

Oxford and the King James Bible

By Paul Streitz

The Problem

The King James Version of the Bible presents the same problem as does the authorship problem of William Shakespeare in attributing the works to the man from Stratford-upon-Avon. There is a long record of attributing the KJV to a group of scholars appointed by King James in 1604. However, as with Shakespeare, problems emerge as soon as one looks closely at the historical record. As with the man from Stratford, there is little evidence that any of the men assigned to work on the KJV had any literary talents whatsoever, and the KJV is called one of the finest pieces of literature in the English language. As with the man from Stratford, the work of the committee assigned to the KJV is quite mysterious. There are no records of meeting, correspondence between the various members. There are no records or notes of the work they did in altering the KJV. Further, the KJV is written in one steady, very artistic hand. If the work were the collaboration, then one would expect to find differences in style between the parts assigned to various groups, but no such variations exist.

This has led to the theory of the “hidden genius” to account for the stylistic unity of the KJV, but unfortunately no member of the group assigned to the task had any literary talent whatsoever. So, the hidden genius theory founders on the lack of any suitable, or unsuitable candidate.

Of course, scholars have noted over the years, the similarity between the KJV and the works of William Shakespeare, but none have suggested that the man from Stratford-upon-Avon had anything to do with the KJV.

Oxfordian scholars, who believe that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, was the man behind the pen name “William Shakespeare” have never offered him forward as a candidate for authorship of the KJV because they believe that Oxford died in 1604, nine years before the publication of the KJV. However, my research indicates that Oxford did not die in 1604 but disappeared. Most likely he was kidnapped by King James and exiled to the Isle of Man. Here I believe Oxford wrote spent his last years, 1604 to 1609, working on the KJV. It is well known that Oxford had extensive knowledge of the Bible and an annotated version of the Geneva Bible, in Oxford’s hand, is in the possession of the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C.

Thus the second great mystery of English literature, “Who wrote the KJV of the Bible” is solved.

The Historical Record¹

At the Hampton Court Conference in January 1604, Dr. John Reynolds suggested to King James that a new translation of the Bible was necessary to remedy the errors in the previous versions printed during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. The two most popular Bibles of the time were the Bishop’s Bible, published during the reign of Edward VI, and the Geneva Bible published in 1566. A copy of the latter Bible is the one owned and annotated by Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford.

On July 22, 1604, the King wrote to the Bishop of London ordering him to begin the work on such a Bible. (This is shortly after Oxford’s disappearance.) A committee of fifty-four learned men was to work on the project, subdivided into six committees of nine men each. Two committees were at Oxford, two at Cambridge and two at Westminster. The names of fifty of the fifty-four men are known. There was a set of rules laid down for the translation of the Bible, which proscribed such things as its purpose, the names to be used and the use of footnotes and margin notes. The project did not seem to get started until 1607, a delay of almost three years. H. Wheeler Robinson reports in *The Bible In Its Ancient and English Versions* that Dr. Samuel Ward wrote a summary of the work, with these details:

After each section had finished its task twelve delegates, chosen from them all, met together and reviewed and revised the whole work.

Lastly the very Reverend the Bishop of Winchester, Bilson, together with Dr. Smith, now Bishop of Gloucester, a distinguished man, who had been deeply occupied in the whole work from the beginning, after all things had been maturely weighed and examined, put the finishing touch to this version.¹

He reports that the object was not to create a new Bible, but to remove errors from the older translation:

¹ My thanks to Richard Kennedy, whose post on the Internet outlined the difficulties surrounding the authorship of the King James Bible.

In the first place caution was given that an entirely new version was not be furnished, but an old version, long received by the Church, to be purged from all blemishes and faults.²

The result of this injunction was that the new version named the King James Authorized Version was stylistically very similar to the preceding English versions of the Bible. In addition, the rules prescribed that if there were words that were subject to interpretation, one interpretation would be in the text and the other would be in the margin of the work. Wheeler states that there were no notes or correspondence between the various translations, nothing is known about the procedures of the committee and nothing is known about how the final revision was completed. None of the manuscripts of the finished version seemed to have survived. Wheeler gives further details of the actual printing of the KJV from Dr. Anthony Walker's book on the life of Dr. John Bois:

Four years were spent in this first service; at the end whereof the whole work being finished, & three copies of the whole Bible sent from Cambridge, Oxford & Westminster, to London; a new choice was to be made of six in all, two out of every company, to review the whole work; & extract one out of all three, to be committed to the presse.

For the dispatch of which business Mr. Downes & Mr. Bois were sent for up to London. Where (though Mr. Downes would not go till he was either fetched or threatened with a pursivant) their four fellow labourers, they went dayly to Stationers Hall, & in three quarters of a year, finished their task.³

In the first edition of the KJV there is a 'Preface of the Translators' written by Dr. Miles Smith, wherein he states the intention of the translators was:

Wee never thought from the beginning, that we should neede to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principall good one,⁴

Olga Opfell's book, *The King James Bible Translators* is a detailed history of the KJV, always with the assumption that the book was written by a committee even though she is well aware that committees seldom produce anything with style and grace. She starts by stating that the dean of Westminster, Lancelot Andrewes was to lead the group at Westminster:

James named the scholarly dean of Westminster, Lancelot Andrewes first of all to the group of learned men who were to make a new translation of the Bible. Andrewes suggested other scholars and assisted in the preliminary arrangements.⁵

She proceeds to describe the translation of the KJV:

The first Westminster group *reportedly* met in the famous Jerusalem Chamber, which was part of the original Abbey House and used for meetings of the dean and chapter.... The Abbey library has *been suggested as a likely* meeting site although it may not have been properly fitted up at the time.... Here he lived the greater part of the time, and *perhaps the scholars* held some meetings within its rooms.

Collaborating with Andrewes on the Bible task was another dean and a special friend...⁶ (Italic inserted.)

A close read reveals much here is only speculation. Opfell never presents any evidence that anything was actually translated at Westminster, but the enormous detail makes it appear as if something happened. Opfell never tells us who is reporting that the group met. Is it a modern day scholar or a person of the time? "Reportedly" adds a distinct note of doubt to the whole business. In the final sentence, "collaborating with Andrewes" is pure speculation. She has not shown a jot on any piece of paper that such a group ever met or produced a page of the KJV. She is merely accepting the traditional viewpoint and embroidering it with detail.

The primary source document quoted by Opfell and others is the biography of John Bois written by his friend Anthony Walker. This account is years after the printing and there are some notes by John Bois, but they seem to be of early stages of the translation. Gustavus S. Paine asks the following question in *The Learned Men*:

But are there any other such notes about the making of a true world masterpiece? Why should these have survived when we have nothing comparable from Shakespeare?⁷

It is certain that Robert Barker was the printer of the KJV. The only clue about the manuscript seems to be that in 1660, a pamphlet was put out in London saying that printers "had obtained the manuscript copy of the Holy Bible."⁸ This manuscript, says Opfell, was never heard of again. But this is the crux of the mystery. With over fifty scholars working over several years, there are no manuscripts, correspondence or detailed notes. One would imagine that such a project would involve communication and review between the scholars, but nothing

seems to exist. As mentioned earlier, the biography of Dr. John Bois reports that he stated there were copies made of the scholars' manuscripts, but this is a remark made seven years after its printing.

Despite these assertions about the work of the committee, suspicions emerged:

...that a committee of forty-seven should have captured (or even, let us say, should have retained and improved) a rhythm so personal, so constant, that our Bible has the voice of one author speaking through its many mouths; that is a wonder before which I can only stand humble and aghast.

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, quoted in Olga S. Opfell, *The King James Bible Translators*⁹

It is a miracle and a mystery, since group writing seldom achieves great heights. Individual writings of the committeemen show no trace of the magnificent style...Though their work was a revision, which represented a long evolutionary progress, it was also creation. Not all the pages were of equal literary value, but over all the result was stunning....To this day its common expressions—labour of love, lick the dust, clear as crystal, a thorn in the flesh, a soft answer, the root of all evil, the fat of the land, the sweat of thy brow, the shadow of death—are heard in everyday speech.

Olga S. Opfell, *The King James Bible Translators*¹⁰

Perhaps the greatest of literary mysteries lies in the unanswered question of how fifty-four translators managed to infuse their work with a unity of effect which seems the result of one inspired imagination. The mystery will never be solved; but the perfect choice throughout of current English words, the rhythmic fall of phrase and clause, the unflinching escape from the heavy and sometimes pompous renderings of the older translations, remain.

Mary Ellen Chase, *The Bible and the Common Reader*¹¹

The historical record, while leaving interesting gaps, in and of itself is not overly suspicious. It seems far more likely that the translator/editors might make the additions and changes than a rural youth turn into Shakespeare. On the other hand, a close student of history should be very suspicious of such anomalies:

As some historians of science have pointed out, anomalous evidence—the stuff that supposedly spawns most scientific revolutions—is usually recognized as anomalous only after the fact. The human mind finds it much easier to assimilate facts into existing cognitive structures than to accommodate these structures to anomalous findings. The history of science is replete with evidence that confirms the observation that *most scientists resist innovation*.¹²

It is useful to compare the questions surrounding the King James Version of the Bible with the origins of the questions about the authorship of the Shakespeare. The Shakespeare Authorship controversy arose not because of any lack of belief in the historical record that the man from Stratford was the author. The few historical facts that existed pointed in the direction of William Shakspeare from Stratford-upon-Avon, and historians and literary scholars filled in the blanks with conjecture. It was Delia Bacon's "literary suspicions" that first put doubt in the Stratfordian theory of authorship. Her book, *The Philosophy of the Plays of Shakspeare Unfolded*, astutely pointed out that the plays were from the point of view of someone inside the moat, not outside. In the same manner, J. Thomas Looney was deeply suspicious that the man from Stratford would have the intimate knowledge of the court that was displayed in Shakespeare's works. For Looney, the biography of the author as known through the works and the biography of the man from Stratford did not match up, and he then went on a search for an individual that would have a biography that matched the works.

The authorship issues of the King James Version of the English Bible arise because (as with Shakspeare), it seems virtually impossible for the committee to have arrived at such an outstanding rendition of the Bible, and the historical record seems (as with Shakspeare) so fragmentary. As with Delia Bacon's literary suspicions of the rural man from Stratford, an equal number of suspicions of the KJV that hinge on the superb literary quality. The KJV is beyond the capability of any individual known to have been involved and it is not possible for a committee to collaborate to produce such a stylistically integrated work. The similarity to Shakespeare has not gone unnoticed:

The Authorized Version is a miracle and a landmark. Its felicities are manifold, its music has entered into the very blood and marrow of English thought and speech, it has given countless proverbs and proverbial phrases even to the unlearned and the irreligious. There is no corner of English life, no conversation ribald or reverent it has not adorned. Embedded in its tercentenary wording is the language of a century earlier. It has both broadened and retarded the stream of English Speech. It is more archaic in places than its forerunners, and it is impossible for us to disentangle from our ordinary talk the phrases of Judea, whether Hebrew or Greek, whether of the Patriarchs, the Prophets, the Poets, or the Apostles. Only the closest scrutiny can give precision to the rhapsodical vagueness with which the Authorized Version is worshipped at a distance.

Wheeler H. Robinson, *The Bible In Its Ancient and English Versions*¹³

How did this come to be? How to explain that sixty or more men, none a genius, none even as great a writer as Marlowe or Ben Jonson, together produced writing to be compared with (and confused with) the words of Shakespeare? Gustavus S. Paine, *The Learned Men*¹⁴

Mary Ellen Chase in her book *The Bible and the Common Reader* gives these as examples of the differences between the KJV and the earlier Bibles. In these examples, the literary quality in the Geneva Bible seems strong, Bishops Bible is more pedantic and the quality blooms even greater in the KJV.

Geneva:

When the stars of the morning praised me together, and all the children of God rejoiced.

Bishops:

When the morning stars praised me together, and all the children of God rejoiced triumphantly.

KJV

When the morning stars sang together, and all the children of God rejoiced triumphantly.

Geneva:

They shall break their swords also into mattocks, and their spears into scythes; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn to fight any more.

Bishops:

They shall break their swords into mattocks, and their spears to make scythes: And one people shall not lift up a weapon against another, neither shall they learn to fight from thenceforth.

KJV

They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

The KJV has gone through many reprintings, corrections and language updates. As a consequence, as with Shakespeare's works, there are often substantial differences between the original printing and subsequent versions. This does not change the literary quality of the KJV, but it is an issue, as would be changing the text of a Shakespeare play. Here is the KJV with the original words and spellings:

they shall beate their swords into plow-shares, and their speares into pruning hookes: [Or, sythes] nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learne warre any more.^{15 2}

The KJV was the authoritative source for laymen and scholars, so there were interruptions of the text to inserted, or illuminating comments as to the source, comparisons to other Bibles, or meaning of the words. Over the years, these were dropped.

When I was a childe, I spake as a childe, I understood as a childe, I thought [Or, reasoned] as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things. For now we see through a glasse, darkely: [Gr. in a riddle] but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am knowen.^{16 3}

Charles Butterworth notes in *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible* that the translation even changes to match the tonality of the passage. He notes that there are two identical passages in the original Hebrew text, but two different versions of the same passage with different tempo and rhythm in the KJV.

In chapter 35 the verse is rendered:

10 And the ransomed of the lord shall returne and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtaine joy and gladnesse, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

In chapter 51 the same text is translated:

11 Therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall returne, and come with singing unto Zion, and everlasting joy *shalbe* upon their head: they shall obtaine gladnesse and joy, *and* sorrow and morning shall flee away.

Each of these is beautiful in itself. Obviously, there was no intentional difference in the meaning between them, since both are translations of the same Hebrew words; yet there are noticeable differences in their literary effect. The first is light and musical; the second is slower and more eloquent. Is the distinction accidental? No, the style of each seems to harmonize to harmonize with the tone of its surrounding ideas.¹⁷

² *The Holy Bible*, A Facsimile in a reduced size of the Authorized Version published in the year 1611 with an introduction by A.W. Pollard and illustrative documents, Oxford, Printed at the University Press, London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, New York, 35 West 32nd Street, 1911.

³ *Ibid.*

Oxford in his Latin dedication to Bartholomew Clerke's translation of *The Courtier* expresses the difference between the two passages:

If weighty matters are under consideration, he unfolds his theme in a solemn and majestic rhythm; if the subject is familiar and facetious, he makes use of words that are witty and amusing.¹⁸

Wheeler was aware of the significant differences that exist between versions of the Bibles and that the final product is not an amalgam of the prior versions.

This rejection of the Genevan reading is characteristic of the whole treatment of the Psalms in this respect. A fundamental revision and often a completely new translation was made, there are enormous differences from the Geneva, though the reading of the Geneva is often transferred to the margin. There are very many marginal notes from the Hebrew, as though a serious attempt was made to supply the materials for a correct rendering in accordance with the original, although the pull of the older versions and the avowed policy of making 'out of many good ones, one principall good one', prevented a completely new and accurate translation without deference to traditional error.¹⁹

Wheeler Robinson notes the quality of the phrasings of the KJV and its poetic quality.

...the final wording is the English wording of the revisers, and the final music is the result of sure instinct working subtly on the vast and various material offered. An excellent instance of this subtlety is Prov. iii. 17, wherein Coverdale, the Great Bible and the Bishops agree in reading

Her wayes are pleasant wayes and all her paths are peaceable.

Geneva has:

Her wayes are wayes of pleasure and all her paths prosperie.

The Authorized Version takes these, turns back to the Hebrew text more accurately than the others, adds a music of alliteration and tactful balance which gives the final version a perfect melody in

Her wayes are wayes of pleasantnesse, and all her pathes *are* peace.²⁰

As future Oxfordian scholars descend on the KJV with an eye to determining what Oxford wrote, they will find not all the brilliance is from his pen. Olga Opfell credits the previous translation by Miles Coverdale with some of the most memorable. The Coverdale version preceded both the Bishop's Bible and the subsequent Geneva Bible.

More often Coverdale, acutely sensitive to rhythm and beauty, produced such memorable phrases as "the valley of the shadow of death" in Psalm 23. He had a great talent for word linkings—loving kindness, tender mercy, morning star, and blood guiltiness originated with his pen.²¹

The Coverdale Bible to Bishop's Bible, to the Geneva Bible and finally to the KJV some of the poetry of the Coverdale version has been lost. In this writer's opinion there are several instances where the verse of Coverdale version is superior in wording and style to the KJV. In the following, the Coverdale version is dramatic, emphasizing what Sampson did, "yea even with the cheek bone of an ass." The Geneva muddles this with "heaps upon heaps," which is unfortunately retained in the KJV.

Judges 15:16

Coverdale

And Samson said: With an old ass's cheek bone, yea even with the cheek bone of an ass have I slain a thousand men.

Geneva

Then Samson said, With the jaw of an ass are heaps upon heaps; with the jaw of ass have I slain a thousand men.

KJV

And Samson said, With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps, with the jaw of an ass have I slain a thousand men.

There is even a loss of meaning from the Coverdale to the Geneva not corrected in the KJV. Here the man is excused from military duty so that he may sleep with his wife, and presumably have children. The sense of this is lost by the KJV.

Deuteronomy 24:5

Coverdale

When a man hath newly taken a wife, he shall not go out a warfare, neither shall he be charged with withal. He shall be free in his house one year long, that he may be merry with his wife which he hath taken.

Geneva

When a man taketh a new wife, he shall not go a warfare, neither shall he be charged with any business, but shall be free at home one year, and rejoyce with his wife which he hath taken.

KJV

When a man hath taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business; but he shall be free at home one year, and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken.

Finally, here is an example where the poetic sense is lost from Coverdale to the KJV. In the Coverdale, the author keeps the metaphor of the flower blooming and fading as a natural occurrence of life, whereas the KJV makes it more dramatic that the flower is “cut down.” However, this loses the sense of naturalness.

Job 14:1, 2

Coverdale

Man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live and is full of diverse miseries.
He cometh up and falleth away like a flower

KJV

Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble.
He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down.

Oxford made significant changes from the Geneva Bible to the KJV that improved the quality of the reading. It does not appear, however, that Oxford had the Coverdale Bible available to him because in some instances the Coverdale Bible has the more poetic reading of the lines.

The Psalms are the section of the Bible that is closest to *Shake-speares Sonnets* and closely match the Sonnets in poetic beauty. Bringing cryptograms and such into any discussion of Shakespeare or authorship is always a tricky issue. Nevertheless, here is Psalm 46. Counting 46 words from the beginning, there is “Shake” and counting 46 words from the last (ignoring the exclamation), there is “spear.” Is this a coincidence?

Ps.46

GOD is our refuge and strength: a very present helpe in trouble.

2. Therefore will not we feare, though the earth be removed: and though the mountaines be carried into the midst of the sea;

3. *Though* the waters thereof roare, *and* be troubled, *though* the mountaines **shake** with the swelling thereof. Selah.

4. *There is* a river, the streames whereof shall make glad the citie of God: the holy place of the Tabernacles of the most High.

5. God *is* in the midst of her: she shall not be moved; God shall helpe her, *and that* right early.

6. The heathen raged, the kingdomes were mooved: he uttered his voyce, the earth melted.

7. The Lord of hosts *is* with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. Selah.

8. Come, behold the workes of the Lord, what desolations hee hath made in the earth.

9. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; hee breaketh the bow, and cutteth the **speare** in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire.

10. Be stil, and know that I *am* God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth.

11. The Lord of hosts *is* with us; the God of Jacob *is* our refuge. Selah.

(***Bold Italic*** is added.)

Here is Oxford in *The Merchant of Venice*:

Portia

The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven,
Upon the place beneath: it is twice blest;
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes:
'Tis mightiest in the mightiest: it becomes
The throned monarch better than his crown;

Charles Butterworth estimates that approximately 40% of the KJV is new or altered material that differs significantly from previous English Bibles. Even if we knew nothing of Oxford as Shakespeare, we would conclude that he would be more than qualified as a poet. Also, his annotated copy of his Geneva Bible points out his deep interest in, and knowledge of the Bible. In addition to Oxford's knowledge of Latin and Italian, he also had knowledge of Greek. There is an article by Eva Turner Clark, "Shakespeare Read Books Written in Greek," in the *Shakespeare Fellowship Newsletter* in 1940. In short, no one was more qualified, or more capable of producing such a magnificent literary and religious document.

What Oxford did with the KJV was similar to his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* from Latin to English, which involved taking the sparse Latin and turning it into rhymed couplets of fourteen syllables. The result was that Oxford's version was about 30% longer than Ovid's. In a similar fashion the KJV is of such singular and exquisite beauty, it might be better described as *The English Bible as Interpreted by the Earl of Oxford*. There does not seem to be an exact word to describe what Oxford did with the Bible. He did not write it because it was written by the biblical writers, he did not translate it because it had been translated into Greek, Latin and English from the Hebrew. He did more than simply edit other people's translations because he added his creativity and phrasings, but whatever it can be called, Oxford made a contribution as significant to the Western world as had done with his works under the name of William Shakespeare.

Conclusion

Oxford: Son of Queen Elizabeth I offers a scenario where Oxford did not die in 1604, rather he disappeared in 1604. The reign of the Tudors was over, Oxford stopped using his "Edward VII," signature and he could contribute little to the political or theatrical life of the new reign. The facts known about the writing of the KJV fit such a scenario, wherein after Oxford disappeared and worked on the KJV for five years, writing *The Tempest* and *Shakespeare's Sonnets* as well.

Established history states that Oxford died June 24, 1604. Supporting that is an entry in the register at the Church of St. Augustine in Hackney with an annotation that he died of the plague. However, Dr. Paul Altrocchi²² asserts that Oxford could not have died of the plague. John Barton²³ makes a strong case that the island described in *The Tempest* is the Isle of Mersea off the eastern coast of England near the town of Chelmsford, which is located further east than Castle Hedingham. The castle was owned by the Earl of Oxford. Finally, Christopher Paul²⁴ states that it is not certain where or when Oxford died and notes that it was not until January 29, 1608 that there is any reference to Oxford being dead.

Therefore, it is most probable that Oxford was abducted and exiled to the Isle of Mersea. He then died in late 1608. There he would write his final works: *The Tempest*, *Shakespeare's Sonnets* and the *King James Bible*.

In 1609, his death was signified by the publication of *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, which lauds the "ever-living" poet. In 1611, *The Tempest* was performed and the KJV was printed and sold in the same year. Whatever the exact history turns out to be, it is impossible for anyone other than Oxford to have written the *King James Version* of the Holy Bible.

Oxford chronicled his life in his plays and poems. It would be unlikely that he would not chronicle his final act. *The Tempest* certainly ruminates on a wise King's loss of power to someone less intelligent and completely amoral, which describes Robert Cecil's usurpation of his throne and his likely abduction of Oxford in 1604. *The Tempest* even includes a brief description of what Oxford was allowed to take to the island.

Knowing I loved my books, he furnish'd me
From mine own library with volumes that
I prize above my dukedom.

¹ H. Wheeler Robinson, ed., *The Bible In Its Ancient and English Versions*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 1940, pg 201.

² Ibid., pg. 201.

³ Ibid., pg. 202.

⁴ Ibid., pg. 203.

⁵ Olga S. Opfell, *The King James Bible Translators*, McFarland, Jefferson, N.C. & London, 1982, pg. 27.

⁶ Ibid., pg. 31.

⁷ Gustavus S. Paine, *The Learned Men*, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1959, pg. 119.

⁸ Olga S. Opfell, *The King James Bible Translators*, McFarland, Jefferson, N.C. & London, 1982, pg. 111.

-
- ⁹ Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, quoted in Olga S. Opfell, *The King James Bible Translators*, McFarland, Jefferson & London, 1982, pg. 119.
- ¹⁰ Olga S. Opfell, *The King James Bible Translators*, McFarland, Jefferson, N.C. & London, 1982, pg. 131.
- ¹¹ Mary Ellen Chase, *The Bible and the Common Reader*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1944, pg. 42.
- ¹² Frank J. Sulloway, *Born to Rebel*, Vintage Books, New York, 1997. pg. 18.
- ¹³ H. Wheeler Robinson, ed., *The Bible In Its Ancient and English Versions*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 1940, pg. 204.
- ¹⁴ Gustavus S. Paine, *The Learned Men*, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1959, pg. 167.
- ¹⁵ H. Wheeler Robinson, ed., *The Bible In Its Ancient and English Versions*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 1940, pg. 219.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pg. 223.
- ¹⁷ Charles C. Butterworth, *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible*, Octagon Books, New York, 1971, pg. 220.
- ¹⁸ Oxford's Introduction to Bartholomew Clerke's translation of *The Courtier*, in *Oxford: Son of Queen Elizabeth I*, Oxford Institute Press, Darien, CT, 2001, pg., 183.
- ¹⁹ H. Wheeler Robinson, ed., *The Bible In Its Ancient and English Versions*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 1940, pg. 215.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1940, pg. 214.
- ²¹ Olga S. Opfell, *The King James Bible Translators*, McFarland, Jefferson, N.C. & London, 1982, pg. 18.
- ²² Paul Hemenway Altrocchi, "It was not 'Ye Plague'" *Shakespeare Matters*, Vol. 1, no. 4, Summer 2002.
- ²³ John Barton, "Prospero's Island," *The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter*, Vol. 39: No. 1., Winter 2003.
- ²⁴ Christopher Paul, "A Monument Without a Tomb: The Mystery of Oxford's Death," *The Oxfordian*, Vol. VII, October 2004.