

## THE TRANSLATORS TO THE READER

**The best things** have been slandered.

Any **effort to promote the common good**, whether by creating something ourselves, or by adapting the work of others, surely deserves serious respect and consideration, yet it finds only a cold reception in the world, **it is greeted with suspicion instead of interest, and with disparagement instead of gratitude.** And if there is any room left for quibbling (and quibblers will invent a pretext if they do not find one), it is sure to be misinterpreted and risk being condemned. Anyone who has any experience or familiarity with history will readily admit this. For **was anything ever undertaken with a touch of newness or improvement about it that didn't run into storms of argument or opposition?** Anyone would think that orderly government, sound laws, education, councils, and Church support, not to mention other such things, should be as safe as a sanctuary, and beyond the range, as they say, of anyone's carping or any dog's yapping. By orderly government we are distinguished from animals which follow their appetites. By sound laws we are controlled and restrained from disgusting behavior and from injuring others, whether by fraud or by violence. By education we are enabled to enlighten and help others by the insight and understanding that we ourselves have gained. Further, by councils we come together in direct negotiations to settle our differences more quickly than by writings, which can be interminable. Finally, giving adequate support to the Church is reasonable and appropriate, just as mothers are considered less cruel who kill their children as soon as they are born, than the nursing fathers and mothers (wherever they are) who keep from the babies at their breasts the support that they need (and who also depend on them for the spiritual and pure milk of the word). **So it is obvious that the things we are speaking of are basic necessities, and that therefore no one can dispute them without being absurd, or object to them without note of wickedness.**

**Yet despite this**, scholars know that honorable men have been condemned to death for attempting to bring good order and discipline to their countrymen, and that in some states it was made a capital crime even to propose a new law abrogating an old law, even though the old law was pernicious. And that some leaders, who were regarded as pillars of the State and models of virtue and prudence, have been **very reluctant to accept common standards of good letters and refined speech, shying away from them as from rocks or from poison.** And fourthly, it was not a rash youth but a reputable scholar who stated, perhaps in passion but yet clearly (in writing which remains to posterity), that he had never seen anything good come from a council or meeting of the Clergy, but rather the opposite. And finally, with regard to Church support and the subsidies that are provided for the ambassadors and messengers of the great King of kings, there is the story (or rather the fable, as our source called it) that when the professors and teachers of Christianity in the Church of Rome (when it was a true Church) were generously endowed, a voice was heard from heaven, saying, "Now poison has been poured into the Church." Thus not only **whenever we say something, but also whenever we do anything of note or consequence, we lay ourselves open to everyone's criticism**, and they are fortunate who are least subjected to idle gossip, because it is impossible to escape it altogether. Anyone is deceived who imagines that this is true only of unimportant

The noble effort to provide the KJV translation was notably slandered.

All newness and progress, whether good or bad, is subject to storms of opposition.

They considered their new translation to be a basic necessity.

Even the truth is treated as *poison* by many who claim to embrace the truth.

people, and that princes are privileged by their position. "You never know who will be killed in a war," as it says in Samuel (2 Samuel 11.25). A great commander once charged his soldiers entering a battle to aim only at the faces of the enemy, and the king of Syria commanded his captains to attack no one but the king of Israel (1 Kings 22.31). And **it is true that envy strikes most cruelly at the fairest and best.** David was a worthy prince, outstanding among his peers for his early deeds; and yet for the worthiest act of his life, **bringing back the Ark of God in solemn triumph, he was despised and scoffed at by his own wife** (2 Samuel 6.16). Solomon was greater than David, not in virtue but in power. By his power and wisdom he **built a temple to the Lord** that was the glory of the land of Israel and the wonder of the whole world. **But was this magnificent achievement appreciated by everyone? Hardly! Otherwise, why do they blame the son and appeal to him to ease the burden, saying, "Lighten the hard service of your father, and his heavy yoke that he placed on us" (1 Kings 12.4). Evidently he oppressed them with conscripted labor and burdened them with taxes, and they reacted disastrously, wishing in their heart that the temple had never been built. It is so difficult to please everyone, even when we please God best, and try to commend ourselves to everyone's conscience.**

**The highest personages have been slandered.**

Coming down to later times we will find many similar examples of this kind, or rather unkind, treatment. Julius Caesar, the first Roman emperor, never did anything more convenient for scholarship, or more useful for later generations for recording events accurately, than **when he reorganized the Calendar by basing it on the solar year. Yet for this he was accused of innovation and arrogance, and severely censured.** Then Constantine, the first Christian emperor (at least the first to openly profess the faith himself and sanction it for others), **by strengthening the empire at great expense and providing for the Church as he did**, earned the name Pupillus (implying that **he was a wasteful Prince, in need of a guardian or overseer**). So Theodosius, the best named Emperor (literally "God's gift"), was considered to be a weakling because he did not go to war until he was forced into it, although in fact he excelled in feats of chivalry and demonstrated as much when he was provoked, and he was condemned for giving himself over to luxury and pleasure because he loved peace, to the benefit of both himself and his subjects. And Justinian, **the most scholarly of the emperors** (at least, the greatest statesman), who **eliminated duplications in the legal code, systematizing the laws with some order and method**, was smeared by some as an epitomist, that is, as one who destroyed valuable volumes simply to promote demand for his abridgments of them. **This is how excellent princes have been treated historically, and their good deeds maligned.** Nor is there any likelihood that envy and spite are dead and buried with the past. Rather, the reproof of Moses applies to every age: "And now you have taken your ancestors' place, a new generation of sinful people" (Numbers 32.14). The wise man says, "What has been done before will be done again. There is nothing new in the whole world" (Ecclesiastes 1.9); and St. Stephen echoes, "You are just like your ancestors!" (Acts 7:51).

The KJV translators themselves were slandered in the guise of defending existing translations.

His Majesty's insistence, **despite slander**, for a survey of English translations.

His Majesty now reigning (and long may he reign, and his descendants after him), thanks to the singular wisdom God has given him and to his rare learning and experience, was well aware that **whoever attempts anything for the public, especially if it has to do with religion or with making the word of God accessible and understandable, sets himself up to be frowned upon by every evil eye, and casts himself headlong on a row of spikes, to be stabbed by every sharp tongue.** For meddling in any way with a people's religion is meddling with their customs, with their inalienable rights. And **although they may be dissatisfied with what they have, they cannot bear to have it altered.** And yet, his royal heart was not daunted or discouraged by any of the rival parties. He was resolute, as immovable as a statue, or like an anvil that cannot be beaten into plates, as they say. He knew who had chosen him as a soldier, or rather as a captain. He was confident that the course he had set was for the glory of God and the building up of his Church, and he would not let it to be distracted by anyone's speeches or actions. It is not only the right of kings, it is their special responsibility to be concerned for religion, to understand it properly, to profess it earnestly, and to promote it to the best of their ability. This is their glory before all proper nations, and it will bring them a far more excellent weight of glory in the day of the Lord Jesus. For the Scripture is true that says "those who honor me I will honor" (1 Samuel 2.30), and Eusebius was right long ago when he said that reverence to God was the weapon, and the only weapon, that both preserved Constantine's person and avenged him on his enemies.

### The praise of the Holy Scriptures.

But now **what is reverence without truth? What truth, what saving truth is there apart from the word of God? What word of God is there that we may be sure of, apart from the Scriptures?** We are commanded to search the Scriptures (John 5.39; Isaiah 8.20). People are commended who searched and studied them (Acts 17.11 and 8.28, 29). People are reproved who did not know them, or were slow to believe them (Matthew 22.29; Luke 24.25). They can give us wisdom that leads to salvation (2 Timothy 3.15). If we are ignorant, they will teach us; if lost, they will bring us home; if confused, they will reform us; if sorrowful, they will comfort us; if dull, they will revive us; if cold, inspire us. A supernatural voice told **St. Augustine**, "Take and read, take and read [the Scriptures]." St. Augustine also says, "Whatever is in the Scriptures, believe me, is lofty and divine; it contains the truth, and teachings so able to refresh and renew the mind, and so well balanced that everyone may draw from them exactly what they need, if only they come with a devout and pious mind, as true religion requires." And **St. Jerome** says, "Love the Scriptures, and wisdom will favor you." St. Cyril in writing against Julian states, "Children that are brought up in the Scriptures, become very religious." But why should we mention these particular applications of the Scriptures when everything to be believed or practiced, or hoped for, is contained in them? Or these few statements by the Fathers, when anyone worth calling a Father, from the time of Christ on down, has written not only of the riches, but also of the perfection of the Scriptures? "I adore the completeness of the Scriptures," says **Tertullian** writing to Hermogenes. And again he says to Apelles, a heretic of the same kind, "I do not accept anything you teach on your own apart from Scripture." So

Sharp slanderous criticism attended the KJV translation in the same way as it does with newer translations.

*Accessibility and understandability* were issues addressed by the translators of this new KJV translation.

St. Augustine is here quoted as a very legitimate source and thereby given credibility by the translators. How would modern day translators be viewed if they did the same?

So also St. Jerome who produced the *Latin Vulgate*.

And Tertullian.

also St. **Justin Martyr** before him says, "We must always remember that it is not lawful (or possible) to learn (any thing) about God or about true piety, except from the Prophets, who teach us by divine inspiration." So also following Tertullian **St. Basil** says, "It is a clear departure from the faith, and a fault of presumption, either to reject any of those things that are written, or to bring up anything that is not written." We will omit statements to the same effect by **St. Cyril**, Bishop of Jerusalem, in the fourth of his *Catechetical Lectures*, or St. Jerome against Helvidius, or by St. Augustine in his third book against the letters of Petilian, and in so many other places in his works. Nor will we mention **the later Fathers**, to avoid wearying the reader. But **if the Scriptures are acknowledged to be so complete and so perfect, how can we avoid the charge of negligence if we do not study them, or the charge of pedantic quibbling if we are not satisfied with them?** People talk about the Eiresion garland, the laurel branch wrapped in wool and filled with fruits; about the Philosopher's stone, that turns copper into gold; about the Cornucopia, fined with all kinds of food; about the herb Panaces, that was good medicine for all diseases; about the drug Catholicon, that works for all purgatives; about Vulcan's armor, that protects against any kind of attack, etc. Well, the claims falsely or wishfully attributed to these things for physical benefits, **we may justly and confidently ascribe to the Scripture for spiritual benefits. It is not just a weapon, but a whole armory of weapons, both offensive and defensive, by which we may save ourselves and put the enemy to flight. it is not an herb, but a tree, or rather a whole garden of life-giving trees, which produce fruit every month: the fruit is good for food, and the leaves for medicine (Revelation 22.2). It is not a pot of Manna, or a cruet of oil, good only as a symbol or perhaps as food for a meal or two; rather it is like a shower of heavenly bread, adequate for a whole army of any size, and a whole cellar filled with enough barrels of oil to provide for all our necessities and pay off our debts as well. in a word, it is a pantry filled with fresh food instead of moldy traditions; a whole drugist's supply (Saint Basil calls it) of antidotes for poisonous heresies; a comprehensive manual of useful laws against disruptive spirits; a treasury of the costliest jewels instead of uncut stones; finally, a fountain of the purest water springing up to everlasting life. And why not? its original is from heaven, not from earth. The author is God, not a human. The source is the Holy Spirit, not the wisdom of the Apostles or Prophets. The scribes were sanctified from before their birth, and endued with a major portion of God's Spirit. The subject matter is truth, reverence, purity, uprightness. The form is God's word, God's testimony, God's oracles, the word of truth, the word of salvation, etc. The results are a clear understanding, a firm confidence, repentance from dead works, a new kind of life, holiness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Lastly, the end and reward of its study is fellowship with the saints, participation in the heavenly nature, and the flowering of an immortal inheritance that is undefiled and will never fade away. Happy is the person who delights in the Scriptures, and thrice happy the one who meditates on it day and night.**

#### **Translation is necessary.**

But **how will people meditate on something they cannot understand? How will they understand something that is kept hidden in an unknown language? As it is written, "If I don't understand the language someone is using, we will be like foreigners to each other" (1 Corinthians 14.11).** The Apostle does not make an exception for any

And Justin Martyr.

And St. Basil.

And St. Cyril.

To assert the need for a new translation is to expose one's self to the charge of dissatisfaction with the very Word of God

**THE POWER AND FULL SUFFICIENCY OF THE WORD OF GOD**

**THE INSPIRATION OF THE ORIGINAL, THE AUTOGRAPHS — NOT THE TRANSLATIONS**

**THE RESULTS PRODUCED BY THE WORD OF GOD**

Language — the specific vocabulary and grammar used are the key to understanding God's Word!

language, whether Hebrew as the oldest, or Greek as the most versatile, or Latin as the most precise. **It is only common sense to admit that all of us are plainly deaf in the languages we do not understand.** We turn a deaf ear to them. The Scythian considered the Athenian, whom he did not understand, as barbarous. So also the Roman considered the Syrian and the Jew. Even St. Jerome himself calls the Hebrew language barbarous, probably because it was foreign to so many. Similarly the Emperor of Constantinople calls the Latin language barbarous, against the strong objection of Pope Nicholas. And the Jews long before Christ called all other nations "speakers of strange languages" (Psalm 114.1), which is little better than barbarous. Therefore as **in the Roman Senate they complained that someone was always calling for an interpreter, so the Church should always be ready with translations in order to avoid the same kind of emergencies. Translation is what opens the window, to let the light in. it breaks the shell, so that we may eat the kernel. It pulls the curtain aside, so that we may look into the most holy place. It removes the cover from the well, so that we may get to the water;** just as Jacob rolled the stone away from the mouth of the well so the flocks of Laban could be watered (Genesis 29.10). **In fact, without a translation in the common language, most people are like the children at Jacob's well (which was deep) without a bucket or something to draw the water with; or like the person mentioned by Isaiah who was given a sealed book and told, "Please read this," and had to answer, "I can not, because it is sealed" (Isaiah 29.11).**

#### The translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek.

When God was to be known exclusively in Jacob, and his name praised only in Israel and nowhere else; when the dew lay only on Gideon's fleece, and all the ground around it was dry (judges 6.37); in those days it was sufficient for the Scriptures to be in Hebrew, because all the people spoke the language of Canaan, namely Hebrew. But **then the fullness of time drew near, when the Sun of righteousness, the Son of God should come into the world.** God appointed him to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood, not only for the Jew, but also for the Greek, and for all peoples throughout the world. **At that time it pleased the Lord to inspire the Greek Prince Ptolemy Philadelphus, King of Egypt (a Greek by ancestry and language), to commission the translation of the book of God out of Hebrew into Greek. This is the Septuagint, as the translation of the Seventy Interpreters is commonly called,** which prepared the way for our Savior among the Gentiles by a written form of preaching, just as St. John Baptist did among the Jews by an oral form. For the Greeks, with their love of learning, were not willing to let valuable books lie collecting dust in royal libraries. They had their servants, many of whom were competent scribes, make copies of them so that they could be widely circulated. Further, the Greek language was widely known and familiar to most of the peoples of Asia because of the Greek conquests and the colonies they established. For the same reasons it was widely understood in many areas of Europe and also of Africa. **Thus the word of God in Greek translation became like a candle set on a candlestick, giving light to everyone in the house, or like a proclamation broadcast in the market-place, soon heard by everyone. Therefore this language was most appropriate for the Scriptures, both for the first preachers of the Gospel to appeal to as a witness, and also for the learners in those days to use for study and reference. it is true that **this translation was not done so well or so perfectly that it did not****

This vocabulary and grammar must be understood by those who read it.

Familiarity with the language used is essential to proper understanding of truth. Otherwise, misunderstanding will result.

#### THE SEPTUAGINT

The KJV translators believed that this translation played a key role in the early New Testament period.

There were many obvious difficulties with the Septuagint.

**need to be corrected in many places. And who would have been as apt for this work as the Apostles and their colleagues? Yet it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and also to them to take what they found, (since it was mostly true and adequate) rather than by making a new translation in that new world and green age of the Church, to expose themselves to many objections and quibblings such as having made a translation to serve their own purpose, so that by bearing witness to themselves their word could be discounted. This may partly explain why the Septuagint was accepted as authoritative. And yet, although it was accepted generally, it did not satisfy scholars completely, particularly among the Jews. For not long after Christ, a new translation was undertaken by Aquila, and after him by Theodotion, and then Symmachus, and there was a fifth translation, and a sixth, the authors of which are unknown. **These together with the Septuagint made up the Hexapla, a valuable and most useful work compiled by Origen. But the Septuagint gained acceptance, and therefore was not only given central position by Origen (for its value and superiority over the rest, as Epiphanius infers), but also was used by the Greek fathers as the basis for their commentaries.** Epiphanius even attributes so much authority to it that he regards its authors not just as translators, but also in a sense as prophets. And when the Emperor Justinian exhorted his Jewish subjects to use the Septuagint, he cites as his reason that "they were, as it were, enlightened with the gift of prophecy." And yet, as the prophet said that "the Egyptians are human, and not God; their horses are flesh, and not spirit" (Isaiah 31.3), **so it is evident (and Saint Jerome affirms as much) that the Seventy were translators. They were not prophets. They did many things well as scholarly men, but as men they stumbled and fell. Sometimes it was through oversight, sometimes through ignorance; sometimes they added to the original, and sometimes they omitted from it. When they left the Hebrew, accordingly, many times the Apostles departed from them in order to convey the true meaning of the word as the Spirit gave them ability. This may suffice with regard to the Greek translations of the Old Testament.****

#### Translation from Hebrew and Greek into Latin.

Within a few hundred years after Christ many translations were made into the Latin language. This language was also a very appropriate medium for the Law and the Gospel, because in those times very **many countries of the West, as well as of the South, East and North, spoke or understood Latin**, since they had become Roman provinces. But **there were too many Latin translations for all of them to be good (Augustine describes them as innumerable).** Further, **the translations of the old Testament were not made from the Hebrew source but out of the Greek stream, and as the Greek was not altogether clear, the Latin derived from it was inevitably even muddier. This prompted St. Jerome**, a scholarly Father and undoubtedly the best linguist of his age, or of any that were before him, to undertake a translation of the Old Testament from the sources themselves. This he accomplished with such evidence of great learning, judgment, industry, and faithfulness, that he has forever bound the Church to him in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness.

**The translating of the Scripture into the vulgar tongues.**

In spite of its shortcomings, the Septuagint was accepted as authoritative.

Origen is here treated as authentic, not as an apostate or heretic. If the translators of today's newer versions gave him this measure of credibility, what would be the response?

The apostles used the Septuagint but made adjustments in order to convey the true meaning.

#### THE REASON FOR THE LATIN VULGATE

St. Jerome is commended for his work on the Latin Vulgate.

The Church had already been supplied with Greek and Latin translations, even before the faith of Christ was generally accepted in the Empire (for scholars know that even in St. Jerome's time the Consul of Rome and his wife were both pagan, as was also the majority of the Senate). **Yet even so, godly scholars were not satisfied merely with having the Scriptures in the languages which they themselves understood, Greek and Latin**, just as the good lepers were not satisfied with being healed themselves, but told their neighbors about the gift that God had sent, so that they also might provide for themselves. **Therefore they made translations into the native languages of their countrymen for the benefit and enlightenment of those who hungered and thirsted after righteousness, and who also had souls to be saved. Consequently most nations under heaven, shortly after their conversion, heard Christ speaking to them in their own languages, not just by the voice of their minister, but also by the translated written word.** if anyone doubts this, there is more than adequate evidence if proof is required. To begin with, St. Jerome says, "The Scriptures translated earlier in the languages of many nations show that those things which were added (by Lucian or Hesychius) are false." The same Jerome elsewhere affirms that earlier he had made a translation from the Septuagint for his countrymen of Dalmatia. Erasmus understands these words to mean that St. Jerome translated the Scriptures into the Dalmatian language, while Sisto da Siena and Alfonso de Castro (to mention only two), men not to be objected to by those of Rome, also frankly admit as much. **St. Chrysostom**, who lived in St. Jerome's time, agrees with him: **"The teaching of St. John did not vanish away (like the philosophers' teaching): but the Syrians, Egyptians, Indians, Persians, Ethiopians, and numerous other nations, being barbarous people, translated it into their languages, and have learned to be (true) philosophers (i.e., Christians)."** To these may be added the evidence of **Theodoret** as the next both for antiquity and for learning. His words are: **"Every country under the sun is full of these words (of the Apostles and Prophets), and the Hebrew language (i.e., the Scriptures in the Hebrew language) is turned not only into the language of the Greeks, but also of the Romans, and Egyptians, and Persians, and Indians, and Armenians, and Scythians, and Sauromatians, and, briefly, into all the languages used by any nation."** Similarly **Ulfilas** is reported by Paulus Diaconus and Isidore, and before them by Sozomen, **to have translated the Scriptures into the Gothic language. John, Bishop of Seville, is said by Vassaeus to have translated them into Arabic about A.D. 717. Bede** is said by Higden to have translated a great part of them **into Saxon. Einhard** is said by Ththemius to have abridged **the French Psalter**, as Bede had done the Hebrew, about the year 800. **King Alfred** is said by the same Higden to have **translated the Psalter into Saxon. Methodius** is said by Aventinus to have translated the Scriptures **into Sclavonian about A.D. 900. Waldo, Bishop of Freising**, is said by Beatus Rhenanus to have commissioned about that time a metrical **translation of the Gospels into German**, which is still extant in the library of Corbinian. **Valdes** is said by several to have translated them himself, or to have had them **translated into French about the year 1160. Charles V**, called The Wise, had them translated **into French** about **two hundred years after the time of Valdes**, many copies of which are still extant, as Beroaldus attests. At about that time, even in the days of our King Richard 11, **John Trevisa translated them into English**, and many manuscript copies of English Bibles most probably translated in this period may still be seen in various places. **The Syriac**

The Scriptures and portions thereof were translated into many languages.

John's Gospel in many languages

The Hebrew Bible in many languages

THE SCRIPTURES IN GENERAL

THE PSALTER

THE GOSPELS

THIRTEENTH CENTURY

**translation of the New Testament** in Widmanstadt's edition is in most scholars' libraries, and many have **copies of the Psalter in Arabic** in the edition of Augustinus Nebiensis. Postel affirms that in his travels he saw **the Gospels in the Ethiopian language**, and Ambrose Thesius vouches for **an Indian Psalter** which he claims to have been published by Potken in Syriac characters. So that having the Scriptures in one's own language is not a quaint idea recently thought up, whether by Lord Cromwell in England, or by Lord Radevil in Poland, or by Lord Ungnadius in the Emperor's dominion, but it has been thought about and put into practice from antiquity, even from the earliest days of the conversion of any nation, probably because it was thought best to encourage faith to grow in men's hearts the sooner, and to enable them to say with the words of the Psalm, "We had heard about it, and now we have seen it" (Psalm 48.8).

**Our adversaries, unwillingness for the Scriptures to be circulated in a common language, etc.**

Now **the Church of Rome** would seem finally to be showing a motherly affection towards her children by allowing them to have the Scriptures in their mother tongue. But while it is a gift, it is not really a gift, because it is a useless gift. They must first get a license in writing before they may use them; and to get that, they must demonstrate to their Confessor that they are, if not frozen in the dregs, at least soured with the leaven of their superstition. But then, it seemed too much to Clement VIII that there should be any license granted to have them in the common language, and therefore he overrules and frustrates the grant of Pius IV. **They are so afraid of the light of the Scriptures (as Tertullian puts it) that they will not trust the people with it, not even when it is translated by their own loyal scholars, and not even with the license of their own bishops and inquisitors.** They are so unwilling to open the Scriptures to the people's understanding in any way, that they are not ashamed to confess that we forced them to translate it into English against their will. This seems to argue a bad cause, or a bad conscience, or both. We know that it is not the person with good gold who is afraid to bring it to the touchstone, but the one that has the counterfeit; nor is it the honest person that avoids the fight, but the evil, lest his deeds be exposed (John 3.20). It is not the straightforward merchant that is unwilling to have the weights or the measures examined, but the one who cheats. But let us overlook this fault, and return to the matter of translation.

**The arguments of our brothers and of our adversaries against this work.**

Many have been arguing for a good while now, and are still arguing, about the translation so long under way, or rather reviews of translations made in the past. And **they ask what is the reason or the necessity for all the effort. Has the Church been deceived, they say, for so long? Has her unleavened bread been tainted with leaven, her silver with dross, her wine with water, her milk with lime?** We had hoped that all was well, that the oracles of God had been given to us, and that although everyone else might have **cause to be embarrassed or reason to complain**, yet that we had none. Has the nurse held out her breast with nothing but wind in it? Has the bread delivered by the Fathers of the Church proved (in Seneca's words) to be nothing but stones? If this isn't handling the word of God deceitfully, as some of our brethren say, what is it? We are told that the enemies of Judah and Jerusalem, like Sanballat in Nehemiah, mocked

THE NEW TESTAMENT

TRANSLATION IN THE  
VERNACULAR IS NOTHING NEW  
— IT HAS BEEN DONE FROM  
THE BEGINNING TO THE GREAT  
PROFIT OF EVERYONE

For various reasons, some are unwilling to have the Scriptures translated in the contemporary language spoken and understood by the masses.

CHARGES LEVELED BY  
CONTEMPORARY CRITICS

Are existing translations a source of deception? In them is the truth tainted with error?

Are we embarrassed?

Didn't we have the truth?



both the workers and their work, saying, "What are these weak Jews doing? Can they make solid stones again out of the burnt dust heaps? Even if they build a stone wall, a fox could go up and break it down (Nehemiah 4.3). **Was the first translation good? Why mend it now? Was it not good? Then why was it foisted on the people?** or again, why did the Catholics (meaning Popish Romanists) consistently and confidently ignore it? Really, if it must be translated into English, Catholics are the most competent to do it. They have the scholarship, they know when a thing is good, and they know when to quit. **We will answer them both** briefly: to the former, who are brethren, we say with St. Jerome, **"Do we condemn the earlier work? Not at all, but following the endeavors of those who were before us, we do the best we can in the house of God." He could as well have said, "Being inspired by the example of the scholars who lived before my time, I thought it my duty to test whether my linguistic skills might in any way be useful to God's Church, that I might not seem to have studied the languages in vain, or to have given more credit to human scholars (however ancient) than they deserved."** **This would be St. Jerome's statement.**

#### A satisfaction to our brethren.

And we would say the same, that **far from condemning the work of any of our predecessors, whether here or abroad**, whether in King Henry's time, or King Edward's (if there was any translation, or revision of a translation, in his time), or Queen Elizabeth's of ever renowned memory. **We acknowledge that they were raised up by God to build up and equip his Church, and that they should always be remembered by us and by our descendants.** The opinion of Aristotle is true and familiar, that while we are indebted to Timotheus for much sweet music, we are indebted to Phrynus (Timotheus' master) for Timotheus. **Therefore we should bless and honor the names of those who break the ice, and take the first steps toward something which promotes the saving of souls. And what can be more useful for this purpose than giving God's book to God's people in a language they can understand?** As Ptolemy Philadelphus wrote to the Jewish leaders (according to Epiphanius), a hidden treasure or a sealed fountain is quite useless; and as St. Augustine says, anyone would rather be with his dog than with a stranger (who speaks a language he can't understand). **In any event, nothing is begun and brought to perfection all at once, and later thoughts are considered to be the wiser. Therefore if we build on the foundation laid by those who went before us, and profiting from their work we attempt to improve on what they did so well, certainly no one can reasonably disapprove, and we are persuaded that if they were alive, they themselves would thank us.** The vintage of Abiezer was good, yet even the gleanings from Ephraim's vineyard were better (Judges 8.2). King Joash of Israel was not satisfied until he had struck the ground three times, and yet he offended the prophet for giving up then (2 Kings 13.18,19). **Aquila, whom we mentioned before, translated the Bible as carefully and as skillfully as he could; and yet he prudently went over it again, and his work became known among the Jews for its accuracy, as Jerome attests.** How many books of profane learning have been revised over and over, by the same translators or by others? There are at least six or seven different translations available of one and the same book of Aristotle's Ethics. Now if this effort may be spent on the gourd, which provides us with so little shade, which flourishes today but tomorrow is cut down, how much should we, or rather, how much shouldn't we

**Objection # 1** If the old translations were good, why should we seek to improve them

**Objection # 2** If the old translations were wrong, why were they foisted on the church?

**THEIR ARGUMENT: The KJV is NOT a condemnation of previous versions!**

The translators did not believe in the inspiration of the *translations* or the *translators*. They believed that they were equally qualified to work on a new translation.

Work on a new translation is not a condemnation or rejection of the old.

Improvements can be made on works previously done. These works are not final!

The translators of the older versions would be grateful to those who built on their foundation and improved the work.

If the translators themselves went over their own work again and again to improve it, then why cannot others do the same without such strenuous objections.

spend on the vine that has fruit to warm the heart and whose roots are perennial? And this is the word of God that we are translating. "What good is straw compared with wheat?" says the Lord (Jeremiah 23.28). Or (as Tertullian says), if a glass bauble is so valuable to us, how much more so a true pearl? **Therefore no one should be jealous because his Majesty is generous. No one should mourn because we have a Prince who seeks to increase the spiritual wealth of Israel. Sanballats and Tobiahs may do so, for which they rightly deserve to be reproved. Let us rather bless God from the depths of our heart for arousing in him this religious concern for a deliberate and careful consideration of Bible translations.** For in this way **whatever is valid already (and our [Protestant] versions are all valid in substance,** the worst of them being far better than the [Roman Catholics'] standard Vulgate) **will shine more brightly, like gold that has been rubbed and polished.** And **if there is anything dubious, or superfluous, or not in agreement with the original, it may be corrected, and the truth set in its place.** And what can the King commission to be done that will bring him more true honor than this? And **how could those who are commissioned better fulfil their duty to the King, their obedience to God, and their love of his saints, than by devoting their efforts to the best of their ability to accomplishing the work?** And besides, they were themselves the initial proponents of it, and therefore they ought least to quarrel about it. For **the real historical fact is, that it was at the insistence of the Puritans when his Majesty was crowned, that the conference at Hampton 'Court was appointed for hearing their complaints, and when they could not make a case on any other grounds, they had recourse at the last to the argument that they could not in good conscience subscribe to the Communion book because they claimed that the Bible used in it was a most corrupted translation.** And although this was considered to be a very poor and empty ploy, yet it suggested to his Majesty how much good might result from a new translation, and immediately **afterward he commissioned this translation which is now offered to you. This much in answer to our scrupulous brethren.**

#### **An answer to the accusations of our enemies.**

Now to answer our enemies: we do not deny, rather **we affirm and insist that the very worst translation of the Bible in English** issued by Protestants (for we have seen no Catholic version of the whole Bible as yet) contains the word of God, or rather, **is the word of God.** **In the same way, when the King's speech delivered in Parliament is translated into French, German, Italian, and Latin, it is still the King's speech, even if it is not interpreted by every translator with the same skill, or perhaps with as appropriate phrasing or always with as great clarity. For as everyone knows, things are classified by their major characteristics. Anyone will admit that a person may be regarded as virtuous even though he has made many slips during his life, otherwise no one could be called virtuous, because "all of us make many mistakes" (James 3.2).** A person may be called handsome and charming, even though he may have some warts on his hand, and not only some freckles on his face, but also scars. **So there is no reason why the word when it is translated should be denied to be the word, or should be declared inauthentic, simply because there may be some imperfections and blemishes in the way it is published. For has there been anything perfect under the sun in which Apostles or their colleagues, people endued with an extraordinary measure of God's Spirit and privileged with the privilege**

All extant protestant versions were considered to be valid but subject to improvement.

The *perfect* translation does not exist. Perfecting the translation and making corrections is regarded as a necessary, ongoing process.

**THEIR ARGUMENT – The very worst translation of the Bible is the word of God**

**The illustration of the argument.**

The original writers were the only ones free from error and thus infallible. Copies and translations do not have this same freedom

of infallibility, were not involved? Therefore when the Romanists refused to hear, and even dared to bum the word when it is translated, they were only showing contempt for the Spirit of grace from whom it came originally, and whose sense and meaning it expressed as well as humanly possible. **Consider some parallels.**

Plutarch writes that **after Rome had been burnt by the Gauls, they soon set about rebuilding it. But they did it in haste, and they did not plan the streets or design the houses in the most attractive or practical way. Was Catifine therefore an honorable man, or a good patriot, when he tried to destroy it? Or was Nero a good prince, when he actually set it on fire?** From the account of Ezra (Ezra 3.12) and the prophecy of Haggai (Haggai 2.3) it may be inferred that **the temple built by Zerubbabel after the return from Babylon was in no way comparable to the one built earlier by Solomon. People who remembered the earlier one wept when they saw it, and yet was the new temple either regarded with disgust and rejected by the Jews, or profaned by the Greeks? We should think in the same way about translations. The translation of the Septuagint departs from the original in many places, and it does not come near the Hebrew for clarity, gravity, and majesty. And yet did any of the Apostles condemn it? Condemn it? Obviously they used it (as St. Jerome and most scholars confess), and they would not have done this, nor by their example of using it so honor and commend it to the Church, if it had been unworthy of the dignity and name of the word of God.**

**Then they argue as their second reason for vilifying and abusing English Bibles, or the portions of it they have seen, that the translations were made by heretics (they call us heretics by the same right that they call themselves Catholics, and they are wrong on both counts). **This logic makes us wonder. We are sure Tertullian disagrees: "Do we judge peoples' faith by who they are? We should judge who they are by their faith." St. Augustine also disagrees, for when he found certain rules made by Tychonius, a Donatist, for better understanding the Word, he was not ashamed to make use of them, and even to insert them into his own book, duly commending them to the extent they were worth being commended (see his *De Doctrina Christiana*, book 3). In short, Origen together with the whole Church of God for some hundred years disagreed: they were so far from rejecting, much less from burning the translations by Aquila, a proselyte (i.e., a Jew by conversion), by Symmachus and by Theodotion, both Ebionites (i.e., vile heretics), that they added them together with the Hebrew original and the Septuagint (as noted by Epiphanius above), and published them openly to be considered and read by everyone. But this is tiresome for the general reader who is not interested, and boring for scholars, who know it already.****

Yet before we finish, we must answer **a third complaint and objection of theirs against us, of altering and amending our translations so often**. This is truly a bold and odd accusation. For **who was ever faulted (by anyone knowledgeable) for going over what they had done, and amending it where necessary?** St. Augustine was not afraid to exhort St. Jerome to a Palinodia or reconsideration. The same St. Augustine was not ashamed to retract, we might say, revoke, many things he had written, and even boasts of seeing his own weaknesses. if we are to be loyal to the truth, we must be attentive to what it says, and disregard our own interests, and other men's too, if either stand in the way. So much for

from error and infallibility.

Illustrations of the above.

The KJV translators believed that the imperfections of the translations do not detract from their authority as the Word of God!

Translations made by heretics were not to be rejected on this basis alone.

This argument would be soundly rejected by *KJV Only* men today. How can they defend a translation put out by men who believed this?

Great credibility is given to Origen.

The third complaint – The KJV translators had altered and amended their work so many times.

The Answer.

NOTE: The basis of all of this was the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts, not the existing text.

principles. **Now to the accusers themselves we would say that of all people they have the least right to raise the charge. For how many different editions do they have, and how many alterations have they made, not only in their service books, manuals, and breviaries, but also in their Latin translation?** The service book attributed to St. Ambrose (*Officium Ambrosianum*) had been in use and in great demand for a long while when Pope Adrian called a council with the aid of Charles the Emperor, and not only abolished it, but had it burnt, and commanded the service book of St. Gregory to be used universally. Then after the *Officium Gregorianum* is recognized as the authorized text, does it escape change or alteration? No, the Roman service itself was in two forms: the new form, and the old. The one was used in some churches, and the other in others, as the Romanist Pamelius notes in his preface to *Micrologus*. The same Pamelius cites Radulphus de Rivo to the effect that about A.D. 1277 Pope Nicholas III removed earlier service books from the churches of Rome and introduced the use of the Friars Minorites' missals, commanding them to be observed there, so that when Radulphus happened to be in Rome about a hundred years later, he found all the books to be new, of the new edition. Nor was this shifting back and forth done only in earlier times, but it has happened recently also. Pius V himself admits that almost every bishopric had its own kind of service, unlike the ones which others had. This moved him to abolish all the other breviaries, however ancient, privileged and published by Bishops in their Dioceses, and to establish and ratify only the one which he himself published in the year 1568. Now when the Father of their Church, who would gladly heal the sore of the daughter of his people gently and easily, and make the best of it, finds so much fault with them for their differences and inconsistencies, we hope the children have no great reason to boast of their uniformity. But **the differences that appear among our translations, and our frequent corrections of them, is what we are charged with specifically. Let us see therefore whether they themselves are without fault in this respect (if it is a fault to make corrections), and whether they are qualified to throw stones at us:** "they that are less healthy themselves ought not point out the infirmities of others" (Horace). if we should tell them that Valla, Lefevre d'Etaples, Erasmus, and Vives found fault with their Vulgate version, and consequently wished that either it should be corrected or a new version should be made, they would probably answer that we produced their enemies as witnesses against them. Yet they were no more enemies than St. Paul was to the Galatians for telling them the truth. if only they had dared tell them more plainly and oftener! But what will they say to the fact that Pope Leo X, by his Apostolic Letter and bull, sanctioned Erasmus's translation of the New Testament, which differs so much from the Vulgate? And that the same Leo encouraged Pagninus to translate the whole Bible, and provided all the expenses necessary for the work? Surely, as the Apostle reasons to the Hebrews (7.11; 8.7), if the former Law and Testament had been sufficient, there would have been no need of another. Similarly, if the old Vulgate had been completely adequate, there would be little reason to go to the labor and expense of preparing a new version. if they argue that this was only one Pope's private opinion, and that he consulted only himself, then we can go further and demonstrate that many more of their leaders, including their own champions at the Council of Trent, Paiva and Vega, and their own Inquisitors, Hieronymus ab Oleastro, and their own Bishop Isidorus Clarius, and their own Cardinal Thomas a Vio Cajetan, either make new translations themselves, or follow new ones that others have made, or note defects in the Vulgate version, without any fear of dissenting from it

There are at least eight revised editions of the KJV.

Why then do men object to further revision? Has there been a divine revelation to discontinue the examination and translation of the text of Scripture?

The charge against new translations is the same today!

or disagreeing with it. And do they claim to represent a consistency of text and of judgment about the text, when so many of their own worthies disclaim the currently accepted opinion? But let us be more explicit. Does their Paris edition not differ from the Louvain edition, and Hentenius's edition differ from both, and yet all of them are sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority? And does Sixtus V not admit that some Catholics (he means some of his own persuasion) were so eagerly making translations of the Scriptures into Latin, that although they did not intend it, Satan could exploit the opportunity to show that such a variety of translations is confusing, and proves that nothing seems to be left certain and firm in them, etc.? And further, did the same Sixtus not ordain by an inviolable decree, with the counsel and consent of his Cardinals, that the Latin edition of the old and New Testaments, which the Council of Trent pronounces to be authoritative, is precisely the one which he then published in a carefully corrected edition, printed by the Vatican Press? Sixtus states this in the Preface to his Bible. And yet Clement VIII, his immediate successor, publishes another edition of the Bible, containing innumerable differences from that of Sixtus, many of which are weighty and substantial, and this edition is declared absolutely authoritative. If this is not an example of vacillating with the faith of our glorious Lord Jesus Christ, what is? What kind of sweet harmony and consistency is this? Therefore, as Demaratus of Corinth advised the great king Philip of Macedon, before criticizing the dissensions among the Greeks, he should settle his own domestic broils (for at that time his queen and his son and heir were in a deadly feud with him). **So when our enemies are making so many different versions themselves and debating their value and authority, they cannot fairly challenge our right to revise and correct.**

The KJV Translators regarded revising and correcting the translation to be their *right!*

### **The purpose of the Translators, their procedures and principles.**

But now we should show briefly what we proposed for ourselves, and what procedures we followed in our review and study of the Bible. **Truly, good Christian Reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, or even to make a bad one into a good one** (for then the criticism of Sixtus had been partly true, that our people had been fed with snake venom instead of wine, with whey instead of milk), **but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones to make one principal good one, not justly to be objected to.** This has been our endeavor, our goal. **For this purpose many men were chosen** who had earned the esteem of others yet remained humble, who sought the truth rather than a name for themselves. Again, they came, or were thought to come, to the work as accomplished scholars, and not as students. For the chief overseer and supervisor under his Majesty, to whom not only we but also our whole Church was much indebted, knew in his wisdom what Gregory Nazianzen taught so long ago, that it is preposterous to teach first and learn later, and that to learn and practice at the same time is neither advisable for the workman, nor safe for the work. Therefore only such persons were selected as could say modestly with St. Jerome, "We have some acquaintance with the Hebrew language, and we have been trained in the Latin almost from our very cradle." Although St. Jerome was competent in Greek, he does not mention that language because he translated the Old Testament not out of Greek, but out of Hebrew. **And on what basis did these come together? Relying on their own knowledge, or their sharpness of wit, or depth of judgment, as it were on their human abilities? Not at all! They relied on the one**

Is it possible to make a good translation better? According to the KJV translators, yes!

Earlier translators relied upon

who has the key of David (Revelation 3.7), who opens and no man shuts. They prayed to the Lord, the Father of our Lord, in the spirit of St. Augustine: "O let the Scriptures be my pure delight; do not let me be deceived in them, nor let me deceive by them." in this confidence and with this devotion they came together; not so many in number that they would impede each other, and yet enough so that few things would escape their notice. If you ask what texts they worked from, it was the Hebrew text for the Old Testament, the Greek text for the New. These are the two golden pipes, or channels, through which the olive branches empty themselves into the gold (Zechariah 4.12). St. Augustine calls them precedent, or original, languages; St. Jerome calls them fountains. The same St. Jerome affirms, and Gratian has quoted him in his decree, that "as the trustworthiness of the old books (i.e., the old Testament) is to be tested against the Hebrew volumes; so of the new by the Greek language (i.e., meaning by the original Greek)." if truth is to be tested against these languages, then what else should a translation be made from, but them? These languages therefore (that is, the Scriptures in those languages) were what we based our translation on, because it was in these languages that God was pleased to speak to his Church through his Prophets and Apostles. We did not speed through the work at a gallop like the Septuagint translators, if the tradition is true that they finished it in seventy-two days. Nor were we restricted or hindered from going over it again, once we had done it, like St. Jerome, if what he himself says is true, that he could not write anything that wasn't immediately caught away and published before he had a chance to correct it. In a word, we were not the first to undertake a translation of the Scripture into English, and consequently without any earlier examples to go by, unlike Origen, who was the first to undertake writing commentaries on the Scriptures, and therefore understandably overshot himself many times. There were none of these problems. The work was not crammed into seventy-two days, but cost the workmen, as light as it seems, the pains of more than twice seven times seventy-two days. Matters of such gravity and consequence are to be pursued with due deliberation: in matters of importance no one fears being blamed for taking all the time necessary. Nor did we hesitate to consult the work of translators or commentators, whether [ancient ones] in Aramaic, Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, or Latin, or [modern ones] in Spanish, French, Italian, or German. We did not refuse to revise what we had done, and to bring back to the anvil what we had once hammered. But having and using as many helps as were necessary, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for speed, we have finally, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to its present state.

Reasons for placing in the margin alternative readings having a claim to authenticity.

Some persons perhaps would want to have no alternative readings or renderings placed in the margin, for fear that any appearance of uncertainty might undermine the authority of the Scriptures as definitive. But we do not consider their judgment to be prudent on this point. It is true that "everything that is necessary is obvious," as St. Chrysostom says, and as St. Augustine says, "the things that are stated clearly in the Scriptures include everything having to do with faith, hope, and love." And yet the fact cannot be disguised that partly in order to keep us alert and make us use our intelligence, partly to keep sophisticated people from looking down on the Scriptures as too simple

divine assistance in the same way as we may and do.

They corrected and revised their own work. Why cannot others do likewise?

#### METHODS USED

They consulted both other translations and also commentaries, ancient and modern

They continually reviewed and revised their work

They recognized the *clear and certain statements* of Scripture, and they recognized that some things were not so *clear*

for them, partly also to encourage us to pray for the assistance of God's Spirit, and finally, to make us look actively to our brethren for help through discussion (not looking down on people who are not as educated as they might be, since we too are ignorant in many areas), **God has been pleased in his divine Providence to scatter here and there words and sentences that are difficult and ambiguous. These do not touch on doctrinal points that have to do with salvation (because we know that in these the Scriptures are clear), but on matters of less importance. Therefore we should be diffident rather than confident, and if we must make a choice, to choose modesty** as did St. Augustine, who said about a situation that was similar though not identical, **"It is better to be reserved about things which are not revealed, than to fight about things that are uncertain."** There are many words in the Scriptures which are found there only once (with neither brother nor neighbor, as the Hebrews say) so that help cannot be gained by comparing passages. Again, there are many rare names for birds, animals, and gems, etc., which the Hebrews themselves are so uncertain about that they seem to have defined them one way or another, more because they wanted to say something, than because they were sure of what they said, as St. Jerome says somewhere about the Septuagint. **In such cases a marginal note is useful to advise the Reader to seek further, and not to draw inferences or dogmatize rashly about this or that. For if it is the fault of incredulity to doubt what is evident, it can be no less than presumption to be definite about things that the Spirit of God has left (even in the judgment of the judicious) questionable.** Therefore as St. Augustine says that alternative translations are profitable for finding out the meaning of the Scriptures, so also we believe that alternative readings in a marginal note, where the text is not clear, must not only be good but even necessary. We know that Sixtus V specifically forbids any alternative readings to be put in the margin of their Vulgate edition (and although this is not precisely what we are discussing here, it is close), yet not all of his colleagues are in agreement with him in this. **The wise would prefer a freedom of choice where there are differences of readings, rather than be restricted to one when there is an alternative. It would be different if they were sure that their high priest had all laws in hand, as Paul II bragged, and that he was by special privilege free from error just as the dictators of Rome were made legally inviolate. Then his word would be an oracle, and his opinion a decision.** But the eyes of the world are open now, God be thanked, and they have been a great while. They find that he is subject to the same feelings and weaknesses that others are, that he is human. Therefore they will recognize and accept only what he proves, and not everything that he claims.

#### Reasons we do not insist pedantically on verbal consistency.

**Another thing that you should know, gentle Reader, is that we have not tried to be as consistent in translating words or phrases as some might wish**, claiming that certain scholars elsewhere have observed just such a precision. Actually, we were especially careful, and we made it a matter of conscience as we were in duty bound, not to introduce inconsistencies as our translation progressed when a word is used in the same sense (for some words are not always used with the same meaning). But **we thought it would be more fastidious than wise always to express the same idea with precisely the same word**, e.g., if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by purpose, never to call it *intent*, if once journeying, never *traveling*, if once *think*, never suppose; if once *pain*,

They believed that matters of doctrine having to do with salvation were beyond dispute or variance. Many other matters were uncertain, even to the translators.

There is no room for an *inspired translation* here. Is it therefore *changing the Word of God* when other translators choose other words?

never *ache*; if once joy, never *gladness*, etc. Affecting such precision would breed scorn in the atheist rather than be useful to the godly reader. For **has the kingdom of God become words and syllables? Why should we be slaves to them, if we could be free? Why use one word exclusively when another equally accurate word is appropriate? One godly Father in the early days was greatly perturbed by someone's novelty in referring to a pallet as a *skimpus* instead of a *krabbaton*, although there is little or no difference in their meaning. Another Father reports that he was reviled for replacing *cucurbita* ("gourd," at the time the familiar reading in Jonah 4.6) with *hedera* ("vine").** Now if this happened in better times and in such small matters, we should expect to be censured if we went about making unnecessary changes in words. We could also be accused (by scoffers) of bias in dealing with a great number of good English words. A certain great philosopher is reputed to have said that some logs were fortunate to be made into images and worshiped, while their comrades, just as good as they, were placed beside the fire as kindling. Similarly we could say, as it were, to some words, "Stand up higher", have a permanent place in this Bible, and to others that are equally good, "Get out, be banished for ever". Then we could perhaps be accused, in the words of St. James, of making distinctions among ourselves and making judgments based on false motives. **And besides, being overly precise with words has always been considered close to triviality, as was also being too particular about names too. We cannot observe a better pattern of expression than God himself; who used different words without distinction in his holy scriptures when referring to the same thing. Unless we are superstitious, we may use the same liberty in our English versions of the Hebrew and Greek, based on the resources he has given us.** Finally, we have on the one hand avoided the strictness of the Puritans, who reject old ecclesiastical words and adopt other words, preferring *washing* for *baptism*, and *Congregation* instead of *Church*. And then on the other hand we have avoided the obscurity of the Papists, with their *Azimes*, *Mnike*, *Rational*, *Holocausts*, *Praepuce*, *Pasche*, and other such words typical of their recent translation. Their purpose is to obscure the meaning, so that if they have to translate the Bible, at least its language can keep it from being understood. But we want the Scripture to speak like itself, as it does in Hebrew, and be understood even by the uneducated.

There are many other things we could mention, gentle Reader, if we had not gone beyond the limits of a preface already. it remains to commend you to God, and to his gracious Spirit, which is able to build further than we can ask or think. He removes the scales from our eyes, the veil from our hearts, opening our minds so that we may understand his word, enlarging our hearts, and correcting our affections, so that we may love it above gold and silver, indeed, so that we may love it to the end. **You have come to fountains of fresh water which you did not dig. Don't throw dirt into them, like the Philistines, and don't prefer broken pits to them, like the wicked Jews. Others have done the hard work, and you can enjoy the results. So don't take such great things lightly. Don't despise such a great salvation. Don't be like swine to tread under foot such precious things, nor like dogs to tear and abuse holy things. Don't say to our Savior like the Gergesites did, "Get out of our land!" Nor like Esau sell your birthright for a bowl of soup. If light has come into the world, don't love darkness more than light: if food, if clothing be offered, don't go naked, don't starve yourselves.** Remember the advice of Gregory Nazianzen, "it is a sad thing to let the market day go by, and

The translator has a legitimate choice in using an "equally accurate word."

Is only the KJV translation valid then?

A further argument of the same point.

Rejection of this new translation is characterized here in a very serious light. What of any translations to follow? Is KJV really the final one for all of the Church age until our Lord returns?



then try to do business." Remember also the advice of St. Chrysostom, "It is quite impossible that anyone who is serious (and attentive) should ever be ignored." And finally, remember St. Augustine's advice and threat, "They that ignore the will of God inviting them, shall feel the will of God taking vengeance of them." it is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God; but it is a blessed thing which will bring us to everlasting blessedness in the end, to listen when God speaks to us, to read his word when he sets it before us, and when he stretches out his hand and calls, to answer, "Here I am, here we are to do your will, O God." May the Lord create in us a care and conscience to know him and serve him, that we may be acknowledged by him at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the Holy Ghost be all praise and thanksgiving. Amen.