THE PREFATORY MATERIALS OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE

The Translators’ Dedication to King James and their Address to the Reader in the King James Bible.
Introduction

This work was written around 2003/2004. It was later condensed significantly and formed part of the Guide to the Pure Cambridge Edition.

It is an initial treatment and attempt to understand the teachings and the references of the King James Bible translators’ scholarship. Since this work was analytical and notational in nature, and represented initial investigations into these details, it must contain various crudities and incomplete assessments. Thus, it must be stressed that this is only a novice study.

As the King James Bible went to the press in 1611, a dedication was written by Thomas Bilson, and an admonition to the reader was written by Miles Smith. These two works in combination show the intention of the translators in their work, and explain various principles in their labouring to present of the Word of God.

These two works are called “The Epistle Dedicatory” and “The Translators to the Reader”. This work treats both these statements.
§ I. Notes on The Epistle Dedicatory

¶ 1. Overview of The Epistle Dedicatory

The Dedication was written by the 1611 translator, Thomas Bilson. It appeared in the 1611 Edition, and has been retained in Cambridge Bibles ever since. A full and proper Cambridge copy of The Epistle Dedicatory (TED) has been supplied, mainly because of slight differences that can be observed in it in different King James Bibles. It is also cut short in some, probably for the reason of eliminating anti-Romanist statements, most specifically, “Popish Persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us” (TED, Paragraph 5). However, this statement should be retained as it is a historical fact. Some publishers do not print The Epistle Dedicatory at all.

The Epistle receives relatively little comment, but has been generally slandered for its enthusiastic royalism. The Epistle Dedicatory was basically a tribute to King James, and ascribed the entire work to him, thus the proper title of the version as being the Authorized King James Version of the Holy Bible, since it was both authorised by and dedicated to him.

It seems that Shakespeare was paraphrasing from this document when, in 1612 or 1613, he wrote in his play, Henry VIII:

“Dread Sovereign, how much are we bound to heaven
In daily thanks, that gave us such a prince;
Not only good and wise, but most religious:
One that, in all obedience, makes the church
The chief aim of his honour; and, to strengthen
That holy duty, out of dear respect,
His royal self in judgment comes to hear
The cause betwixt her and this great offender.”

¶ 2. Commentary and analysis of The Epistle Dedicatory

The Epistle Dedicatory has been broken down into portions, representing the 1611 Edition and the Cambridge side by side, with a central column giving the reference as to where the portion belongs in the document, which is also useful for quotations. A series of small notational letters in the 1611 Edition’s text correspond to a section dealing on differences between the 1611 Edition and the present edition, and other textual variants.

1611 EDITION. TED INTR. CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTIE Prince, IAMES by the grace of God King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.

TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE JAMES, BY THE GRACE OF GOD, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND IRELAND, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, &c.

The Epistle Dedicatory is named so in the heading on the second page in Cambridge Bibles, and the second and third pages of the 1611 Reprint. It was written as an open letter to King James the First from the translators of the King James Bible; the language is eloquent throughout, as befitting a king (see Acts 2:42–3). King James was not the first king to be called “high”: Ireland had its high king;
Melchizedek was the king of Salem, and priest of the most high God (see Genesis 14:18) and a type of Christ, a high priest (see Hebrews 5:10), and God Himself is Most High. According to the doctrine of “divine representation”, the king or chief magistrate was a representative of God upon the earth, set up by God, and responsible to Him (see Romans 13:1–7). While the passage in Romans 13:1–7 has been interpreted to relate to authorities in the Church (see 1 Corinthians 12:28), the passage also relates to civil authority, (see 1 Peter 2:27). “Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.” (Romans 13:7). A ruler, such as a king, is responsible to God. If he is evil, he is subject to perishing, “When the wicked rise, men hide themselves: but when they perish, the righteous increase.” (Proverbs 28:28). It is always justifiable for righteousness to be established in the stead of wickedness. Oliver Cromwell proved it, in establishing monarchical principles upon the Bible. There was no reason for King James to be overthrown, because he was, in God’s eyes, a king who did good.

The title should not be misread as “Prince James”, but “prince” described the state of being first, or principal, as Abraham was called (see Genesis 23:6). The name “James” is the Greek form of “Jacob”, which appears in the New Testament as the name of the half brother of Jesus, who led the Jerusalem Church, and also of the apostle, the brother of John. King James was the first of England by that name: originally king of Scotland, he was born in 1566, and ruled on the throne of England from 1603 to 1625, the year he died. He was the first Stuart monarch. His most famous attribute besides his Bible version was that he advocated the divine right of kings. It was not by man, but by God’s grace and providence that James was king of England (see 1 Corinthians 15:10). It was providential that James was the king, and from this position he curbed the excesses of Calvinism and kept England free from the rule and terror of Romanism.

King James ruled Great Britain, that is, the island consisting of England, Scotland and Wales. England already ruled Wales, and since James was the king of Scotland, this solidified the “United Kingdom”. Since William the Conqueror of Normandy had established his rule in England, the English monarchs had the right to the throne of France. These claims led to the Hundred Years’ War, which England ultimately lost, and concluded with English dominion of only the channel islands. Since the French Revolution, and in light of the death of the heir to the French throne in 1783, the monarch of England could, in effect, be the royal head of France. The Irish were conquered by England in 1771, and had to be pacified at various times through history because some of the Irish were rebellious due to the influence of Romanism. Since the Irish monarchs had been lost, this could allow for the monarch of England to claim to be the sovereign head of that island. In modern times it is unlikely that the monarch of England should claim France or Ireland, in that there is a trend toward the division and ending of anything which made the British Empire great.

The title “Defender of the Faith” (see Jude verse 3) was given to Henry the Eighth by Pope Leo the Tenth for his attack on Martin Luther. This title was ratified by King Henry’s parliament in 1544. However, the “faith” which King James contended for was not Romanism, but Protestantism.

The translators were godly men, and their language here reflected the style of the Pauline Pastoral Epistles in their will for grace, mercy and peace (see 1 Timothy 1:2, 2 Timothy 1:2 and Titus 1:4). The translators also showed that the witness of the Holy Ghost was present, since no one could say
that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Spirit (see 1 Corinthians 12:3). Thus, the translators were true and genuine Christians, and that King James himself was also a Christian.

GReat and manifold were the blessings (most dread Soueraigne) which Almighty GOD, the Father of all Mercies, bestowed vpon vs the people of ENGLAND, when first he sent your Maiesties Royall person to rule and raigne ouer us.5

England at the time was in danger of falling back to Romanism: “Therefore thou deliveredst them into the hand of their enemies, who vexed them: and in the time of their trouble, when they cried unto thee, thou hearest them from heaven; and according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them saviours, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies.” (Nehemiah 9:27). King James kept Britain from falling back to a state of Romanism. This was the mercy of God at work (see 2 Corinthians 1:3). Such a state led to great thanksgiving to God for His work (see 2 Corinthians 1:11, 1 John 3:1). “Seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy providence, We accept it always, and in all places, most noble Felix, with all thankfulness.” (Acts 24:2b, 3).

The rule was the authority, the royal power and administration, while the reign was the period and time in which the rule outworked. King James both ruled and reigned.

The translators well understood not only the Bible, but the times and seasons, that is, the signs around them. They knew that England was being blessed. And the blessing was for a purpose, namely, for the propagation of the Bible throughout the world. These words foreshow that one day, the greatest blessing of all, the Word of God, would be — by God’s grace and favour — put forth in its most purified form all over the world.
when we beheld the government established in your HIGHNESSE, and your hopeful Seed, by an undoubted Title, and this also accompanied with Peace and tranquillitie, at home and abroad.

There was a great amount of distrust toward foreigners in England. King James, who was Scottish, had his reputation smeared and blackened by various enemies, especially religious extremists and Romanists. Regardless of this, in the eyes of the Church of England as shown in the Epistle Dedicatory, King James was presented as a saviour, figuratively represented as the deliverer of Sion, and made like Christ the great King (see Romans 11:26).

Queen Elizabeth the First was figuratively presented as the Star of the West, the Evening Star — Venus — primarily for her popularity and goddess-like attributes. She was also Lady of the Sea, with her naval victory over the Spanish Armada in 1588. Queen Elizabeth died in 1603, but the love toward her was still strong in 1610 when Bilson wrote this Epistle.

It may be observed through the Old Testament that the religious persuasion of the monarch had great affect and influence on the populace. When Henry the Eighth sundered from the Papacy, England followed, and more so with Edward the Sixth. There was a darkening in England during the fires of the Romanist Queen Mary. Protestantism was ascendant again under Queen Elizabeth and King James. The trend toward Protestantism meant that a Romanist monarch could not be allowed, whether it was Charles the First or James the Second.

The darkness seemed threatening (see Job 3:4, 5; 10:21, 22 and Isaiah 60:1, 2). The appearance of King James as the sun was not merely a slow dawning, but the midday sun coming from behind great storm clouds that dissolved into nothing. The entire image was taken from a prophecy about Christ: “The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up.” (Matthew 4:16). It was similar to Melchizedek who appears on the scene as a fully fledged king without a history.

The government of a true king is of righteous judgment, establishing truth in the land (see Psalm 99:4, Proverbs 25:5; 29:4, 14).

The heirs of King James were Prince Henry, who died in 1612, and King Charles, whose reign began in 1625 and ended with execution in 1649 because of his Romanism. King James himself was the son of Mary Queen of Scots, whose grandmother was the sister of King Henry the Eighth. James was already King James the Sixth of Scotland before he took the throne of England, doing so because Queen Elizabeth left no heir. King James ruled in a time when England was not beset by outright wars. James in fact proposed peace with Spain, rather counter to the animosities which had occurred during Elizabeth’s naval war with Spain.

The progress of the Church with the Word is full of hope. Nothing, whether plots, confusion or other darkness can confound what God is doing in setting up His witness. England was raised up by God to bring the Gospel to the world, and it was through this that the Word of God might have both grounds and continuence in the last days. Even though England and much of the Church have been compromised, corrupted and fallen, God still had His faithful remnant, a continuing witness
with the Word of God, being blessed and brought forth by His hand, to be preachers to the world in the last days.

But amongst all our joys, there was no one that more filled our hearts, then the blessed continuance of the Preaching of GODS sacred word amongst us, which is that inestimable treasure, which excelleth all the riches of the earth, because the fruit thereof extendeth it selfe, not onely to the time spent in this transitory world, but directeth and disposeth men unto that Eternall happiness which is aboue in Heauen.

"I EXHORT therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." (1 Timothy 2:1–4). The Word being preached (especially by the allowance of the government) would have tremendous results, for by it men would prosper (see Psalm 1) and would be born again (see 1 Peter 1:23). It was for this reason that the Word was esteemed (see Psalm 119:103, 128, 140, Job 23:12). The Word would inevitably bring forth fruit of its own power in any place, including England (see Colossians 1:6). Such fruits would be eternal, even though the world would fail (see 2 Corinthians 4:18). "So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed." (Acts 19:20). These were the true glad tidings (see Luke 8:1).

The greatest blessing for a Bible believing nation was not merely military or financial might, but that the Word of God was by them both held and spread forth.

Then, not to suffer this to fall to the ground, but rather to take it vp, and to continue it in that state, wherein the famous predecessour of your HIGHNESSE did leaue it; Nay, to goe forward with the confidence and resolution of a Man in maintaining the truth of CHRIST, and propagating it farre and neere, is that which hath so bound and firmly knit the hearts of all your MAIESTIES loyall and Religious people vnto you, that your very Name is precious among them, their eye doeth behold you with comfort, and they blesse you in their hearts, as that sanctified person, who vnder GOD, is the immediate authour of their true happiness.
happinesse.

No word of God would fail or fall to the ground, as shown in Samuel’s words (see 1 Samuel 3:19). In like manner, King James ensured that the version would continue that very thing: the King James Bible would perpetuate the infallible Word of God, as it does to this present day. Even as the Word of God had been preserved and purified through the reign of Elizabeth, so that the final labours could be bestowed in the time of James. The Bishops’ Bible was the standard Bible of Elizabethan times, though its rival, the Geneva, was more popular. These led to the final version, the King James Bible.

The Word itself was to be taken up, just as the Apostle John took the Word (see Revelation 5:7; 10:10), and Augustine of Hippo was directed to “Take up and read, take up and read the Scriptures” (see TTR, Section 4). And after this, it was needful to continue in it (see John 8:31). “But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.” (2 Timothy 3:14–17).

King James would be remembered for his writings and arguments, most especially against false and excesses of religion. Most especially, his name would thereafter be perpetuated with the Gospel wheresoever it would be preached in the English tongue, because of the Bible version which bears his name. The name of King James was in later history slandered: he was accused of being an effeminate and shambling imbecile who dribbled while fawning over his favourites. Such charges were originally made by those suspicious of Scottish intentions, and continue to be presented modern works. However, these gross distortions of physical and mental deformities in King James are untrue.

As to the Christianity and virtue of King James, he was sanctified by God, separated for service, yet still a man. On a certain occasion David, a future king, partook of the holy shewbread, knowing that it was still bread all the same (see 1 Samuel 21:4–6); nevertheless, there were some requirements for partaking of the consecrated bread. Again, Jeremiah the prophet was called according to the purpose of God, and responsible (see Jeremiah 1:5). These are taken to apply to King James, who as a king, was ordained of God for the purpose of ruling the nation, and perpetuating special works, for the good of the people (see Proverbs 14:28, 34, 35; 16:10, 15; 22:11, Ecclesiastes 8:2). “THE king’s heart is in the hand of the L ORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will.” (Proverbs 21:1).

“It is be that giveth salvation unto kings: who delivereth David his servant from the hurtful sword. Rid me, and deliver me from the hand of strange children, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of falsehood: That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth; that our daughters may be as corner stones, polished after the similitude of a palace: That our garners may be full, affording all manner of store: That our sheep may bring forth thousands and ten thousands in our streets: That our oxen may be strong to labour; that there be no breaking in, nor going out; that there be no complaining in our streets. Happy is that people, that is in such a case: yea, happy is that people, whose God is the LORD.” (Psalm 144:10–15).
doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled, manifesting it self abroad in the farthest parts of Christendom, by writing in defence of the Truth, (which hath given such a blow unto that man of Sinne, as will not be healed) and every day at home, by Religious and learned discourse, by frequenting the house of God, by hearing the word preached, by cherishing the Teachers thereof, by caring for the Church as a most tender and loving nourcing Father.

That which is good accrues value (see Leviticus 25:16). Zeal toward the house of God was central in Christ Himself (see John 2:17).

Christendom was the places where Christianity had political recognition. The term was used by the Romanists to describe the state of Europe in the Middle Ages, an ecclesiastical Roman Empire, as well as toward the Orthodox as Eastern Christendom. The word was used to refer to where Christianity had dominion, and in the Millennium, Christ’s dominion would be absolute and universal. Thus, King James’ name would go out and be found throughout Christendom. This could only be possible with the globalisation of the English language.

The Gospel was to be defended (see Philippians 1:7, 17), and was being done so by King James when he wrote a pamphlet against the Papacy. The Papacy had been identified as the Antichrist (see 2 Thessalonians 2:3), and also was a great false prophet in the earth, (see Revelation 13:11–18). The “deadly wound” was caused by the Reformation and the ending of the power of the Papacy in 1798, but it would not be wrong to interpret that King James himself had done such a thing. The sword of the hand of the ruler (see Romans 13:4) could be the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God (see Ephesians 6:17), and in particular, the King James Bible. However, the “deadly wound” has healed, but ultimately Rome and the future and Antichrist are doomed.

The Gospel and preaching did not cease (see Acts 5:42 and Romans 10:13–17). “How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!” (Romans 10:15b). Such preachers should be valued (see Romans 16:1–2), even as the king did so, like a nursing father (see Numbers 11:12 and Isaiah 49:23).
True religion was of works, not merely mental ascent (see James 1:25–27). It was practically shown and outworked by King James, who accomplished the work of organising the translation, organisation, finance and everything that was necessary to the production of the new version: all the work of the translators was ultimately pushed by King James. The publishing of the King James Bible and its public release was a great venture, and a sizable amount of finances were involved. Robert Barker, the printer, considered this work to be an investment.

Since King James was the principal figure behind this version, it bore his name throughout the ages. Furthermore, this Bible version was controlled by the crown, unlike the Tyndale or the Geneva versions. The King James Bible was done by royal command, and the right to it has been hereditary, though it has been made available to the public domain.

The idea of the new translation was proposed by King James after hearing the complaints of the Puritan Millinery Petition at Hampton Court. This new version was to consider the original tongues, that is, Hebrew and Greek, which were all available in various copies and critical editions, as well as the former English versions, that is, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ English Bibles, and other foreign language translations, such as, Latin, French, Spanish, Italian and Dutch (German) Bibles. It would consider the Church Fathers such as Jerome and Augustine of Hippo, others such as Bede and Wycliffe, and all the Protestants, but most especially Tyndale.

The words describing the King James Bible as “one more” translation indicate that the it was to be and seen as the final English Translation. It was an exact translation, that is, not poetic, paraphrased, or otherwise based on corruption. The translators considered that the Scripture was currently available, and currently translated into English. This was done with tremendous foresight, as the English language became the global language.

The king supported the translation process, but it was not unduly rushed, as the Lord promised, “I will hasten my word to perform it.” (Jeremiah 1:12b). The King James Bible translators and others considered the whole matter surrounding and the version itself to be highly important. The Archbishop of Canterbury was put in charge of the work, though he died before the conclusion in 1610. The weightiness of the matter was impressed upon them: this was no mean endeavour wrought
by an individual or a few, it was in every way a rival to the most famous translation of history, the Septuagint, which it far superseded. The Word and work was to be a witness to men, not to be lightly esteemed: “I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.” (Deuteronomy 18:18, 19).

The diligence of the translators was well rewarded (see Proverbs 12:24; 21:5). “Seest thou a man diligent in his business? he shall stand before kings; he shall not stand before mean men.” (Proverbs 22:29). The work was at last concluded: not only being the present labours, but also the end of works to bring about a worthy English translation of the Scriptures. And not as though the others were not worthy, but that this work should be the paragon of quality.

The benefit would be for the whole Church, not merely the Anglican Church, but all the Christian Church of England, and of the English-speaking colonies, and ultimately, the world. For the fruit to be good, the seed had to be good; therefore, the King James Bible was considered to be good in order to get the godly fruit: “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.” (Galatians 6:7–9).

Since the servant (translator) was not greater than his lord (the king), the work was ascribed to King James itself (see John 13:16). The translation was considered a thing of high quality, even compared to other Christian works and endeavours; nevertheless, it was also attacked: the Romanists gave their censures, that is, formalised disapproval, other religious slanderers disliked the Word, choosing rather to continue in lust while theologically justifying their sin with heresy. The king gave the work his
approbation, that is, formalised approval and consent, as well as protection.

King James was known to be a philosopher prince, and a wise judge of policy. From him the translators expected and received his praise (see Luke 17:10 and Romans 13:3), even though calumniations were made, that is false and defamatory statements. The hard interpretations were intended to be stumbling blocks to them. These were not things that were actually hard to understand, but some people were steadfast in false teachings and false accusations against the translators, alleged that they had made wrong translations, all the while, they twisted the Scriptures to their own hurt (see 2 Peter 3:16 and Jeremiah 8:9).

The chief of the traducers, that is, those who were spreading ridicule, were the Romanists. There were Romanists in England, though the more extreme ones had fled or were imprisoned under Queen Elizabeth the First. But there were many more overseas: in Ireland, France, Spain and Italy. The Romanists were spreading evil reports about the translation.

The statement that the translators were poor instruments was not their own admission at all, but a quoted accusation from the Romanists. When the King James Bible or its translators are attacked, such a person is actually aligning themselves with the Romanists, and this is evident because they use the Romanists’ arguments. The Romanists, as evidenced through the Counter-Reformation, considered it their duty and right to educate the people. The Reformation was an unveiling of the Gospel in a time when the Romanists desired to keep the Bible out of the reach of the masses.

There were anti-Romanist Protestants who were also against the King James Bible. These brethren were questionably brethren at all, but heretics and extremists. For example, moderate Puritans and
moderate Anglicans could coexist quite happily: it was the extremists which were the problem (i.e. Romanising ultra-Arminians and hyper-Calvinists). Those who walked their own way (see Romans 12:16) had gone out of the way (see Romans 3:12) into the way of error (see Proverbs 1:16). Most especially, false doctrines which had been framed by misusing Scriptures, namely extreme Calvinism: “Surely your turning of things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter’s clay: for shall the work say of him that made it, He made me not? or shall the thing framed say of him that framed it, He had no understanding?” (Isaiah 29:16). Yet the Bible should not be moved when made by godly workmen (see Isaiah 41:7). The extreme Calvinists held their Geneva Version, and had an aversion to any other, chiefly because they loved its marginal notes. The Geneva Version was good, but they would not relinquish it in the face of something better; but, by the end of the time of Oliver Cromwell, the Geneva Version was dead.

All manner of spiritual arguments could be made for the King James Bible and justifying it, as evidenced in The Translators to the Reader. The witness of the conscience was important. The King James Bible was not coerced, or forced, or done with an evil agenda. The good and Christian character of the translators has been well documented, and praises of them were published for scores of years afterwards. A man who obeyed the king in translating was not doing it unto the king, but unto the Lord (see Ephesians 6:5, 6). The king was the Lord’s representative (see Hebrews 13:17 and 1 Peter 2:17), but it was the Lord’s work, and it was ultimately the Lord who put this into King James’ heart to do it (see Daniel 4:17 and Proverbs 21:1).

The translators indicated that the King James Bible’s witness, and the name of King James would last through all the ages of men. The translators were aware, therefore, at the ramifications of such a project. They knew how much the Septuagint was held in regard, and how much more should the entire Bible in the English tongue should be regarded. The translation of the King James Bible was far more certain and better than the Septuagint, as the translators themselves admitted in The Translators to the Reader. They were also aware that Christian works, including missionary endeavours, establishment of Christian societies, true revivals of religion and general zeal toward God would be enflamed by the King James Bible. All this would go on, despite the florid and verbose condemnations contained in Papal bulls or listings on the Romanist index of banned books, or else the doubtful disputations of renegade Protestants.

King James had a relatively long and relatively successful reign, he had a high degree of learning and knowledge in areas of politics, philosophy and theology. The King James Bible ought to be recognised as the monument that it is in the modern age, and promote great happiness to all Bible-believing Christians. The King James Bible was a gift from God for the Church: “Looking for that
blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” (Titus 2:13),
“But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory
both now and for ever. Amen.” (2 Peter 3:18).

¶ 3. Notes on the text of The Epistle Dedicatory

The text of The Epistle Dedicatory has been edited since 1611, as evidenced by a comparison of the
1611 Edition with the Cambridge Edition. The editing has been done in a process not unlike that
which the Bible text itself has been conformed to, though there are some noticeable differences in
style such as capitalisations and use of italics. The most pertinent differences have been identified
with a notational character in the 1611 text, which aligns to the list below.

a  (Introduction.) The usual rule that the word “LORD” indicates the usage of the word “Jehovah”
makes no sense where the original is English, and where the English word was used. Thus the
Cambridge Edition is consistent with its original tongue. The quotations containing these words in
the New Testament do not present the word with small capital letters.

b  (Paragraph 1.) Nouns such as place names are presented in italic. The 1611 is very haphazard in this
regard.

c  (Paragraph 1.) 1611 should have been spelt “vs”.

d  (Paragraph 2.) 1611 reads “amongst”, Cambridge “among”. There is a difference between “among”
and “amongst”, where “among” refers to being in the mingling or assembling of objects, and
“amongst” refers to dispersion and intermixture with the objects. “Amongst” is more rarely used, and
the Cambridge Edition is correct in this case.

e  (Paragraph 2.) 1611 reads “then”, Cambridge “than”. The old spelling of “than” was “then”.

f  (Paragraph 2.) 1611 reads “amongst”, Cambridge “among”. See note d.

g  (Paragraph 3.) 1611 reads “doeth”, Cambridge “doth”. There is a plain difference between “doeth” and
“doth”, “doeth” is a verb, while “doth” is not.

h  (Paragraph 3.) 1611 reads “doeth”, Cambridge “doth”. See note g.

i  (Paragraph 3.) 1611 reads “towards”, Cambridge “toward”. The word “toward” is used throughout the

j  (Paragraph 3.) 1611 reads “furthest”, Cambridge “farthest”. The proper use of “farthest” means most
far, whereas “furthest” means that there is a possibility to go further, and is at this present only so far.
Clearly, the meaning was supposed to be “farthest”.

k  (Paragraph 4.) 1611 reads “then”, Cambridge “than”. See note e.

l  (Paragraph 4.) 1611 reads “of the accomplishing”, “of accomplishing”. The word “the” has been taken
away, as it appears already in the sentence before the word “vehement”.

m  (Paragraph 5.) 1611 reads “hope”, Cambridge “hopes”. The word “hopes” are plural because they
belong to “we”, that is, more than one.

n  (Paragraph 5.) 1611 reads “then”, Cambridge “than”. See note e.

o  (Paragraph 5.) The apostrophe was not used in 1611.

p  (Paragraph 5.) The hyphen from 1611 has been eliminated.

q  (Paragraph 6.) 1611 reads “later”, Cambridge “latter”. The word “later” does not make sense here,
“latter” is the opposite of “former”, meaning either the New Testament or the Modern Era.

¶ 4. Variants in the text of The Epistle Dedicatory

Paragraph 4. The word “Christian” is presented in the Oxford and London Editions as “christian”
(lowercase) is plainly improper, and not fitting with the capitalisation of the other words in the
Dedication.
Paragraph 5. As above.
The Dedication found in Collins Bibles differs more substantially in punctuation.
§ II. Notes on the text of The Translators to the Reader

¶ 1. Overview of the translators’ preface

The Cambridge Edition of The Translators to the Reader (TTR) has been supplied. The text of the preface as presented is used in this work as the standard text for quotations and commentary. The preface is in the public domain and may be freely used.

The preface was written by Miles Smith, of Brasenose College, Oxford, one of the translators of the King James Bible. He became the Bishop of Gloucester in 1612. “The reputed author of this noble Preface (for, in spite of the quaintness of its style and the old fashion of its learning, it deserves no meaner epithet) is Dr Miles Smith of the first Oxford Company, who would naturally be one of the ... final revisers.”¹ “His Preface for many years stood at the beginning of the version. But for various reasons — its length, its obscurity, its controversial and academic character — it has gradually come to be omitted by modern publishers of the King James [Bible]”.²

It appeared in the first King James Bible printed in 1611, and in later King James Bibles. Since 1769 it has grown more and more rare. All the major publishers have editions with the preface, and it can also be found in various other tracts and books, such as Scrivener (1884), The Trinitarian Bible Society (1911), Goodspeed (1935), Beegle (1960), &c. A vast majority of present King James Bibles do not contain the preface. It was once printed separately and distributed as a tract by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

¶ 2. The need for a standard text of the translators’ preface

Unlike The Epistle Dedicatory, quite noticeable differences can be found in the texts of The Translators to the Reader, especially in the most readily available and supplied copies. The reasons for this are on account of the general rarity of the preface, and secondly, the ready supply of edited editions directly based on the 1611 Edition.

The preface has undergone a history similar to the text of the King James Bible, and its texts can be classified into broad groups.

1. The first class are those which rigidly follow the text from 1611, such as reprints and facsimiles. For example, in Section 11, the word “perfected” is spelt in 1611 as “perfited”, while later copies have the regular spelling, “perfected”.

2. The second class are those which exhibit several changes in line with the revisions to which the Bible text was subjected to up to 1769 and beyond, including the standard Cambridge text. Most of these editions are fairly good, and have changes such as “brute beasts” not “bruit-beasts”, or “an hole” not “a hole” in Section 1, Paragraph 1.

3. The third class are those which attempt to restore (or follow) the 1611 text while introducing some modern spelling and punctuation (to greater or lesser extents). These editions have been created on misguided principles, and are flawed:
   a. They are not based on a final authority. Even if they were to consult what Miles Smith actually wrote by hand, (which is possibly in the Bodleian Library, Oxford), they would still be introducing
changes by altering spelling and the like. They do not follow the 1611 Edition to the letter, and are making alterations on their own authority.

b. They are based on the typographically inaccurate 1611 Edition, and they perpetuate various mistakes or obscurities, such as presenting the abbreviation for “Saint” as “S.” instead of “St.”

c. They disregard the lineage of proper editions that is available to the present time. They put unauthorised persons, no matter how well educated, as bad interpreters of the original translator’s words.

d. There is no need to “edit the original preface” when it is currently available. The use of the word “original” is almost indicating that current copies are no longer “answerable to the original”. There is no need to “restore” the preface by them, since this actually means turning improvements and corrections back to errors. Worst of all, the redaction done by modern editors disregards the lineage of authoritative and proper copies, and the clear copies which are available, most especially the Cambridge Edition.

4. The fourth class are completely modern versions of the preface, which only vaguely resemble a proper copy of the preface. These are those extremely modernised versions which change the whole tone by introducing modern language and American spelling. These should be discounted altogether.

Several also have purposely adjusted so-called “offensive” statements, like deleting out reference to the Jewish tongue being barbarous, removing a portion which calls certain people “dogs”, or changing an inference to the Popes as being Antichrist.

Since the available editions of The Translators to the Reader contain all types of variations to each other, there has been a need to adhere to a proper standard for the use of quotations and for proper understanding. Scrivener’s Edition would have sufficed, and has been adopted by some scholars, but there are inconsistencies in this text. Also, it is plain that Scrivener systematically rejected almost all changes, attempting to redact the 1611 text to a pedantic degree, even by using identical margin reference marks in the text. His version was the vanguard for those of the third class as listed above.

The Cambridge Edition of the Translators to the Reader has been used and presented, taken from a Bible containing the Pure Cambridge Edition. This particular copy did not use italic type, nor contained marginal notations. The italics have never been used entirely consistently, as some names — such as, Rome, Jews and Philistines — sometimes escaped being italicised. The marginal notes are not necessary for the average reader, and therefore, their removal should not be considered a loss.

¶ 3. Commentary on the translators’ preface

Since the preface is the product of a mind with a classical education of Elizabethan and Jacobean England, one should expect that there may be some difficulties in understanding upon the first reading. It was written to appeal to Puritans and answer Catholics. The preface contains Latin, Greek, allusions to classical history and quotes from early Church Fathers. It would be beneficial to give an overview, the lettering system below each section heading is arbitrary, and the presentation interpretive. The marginal notes of the 1611 Edition are set in square brackets within the text. Also, throughout the text, notational marks link differences between the two editions to a short note at the end of the commentary.
The best things have been slandered
A. The Work ought to be accepted, instead it is rejected
B. It is generally rejected, and has false accusations made against it
C. This is known from history:
   a. New things are often rejected
   b. Even those new things that bring:
      i. Civility
      ii. Law
      iii. Learning
      iv. Discussion
   c. Therefore, anyone rejecting this is foolish, examples:
      i. Some have been killed for bringing civilisation to barbarians
      ii. Some places have made unworkable laws unchangeable
      iii. Some consider learnedness the same as compromise with worldliness
      iv. Some hold doctrinal discussions useless
      v. Some have not held to the Scriptures, but allowed error to poison them
   d. Thus, anyone who is to do anything worthy should expect persecution

D. It is not only the common man who suffers, but the sovereign who sponsors a work, examples:
   a. The Syrian army was commanded to fight against king of Israel, not other soldiers
   b. King David was scoffed at for dancing before the Lord, though others were also joyful
   c. King Solomon was despised for the taxes for the temple, though it was for God

E. It is a hard thing to please everyone, but God is the first one that must be pleased

The best thing is the Word of God, especially the King James Bible, which revised other translations and devised a standard English text. Yet, the Word and the translators were slandered. The King James Bible was for the common good, deserved respect and was worthy of esteem.

“My zeal hath consumed me, because mine enemies have forgotten thy words. Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it. I am small and despised: yet do not I forget thy precepts. Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth.” (Psalm 119:139–142).

“Wherefore thus saith the LORD God of hosts, Because ye speak this word, behold, I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them.” (Jeremiah 5:14).

“For thus saith the LORD, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place. For I know the thoughts
that I think toward you, saith the LORD, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end.” (Jeremiah 29:10, 11).

Clearly, the King James Bible should have been loved, and hearty thanksgiving should have been given to God. But the Presbyterians were suspicious of the work of the Anglican establishment (no Scottish Presbyterians took part in the translation), and the Romanists attempted to bring out their rival English version, the Rheims-Douay Version, which was for the express purpose of countering the Protestant translations. These enemies made petty objections, and even made up lies about the King James Bible, for, no matter how good it was, the enemies were predetermined to reject it. And this same attitude has prevailed among the modernists.

The moderate Puritans were involved with the translation, and were supportive of it. The reason why modern day genuine Christians hold to the King James Bible is because it was accepted by the Puritans in history.

“Story” means the account of past events, the scope of history.

“Remember this, and shew yourselves men: bring it again to mind, O ye transgressors. Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me” (Isaiah 46:8, 9).

When Jesus came, some believed, and some were filled with wrath: “And they were all amazed, and they glorified God, and were filled with fear, saying, We have seen strange things to day.” (Luke 5:26). The King James Bible, at that time was filled with the sense of newness and renewing, but at the same time, it was confronted by evil speaking and persecutors: “Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also.” (John 15:20). The Word of God has been persecuted in history, and the King James Bible has been heavily persecuted. In fact, the King James Bible must be most worthy because so many resist it, even in the present.
A man would think that civility, wholesome laws, learning and eloquence, synods, and church-maintenance, (that we speak of no more things of this kind) should be as safe as a sanctuary, and out of shot, as they say, that no man would lift up the heel, no, nor dog move his tongue against the motioners of them.

The Word of God, especially the King James Bible, was seen as virtuous, to bring goodness to mankind, that it should be untouchable, kept holy, never defeated: “Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.” Ephesians 6:16.

No person should spurn the Word like Judas did, “but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.” (John 13:18). “But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast” (Exodus 11:7).

Briefly, by the fourth, being brought...
together to a parle face to face, we sooner compose our differences than by writings, which are endless:

“God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” (1 Corinthians 1:9, 10). There has been no doubt that the clearest, best and most successful Christianity has been with the King James Bible, because in it the standards of Christianity are revealed (see Hebrews 10:25, 12:15).

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

And lastly, that the Church be sufficiently provided for, is so agreeable to good reason and conscience, that those mothers are holden to be lesse cruell, that kill their children assoone as they are borne, then those nourishing fathers and mothers (wheresoever they be) that withdraw from them who hang upon their breasts (and upon whose breasts again themselves do hang to receive the Spirituall and sincere milke of the word) liuelyhood and support fit for their estates.

“God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” (1 Corinthians 1:9, 10). There has been no doubt that the clearest, best and most successful Christianity has been with the King James Bible, because in it the standards of Christianity are revealed (see Hebrews 10:25, 12:15).

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

And lastly, that the Church be sufficiently provided for is so agreeable to good reason and conscience, that those mothers are holden to be less cruel, that kill their children as soon as they are born, than those nourishing fathers and mothers (wheresoever they be) that withdraw from them who hang upon their breasts (and upon whose breasts again themselves do hang to receive the spiritual and sincere milk of the word) livelihood and support fit for their estates.

“As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby” (1 Peter 2:2).

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things” (2 Timothy 4:2–5a).

The King James Bible was seen as the Word of God for the English-speaking Church, so that Christians everywhere may have the Word, and so be nourished like children, not starved; the King James Bible was sufficient, a provision for Christians, agreeable to good reason, acceptable to the conscience, spiritual, sincere, life-giving and fit for use.

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

Thus it is apparent, that these things which we speake of, are of most necessary use, and therefore, that none, either without absurditie can speake against them, or without note of wickednesse can spurne against them.

Thus it is apparent, that these things which we speak of are of most necessary use, and therefore that none, either without absurdity can speak against them, or without note of wickedness can spurn against them.

Since the King James Bible was so useful for the world, anyone who rejects it was either foolish or willingly wicked.
Yet for all that, the learned know that certaine worthy men [Anacharsis with others.] haue bene brought to untimely death for none other fault, but for seeking to reduce their Countrie-men to good order and discipline:

For though the King James Bible was useful, yet it can be likened to the story of Anacharsis. According to the Greek master historian Herodotus (484–430 B.C.), Anacharsis was an ancient Scythian prince who went to foreign lands to obtain knowledge, but on his return to his own people, was killed for trying to introduce Hellenic customs and religion to the barbarians.

And that in some Common-weales it was made a capitall crime, [Locri.] once to motion the making of a new Law for the abrogating of an old, though the same were most pernicious:

In the case of the Greeks, the commonwealths, or self-sufficient city states called “Locri”, such as Athens, had made it a capital crime to repeal an old law, because the traditions were more important than good laws.

And that certaine, [Cato the elder.] which would be counted pillars of the State, and paternes of Vertue and Prudence, could not be brought for a long time to giue way to good Letters and refined speech, but bare themselues as averse from them, as from rocks or boxes of poison:

Cato (234–139 B.C.) was a politician who attempted to censor liberal behaviour in Rome, he was considered rustic in manner and speech, though he was a learned writer, he, no doubt, regarded being refined as a compromise with cosmopolitanism.

And fourthly, that hee was no babe, but a great clearke, [Gregory the Divine.] that gaue foorth (and in writing to remaine to posteritie) in passion peraduenture, but yet he gaue foorth, that hee had not seene any profit to come by any Synode, or meeting of the Clergie, but rather the contrary:
Gregory of Nazianzus (330–389 A.D.) was a supporter of the Nicene Trinitarian doctrine, and the teacher of Jerome. He withdrew from most Church matters at the time of the Second Church Council at Constantinople, 381 A.D. He was known for his great knowledge, and wrote poems, letters and other orations. The stand on the Trinitarian doctrine preserved Christianity from subjection to heresy.

And lastly, against Church-maintenance and allowance, in such sort, as the Embassadors and messengers of the great King of Kings should be furnished, it is not vnknown what a fiction or fable (so it is esteemed, and for no better by the reporter himselfe, [Nauclerus.] though superstitious) was devised; Namely, that at such time as the professours and teachers of Christianitie in the Church of Rome, then a true Church, were liberally endowed, a voice forsooth was heard from heauen, saying; Now is poison poured down into the Church, &c.

And lastly, against Church-maintenance and allowance, in such sort as the ambassadors and messengers of the great King of kings should be furnished, it is not unknown what a fiction or fable (so it is esteemed, and for no better by the reporter himself, though superstitious) was devised: namely, That at such time as the professors and teachers of Christianity in the Church of Rome, then a true Church, were liberally endowed, a voice forsooth was heard from heaven, saying, Now is poison poured down into the Church, &c.

“From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling” (1 Timothy 1:6).

Foxe's Book of Martyrs has Lord Cobham quoting this statement from the Chronicles of Nauclerus, that when Constantine endowed the Church, an angel in the air cried, “Woe, woe, woe, this day is venom shed into the Church of God.” At one time there were true believers in Rome — the Apostle Paul both wrote them an epistle and went there himself — and those believers should have held to the Word of God, and not turned aside to the old superstitions. There were enough Scriptures and Christians in Rome to make it the best Christian Church, yet poison entered in, and so people turned aside from the truth. Thus, the state and good things of their religion was not maintained, but they were compromised and corrupted.

Thus not only as oft as we speake, as one saith, but also as oft as we do any thing of note or consequence, we subiect our selues to euery ones censure, and happy is he that is least tossed vpon tongues; for utterly to escape the snatch of them it is impossible.

“Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” (2 Timothy 3:12). In Christ, it is inevitable that the Word of God and the people of God are attacked.
If any man conceit, that this is the lot and portion of the meaner sort only, and that Princes are privileged by their high estate, he is deceived.

King James has been extensively attacked, and these attacks are not separate to, but made in connection with the King James Bible. He is called a sodomite, which accusations are based on a false witnesses from his reign, and have no grounds in the truth.

As the sword devoureth as well one as the other, as it is in Samuel; [2. Sam. 11. 25.] nay as the great Commander charged his soldiers in a certaine battell, to strike at no part of the enemie, but at the face; And as the King of Syria commanded his chiefe Captaines to fight neither with small nor great, save onely against the King of Israel: [1. King. 22. 31.] so it is too true, that Enuie striketh most spitefully at the fairest, and at the chiefest.

“Then David said unto the messenger, Thus shalt thou say unto Joab, Let not this thing displease thee, for the sword devoureth one as well as another, make thy battle more strong against the city, and overthrow it: and encourage thou him.” (2 Samuel 6:16). “But the king of Syria commanded his thirty and two captains that had rule over his chariots, saying, Fight neither with small nor great, save only with the king of Israel.” (1 Kings 22:31).

David was a worthy prince, and no man to be compared to him for his first deeds; and yet for as worthy an act as ever he did, even for bringing backe the Arke of God in solemnfitie) he was scorned and scoffed at by his owne wife. [2. Sam. 6. 16.]

“And as the ark of the LORD came into the city of David, Michal Saul’s daughter looked through a window, and saw king David leaping and dancing before the LORD; and she despised him in her heart.” (2 Samuel 6:16).

Solomon was greater than David, though not in virtue, yet in power; and by his power and wisdome he built a Temple to the LORD, such a one was the glory of the land of Israel, and the wonder of the whole world.
“So there was great joy in Jerusalem: for since the time of Solomon the son of David king of Israel there was not the like in Jerusalem.” (2 Chronicles 30:26).

The King James Bible was likened to a magnificent work, which was disliked and grumbled against by some: “But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.” (Acts 5:39).

And he said unto them, What advice give ye that we may return answer to this people, which have spoken to me, saying, Ease somewhat the yoke that thy father did put upon us?” (2 Chronicles 10:9).

“Thy father made our yoke grievous: now therefore make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve thee.” (1 Kings 12:4).

Belike he had charged them with some levies, and troubled them with some carriages; Hereupon they raise vp a tragedie, and wish in their heart the Temple had neuer bene built.

“Your words have been stout against me, saith the LORD. Yet ye say, What have we spoken so much against thee? Ye have said, It is vain to serve God: and what profit is it that we have kept his ordinance, and that we have walked mournfully before the LORD of hosts?” (Malachi 3:13, 14).

The translators admitted that the King James Bible pleased God, and that God was more pleased with it than any man could be. Furthermore, they knew that men of good conscience would accept the work; nevertheless, they expected those who were evil affected to be against it. “But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren.”
2. The highest persons have been slandered
A. The following examples are of rulers who have suffered slander:
   a. Cæsar was considered arrogant for standardising the calendar
   b. Constantine was thought immature in his ready donations to “Christianity”
   c. Theodosius was an intellectual ruler, and so some said he was no warrior
   d. Justinian was accused of reforming the laws just to bring in his own laws
B. Their goodness was spoken against
C. This phenomenon lasts until modern days, examples:
   a. Moses said that the second generation were as bad as the first
   b. Solomon said that there is nothing new, but history repeats itself
   c. Stephen said that the Jews of his day were the same as the unbelievers in Moses’ days

Plutarch (46–119 A.D.) was a historian. Julius Cæsar (100–44 B.C.) invented the Julian Calendar, which was to stabilise timekeeping, as the Calendar would be manipulated for political purposes. Claudius Cæsar (10 B.C.–54 A.D.) was the first Roman Emperor of Britain, and promoted administrative reforms, including the Julian Calendar.
So the first Christened Emperour \cite{Constantine} (at the leastwise that openly professed the faith himselfe, and allowed others to doe the like) for strengthening the Empire at his great charges, and prouiding for the Church, as he did, got for his labour the name Pupillus, \cite{Aurelius Victor} as who would say, a wastefull Prince, that had neede of a Guardian, or overseer.

Constantine (280–337 A.D.) was the Roman Emperor who convert ed to Christianity, though he was actually a pagan. He revi
talised the city of Constantinople. Sextus Aurelius Victor was a historian of the Emperors. Constantine passed an edict which allowed for the free adherence to any deity, and himself supported Christian endeavours against heresy. His wealthy contributions to Christianity were scorned by some.

So the best Christened Emperor, \cite{Theodosius} for the loue that he bare unto peace, thereby to enrich both himselfe and his subiects, and because he did not seeke warre but find it, was judged to be no man at armes, \cite{Zosimus} (though in deed he excelled in feats of chiualrie, and shewed so much when he was prouoked) and condemned for giuing himselfe to his ease, and to his pleasure.

Theodosius (347–395 A.D.) was a Roman Emperor who suppressed heresy and paganism. At this time Germanic peoples were making incursions into the Roman Empire, which had by this time become consumed with self-gratification. Zosimus was Pope from 417 to 418 A.D., when he died.

To be short, the most learned Emperour of former times, \cite{Justinian} (at the least, the greatest politician) what thanks had he for cutting off the superfluities of the lawes, and digesting them into some order and method?

Justinian (483–565 A.D.) was known for his administrative reorganisation of the Eastern Roman Empire, and introduction of a new system of laws.

This, that he hath been blotted by some to bee an Epitomist, that is, one
that extinguished worthy whole volumes, to bring his abridgements into request.

This example links with the accusation by certain that the King James Bible never needed to be made, since the earlier English versions were adequate. This was not the case.

This is the measure that hath been rendered to excellent Princes in former times, even, Cum bene facerent, malè audire, For their good deeds to be euill spoken of.

If the good reforms done by leaders in the past were slandered, then it is not unlikely that King James would be smeared for his authorising of the Authorized Version.

Neither is there any likelihood that envy and malignity died and were buried with the ancient.

Such accusations are perennial, they have been always made, and can yet be heard.

No, no, the reproofe of Moses taketh hold of most ages; You are risen vp in your fathers stead, an increase of sinfull men. [Numb 32. 14.]

"And, behold, ye are risen up in your fathers' stead, an increase of sinful men, to augment yet the fierce anger of the LORD toward Israel." (Numbers 32:14).

What is that that hath been done? that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the Sunne, [Eccles. 1. 9.] saith the wiseman:

"The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun." (Ecclesiastes 1:9).

And St Stephen, As your fathers did, so do ye. [Acts 7. 51.]

"Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." (Acts 7:51).
3. King James’ continuance regardless of the slanders
A. King James, ruler by right, learned, knew that slander would come
B. Though change is necessary, yet it is not abided by some
C. King James continued steadfastly regardless of this
D. It is the duty of a sovereign to uphold religion
   a. They are honoured by men
   b. They are honoured by God

King James the First was consistent in the project, despite the accusations, especially that there had already been sufficient English translations. Interestingly, this accusation is quite reversed today, where there is always a need now for more new translations.

It was recognised that King James had great learning for a king. He was aware, and it came to pass, that the authorising of the King James Bible was thing which led to great criticism: sharp tongues like weapons were set upon his character.
Bible translations were still open for correction in the time of the King James Bible, yet many could not abide change, because they wanted to hold to the old things, even to the disregard of proper translation and truth. “Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.” (Matthew 15:6b).

Notwithstanding his Royal heart was not daunted or discouraged for this or that colour, but stood resolute, as a statue immovable, and an anvil not easy to be beaten into plates, [Suidas. ὡσπερ τις ανδριας απεριτρεπτος και ακμων ανηλατος.] as one sayth; he knew who had chosen him to be a Souldier, or rather a Captaine, and being assured that the course which he intended made much for the glory of God, & the building vp of his Church, he would not suffer it to be broken off for whatsoever speeches or practises.

King James did not waver in his decision to make a new translation, and once done, it would stand. “For the customs of the people are vain: for one cutteth a tree out of the forest, the work of the hands of the workman, with the axe. They deck it with silver and with gold; they fasten it with nails and with hammers, that it move not. They are upright as the palm tree, but speak not: they must needs be borne, because they cannot go. Be not afraid of them; for they cannot do evil, neither also is it in them to do good.” (Jeremiah 10:3–5). “So the carpenter encouraged the goldsmith, and he that smootheth with the hammer him that smote the anvil, saying, It is ready for the sodering: and he fastened it with nails, that it should not be moved.” (Isaiah 41:7). The Authorized Version of the Bible has given great glory to God, built up the Church, and was not stopped just because some did not like it.

Suidas is used as the name of a Greek encyclopædic dictionary containing historical information, dated about the year 1000.

“Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?” (Ecclesiastes 8:4). “For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.” (John 13:15). The king is an example to the people, and so it is proper if the king sanction a religious work, and promote it. This was the exact situation with the authorisation of the King James Bible.
This is their glory before all nations which meane well, and this will bring unto them a farre most excellent weight of glory in the day of the Lord Jesus.

The righteous ruler would be with Christ in the judgment, and the righteous nation with him: “The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.” (Matthew 12:42).

For the Scripture saith not in vaine, Them that honor me, I will honor, [1. Sam 2. 30.] neither was it a vaine word that Eusebius deliuered long agoe, [θεοσεβεια. Eusebius lib. 10. cap. 8.] that pietie towards God was the weapon, and the onely weapon that both preserued Constantines person, and auenged him of his enemies.

“Wherefore the LORD God of Israel saith, I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me for ever: but now the LORD saith, Be it far from me; for them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.” (1 Samuel 2:30).

Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine, wrote the Ecclesiastical History, which gave the history of the Church to his time. He wrote commentaries and was a contemporary of Constantine, writing about him after his death. He did not recognise the primacy of Rome.

4. The praise of the Scripture
A. No one can do right and know the truth without Scripture
   a. The Scripture must be searched
   b. The Scripture must be studied
   c. The Scripture reproves those who do not know it
   d. The Scripture makes wise
   e. The Scriptures instruct, make hot, &c.
B. Take up and read the Scriptures!
C. They are full of doctrine, wisdom, religion, &c.
   a. As Augustine promoted
   b. As Jerome wrote
   c. As Cyrill taught
D. All true Christian leaders will give witness to its perfection
   a. Tertullian calls it full
   b. Tertullian accepts nothing without it
   c. Justin Martyr relies only on the divine inspiration
d. Basil rejects anything else, including all additions and subtractions

e. And to many others witness could be sought

E. The Scriptures are like the pagan concepts of cornucopia, the invincible, impenetrable items

a. If these items are of men's myth, how much better is the spiritual? Examples:
   i. Like a complete weapons system
   ii. Like the trees for the healing of the nations
   iii. Like prophet's blessing of the cruse of unlimited oil
   iv. Like good bread, not mouldy
   v. Like good herbs, not poison
   vi. Like water, not lack thereof, &c.

F. This is to be expected, since God in heaven is perfect

a. He inspired it
b. Its form is God
c. He makes it effective
d. By it men are blessed

But now what piety without truth?
What truth, what saving truth, without the word of God? What word of God, whereof we may be sure, without the Scripture?

“In God will I praise his word: in the LORD will I praise his word.” (Psalm 56:10).

“Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. ... But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.” (1 Peter 1:22, 23, 25).

The Scriptures we are commanded to search. John v. 39. Isaiah viii. 20.

“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” (Isaiah 8:20).

“They are commended that searched & studied them. Acts xvii. 11 and viii. 28, 29.

“These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” (Acts 17:11).
“Was returning, and sitting in his chariot read Esaias the prophet. Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.” (Acts 8:28, 29).

They are reproved that were unskilful in them, or slow to believe them. Mat. 22.29. Luk. 24.25.

“Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.” (Matthew 22:29).

“Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken” (Luke 24:25).

They can make us wise unto salvation. 2. Tim. 3.15.

“And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” (2 Timothy 3:15).

If we be ignorant, they will instruct us; if out of the way, they will bring us home; if out of order, they will reform us; if in heaviness, comfort us; if dull, quicken us; if cold, inflame us.

Altogether, the King James Bible must have been recognised to have all these attributes: instruction, guidance, reformation, comfort, life and fire.

Tolle, lege; Tolle, lege; Take vp and read, take vp and read the Scriptures, (for unto them was the direction) it was said unto S. Augustine by a supernatural voice. [S. August. conf. lib. 8. cap. 12.]

Tolle, lege; tolle, lege; Take up and read, take up and read the Scriptures, (for unto them was the direction) it was said unto St Augustine by a supernatural voice.

Augustine of Hippo (354–430 A.D.) was a thinker and theologian who contributed much to the Church in theology, philosophy and interpretation of the Scripture, though he championed the political absolutism of the Roman Institution, the Papal Roman Empire.
tempered, that every one may draw from thence that which is sufficient for him, if hee come to draw with a devout and pious minde, as true Religion requireth. Thus S. Augustine.

The Apostle James revealed the relationship between the Word and true religion: “receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls. But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. ... If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man’s religion is vain. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this” (James 1:21b, 22, 26, 27a).

Jerome, or Eusebius Hieronymus (347–420 A.D.), was the foremost of the Latin Fathers. His most famous act was the translation of the Scriptures into Latin, called the Vulgate.

Cyril of Alexandria (375–444 A.D.) was involved in arguments about heresy at his time, and refuted the Emperor Julian (reigned 361–363 A.D.), who had been brought up a Christian but turned pagan.

But what mention wee three or foure uses of the Scripture, whereas whatsoever is to be beleued or practised, or hoped for, is contained in them? or three or foure sentences of the Fathers, since whosoever is worthy of the name of a Father, from Christ’s time downward, hath likewise written not onely of the riches, but also of the perfection of the Scripture?

The prophets and apostles, the true Church Fathers and the Reformers all agreed that the Word was rich and perfect. If the Word is perfect, then its perfection should be discoverable. Evidently, the English translation conveyed perfectly the Originals, so that the King James Bible was made the perfect Word in English.
Tertullian (155–220 A.D.) was the father of ecclesiastical Latin. His refutations against heretics included an attack on the artist, Hermogenes, who said that creation was made from pre-existing matter.

The definition of heresy is any belief which does not have a basis in Scripture, but is purported to be true. Thus, no teaching should be received without the backing of Scripture. “These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” (Acts 17:11).

Justin Martyr (100–165 A.D.) defended the Christian faith, and showed that Christians were martyrs, being unjustly killed.

Basil of Cæsarea (329–379 A.D.) defended the Church against the Arian heresy, and supported the Trinitarian Doctrine.

The attack on Christianity, according to Basil, was that the Scriptures were either being deleted from or added to. This is what he called a fault or a heresy.

ἐπεισάγειν — pronounced epeisagein.
We omit to cite to the same effect, S. Cyrill B. of Hierusalem in his 4. Cataches. Saint Hierome against Heludius, Saint Augustine in his 3. booke against the letters of Petilian, and in very many other places of his workes.

Catechisms are teachings which lay out doctrine, especially for instruction, so that one may be instructed against heresy, and know when the Scripture has been added to or taken from.

Also we forebeare to descend to latter Fathers, because wee will not wearie the reader.

There were manifold historical examples of Christians who held the Scripture in authority.

The Scriptures then being acknowledged to bee so full and so perfect, how can wee excuse our selues of negligence, if we doe not studie them, of curiositie, if we be not content with them?

The King James Bible, being full and perfect, provided no excuse for anyone to not study it. There were no grounds to reject it, or to think that its content was somehow lacking in words or improper translations. “The law of the L ORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the L ORD is sure, making wise the simple.” (Psalm 19:7).

Men talke much of εἰρεσιώνη, εἰρεσιώνη σοκα φερει, και πιονας αρτον, και μελι εν κοτυλη, και ελαιον, &c. An oliue bow wrapped about with wooll, wherevpon did hang figs, & bread, and honie in a pot, & oyle.] how many sweete and goodly things it had hanging on it; of the Philosophers stone, that it turneth copper into gold; of Cornucopia, that it had all things necessary for food in it; of Panaces the herb, that it was good for all diseases; of Catholicon the drugge, that is in stead of all purges; of Vulcan's armour, that it was an armour of proofe against all thrusts and all blows, &c.
Pyanepsia was a feast where offerings would be made to Apollo, where an olive bough wrapped with wool would have food offerings hung on it. This was called the eiresione, the wool pole. The cornucopia, a large twisting horn overflowing with fruits and grains, was a symbol of prosperity. The panacea was a supposed thing which cured all ills and rectified all situations. The armour of Vulcan (the Smith) was similar to the stories of Achilles, Siegfried and Balder, all of whom could not be harmed.

εἰρεσιώνη — pronounced εiresione.

Well, that which they falsely or vainly attributed to these things for bodily good, wee may justly and with full measure ascribe unto the Scripture, for spiritual.

If the ideas of heathenism were largely vanity, then the Word of God, being much better, was fullness, and the true model of perfection, abundance and impenetrability.

It is not only an armour, but also a whole armoury of weapons, both offensive and defensive; whereby we may save ourselves, and put the enemy to flight.

The Bible is a great weapon system or array, not merely an plaything. The King James Bible being skilfully used would both protect the user and destroy the enemies. “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” (Hebrews 4:12), “and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God” (Ephesians 6:17b).

It is not an herb, but a tree, or rather a whole paradise of trees of life, which bring forth fruit every month, and the leaves thereof is for meate, and the leaues for medicine.

“In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.” (Revelation 22:2).
were a showre of heauenly bread sufficient for a whole host, be it neuer so great; and as it were a whole cellar full of oyle vessels; whereby all our necessities may be prouided for, and our debts discharged.

The Scripture is likened to the heavenly bread which the Israelites ate continually in the wilderness (see Exodus 16:14–18). Again, the Scripture is like the woman who poured volumes of oil from one pot by the word of Elisha, and was able to sell it, and be delivered from great debt (see 2 Kings 4:1–6).

In a word, it is a Panary of wholesome food against fenowed traditions; a Physions-shop (Saint Basil calleth it) of preservatues against poisoned heresies; a Pandect of profitable laws, against rebellious spirits; a treasurie of most costly jewels, against beggarly rudiments; Finally a fountaine of most pure water springing up unto everlasting life.

A “panary” is a store of bread, “fenowed” is mouldy, the “preservatives” are natural, the “pandect” is the body of laws, and the “rudiments” are the bare basics.

And what maruaile? The originall thereof being from heauen, not from earth; the authour being God, not man; the enditer, the holy spirit, not the wit of the Apostles or Prophets; the Pen-men such as were sanctified from the wombe, and endued with a principall portion of Gods spirit; the matter, verity, piety, puritie, vprightnesse; the forme, Gods word, Gods testimonie, Gods oracles, the word of trueth, the word of salvation, &c.; the effects, light of vnderstanding, stablenesse of persuasion, repentance from dead workes, newnesse of life, holinesse, peace, joy in the holy Ghost; lastly, the end and reward of the studie thereof, fellowship with the Saints, participation of the heavenly nature, fruition of an inheritance immortall, vndefiled, and that neuer shall fade away: Happy is the man that...
away: Happie is the man that delighteth in the Scripture, and thrise happy that meditateth in it day and night.

The Bible is of heavenly origin, the Original comes from God. The words are God’s, not merely mens’, and are full of good effects. The King James Bible must be and have all such good attributes. “BLESSED is the man that [hath] his delight is in the law of the LORD; and in his law doth he meditate day and night.” (Psalm 1:1a, 2b).

The “inditer” is one who dictates or composes.

5. Translation is necessary
A. Men must understand the Word in their own language
B. The Bible does not restrict itself from or to any language
C. Whilst it remains untranslated, it is useless to the common man
   a. The Scythians and Greeks were foreign to each other
   b. The Latin Romans said Classical Syriac was barbarous
   c. The Jews likewise treated the Gentiles as strangers
D. Thus, the Senate in Rome needed translators for the Empire’s good
E. The Christians required translations to:
   a. Break the shell or husk
   b. Open the window for light
   c. Remove the cover of the well
F. Otherwise one cannot read for being unlearned, it is then a sealed book to him

“Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me.” (1 Corinthians 14:11), thus, the Bible must be in a language which is understood.
No language is especially mentioned as the one in which the Word of God must remain, nor is there a restriction from any language. Hebrew was spoken at Babel, though Greek was the most widespread due to Alexander’s conquest, and Latin was the imperial tongue of the rich and powerful. Yet, there was no restriction on God using any of these languages to preach the Word.

Men do not understand something in a foreign language. No one can get anything from something they cannot understand. The Bible in a foreign language is useless, but the Bible in a man’s own language is useful.

Clement of Alexandria (150–215 A.D.) was a Greek missionary in Egypt. Theophilus was Byzantine Emperor (died 842 A.D.), he promoted a revival in learning, and had the Greek language turn away from uncial to cursive script. Michael the Third (838–867 A.D.) came to the throne as a child, and during his reign, the use of icons was restored. He caused the schism from Rome, the Pope at that time was Pope Nicolas (819–867 A.D.).
Cicero (146–43 B.C.) is the best known Roman philosopher from pre-Christian times.

There was a need to have translations in the common tongue for the Church, just as a great empire would need to translate its laws. “Exigent” means need, pressing urgency.

Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may looke into the most Holy place; that remoueth the couer of the well, that wee may come by the water, even as Jacob rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well, by which means the flockes of Laban were watered. [Gen. 29. 10.]

“And it came to pass, when Jacob saw Rachel the daughter of Laban his mother’s brother, and the sheep of Laban his mother’s brother, that Jacob went near, and rolled the stone from the well’s mouth, and watered the flock of Laban his mother’s brother.” (Genesis 29:10).

Indeed without translation into the vulgar tongue, the unlearned are but like children at Jacob’s well (which was deep) without a bucket or something to draw with: or as that person mentioned by Esau, to whom when a sealed booke was deliuered, with this motion, Read this, I pray thee, he was faine to make this answere, I cannot, for it is sealed. [Esay 29. 11.]

“The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast thou that living water?” (John 4:11).

“And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot; for it is sealed” (Isaiah 29:11).

The translation of the olde Testament out of the Hebrew into Greeke.

6. Old Testament translation from Hebrew to Greek
   A. While Hebrew was the language of Israel, the Old Testament in Hebrew was sufficient
   B. Nearer to Christ, the Greeks ruled Palestine, so the Jews in Egypt translated the Septuagint
   C. The Septuagint was a preparation for Christ like another John the Baptist
a. The Greeks were interested in books and religion, and had good scribes
b. The Greek tongue was a common tongue
c. It was known in Asia, Europe and Africa
D. When the Gospel came to the Gentiles, there was a translation ready for them
E. However, the Septuagint was imperfect
   a. The apostles did not officially change it, or they could be accused of manufacturing
   b. The Septuagint was allowed to be used, even though the Jews themselves knew its faults
   c. Thus, other Greek translations were made after Christ
d. These were collected by Origin in the Hexapla
e. The Septuagint remained the most prominent
f. The Septuagint was even called an “Inspired Translation” out of ignorance
   i. It was made by men
   ii. It was good, but contained additions, subtractions, corruptions

While God would be known only in Jacob, and have his name great in Israel, and in none other place, while the dew lay on Gideon's fleece only, and all the earth besides was dry; [See S. August. lib. 12. contra Faust. c. 32.] then for one and the same people, which spake all of them the language of Canaan, that is, Hebrew, one and the same original in Hebrew was sufficient.

But when the fulness of time drew near, that the Sun of righteousness, the Son of God, should come into the world, whom God ordained to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood, not of the Jew only, but also of the Greek, yea, of all them that were scattered abroad; then lo, it pleased the Lord to stir up the spirit of a Greek prince, (Greek for descent and language) even of Ptolemy Philadelph King of Egypt, to procure the translating of the Book of God out of Hebrew into Greek.
But, as God looked beyond the Hebrews, to the Gentiles, the first step was the get the Old Testament translated into Greek. This was done under the auspices of the Greek king of Egypt, Ptolemy the Second.

The *Septuagint* coming to the Gentiles was to preceded the Gospel like John the Baptist preceded Christ (see Matthew 11:10).

Many copies were made of the *Septuagint*, and was included in the *Hexapla*, and available to the King James Bible translators by the *Complutensian Polyglot*.

Since the Greeks under Alexander had conquered Asia Minor, and into the East, they were able to receive the Scriptures in Greek, because Grecian was the common tongue.

Greek was likewise spoken and understood in North Africa, Sicily and in parts of Europe too.
which giveth light to all that are in the house, or like a proclamation sounded forth in the market place, which most men presently take knowledge of; and therefore that language was fittest to contain the Scriptures, both for the first Preachers of the Gospel to appeal unto for witness, and for the learners also of those times to make search and triall by.

When the Gospel came to the Gentiles, they were able to read the Scriptures of the Old Testament in Greek.

1611 EDITION. 
It is certain, that the Translation was not so sound and so perfect, but that it needed in many places correction; and who had bene so sufficient for this worke as the Apostles or Apostolike men?

Nevertheless, there was a need for improvements, because the Scripture in Greek was not a perfect translation. This situation was like that of the Geneva and the Bishops’ versions, which needed improvement.

1611 EDITION. 
Yet it seemed good to the holy Ghost and to them, to take that which they found, (the same being for the greatest part true and sufficient) rather then by making a new, in that new world and greene age of the Church, to expose themselves to many exceptions and cavillations, as though they made a Translation to serve their owne turne, and therefore bearing witnesse to themselves, their witnesse not to be regarded.

But making a new Greek translation would have caused men to accuse the Christians of twisting things to their own ends. That is why the Christians used the Greek copies that were already available (having been made by the Jews) though they noted or disregarded places where there were errors.

1611 EDITION. 
This may be supposed to bee some cause, why the Translation of the Seventie was allowed to passe for currant.
And so this would explain why the Septuagint gained an ascendancy.

Notwithstanding, though it was commended generally, yet it did not fully content the learned, no not of the Jews.

For the merits of the Septuagint, it was known by the Jews and by the learned Greeks to contain errors. Thus, if they knew of errors, it would also be possible to have a translation that was exactly right, and to content the users in that language, like the King James Bible in English.

For not long after Christ, Aquila fell in hand with a new Translation, and after him Theodotion, and after him Symmachus: yea, there was a fifth and a sixth edition, the authors whereof were not known.

Aquila in 130–140 A.D. made a new translation from Hebrew to Greek, and after him others.

These with the Seventy made up the Hexapla, and were worthily and to great purpose compiled together by Origen.

These Greek translations were put together in parallel by Origen (185–254 A.D.), in his Hexapla.

Howbeit the Edition of the Seventy went away with the credit, and therefore not onely was placed in the midst by Origen (for the worth and excellencie thereof above the rest, as Epiphanius gathereth) [Epiphan. de mensur. & ponderibus.] but also was vsed by the Greeke fathers for the ground and foundation of their Commentaries. [See S August. 2°. de doctrin. Christian. c. 15°.]

Nevertheless, the less than perfect Septuagint still retained its status of dominance, being commonly used. The Greek Church Fathers based their writings of the Old Testament on the Septuagint.

Epiphanius of Constantia (315–403 A.D.) attacked Origen’s doctrines as heretical.
Yea, Epiphanius abovenamed doth attribute so much unto it, that he holdeth the Authours thereof not only for Interpreters, but also for Prophets in some respect: and Justinian the Emperor [Novell. diast. 146.] enjoiynng the Iewes his subjects to vse specially the Translation of the Seventie, rendreth this reason thereof, because they were as it were enlightened with prophetical grace. [προφητικης εσπερ χαριτος περιλαμψας αυτως.]

There was an ongoing belief that the Septuagint translators were prophets, and that the translation was prophetical. This is not unlike the way that the King James Bible translators have been treated, whereas the Septuagint translators were less than perfect, the translation of 1611 was in all ways superior, and this implies nothing short of God's grace aiding and making this so. Nevertheless, the translators of the King James Bible were not infallible or inspired in their translation. They were used of God to make a careful and proper translation of the inspired Word of God.

Yet for all that, as the Egyptians are said of the Prophet to bee men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit: [Esa. 31. 3.] so it is evident, (and Saint Hierome affirmeth as much) [S. Hieron. de optimo genere interpret.] that the Seventie were Interpreters, they were not Prophets.

"Now the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses flesh, and not spirit. When the LORD shall stretch out his hand, both he that helpeth shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fail together." (Isaiah 31:3).

The translators say that the Seventy were only interpreters, and not prophets. However, a translation can be “spiritual” or “natural” — the Septuagint was a “natural” translation, whereas the King James Bible was a “spiritual” one.

They did many things well, as learned men; but yet as men they stumbled and fell, one while through oversight, another while through ignorance, yea, sometimes they may be noted to adde to the Originall, and sometimes to take from it; which made the Apostles to leave them many times, when they left the Hebrew, and to deliver the sence
thereof according to the truth of the word, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

While the Septuagint is worthy, its translators made errors through oversight, ignorance, adding to the original and taking from the original. This can be shown because the Apostles in their quotes do not agree with the Septuagint, since the Apostles were writing by the Holy Ghost, and would agree with the original author.

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

This may suffice touching the Greek Translations of the Old Testament.

Thus, the King James Bible translators, in knowing and seeing this, must logically have produced a better translation than the Septuagint.

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

Translation out of Hebrew and Greek into Latine.

7. Translation of Hebrew and Greek into Latin
A. Latin was a universal tongue because of Rome’s dominion
B. There were many Latin translations, not all of them good
   a. There were Old Testament translations from the Greek rather than Hebrew
   b. However, Jerome rectified this in his Vulgate
C. Jerome’s Latin became the standard, and was useful for Protestants later

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

There were also within a few hundred years after Christ, translations many into the Latine tongue: for this tongue also was very fit to convey the Law and the Gospel by, because in those times very many Countrieys of the West, yea of the South, East and North, spake or understood Latine, being made Provinces to the Romanes.

Since, at the time of the early Church, Rome ruled the world, Latin was a common tongue. There were many places in the Roman Empire which could hear the Gospel after both Testaments of the Bible were translated into Latin.

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

But now the Latine Translations were too many to be all good, for they were infinite (Latini Interpretes nullo modo numerari possunt, saith S. Augustine.)

[S. Augustin. de doctr. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 11.]
There were many old Latin translations before Jerome. Augustine knew that some were of a poor character.

The Latin Old Testament was based on the Septuagint, not the Hebrew.

The Romanists preserved and carried the Scripture through time in the Latin Vulgate, which was based on Jerome’s translations from Hebrew and Greek, not merely on other translations.

8. Translating into the common tongue
A. The Latin translations were available before Rome officially became “Christian”
B. Some examples of the betterment of the state of the Scripture by translation:
   a. Jerome was able to discern many false readings, and eliminate them in the Latin
   b. Jerome also was able to consult and translate the Septuagint
   c. Jerome, according to Erasmus and Romanists, also made another translation
   d. Chrysostom spoke of the Gospel increasing in other tongues
   e. Theodoret said that the Word had gone to many nations
   f. There are multiple other examples of translation in Europe, &c. up to the Reformation
C. The notion of translation is not new, but old
Now though the Church were thus furnished with Greek and Latin Translations, even before the faith of Christ was generally embraced in the Empire: (for the learned know [S. Hieronym. Marcell. Zosim.] that even in S. Hierons time, the Consul of Rome and his wife were both Ethnicks, and about the same time the greatest part of the Senate also) yet for all that the godly-learned were not content to have the Scriptures in the Language which themselves understood, Greek and Latin, (as the good Lepers were not content to fare well themselves, but acquainted their neighbours with the store that God had sent, that they also might provide for themselves) but also for the behoof and edifying of the unlearned which hungered and thirsted after Righteousnesse, and had souls to be saved as well as they, they provided Translations into the vulgar for their Countreymen, insomuch that most nations under heaven did shortly after their conversion, hear Christ speaking unto them in their mother tongue, not by the voice of their Minister onely, but also by the written word translated.

Many versions of the Bible existed before 1611. As missionaries went out from Jerusalem, and Antioch, so was there a necessity to bring the Bible into the language of the common people, and eventually among the various nations and tribes outside the Roman empire.

"Then they said one to another, We do not well: this day is a day of good tiding s, and we hold our peace: if we tarry till the morning light, some mischief will come upon us: now therefore come, that we may go and tell the king’s household." (2 Kings 7:9).

If any doubt hereof, he may be satisfied by examples enough, if enough will serve the turn.

There are many examples of translations of the Scripture.
in 4. Euangel.] Multarum gentiū linguis Scriptura ante translata, docet falsa esse quae addita sunt, &c. i.e. The Scripture being translated before in the languages of many Nations, doth shew that those things that were added (by Lucian or Hesychius) are false. So S. Hierome in that place.

Jerome witnessed that the Scripture had been translated.

The same Hierome elsewhere affirmeth that he, [S. Hieron. Sophronio.] the time was, had set forth the translation of the Seuenty, sua linguae hominibus. i.e. for his countrymen of Dalmatia.

Jerome also spoke of his own translation of the Septuagint.

Which words not only Erasmus doth understand to purport, that S. Hierome translated the Scripture into the Dalmatian tongue; but also Sixtus Senensis, [Six. Sen. lib. 4.] and Alphonsus à Castro [Alphon. à Castro, lib. 1. ca. 23.] (that we speak of no more) men not to be excepted against by them of Rome, doe ingenuously confess as much.

Sixtus Senensis and Alphonsus a Castro were Romanist historians, who bewrayed the fact that translations had been made. Sixtus Senensis admitted that to let the common man read the Scriptures in his own language was to cast pearls before swine, and by this, he admitted that the Scriptures in the common tongue were indeed pearls.

So, S. Chrysostome [S. Chrysost. in Iohan. cap. 1. hom. 1.] that liued in S. Hieromes time, giueth evidence with him: The doctrine of S. Iohn (saith he) did not in such sort (as the Philosophers did) vanish away: but the Syrians, Egyptians, Indians, Persians, Ethiopians, and infinite other nations being barbarous people, translated it into their (mother) tongue, and have learned to be (true) Philosophers, he meaneth Christians.
John Chrysostom (347–407 A.D.) was the archbishop of Constantinople, and a revered Bible teacher. His writings and teachings have had a great impact on the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Theodoret (393–458 A.D.) was a bishop at Cyrrhus, Syria. He was influenced by Chrysostom, and his works have been considered minor classics.

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (Matthew 24:14).

The Sauromatians (Sarmatians) are a people group who live in Kazakhstan.

Paul the Deacon (720–799 A.D.) was an Italian ecclesiastical historian.

Isidore of Seville (560–636 A.D.) wrote on language studies and the history of the Church in Spain.

Sozomen (400–450 A.D.) was a lawyer in Constantinople who wrote about Church history, and included material from the western Europe.

Paul the Deacon (720–799 A.D.) was an Italian ecclesiastical historian.

Isidore of Seville (560–636 A.D.) wrote on language studies and the history of the Church in Spain.

Sozomen (400–450 A.D.) was a lawyer in Constantinople who wrote about Church history, and included material from the western Europe.
into Arabicke, about the yeere of our Lord 717:

The Scripture being turned into Arabic occurred after the founding of Mahometism, though, the Scripture was no doubt already turned into Arabic before this.

Polydore Virgil (1470–1555) was an Italian who wrote a history of England.

Johannes Trithemius was a German scholar and historian. Bede (672–735 A.D.) was an Anglo-Saxon historian and theologian. His work gives insight into the politics behind the conversion to Romanism and attack on the Celtic and Northumbrian Church. He made Scripture translations into English, which are now lost.

King Alured, the West Saxon king, promoted learning and the continuation of the Saxon tongue during England’s darker days.

Aventinus (1477–1534) was a Bavarian who disapproved of Romanism, and who was for a time at the University of Ingolstad. Sclavonian is Slavic.
Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547) was a friend of Erasmus, who produced works based on manuscripts, especially on German history. He lived in Germany, France and Switzerland.
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Valdus, by divers to have turned them himselfe, or to have gotten them turned into French, about the yeere 1160:


Valdus by divers, to have turned them himself, or to have gotten them turned, into French about the year 1160:

Peter Waldo was leader of the Waldenses in the period 1170–1176. The Waldenses was an old Latin Christian movement based in northern Italy which had for centuries broken away from Romanism, but under Waldo, the movement gained an international distinction. In the Reformation they became affiliated with the Calvinists at Geneva.
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Charles the 5. of that name, surnamed The wise, to have caused them to be turned into French, about 200. yeeres after Valdus his time, of which translation there be many copies yet extant, as witnesseth Beroaldus.


Charles the fifth of that name, surnamed The wise, to have caused them to be turned into French, about 200 years after Valdus his time; of which translation there be many copies yet extant, as witnesseth Beroaldus.

Charles the Fifth (1338–1380) was an intellectual king. During his reign France recovered from the wars with the English. His support for a rival Pope led to a great schism in the Romanist Institution.
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Much about that time, even in our King Richard the seconds dayes, John Trevisa translated them into English, and many English Bibles in written hand are yet to be seene with diuers, translated as it is very probable, in that age.


Much about that time, even in our King Richard the second’s days, John Trevisa translated them into English, and many English Bibles in written hand are yet to be seen with divers; translated, as it is very probable, in that age.

John of Trevisa (circa 1387) translated several classics into English. King Richard the Second (1367–1400) ruled England through some of its most turbulent days, and generally brought about an instability which lasted for years after his reign.
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So the Syrian translation of the New Testament is in most learned mens Libraries, of Widminstadius his setting forth, and the Psalter in Arabick is with many, of Augustinus Nebiensis setting foorth.


So the Syrian translation of the New Testament is in most learned men’s libraries, of Widminstadius his setting forth; and the Psalter in Arabick is with many, of Augustinus Nebiensis’ setting forth.

Widminstadius (1555). Augustinus Nebiensis (1516).
So Postel affirmeth, that in his trauaile he saw the Gospels in the Ethiopian tongue; And Ambrose Thesius alleageth the Psalter of the Indians, which he testifieth to have bene set forth by Potken in Syrian characters.

W. Postel (1510–1581).

So that, to haue the Scriptures in the mother-tongue is not a quaint conceit lately taken vp, either by the Lord Cromwell in England, [Thuan.] or by the Lord Radevil in Polonie, or by the Lord Ungnadius in the Emperours dominion, but hath bene thought vpon, and put in practise of old, even from the first times of the conversion of any Nation; no doubt, because it was esteemed most profitable, to cause faith to grow in mens hearts the sooner, and to make them to be able to say with the words of the Psalm, As we haue heard, so we haue seene. [Psal. 48. 8.]

Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex, (1485–1540), supporter of the translation of the Bible in 1538, the Great Bible. He brought the Reformation into England through the government.


“As we have heard, so have we seen in the city of the LORD of hosts, in the city of our God: God will establish it for ever. Selah.” (Psalm 48:8).

The unwillingnes of our chief Aduersaries, that the Scriptures should be divulged in the mother tongue, &c.

9. The Romanists’ unwillingness that the Scripture should be translated into the common tongues
A. Romanists made it a sin to read or translate the Word in the mother tongue
B. One Pope was more lenient than another, thus a double standard
C. They are afraid of the light because their deeds are evil
D. But even some of their own men have translated the Scripture into the vulgar tongues
E. The Rheims-Douay was only done to answer the Protestant English versions
F. This shows their guilty conscience
G. But they use darkness and deceit to shy away from the Word
Now the Church of Rome would seem at the length to beare a motherly affection towards her children, and to allow them the Scriptures in their mother tongue: but indeed it is a gift, not deserving to be called a gift, an unprofitable gift: [δωρον αδωρον κουκ ονησιμον. Sophocles.] they must first get a Licence in writing before they may use them, and to get that, they must approve themselves to their Confessor, that is, to be such as are, if not frozen in the dregs, yet soured with the leaue of their superstition.

The main enemies of the truth were the Romanists, who were against the translation of the Scripture into the common tongues, and who made it a sin to read the Scripture in the common tongue.

Sophocles (496–406 B.C.) was a famous Greek playwright.

“Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.” (Mark 7:13).

Pope Clement the Eighth (1536–1605), a counter-Reformation Pope who disallowed the printing of any Bible except the Vulgate. His edition of the Vulgate, the Clementine Vulgate, 1592, was the standard Vulgate until the Second Vatican Council.

Clement wrote in the Roman Catholic Index of Prohibited Books, 1596, “hitherto by the order and practice of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition the power has been taken away from them to grant licences to read or keep the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue or any other part of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament published in any vulgar language, even not so much as a summary or compendium of the said Book or Books of the Holy Scriptures translated into the vulgar language, all which is to be inviolably observed.”
Pope Pius the Fourth (1499–1565), a counter-Reformation Pope who made the *Index of Prohibited Books*.

"Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." (Psalm 119:105).

"And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." (John 3:19–21).

The Rheims-Douay Version (1582, 1609–1610) was only done to counter the effect of the Protestant English translations.

"And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one" (John 8:9a).

Sure we are, that it is not he that hath good gold, that is afraid to bring it to the touchstone, but he that hath the counterfeit; neither is it the true man that shunneth the light, but the malefactor, lest his deeds should be reproved: [Joan 3. 2o.] neither is it the plaine dealing Merchant that is unwilling to have the weights, or the meteyard brought in place, but he that useth deceit.
“For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.” (John 3:20).

But we will let them alone for this fault, and returne to translation.

“A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject; Knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.” (Titus 3:10, 11).

The speeches and reasons, both of our brethren, and of our Adversaries against this worke.

10. The reasons of Protestant dissenters and Romanists against the work

A. The Work was accused of being slow, and of too much checking of past translations
   a. They asked, Are none of the past translations any good that a new one must be done?
   b. They said, The world will see that you are taking so long and think ill of it
   c. They said, These are not Catholics, they are not able to do it

B. But the response was:
   a. The translators did not condemn the old translations
   b. The translators did their best in checking, and this was for pleasing God, not men
   c. The translators worked by God’s grace and for His glory

Many mens mouths haue bene 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 necessitie of the employment:

There had been much speaking and complaining against the translation of the King James Bible for it taking so long, and that it was needlessly looking through old translations.

Hath the Church bene deceived, say they, all this while? Hath her sweet bread bene mingled with leauen, her silver with dross, her wine with water, her milke with lime? (Lacte gypsum malè miscetur, saith S. Ireney,)[3. lib. cap. 19.]
Irenaeus (130–203 A.D.), Bishop of Lyon, was an opponent of Gnostic heretics. He also centralised the authority of bishops, especially of the bishop of Rome, and promoted the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

“For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.” (2 Peter 2:21).

“Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.” (Jude verse 3).

“But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.” (2 Corinthians 4:2).

“Now Tobiah the Ammonite was by him, and he said, Even that which they build, if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stone wall.” (Nehemiah 4:3).
Why do they now mend it? Was it not good? Why then was it obtruded to the people? Yea, why did the Catholicks (meaning Popish Romanists) always go in jeopardy, for refusing to go to heare it?

“Obtrude” means to force upon.

Nay, if it must be translated into English, Catholicks are fittest to doe it. They haue learning, and they know when a thing is well, they can manum de tabulâ.

The Romanists billed themselves as the most competent translators to give the Scripture in English. The translators of the King James Bible considered them unfit, and there were no Romanists on the King James Bible translation committees.

Wee will answere them both briefly: and the former, being brethren, thus with St Hierome, Damnamus veteres? Minime, sed post priorum studia in domo Domini quod possumus laboramus. That is, Do we condemne the ancient? In no case: but after the endeavours of them that were before us, wee take the best pains we can in the house of God.

EXCEPT the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.” (Psalm 127:1).

The King James Bible translators put all effort into making the translation as good as possible. In fact, it ended up being the best.
was in them. Thus St Hierome may be thought to speak.

The King James Bible relied on that which came before. The translators knew they had the talent and ability to translate, but unless they compared what they did with what came before, they would not be certain whether they were edifying the Church. Thus, they were agreeing with Jerome's sentiment.
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A Satisfaction to our brethren.

11. A satisfactory answer to the brethren
A. The former English translations were good, needful and were being checked
   a. There could be no new translation without basis on the old
   b. The former helped the latter
   c. The best translation would result
   d. The Word would be fully revealed and understood
B. It took time and work to make a good translation: perfection would now come
   a. Those who did the former works should not be despised, nor yet the latter works
   b. The work of victory would only come from multiple battles, not just three, but five or six
   c. Aquila needed to revise his Greek translation before it was accepted
   d. Even worldly books are edited and are better, such as Aristotle
      i. If worldly books are so treated, how much more should the heavenly?
      ii. It is like chaff to wheat, glass to pearls
C. Therefore, let no one despise the work, since it is good to maturely examine and present
   a. If anything is wanting, it is corrected
   b. The worst in the English versions is better than the Romanist
   c. And by the process, perfection is revealed
D. It is to King James' credit that he ordered this revision
   a. The translators did their duty
   b. The Protestant dissenters should realise that the king did this for them
      i. The Puritans brought up their grievances at Hampton Court
      ii. They suggested a new translation
      iii. The king agreed
      iv. The Puritans should be satisfied with this
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And to the same effect say wee, that we are so farre off from condemning any of their labours that trauelled before vs in this kinde, either in this land or beyond sea, either in King Henries time, or King Edwards (if there were any translation, or correction of a translation in his time) or Queene Elizabeths of euer-renoumed memorie, that we acknowledge them to have
beene raised vp of God, for the building and furnishing of his Church, and that they deserve to be had of vs and of posteritie in everlasting remembrance.

The translators did not reject the labours of the English translations from Tyndale (1525) to the Bishops’ Bible, whether done in England or abroad, because they realised that each of these six versions were amounting, and building up to a perfect thing, a new version that would ultimately be held in everlasting remembrance. That is, an eternal translation that would commemorate, or perpetuate the other six translations that came before it. Queen Elizabeth the First would also be remembered by the versions done in her time, and by her name being mentioned in the front of the King James Bible; notwithstanding, the English Bible itself would be eternal — just as Christ came and was perfect in a corrupt world, the Church existed in the midst of wickedness, and believers were born again, so the Word of God was come to perfection not in a heavenly future, but already in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation.

“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.” (1 Peter 1:23–25).

Aristotle (384–322 B.C.) was a great Greek philosopher who had an impact on European thought for many years after his death.

Timotheus was an artist, one of the decorators of the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus (352–350 B.C.), one of the Seven Wonders of the World.
Now what can bee more availeable thereto, then to delieuer Gods booke vnto Gods people in a tongue which they vnderstand?

The King James Bible is called “God’s book”. The translators saw themselves as deliverers of God’s book to Christians. This is the highest thing, of which nothing could be deemed “more available” than the understanding and knowledge of God’s very words.

Since of an 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 St Augustine saith, A man had rather be with his dog than with a stranger (whose tongue is strange unto him.)

The Bible not in English is of no use to the English-speaking peoples. When the religious leaders (whether of the Jews, or in England) were desired of by their king to make a translation of the Scripture into the common tongue, it was for the spiritual benefit of all.

Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfected at the same time, and the latter thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, doe endeavour to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike vs; they, we persuade our selues, if they were alive, would thank us.

Having God’s own book in English is not an instantaneous process. The King James Bible itself did not come to pass overnight, nor even within a year, rather, after much labour many years after Tyndale had made his translation. The King James Bible is here called “perfected”, “wiser”, “better” and “good”. Furthermore, there was nothing in their Bible which was worse than any that came before theirs. In fact, they knew theirs was better.

The vintage of Abiezer, that strake the stroke: yet the gleaning of grapes of Ephraim was not to be despised. See Judges viii. 2.
“And he said unto them, What have I done now in comparison of you? Is not the gleaning of the grapes of Ephraim better than the vintage of Abi-ezer?” (Judges 8:2).

The end product, the aged wine of the King James Bible was much better than the first pickings of the grapes; nevertheless, the grapes of Tyndale and all were by no means bad from whence the wine came.
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Ioash the king of Israel did not satisfie himselfe, till he had smitten the ground three times; and yet he offended the Prophet, for giuing ouer then. [2 Kings 13. 18, 19.]

“Aand he said, Take the arrows. And he took them. And he said unto the king of Israel, Smite upon the ground. And he smote thrice, and stayed. And the man of God was wroth with him, and said, Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times; then hadst thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it: whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice.” (2 Kings 13:18–19).

There was a need to go over and over the Bible translation until it would satisfy the prophet. The King James Bible was in fact the sixth smiting after the firing of the first arrow (Tyndale). Thus, one arrow was fired, and then the rest of the arrows were to strike the ground, that is, six times to best please the spiritual man.
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Aquila, of whom we spake before, translated the Bible as carefully, and as skilfully as he could; and yet he thought good to goe ouer it againe, and then it got the credit with the Jewes, to be called κατὰ ἀκριβείαν, that is accuratly done, as Saint Hierome witnesseth. [S. Hieron. in Ezech. cap. 3.]

About 130–140 A.D., Aquila translated the Old Testament into Greek with the guidance of Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph, the patron of Jewish oral tradition. Aquila was a Gentile convert from Pontius in Asia Minor. His translation was very strict and literal; however, it was not for the purposes of Christian use, but rather the pagan Judaists'.

κατὰ ἀκριβείαν — pronounced kata akribeian.
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How many bookes of profane learning haue bene gone ouer againe and againe, by the same translators, by others?

How many books of profane learning have been gone over again and again, by the same translators, by others?
Worldly books have been edited and revised to make them better, as it is witnessed by the authors and editors the world's greatest books.

Likewise, many old classics are translated differently by different translators.

"And the L ORD God prepared a gourd, and made it to come up over Jonah, that it might be a shadow over his head, to deliver him from his grief. So Jonah was exceeding glad of the gourd. But God prepared a worm when the morning rose the next day, and it smote the gourd that it withered." (Jonah 4:6, 7).

"For the sun is no sooner risen with a burning heat, but it withereth the grass, and the flower thereof falleth, and the grace of the fashion of it perisheth: so also shall the rich man fade away in his ways." (James 1:11).

"For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away" (1 Peter 1:24).

"He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man: that he may bring forth food out of the earth; And wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart. The trees of the L ORD are full of sap; the cedars of Lebanon, which he hath planted" (Psalm 104:14–16).

"And he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one. AND there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots" (Isaiah 10:34–11:1).

"Thy people also shall be all righteous: they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." (Isaiah 60:21).

Worldly works are likened to plants which have but a short life span, but the Word of God — specifically the King James Bible — is of everlasting value and endures forever.
And this is the word of God, which we translate.

The King James Bible is the English translation of the Word of God which abides forever.

What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord? [Jerem. 23. 28.]

“The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the LORD.” (Jeremiah 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?

“Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: Who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.” (Matthew 13:45, 46).

If an ordinary piece of glass has value, or if an ordinary pearl has value, how much more does the King James Bible, which is that pearl of great price? The answer is that the value is infinite.

Therefore let no mans eye be euill, because his Maiesties is good; neither let any be grieved, that wee haue a Prince that seeketh the increase of the spirituall wealth of Israel; (let Sanballats and Tobiahs do so, which therefore doe beare their iust reproof) but let vs rather blesse God from the ground of our heart, for working this religious care in him, to haue the translations of the Bible maturely considered of and examined.

“Beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart, saying, The seventh year, the year of release, is at hand; and thine eye be evil against thy poor brother, and thou givest him nought; and he cry unto the LORD against thee, and it be sin unto thee.” (Deuteronomy 15:9).

King James’ resolution and support of the King James Bible was called “good”, and the entire matter of the King James Bible was considered to be for the general spiritual wealth of Christianity, despite evildoers. The process of the King James Bible was the consideration and examination of other
translations of the Bible, and done with great learning and maturity, so that the very best effect would be had upon Christendom. Thus, the translators encouraged thanksgiving.

The King James Bible is like a prophecy come to pass, it is called “sound”, “far better”, “as gold”, “more brightly”, “rubbed and polished”, “agreeable to the original”, “corrected” and “truth”.

The King James Bible was the greatest and most honourable thing that King James could ever have ordered.

The greatest servant of King James was one who worked on the King James Version.

Those persons of England, and especially the Puritans, were the reasons why the King James Bible was translated, for them and their benefit. It was to be a benefit for all English-speaking Christians, besides for the whole Church generally.
upon the importunate petitions of the Puritans, at this Maiesties comming to this Crowne, the Conference at Hampton Court hauing bene appointed for hearing their complaints: when by force of reason they were put from all other grounds, they had recourse at the last, to this shift, that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the Communion booke, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated, which was as they said, a most corrupted translation.

A good conscience regarding the Word of God is necessary, and this good point was brought up by the Puritans, as concerning the current state of the translations. The Hampton Court Conference took place in January, 1604 between the king with the Anglican leaders, and four Puritan representatives.
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And although this was judged to be but a very poore and emptie shift; yet euen hereupon did his Maiestie beginne to bethinke himselfe of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and presently after gaue order for this Translation which is now presented vnto thee.
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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.

King James seized on the idea of a new translation, and afterwards gave the order, which was then presented for the use of all readers of the Bible.
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Thus much to satisfie our scrupulous Brethren.
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Thus much to satisfy our scrupulous brethren.

The King James Bible could not be gainsaid, in that it was to the satisfaction of all concerned, especially Puritans.
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An answer to the imputations of our aduersaries.
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An answer to the imputations of our adversaries

12. Answering the adversaries
A. Every Protestant English translation is the Word of God, though some are less fit than others
   a. Just as a man may be good looking, yet have blemishes
   b. The Word should not be banned because of blemishes
   c. The Original was perfect
d. The Romanists refused the Word, and burnt it — so they despised God’s Spirit

B. Several examples are given:
   a. Rome was badly rebuilt, yet should it have been burnt for this reason?
   b. Nero was never justified for his burning of it

C. Again,
   a. Was the second temple of Ezra and Haggai any less, because it was unlike Solomon’s?
   b. The Jews wept, and were angry against the Greeks who profaned it

D. Likewise are translations,
   a. Though the Septuagint was poor, the Apostles did not reject it
   b. The Christians used the Septuagint, and considered it to be generally the Word

E. The Romanists accused the English translators of being heretics
   a. The translators claim that they were not heretics
   b. They claim that the Romanists were not “catholic”, i.e. universal Christians
   c. Men should be tried by their faith, not by their supposed poor translations
   d. Augustine used a heretic’s work when it was correct
   e. The Christians used the translations of the Jews and the heretic Origen

F. Those who do not know these things are wearied, and those who do know are troubled

G. The third area which the translators were attacked in was the area of mending translations
   a. It was a good thing to fix mistakes in the English
   b. It was like repenting
   c. It was like being aware of one’s faults
   d. Pride must not be in the way

H. The Romanists themselves have adjusted their own works, official books and translations
   a. One Pope accepted one service book, another abolished it
   b. Then Romanist congregations were split between and old and a new edition
   c. In the mediæval times, a certain Pope eliminated the older style
   d. Later, the variety of breviaries was replaced with one
   e. Thus, the Romanists themselves are inconsistent, and ever changing

I. If the Romanists accuse the Protestant of differences in their translations:
   a. They are inconsistent, like hypocrites stoning others
   b. Even Romanist revisers of the Vulgate admitted to problems in it
   c. One Pope accepted Erasmus, another did not
   d. Pope Leo also ordered translations
   e. It is much like the Old Testament, which was insufficient, and needed the New

J. If the Romanists say that the inconsistencies were the private opinions of a certain Pope,
   a. These private opinions were shared by inquisitors, Trent councillors and others
   b. One edition of the Vulgate printed in one place differs from another, yet both are accepted

K. One Pope commented that so many translations into Latin was the work of Satan
   a. The mingling made all words doubtful and uncertain
   b. This same Pope said the Vulgate alone was the standard
   c. Then he commanded a new revision of it
   d. The Pope after him made changes to it
   e. Thus, there is no harmony among them

L. The whole matter would be one of setting the house in order before going to war
Now to the latter we answere; that wee do not deny, nay wee affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set foorth by men of our profession (for wee haue scene none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God. As the Kings Speech which hee uttered in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian and Latine, is still the Kings Speech, though it be not interpreted by euery Translator with the like grace, nor peraduenture so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sence, every where.

The translation of the Word of God into English could be done well, or poorly: but even the worst English translation of the Scripture would be better than the Romanists' Rheims-Douay Version, which was still being printed in France, and had not yet appeared in 1610 when The Translators to the Reader was written.

For it is confessed, that things are to take their denomination of the greater part; and a natural man could say, Verum ubi multa nitent in carmine, non ego paucis offendor maculis, &c. A man may be counted a virtuous man, though hee haue made many slips in his life, (else, there were none vertuous, for in many things we offend all) [James 3. 2.] also a comely man and lovely, though hee haue some warts vpon his hand; yea, not onely freckles vpon his face, but all skarres.

Horace (65–8 B.C.) was a Latin poet.

“For in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body.” (James 3:2).
“The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.” (Psalm 12:6). It would be obvious in later purifications which impurities were eliminated from those earlier ones. The blemishes would include those errors of the printing press.

The Scripture was perfect when it was given, and following versions were perfect inasmuch as they kept to the perfection of the Originals.

The Roman Catholics rejected the present Word, and in doing so, were rejecting the Original Word as inspired by the Holy Ghost. Thus, they rejected the Holy Ghost Himself.

Some examples are presented of where copies should have matched the Original, but are justifiable if they are on the trend of matching to the Original, if they are purifications (such as the early English versions), not dissensions (like the Rheims-Douay Version).

In 390 A.D., the Gauls (Celtic French of classical times) sacked Rome.
The example here is of the original Rome, like the inspired Originals of Scripture, was the standard, and when Rome was rebuilt in haste, it was still Rome, but not as good, this could be likened to poor translations of the Scripture executed in haste.

Catiline (108–62 B.C.) was the instigator of an insurrection against the Republic of Rome.

The Roman Emperor Nero (37–68 A.D.) has been the most hated Emperor of Rome, who persecuted Christians, and has been portrayed as a brutish fellow, self-indulgent and a grandiloquent artist. On his orders Rome was burnt so that his new building works could be implemented. He blamed the fire on the Christians.

The inference is that those who attempted to destroy or destroy a thing, even though they claimed it would be for the better (new government or better buildings), such an excuse would not justify these actions. Thus, the Romanists destroying Scripture was also without excuse.

"But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice; and many shouted aloud for joy" (Ezra 3:12).

Even though the latter Temple of Ezra and Haggai was less than Solomon’s Temple; nevertheless, the Jews treated it as the Temple, and so worshiped their, and were incensed against the Greeks who profaned it.

In regards to the second Temple, any Bible translation in English was to be considered as the Word of God, though it may have been “less” than the Original.
The translation of the Seventy dissenteth from the Original in many places, neither doeth it come near it, for perspicuitie, gratuitie, maiestie; yet which of the Apostles did condemn it?

The early Greek translation, the Septuagint, was certainly less than the Originals, yet it was not rejected.

Condemne it? Nay, they used it, (as it is apparent, and as Saint Hierome and most learned men doe confess) which they would not have done, nor by their example of using of it, so grace and commend it to the Church, if it had bene unworthy the appellation and name of the word of God.

The Septuagint, although imperfect, was still used for the benefit of the Church. Jerome and others understood this, that even though the Septuagint was imperfect, it was permissible to use it as the Word of God. In fact, it would be usable until something more perfect came along, and until a perfect translation finally could be made.

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 Authours of the translations, (heretics they call us by the same right that they call themselves Catholicks, both being wrong) we marvel what divinity taught them so.

The Romanists then went to attack the content of the Protestant English translations, based not on the merits of the translations, but on their calling of the authors thereof as “heretics”. The Romanists, of course, are not truly “Catholic”, that is, of the universal Church, nor are the Protestants “heretics”.

We are sure Tertullian was of another minde: [Tertul. de prescript. contra haereses.] Ex personis probamus fidem, an ex fide personas? Doe we trie mens faith

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
by their persons? we should trie their persons by their faith.

According to Tertullian, people should be judged by their beliefs, not their beliefs by who they are.

Augustine recognised the principles in a certain heretic’s works, and thought they were good in that they agreed with Scripture. Therefore, the Romanist also should, when regarding the King James Bible, not wholly reject it just because it is not Romanist. In fact, later Romanists have used the King James Bible. This does not excuse Romanism, but shows that there are some sensible people who happen to be caught up in Romanism and must leave it.

The Donatists were a group which broke with the Emperor Constantine and the Romanist Church in 312 A.D. The movement was persecuted, and granted toleration by the Emperor. They became the largest body of Christians in North Africa, and were opposed by Augustine, until, they were ravaged by invasions, and destroyed by Islam.

It was well known that the Christians were using Jewish versions of Greek translations of the Old Testament, and the Hexapla was a public spectacle which could be consulted at Cæsarea.
But we weary the unlearned, who need not know so much, and trouble the learned, who know it already.

The author comes to a balance, he cannot instruct in too much detail for the sake of the unlearned, and for those who know these things already, they are troubled as to them.

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.

In less than a hundred years, there were eight English versions of the Bible, seven of which were in the line of purification from Tyndale to the Authorized Version. Moreover, there were multiple editions of some, such as the case of the Great Bible: “The first printing was exhausted within a short while, and it went through six subsequent editions between 1540 and 1541. ‘Editions’ is preferred to ‘impressions’ here since the six successive issues were not identical.”

For to whom ever 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?

It is never wrong for someone to amend his own work to make it better.

Saint Augustine was not afraid to exhort St Hierome to a Palinodia or recantation; [S. Aug. Epist. 9.]

“Palinodia” was the term given to a literary apology. The most famous example was of Stesichorus (approx. 632–approx. 553 B.C.) who later made an apology on a work he wrote against Helen of Troy. Augustine of Hippo wanted Jerome to recant of some of the things that he had stated.

The same St Augustine was not ashamed to retractate, [S. Aug. lib. Retractat.] we might say reuoke, many things that had passed him, and doth euen glory that he seeth his infirmities. [Video interdum vita mea, S. Aug. Epist. 8.]

Augustine of Hippo developed his ideas, and sometimes his earlier ideas were — in his developed thinking — wrong, or else, some of what he wrote contained errors, which he wanted to correct. “Of
such an one will I glory: yet of myself I will not glory, but in mine infirmities.” (2 Corinthians 12:5). That is, that one should give glory to God, rather than glory in his own abilities.

The truth itself is more important than man’s pride, reputation or knowledge. “God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.” (Romans 3:4).

The cause is the truth.

then to the persons we say, that of all men they ought to be most silent in this case.

Man’s pride is therefore a falsehood.

But even Romanism has many adjustments in their own works: in their Vulgate, in their missals (mass books), in their breviaries (abridged liturgies) and portesses (manuals of devotion). If all these works have changed over time, then they are hypocrites if they accuse the English Bible from Tyndale to the Authorized Version of being changed.
Ambrose of Milan (339–397 A.D.) was a convert of Augustine, who made the official service book which lasted until mediaeval times. Durand (1230–1296) was a renowned mediaeval liturgist. Pope Adrian the First (reigned 772–795 A.D.) was in union with Emperor Charlemagne (742–814). Gregory the First (540–604 A.D.) was the Pope who patronised the Gregorian Chant.

Well, Officium Gregorianum gets by this means to be in credit, but doeth it continue without change or altering?

Although the Gregorian service was made official, it was not unchanged.

No, the very Roman service was of two fashions; the new fashion, and the old, the one used in one Church, and the other in another; as is to be seen in Pamelius a Romanist, his Preface, before Micrologus.

There were two Gregorian services, the old and the new, and its use differed from one Romanist congregation to another. Guido of Arrezo (990–1050 A.D.) was an Italian music theorist who wrote about religious music in a famous book called Micrologus de Disciplina Artis Musicae.

Neither was there this chopping and changing in the more ancient times only, but also of late:

Radulphus de Rivo lived around 1377, whilst Parmelius lived afterwards. Pope Nicholas the Third (1225–1280) instigated a purge of the old books, which obviously took about a hundred years to entirely fulfil.
The more ancient times could be counted as pre-1453. “The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us.” (Ecclesiastes 1:9, 10).

Pius Quintus himself confesseth, that every Bishopricke almost had a peculiar kind of service, most vnlike to that which others had: which moued him to abolish all other Breuiaries, though never so ancient, and pruiledged and published by Bishops in their Dioceses, and to establish and ratifie that onely which was of his owne setting forth, in the yeere 1568.

Pius the Fifth (1504–1572) was an austere, post-Trent Pope known for his purges against Protestantism and heretics. He introduced a new Catechism in 1566, a new breviary in 1568 and a new missal in 1570.

Now, when the father of their Church, who gladly would heale the soare of the daughter of his people softly and sleightilly, and make the best of it, findeth so great fault with them for their odds and jarring; we hope the children haue no great cause to vaunt of their vniformitie.

If the Pope, as a father, was so concerned about the diversity of books of practice, how much less can Romanists point to Protestant Bibles as being diverse and therefore wrong?

But the difference that appeareth betwenee our Translations, and our often correcting of them, is the thing that wee are specially charged with; let us see therefore whether they themselves bee without fault this way, (if it be to be counted a fault, to correct) and whether they bee fit men to throw stones at vs: O tandem maior parcas insane minori: [Horat.] they that are lesse sound themselves, ought not to object infirmities to others.

To have a difference is not bad, as long as the difference is one of improvement and purification. Yet,
if the Romanists object, the Scripture may be spoken to them: “So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.” (John 8:7).
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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 answere peraduenture, that we produced their enemies for witnesses against them; albeit, they were in no other sort enemies, then as S. Paul was to the Galatians, for telling them the truth: [Galat. 4. 16.] and it were to be wished, that they had dared to tell it them plainlier and oftner.

Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457) criticised the Latin Vulgate, and collated various readings of the New testament, which was finally printed in 1505. Johannes Faber Stapulensis (1455–1536) was a French reformer who translated the Bible into French from the Vulgate in 1530. Desiderius Erasmus (1469–1536) was the most famous renaissance editor and scholar of the New Testament. Juan Luis Vives (1492–1540) was a Spanish student of Erasmus.

To mend or make a new translation of the Vulgate would mean that the old was not perfect or entirely good. None of these men were strictly Protestants, though the later ones emphatised with the Reformation.

“Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?” (Galatians 4:16).
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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 Apostolike Letter & Bull;

Pope Leo the Tenth (1475–1521) was a friend of Erasmus, he also belatedly excommunicated Martin Luther in 1521. The Pope had given his support to Erasmus’ new Latin New Testament, even though it differed from the standard edition at that time.

1611 EDITION.
that the same Leo exhorted Pagnin to translate the whole Bible, [Sixtus Seneus.] and bare whatsoeuer charges was necessary for the worke.
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But what will they say to this, That Pope Leo the tenth allowed Erasmus’s translation of the New Testament, so much different from the Vulgar, by his apostolick letter and bull?

That the same Leo exhorted Pagine to translate the whole Bible, and bare whatsoever charges was necessary for the work?
Santes Pagninus (1470–1536) made a new Latin translation of the Bible in 1528, being the first to put the Bible into chapters with verses, though his verse divisions were never adopted. His translation has been praised as literal, and better than the Vulgate.

Surely, as the Apostle reasoneth to the Hebrews, that if the former Law and Testament had beene sufficient, there had beene no need of the latter: [Heb. 7. 11, & 8. 7.] so we may say, that if the olde vulgar had bene at all points allowable, to small purpose had labour and charges bene vndergone, about framing of a new.

“If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?” (Hebrews 7:11).

“For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second.” (Hebrews 8:7).

If the old Vulgate was sufficient, then any mending of it, and money spent doing so, would have been wasteful.

To “aver” means to state a case, to allege a fact be true in support of a plea.

Evidently, the opinion that the Vulgate was in need of correction was not only held to by one Pope, but by a whole list of prominent Romanists.
Cardinal Cajetan (1468–1534), at the time of the beginning of the Reformation, defended the Apocrypha. He was a follower of Thomas Aquinas, and interviewed Martin Luther, and was later instrumental in his excommunication. He was known for his commentaries on various books of the Bible and other classical works.

The Romanist unchangeability is a lie: the Vulgate has changed, and was wished to be changed by their own kind.

Pope Sixtus the Fifth (1520–1590) was able to put into practice the principles of the Counter-Reformation, which set the tone of the Romanist Institution until 1968. In fact Sixtus the Fifth’s contention is very sound and reasonable: if there is not standard, but a variety of translations apparently equal, then God’s Word is weak, dulled and made void.
ordaine by an inviolable decree, and that with the counsell and consent of his Cardinals, that the Latin edition of the olde and new Testament, which the Councill of Trent would haue to be authentick, is the same without controversie which he then set forth, being diligently corrected and printed in the Printing-house of Vatican?

Pope Sixtus the Fifth made the declaration that the Latin Version as printed from the Vatican was correct.

And he stated as much in the preface of this Vatican Vulgate.

However, Sixtus the Fifth’s immediate successor, to account of, was Clement the Eighth (1536–1605), who was made a cardinal by Sixtus the Fifth. There were in fact three Popes between them who all reigned ineffectively for very short periods of time (1590–1591): Urban the Seventh, twelve days; Gregory the Fourteenth, ten months; and Innocent the Ninth, two months. Clement the Eighth became Pope in 1592, and his version of the Vulgate (which the translators could easily consult) was different in over 3000 places from the Sixtine Edition. Thus, the standard Sixtine Edition (1546) was replaced by the new Clementine Edition (1590). This prompted Clement to ban the printing of all Bibles, including Roman Catholic editions, except his own edition. Therefore, during the very time that the King James Bible was being translated, all Romanist Bibles were being carefully and pedantically collated and conformed to the exact wording of the Clementine Edition. This is a massive proof to show that the King James Bible translators would have supported one standard edition of their own version. Therefore, it is arguable to contend that it is the Pure Cambridge Edition.

But as God is true, our word toward you was not yea and nay. For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, even by me and Silvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in
him was yea. For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us. Now he which establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God” (2 Corinthians 1:18–21).

“If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness” (1 Timothy 6:3).

The Clementine Edition of the Vulgate was attacked by certain Romanists because of “faults”. Therefore, they brought out new versions, this time in English, based on the Hebrew and Greek. God’s Word cannot be made null by dissenting editions, yet, if necessary, the presentation of God’s Word can be improved by goodly editions. This again supports the historical purification editions of the King James Bible, and secondly supports the pre-eminence of the Pure Cambridge Edition over all other contemporary editions.

Demaratus the Corinthian was a Spartan king, who counselled the Persian king, Xerxes, in his Greek campaign in 480 B.C. If the Romanists accuse the King James Bible of being different to former translations, then they are hypocrites, and need to adhere to the word, “Set thine house in order” (Isaiah 38:1c), because there are different editions of the Vulgate. This according to the Biblical logic, “(For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)” (1 Timothy 3:5).
H. There were not too few or too many of them
I. They had the Originals of the Old and New Testament to use, that is, the authority
   a. The truth is tried by the Greek and Hebrew
   b. Translations must be based on the original tongues
   c. This is what the translators of the work used
J. They took their time and were not hasty
   a. They did not overshoot, nor fall short
   b. It took over a thousand days to do
   c. Though maturity in understanding means quickness, this work was slowed by importance
K. Other translations were carefully checked
L. Thus, the translation was brought about

The outline of the proposed and actual pursuit of the making of the King James Bible is to be given.

The first premise was that there was no need for a new translation in the sense of a debut or novitiate. Nor was it needful to get good fruit from wild trees, or sweet waters from bitter fountains. One Pope made out as though bad substitutes had been given instead of the truth when it came to the Word of God in English as made by Protestants. The reality is that the early English Bibles were good, and that the best one would be the King James Bible. Here, the King James Bible is called “good”, “better”, and “one principal good one” (or “best”). Furthermore, in the eye of impartial judgment, nothing could be held or found against it: this was the high aim of the translators, and they obviously hit this mark. Such an achievement is therefore not exo belois (out of range). The Pure Cambridge Edition is an extension on this, representing the most focused line of this mark, and the virtue of being the very principal of principal.
To that purpose there were many chosen, that were greater in other mens eyes then in their owne, and that sought the truth rather then their own praise.
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Againe, they came or were thought to come to the worke, not exercendi causa (as one saith) but exercitati, that is, learned, not to learne: For the chiefe ouerseer and ἐργοδιώκτης vnder his Maiestie, to whom not onely we, but also our whole Church was much bound, knew by his wisedome, which thing also Nazianzen taught so long agoe, [Nazianzen. εἰς ῥυ. ἐπίσκ. παρουσ. Idem in Apologet.] that it is a preposterous order to teach first and to learne after, yea that τὸ ἐν πίθῳ κεραμίαν μανθάνειν, to learne and practise together, is neither commendable for the workman, nor safe for the work.

The workers on the King James Bible were educated, as King James himself also was an educated man. It is stressed that none of these learned on the job, but were already learned.

Nazianzene is another name for Gregory the Divine.

ἐργοδιώκτης — pronounced ergodioktes.

τὸ ἐν πίθῳ κεραμίαν μανθάνειν — pronounced to en pitbo kerameian manthanein.

The translators all were learned in many relevant tongues, even from childhood.
Hierome maketh no mention of the Greek tongue, wherein yet he did excel; because he translated not the Old Testament out of Greek, but out of Hebrew.

The Old Testament of the Vulgate had some value, since it was not corrupted by intermediaries, that is, by poor Greek translations. For this to be possible, Jerome had to know Hebrew.

And in what sort did these assemble? In the trust of their own knowledge, or of their sharpness of wit, or deepness of judgment, as it were in an arm of flesh? At no hand.

"Some trust in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the LORD our God." (Psalm 20:7).

"Be strong and courageous, be not afraid nor dismayed for the king of Assyria, nor for all the multitude that is with him: for there be more with us than with him: With him is an arm of flesh; but with us is the LORD our God to help us, and to fight our battles. And the people rested themselves upon the words of Hezekiah king of Judah." (2 Chronicles 32:7–8).

"Be not wise in thine own eyes: fear the LORD, and depart from evil." (Proverbs 3:7).

The King James Bible translators were not proud, wise in their own conceits or seeking self-glory, but assembled for the good of the work.

They trusted in him that hath the key of David, opening and no man shutting; they prayed to the Lord the Father of our Lord, to the effect that S. Augustine did; O let thy Scriptures be my pure delight, let me not be deceived in them, neither let me deceive by them.

"These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth" (Revelation 3:7b).

The Scripture being unlocked, and made available by the Lord, could not be gainsaid or undone. Therefore, they translators prayed in the vein of Augustine, that they should delight in the law of the Lord, and not turn aside to the left or to the right hand from them.
In this confidence, and with this devotion did they assemble together; not too many, lest one should trouble another; and yet many, lest many things haply might escape them.

Fifty-four translators were chosen, which was not too few, so that something could be missed, neither were there too many, as though there would be trouble. There were others who could have been chosen also, but were rejected, such as Hugh Broughton (1549–1612) who had a vile temper.

The translation of the King James Bible was from the Originals, not merely from another English version or Latin or from some other foreign translation.

“And I answered again, and said unto him, What be these two olive branches which through the two golden pipes empty the golden oil out of themselves? And he answered me and said, Knowest thou not what these be? And I said, No, my lord. Then said he, These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth. THEN I turned, and lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a flying roll.” (Zechariah 4:12–5:1).

The two golden pipes are being interpreted as the two Testaments.

Since the original tongues are the primary tongues, they are the ones which should primarily be used as the basis of translation.
the Old Testament) is to be tried by the Hebrewe Volumes, so of the New by the Greeke tongue, he meaneth by the originall Greeke.

Hebrew volumes; so of the New by the Greek tongue, he meaneth by the original Greek.

Gratian, an Italian Benedictine monk, who in around 1140 put together Romanist canon law, made it binding that the authority of the Old Testament was the Hebrew and the New was in the Greek.

If truth be to be tried by these tongues, then whence should a Translation be made, but out of them?

The translation of the Scripture should be based on the Hebrew and Greek.

These tongues, therefore, the Scriptures wee say in those tongues, wee set before vs to translate, being the tongues wherein God was pleased to speake to his Church by his Prophets and Apostles.

These languages were the ones which the apostles and prophets originally wrote in, and therefore were the ones which the translators of the King James Bible used.

Neither did we run over the work with that posting haste that the Septuagint did, if that be true which is reported of them, that they finished it in seventy two days; neither were we barred or hindered from going over it againe, having once done it, like St Hierome, if that be true which himself reporteth, that he could no sooner write any thing, but presently it was caught from him, and published, and he could not have leave to mend it: neither, to be short, were we the first that fell in hand with translating the Scripture into English, and consequently destitute of former helps, as it is written of Origen, that he was the first in a manner, that put his hand to write Commentaries vpon the Scriptures, and therefore no
marueile, if he ouershot himselfe many times.

Flavius Josephus (37–100 A.D.) was a Jewish historian, who was heavily influenced by Roman thinking.

The Septuagint was executed rather to hurriedly, whereas the King James Bible was checked and rechecked, so that it could be entirely perfect. Thus, not only any internal errors could be eliminated, but the version could be checked against other versions and witnesses. The year 1611 was a recent enough time to have such a body and weight of evidence available for use.

None of these things: The work hath not been huddled up in seventy two days, but hath cost the workmen, as light as it seemeth, the pains of twice seven times seventy two days, and more.

The work was not done in secret in a mere seventy-two days, but took at least three years: the organisation began from the beginning of 1604, by 1607 all translation was underway, by 1610 the work was completed, and printed in 1611.

Neither did we think much to consult the translators or commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek, or Latin; no nor the Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch; neither did we disdain to revise that which we had done, and to bring back to the anvil that which we had hammered: but having and using as great helps as were needfull, and fearing no reproch for slownesse, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have at the length,
Besides the original languages, there was also commentators, and other translations and versions. There was the processes of checking, rechecking and cross-checking. This was all done without having to worry about time, so that a proper and thorough job could be done. The translators lay claim to the good hand of the Lord being upon them, bringing to pass the King James Bible. Thus, the King James Bible is the Lord’s work.

Those that oppose the King James Bible should be aware: “And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.” (Acts 5:38, 39).
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Reasons moving vs to set diversitie of senses in the margin, where there is great probability for each.

14. The diversity of senses in the margins where there is a possibility for it being correct
A. Some would not have anything in the margin, since it would undermine the authority of Scripture
B. But this is not sound, because:
   a. The basics are clear in Scripture
   b. People must exercise learning to check each reading
   c. People must rely on God to help them
   d. People must search the Scripture for conference
C. God has allowed for a variety in certain places
   a. Which does not disturb the area of salvation
   b. So that men would move with godly fear in these cases
   c. For honesty of the actual state of things
D. There are some words which appear once, and are somewhat uncertain
   a. The Jewish Rabbins are uncertain about some things
   b. The Septuagint is uncertain about some things
E. Therefore, the margin allows for a reader to discern, and to judge (by God’s help)
   a. Variety of translations are profitable for understanding the sense
   b. Yet a Pope forbade this, though some did not agree with him
   c. It is better to judge, than to be ignorantly certain and in error
   d. As though a man in his own knowledge is unable to make an error
   e. But men, especially Popes, are seen as fallible
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Some peraduenture would haue no varietie of sences to be set in the margine, lest the authoritie of the Scriptures for deciding of controversies by that shew of vncertaintie, should somewhat be shaken.
Some words were difficult to translate, or there were different interpretations; nevertheless, the Word of God is absolute, and there are not different ways of presenting it perfectly. Many of the marginal readings are old interpretations found in copies of the Greek and Hebrew. These are to be considered suspect, as the work of men compared to the work of God is always inferior. The King James Bible translators did not claim infallibility, but by time and effort, and honesty (by using italics and by presenting the rejected variant readings in the margin) showed that, by God’s help, they were able to bring about a perfect work. And they invited the reader to investigate to see whether indeed the very sense of God’s message is presented, that the wording is correct.

The marginal readings are not a show of uncertainty, in that they are not the words of God: “But as God is true, our word toward you was not yea and nay.” (2 Corinthians 1:18).

For though, whatsoever things are necessary are manifest, as St Chrysostome saith; and, as St Augustine, In those things that are plainly set down in the Scriptures all such matters are found that concern Faith, hope, and Charity: yet for all that it cannot be dissembled, that partly to exercise and whet our wits, partly to wean the curious from loathing of them for their everywhere plaineness, partly also to stir up our devotion to crave the assistance of God’s Spirit by prayer, and lastly, that we might be forward to seek aid of our brethren by conference, and never scorn those that be not in all respects so complete as they should be, being to seek in many things ourselves, 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 beseem us than confidence, and if we will resolve, to resolve upon modestie with St Augustine, (though not in this same case altogether, yet upon the same ground) Melius est dubitare de occultis, quam litigare de
li. 8. de Genes. ad liter. cap. 5.] (though not in this same case altogether, yet upon the same ground) Melius est dubitare de occultis, quàm litigare de incertis, it is better to make doubt of those things which are secret, then to strive about those things that are uncertain.

The Scripture is plainly manifest to be true, and no doubt can be entered into all the doctrines of Scripture, even if there are other renderings. God has therefore supplied variant readings for the intelligent exercise of man, so that a person must rely on God, that a person must be confident in God, and not merely in some Scripture inscribed somewhere in stone. Yet, it is honest to show that uncertainty does on occasions exist; nevertheless, this uncertainty is only resolved by faith. A reader cannot merely rely on the fact that the King James Bible translators or others have denounced the variant readings, but must examine and see their inferiority for themselves.

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

There be many words in the Scriptures, which be never found there but once, \(\alpha^{\text{apax lēgoμeνα}}\) (having neither brother nor neighbour, as the Hebrews speak) so that we cannot be holpen by conference of places.

The cases of difficulties in translating Bible words are usually those where a word only appears once.

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

Againe, there be many rare names of certaine birds, beasts and precious stones, &c. concerning which the Hebrewes themselves are so diuided among themselues for iudgement, that they may seeme to haue defined this or that, rather because they would say something, thë because they were sure of that which they said, as S. Hierome somewhere saith of the Septuagint.

An actual examination of the King James Bible, whether 1611 or the Pure Cambridge Edition, will show that in those places where there are lists of precious stones and birds and animals, there are very few cases of variants being offered. In fact, this gives witness to the fact that modern thought on the probability of equality of various readings is in fact not a doctrine supported in the King James Bible, nor is it presented in The Translators to the Reader.

1611 EDITION. TTR CAMBRIDGE EDITION.

Now in such a case, doth not a margine do well to admonish the Reader to seeke further, and not to conclude or
The following doctrine is an utter perversion of what the King James Bible is and stands for: “Our conscientious translators, not being in several cases to determine which of two meanings borne by a word, or which of two words found in different copies, should be admitted into the text, adopted the measure of receiving both, placing one in the Margin and the other in the Text, thus leaving the reader at liberty to adopt either, both of which in their apprehension stood nearly on the same authority.” The reality is that in the end, one reading had the authority, the other did not; therefore, one was placed in the text and the other not.

The fault of incredulity is unbelief of the Scripture. To remain doubtful of the variant readings is likewise harmful. Notwithstanding, it is no good to merely reject those marginal readings without knowledge, but they must be rejected when examined by knowledge in the light of Scripture. A thing which any Christian could do, which most Christians have not done: even claimed supporters of the King James Bible apparently believe that the marginal readings are “genuine” or equal to Scripture, or equally plausible as Scripture.

In the translation of the King James Bible, the consultation of the great variety of translations was needful and beneficial, but presently, is no longer necessary. Likewise, where other interpretations were put into the margin was also commendable, being taken (at least in part) from these variety of translations. From the variety one central truth could be discerned, and was presented in the text, whist other variant (inferior, false) readings were set in the margin.
Sixtus Quintus was speaking of the translation into Latin from Greek as opposed to the historical Latin Vulgate available at his time. He sought to establish a standard, even when it meant being faithful to tradition over truth. Not all Romanists agreed with this anti-intellectual stance.

They that are wise, had rather have their judgments at liberty in differences of readings, than to be captivated to one, when it may be the other.

Those that are wise will admit in all cases where they could be wrong. Nevertheless, the Scripture is never wrong. Furthermore, a truly wise endeavour, such as the production of the King James Bible, while was honest to show the places where there were variants, also showed by authority which “alternative” was preferred, being the reading of the text. The reader then would be free to agree with the text, whilst being able to, in every case, if he so wished, to ponder the variant, and would honestly see that it would be wrong.

If they were sure that their high priest had all laws shut up in his breast, as Paul the second bragged, and that he were as free from error by special privilege, as the dictators of Rome were made by law inviolable, it were another matter; then his word were an oracle, his opinion a decision.

Paul the Second (1417–1471) was an especially dictatorial Pope.

No man, whether a Pope or emperor has been infallible in his own strength, yet God is able to help, make and establish a true authority. “And Samuel grew, and the LORD was with him, and did let none of his words fall to the ground.” (1 Samuel 3:19). God has made the King James Bible this authority for the end of the world.

But the eyes of the world are now open, God be thanked, and have bene a great while, they find that he is subject to the same affections and infirmities that others be, that his skin is penetrable, and therefore so much as he
and therefore so much as he prooveth, not as much as he claimeth, they grant and embrace.

After the Reformation, Europeans were generally less superstitious, and saw the Pope for what he was. “And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.” (Revelation 13:3). Pope John Paul the Second (1920–2005), for example, was shot and wounded in 1981 by a Turkish assassin.

15. Why the translators did not always use the same English word for the same original word
A. Some think it would be exact to always use the same word
   a. This may be right, but the sense changes when the same word is employed
   b. And by this inflexible rule, the same English word would always be used
   c. But the Kingdom of God is not restricted in vocabulary
   d. For ever has there been strifes about words, and these are meaningless
B. Others accused the translators of treating English words unequally
   a. Words are amoral
   b. Words are tools
   c. Words should follow the Hebrew and Greek into English, not invented English
C. The false doctrines of the extreme Protestants were avoided by not using their words
D. The darkening of the understanding of Romanists’ Latinised words were also avoided
E. But the Scripture in English is to be for the understanding
F. There are many other things also, but shall not be said
G. The reader is commended to God, who by His Spirit will teach, help and lead
   a. God opens the eyes
   b. God provides the water to drink
   c. God had the King James Bible translated:
      i. God, King James, and the translators ought to be thanked, not despised
      ii. One must not be like the swine who trod the pearls under feet
      iii. One must not be like the people who begged Jesus to leave
      iv. One must not be like Esau who sold his birthright for some pottage
      v. Love the light, receive the good things, do not go naked or hungry
   d. No one should reject this, and then make some other translation afterwards
      i. Believers must be sober and defend it
      ii. But for those who reject it, they shall feel God’s wrath
      iii. The reader should do God’s will
      iv. And serve Him

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
peraduenture would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men some where, have beene as exact as they could that way.

would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere have been as exact as they could that way.

The translators did not always use the same English word for the same original word.

\[\text{πολυσημα}\]

If the same word had the same meaning, then it was translated the same way, but if the meaning altered, then another relevant English word was used.

The translators did not strive to be clever, in that they did not randomly try and use every different word they could for the same original word, which would have made the Bible foolish.

The translators were free to use exactly the right English word for the right meaning or sense. This meant that exactly the correct word was used.
A godly Father in the Primitie time shewed himselfe greatly moued, that one of the newfanglednes called κραββατον σκιμπους, [A bed.] though the difference be little or none; [Niceph. Calist. lib. 8. cap. 42.] and another reporteth, [S. Hieron. in 4. Ione. See S. Aug: epist: 10.] that he was much abused for turning Cucurbita (to which reading the people had beene vsed) into Hedera.

Nicephorus Callistus (1256–1335) wrote an ecclesiastical history regarding early controversies.

People where attacked in the classical times if they used a different word to mean the same thing, or if they changed a word.

“Cucurbita” is a type of plant, as is “hedera”. One word was changed to another in Jonah in the Vulgate, which caused an outcry at the time.

κράββατον, σκίμπους — pronounced krabbaton, skimpous. The meaning is a bed, whether a cot or couch.

Now if this happen in better times, and vpon so small occasions, wee might iustly feare hard censure, if generally wee should make verball and vnnecessary changings.

We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some vnequall dealing towards a great number of good English wordes.

For as it is written of a certaine great Philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happie that were made images to be worshipped; for their
fellowes, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certaine words, Stand vp higher, have a place in the Bible always, and to others of like qualitie, Get ye hence, be banished for euer, wee might be taxed peraduenture with S. James his words, namely, To be partiall in our selues and iudges of euill thoughts.

The translators did not think to chose certain words to be continued, and other words to be destroyed, as though they were more concerned about the vocabulary than their work. They were, evidently, aware that their work was to have a massive impact on the vocabulary and the future of the English language.

As God is the master of language, and the Scripture contains many different words, so the King James Bible used a variety of English words, without being caught up in strifes about words, which are endless.

“If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.” (1 Timothy 6:3–5).
The translators did not go to the extreme of leaving behind all the old words, as certain extreme Puritans had done, because of certain doctrines. To make “baptism” into “washing” or “church” to “congregation” is nonsense and unacceptable to all true Puritans.

Neither did the translators follow the Romanists, who in their version used many Latinate words, and made it an incomprehensible version, being more like quasi-English, or Anglo-Latin. “Azymes” means unleavened bread; “tunik”, certain clothing; “rational”, reckoning or reason, “holocaust”, mass burning; “prepuce”, foreskin; and “pasche”, the Latin Easter.

But the King James Bible was to be presented in a way that could be understood by the unlearned, yet not compromised. This meant that the language had to be peerless, timeless, full of gravity and majesty, yet invigorating.

There are many other issues and comments and areas to which the writer could have written, and that the translators could have made known, but such writings could possibly be endless, and therefore unprofitable.
It is God alone who can teach, guide and bring a person to a full understanding of the truth.

“And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified.” (Acts 20:32).

“But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.” (1 John 2:27).

“Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us,” (Ephesians 3:20).

“Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures” (Luke 24:45).

“I will run the way of thy commandments, when thou shalt enlarge my heart.” (Psalm 119:32).

“The law of thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver.” (Psalm 119:72).

“Teach me, O LORD, the way of thy statutes; and I shall keep it unto the end.” (Psalm 119:33).

“Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, [Gen. 26. 15.] neither preferre broken pits before them with the wicked Iewes. [Jerem. 2. 13.]” (1611 EDITION. TTR S. 15 P. 2 CAMBRIDGE EDITION.)

“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.”

“For all the wells which his father’s servants had digged in the days of Abraham his father, the Philistines had stopped them, and filled them with earth.” (Genesis 26:15).
“For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.” (Jeremiah 2:13).

There is a great benefit to be had from the King James Bible, whose translators made available such a work for modern times.

“I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labour: other men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours.” (John 4:38).

The King James Bible is called “great things”, and is even linked with salvation.

“WE then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain. (For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.)” (Hebrews 6:1, 2).

“Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.” (Matthew 7:6).

“And, behold, the whole city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought him that he would depart out of their coasts.” (Matthew 8:34).

“Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright.” (Hebrews 12:16).
starue not your selues. starve not yourselves.

The King James Bible is called light, and is the opposite and answer to the great deception in the present world, most especially, the exposer of false Christian religion.

“And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.” (John 3:19).

“I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see.” (Revelation 3:18).

Those who deny the good gold, food and clothing, and yet seek these very things after their own fashion will be found to be terribly wanting: this is the state of deception with the modern versions, which have turned aside from the King James Bible.

For those who seek to find, or have a need, can be assured and confident that God’s Word is available in English in a perfect form, and that God, in His great care and love, has provided the Church with the King James Bible.

There is a warning for those who persist in speaking against the King James Bible, or else still do not take it up: God is indeed set against them.
It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God; 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 doe thy will, O God.

The King James Bible is, as it were, God present with His people in written form. It is by this and through this that the Spirit is now speaking to the world.

“It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.” (Hebrews 10:31).

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.

Therefore, all Christians should be convinced of the rightness and use of the King James Bible and forthwith lay aside all false doctrines, and turn to the Lord with a whole heart. In serving the Lord with one Word, the Lord shall be most especially pleased.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” (1 Corinthians 1:10).

¶ 4. Notes on the text of the translators’ preface

The superscript letters throughout the 1611 Edition of The Translators to the Reader correspond to the list below.

a “an” is consistent with the usage and meaning in Exodus 39:23.
b “parley” is the modern spelling of this word.
c the wording was changed to conformity with the King James Bible quotation of 2 Samuel 11:25. The 1611 probably followed the Geneva Version.
d “an” is consistent with the usage and meaning in 2 Corinthians 12:15.
e the deletion of the word “of” elevates a possible misreading of the 1611 sentence.
f the wording was changed to conformity with the King James Bible quotation of Numbers 32:14. The 1611 probably followed the Geneva Version.
g the wording was changed to conformity with the King James Bible quotation of Acts 7:51. The 1611 probably followed the Geneva Version.
the wording has been altered in line with the principles of standardised English word changes in the
King James Bible.
the deletion of the word “things” is a deletion of a tautological expression.
the change to this Hebrew word has been made in the manner of the changes to words appearing in
the revisions of the King James Bible.
the Greeks made conquests, because while Alexander’s life may have been one campaign, the wars
between Syria and Egypt were ongoing conflicts.
the older spelling is “injoining”, which was introduced after 1611, though “enjoin” is found in the
the deletion of the word “other” is a deletion of a tautological expression.
not only was the spelling updated, but the meaning was changed, in that the works in question were
presented in poetical form, and were called “Rijmbijbel” (Rime-bible).
these are spelling differences which came about through the adoption of a standard expression of
foreign names.
the change to the word “open” allows for the opening to last to the present.
as in the text of the Bible, “travail” has been made “travel”. Proverbs 16:11 in 1611 had “travaileth”
while the Pure Cambridge Edition has “travelleth”. “Travel” means “journey” (as Section 15 of The
Translators to the Reader interprets) while “travail” has to do with labour and grief. Thus, the
meaning in the place is “journeyed”.
consistent with “begun” and “perfected”, “latter” with “former” rather than “later”.
when written in figures, a reference does not need the word “verse”.
the 1611 reading does not appear false until the corrected reading clarifies the sense of the passage.
the word “of” is added to eliminate a possible false understanding that the example could be used
rather than the thing which the example was representing.
the word “and” has been added in accordance with the ordinary grammar of Standard English.
the plural was an error in 1611 since only one name was mentioned.
the old “his” has been contracted to an apostrophe “s”.
the tense has been changed, in that it is being reported of as happening in the past.

5. Variants in the text of translators’ preface

The main differences between the Cambridge Edition and the other historical editions of the
translators’ preface, not counting where one favours the 1611 Edition include:
Section 1, Paragraph 1. “Churchmaintenance”. The London Edition often leaves out hyphens.
Section 1, Paragraph 1. The words “his heel” instead of “the heel”. The London edition follows the
wording from the King James Bible in John 13:18 against the original preface.
Section 1, Paragraph 2. The word “at” is deleted from “at the chiefest” in the London Edition.
Section 2. The word “latter” for “later”. The London Edition is clearly wrong, in that “latter” implies
a choice between two times, but “later” describes times more recent than those previously mentioned:
this is clearly the case here.
Section 2. The word “even” is deleted from before “Cum” in the London Edition.
Section 3. The word “more” is substituted for “most” in the London Edition to align with several
occurrences of “more excellent” in the King James Bible.
Section 4. The London Edition wrongly substitutes “later” for “latter”, where the Church Fathers are
divided between those which came before or after Augustine (or the council of Nicaea).
Section 4. The wrong use of grammar, “as St. Basil calls it” instead of “St Basil calleth it”. The
London Edition is inconstant with itself in numerous other places by doing this.
Section 9. The lowercase “church of Rome” (Section 9) in the London Edition, which should be capitalised.

Section 9. The word “toward” instead of “towards”. This is consistent with the 1769 Revision of the King James Bible; however, these rules do not necessarily apply in the non-Biblical text.


Section 10. The spelling of “Jerusalem” from “Hierusalem”. The London Edition has modernised the spelling.

Section 11. The quaint form of “Hampton-court” is found in the London Edition.

Section 12, Paragraph 3. The words, “to account of” are added before “publisheth” in the London Edition, while the Cambridge Edition has “published” in that place. The apparent immediate succession of Popes is explained by adding the words “to account of” in the London Edition, so as to allow for the fact that several Popes were instated but did not effectively rule between the two Popes mentioned.

Section 12, Paragraph 3. The old spelling of “shew” for “show” is introduced into the London Edition, against the 1611 Edition.

Section 13. The word “wheal” is substituted for “whey” in the London Edition. The word “wheal” means welts, and creates a mixed metaphor, as welts cannot be drunk.

Section 13. The word “yea” is deleted from the London Edition, against the witness of the original.


Section 14. The old word “lothing” replaces “loathing” in the London Edition, against the witness of the original.

Section 14. The London Edition boldly replaces “skin is penetrable” with “body is subject to wounds” in line with a quotation from Revelation 13, referring to the Pope.

Section 15, Paragraph 1. “Get you hence” has replaced “Get ye hence” in the London Edition in line with the language and revision which has taken place in the King James Bible.
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