

Sunday, March 12, 2023—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*  
 Lesson 198 The AV 1611: Producing A Proper Perspective on the Preface (Answer to Adversaries)

### Introduction

- Since [Lesson 190](#) we have been looking at the AV of 1611 as a historical artifact. After looking at the Preliminary Materials in Lessons [190](#), [191](#), and [192](#) we began an intensive study of the Preface in Lesson 193. Thus far we have considered the following in our mini-series titled Producing A Proper Perspective of the Preface.
  - [Lesson 193](#)—Access, Structure, & Style
  - [Lesson 194](#)—Calumination (Slander Sections)
  - [Lesson 195](#)—Praise of the Holy Scriptures & Translation Necessary
  - [Lesson 196](#)—Translation Sections: LXX & Latin Vulgate
  - [Lesson 197](#)—Translation Sections: Vulgar Tongues & Opposition of Adversaries
- In this Lesson we will continue our systematic study of the Preface by looking at the following subsections.
  - The Speeches And Reasons, Both Of Our Brethren, And Of Our Adversaries Against This Work
  - A Satisfaction To Our Brethren

### **The Speeches And Reasons, Both Of Our Brethren, And Of Our Adversaries Against This Work**

<b>Modern Spelling Transcription</b>	<b>Modern Form Edited by Rhodes &amp; Lupas</b>
¶11) Many men's mouths have been open a good while (and yet are not stopped) with speeches about the Translation so long in hand, or rather perusals of Translations made before: and ask what may be the reason, what the necessity of the employment: Hath the Church been deceived, say they, all this while? Hath her sweet bread been mingled with leaven, her silver with dross, her wine with water, her milk with lime? ( <i>Lacte gypsum male miscetur</i> , saith S. Ireney,) We hoped that we had been in the right way, that we had the Oracles of God delivered unto us, and that though all the world had cause to be offended and to complain, yet that we had none. Hath the nurse holden out the breast, and nothing but wind in it? Hath the bread been delivered by the fathers of the Church, and the same proved to be <i>lapidosus</i> , as <i>Seneca</i> speaketh? What is it to handle the word of God deceitfully, if this be not? Thus certain	¶11) “Many have been arguing for a good while now, and are still arguing, about the translation so long under way, or rather reviews of translations made in the past. And they ask what is the reason or the necessity for all the effort. Has the Church been deceived, they say, for so long? Has her unleavened bread been tainted with leaven, her silver with dross, her wine with water, her milk with lime? We had hoped that all was well, that the oracles of God had been given to us, and that although everyone else might have cause to be embarrassed or reason to complain, yet that we had none. Has the nurse held out her breast with nothing but wind in it? Has the bread delivered by the Fathers of the Church proved (in Seneca’s words) to be nothing but stones? If this isn’t handling the word of God deceitfully, as some of our brethren say, what is? We are told that the

<p>brethren. Also the adversaries of <i>Judah</i> and <i>Jerusalem</i>, like <i>Sanballat</i> in <i>Nehemiah</i>, mock, as we hear, both the work and the workmen, saying; "What do these weak Jews, etc. will they make the stones whole again out of the heaps of dust which are burnt? although they build, yet if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stony wall." [Neh 4:3] Was their Translation good before? Why do they now mend it? Was it not good? Why then was it obtruded to the people? Yea, why did the Catholics (meaning Popish <i>Romanists</i>) always go in jeopardy, for refusing to go to hear it? Nay, if it must be translated into English, Catholics are fittest to do it. They have learning, and they know when a thing is well, they can <i>manum de tabula</i>. We will answer them both briefly: and the former, being brethren, thus, with <i>S. Jerome</i>, "<i>Damnamus veteres? Minime, sed post priorum studia in domo Domini quod possums laboramus.</i>" That is, "<i>Do we condemn the ancient? In no case: but after the endeavors of them that were before us, we take the best pains we can in the house of God.</i>" As if he said, Being provoked by the example of the learned men that lived before my time, I have thought it my duty, to assay whether my talent in the knowledge of the tongues, may be profitable in any measure to God's Church, lest I should seem to laboured in them in vain, and lest I should be thought to glory in men, (although ancient,) above that which was in them. Thus <i>S. Jerome</i> may be thought to speak.</p>	<p>enemies of <i>Judah</i> and <i>Jerusalem</i>, like <i>Sanballat</i> in <i>Nehemiah</i>, mocked both the workers and their work, saying, "What are these weak Jews doing? Can they make solid stones again out of the burnt dust heaps? Even if they build a stone wall, a fox could go up and break it down (<i>Nehemiah</i> 4.3). Was the first translation good? Why mend it now? Was it not good? Then why was it foisted on the people? Or again, why did the Catholics (meaning Popish <i>Romanists</i>) consistently and confidently ignore it? Really, if it must be translated into English, Catholics are the most competent to do it. They have the scholarship, they know when a thing is good, and they know when to quit. We will answer them both briefly: to the former, who are brethren, we say with <i>St. Jerome</i>, "Do we condemn the earlier work? Not at all, but following the endeavors of those who were before us, we do the best we can in the house of God." He could as well have said, "Being inspired by the example of the scholars who lived before my time, I thought it my duty to test whether my linguistic skills might in any way be useful to God's Church, that I might not seem to have studied the languages in vain, or to have given more credit to human scholars (however ancient) than they deserved." This would be <i>St. Jerome's</i> statement. (<i>Rhodes &amp; Lupas</i>, 75-76)</p>
--	---

- After having addressed Roman Catholic opposition to the notion "that the scriptures should be divulged in the mother tongue" in the previous subsection, Smith now addresses the contents of "speeches and reasons" given by both Catholics and Protestants against the new translation in subsection ten. The main argument Smith is addressing here is what was wrong with the English scriptures already in existence? Were they not the "oracles of God?" Why does there need to be a new translation if the people were not complaining and/or clamoring for a new one?
  - "Many men's mouths have been open a good while (and yet are not stopped) with speeches about the Translation so long in hand, or rather perusals [the action of reading or examining something] of Translations made before: and ask what may be the reason, what the necessity of the employment: Hath the Church been deceived, say they, all this while? Hath her sweet bread been mingled with leaven, her silver with dross, her wine with water, her milk with lime? (*Lacte gypsum male miscetur*, saith *S. Ireney*.) We hoped that we had been in the right way, that we had the Oracles of God delivered unto us, and that though all the world had cause to be offended and to complain, yet that we had none. Hath the nurse holden out the breast, and nothing but wind in it? Hath the bread been

delivered by the fathers of the Church, and the same proved to be *lapidosus*, as *Seneca* speaketh? What is it to handle the word of God deceitfully, if this be not? ”

- In the next couple lines Smith uses the story of Sanballat and Tobias from Nehemiah 4 to illustrate how “both the work and the workmen” were being mocked via the speeches made against the work of the translators.
  - “Thus certain brethren. Also the adversaries of *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, like *Sanballat* in *Nehemiah*, mock, as we hear, both the work and the workmen, saying; “*What do these weak Jews, etc. will they make the stones whole again out of the heaps of dust which are burnt? although they build, yet if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stony wall.*” [Neh 4:3] Was their Translation good before? Why do they now mend it? Was it not good? Why then was it obruded to the people? Yea, why did the Catholics (meaning Popish *Romanists*) always go in jeopardy, for refusing to go to hear it? Nay, if it must be translated into English, Catholics are fittest to do it. They have learning, and they know when a thing is well, they can *manum de tabula.*”
- Smith concludes the paragraph by answering the former challenges possessed by his “brethren” by appealing to Jerome.
  - “We will answer them both briefly: and the former, being brethren, thus, with *S. Jerome*, “*Damnamus veteres? Mineme, sed post priorum studia in domo Domini quod possums laboramus.*” That is, “*Do we condemn the ancient? In no case: but after the endeavors of them that were before us, we take the best pains we can in the house of God.*” As if he said, Being provoked by the example of the learned men that lived before my time, I have thought it my duty, to assay whether my talent in the knowledge of the tongues, may be profitable in any measure to God's Church, lest I should seem to laboured in them in vain, and lest I should be thought to glory in men, (although ancient,) above that which was in them. Thus *S. Jerome* may be thought to speak.”
- The current subsection lays the groundwork for the next two dealing with “a satisfaction to our brethren” whom Smith addresses first and his Catholic opposition whom he addresses in “an answer to the imputations of our adversaries” in subsection twelve.
- Before moving on, we need to note one scriptural quotation found in this subsection. When Smith uses Sanballat’s mocking of “Judah and Jerusalem” to illustrate the gainsaying of the translators work by their adversaries, he quotes from Nehemiah 4:2-3. In this case Smith is employing a compound quote from two different verses.

Passage	Preface	AV	Geneva
Neh. 4:2-3	<b>What do these weak Jews, etc. will they make the stones whole again out of the heaps of dust which are burnt? although they build, yet</b>	What doe these feeble Iewes? . . . wil they reuiue the stones, out of the heapes of the rubbish, which are burnt?	<b>What doe these weake Iewes? . . . will they make the stones whole againe out of the heapes of dust, seeing they are burnt?</b>

	<b>if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stony wall."</b>	. . . Euen that which they build, if a foxe goe vp, he shall euen breake downe their stone wall.	<b>. . . Although they buylde, yet if a foxe goe vp, he shall euen breake downe their stonie wall.</b>
--	--	--	--

- When one compares the reading of Nehemiah 4:2-3 found in the Preface with both Geneva, Bishops, and AV readings, it is very clear that Smith was quoting from the Geneva Bible in this case. The Bishops reading was amended by the translators of the AV; both of which are different from the Geneva.

### A Satisfaction To Our Brethren

<b>Modern Spelling Transcription</b>	<b>Modern Form Edited by Rhodes &amp; Lupas</b>
¶12) And to the same effect say we, that we are so far off from condemning any of their labors that travailed before us in this kind, either in this land or beyond sea, either in King <i>Henry's</i> time, or King <i>Edward's</i> (if there were any translation, or correction of a translation in his time) or Queen <i>Elizabeth's</i> of ever renowned memory, that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God, for the building and furnishing of his Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance. The judgment of <i>Aristotle</i> is worthy and well known: " <i>If Timotheus had not been, we had not had much sweet music; but if Phrynys (Timotheus his master) had not been, we had not had Timotheus.</i> " Therefore blessed be they, and most honoured be their name, that break the ice, and giveth onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls. Now what can be more available thereto, than to deliver God's book unto God's people in a tongue which they understand? Since of a hidden treasure, and of a fountain that is sealed, there is no profit, as <i>Ptolemy Philadelph</i> wrote to the Rabbins or masters of the Jews, as witnesseth <i>Epiphanius</i> : and as <i>S. Augustine</i> saith; " <i>A man had rather be with his dog than with a stranger (whose tongue is strange unto him).</i> " Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfected at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to dislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us. The vintage of <i>Abienzer</i> , that strake the stroke: yet the gleanings of grapes of <i>Ephraim</i> was not to be despised. See <i>Judges</i> 8:2.	¶12) "And we would say the same, that far from condemning the work of any of our predecessors, whether here or abroad, whether in King Henry's time, or King Edward's (if there was any translation, or revision of a translation, in his time), or Queen Elizabeth's of ever renowned memory. We acknowledge that they were raised up by God to build up and equip his Church, and that they should always be remembered by us and by our descendants. The opinion of Aristotle is true and familiar, that while we are indebted to Timotheus for much sweet music, we are indebted to Phrynys (Timotheus' master) for Tmotheus. Therefore we should bless and honor the names of those who break the ice, and take the first steps toward something which promotes the saving of souls. And what can be more useful for this purpose than giving God's book to God's people in a language they can understand? As Ptolemy Philadelphus wrote to the Jewish leaders (according to Epiphanius), a hidden treasure or a sealed fountain is quite useless; and as St. Augustine says, anyone would rather be with his dog than with a stranger (who speaks a language he can't understand). In any event, nothing is begun and brought to perfection all at once, and later thoughts are considered to be the wiser. Therefore, if we build on the foundation laid by those who went before us, and profiting from their work we attempt to improve on what they did so well, certainly no one can reasonably disapprove, and we are persuaded that if they were alive, they themselves would thank us. The vintage of Abiezer was good, yet even the gleanings from Ephraim's vineyard were better (Judges 8.2). King Joash of Israel was not satisfied until he had struck the ground three

*Joash* the king of *Israel* did not satisfy himself, till he had smitten the ground three times; and yet he offended the Prophet, for giving over then. *Aquila*, of whom we spake before, translated the Bible as carefully, and as skilfully as he could; and yet he thought good to go over it again, and then it got the credit with the Jews, to be called accurately done, as *Saint Jerome* witnesseth. How many books of profane learning have been gone over again and again, by the same translators, by others? Of one and the same book of *Aristotle's Ethics*, there are extant not so few as six or seven several translations. Now if this cost may be bestowed upon the gourd, which affordeth us a little shade, and which today flourisheth, but tomorrow is cut down; what may we bestow, nay what ought we not to bestow upon the Vine, the fruit whereof maketh glad the conscience of man, and the stem whereof abideth forever? And this is the word of God, which we translate. "*What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord?*" [Jer 23:28] *Tanti vitreum, quanti verum margaritum* (saith *Tertullian*.) if a toy of glass be of that reckoning with us, how ought we to value the true pearl? [Jerome. ad Salvin.] Therefore let no man's eye be evil, because his Majesty's is good; neither let any be grieved, that we have a Prince that seeketh the increase of the spiritual wealth of *Israel* (let *Sanballats* and *Tobiahs* do so, which therefore do bear their just reproof) but let us rather bless God from the ground of our heart, for working this religious care in him, to have the translations of the Bible maturely considered of and examined. For by this means it cometh to pass, that whatsoever is sound already (and all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours far better than their authentic vulgar) the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished; also, if anything be halting, or superfluous, or not so agreeable to the original, the same may be corrected, and the truth set in place. And what can the King command to be done, that will bring him more true honour than this? and wherein could they that have been set a work, approve their duty to the King, yea their obedience to God, and love to his Saints more, than by yielding their service, and all that is within them, for the furnishing of the work? But besides all this, they were the principal motives of it, and therefore ought least to quarrel it: for the very Historical truth is, that upon the importunate

times, and yet he offended the prophet for giving up then (2 Kings 13.18,19). *Aquila*, whom we mentioned before, translated the Bible as carefully and as skillfully as he could; and yet he prudently went over it again, and his work became known among the Jews for its accuracy, as *Jerome* attests. How many books of profane learning have been revised over and over, by the same translators or by others? There are at least six or seven different translations available of one and the same book of *Aristotle's Ethics*. Now if this effort may be spent on the gourd, which provides us with so little shade, which flourishes today but tomorrow is cut down, how much should we, or rather, how much shouldn't we spend on the vine that has fruit to warm the heart and whose roots are perennial? And this is the word of God that we are translating. "What good is straw compared with wheat?" says the Lord (*Jeremiah* 23.28). Or (as *Tertullian* says), if a glass bauble is so valuable to us, how much more so a true pearl? Therefore no one should be jealous because his Majesty is generous. No one should mourn because we have a Prince who seeks to increase the spiritual wealth of *Israel*. *Sanballats* and *Tobiahs* may do so, for which they rightly deserve to be reproof. Let us rather bless God from the depths of our heart for arousing in him this religious concern for a deliberate and careful consideration of Bible translations. For in this way whatever is valid already (and our [Protestant] versions are all valid in substance, the worst of them being far better than the [Roman Catholics'] standard Vulgate) will shine more brightly, like gold that has been rubbed and polished. And if there is anything dubious, or superfluous, or not in agreement with the original, it may be corrected, and the truth set in its place. And what can the King commission to be done that will bring him more true honor than this? And how could those who are commissioned better fulfil their duty to the King, their obedience to God, and their love of his saints, than by devoting their efforts to the best of their ability to accomplishing the work? And besides, they were themselves the initial proponents of it, and therefore they ought least to quarrel about it. For the real historical fact is, that it was at the insistence of the Puritans when his Majesty was crowned, that the conference at Hampton Court was appointed for hearing their complaints, and

<p>petitions of the Puritans, at his Majesty's coming to this Crown, the Conference at Hampton Court having been appointed for hearing their complaints: when by force of reason they were put from other grounds, they had recourse at the last, to this shift, that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the Communion book, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated, which was as they said, a most corrupted translation. And although this was judged to be but a very poor and empty shift; yet even hereupon did his Majesty begin to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and presently after gave order for this Translation which is now presented unto thee. Thus much to satisfy our scrupulous Brethren.</p>	<p>when they could not make a case on any other grounds, they had recourse at the last to the argument that they could “ not in good conscience subscribe to the Communion book because they claimed that the Bible used in it was a most corrupted translation. And although this was considered to be a very poor and empty ploy, yet it suggested to his Majesty how much good might result from a new translation, and immediately afterward he commissioned this translation which is now offered to you. This much in answer to our scrupulous brethren. (Rhodes &amp; Lupas, 76-77)</p>
--	--

- Recall that at the end of the previous subsection, Smith began his answer to the translators’ Protestant adversaries who slandered the new translation by quoting from Jerome. Here in paragraph twelve subsection eleven, Smith elaborates as he attempts to provide “a stratification to our brethren.” He begins by saying that it was never the intention of the King James translators to “condemn” the labors of those who toiled on the text before them.
  - “And to the same effect say we, that we are so far off from condemning any of their labors that travailed before us in this kind, either in this land or beyond sea, either in King *Henry's* time, or King *Edward's* (if there were any translation, or correction of a translation in his time) or Queen *Elizabeth's* of ever renowned memory, that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God, for the building and furnishing of his Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance.”
- After quoting Aristotle, to illustrate his point, “*If Timotheus had not been, we had not had much sweet music; but if Phrynus (Timotheus his master) had not been, we had not had Timotheus,*” Smith states the following:
  - “Therefore blessed be they, and most honoured be their name, that break the ice, and giveth onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls. Now what can be more available thereto, than to deliver God's book unto God's people in a tongue which they understand? Since of a hidden treasure, and of a fountain that is sealed, there is no profit, as *Ptolemy Philadelph* wrote to the Rabbins or masters of the Jews, as witnesseth *Epiphanius*: and as *S. Augustine* saith; “*A man had rather be with his dog than with a stranger* (whose tongue is strange unto him).”
- Those who translated the Bible in the time of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth broke the ice in order “to deliver God's book unto God's people in a tongue which they understand?” In the next sentence Smith makes it clear that the King James translators were “building upon their

foundation that went before us.” This was not done to deride this earlier work but rather to perfect what had been previously started.

- “Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and **perfected** at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us.”
- Here we encounter the fourth occurrence of a form of the word “perfect” in the Preface. Smith says, “Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and **perfected** at the same time.” In this occurrence we see the use of the past tense form of the verb “perfect” being employed in a context that speaks of the completion of the process that had begun at a prior time. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) there is an “*obsolete*” meaning of “perfect” that means: “to complete or finish successfully; to carry through, accomplish. In early use also: † to bring to fulfilment or full development (*obsolete*).” I believe this was the meaning the Smith had in mind when he used the word “perfected” in this subsection of the Preface. In other words, Smith viewed the work of the translators as completing, successfully finishing, improving upon, or bringing to completion the translational work begun by prior English Bibles. Therefore, Smith concludes that their translational forebears would have no reason to “mislike” the King James translators, but would rather “thank” them for finishing their work.
- In the next portion of paragraph twelve, Smith offers examples, both Biblical and secular, to illustrate his points. Specifically, he alludes to Judges 8:2 and II Kings 13:18-19 without quoting them directly before moving on to Aquila’s translation and Aristotle’s Ethics as examples.
  - “The vintage of *Abienzer*, that strake the stroke: yet the gleaning of grapes of *Ephraim* was not to be despised. See *Judges* 8:2. *Joash* the king of *Israel* did not satisfy himself, till he had smitten the ground three times; and yet he offended the Prophet, for giving over then. *Aquila*, of whom we spake before, translated the Bible as carefully, and as skilfully as he could; and yet he thought good to go over it again, and then it got the credit with the Jews, to be called accurately done, as Saint *Jerome* witnesseth. How many books of profane learning have been gone over again and again, by the same translators, by others? Of one and the same book of *Aristotle’s* Ethics, there are extant not so few as six or seven several translations. Now if this cost may be bestowed upon the gourd, which affordeth us a little shade, and which today flourisheth, but tomorrow is cut down; what may we bestow, nay what ought we not to bestow upon the Vine, the fruit whereof maketh glad the conscience of man, and the stem whereof abideth forever? And this is the word of God, which we translate. “*What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord?*” [Jer 23:28] *Tanti vitreum, quanti verum margaritum* (saith *Tertullian*,) if a toy of glass be of that reckoning with us, how ought we to value the true pearl?”
- Next, with these illustrations in mind, Smith turns his attention to why no one should speak ill of King James for thinking it prudent that there should be an additional English Bible. In fact, Smith attributes the King’s honorable decision to the Lord’s special leading. In Smith’s mind there is nothing more honorable for a king to be involved in than “to have the translations of the Bible maturely considered of and examined.”

- “Therefore let no man's eye be evil, because his Majesty's is good; neither let any be grieved, that we have a Prince that seeketh the increase of the spiritual wealth of Israel (let *Sanballats* and *Tobiahs* do so, which therefore do bear their just reproof) but let us rather bless God from the ground of our heart, for working this religious care in him, to have the translations of the Bible maturely considered of and examined. For by this means it cometh to pass, that whatsoever is sound already (and all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours far better than their authentic vulgar) the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished; also, if anything be halting, or superfluous, or not so agreeable to the original, the same may be corrected, and the truth set in place. And what can the King command to be done, that will bring him more true honour than this? and wherein could they that have been set a work, approve their duty to the King, yea their obedience to God, and love to his Saints more, than by yielding their service, and all that is within them, for the furnishing of the work?”
- According to Smith, the translators of the AV took what was “sound already” and “rubbed and polished” it, thereby removing anything that was “not so agreeable to the original” that it “may be corrected and the truth set in place.” These sentiments comport with what we have observed from the Epistle Dedicatory and elsewhere in the Preface regarding James ordering a “survey of the English translations” (title of subsection three). Smith clearly viewed the work of the King James translators as having “corrected” and “perfected” the work that was began by prior English translations.
- We will revisit this subject matter of improving upon past translational work when we consider subsection thirteen, as Smith makes explicit statements about the methods and procedures utilized by the King’s translators. Smith concludes his answer to his Protestant brethren in paragraph twelve by recounting the history that gave birth to the project in the first place. It was upon petition by the Puritans at Hampton Court for a new translation that King James initiated the project.
  - “But besides all this, they were the principal motives of it, and therefore ought least to quarrel it: for the very Historical truth is, that upon the importunate petitions of the Puritans, at his Majesty's coming to this Crown, the Conference at Hampton Court having been appointed for hearing their complaints: when by force of reason they were put from other grounds, they had recourse at the last, to this shift, that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the Communion book, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated, which was as they said, a most corrupted translation. And although this was judged to be but a very poor and empty shift; yet even hereupon did his Majesty begin to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and presently after gave order for this Translation which is now presented unto thee. Thus much to satisfy our scrupulous Brethren.”
- Smith makes a couple of interesting statements in this final portion of the paragraph that merit further discussion. First, the statement “when by force of reason they were put from other grounds, **they had recourse at the last**, to this shift, that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the Communion book, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated, which was as they said, a most corrupted translation” fits with what we observed in [Lesson 156](#) about



the timing of John Rainolds' (Reynolds) request for a new translation. After being thoroughly shut down by King James on all previous petitions for reforming the Anglican Church, at the tail end of a list of suggestions, John Rainolds the chief Puritan speaker floated the request for a new translation. William Barlow records the exchange in his record of the Hampton Court Conference *The Sum And Substance*.

- Smith's next statement, "and although this was judged to be but a very poor and empty shift," is a reference to the immediate response to Rainolds' petition. After recording the three textual examples that Rainolds' presented to justify a new translation, Barlow commented that the objections were "trivial, old, and already in print, and often answered." (Barlow, 46) Moreover, Barlow records the response of the Bishop of London Richard Bancroft, "if every man's humor should be followed there would be no end of translating." (Barlow, 46-47)
- Had it not been for the King's response, there is little doubt that nothing would have come of Rainolds' request. Immediately after noting Bancroft's opposition, Barlow records the following:
  - "Whereupon his Highness wished, that some especial pains should be taken in that behalf for one uniform translation (professing that he could never, yet, see a Bible well translated in English, but the worst of all his Majesty thought the Geneva to be) and this to be done by the best learned in both the Universities, after them to be reviewed by the Bishops, and the chief learned of the Church; from them to be presented to the Privy Council; and lastly, to be ratified by his Royal authority; and so this whole Church to be bound unto it and none other: Mary, withal, he gave this caveat (upon a word cast out by my Lord of London that no marginal notes should be added, having found in them which are annexed to the Geneva translation (which he saw in a Bible given him by an English Lady) some notes very partial, untrue, seditious, and favouring too much of dangerous, and traitorous conceits) as, for example, Exod. 1:19, where the marginal notes alloweth disobedience to Kings. And 2 Chron. 15:16, the note taxeth Asa for deposing his mother, only, and not killing her." (Barlow, 47)
- Therefore, the following statement by Myles Smith in the Preface coincides with the history recorded by Barlow in *The Sum and Substance*.
  - "... yet even hereupon did his Majesty begin to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and presently after gave order for this Translation which is now presented unto thee."
- In the end, Smith's answer to his "scrupulous Brethren" was to take it up with the King. It is also important to note the Hebraist Hugh Broughton is also no doubt in view as a Protestant who heavily criticized the new Bible both before and after it was released.
- There is one Biblical quotation in subsection 11. Myles Smith quotes from Jeremiah 23:28.

<b>Passage</b>	<b>Preface</b>	<b>AV</b>	<b>Geneva</b>
Jer. 23:28	<b>What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord?</b>	. . . what is the chaffe to the wheat, sayth the Lord ?	<b>. . . what is the chaffe to the wheate, sayth the Lord?</b>

- This is yet another example of where the King’s translators revised the Bishops Bible to reinstate a Genevan reading. The 1602 Bishops Bible reads as follows in this verse, “. . . for what hath chaffe and wheate to do together saith the Lorde.”

### **Works Cited**

Barlow, William. *The Sum and Substance of The Conference*.

Rhodes, Errol F. and Liana Lupas. *The Translators to the Reader: The Original Preface of the King James Version of 1611*. New York, NY: American Bible Society, 1997.