THE KING JAMES VERSION AT 400

Society of Biblical Literature

Biblical Scholarship in North America

Number 26

THE KING JAMES VERSION AT 400

Assessing Its Genius as Bible Translation and Its Literary Influence

THE KING JAMES VERSION AT 400

ASSESSING ITS GENIUS AS BIBLE TRANSLATION AND ITS LITERARY INFLUENCE

Edited by

David G. Burke, John F. Kutsko, and Philip H. Towner

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

THE KING JAMES VERSION AT 400
Assessing Its Genius as Bible Translation and Its Literary Influence

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The King James version at 400 : assessing its genius as Bible translation and its literary influence / edited by David G. Burke, John F. Kutsko, and Philip H. Towner.
p. cm. — (Society of Biblical Literature Biblical Scholarship in North America ; number 26)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-58983-800-0 (hardcover : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-798-0 (pbk. : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-799-7 (electronic format)
1. Bible. English. Authorized—History—Congresses. 2. Bible. English. Authorized—Influence—Congresses. 3. Bible—Translating—Congresses. I. Burke, David G., editor. II. Kutsko, John F., 1963– editor. III. Towner, Philip H., 1953– editor.
BS188.K564 2013
220.5'2038—dc23 2013014407

Index prepared by J. Naomi Linzer Indexing Services

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper conforming to
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994
standards for paper permanence.

Contents

The Role of the Metatexts in the King James Version as a Means of Mediating Conflicting Theological Views

Jacobus A. Naudé

Translations of sacred texts have often been accompanied by metatexts, which function to guide the reader in interpreting the text. The King James Version as it was originally published in 1611 included various kinds of metatexts. This paper examines three metatexts—two metatexts consisting of the two prefaces found in the preliminaries, and the set of marginal notes accompanying the translation. One preface was a three-page dedication to the king. A second, eleven-page preface to the translation articulated the aims and goals of the translators with great clarity. It also carefully specified the nature of the marginal notes as metatexts—no marginal notes were allowed except for explanations of Greek and Hebrew words that could not be easily expressed in the text.

Prior to the translation, there had been serious tensions between Anglicans and Puritans that could have torn England apart had they been handled badly. Aware of the importance of maintaining religious peace, James decided at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 to make at least some conciliatory gesture by commissioning a new Bible translation to unite them around a common English Bible.

My analysis of these two prefaces and a selection of the marginal notes as metatexts will show that they utilize the technique of keeping silent about contemporary issues while focusing instead on the basic principles of translation similar to those advocated by modern translation theorists. Thus these metatexts of the King James Version regulated the reader's mental preparation for a translation that, on the one hand, kept open interpretive questions and, on the other hand, diverged from the accepted Puritan interpretations as promoted in the metatexts of the Geneva Bible.

As a result, these metatexts served as a subtle but powerful tool for mediating conflicting theological views.

1. Introduction

Not everything in a source text can be rendered in a translation; because of the dynamics of language, it is impossible ever to relate everything. This fact foregrounds the agency role of the translator, who has to decide on the interplay between source text and target text and then choose which features of the source text merit greater prominence in the translation.[1] There is thus no neutral translation; the question is not *whether* the translator is ideologically involved in the text, but *how*.

Every choice in translation acts as a kind of index that activates a narrative, a story of what the world or some aspect of the world is like. The point, then, is not to treat any specific translational choice as random but rather as embedded in, and contributing to, the elaboration of a concrete social reality.[2] Structures of anticipation (or frames) can be created that guide the interpretation of these choices. According to Mona Baker, processes of framing can draw on practically any linguistic or nonlinguistic resource to set up an interpretive context for the reader or hearer.[3] In translations, these may include exploiting metalinguistic or paralinguistic devices. Metatexts are supplemental materials that create a frame to guide the reader in interpreting the translation. Metatexts include prefaces, dedications, introductions; subject headings, titles of books/chapters; marginal notes, footnotes, endnotes; illustrations; indices, addenda, and visual presentation (typeface, printing layout, etc.). Metatexts are useful precisely because they trace the contours of literary ideology and expose the sociocultural context that commands literary exchanges. Metatexts can provide an important overview of the ideological context of the translation and of the expectations of the readers. A metatext also has the function of calling attention to the translator as cosigner of the work and his/her intervention in the work.[4]

As far as sacred texts are concerned, readers are preoccupied with the transmission of the "correct" meaning. Any translation diverging from the accepted interpretation is likely to be deemed heretical and to be censured or banned. Translators often defend themselves and their translations by utilizing metatexts to (re)frame the translations of sacred texts and to narrate the nature of the specific translation.[5]

In addition to the marginal notes, the original publication of the KJV in 1611 included twelve preliminaries consisting of seventy-four pages.[6] This front matter consisted of the following:

- a title page (including the work of Flemish artist Cornelius Boel) and an indication that it was "appointed to be read in churches"[7]
- a dedicatory epistle to King James (probably written by Thomas Bilson, bishop of Winchester)
- a preface from the translators to the reader (by Miles Smith of the First Oxford Company, the company responsible for the Old Testament from Isaiah to Malachi, and who was on the Committee of Revisers)
- a calendar
- an almanac for thirty-nine years
- a table for the calculation of Easter
- a table and calendar setting out the order of Psalms and lessons to be said at morning and evening prayers throughout the year
- a list of the books of the Testaments and the Apocrypha
- the royal coat of arms of James I, and the Latin phrase *Cum privilegio Regiae Maiestas*, indicating that the translation was printed "by the authority of the king"
- genealogies from Adam to Christ (compiled by the antiquarian John Speed in collaboration with the Hebraist Hugh Broughton)[8]
- a table of place names in Canaan
- a map of Canaan begun by John More, a learned clergyman, and finished by John Speed

By analyzing a selection of metatexts of the King James Version (or Authorised Version)—especially the dedication, the preface, and the marginal notes—I will show how they were constructed to serve as subtle but powerful tools for mediating between conflicting theological views and uniting religious parties around a single English Bible. By utilizing a technique of keeping silent about contemporary issues and instead focusing on the basic principles of translation, the metatexts regulate the reader's mental preparation for a translation that diverges from the accepted sectarian interpretations in order to ensure that broader, nonsectarian

interpretations will be considered orthodox. In this respect, the King James translation adopted a stance toward both metatext and translation strategy that was diametrically opposed to that of the Geneva Bible, even though much of the specific wording of the KJV was drawn from the Geneva Bible.

The outline of the paper is as follows: the exposition begins with a few statements about the background of English Bible translations as a source of religious division,[9] followed by a description of the visual presentation of the KJV as compared with the existing Bible traditions. Then the two prefaces, the dedication to the king and "The Translators to the Reader," are analyzed, followed by an analysis of the marginal notes.

2. The English Bible Translations as a Source of Religious Division

When James VI of Scotland became James I of England in 1603, the Elizabethan era (1558–1603) was just ending. The pre-Jacobean period was shaped not only by the struggles between monarchy and democracy, the balancing of tolerance and intolerance, and the separation of Protestant and Roman Catholic, but also by battles within Protestantism. The Puritans were loyal to the Crown but wanted even more distance from Rome. The Presbyterians were Puritans who were ready to do away with the hierarchical structure of powerful bishops. The Pilgrims, including Nonconformists and Separatists, wanted the state out of church affairs. All of these Protestant groups opposed the Church of England bishops (the Prayer Book defenders or the Protestant hierarchy).[10]

Among religious parties in England, the text of the Bible was a source of division rather than a bond of unity.[11] Although the Bishops' Bible (in print 1568–1617), translated under the direction of Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, was the official version of the established church, the Puritan's Geneva version (in print 1560–1644) enjoyed broad popularity as the most widely read Bible of the Elizabethan era and subsequently of the Jacobean era. The Geneva Bible was the production of exiles who fled England for refuge within the Protestant havens of Europe in the first years of Mary Tudor's reign. It broke new ground and set new standards in biblical translation, illustration, and layout. Its numerous features—such as the marginal comments—propelled it to the forefront of English Bible translations, and it was the undisputed market leader. The Great Bible (in print 1539–1569) and its officially sanctioned successors were powerless to

meet the challenge posed by the Geneva Bible, which was the product of private enterprise and religious enthusiasm on the part of a small group of English Protestant exiles in the city of Geneva.[12] It offered comments on the text, which often expressed the radical Protestant ideas associated with Geneva at this time.

Meanwhile the translation of the Bible used in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer (1549, revised 1552, 1559) was under criticism for its inaccuracies. In addition, with their persecution under Elizabeth, the Catholics felt the need for their own translation to counter the increasingly popular Protestant editions. Roman Catholic scholars who had fled to the Continent published the Rheims-Douay New Testament in 1582 and the Old Testament in 1609. Its reception in England was comparable to that of the Tyndale New Testament. Copies were burned, and its owners, usually priests, were imprisoned and tortured.[13] These tensions between Anglicans and Puritans (who insisted that the Reformation in England did not go far enough and that the Church of England retained too many Catholic elements), on the one hand, and Catholics, on the other hand, could have torn England apart had they been handled badly.

The announcement that James VI of Scotland was to succeed Elizabeth caused undisguised delight in Puritan circles in England. James has been baptized a Catholic and crowned king of Scotland as a Protestant (John Knox preached at his coronation) when he was thirteen months old. He was raised by neither his mother nor his father, but only by regents, since his mother, Mary Queen of Scots, was forced to abdicate and was imprisoned. His regents played critical roles in his upbringing. From a very early age, he learned Latin and Greek. He read prolifically and became an articulate intellectual leader. He was selected by Elizabeth I of England, who had no offspring, to succeed her as king of England. His education and experience, having already been the king of Scotland, boded well for him. Yet the reality of the situation was very different. James disliked Presbyterianism; and, believing passionately that his royal authority was dependent upon bishops, he lobbied for the retention of episcopal governance of the church.[14]

In order to reconcile the differences of the various religious parties, the king called for a conference at Hampton Court in January 1604.[15] He took complete control of managing that meeting with both the Anglican bishops and the Puritans. After much inconclusive debate, John Rainolds (or Reynolds) of Oxford and a spokesperson for the Puritan group suggested making a new translation that could be approved by the whole

church. Aware of the importance of maintaining religious peace, James decided to make at least some conciliatory gesture by commissioning a new Bible translation, thereby surprising the bishops and delighting the Puritans by the strength and direction he gave this matter. His goal was to unite the religious factions around a common English Bible. He accomplished a measure of religious unity directly and immediately with the composition of the translation teams (established in six "companies": two at Oxford, two at Cambridge, and two at Westminster) and the setting up of the translation process with each group reviewing the other.[16] The translation brief for the companies was not merely to work together but to produce a Bible of solid academic standards, closely controlled by the Hebrew and Greek texts, and one that could be read in the churches.

The use of teams of individuals is one of the KJV's innovations in translation. The teams were given fifteen rules, possibly drafted by Bishop Richard Bancroft but certainly supervised by James. Most of these rules were followed, as can be seen in the 1618 eight-point summary by Samuel Ward, one of the translators, for the Synod of Dort with respect to the Dutch Statenvertaling of 1637. The rules stated the necessity of using the Hebrew and Greek originals. This dependence on Hebrew and Greek originals, as opposed to the Latin, generated the debates between Catholic and Protestant and, indeed, drew the Puritans and Anglicans closer together. The scholarly credentials behind the KJV were not doubted, because the companies could command "any learned man in the land" to respond to questions they could not answer. However, it took decades for the KJV to displace the Geneva Version in popular acceptance. As late as 1659 the Reverend Doctor Robert Gell, minister of the parish of St. Mary, Alder-Mary, London, published an eight-hundred-page treatise denouncing it and discussing its faults in detail, counting among them a denial of Christ's authority.

In what follows I will show how the appeal of the familiar in the visual presentation of the KJV regulated the reader's mental preparation so that the translation would be considered orthodox.

3. The Visual Presentation of the King James Version as an Appeal of the Familiar

To exude the appeal of the familiar, the visual presentation of the KJV was drawn from the history of Bible presentation, which culminated in the Geneva Bible and the latest version of the Bishops' Bible (1568).[17] For exam-

ple, on the first page of Genesis, both the KJV and the Geneva Bible contain the same heading—"The creation of the world." In both translations, the name of the book is "The First Book of Moses, called Genesis." In both translations, chapters begin with subject headings that are formatted similarly, even when their specific content differs. The artwork around the display capital of the first letter of the book of Genesis as well as the format of the columns and marginal notes are similar. The Geneva Bible also contains a dedication to the monarch and a preface to the readers. The 1526 edition of the New Testament by William Tyndale already contains a brief epistle "To the Reder," which was placed at the end of the printed translation.[18]

The KJV follows the standard Protestant order of the books, with the Apocrypha given separately, a tradition that originated with Jerome. The columns of text are similar to early Greek manuscripts and the marginal annotations to the Hebrew texts with the Masora. It follows the chapter numbers of Stephan Langton, archbishop of Canterbury early in the thirteenth century, and headers and verse divisions of Robert Estienne in 1540 and 1551. Along with these general features went the particular practices of the King's Printer, Robert Barker. Every feature of the King James Version as a piece of printing was present in the 1602 Bishops' Bible, even the use of printed lines to frame the columns of text and the margins.[19] The same pertains to the preliminaries. "A table and calendar setting out the order of Psalms and lessons to be said at morning and evening prayers throughout the year" set out the principles for ensuring that all the required biblical passages were read at the appropriate times as set out in the Book of Common Prayer. The inclusion of this table in the King James Bible as well as the "calendar" and "an almanac for thirty-nine years," indicating important dates and events in the church calendar, represented a defeat for the Puritan party, which disliked orchestrated readings and prayers. However, in the "List of the Books of the Testaments and the Apocrypha," the titles of two apocryphal books seem to have been adjusted to acknowledge Puritan sensitivities: the "Historie of Susanna" appears here as the "Story of Susanna," and the abbreviated title of "Bel and the Dragon" is rendered emphatically as "The idole Bel and the Dragon." By including, on the one hand, metatexts reflecting and facilitating worship in the Church of England while, on the other hand, adjusting the wording of two metatexts (the titles of two apocryphal books), the translators of the KJV presented an evenhanded and diplomatic approach to the contradictory sensibilities of the Puritans and the Anglicans.

The title page and Speed's genealogies are novel in the King James Bible, but all the other preliminary matter was familiar from previous

translations of the Bible. Thus *visually* the first edition of the King James was both new and familiar.[20] The KJV was presented as a lightly polished revision of the latest version of the Bishops' Bible (1568), which was the second "authorized" version.

Later editions of the King James Bible do not preserve the preliminaries except the lists of books in the Testaments. Some editions print the dedicatory epistle to King James and a few include the epistle from the translators to the reader, but the other preliminaries have all disappeared. One disappeared after it was out of date—the almanac, which was valid only for 39 years, from 1603 through 1641. Some of the preliminaries were provided for in the 1662 edition of the Book of Common Prayer. Thus it is fair to assume that after fulfilling the functional role to regulate the reader's mental preparation for a translation to be considered orthodox, the preliminaries and even the marginal notes were removed, that is, when the KJV was accepted as authoritative (and even considered authoritative as an original and not a translation).[21]

In the next two sections I will show how two metatexts in the form of prefaces, namely the dedication to King James and "The Translators to the Reader," regulated the KJV's first readers' mental preparation for translations in order to ensure that KJV would be considered orthodox.

4. The Divine Rule of the King as Base of Authority of the King James Version

The four-page dedication to King James (of which the actual type is larger than the type anywhere else in the 1611 edition) was probably written by Thomas Bilson, Oxford scholar, theologian, bishop of Winchester, and one of the two final revisers.[22] He was a translation coordinator but not a translator. However, he carried impressive weight in the ecclesiastical community. In the preface, Bilson pays homage to visible majesty, and does so with eloquence befitting King James.

The KJV was shaped by significant people, not least the king himself. In the dedication King James is described as "the principal mover and author[23] of the work": this is meant to imply that it was his commission that made it happen. He is further praised for his "vehement and perpetuated desire of the accomplishing and publishing of this work."

Political and religious unity were to be achieved through the person of the monarch and through a single version of the Bible, issued with royal authority. This ideology was promoted by the visual statement of

the king (Henry VIII) giving the Bible to his people as depicted on the title page of the Great Bible (1539) in the artwork by Hans Holbein (the first "authorised" version). The image projected is that of a unified nation, united under the monarch and the Bible, in which church and state work harmoniously together. The church upholds the monarchy and the monarchy defends true religion. It is an icon of a godly state and church under their supreme head, who in turn acknowledges his obligations to God, expressed in the Bible. The social ordering of England was thus affirmed every time the Great Bible was opened on a church lectern.[24]

This view of the authority of the monarch is supported by other cases. While in Basel, John Calvin wrote *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, dedicated to the king of France, in which he set out clearly the main ideas of the French Reformation.[25] It was published in Latin in May 1536. By using the authority of the king, Calvin's intention was both to refute his many critics within France, and to set out clearly and attractively the leading themes of Protestant theology.

Other English Bible translations also situated themselves with respect to the monarchy. With a sense of political savvy, Miles Coverdale cultivated support from the royal family as powerful protectors of his Bible translation (1535). It includes an elaborate dedication to King Henry VIII.[26] The dedication cites Henry's second wife, Anne (Boleyn), who had long supported Coverdale's work on the Bible. After Henry's divorce from Anne and her eventual execution, surviving copies show a correction of "Anne" to "Jane" (Seymour), Henry's third wife. However, her arrest and execution prevented the king from officially authorizing the Bible she had supported.[27]

Aware of the importance of the religious reforms introduced by Elizabeth I, William Whittingham (ca. 1524–1579), the leading translator of the Geneva Bible (1560) and John Calvin's brother-in-law, included a dedicatory epistle to the English monarch, praising her explicitly for her many religious virtues. The none-too-subtle subtext of this dedicatory epistle could hardly be missed: Whittingham wanted his translation to be the Bible of choice for use in churches, to be the people's Bible. A portrait of Elizabeth I also adorned the title page of the Bishops' Bible (1568).[28] Thus both translations appealed to the monarch for support and endorsement.

Through the dedication of the new translation to King James in the language and style of dignified flattery, the intent was to achieve political and religious unity through the person of the monarch and through a single version of the Bible, issued with royal authority. Even the actual type in the dedication is larger than the type anywhere else in the 1611

Bible. The "unity factor" is perceived in the statement that qualifies King James: "to the most high and mighty prince, James, by the grace of God king of Great Britain, France, and Ireland." At that time, the country of Great Britain existed only in the mind of King James. He wanted England and Scotland to unite, but they were not to do so until 1707, almost a century later. The claim to the throne of France was the vestige of a claim first made in 1340. The mention of Great Britain, France, and Ireland suggests that instead of merely enjoying the glory of the realm left behind by the former queen, he will take his subjects to an even greater glory, by observing his duty to God as their prince. He is further praised for his care for the church "as a most tender and loving nursing father," alluding to Isa 49:23. The two realms (kingdom and church) are not sharply distinguished but are rather depicted as caught up together. On the surface, the dedication both panders to and glorifies the king. The subtext of the dedication subtly admonishes him to impose his firm rule over the realm.[29]

The translation is offered to the king and his authorization is sought rather than assumed. The dedication is begging for his "approbation and patronage," which is provided by way of silence—the authorization is never denied or officially declared by James. There is no evidence that the translation ever received a definite ecclesiastical or legislative sanction.[30] However, it certainly had the king's blessing, and to call it an authorized version does not seem a misrepresentation. Bilson cites the king as the protector, the defender of faith: fear of attack by "Popish persons" and "self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil," will be prevented or nullified if King James gives his approval. The dedication concludes with a blessing on James.

The dedication to King James prepares the reader mentally to accept the translation as the version to be used by all English-speaking subjects of King James, regardless of their religious party. The idea of divine rule by monarchs and the special dedication to King James provides authority to this translation. The King James Version would be His Majesty's version of Scripture.

5. The King James Version Embodied the Basic Practice of Bible Translation

The second preface ("The Translators to the Reader") is an eleven-page introduction to the translation in which the intentions, concerns, method-

ologies, and uncertainties of the translators are articulated with great clarity.[31] This preface was written by Miles Smith, later the bishop of Gloucester. Smith was an orientalist and a member of the first Oxford Company of translators, which was responsible for translating the Old Testament books of Isaiah through Malachi, and also one of the two final revisers of the version.[32] This preface is all about the obligation of the translators to the enterprise of translation. It is the most important part of the preliminary material that appeared in the original edition of 1611 because of what it has to say about the nature of the Bible in general and of the translation in particular. It embodies the most cogent description of the practice and activity of Bible translation since the long description in the *Letter of Aristeas*.[33] It is written in a heavy and dense style, and because of its length it is rarely reprinted.

Rhodes and Lupas as well as Newman and Houser characterize the second preface as an apologia or defense (of the necessity for a translation).[34] The point being made is that the translation now being set before the public can be thought of as representing the best possible distillation of the wisdom, grace, and beauty of existing translations, corrected where necessary against the original biblical documents in their original languages.[35] The origins of the KJV are not to be seen in Puritan concerns over the accuracy of existing translations, or the need to ensure that the biblical translations included in the Prayer Book were reliable. The credit for the decision to translate is firmly given to James himself: "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." The translation of the Septuagint was similiarly initiated by a king, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, who is treated with flattering detail in the Letter of Aristeas, as is the case with James I in the dedication. Although a pagan (but at least by descent a royal Greek rather than an Egyptian), Ptolemy received the benefit of God's divine intervention. This stirred in him the spirit to prepare a whole Bible for the Gentiles. So too James was visited by God's spirit to promote a new, authorized version.[36]

The preface mediated the religious issues in the following ways. The preface begins with an acknowledgment that no worthy undertaking is without the risk of opposition and misunderstanding. The translators were well aware that the king's desire to promote the welfare of the church could be met with suspicion and resentment, whereas his primary concern was for the Word of God to be clearly understood. Miles Smith stressed the immense spiritual richness of the Bible and its central place in Christian life and thought for spiritual growth, personal integrity, and

doctrinal correctness. To achieve this purpose, the preface argued, a new translation is necessary. An overview of the history of the ancient translations (Hebrew into Greek and Hebrew and Greek into Latin and the "vulgar" tongues) is provided to illustrate that translating the Scriptures into the common language of a people is not the novel invention of a modern generation, but both traditional and integral to the history of evangelism. That the translations were imperfect and unsatisfactory led to further attempts to replace earlier translations. Yet with all the imperfections, each translation was acknowledged as the Word of God and was used to the glory of God in evangelism. The translators criticized church leaders who would protect the Scriptures by limiting them to Latin.

The translators had been pressed by the Protestants as well as the Catholics to justify the new (re)translation: Why was a new translation necessary, and if the translations were good, why should they now be emended?

For Protestants the preface indicated, first, that perfection is not achieved "at a single stroke" and that a good translation may be improved "as gold shines more brightly with rubbing and polishing." There were at least three different attempts to revise or replace the Septuagint because of all its imperfections; a new English translation should be understood as similarly appropriate. Second, historically it was their complaints at Hampton Court about the corrupt state of the Book of Common Prayer that had prompted the king to sponsor a revision.

For Catholics, the preface answered their concerns as follows. First, regardless of the skill of the interpreters who render it in their respective languages (German, French, Italian, or Latin), the king's speech in Parliament is still the king's speech and therefore a translation can still be the Word of God. Second, they argued that the truth of Protestant versions can be tested. Third, against the complaint that Protestant versions are so often changed and revised, the preface pointed to the great variety of editions of the Latin Bible sanctioned by Roman authority.

The purpose of the translators as described in the preface was in effect to take up the mantle of Tyndale, who produced the first printed English Bible of 1535 and its further modifications in various other translations—Matthew's Bible (1537), Taverner's Bible and the Great Bible (1539), the Geneva Bible (1560), and the Bishops' Bible (1568). The translators were instructed to start with the Bishops' Bible, and to test it carefully against earlier English translations, and especially against the text in its original languages. To this end they made use of all the resources available to them: linguistic tools, ancient as well as modern Bible versions and

commentaries, especially noting the resources available in the Spanish, French, Italian, and German ("Dutch") languages.

When citing from the Bible, the preface itself chose to use the Geneva translation rather than the new translation that the preface was intended to introduce and commend.[37]

The preface describes two matters concerning the editorial policy of the translators. The first concerned the use of marginal notes where there is uncertainty about the wording of the original text or about its interpretation.[38] The translators were aware that some persons might fear that such notes would bring into question the authority of the Scriptures, but they were convinced that such notes were necessary. Alternative readings having a claim to authenticity were to be indicated. The second matter concerned the degree of verbal consistency to be observed in translation.[39] The translators do not insist pedantically on verbal consistency. Truth is not tied to particular words. They examined the words of the originals with immense subtlety; they chose their words with fidelity, precision, and sensitivity; but they caution against taking them too absolutely. The translators avoided the jargon of both the Puritans and the Roman Catholics. Their aim—like Tyndale's—was to be faithful to the language of the originals and comprehensible to everybody.

After these observations the preface concludes with an exhortation to the reader to take the Bible seriously to heart.

The preface keeps silent about contemporary issues that divided the church. By focusing on the basic principles of translation, the potential and shortcomings of translations, as well as the nature of translated texts, the preface mentally prepares the reader to consider the new translation, that is, the King James Version, as orthodox.

6. The Antimarginal Note Policy of the King James Version as a Silencing Tool

Another way in which the translators mediated the conflict was to restrict the nature of the marginal notes. As explained in "The Translators to the Reader," notes were restricted to mainly three kinds. An asterisk in the text (5,200 cases) alerts the reader to cross-references in the margin where related passages are indicated. A dagger in the text (about 4,000 passages) indicates a note providing the Hebrew form of a word, the Hebrew meaning of a word or phrase, or the literal form of a Hebrew idiom underlying the translation. There are also more than 2,500 Old Testament passages

where parallel vertical bars point to some comment in the margin, which may explain a Hebrew unit of weight or measure, flag an ambiguity in the original text, present an alternative rendering of the original text, or propose an alternative reading for the original text. In the New Testament the dagger and parallel vertical bars are used rather interchangeably to indicate examples of ambiguity, literal translations of Hebrew idioms, or where the wording of the original text is in doubt.

The translators' position concerning notes was a reaction especially to the numerous interpretive, polemical, antimonarchical, and devotional notes that cluttered the margins of the Puritans' Geneva Bible. But more importantly, this policy concerning restricting the metatextual material in notes played a role in mediation between the viewpoints of the Anglicans and the Puritans. To illustrate the role of the presence or absence of notes in restricting or opening up the interpretation of the biblical text, we will examine representative examples of the interplay between translated text and metatextual note with respect to central issues in the debate between Anglicans and Puritans—the king and the monarchy, Calvinistic theology, and church polity involving especially bishops.[40]

6.1. The King and the Monarchy

A central debate between Anglicans and Puritans involved the king and the role of the monarchy. The Geneva Bible used extensive marginal notes to highlight the Puritan perspective concerning the king (see table 1 in the appendix). For example, in 1 Kgs 12:9 the translation of the KJV and the Geneva Bible are identical:[41]

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
And hee said vnto them, What counsell giue ye, that we may answere this people, who haue spoken to mee, saying, Make the yoke which thy father did put vpon vs, lighter?	And he said vnto them, [c]What counsel giue ye, that we may answer this people, which haue spoken to me, saying, Make the yoke, which thy father did put vpon vs lighter?	[c]There is no thing harder for them, that are in autoritie, then to bridel their affections and followe good counsel.

However, the Geneva Bible has a note that provides a critical assessment of the inability of "them, that are in authoritie" to "bridel their affections and followe good counsel." The KJV translators agreed with the

wording of the Geneva Bible, but avoided the note, thus silencing the Puritans' overt criticism of the monarchy.

The metatextual strategy of the KJV translators is similar in Prov 31:4:

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
It *is* not for kings, O Lemuel, *it is* not for kings to drinke wine; nor for Princes, strong drinke:	It is not for Kings, o Lemuel, it is not for Kings to drinke wine, nor for princes [e]strong drinke,	[e]That is, the King must not giue him self to wantones & neglect his office, which is to execute iudgement.

The biblical text itself cautions kings concerning the use of alcohol, but the Geneva Bible adds a note to expand the principle to "wantones" and the neglect of his office, "which is to execute iudgement." In this way, the metatext of the Geneva Bible explicates an application of the verse to kings by broadening its interpretation. The KJV translators agreed with the wording of the Geneva Bible but shunned the note, thus silencing the criticism of the king as well as the expansion of the interpretation of the verse to general "wantonness" and injustice by the monarchy.[42]

In Exod 1:19 the metatextual note of the Geneva Bible is antimonarchical, but its relation to the translated verse is different:

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
And the midwiues said vnto Pharaoh, Because the Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women: for they are liuely, and are deliuered ere the midwiues come in vnto them.	And the midwiues answered Pharaoh, Because the Ebrewe [g]wome are not as the women of Egypt: for they are liuelie, and are deliuered yer ye midwife come at the.	[g]Their disobedience herein was lawful, but their dissembling euil.

The Geneva translators provide a note in order to guide the reader in the interpretation of the actions of the Israelite midwives. Their disobedience to the king was proper; only their dishonesty was evil. The KJV rendering of the verse is nearly identical to that of the Geneva Bible, but no such note is given. The absence of the metatext means that the interpretation of the midwives' actions is open and the reader must determine whether they behaved appropriately in disobeying the king. In this way, the KJV translators silenced the Puritan's approval of disobedience to the king.

Much less frequently, the KJV translators added a marginal note where none is found in the Geneva Bible, as in Eccl 4:13:

KJV	KJV note	Geneva
Better *is* a poore and a wise child, then an old and foolish king† who will no more be admonished.	†Heb. *who knoweth not to be admonished.*	Better is a poore and wise childe, then an olde and foolish King, which wil no more be admonished.

The KJV agreed with the rendering of the Geneva Bible, but added a note concerning another (more literal) rendering of the Hebrew source text. While the translated text could be understood as criticizing an obstinate king who refuses to be admonished, the alternative rending of the KJV note softens the verse by picturing a senile king who in his old age no longer has the good sense to be admonished. The alternate viewpoints of the KJV and the Geneva Bible with respect to the monarchy in this verse are further highlighted by their respective subject headings at the beginning of the chapter (Eccl 4), another type of metatext:

KJV subject headings for chapter	Geneva subject headings for chapter
1 Vanitie is encreased vnto men by oppression, 4 By enuie, 5 By idlenesse, 7 By couetousnesse, 9 By solitarinesse, 13 By wilfulnesse.	1 The innocents are oppressed. 4 Mens labours are ful of abuse and vanitie. 9 Mans societie is necessarie. 13 A yong man poore, and wise is to be preferred to an olde King that is a foole.

Whereas the KJV summarizes the contribution of verse 13 to the chapter as "willfulness," which is a means by which "vanitie is increased vnto men," the Geneva Bible summarizes verse 13 with an explicit mention that a poor, wise young man is "to be preferred to an olde King that is a foole."

Another general strategy of the Geneva notes is to explicate the referents of epithets and other descriptive expressions in the text. This also occurs with respect to verses involving the monarchy. In the lament of David for Saul and Jonathan in 2 Sam 1:19, we can see how this metatextual strategy furthers the Geneva translators' negative view of the monarchy:

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
The beauty of Israel is slaine vpon thy high places: how are the mightie fallen!	O noble Israel,[h] he is slaine vpon thy hie places: how are the mighty ouerthrowen?	[h]Meaning Saúl.

The Geneva Bible narrows the interpretation of the lament to a king viewed elsewhere in the text as evil and illegitimate. The KJV has no such note, thus opening up the interpretation concerning whether the reference is to Saul alone, to Saul and Jonathan jointly, or to all of the slain Israelites. Furthermore, the KJV rendering of the Hebrew נָפְלוּ with the literal translation "fallen" provides a negative view of the demise of the monarch in contrast to the Geneva translation "overthrowen," which indicates the legitimate, forceful removal of an illegitimate ruler.[43]

The Geneva strategy of using notes to explicate referents in the text is similarly followed in Prov 31:1–2:

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
The wordes of King Lemuel, the prophecie that his mother taught him.	THE WORDES OF KING [a]Lemuel: The [b]prophecie which his mother taught him.	[a]That is, of Solomon, who was called Lemuel, that is, of God because God had ordeined him to be King ouer Israel. [b]The doctrine, which his mother Bathsheba taught him.
What, my sonne! and what, the sonne of my wombe! and what, the sonne of my vowes!	What my sonne! and what the sonne of [c]my wombe! and what, o sonne of my desires!	[c]By this often repitition of one thing she declareth her motherlie affection,

The Geneva notes in Prov 31:1 identify Lemuel with Solomon and "his mother" with Bathsheba. In this way the interpretation of Prov 31:1–9 is narrowed to refer to the life and reign of Solomon, as recorded in the narratives of 1 Kings. Furthermore, the "prophecie" that his mother taught the king is characterized by the Geneva note as simply a "doctrine" as opposed to a prophetic message. In 31:2 the Geneva note serves to highlight their interpretation of the repetitive exclamations in the

verse as reflecting "motherlie affection." The note, then, furthers the Geneva translators' unusual rendering of Hebrew נְדָרַי as "my desires" as opposed to the direct rendering of the Hebrew as "my vows" in the KJV. By avoiding the metatextual note of the Geneva Bible, the KJV translators left open the identification of Lemuel (an otherwise unknown figure in the Bible) and Lemuel's mother. Furthermore, the KJV translators refrain from making explicit the nature of the "prophecy" of Lemuel's mother, instead leaving the interpretation open to the reader. Nor do the KJV translators explicate the pragmatic nuance of the repetitive expressions that begin the mother's exhortation to her sons. In every way, the KJV silences the metatextual explications and interpretations of the Geneva Bible as a means to allow a diversity of interpretations and characterizations.

The translation and interpretation of the Hebrew term מָשִׁיחַ ("anointed") also relates to the controversy concerning the monarchy, but with an additional theological twist—the term can also be interpreted christologically. The Geneva translators often explicate the referent of the anointed one by means of a note. In 1 Sam 12:5 the identity of "his Anointed" is explicated in a footnote along with a polemical statement that the king "is anointed by the commandment of the Lord" (that is, not solely on a hereditary basis):

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
And hee said vnto them, The LORD *is* witnesse against you, and his Anointed is witnesse this day, that ye haue not found ought in my hand: And they answered, He is witnesse.	And he said vnto them, The Lord is witnes against you, and his [d]Anointed is witnes this day, that ye haue foude noght in mine hands. And they answered, He is witnes.	[d]Your King, who is anointed by the commandement of the Lord.

The KJV rendering of the verse is essentially identical to that in the Geneva Bible (KJV "you have not found ought" versus Geneva "ye haue foude noght"), but the note of Geneva is silenced. For additional examples in which the KJV refrains from explicating the identity of the anointed one even when it is not controversial or polemical, see 1 Sam 16:6 and Ps 105:15 in table 2 in the appendix; Luke 2:26 is similar.

In some verses, the Geneva note provides not just the explication of identity of the anointed one, but an interpretive explication. In Ps 89:51, for example, the Geneva footnote promotes a christological interpretation:

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
Wherewith thine enemies haue reproached, O LORD: wherewith they haue reproached the foote-steppes of thine Annointed.	For thine enemies haue reproched *thee*, O Lord, because they haue reproched the [l]fotesteppes of thine Anointed.	[l]They laugh at vs, we pacietly waite for the coming of thy Christ.

In the original context of the psalm, the anointed one is the king. However, the metatext of the Geneva note guides the reader in a christological interpretation that the anointed one is Christ and the anointed one's footsteps are the coming of Christ. The metatext also guides the reader in appropriating the sentiments of the psalm for the reader's current situation by paraphrasing it: "they laugh at *us*, *we* patiently waite for the coming of thy Christ." The KJV translators keep the interpretation open, neither promoting nor foreclosing either a christological interpretation or an almost devotional appropriation of the sentiments to the reader's current situation. (See also Ps 84:9 in table 2.)

Occasionally, the KJV translators rendered the Hebrew term directly in contrast to the interpretive rendering in the Geneva, as in Ps 2:2:

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
The Kings of the earth set themselues, and the rulers take counsell together, against the LORD, and against his Anoynted, saying,	The Kings of the earth band them selues, and the princes are assembled together against the Lord, and against his "Christ.	"Or, anointed.

The Geneva Bible translates "his Christ," thus promoting an explicitly christological interpretation of the verse, with the alternative literal translation in a note. In contrast, the KJV translators declined to interpret, translating directly "his Anoynted" and providing no note to an alternative, christological rendering of the Hebrew.

6.2. Bishops and Church Polity

A second area that fuelled Puritan-Anglican controversy involved the role of bishops and church polity.[44] The contrast in the interplay between text and metatextual notes in both KJV and Geneva is especially striking. One of the most instructive examples involves Ps 109:8 (top row) and its intertextual citation in Acts 1:20 (bottom row):

KJV	KJV note	Geneva	Geneva note
*Let his dayes be few: and let another take his ‖office.	*Act. 1.20 ‖Or, *charge*.	Let his daies be fewe, and let another take his [e]charge.	[e]Or, ministrie.
For it is written in the booke of Psalmes, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: *And his ‖Bishopricke let another take.	*Psal. 109.7 ‖Or, *office*; or, *charge*.	For it is written in the boke of Psalmes, Let his habitacion be voyde, and let no man dwell therein: also, Let another take his "charge.	"Or, ministerie.

In Ps 109:8 the Hebrew word פְּקֻדָּתוֹ was rendered in the KJV as "his office," with the alternative translation "his charge," the Geneva Bible's translation, in a note. In this way the KJV translators both acknowledged the difficulty in rendering the Hebrew term and allowed for both an Anglican interpretation ("office") and the Puritan one ("charge"). The Geneva Bible provides no alternative rendering and thus promotes only the Puritan interpretation. In Acts 1:20 the text of Ps 109:8 is cited and the Greek New Testament uses the term ἐπισκοπὴν. The KJV renders the term as "Bishoprick" with a metatextual note to suggest renderings promoting a Puritan point of view—"office" or "charge." By contrast, the Geneva Bible renders "charge" and provides only an explication based on their theological stance: "Or, ministrie." The KJV translators were clearly using the resources of metatextual notes to promote a balanced, evenhanded approach to the controversy regarding the ecclesiastical structures, in contrast to the Geneva Bible, which promoted a Puritan point of view

by going so far as to suppress the normal etymological connection of ἐπισκοπὴν to bishops.[45]

In Phil 1:1 the KJV and Geneva Bible agree completely on the translation of the Greek, but the Geneva Bible promotes a Puritan view of church structure in a note:

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
Paul and Timotheus the seruants of Iesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Iesus which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons:	Paul & Timotheus the seruants of IESVS CHRIST, to all the Saintes in Christ Iesus which are at Philippi, with the [a]Bishops, and Deacons:	[a]By bishops here he meaneth them that had charge of the worde & gouerning, as pastours doctors, elders: by deacons, suche as had charge of the distribution, & of the poore and sicke.

The note in the Geneva Bible directs the reader's interpretation of bishop to specify not an individual ordained as bishop but rather "them that had charge of the worde & gouerning, as pastours, doctors, elders." Similarly, the Geneva translators wanted readers to interpret "deacons" as consisting of "suche as had charge of the distribution, & of the poore and sicke," rather than (as was the case in the Church of England) a deacon as an ordained position with liturgical functions. By avoiding the Geneva note, while simultaneously agreeing with Geneva's rendering of the verse, the KJV translators opened the interpretation of the verse. (See also 1 Tim 1:1 and table 3.)

As a contrastive example illustrating the general principle, consider 1 Pet 2:25:

KJV	Geneva
For yee were as sheepe going astray, but are now returned vnto the shepheard and Bishop of your soules.	For ye were as shepe going astraye: but are now returned vnto the shepherd and bishope of your soules.

The term ἐπίσκπον ("bishop") is used in 1 Pet 2:25 in a metaphoric sense to refer to Christ. This use of "bishop" does not figure in the controversy concerning church polity. As a result, not only are the translations of the Geneva and KJV identical, but the Geneva translators felt no need to provide an explanatory comment explicating the identity of the bishop.

6.3. Puritan Theology

The KJV policy of suppressing interpretive notes extended to instances in which the Geneva Bible used notes to promote Puritan theology.[46] In Isa 2:4, for example, the KJV provides a note that comments on the theologically neutral alternative rendering "scythes" for "pruning hooks":

KJV	KJV note	Geneva	Geneva notes
And hee shall iudge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beate their swords into plow-shares, and their speares into ‖pruning hookes: nation shall not lift vp sword against nation, neither shall they learne warre any more.	‖Or, *sythes*.	And [g]he shal iudge among the natios, & [h]rebuke manie people: thei shal [i]breake their swordes also into mattockes, & their speares into sithes: nacion shal not lift vp a sworde against nacion, nether shal they learne [k]to fight anie more.	[g]The Lord, who is Christ, shal haue all power giuen him. [h]That they may acknowledge their sinnes, & turne to him. [i]He sheweth the frute of the peace, which the Gospel shulde bring: to wit, that men shulde do good one to another, where as before they were enemies. [k]He speaketh not against the vse of weapons and lawful warre, but sheweth how the hearts of the godlie shalbe affected one toward another: which peace and loue doeth beginne and growe in this life, but shal be perfited, when we are ioyned with our head Christ Iesus.

The Geneva Bible, by contrast, provides four interpretive notes. The first promotes a christological interpretation with escatological overtones. The following three notes present a devotional theological viewpoint. In addition, the fourth note insures that the verse cannot be interpreted in a pacifistic way by providing it with an escatological interpretation. By eschewing all theological notes, the KJV translators prevent a Calvinist worldview and escatology from shaping the reading of the text.

In Eccl 3:1 the KJV and the Geneva Bible render the Hebrew differently:

KJV	Geneva	Geneva note
To euery thing *there is* a season, and a time to euery purpose vnder the heauen:	To all things *there is* an [a]appointed time, and a time to euerie purpose vnder the heauen.	[a]He speaketh of this diuersitie of time for two causes, first to declare ye there is nothing in this worlde perpetual: next to teache vs not to be grieued, if we haue not all things at once according to our desires, nether enjoye them so long as we wolde wish.

The KJV translates "a season" where the Geneva has the Calvinistic phrase "an appointed time." The Geneva Bible provides a note to further guide the reader's theological understanding of the verse. The KJV's metatextual silence leaves the intepretation of the verse—and its application to the reader—open.

The KJV is not burdened with marginal notes that are partial, untrue, seditious, or treacherous toward kingship, but rather by the technique of silence promotes the idea of divine rule by monarchs.

We have seen that the Geneva Bible's notes as metatexts served to regulate the reader's mental preparation to read the translated verses in accordance with the Puritan views concerning the king and the monarchy, ecclesiastical structure, and Calvinistic theology. The KJV translators judiciously used notes as metatexts in a highly restricted way. Often the notes provide alternative readings or renderings of the source text that may support an alternative theological possibility, but only rarely do the notes provide an overt theological or ideological interpretation. More frequently, the KJV translators silenced the ideological notes of the Geneva Bible, thus simultaneously opening up the translated verse to multiple interpretive possibilities while suppressing a distinctively Puritan ideological reading.

7. Conclusion

In this paper I have demonstrated the role of the metatexts in the King James Version as a means of mediating conflicting theological views. Translators often defend themselves and their translations by utilizing metatexts to frame the translations of sacred texts and to narrate the nature of the specific translation. Metatexts trace the contours of literary ideology and expose the sociocultural context that command literary exchanges and interventions.

By utilizing a technique of keeping silent about contemporary issues and instead focusing on the basic principles of translation, the metatexts of the KJV regulate the reader's mental preparation for a translation that diverges from the accepted sectarian interpretations in order to ensure that broader, nonsectarian interpretations will be considered orthodox. In this respect, the KJV adopted a stance toward both metatext and translation strategy that was diametrically opposed to that of the Geneva Bible, even though much of the specific wording of the KJV was drawn from or agrees with the Geneva Bible. Furthermore, to exude the appeal of the familiar, the visual presentation of the KJV was drawn from the history of Bible presentation, which culminated in the latest version of the Bishops' Bible (1568).

The dedication to King James prepares the reader mentally to accept the translation as the version to be used by all English-speaking subjects of King James, regardless of their religious party.

The second preface ("The Translators to the Reader") keeps silent about contemporary issues that divided the church. By focusing on the basic principles of translation, the potential and shortcomings of translations as well as the nature of translated texts, the reader is mentally prepared to consider the new translation, that is, the King James Version, as orthodox.

The Geneva Bible's notes as metatexts served to regulate the reader's mental preparation to read the translated verses in accordance with the Puritan views concerning the king and the monarchy, ecclesiastical structure, and Calvinistic theology. In their antinote policy the KJV translators judiciously used notes as metatexts in a highly restricted way. Many notes provide alternative readings or renderings of the source text that may support an alternative theological possibility, but only a few provide an overt theological or ideological interpretation. More frequently, the KJV translators silenced the ideological notes of the Geneva Bible, thus simultane-

ously opening up the translated verse to multiple interpretive possibilities while suppressing a distinctively Puritan ideological reading.

The metatexts of the KJV, far from being incidental to the ideology and goals of the king who commissioned its translation, are instead subtle but powerful means of mediation for advancing, achieving, and implementing goals of political unity and theological harmony.

* I wish to thank the staff of the Lichfield Cathedral library near Birmingham, UK, and Liana Lupas of the Museum of Biblical Art (MoBIA), American Bible Society, New York, for providing access to manuscripts and assistance in the research. At my own institution, the University of the Free State, I thank Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé, for valuable comments and for her assistance in editing the text and technical matters of this article. This work is based on research supported in part by the National Research Foundation of South Africa (UID 85902).

Notes

1. See John Milton and Paul Bandia, *Agents of Translation* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009).

2. Mona Baker, *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account* (London: Routledge, 2006).

3. Ibid.

4. See Charles W. Eliot, ed., *Prefaces and Prologues to Famous Books* (1910; Harvard Classics; repr., New York: Collier, 1969), 3–4; and Alasdair Gray, ed., *The Book of Prefaces* (2000; repr., London: Bloomsbury, 2002), 7–11.

5. For example, the Letter of Aristeas served as a metatext for the Septuagint (LXX) and St. Jerome's Letter to Pammachius served as a metatext for the Vulgate. See J. A. Naudé, "The Role of Metatexts in the Translations of Sacred Texts: The Case of the Book of Aristeas and the Septuagint," in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa* (ed. Johann Cook; Vetus Testamentum Supplement 127; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 281–97.

6. See also Gordon Campbell, *Bible: The Story of the King James Version 1611–2011* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 88, 302–8.

7. Although a twenty-first-century reader would naturally interpret the word *appointed* to refer to *authorized*, this is not the seventeenth-century reference of the English term. The words simply imply that the work was laid out in a way suitable for public reading in churches. See Alister McGrath, *In The Beginning: The Story of the King James Bible and How It Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 206.

8. The thirty-four pages of genealogies, the map of Canaan, and the list of place names printed on the reverse were added on account of an arrangement negotiated with James I by the noted entrepreneur John Speed in October 1610. On the basis of this "priviledge," every edition of the Bible printed for the next ten years had to include this material (see McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 211).

9. This section is substantially drawn from Jacobus A. Naudé and Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé, "Lamentations in the English Bible Translation Tradition of the King James Bible (1611)," *Scriptura* 110 (2012): 208–26, esp. 209–12

10. Willis Barnstone, *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 197–216.

11. S. L. Greenslade, "The English Versions of the Bible, 1525–1611," in *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of the Bible*; ed. S. L. Greenslade; 1963; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 141–68; see also A. Kenneth Curtis, "The Hampton Court Conference," in *Translation That Openeth the Window: Reflections on the History and Legacy of the King James Bible* (ed. David G. Burke; Society of Biblical Literature Biblical Scholarship in North America 23; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 57–71.

12. Barnstone, *Poetics of Translation*, 209; McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 98.

13. Barnstone, *Poetics of Translation*, 209–10.

14. McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 139.

15. Herbert describes the *editio princeps* of the KJV and provides a summary of its commissioning, translation process, and production with extant examples in various collections (A. S. Herbert, *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible, 1525–1961* [London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1968], 130–33, 136–39).

16. It strikingly recalls the circumstance and practice of the 72 interpreters of the Septuagint in their monastic quarters on Pharos. See Barnstone, *Poetics of Translation*, 214.

17. A typical page of the KJV was laid out as follows (see McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 200–212). The text is in two columns, each of which is enclosed within ruled margins, containing fifty-nine lines of text per column. Each verse begins on a new line, with its number clearly indicated at the beginning of the line, in the same size of type as the remainder of the verse itself. At the top, the title of the biblical book is displayed as a central header, with the subject matter of the pages being displayed on either side. No page numbers were provided.

18. Tyndale's NT has now been published as a facsimile; see *The New Testament: A Facsimile of the 1526 Edition Translated by William Tyndale* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2008).

19. David Norton, *The King James Bible: A Short History from Tyndale to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 121–22.

20. See ibid., 117–27.

21. Burke, "Introduction," in Burke, *Translation That Openeth the Window*, xiii.

22. Olga S. Opfell, *The King James Bible Translators* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 1982), 107.

23. The word *author* here implies authority, dominion, authentication (*Oxford English Dictionary*), that is, "he who authorizes or instigates"; see David Teems, *Majestie: The King behind the King James Bible* (Nashville: Nelson, 2010), 234. The style of the dedication seems overly flattering to a modern reader, but it reflects the way for seventeenth-century readers to address the sovereign upon whom their welfare, even their lives, might depend; see David Daniell, *The Bible in English* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 446.

24. McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 93–98.

25. Eliot, *Prefaces and Prologues*, 27–51.

26. Gray, *Book of Prefaces*, 189–90.

27. Donald L. Brake and Shelly Beach, *A Visual History of the King James Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011), 54; and Barnstone, *Poetics of Translation*, 208.

28. Though approved by the Convocation of Canterbury, the Bishops' Bible apparently did not receive Elizabeth's authorization.

29. Teems, *Majestie*, 232–35.

30. Nonetheless, it immediately replaced the Bishops' Bible as the standard in churches, and within forty years it supplanted the Geneva Bible as the most popular text for private use.

31. A facsimile, transcription, and modern translation of the preface is found in Erroll F. Rhodes and Liana Lupas, eds., *The Translators to the Reader: The Original Preface of the King James Version of 1611 Revisited* (New York: American Bible Society, 1997), 9–85. A transcription is provided in Daniell, *Bible in English*, 775–93. On the nature of the literary style in the preface, see David Norton, *A History of the English Bible as Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 63–70; and idem, *King James Bible*, 111–17.

32. Opfell, *King James Bible Translators*, 107–10.

33. Barnstone, *Poetics of Translation*, 216.

34. Rhodes and Lupas, *Translator to the Reader,* 1–8; Barclay M. Newman and Charles Houser, "Rediscovering the Preface and Notes to the Original King James Version," in Burke, *Translation That Openeth the Window,* 73–86; and Daniell, *Bible in English*, 446, 775–93.

35. In their preface, the Roman Catholic translators of the Douay-Rheims defend translating from the Vulgate rather than from the original languages by noting that the Vulgate was corrected by Jerome and commended by Augustine. Catholics of the Renaissance were unconvinced by "apostate" scholars who returned to the original texts, and they offered the traditional argument that only the Vulgate contained pure Scripture (Barnstone, *Poetics of Translation*, 210).

36. Barnstone, *Poetics of Translation*, 214; McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 189.

37. McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 99.

38. Archbishop Matthew Parker (1504–1575) disliked the Geneva Bible, not on account of the translation it offered, but because of the notes that accompanied it. Like Matthew's Bible before it, the Geneva Bible alienated the establishment because of its marginal notes (McGrath, *In the Beginning*, 124).

39. Norton, *King James Bible*, 114–17.

40. The data for this analysis are drawn from the facsimile editions: *The Holy Bible 1611 Edition King James Version* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2010); and *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007).

41. Despite King James's rule that the Bishops' Bible be the guiding English translation, several phrases appear to have been taken from the Geneva Bible for the King James translation. In some passages the KJV emends the Bishops' version in favor of the Geneva Bible.

42. For additional examples of similar metatextual strategies by the KJV and Geneva translators, see Prov 31:3 and table 1 in the appendix.

43. According to David Crystal, the KJV rendering in this verse is unique among the five major predecessor translations (*Begat: The King James Bible and the English Language* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010], 75–82, 263).

44. J. E. Wehrmeyer, "Where Have All the Bishops Gone?" in *The Bible and Its Translations: Colonial and Postcolonial Encounters with the Indigenous* (ed. J. A. Naudé; Acta Theologica Supplementum 12; Bloemfontein: SUN MeDIA, 2009), 106–29.

45. Tyndale insisted that the Greek word *presbyteros*, used in Paul's letters to refer to the priestly office within the Christian church, should be rendered instead as "senior." (In 1534, he altered this to "elder.") The English word *priest* was reserved to refer exclusively to refer to Jewish or pagan priests (McGrath, *In the Beginnning*, 75). The Greek term *ekklēsia*, "church," is translated as "congregation." As a result, a term that is endorsing the institution of the church was now to be understood as referring to local congregations of believers. However, the Geneva Bible chose to abandon the use of the term *congregation* and replace it with the more nuanced term *church*.

46. The Geneva Bible refers collectively to the letters of James, Peter, John, and Jude as "General Epistles," while previously they were referred to collectively as "Catholic Epistles."

Appendix: The Data concerning Text and Metatextual Notes

Table 1. Comparison of "Anointed" in KJV and Geneva

Reference	KJV	KJV note	Geneva	Geneva note
1 Sam 2:35	And I will raise me vp a faithfull Priest, *that* shall doe according to *that which is* in my heart and in my mind, and I will build him a sure house; and hee shall walke before mine **Anointed** for euer.	—	And I will sterre me vp a [z]faithful Priest, that shal do according to mine heart and according to my minde: and I wil buylde him a sure house, and he shal walke before mine **Anoynted** for euer.	[z]Meaning, Zadok, who succeded Abiathar, and was the figure of Christ.
1 Sam 12:5	And hee said vnto them, The Lord *is* witnesse against you, and his **Anointed** is witnesse this day, that ye haue not found ought in my hand: And they answered, He is witnesse.	—	And he said vnto them, The Lord is witnesse against you, and his [d]**Anointed** is witnes this day, that ye haue foude noght in mine hands. And they answered, He is witnes.	[d]Your King, who is anointed by the comandement of the Lord.
1 Sam 16:6	And it came to passe, when they were come, that he looked on Eliab, and said, Surely the Lords **anointed** is before him.	—	And when they were come, he loked on Eliab, and said, Surely the Lords [d]**Anointed** is before him.	[d]Thinking, Eliab had bene appointed of God to be made King.

Ps 2:2	The Kings of the earth set themselues, and the rulers take counsell together, against the LORD, and against his **Anoynted**, *saying*,	—	The Kings of the earth band them selues, and the princes are assembled together against the Lord, and against his **Christ**.	Or, anointed.
Ps 84:9	Behold, O God our shield: and looke vpon the face of thine **anointed**.	—	Beholde, o God, our shield, & loke vpon the face of thine **Anointed**.	That is, for Christs sake, whose figure I represent.
Ps 89:51	Wherewith thine enemies haue reproached, O LORD: wherewith they haue reproached the footesteppes of thine **Annointed**.	—	For thine enemies haue reproched *thee*, o Lord, because they haue reproched the fotesteppes of thine **Anointed**.	They laugh at vs, we pacietly waite for the comming of thy Christ.
Ps 105:15	*Saying*, Touch not mine anointed; and doe my Prophets no harme.	—	Touche not mine [h]anointed, and do my [i]Prophetes no harme.	[h]Those whome I haue sanctified to be my people. [i]Meaning the olde fathers, to whome God sheweth himself plainely, and who were setters forthe of his worde.
Luke 2:26	And it was reuealed vnto him by the holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seene the Lords **Christ**.	—	And a reuelation was giuen him of the holie Gost, that he shulde not se death, before he had sene the Lords **Christ**.	Or, *Mesias*.

Table 2. Comparison of "Bishop" in KJV and Geneva

KJV	KJV note	Geneva	Geneva note
Acts 1:20			
For it is written in the booke of Psalmes, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: *And his ‖**Bishopricke** let another take.	*Psal. 109.7 ‖Or, *office*; or, *charge*.	For it is written in the boke of Psalmes, Let his habitacion be voyde, and let no man dwell therein: also, Let another take his *charge*.	Or, ministerie.
Ps 109:8			
*Let his dayes be few; *and* let another take his ‖**office**.	*Act. 1.20 ‖Or, *charge*.	Let his daies be fewe, and let another take his **charge**.	This was chiefly accomplished in Iudas, Act. 1.20.
Phil 1:1			
Paul and Timotheus, the seruants of Iesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Iesus, which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons:	—	Paul & Timotheus the seruants of IESVS CHRIST, to all the Saintes in Christ Iesus which are at Philippi, with the [a]Bishops, and Deacons:	[a]By bishops here he meaneth them that had charge of the worde & gouerning, as pastours doctors, elders: by deacons, suche as had charge of the distribution, & of the poore and sicke.

1 Tim 3:1

This is a true saying: If a man desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good worke.	—	This *is* a true saying, If any man desire the office of a [b]bishoppe, he desireth a worthie worke.	[b]Whether he be Pastor or Elder.

1 Pet 2:25

For yee were as sheepe going astray; but are now returned vnto the shepheard and Bishop of your soules.	—	For ye were as shepe going astraye: but are now returned vnto the shepherd and bishope of your soules.	

Table 3. Comparison of Texts Concerning the King in the KJV and Geneva Bible

KJV	KJV note	Geneva	Geneva note
Exod 1:19			
And the midwiues said vnto Pharaoh, Because the Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women: for they *are* liuely, and are deliuered ere the midwiues come in vnto them.	—	And the midwiues answered Pharaoh, Because the Ebrewe [g]wome *are* not as the women of Egypt: for they are liuelie, and are deliuered yer ye midwife come at the.	[g]Their disobediece herein was lawful, but their dissembling euil.
2 Sam 1:19			
The beauty of Israel is slaine vpon thy high places: how are the mightie fallen!	—	O noble Israel, [h]he is slaine vpon thy hie places: how are the mighty ouerthrowen?	[h]Meaning Saúl.
1 Kgs 12:9			
And hee said vnto them, What counsell giue ye, that we may answere this people, who haue spoken to mee, saying, Make the yoke which thy father did put vpon vs, lighter?	—	And he said vnto them, What counsel giue ye, that we may answer this people, which haue spoken to me, saying, Make the yoke, which thy father did put vpon vs lighter?	There is no thing harder for them, that are in autoritie, then to bridel their affections and followe good counsel.

Prov 31:1

The wordes of King Lemuel, the prophecie that his mother taught him.

—

THE WORDES OF KING [a]Lemuel: The [b]prophecie which his mother taught him.

[a]That is, of Salomon, who was called Lemuel, that is, of God because God had ordeined him to be King ouer Israel.

[b]The doctrine, which his mother Bathsheba taught him.

Prov 31:2

What, my sonne! and what, the sonne of my wombe! and what, the sonne of my vowes!

—

What my sonne! and what the sonne of [c]my wombe! and what, o sonne of my desires!

[c]By this often repitition of one thing she declareth her motherlie affection,

Prov 31:3

Giue not thy strength vnto women, nor thy wayes to that which destroyeth kings

—

Giue not thy strength vnto wome, [d]nor thy waies, *which is* to destroy Kings.

[d]Meaning, ye women are the destruction of Kings, if thei hante them.

Prov 31:4

It *is* not for kings, O Lemuel, *it is* not for kings to drinke wine; nor for Princes, strong drinke:

—

It is not for Kings, o Lemuel, it is not for Kings to drinke wine, nor for princes [e]strong drinke,

[e]That is, the King must not giue him self to wantones & neglect his office, which is to execute iudgement.

Eccl 4

	HEADING		HEADING
	1 Vanitie is encreased vnto men by oppression, 4 By enuie, 5 By idlenesse, 7 By couetousnesse, 9 By solitarinesse, 13 By wilfulnesse.		1 The innocents are oppressed. 4 Mens labours are ful of abuse and vanitie. 9 Mans societie is necessarie. 13 A yong man poore, and wise is to be preferred to an olde King that is a foole.
Eccl 4:13			
Better *is* a poore and a wise child, then an old and foolish king† who will no more be admonished.	†Heb. *who knoweth not to be admonished.*	Better is a poore and wise childe, then an olde and foolish King, which wil no more be admonished.	
Eccl 5:9 Moreouer the profit of the earth is for all: the king *himselfe* is serued by the field.	—	And the[g] abundance of the earth is ouer all: the King [h]*also consisteth* by the field that is tilled.	[g]The revenues of ye earth are to be preferred aboue all things, we apperteine to this life. [h]Kings and princes ca not mainteine their estate without tillage we this commendeth ye excellencie of tillage.

Table 4. Comparison of Texts Involving Possible Calvinist Interpretations

KJV	KJV note	Geneva	Geneva note
Eccl 3:1			
To euery *thing there is* a season, and a time to euerie purpose vnder the heauen.	—	To all things *there is* an [a]appointed time, and a time to euerie purpose vnder the heauen.	[a]He speaketh of this diuersitie of time for two causes, first to declare ye there is nothing in this worlde perpetual: next to teache vs not to be grieued, if we haue not all things at once according to our desires, nether enjoy them so long as we wolde wish.
Isa 2:4			
And hee shall iudge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beate their swords into plow-shares, and their speares into ||pruning hookes: nation shall not lift vp sword against nation,	||Or, *sythes*.	And [g]he shal iudge among the natios, & [h]rebuke manie people: thei shal [i]breake their swordes also into mattockes, & their speares into sithes: nacion shal not lift vp a sworde against nacion, nether shal they learne [k] to fight anie more.	[g]The Lord, who is Christ, shal haue all power giuen him. [h]That they may acknowledge their sinnes, & turne to him. [i]He sheweth the frute of the peace, which the Gospel shulde bringe: to wit, that men shulde

neither shall they learne warre any more.

do good one to another, where as before they were enemies.

[k]He speaketh not against the vse of weapons and lawful warre, but sheweth how the hearts of the godlie shalbe affected one toward another: which peace and loue doeth beginne and growe in this life, but shal be perfited, when we are ioyned with our head Christ Iesus.

TABLE 5. UNIQUE EXPRESSIONS IN KJV THAT AVOID EXPLICATIONS OF OTHER VERSIONS

KJV	KJV note	Geneva	Geneva note
Gen 4:16 קִדְמַת־עֵדֶן And Cain went out from the presence of the LORD, and dwelt in the land of Nod, **on the East of Eden**.	—	Then Kain went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod **towarde the Eastside of Eden**.	—

Job 19:28
וְשֹׁרֶשׁ דָּבָר נִמְצָא־בִי

But ye should say, Why persecute we him? ||**seeing the root of the matter is found in me**.

|Or, *and what roote of matter is found in me?*

But ye said, Why is he persecuted? **And there was a [s]depe matter in me.**

[s]Thogh his friends thoght he was but persecuted of God for his sinnes, yet he declareth that: here was a deper consideration: to wit, the tryal of his faith & pacience, and so to be an example for others.

Acts 17:6
Οἱ *τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες*

And when they found them not, they drew Iason and certaine brethren vnto the rulers of the citie, crying, These that haue turned the world vpside downe are come hither also,

—

But when they founde them not, they drewe Iason & certeine brethren vnto the heades of the citie, crying, These are they which haue subuerted the state of the worlde, and here they are,

—