

Sunday, May 14, 2023—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*
Lesson 204 The AV 1611: Producing A Proper Perspective on the Preface (Identity of Phrasing)

Introduction

- In [Lesson 203](#) we looked at subsection fourteen of Myles Smith’s famous Preface titled “Reasons Moving Us to Set Diversity of Senses In the Margin, Where There Is Great Probability For Each”
- In doing so we observed the thinking and rationale of the translators in terms of when it was appropriate to set forth differences of senses in the margin. Fundamentally Smith identified two different criteria for setting a “diversity of senses in the margin.”
 - Difficult Words & Sentences—“. . . it hath pleased God in his divine providence, here and there to scatter words and sentences of that difficulty and doubtfulness, not in doctrinal points that concern salvation, (for in such it hath been vouched that the Scriptures are plain) but in matters of less moment, that fearfulness would better beseech us than confidence, and if we will resolve upon modesty with S. *Augustine* . . . “it is better to make doubt of those things which are secret, than to strive about those things that are uncertain.”
 - Singular Word Occurrences & Rare Animals Etc.—“There be many words in the Scriptures, which be never found there but once, (having neither brother or neighbor, as the *Hebrews* speak) so that we cannot be holpen by conference of places. Again, there be many rare names of certain birds, beasts and precious stones, etc.”
- In this current Lesson we will turn our attention to subsection fifteen, the final section of Smith’s Preface.

Reasons Inducing Us Not To Stand Curiously Upon An Identify of Phrasing

Modern Spelling Transcription	Modern Form Edited by Rhodes & Lupas
¶17) Another things we think good to admonish thee of (gentle Reader) that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere, have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not the same sense everywhere) we were especially careful, and made a conscience, according to our duty. But, that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as for example, if we translate the <i>Hebrew</i> or <i>Greek</i> word once by <i>Purpose</i> , never to call it <i>Intent</i> ; if one where <i>Journeying</i> , never <i>Traveling</i> ; if one where <i>Think</i> , never <i>Suppose</i> ; if one where <i>Pain</i> , never <i>Ache</i> ; if one where <i>Joy</i> , never <i>Gladness</i> , etc.	¶17) Another thing that you should know, gentle Reader, is that we have not tried to be as consistent in translating words or phrases as some might wish, claiming that certain scholars elsewhere have observed just such a precision. Actually, we were especially careful, and we made it a matter of conscience as we were in duty bound, not to introduce inconsistencies as our translation progressed when a word is used in the same sense (for some words are not always used with the same meaning). But we thought it would be more fastidious than wise always to express the same idea with precisely the same word, e.g., if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by <i>purpose</i> , never to call it <i>intent</i> ; if once <i>journeying</i> , never <i>traveling</i> ; if once <i>think</i> , never <i>suppose</i> ; if once <i>pain</i> , never <i>ache</i> ; if once <i>joy</i> , never <i>gladness</i> , etc. Affecting such precision would breed scorn in the atheist rather than be useful to the godly

Thus to mince the matter, we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the Atheist, than bring profit to the godly Reader. For is the kingdom of God to become words or syllables? why should we be in bondage to them if we may be free, use one precisely when we may use another no less fit, as commodiously? A godly Father in the Primitive time showed himself greatly moved, that one of newfangledness called [NOTE: Greek omitted but was a dispute over the word for "a bed"] though the difference be little or none; and another reporteth that he was much abused for turning *Cucurbita* (to which reading the people had been used) into *Hedera*. Now if this happens in better times, and upon so small occasions, we might justly fear hard censure, if generally we should make verbal and unnecessary changings. We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good English words. For as it is written of a certain great Philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped; for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always, and to others of like quality, Get ye hence, be banished forever, we might be taxed peradventure with S. *James* his words, namely, *To be partial in ourselves and judges of evil thoughts*. Add hereunto, that niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling, and so was to be curious about names too: also that we cannot follow a better pattern for elocution than God himself; therefore he using divers words, in his holy writ, and indifferently for one thing in nature: we, if we will not be superstitious, may use the same liberty in our English versions out of *Hebrew* and *Greek*, for that copy or store that he hath given us. Lastly, we have on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the old Ecclesiastical words, and betake them to other, as when they put *washing* for *Baptism*, and *Congregation* instead of *Church*: as also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their *Azimes*, *Tunike*, *Rational*, *Holocausts*, *Praepuce*, *Pasche*, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may be kept

reader. For has the kingdom of God become words and syllables? Why should we be slaves to them, if we could be free? Why use one word exclusively when another equally accurate word is appropriate? One godly Father in the early days was greatly perturbed by someone's novelty in referring to a pallet as a *skimpus* instead of a *krabbaton*, although there is little or no difference in their meaning. Another Father reports that he was reviled for replacing *cucurbita* ("gourd," at the time the familiar reading in Jonah 4.6) with *hedera* ("vine"). Now if this happened in better times and in such small matters, we should expect to be censured if we went about making unnecessary changes in words. We could also be accused (by scoffers) of bias in dealing with a great number of good English words. A certain great philosopher is reputed to have said that some logs were fortunate to be made into images and worshiped, while their comrades, just as good as they, were placed beside the fire as kindling. Similarly we could say, as it were, to some words, Stand up higher, have a permanent place in this Bible, and to others that are equally good, Get out, be banished for ever. Then we could perhaps be accused, in the words of St. James, of making distinctions among ourselves and making judgments based on false motives. And besides, being overly precise with words has always been considered close to triviality, as was also being too particular about names too. We cannot observe a better pattern of expression than God himself; who used different words without distinction in his holy scriptures when referring to the same thing. Unless we are superstitious, we may use the same liberty in our English versions of the Hebrew and Greek, based on the resources he has given us. Finally, we have on the one hand avoided the strictness of the Puritans, who reject old ecclesiastical words and adopt other words, preferring *washing* for *baptism*, and *Congregation* instead of *Church*. And then on the other hand we have avoided the obscurity of the Papists, with their *Azimes*, *Tunike*, *Rational*, *Holocausts*, *Prcepuce*, *Pasche*, and other such words typical of their recent translation. Their purpose is to obscure the meaning, so that if they have to translate the Bible, at least its language can keep it from being understood. But we want the Scripture to speak like itself, as it does in Hebrew, and be understood even by the uneducated.

from being understood. But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of *Canaan*, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar.

¶18) Many other things we might give thee warning of (gentle Reader) if we had not exceeded the measure of a Preface already. It remaineth, that we commend thee to God, and to the Spirit of his grace, which is able to build further than we can ask or think. He removeth the scales from our eyes, the veil from our hearts, opening our wits that we may understand his word, enlarging our hearts, yea correcting our affections, that we may love it to the end. Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews. Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things. Say not to our Saviour with the *Gergesites*, Depart out of our coast [Matt 8:34]; neither yet with *Esau* sell your birthright for a mess of pottage [Heb 12:16]. If light be come into the world, love not darkness more than light; if food, if clothing be offered, go not naked, starve not yourselves. Remember the advice of *Nazianzene*, *It is a grievous thing (or dangerous) to neglect a great fair, and to seek to make markets afterwards*: also the encouragement of *S. Chrysostom*, *It is altogether impossible, that he that is sober" (and watchful) should at any time be neglected*: Lastly, the admonition and menacing of *S. Augustine*, *They that despise God's will inviting them, shall feel God's will taking vengeance of them*. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God; [Heb 10:31] but a blessed thing it is, and will bring us to everlasting blessedness in the end, when God speaketh unto us, to hearken; when he setteth his word before us, to read it; when he stretcheth out his hand and calleth, to answer, Here am I, here we are to do thy will, O God. The Lord work a care and conscience in us to know him and serve him, that we may be acknowledged of him at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the holy Ghost, be all praise and thanksgiving. Amen.

¶18) There are many other things we could mention, gentle Reader, if we had not gone beyond the limits of a preface already. It remains to commend you to God, and to his gracious Spirit, which is able to build further than we can ask or think. He removes the scales from our eyes, the veil from our hearts, opening our minds so that we may understand his word, enlarging our hearts, and correcting our affections, so that we may love it above gold and silver, indeed, so that we may love it to the end. You have come to fountains of fresh water which you did not dig. Don't throw dirt into them, like the Philistines, and don't prefer broken pits to them, like the wicked Jews. Others have done the hard work, and you can enjoy the results. So don't take such great things lightly. Don't despise such a great salvation. Don't be like swine to tread under foot such precious things, nor like dogs to tear and abuse holy things. Don't say to our Savior like the *Gergesites* did, "Get out of our land!" Nor like *Esau* sell your birthright for a bowl of soup. If light has come into the world, don't love darkness more than light: if food, if clothing be offered, don't go naked, don't starve yourselves. Remember the advice of *Gregory Nazianzen*, "It is a sad thing to let the market day go by, and then try to do business." Remember also the advice of *St. Chrysostom*, "It is quite impossible that anyone who is serious (and attentive) should ever be ignored." And finally, remember *St. Augustine's* advice and threat, "They that ignore the will of God inviting them, shall feel the will of God taking vengeance of them." It is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God; but it is a blessed thing which will bring us to everlasting blessedness in the end, to listen when God speaks to us, to read his word when he sets it before us, and when he stretches out his hand and calls, to answer, "Here I am, here we are to do your will, O God." May the Lord create in us a care and conscience to know him and serve him, that we may be acknowledged by him at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the Holy Ghost be all praise and thanksgiving. Amen. (Rhodes & Lupas, 83-85)

- At long last we have made it to subsection fifteen, the final subsection of the Preface. Comprising two paragraphs, subsection fifteen is titled “Reasons Inducing Us Not To Stand Curiously Upon An Identify of Phrasing.” In this subsection Myles Smith makes it clear that the translators did not use a principle of rigidity when conducting their work but rather utilized a variety of English words to capture the sense of the Hebrew and Greek in English.
- Consider the first sentence of paragraph seventeen:
 - “Another thing we think good to admonish thee of (gentle Reader) that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere, have been as exact as they could that way.”
- Myles Smith found it necessary to “admonish” the readers of the AV that the translators did not tie themselves to a “uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words.” Simply stated, they did not use the same English word every time a given Hebrew or Greek word occurred in the text. They did this on purpose knowing that some “learned men” would seek to gainsay the product because it was not “as exact” as it could have been in this regard. I believe that this comment is directed to the chief Protestant critic of the work Hugh Broughton who complained about this exact issue i.e., that the AV did not employ a “uniformity of phrasing” or “an identity of words.”
- Despite their rejection of rigidity, the translators never strayed from the sense of a given passage.
 - “Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not the same sense everywhere) we were especially careful, and made a conscience, according to our duty.”
- I find this to be a confusing statement on the part of Myles Smith. It seems to contradict what was stated in the preceding sentence as well as the sentences that follow. So how should we understand this statement? First, we need to apply the principle of clarity and seek to understand the unclear from the vantage point of the clear. Smith clearly states before and after the sentence in question that rigidity was not the overarching principle the translators sought to employ when doing their work. There were, however, times where they did choose to use the same English word when the sense of a word “signified the same” meaning as what they “had translated before.” They were “especially careful” and judicious according to their “conscience” and “duty” in when they chose to do this, but it was not their main mode of operation. It is possible that they acted in this manner when they thought it important for the establishment of cross references.
- The next sentence expounds upon the first. The translators did not tie themselves “to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words,” in the following manner.
 - “But, that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as for example, if we translate the *Hebrew* or *Greek* word once by *Purpose*, never to call it *Intent*; if one where *Journeying*, never *Traveling*; if one where *Think*, never *Suppose*; if one where *Pain*, never *Ache*; if one where *Joy*, never *Gladness*, etc.”

- In my opinion, this is one of the most important parts of the entire Preface. In this sentence Myles Smith clearly explains that the translators did not use a principle of rigidity when rendering Hebrew and Greek words in English. If a given English word accurately captured and expressed the sense of the original language texts, they utilized English synonyms. For example, the Greek word *typos* is translated as both “examples” and “ensamples” in the same context in I Corinthians 10.
 - I Corinthians 10:6—Now these things were our **examples** [*typos*], to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted.
 - I Corinthians 10:11—Now all these things happened unto them for **ensamples** [*typos*]: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.
- The *Oxford English Dictionary* reports that “example” and “ensample” are “are ultimately the same word.”

From the second edition (1989):

example, n.

(eg za:mp(s)), -æ-) Forms: 4-6 **exemple**, **exsaumple**, 5-6 **exaample**, -awmple, (5 **axampil**, **exsawmple**, 6 **exampul(l)**), 5-6 *Sc.* **exaimple**, **exampill**, -empill, 5-**example**. [a. OF. *exsample*, *exsample*, a refashioning (after Lat.) of earlier *essample* (see ASAUMPLE):—L. *exemplum*, f. *exem-*, *eximēre* to take out: see EXEMPT. The primary sense is thus ‘something taken out, a SAMPLE, specimen’. The main Eng. senses are derived from Lat. through Fr. In the arrangement below the presumed logical order has been adopted in preference to the order in which the senses are recorded in Eng. See also ASAUMPLE, ENSAMPLE, SAMPLE, which are ultimately **the same word**.]

- Likewise with the Hebrew word *kûn* in contexts related to the Davidic Covenant. In II Samuel 7 the King James translators use “establish” and “stablish” interchangeably when speaking of the Davidic Covenant.
 - II Samuel 7:12—And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will **establish** [*kûn*] his kingdom.
 - II Samuel 7:13—He shall build an house for my name, and I will **stablish** [*kûn*] the throne of his kingdom for ever.
 - II Samuel 7:16—And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be **established** [*kûn*] for ever.
- Notice that “stablish” and “established” are used interchangeably in the same context to speak about the throne of David. Moreover, they are both translations of the same Hebrew word. In addition, I Chronicles 17:11 and 12 the same phenomenon occurs when speaking about aspects of the Davidic Covenant. It is commonly asserted by some defenders of the AV that the word “establish” refers to the initial founding or setting up of something and that “stablish” means to stabilize something that already exists or that was previously “established.” These alleged discriminated meanings break down when considering the use of the two words in relation to the David Covenant in II Samuel 7. First note that in verse 13 that God will “stablish” David’s throne before it is said to be “established” in verse 16. This progression does not match what is commonly stated about “establish” preceding “stablish” in the order of operations. Furthermore, if God almighty will “establish” David’s Kingdom (v. 12) and throne (v. 16) will He do so in

such a manner that He will later need to “stablish” i.e., stabilize that which He previously founded or set up? More directly, when God founds or initially sets something up (establish) does He do so in an insufficient manner that requires Him to come back later and stabilize (stablish) it? Some latch onto visual differences in words and assume that there must be a different meaning. While this is sometimes the case, it is not always true. Tools like dictionaries and more importantly Biblical context should be considered when ascertaining the meaning of words. I take Myles Smith’s admonition to the “gentle reader” as a statement of caution against dogmatizing upon words given the translational principles utilized by the translators.

- The purpose of the last quote from the pen of Myles Smith is not to set forth an exhaustive list of English words to which the principle applies but to establish the principle as a governing feature of the translator’s work and practice. There are many more pairs of English synonyms to which the principle applies than can be covered in this Lesson.
- Smith’s next two sentences make it clear that the King James translators rejected what we have called in this class *verbatim identity of wording*.
 - “Thus to mince the matter, we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the Atheist, than bring profit to the godly Reader. For is the kingdom of God to become words or syllables? why should we be in bondage to them if we may be free, use one precisely when we may use another no less fit, as commodiously?”
- Put another way, rigidity in translation i.e., woodenly using the same English word every time would “breed scorn in the Atheist” rather than “bring profit to the godly Reader,” by causing them to “savour more of curiosity.” Smith rhetorically questions, “is the kingdom of God to become words or syllables?” To which he answers, “why should we be in bondage to them if we may be free, use one precisely when we may use another no less fit, as commodiously?” Put another way, Smith represents the translators as rejecting *verbatim identity of wording* as the standard. As long as a given word accurately captured the sense and force of the original language texts, the translators viewed themselves as “free” to employ English synonyms. The King James translators approved of *substantive doctrinal equivalence* without demanding *verbatim identity of wording*.
- Smith defends the translator’s principle and practice by appealing to the fact that the scriptures themselves use “divers words” to talk about the same thing.
 - “A godly Father in the Primitive time showed himself greatly moved, that one of newfangledness called [NOTE: Greek omitted but was a dispute over the word for "a bed"] though the difference be little or none; and another reporteth that he was much abused for turning *Cucurbita* (to which reading the people had been used) into *Hedera*. Now if this happens in better times, and upon so small occasions, we might justly fear hard censure, if generally we should make verbal and unnecessary changings. We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good English words. For as it is written of a certain great Philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped; for their fellows, as

good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always, and to others of like quality, Get ye hence, be banished forever, we might be taxed peradventure with S. *James* his words, namely, *To be partial in ourselves and judges of evil thoughts*. Add hereunto, that niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling, and so was to be curious about names too: also that we cannot follow a better pattern for elocution than God himself; therefore he using divers words, in his holy writ, and indifferently for one thing in nature: we, if we will not be superstitious, may use the same liberty in our English versions out of *Hebrew* and *Greek*, for that copy or store that he hath given us.”

- Any ambiguity in the portion cited above can be cleared up by looking at the Modern Form set forth by Drs. Rhodes and Lupas above. The bottom line is this, according to Rhodes and Lupas:
 - “We cannot observe a better pattern of expression than God himself; who used different words without distinction in his holy scriptures when referring to the same thing. Unless we are superstitious, we may use the same liberty in our English versions of the Hebrew and Greek, based on the resources he has given us.” (Rhodes & Lupas, 84)
- According to Myles Smith, the translators did not tie themselves “to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words” i.e., they did not require *verbatim identity of wording* by using a principle of rigidity. Rather they followed God’s “pattern for elocution” and used “divers words” to refer to the same thing just as God Himself did when inspiring the “holy writ.” Smith’s argument is essentially, “we sought to mirror the way the scriptures were inspired. If you have a problem with it, take up with the Almighty.”
- On this point, before moving on, the thoughts of Dr. David Norton on this first half of paragraph seventeen are interesting to consider. In his 2011 publication for Cambridge University Press titled *The King James Bible: A Short History From Tyndale to Today* Dr. Norton states the following:
 - “Identity of phrasing is a particularly difficult issue in translating the Bible. Unvaried translation would have the advantage of allowing the reader to perceive identities in the original languages, but, ever setting aside the huge problem of different meanings in different contexts, there was also the very practical problem of achieving consistency across different groups of translators. Even when it would seem to be a straightforward matter, as when two Gospels have the identical Greek phrase, the KJB often varies its translation. The same Greek that is translated in Matthew as ‘they toil not, neither do they spin’ (6:28) is ‘they toil not, they spin not’ in Luke 12:27. Both are good, the Matthew producing a pleasing cadence, while the Luke follows the Greek literally. Sometimes the translators go the other way, and use a single English word for different Greek words (in English the statements just quoted from both begin ‘consider’, but the Greek has different verbs).” (Norton, 114-115)
 - “This is at once serious and witty, playing with the idea that the words of the English language are an abundance (‘copy’ means copiousness) given by God in the same way that he created the original words of Scripture. As God’s creations, all have equal title to be in the Bible. As well as seriously invoking the precedent or varied vocabulary and

phrasing in the Bible, this ingeniously justifies variety in the English. But, if one fit word is as good as another, there is a strong sense that truth is not tied to the particular words. Earlier, Smith argued that the ‘the King’s speech which he uttered in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian and Latin, is till the King’s speech, though it be not interpreted by every translator with the like grace, nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor expressly for sense, everywhere’ (p. xxviii): essence is separate from verbal form. Now the drift of his argument is to downplay the particular words the translators have chosen: they are not the truth but way to the truth. There is a paradox here. The translators examined the words of the original with immense subtlety, they chose their words with fidelity, precision and sensitivity, but they caution against taking them too absolutely. ‘Niceness in words,’ too pedantic an attention to the letter, Smith warns, ‘was always accounted the next step to trifling’. In effect he is saying, we have done our best, but do not make too much of it.” (Norton, 116)

Avoiding Extremes

- In the next sentence of paragraph seventeen Smith explains that the translators have sought to avoid the ditches or extremes along both sides of the translational road as it were. According to Olga S. Opfell, Smith “delights in the middle way between Puritan (Geneva) and papist (Rheims) versions.” (Opfell, 110)
 - “Lastly, we have on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the old Ecclesiastical words, and betake them to other, as when they put *washing* for *Baptism*, and *Congregation* instead of *Church*: as also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their *Azimes*, *Tunike*, *Rational*, *Holocausts*, *Praepuce*, *Pasche*, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may be kept from being understood.”

Puritan Extreme

- According to Smith, the first ditch the translators sought to avoid was that of the Puritans, “who leave the old Ecclesiastical words, and betake them to other, as when they put *washing* for *Baptism*, and *Congregation* instead of *Church*.” Recall that the Puritans were the faction of the English Church that desired further reforms beyond those exhibited by the Anglican Church. Generally, Puritans desired to rid the Church of England of practices and vocabulary that they thought smacked of Roman Catholicism.
- Please recall from [Lesson 158](#) that one of Archbishop Bancroft’s fourteen Rules addressed the issue of “old Ecclesiastical words” in the AV. Rule 3 stated the following:
 - “The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, viz.: the word ‘Church’ not to be translated ‘Congregation’ etc.”
- Dr. Gordon Campbell of Oxford University offered the following commentary on Rule 3 in his book *Bible: The Story of the King James Version 1611-2011*.

- “The implementation of this rule was to be a persistent source of puritan objections to the KJV, as puritans, appropriating Tyndale’s argument preferred ‘congregation’ to ‘church’, ‘wash’ to ‘baptize,’ ‘elder’ or ‘senior’ to bishop,’ and ‘minister’ to ‘priest.’” (Campbell, 36)
- Smith’s comment about “old Ecclesiastical words” in subsection fifteen of the Preface indicates that Rule 3 was followed by the translators with a high degree of fidelity.

Roman Catholic Extreme

- The second ditch on the other side of the road the translators sought to avoid was the Roman Catholic ditch. Regarding this ditch Smith stated, “also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their *Azimes*, *Tunike*, *Rational*, *Holocausts*, *Praepuce*, *Pasche*, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may be kept from being understood.”
- This statement is interesting in that it demonstrates that the Douay Old Testament, along with some of its unique readings, were known to Myles Smith when he wrote the Preface. The words *azimes*, *tunike* (tunic), *rational* (breastplate), *holocausts*, *praepuce*, and *pasche* mentioned in Smith’s Preface are all found in the Douay-Rheims Bible with “*tunike*” and “*rational*” only occurring in the Douay Old Testament which was published in two volumes in 1609 and 1610. (Vance, 319)
- Smith’s statement here in subsection fifteen regarding the Catholic Bible is interesting for a couple of reasons. First, it seems to contradict an earlier statement made by Smith in subsection twelve titled “An answer to the imputations of our adversaries.”
 - “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.”
- In this statement from subsection twelve Smith seems to be saying that the translators, i.e., “we”, had not yet seen a Roman Catholic copy of “the whole Bible as yet.” Yet in subsection fifteen Smith cites word usage choices from both the Old (1609 and 1610) and New (1582) Testaments of the Douay-Rheims Bible. How are we to reconcile these seemingly contrary statements from the pen of Myles Smith. In my mind, the most charitable interpretation is to view Smith as speaking on behalf of all the translators in subsection twelve who indeed had not seen “the whole bible as yet” put forth by their Roman Catholic adversaries since the Old Testament was not yet available when the bulk of the Company work took place between 1604 and 1609. Whereas, in subsection fifteen of the Preface, it is arguably written in late 1610 or early 1611 as the final preparations for the press were underway. Therefore, Smith in his person would have had the liberty to inspect the Douay Old Testament in its entirety before authoring the Preface.
- The above point alludes to a second matter of interest centered around Myles Smith’s mention of Catholic readings in subsection fifteen. Namely, the timing of when the Douay Old Testament

was published within the chronology in production of the AV. My friend and fellow researcher Christopher Yetzer states the following in a yet unpublished essay on this topic.

- “The Rheims New Testament was printed in 1582 and was clearly available and used by the translators.⁶⁰ The Old Testament was printed at Douai, France in two volumes in 1609 and 1610. According to the 1609 preface, these were made to complete the work of the 1582 Rheims New Testament and create a whole Catholic translation of the Scriptures. The approbation for both Douai volumes is dated November 8, 1609. The first volume surely would have been available at least to the general committee which met in London. Bois’ letters to Isaac Casaubon near the end of 1610 and the past tense reference to Bancroft in the preface who died in November 1610, both demonstrate that most likely the second volume would have been available as well. . . In a previous section of this study I made reference to Smith replying primarily to the 1582 Rheims preface. While that is true, it also seems that he may have made use of the 1609 preface which itself often borrows from the information found in the Rheims preface.” (Yetzer, 7-8)
- In support of this statement, Brother Yetzer goes on to compare Smith’s Preface from 1611 with the earlier Prefaces of Gregory Martin from the 1582 Rheims New Testament and the first volume of the Douay Old Testament from 1609.
 - Smith’s 1611 KJV preface: “on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their *Azimes, Tunike, Rational, Holocausts, Præpuce, Pasche*, and a number of such like,”
 - 1609 Douai preface: “And why then may we not say *Prepuce, Phase or Pasch, Azimes, Bredes of Proposition, Holocaust*, and the like? Rather than as Protestants translate them: *Foreskinne, Passeover, The feast of swete breades, Shew breades, Burnt offerings: &c.*”
 - 1582 Rheims preface: “*The Pasche. The feaste of Azymes. The bread of Proposition. Which they translate The Passeover, The feast of swete bread, The shew bread.”” (Yetzer, 8)*
- Elaborating on a point cited by Lawrence Vance, Brother Yetzer states the following after quoting the three prefaces:
 - “Besides the words which Smith used that are also found in the 1609 preface, another reason this may more clearly represent the 1609 text is that the 1582 Rheims used breast-plate in Ephesians 6:14 and 1 Thessalonians 5:8 instead of rational which was only used in the Douai Old Testament. Also the New Testament never used tunic as the Old Testament did.” (Yetzer, 8)
- Footnote 194 from *The Translators to the Reader: The Original Preface to the King James Version of 1611 Revisited* by Rhodes and Lupas is also extremely helpful in bringing clarity to this difficult topic. Therefore, we have included it below in its entirety.

- “This phrase may be an answer to a remark in the Preface of the Douay Old Testament of 1609, leaf +5 recto: “And why then may we not say *prepuce*, *phase* or *pasch*, *azimes*, *bread of proposition*, *holocaust*, and the like, rather than as protestants translate them: *foreskin*, *passover*, *the feast of sweet breads*, *shewbreads*, *burnt offerings*, etc.”

Azyme (see *OED* and Lat. *azymus*, Gk. ἄζυμος,) is first used in print in the Rheims New Testament of 1582, where it is the only rendering of Gk. ἄζυμος (see Matthew 26.17; Mark 14.1; Luke 22.1; 1 Corinthians 5.7, etc.). It also occurs in the Douay Old Testament (Exodus 8.15; 13.6-7; Joshua 5.11, etc.), where phrases such as *unleavened bread* or *bread without leaven* are used as well (Genesis 19.3; Exodus 12.8, 20, 39; Leviticus 2.4, etc.). *Unleavened bread* is the translation used in the KJV following the Geneva Bible. The Bishops’ Bible has sweet bread, following Tyndale and Coverdale (which also has *sweet cakes* in the Old Testament).

***Tunic* does not occur in the Rheims New Testament**, where Greek χιτών is rendered by *coat* (see Matthew 5.40; 10.10; Mark 14.63; Luke 6.29; John 19.23; Jude 23, etc.). **It is used, however, in the Douay Old Testament of 1609** (see, for instance, Exodus 28.39; 29.5,8; Leviticus 8.7). The KJV has coat and clothes.

Rational (see *OED* and Lat. *rationale*) is the breastplate worn by the Jewish high-priest. It first occurs in Wycliffe’s translation of the Bible, which dates from the 1380s and was first printed in 1850. **The word does not occur in the Rheims New Testament but is used frequently in the Douay Old Testament, often in the phrase *rationale of judgement*** (see Exodus 28.15-26; 29.5; 39.8, 15-18, etc.). In the KJV, this word is rendered as *breastplate*.

Holocaust (see *OED* and Lat. *holocaustum*) is already used in Tyndale’s New Testament of 1526 (Mark 12.33; Hebrews 10.6, 8). It occurs in both the Rheims New Testament and the Douay Old Testament (see, besides the examples from Mark and Hebrews quoted above, Exodus 18.12; 20.24; Leviticus 1.3, etc.). The KJV prefers the phrases *burnt offerings* or *burnt sacrifice*.

Prepuce (see *OED* *prepuce* and Lat. *præputium*) is first attested in Wycliffe’s translation of the Bible. The Rheims-Douay version uses it often (Genesis 17.11; Exodus 4.25; Deuteronomy 10.16; Romans 2.25, etc.), but the KJV has only foreskin in the Old Testament and *uncircumcision* in the New Testament.

Pasche is adapted from Lat. *pascha* and is used under different variant forms since about 1200 (see *OED* *pasch*). In Wycliffe’s translation it appears as *phask* (Exodus 12.43), in the Rheims New Testament, as *pasche* (Matthew 26.2; Mark 14.1), in the Douay Old Testament as *phase* (Exodus 12.21; Leviticus 23.5; Numbers 9.2). The translation passage is used in the Douay version of Exodus 12.27, while *passover* is the only term used in the KJV.” (Rhodes & Lupas, 61)

- Lastly, Myles Smith seems to be suggesting that the Papists chose these obscure English words to intentionally “darken the sense.” Furthermore, this purposeful choice made by Catholic translators was made to be “kept from being understood” since the Catholics could not avoid

making an English translation. Therefore, the Papists sought to bind up the word of God in English so that the Catholic laity could not understand, according to Myles Smith.

- After contrasting the views of the Puritans and Papists when it comes to word choices, Smith ends paragraph seventeen with the following statement:
 - “But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of *Canaan*, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar.”
- The translators desired that the scriptures speak like they do in Hebrew i.e., “the language of *Canaan*.” Put another way, they should speak and sound like themselves without any needless ambiguity so they can be “understood” by the most uneducated commoner i.e., “the very vulgar.” That is without the excessive rigidity of Puritan preferences or the intentional difficulty of the Papists.
- We will look at the last paragraph of the Preface in the next Lesson.

Works Cited

- Campbell, Gordon. *Bible: The Story of the King James Version*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Norton, David. *The King James Bible: A Short History From Tyndale to Today*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Opfell, Olga S. *The King James Bible Translators*. Jefferson & London: McFarland, 1982.
- 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.
- Vance, Lawrence M. "Chapter 4: The Rheims New Testament and the Authorized Version" in *The Text of the King James Bible*. Orland: Vance Publications, 2021.
- Yetzer Christopher. "The Very Vulgar" Unpublished Essay.