

Sunday, April 2, 2023—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*

Lesson 200 The AV 1611: Producing A Proper Perspective on the Preface (Answer to Adversaries, Cont.)

### Introduction

- In [Lesson 199](#) we began looking at subsection twelve of the Preface to the AV 1611 titled “An Answer To The Imputations of Our Adversaries”. Myles Smith answers the Roman Catholic opposition to King James’ project to create “one uniform translation” of the Bible into English. This took shape around a revision of the Bishops Bible by comparing it to the “original Sacred tongues” as well as prior English Bibles. Among Romanists, this engendered an objection that the Protestants are constantly revising their Bible. Answering these Roman Catholic imputations is the primary focus of subsection twelve.

### **An Answer To The Imputations of Our Adversaries**

<b>Modern Spelling Transcription</b>	<b>Modern Form Edited by Rhodes &amp; Lupas</b>
<p>¶13) Now to the latter we answer; that we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God. As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into <i>French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin</i>, is still the King's speech, though it be not interpreted by every Translator with the like grace, nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere. For it is confessed, that things are to take their denomination of the greater part; and a natural man could say, <i>Verum ubi multa nitent in carmine, non ego paucis offendor maculis, etc.</i> A man may be counted a virtuous man, though he have made many slips in his life, (else, there were none virtuous, <i>for in many things we offend all</i>) [James 3:2] also a comely man and lovely, though he have some warts upon his hand, yea, not only freckles upon his face, but also scars. No cause therefore why the word translated should be denied to be the word, or forbidden to be current, notwithstanding that some imperfections and blemishes may be noted in the setting forth of it. For whatever was perfect under the Sun, where Apostles or Apostolic men, that is, men endued with an extraordinary measure of God's spirit, and privileged with the privilege of infallibility, had not their hand? The Romanists therefore in refusing to hear, and daring to burn the Word translated, did no less than despite the spirit of grace, from whom originally it proceeded, and whose sense and meaning, as well as man's</p>	<p>¶13) “Now to answer our enemies: we do not deny, rather we affirm and insist that the very worst translation of the Bible in English issued by Protestants (for we have seen no Catholic version of the whole Bible as yet) contains the word of God, or rather, is the word of God. In the same way, when the King’s speech delivered in Parliament is translated into French, German, Italian, and Latin, it is still the King’s speech, even if it is not interpreted by every translator with the same skill, or perhaps with as appropriate phrasing or always with as great clarity. For as everyone knows, things are classified by their major characteristics. Anyone will admit that a person may be regarded as virtuous even though he has made many slips during his life, otherwise no one could be called virtuous, because “all of us make many mistakes” (James 3.2). A person may be called handsome and charming, even though he may have some warts on his hand, and not only some freckles on his face, but also scars. So there is no reason why the word when it is translated should be denied to be the word, or should be declared inauthentic, simply because there may be some imperfections and blemishes in the way it is published. For has there been anything perfect under the sun in which Apostles or their colleagues, people endued with an extraordinary measure of God’s Spirit and privileged with the privilege of infallibility, were not involved? Therefore when the Romanists refused to hear, and even dared to burn the word when it is translated, they were only showing contempt for the Spirit of grace from whom it came originally, and whose sense and meaning it expressed as well</p>

weakness would enable, it did express. Judge by an example or two. *Plutarch* writeth, that after that *Rome* had been burnt by the *Gauls*, they fell soon to build it again: but doing it in haste, they did not cast the streets, nor proportion the houses in such comely fashion, as had been most slightly and convenient; was *Catiline* therefore an honest man, or a good patriot, that sought to bring it to a combustion? Or *Nero* a good Prince, that did indeed set it on fire? So, by the story of *Ezra*, and the prophecy of *Haggai* it may be gathered, that the Temple built by *Zerubbabel* after the return from *Babylon*, was by no means to be compared to the former built by *Solomon* (for they that remembered the former, wept when they considered the latter) [Ezra 3:12] notwithstanding, might this latter either have been abhorred and forsaken by the *Jews*, or profaned by the *Greeks*? The like we are to think of Translations. The translation of the *Seventy* dissenteth from the Original in many places, neither doth it come near it, for perspicuity, gravity, majesty; yet which of the Apostles did condemn it? Condemn it? Nay, they used it, (as it is apparent, and as *Saint Jerome* and most learned men do confess) which they would not have done, nor by their example of using it, so grace and commend it to the Church, if it had been unworthy of the appellation and name of the word of God. And whereas they urge for their second defence of their vilifying and abusing of the *English Bibles*, or some pieces thereof, which they meet with, for that heretics (forsooth) were the Authors of the translations, (heretics they call us by the same right that they call themselves Catholics, both being wrong) we marvel what divinity taught them so. We are sure *Tertullian* was of another mind: *Ex personis probamus fidem, an ex fide personas?* Do we try men's faith by their persons? we should try their persons by their faith. Also *S. Augustine* was of another mind: for he lighting upon certain rules made by *Tychonius* a *Donatist*, for the better understanding of the word, was not ashamed to make use of them, yea, to insert them into his own book, with giving commendation to them so far forth as they were worthy to be commended, as is to be seen in *S. Augustine's* third book *De doctrina Christiana*. To be short, *Origen*, and the whole Church of God for certain hundred years, were of another mind: for they were so far from treading under foot, (much more from burning)

as humanly possible. Consider some parallels. *Plutarch* writes that after *Rome* had been burnt by the *Gauls*, they soon set about rebuilding it. But they did it in haste, and they did not plan the streets or design the houses in the most attractive or practical way. Was *Catiline* therefore an honorable man, or a good patriot, when he tried to destroy it? Or was *Nero* a good prince, when he actually set it on fire? From the account of *Ezra* (Ezra 3.12) and the prophecy of *Haggai* (Haggai 2.3) it may be inferred that the temple built by *Zerubbabel* after the return from *Babylon* was in no way comparable to the one built earlier by *Solomon*. People who remembered the earlier one wept when they saw it, and yet was the new temple either regarded with disgust and rejected by the *Jews*, or profaned by the *Greeks*? We should think in the same way about translations. The translation of the *Septuagint* departs from the original in many places, and it does not come near the Hebrew for clarity, gravity, and majesty. And yet did any of the Apostles condemn it? Condemn it? Obviously they used it (as *St. Jerome* and most scholars confess), and they would not have done this, nor by their example of using it so honor and commend it to the Church, if it had been unworthy of the dignity and name of the word of God. Then they argue as their second reason, for vilifying and abusing *English Bibles*, or the portions of it they have seen, that the translations were made by heretics (they call us heretics by the same right that they call themselves Catholics, and they are wrong on both counts). This logic makes us wonder. We are sure *Tertullian* disagrees: "Do we judge peoples' faith by who they are? We should judge who they are by their faith." *St. Augustine* also disagrees, for when he found certain rules made by *Tychonius*, a *Donatist*, for better understanding the Word, he was not ashamed to make use of them, and even to insert them into his own book, duly commending them to the extent they were worth being commended (see his *De Doctrina Christiana*, book 3). In short, *Origen* together with the whole Church of God for some hundred years disagreed: they were so far from rejecting, much less from burning the translations by *Aquila*, a proselyte (i.e., a Jew by conversion), by *Symmachus* and by *Theodotion*, both *Ebionites* (i.e., vile heretics), that they added them together with the Hebrew original and the *Septuagint* (as

the Translation of *Aquila* a Proselyte, that is, one that had turned *Jew*; of *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*, both *Ebionites*, that is, most vile heretics, that they joined together with the *Hebrew* Original, and the Translation of the *Seventy* (as hath been before signified out of *Epiphanius*) and set them forth openly to be considered of and perused by all. But we weary the unlearned, who need not know so much, and trouble the learned, who know it already.

¶14) Yet before we end, we must answer a third cavil and objection of theirs against us, for altering and amending our Translations so oft; wherein truly they deal hardly, and strangely with us. For to whomever was it imputed for a fault (by such as were wise) to go over that which he had done, and to amend it where he saw cause? Saint *Augustine* was not afraid to exhort *S. Jerome* to a *Palinodia* or recantation; and doth even glory that he seeth his infirmities. If we be sons of the Truth, we must consider what it speaketh, and trample upon our own credit, yea, and upon other men's too, if either be any way an hindrance to it. This to the cause: then to the persons we say, that of all men they ought to be most silent in this case. For what varieties have they, and what alterations have they made, not only of their Service books, Portesses and Breviaries, but also of their *Latin* Translation? The Service book supposed to be made by *S. Ambrose* (*Officium Ambrosianum*) was a great while in special use and request; but Pope *Hadrian* calling a Council with the aid of *Charles the Emperor*, abolished it, yea, burnt it, and commanded the Service book of Saint *Gregory* universally to be used. Well, *Officium Gregorianum* gets by this means to be in credit, but doth it continue without change or altering? No, the very *Roman* Service was of two fashions, the New fashion, and the Old, (the one used in one Church, the other in another) as is to be seen in *Pamelius* a Romanist, his Preface, before *Micrologus*. the same *Pamelius* reporteth out *Radulphus de Rivo*, that about the year of our Lord, 1277, Pope *Nicolas* the Third removed out of the Churches of *Rome*, the more ancient books (of Service) and brought into use the Missals of the Friars Minorites, and commanded them to be observed there; insomuch that about an hundred years after, when the above name *Radulphus* happened to be at *Rome*, he found all the books to be new, (of the new stamp). Neither were there

noted by *Epiphanius* above), and published them openly to be considered and read by everyone. But this is tiresome for the general reader who is not interested, and boring for scholars, who know it already.

¶14) Yet before we finish, we must answer a third complaint and objection of theirs against us, of altering and amending our translations so often. This is truly a bold and odd accusation. For who was ever faulted (by anyone knowledgeable) for going over what they had done, and amending it where necessary? *St. Augustine* was not afraid to exhort *St. Jerome* to a *Palinodia* or reconsideration. The same *St. Augustine* was not ashamed to retract, we might say, revoke, many things he had written, and even boasts of seeing his own weaknesses. If we are to be loyal to the truth, we must be attentive to what it says, and disregard our own interests, and other men's too, if either stand in the way. So much for principles. Now to the accusers themselves we would say that of all people they have the least right to raise the charge. For how many different editions do they have, and how many alterations have they made, not only in their service books, manuals, and breviaries, but also in their Latin translation? The service book attributed to *St. Ambrose* (*Officium Ambrosianum*) had been in use and in great demand for a long while when Pope *Adrian* called a council with the aid of *Charles the Emperor*, and not only abolished it, but had it burnt, and commanded the service book of *St. Gregory* to be used universally. Then after the *Officium Gregorianum* is recognized as the authorized text, does it escape change or alteration? No, the *Roman* service itself was in two forms: the new form, and the old. The one was used in some churches, and the other in others, as the Romanist *Pamelius* notes in his preface to *Micrologus*. The same *Pamelius* cites *Radulphus de Rivo* to the effect that about A.D. 1277 Pope *Nicholas III* removed earlier service books from the churches of *Rome* and introduced the use of the Friars Minorites' missals, commanding them to be observed there, so that when *Radulphus* happened to be in *Rome* about a

this chopping and changing in the more ancient times only, but also of late: *Pius Quintus* himself confesseth, that every Bishopric almost had a peculiar kind of service, most unlike to that which others had: which moved him to abolish all other Breviaries, though never so ancient, and privileged and published by Bishops in their Dioceses, and to establish and ratify that only which was of his own setting forth, in the year 1568. Now when the father of their Church, who gladly would heal the sore of the daughter of his people softly and slightly, and make the best of it, findeth so great fault with them for their odds and jarring; we hope the children have no great cause to vaunt of their uniformity. But the difference that appeareth between our Translations, and our often correcting of them, is the thing that we are specially charged with; let us see therefore whether they themselves be without fault this way, (if it be to be counted a fault, to correct) and whether they be fit men to throw stones at us: *O tandem maior parcas insane minori*: they that are less sound themselves, out not to object infirmities to others. If we should tell them that *Valla*, *Stapulensis*, *Erasmus*, and *Vives* found fault with their vulgar Translation, and consequently wished the same to be mended, or a new one to be made, they would answer peradventure, that we produced their enemies for witnesses against them; albeit, they were in no other sort enemies, than as *S. Paul* was to the *Galatians*, for telling them the truth [Gal 4:16]: and it were to be wished, that they had dared to tell it them plainlier and oftener. But what will they say to this, that Pope *Leo* the Tenth allowed *Erasmus'* Translation of the New Testament, so much different from the vulgar, by his Apostolic Letter and Bull; that the same *Leo* exhorted *Pagnine* to translate the whole Bible, and bare whatsoever charges was necessary for the work? Surely, as the Apostle reasoneth to the *Hebrews*, that *if the former Law and Testament had been sufficient, there had been no need of the latter*: [Heb 7:11, 8:7] so we may say, that if the old vulgar had been at all points allowable, to small purpose had labour and charges been undergone, about framing of a new. If they say, it was one Pope's private opinion, and that he consulted only himself; then we are able to go further with them, and to aver, that more of their chief men of all sorts, even their own *Trent* champions *Paiva* and *Vega*, and their own

hundred years later, he found all the books to be new, of the new edition. Nor was this shifting back and forth done only in earlier times, but it has happened recently also. *Pius V* himself admits that almost every bishopric had its own kind of service, unlike the ones which others had. This moved him to abolish all the other breviaries, however ancient, privileged and published by Bishops in their Dioceses, and to establish and ratify only the one which he himself published in the year 1568. Now when the Father of their Church, who would gladly heal the sore of the daughter of his people gently and easily, and make the best of it, finds so much fault with them for their differences and inconsistencies, we hope the children have no great reason to boast of their uniformity. But the differences that appear among our translations, and our frequent corrections of them, is what we are charged with specifically. Let us see therefore whether they themselves are without fault in this respect (if it is a fault to make corrections), and whether they are qualified to throw stones at us: "they that are less healthy themselves ought not point out the infirmities of others" (Horace). If we should tell them that *Valla*, *Lefevre d'Etaples*, *Erasmus*, and *Vives* found fault with their Vulgate version, and consequently wished that either it should be corrected or a new version should be made, they would probably answer that we produced their enemies as witnesses against them. Yet they were no more enemies than *St. Paul* was to the *Galatians* for telling them the truth. If only they had dared tell them more plainly and oftener! But what will they say to the fact that Pope *Leo X*, by his Apostolic Letter and bull, sanctioned *Erasmus'* translation of the New Testament, which differs so much from the Vulgate? And that the same *Leo* encouraged *Pagninus* to translate the whole Bible, and provided all the expenses necessary for the work? Surely, as the Apostle reasons to the *Hebrews* (7.11; 8.7), if the former Law and Testament had been sufficient, there would have been no need of another. Similarly, if the old Vulgate had been completely adequate, there would be little reason to go to the labor and expense of preparing a new version. If they argue that this was only one Pope's private opinion, and that he consulted only himself, then we can go further and demonstrate that many more of their leaders, including their own champions at the

Inquisitors, *Hieronymus ab Oleastro*, and their own Bishop *Isidorus Clarius*, and their own Cardinal *Thomas a Vio Caietan*, do either make new Translations themselves, or follow new ones of other men's making, or note the vulgar Interpreter for halting; none of them fear to dissent from him, nor yet to except against him. And call they this an uniform tenor of text and judgment about the text, so many of their Worthies disclaiming the now received conceit? Nay, we will yet come nearer the quick: doth not their *Paris* edition differ from the *Lovaine*, and *Hentenius* his from them both, and yet all of them allowed by authority? Nay, doth not *Sixtus Quintus* confess, that certain Catholics (he meaneth certain of his own side) were in such an humor of translating the Scriptures into *Latin*, that Satan taking occasion by them, though they thought of no such matter, did strive what he could, out of so uncertain and manifold a variety of Translations, so to mingle all things, that nothing might seem to be left certain and firm in them, etc.? Nay, further, did not the same *Sixtus* ordain by an inviolable decree, and that with the counsel and consent of his Cardinals, that the *Latin* edition of the old and New Testament, which the Council of *Trent* would have to be authentic, is the same without controversy which he then set forth, being diligently corrected and printed in the Printing-house of *Vatican*? Thus *Sixtus* in his Preface before his Bible. And yet *Clement* the Eighth his immediate successor, published another edition of the Bible, containing in it infinite differences from that of *Sixtus*, (and many of them weighty and material) and yet this must be authentic by all means. What is to have the faith of our glorious Lord JESUS CHRIST with Yea or Nay, if this be not? Again, what is sweet harmony and consent, if this be? Therefore, as *Demaratus* of *Corinth* advised a great King, before he talked of the dissensions of the *Grecians*, to compose his domestic broils (for at that time his Queen and his son and heir were at deadly feud with him) so all the while that our adversaries do make so many and so various editions themselves, and do jar so much about the worth and authority of them, they can with no show of equity challenge us for changing and correcting.

Council of Trent, Paiva and Vega, and their own Inquisitors, Hieronymus ab Oleastro, and their own Bishop Isidorus Clarius, and their own Cardinal Thomas a Vio Cajetan, either make new translations themselves, or follow new ones that others have made, or note defects in the Vulgate version, without any fear of dissenting from it or disagreeing with it. And do they claim to represent a consistency of text and of judgment about the text, when so many of their own worthies disclaim the currently accepted opinion? But let us be more explicit. Does their Paris edition not differ from the Louvain edition, and Hentenius's edition differ from both, and yet all of them are sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority? And does Sixtus V not admit that some Catholics (he means some of his own persuasion) were so eagerly making translations of the Scriptures into Latin, that although they did not intend it, Satan could exploit the opportunity to show that such a variety of translations is confusing, and proves that nothing seems to be left certain and firm in them, etc.? And further, did the same Sixtus not ordain by an inviolable decree, with the counsel and consent of his Cardinals, that the Latin edition of the Old and New Testaments, which the Council of Trent pronounces to be authoritative, is precisely the one which he then published in a carefully corrected edition, printed by the Vatican Press? Sixtus states this in the Preface to his Bible. And yet Clement VIII, his immediate successor, publishes another edition of the Bible, containing innumerable differences from that of Sixtus, many of which are weighty and substantial, and this edition is declared absolutely authoritative. If this is not an example of vacillating with the faith of our glorious Lord Jesus Christ, what is? What kind of sweet harmony and consistency is this? Therefore, as Demaratus of Corinth advised the great king Philip of Macedon, before criticizing the dissensions among the Greeks, he should settle his own domestic broils (for at that time his queen and his son and heir were in a deadly feud with him). So when our enemies are making so many different versions themselves and debating their value and authority, they cannot fairly challenge our right to revise and correct. (Rhodes & Lupas 78-81)

- Please recall from [Lesson 199](#) that subsection twelve titled “An Answer To The Imputations of Our Adversaries” spans two dense paragraphs (§13 and 14) of information as Myles Smith seeks to answer the translators’ Roman Catholic “adversaries.” Having dealt with the contents of paragraph thirteen in the pervious Lesson, we will now turn our attention to unpacking the contents of paragraph fourteen.
- Smith opens paragraph fourteen with the following statement:
  - “Yet before we end, we must answer a third cavil and objection of theirs against us, for altering and amending our Translations so oft; wherein truly they deal hardly, and strangely with us. For to whomever was it imputed for a fault (by such as were wise) to go over that which he had done, and to amend it where he saw cause?”
- Before moving on, Smith offers “a third cavil and objection of theirs against us.” The English noun “cavil” carries the following meanings according to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED):
  - 1. A captious, quibbling, or frivolous objection.
  - 2. The raising of frivolous objections; cavilling.
- Thus a “cavil” is a frivolous complaint. Smith identifies that there is a third “cavil and objection” that he feels he is compelled to answer. Naturally, this ought to raise the question, “what were the first two complaints/objections that Smith answered. We must therefore look back to paragraph thirteen to remind ourselves of the cavilling that Smith has already addressed.
  - Romanists have despised the spirit of grace that gave men the word of God by opposing English translations.
    - “Now to the latter we answer, that we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God.” Therefore, “the Romanists . . . in refusing to hear, and daring to burn the Word translated, did no less than despite the spirit of grace, from whom originally it proceeded, and whose sense and meaning, as well as man's weakness would enable, it did express.”
  - Romanists defended their burning of English translations by arguing they were produced by heretics.
    - “And whereas they urge for their second defense of their vilifying and abusing of the *English* Bibles, or some pieces thereof, which they meet with, for that heretics (forsooth) were the Authors of the translations, (heretics they call us by the same right that they call themselves Catholics, both being wrong) we marvel what divinity taught them so.”
- The “third cavil” that Smith addressed in paragraph fourteen is related to the Catholic complaint that the Protestants were often “altering and amending” their translations. Smith views this as

“hard” and “strange” treatment by their Catholic opposition. Why should going over and amending one’s work be “imputed for a fault,” Smith wonders? Smith offers Augustine’s exhortation to Jerome to recant as well as his acknowledgement of his own “infirmities” as evidence of our need to change our minds as men.

- “Saint *Augustine* was not afraid to exhort *S. Jerome* to a *Palinodia* or recantation; and doth even glory that he seeth his infirmities.”
- According to Smith, Augustine’s ability to admit his own infirmities/errors is a “glory” unto him. Smith would have all men behave in such a manner.
  - “If we be sons of the Truth, we must consider what it speaketh, and trample upon our own credit, yea, and upon other men’s too, if either be any way an hindrance to it. This to the cause: then to the persons we say, that of all men they ought to be most silent in this case.”
- Smith argues that in the cause of truth men must be willing to “trample upon” their own thoughts/ideas as well as those of other men that are deemed out of step with the truth.
- Next, Smith turns his attention to the fact that the translators’ Catholic adversaries have revised their own books and translations many times while at the same cause deriding their Protestant opposition for doing likewise.
  - “For what varieties have they, and what alterations have they made, not only of their Service books, Portesses and Breviaries, but also of their *Latin* Translation?”
- Smith provides many historical examples of how the Roman Church altered their Service books.
  - “The Service book supposed to be made by *S. Ambrose* (*Officium Ambrosianum*) was a great while in special use and request; but Pope *Hadrian* calling a Council with the aid of Charles the Emperor, abolished it, yea, burnt it, and commanded the Service book of Saint *Gregory* universally to be used. Well, *Officium Gregorianum* gets by this means to be in credit, but doth it continue without change or altering? No, the very *Roman* Service was of two fashions, the New fashion, and the Old, (the one used in one Church, the other in another) as is to be seen in *Pamelius* a Romanist, his Preface, before *Micrologus*. the same *Pamelius* reporteth out *Radulphus de Rivo*, that about the year of our Lord, 1277, Pope *Nicolas* the Third removed out of the Churches of *Rome*, the more ancient books (of Service) and brought into use the Missals of the Friars Minorites, and commanded them to be observed there; insomuch that about an hundred years after, when the above name *Radulphus* happened to be at *Rome*, he found all the books to be new, (of the new stamp). Neither were there this chopping and changing in the more ancient times only, but also of late: *Pius Quintus* himself confesseth, that every Bishopric almost had a peculiar kind of service, most unlike to that which others had: which moved him to abolish all other Breviaries, though never so ancient, and privileged and published by Bishops in their Dioceses, and to establish and ratify that only which was of his own setting forth, in the year 1568. Now when the father of their Church, who gladly would heal the sore of the daughter of his people softly and slightly, and make the best of it, findeth so great fault

with them for their odds and jarring; we hope the children have no great cause to vaunt of their uniformity.”

- Put another way, the Roman Church has a long history of revising its “Service book.” Therefore, Smith argues that “the children” of Rome “have no great cause to vaunt of their uniformity,” because there was none.
- In the next sentence Smith shifts his focus from the Catholics’ revised “Service book” to translations of the scriptures. Specifically, he takes up the charge of whether the Catholics are fair in their criticism that Protestants are “often correcting” their translations.
  - “But the difference that appeareth between our Translations, and our often correcting of them, is the thing that we are specially charged with; let us see therefore whether they themselves be without fault this way, (if it be to be counted a fault, to correct) and whether they be fit men to throw stones at us: *O tandem maior parcas insane minori: they that are less sound themselves, out not to object infirmities to others.*”
- Ultimately, Smith views that the Catholics are not above reproach themselves on the matter of “often correcting” their translation and therefore should not “throw stones” and not “object infirmities to others” that they themselves are guilty of. In the next section Smith provides historical evidence to buttress his position.
  - “If we should tell them that *Valla, Stapulensis, Erasmus, and Vives* found fault with their vulgar Translation, and consequently wished the same to be mended, or a new one to be made, they would answer peradventure, that we produced their enemies for witnesses against them; albeit, they were in no other sort enemies, than as *S. Paul* was to the *Galatians*, for telling them the truth [Gal 4:16]: and it were to be wished, that they had dared to tell it them plainlier and oftener.”
- Here Smith is reminding the Catholics of historical examples from within their own ranks (Lorenzo Valla, Stapulenis, Erasmus, and Vines) who “found fault with their vulgar Translation, and consequently wished the same to be mended, or a new one to be made.” Recall from [Lesson 100](#) that when Erasmus published his first edition of the Greek New Testament in 1516, it was accompanied by a revised Latin text. Smith heads off at the pass any Catholic argument that the four names mentioned were enemies of the Catholic Church by alluding to Galatians 4:16, “Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?” If it is so that the Catholics viewed Erasmus and company as enemies of the Church, “it were to be wished, that they had dared to tell it them plainlier and oftener.”
- Next, Smith provides historical evidence of Papal desire to revise the “vulgar” Latin.
  - “But what will they say to this, that Pope *Leo* the Tenth allowed *Erasmus’* Translation of the New Testament, so much different from the vulgar, by his Apostolic Letter and Bull; that the same *Leo* exhorted *Pagnine* to translate the whole Bible, and bare whatsoever charges was necessary for the work? Surely, as the Apostle reasoneth to the *Hebrews*, that *if the former Law and Testament had been sufficient, there had been no need of the latter*: [Heb 7:11, 8:7] so we may say, that if the old vulgar had been at all points



allowable, to small purpose had labour and charges been undergone, about framing of a new.”

- Anticipating the charge that such was “one Pope’s private opinion,” Smith cites an array of Jesuits and Inquisitors who made, used, or advocated for revised editions of the Latin Vulgate.
  - “If they say, it was one Pope's private opinion, and that he consulted only himself; then we are able to go further with them, and to aver, that more of their chief men of all sorts, even their own *Trent* champions *Paiva* and *Vega*, and their own Inquisitors, *Hieronimus ab Oleastro*, and their own Bishop *Isidorus Clarius*, and their own Cardinal *Thomas a Vio Caietan*, do either make new Translations themselves, or follow new ones of other men's making, or note the vulgar Interpreter for halting; none of them fear to dissent from him, nor yet to except against him. And call they this an uniform tenor of text and judgment about the text, so many of their Worthies disclaiming the now received conceit?”
- The last sentence of the above quote is dripping with sarcasm. Having cited historical examples of Catholic officials using revised Vulgate editions, Smith derides them for calling their position “uniform” when compared to that of the Protestant, “And call they this an uniform tenor of text and judgment about the text, so many of their Worthies disclaiming the now received conceit?”
- In the final portion of the paragraph Smith cuts to the “quick” of the Roman Catholic opposition to revising the Bible by factually pointing out the utter hypocrisy of Rome’s position.
  - “Nay, further, did not the same *Sixtus* ordain by an inviolable decree, and that with the counsel and consent of his Cardinals, that the *Latin* edition of the old and New Testament, which the Council of *Trent* would have to be authentic, is the same without controversy which he then set forth, being diligently corrected and printed in the Printing-house of *Vatican*? Thus *Sixtus* in his Preface before his Bible. And yet *Clement* the Eighth his immediate successor, published another edition of the Bible, containing in it infinite differences from that of *Sixtus*, (and many of them weighty and material) and yet this must be authentic by all means. What is to have the faith of our glorious Lord JESUS CHRIST with Yea or Nay, if this be not? Again, what is sweet harmony and consent, if this be? Therefore, as *Demaratus* of *Corinth* advised a great King, before he talked of the dissensions of the *Grecians*, to compose his domestic broils (for at that time his Queen and his son and heir were at deadly feud with him) so all the while that our adversaries do make so many and so various editions themselves, and do jar so much about the worth and authority of them, they can with no show of equity challenge us for changing and correcting.”
- In response to the Protestant Reformation, the Council of Trent ruled that the Latin Vulgate was absolutely “authentic” and infallible. Yet, the two principle Reformation Era editions of the Vulgate by Sixtus and Clement VIII were not identical to each other. The Clementine Vulgate of 1592 differed from the Sixtine edition deemed “authentic” by the Council of Trent a few decades earlier. According to Smith, these two editions of the Vulgate contain “infinite differences” many of which are “weighty and material” and yet both are deemed “authentic” by Catholics.

- Smith concluded subsection twelve by calling out the duplicity of the Romanists on this point, “so all the while that our adversaries do make so many and so various editions themselves, and do jar so much about the worth and authority of them, they can with no show of equity challenge us for changing and correcting.”
- In the end, the translators’ Catholic enemies were guilty of the same charge that they had been leveling at their Protestant opponents, “changing and correcting” their editions of the Bible.
- All told, Smith’s answer to the “imputations of our adversaries” centered around three different arguments:
  - Romanists have despised the spirit of grace that gave men the word of God by opposing English translations.
  - Romanists defended their burning of English translations by arguing they were produced by heretics.
  - Romanists were guilty of the very imposition they were leveling against Protestant translators i.e., changing, correcting, and revising the Latin Vulgate.

#### *Biblical Quotations/Allusions in Subsection Twelve*

- Before completing our discussion of subsection twelve, we need to note the Biblical quotations/allusions utilized by Myles Smith therein. In paragraph thirteen there are two allusions to Ezra 3:12 and Haggai 2:3 when Smith was talking about, “the Temple built by *Zerubbabel* after the return from *Babylon*,” and how it “was by no means to be compared to the former built by *Solomon* (for they that remembered the former, wept when they considered the latter).”
- In addition, there is one partial quotation of James 3:2 in paragraph thirteen. Please consider the following table.

<b>Passage</b>	<b>Preface</b>	<b>AV</b>	<b>Geneva</b>
James 3:2	(. . . <i>for in many things we offend all</i> )	<b>For in many things we offend all. . .</b>	For in many things we sinne all. . .

- In case of this partial quotation of James 3:2 in subsection twelve, Smith appears to be quoting from the AV as the reading he provides does not match the Geneva, Bishops, or any other early modern English translation.
- In paragraph fourteen of subsection twelve there are two Biblical allusions. The first allusion is to Galatians 4:16, “Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?” The allusion is found in the following statement by Smith:
  - “If we should tell them that *Valla*, *Stapulensis*, *Erasmus*, and *Vives* found fault with their vulgar Translation, and consequently wished the same to be mended, or a new one to be

made, they would answer peradventure, that we produced their enemies for witnesses against them; albeit, they were in no other sort enemies, **than as S. Paul was to the Galatians, for telling them the truth** [Gal 4:16]: and it were to be wished, that they had dared to tell it them plainlier and oftener.”

- The second allusion is found in the following statement where Smith references the book of Hebrews:
  - “. . . as the Apostle reasoneth to the *Hebrews*, that ***if the former Law and Testament had been sufficient, there had been no need of the latter***: so we may say, that if the old vulgar had been at all points allowable, to small purpose had labour and charges been undergone, about framing of a new.”
- Drs. Rhodes and Lupas, the editors of *The Translators to the Reader: The Original Preface of the King James Version of 1611 Revisited*, say that the allusion is to both Hebrews 7:11 and 8:7. Please consider the full text of the verses in question as they appeared in the 1611:
  - Hebrews 7:11—If therefore perfection were by the Leuiticall Priesthood (for vnder it the people receiued the Law) what further neede was there, that another Priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not bee called after the order of Aaron?
  - Hebrews 8:7—For if that first Couenant had bene faultles, then should no place haue bene sought for the second.
- While the connection to Hebrews 8:7 is clear, the connection to Hebrews 7:11 stems from Smith’s use of the word “Law” in the phrase, “Law and Testament.” In any event, one cannot call Smith’s compound allusion to Hebrews a Biblical citation since it matches no known reading. It is best viewed as a compound Biblical allusion to underscore his contextual point regarding the double standards of the translators’ Roman Catholic opposition.

### Works Cited

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.