his final comments. Having rounded up his anxieties about what a translation made under Bancroft might contain, and summarised at each point how much better he would do, Broughton concluded:

Yf the K. might haue had his mind, a ~~the~~ translation of this kind might haue bene sene four yeres agoe: from one who translated the Hebrew Prophetes into Greke four & twenty yeres ago: But Buyshops will haue their ware s<sup>old</sup> sold: & forced upon many better-lerned. All be free to call any translators to accompt: dealing in sage grautie: & lerned proceeding.

Yf they go over my bridge & pay me no toll: I will arrest theyr ware: & yf they cloth Aharon better I will marveile. This sum we must make: that a barbarous translation Athean in story, or offensiue in terms vnfit, is the plague of God. But one true for story, sure in terms, clear in brightnes, pleasant in elegancie wold bring our whole nation to study the booke of trueth.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> British Library Egerton MS 791, fol. 39r.

Broughton's comment that James could have had a better translation four years ago could be a reference to the letter “Of Amending the Genevan translation” discussed above, or one similar: the point being that Broughton had over the past twenty years made multiple overtures about a new translation to important English authorities, but to no effect. These comments also set the stage for Broughton’s shorter printed attack on the King James Bible, *A censure of the late translation*: as is well-known, Broughton did not “marveile” at the final product of Bancroft’s committees. Indeed, many of the worried predictions Broughton made in the “Rules” turned out to be well-founded, and there is significant overlap between this document and the printed criticisms Broughton made of the translation.<sup>76</sup> But by this point, as Egerton 791 shows, Broughton’s response to the King James Bible was not purely scholarly, but conditioned by a complex concoction of emotional and intellectual attitudes, neither of which can be properly studied in isolation.

## Conclusion

This evidence clearly illustrates the inadequacy of claims that Broughton disliked the new translation simply because it contained errors, or even because it contained genealogical and chronological inconsistencies. But neither does it suffice to conclude that his dislike was fuelled purely by the sting of exclusion. Rather, his reaction was a mixture of longstanding personal and theological-intellectual objections: a combination of intense animosity towards particular individuals, strong enough to lapse occasionally into rumour and intrigue, but all undergirded by quite profound scholarship and theological labour. To reduce his position to a dislike of error, as has often been done in modern accounts of Broughton, does disservice to

---

<sup>76</sup> For instance Points II, V, VII, IX and X of Broughton, *A censure of the late translation* overlap with sections XIII, XIX, XI/XII/IX, II and I respectively in British Library Egerton MS 791.

both the intellectual and emotional qualities that structured his response, each informing the other, and at times not clearly distinguishable.

But there is also a more general problem with the concept of ‘error’ when applied to early modern biblical translation, which the case studies discussed in this article highlight. Because so many of the questions and issues involved in translating the Bible were bound up with broader narratives of biblical history, doctrinal development, human corruption and/or restoration, it is less accurate to describe any given translator as making a mistake, so much as making a choice based on an entirely different understanding of the historical and theological particularities manifesting in the verse to be translated. For early modern biblical translators, the text was a window into the living, breathing biblical world in its peculiar moment within the unfolding narrative of history; and the particularities of this world were informed at once by the philological details of the verse at hand as well as by many other considerations, texts, and sources, each of which in turn reflected back upon and shaped translation of the original verse. This is most aptly shown by the case of Genesis 4:26, where to say that the Bishops’ Bible contained an error helps us far less than to say that we here have two quite different scholarly traditions, sets of sources, and understandings of scriptural history coming into conflict, and that the vehicle for this conflict happens to be that of biblical translation, although it could just as easily have been any other form.

This kind of conclusion might lead us to emphasise, perhaps paradoxically, the tangentiality of translation *per se* to the questions and problems that make biblical translation in this period so interesting. Indeed, this is something which has become more and more apparent in the most recent work on the English Bible, which has emphasised scholarly complexity over literary quality, recognised the depth and weight of learning behind the most prominent biblical translations, and picked apart the interactions early modern readers had with the biblical text, assuming a much higher level of engagement, intellectual interest and

understanding on the part of a lay audience, both male and female, than was once thought to be possible.<sup>77</sup> Such work has coincided helpfully with a greater appreciation for the complexity and sophistication of Protestant attitudes to the scripture, which have made it ever more difficult to fall back into the old stereotypes of Protestant readers (or translators) being ahistorical and overly “literal”.<sup>78</sup> This in turn has reinforced the conclusions of literary scholars who have emphasised the hugely diverse political and social potential of scriptural translation, portraying the English Bibles of the period as continually consuming but also creating the social and political realities around them in a constant feedback loop.<sup>79</sup>

Increasingly, in other words, we are looking at a field concerned less with the “English Bible” (and even less with any single canonical version), and more with vernacular biblical scholarship as an umbrella category that encompasses the multiple and interlocking activities of reading, annotating, translating, paraphrasing and engaging with the Bible, in polyglot and multivocal ways that require new skills, methods and fields of knowledge in order to be

---

<sup>77</sup> See for instance the essays in Feingold, ed., *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord*; Dirk van Miert, “Making the States’ Translation (1637): Orthodox Calvinist Biblical Criticism in the Dutch Republic”, *Harvard Theological Review* 110, no. 3 (2017): 440-63; Femke Molekamp, “Genevan Legacies: The Making of the English Geneva Bible”, in Killeen, Smith, and Willie, *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible*, 38-53; Jaime Goodrich, *Faithful Translators: Authorship, Gender, and Religion in Early Modern England* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2014); Femke Molekamp, *Women and the Bible in Early Modern England: Religious Reading and Writing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Kate Narveson, *Bible Readers and Lay Writers in Early Modern England: Gender and Self-Definition in an Emergent Writing Culture* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012); the articles in Thomas Fulton, ed., “The Bible and English Readers”, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 47, no. 3 (2017); 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 Crick and Alexandra Walsham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004), 135-56; Scott Mandelbrote, “A Family Bible? The Henrys and Dissenting Readings of the Bible, 1650-1750”, in *Dissent and the Bible in Britain, c. 1650-1950*, ed. Scott Mandelbrote and Michael Ledge-Lomas (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 39-57; Crawford Gribben, ‘Bible Reading, Puritan Devotion, and the Transformation of Politics in the English Revolution’, in *The English Bible in the Early Modern World*, ed. Robert Armstrong and Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 141-60.

<sup>78</sup> Brian Cummings, “The Problem of Protestant Culture: Biblical Literalism and Literary Biblicism”, *Reformation* 17 (2012): 177-98; Thomas Fulton, “Towards a New Cultural History of the Geneva Bible”, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 47, no. 3 (2017): 487-516.

<sup>79</sup> Naomi Tadmor, *The Social Universe of the English Bible: Scripture, Society and Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 161-71; Kevin Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

understood. This kind of deep and rounded approach to the English Bible as merely the most prominent facet of vernacular biblical scholarship is one that, in some senses, has long been applied to the work of the earliest translators, principally William Tyndale, thanks to the work of David Daniell, but is only finally now beginning to be applied more systematically to later efforts of translation.<sup>80</sup> So while Broughton is clearly an unusual case in many ways, his approach to translation illustrates the extent to which recent studies in the English Bible have been so fruitful largely by dissolving the very categories of "biblical translation" and "English Bible" in which they operate, in the process opening the field up to new methods, sources, and questions that still hold enormous potential for further illumination.

---

<sup>80</sup> Principally in David Daniell, *William Tyndale: A Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 267-80; Morna Hooker, "Tyndale's 'Heretical' Translations", *Reformation* 2 (1997): 127-42; see the helpful overview in Ellie G. Bagley, "Writing the History of the English Bible: A Review of Recent Scholarship", *Religion Compass* 5, no. 7 (2011): 300-13.