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Imagine you have just been crowned the King of England. The year is 1603, and all is not well in the land. Tensions that threaten to tear the Kingdom apart and that, in 39 short years will lead to civil war, have been simmering for years. What has made things particularly dangerous is that disputes between opposing factions are often cast in religious terms, leading to outbursts of righteous anger even when a particular disagreement is primarily political in nature.

At the time you become King, there are two key factions in the realm. One faction consists of the Anglicans,[[1]](#footnote-1) who are conservative and whose forms of worship and hierarchical structure are patterned after those of the Roman Catholic Church. The Anglicans are strong supporters of the monarchy. They dominate public and religious life, holding most of the plum jobs in the government as well as in the Church. The Anglicans feel entitled to their rights and privileges and are willing to fight to keep them.

The other primary faction consists of the Puritans,[[2]](#footnote-2) who have a populist bent and whose core beliefs challenge the foundations that support the right of the Anglican Church and of the monarchy to rule.

As you become King, you are acutely aware that the battle between these two factions has often played out in fights over which English translation of the Bible should be used for public and private worship. During the reign of one of your predecessors, King Henry VIII, an exiled Puritan named William Tyndale published the first printed English translation of the Bible. Tyndale’s New Testament[[3]](#footnote-3) translation was published in Germany in 1526—about 75 years before you become King—and was smuggled into England.

Tyndale’s translation created an uproar. For example, a Greek word the Anglican bishops had claimed meant “church” was translated by Tyndale as “congregation.” For the Greek word the Anglicans said meant “priest,” Tyndale believed the more accurate translation to be “elder” or “senior.” Those may seem like minor differences, but they had radical import. Tyndale’s translation led to the conclusion that the governing body should be the “congregation,” not the Anglican Church, and that the congregation could decide to be led by any senior or elder it chose rather than only by priests selected by the Church.

The Anglicans were outraged, and they reacted swiftly and aggressively, persuading King Henry to outlaw the Tyndale translation. They tried to destroy all copies of it. The translator, Tyndale, was found in Antwerp, arrested, convicted of heresy, and burned at the stake.

Once Tyndale opened the door, however, other English translations of the Bible began to appear. About 35 years after Tyndale—about 40 years before you become King of England—a translation specifically made to be read by the general public was published by radical Puritans living in Geneva, Switzerland. That translation—and various “commentaries” that accompanied it—became known as the “Geneva Bible.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

The Anglicans would have liked to do to the Geneva Bible what they had done to Tyndale’s New Testament: to outlaw it and to destroy all of the copies they could find. However, it was impossible to do that. As much as the Anglicans hated the Puritan’s Geneva Bible, it quickly became too popular and too widely used to be banned and destroyed. For example, the Geneva Bible was the version William Shakespeare referenced in his plays.

Consequently, the Anglicans went a different route. They decided to prepare their own translation of the Bible—a translation that became known as the “Bishops Bible”[[5]](#footnote-5)—with the hope and expectation that, by being officially sanctioned, their translation would replace the Puritan’s Geneva Bible.

So what, at its core, was a political fight between conservative, establishment Anglicans and reformer, populist Puritans became a fight over which translation of the Bible should be used: the conservative Bishop’s Bible or the reform Geneva Bible.

At the beginning of the reign of your immediate predecessor, Queen Elizabeth I, the split between the Anglicans and the Puritans had not yet reached the chasm it became at the end of her reign, at the beginning of your rule.[[6]](#footnote-6) At the time of Elizabeth’s coronation, the major battle was between Catholics, on the one hand, and, on the other, Protestants of varying types. Yet the tensions that exist between the Anglicans and Puritans as you are crowned King of England in 1603 were very much alive, if somewhat nascent, in Elizabeth’s time.

One of the reasons religious tensions were relatively quiet during her reign is that Elizabeth, the so-called Virgin Queen, had not married and had no heirs. So all sides had been biding their time, hoping—planning, plotting—for someone sympathetic to their views to take the throne at her death.

Because of this hostility simmering just below the surface, your selection as King of England was particularly provocative and risked plunging the Kingdom into civil war. Before you became King James I of England, you had been King James VI of Scotland, and Scotland was a hotbed of Puritan passions. Your coronation brought great hope to the reformer Puritans and great fear to the establishment, conservative Anglicans.

What most did not know, though, was that you were horrified by what you viewed as the Puritans’ populist, radical program. For example, the commentaries in the Puritan-published Geneva Bible indicated that kings were often tyrannical, and that the only reason God allowed tyrannical kings to exist was to punish people for their sins. Once those sins had been punished, the tyrant kings should be overthrown. According to the commentaries in the Puritan’s Geneva Bible, God not only allowed, but required, the commandments of kings to be disobeyed if those kingly commandments conflicted with the will of God. As a king, you were horrified by this suggestion that your subjects could decide for themselves which of your commands to obey and which to ignore.[[7]](#footnote-7)

At the time you take the throne, you are well aware that choosing between the Anglican’s Bishop’s Bible and the Puritan’s Geneva Bible would have significant political, and not just religious, ramifications. Your heart is with the establishment Anglicans, but could you, as a new King seeking to consolidate your Kingdom, risk making your views known and thereby alienate the Puritans?

How did this come about? How did the passions between Anglicans and Puritans become so inflamed? In many ways, this was a consequence of a fundamental transformation in society that began with two radical changes occurring a century and a half or so before your coronation: (1) the printing of books and (2) the translation of the Bible into local, native languages.

Prior to the Guttenberg printing press, only a few had access to books. There was no way to duplicate a book other than copying it by hand, which was extremely time-consuming and expensive. Consequently, the general population had no access to books and had to take at face value what those who owned books told them those books said. Clerics and scholars could make pronouncements about what the Bible said, and the general public had no way to read the Bible for themselves to evaluate whether what they were being told was accurate. However, once books began to be printed, they became available to a wider audience.

So long as books remained in Latin, though—as was Guttenberg’s Bible[[8]](#footnote-8)—they still could be read by only a small group of international elites. Initially, of course, Latin was the language of the Roman Empire. However, after the collapse of Rome, Latin became the language of the Church and of scholars since the key texts from Roman times had been handed down—and copied—in Latin. So although the printing press expanded the number of people who could own and read a Bible, the use of Latin still restricted the direct knowledge of the scriptures to a relatively small group of international elites.

Knowledge was power, then perhaps even more than now. So the fact that only a small group could read the Bible meant that that small group had great control over the entire populace, who believed they would spend an eternity in damnation if they did not do what the priests and nobility told them God had commanded them to do.

However, once the Bible began to be translated into native languages—and to be printed, rather than hand-copied, in those native languages—the number of people who could read the Bible expanded significantly.

The translation of the Bible into local, native languages allowed the general population to challenge the authority of those in power. It became possible, for example, for a merchant to question why the monasteries that were so wealthy needed his financial support when Christ seemed to command that those who are most spiritual should live a life of poverty. As another example, and one deeply troubling to you, people began to ask where the scriptures specified that kings were anointed by God and that they must be obeyed in all instances.

This is the background as you take your place as King James I of England.

Almost as soon as you arrive in London as the new King, you receive a petition from the reformer Puritans demanding a number of changes to various aspects of Church and State. A number of the demanded changes are rooted in the Puritans’ hope that you will make the Puritan’s Geneva Bible, rather than the Anglican’s Bishop’s Bible, the official Bible of England. Because you are from Scotland, you are viewed by the Puritans as their ally.[[9]](#footnote-9) They have great hopes that you will act favorably on their requests. Yet, in your heart, your sympathies lie with the Anglicans. You also know that ruling in favor of the Puritans could trigger a revolt by the Anglicans, who hold most of the levers of administrative and clerical power.

Upon receiving that petition from the Puritans demanding change, what would you do???

\*\*\*\*\*

What King James did was to convene what he hoped would be a peace conference at Hampton Court[[10]](#footnote-10) where he could bring Puritans and Anglicans together to let each side present its views as he considered the Puritans’ petition for changes. When the conference was first announced, the Anglicans were extremely nervous that the new King—a king from Puritan Scotland, of all places—had granted the Puritans a forum allowing them to advocate for change. However, the Anglicans’ fears began to subside when they saw that the conference was going to be stacked against the Puritans. For example, of the 23 conference delegates selected to participate, 19 were from the Anglican establishment, and all four of the Puritan delegates were moderates; none were from the Puritan’s radical wing.

The Anglicans also began to breathe more easily when, at the conference, King James began to reject each of the requests of the Puritans, item by item. Finally, in frustration, the Puritans made a new request, not part of their original petition, and that was that a new translation of the Bible be prepared. The Puritans no longer held out hope that James would make the Puritan’s Geneva Bible the official Bible of England. However, they pointed out numerous translation errors in the Anglican’s Bishops’ Bible and hoped that, through a new translation, they could correct those errors.

To the surprise of all the parties at the conference, King James agreed to this request for a new translation.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Once James ordered the new translation, however, the Anglicans moved quickly to ensure that it would not contain radical Puritan ideas. Most significantly, at the Anglicans’ behest, King James put the translation process under the oversight of the person who would become the Archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the Anglican Church, Richard Bancroft. One of the first steps Archbishop Bancroft took was to issue various translation “rules” that the translators were required to follow. Several of the rules were particularly impactful in steering the new translation toward Anglican, rather than Puritan, ideas. Most importantly, Rule 1 required the translators to begin by using the Anglican’s Bishops’ Bible and to only deviate from the Bishops’ Bible if following it would be clearly contrary to the original Hebrew or Greek text.[[12]](#footnote-12)

The translation process itself[[13]](#footnote-13) was quite bureaucratic. The translation work started with six teams of scholars. After each team completed work on the section of the Bible assigned to it, its work was reviewed by a committee of 12 individuals, comprised of two members of each of the six teams. After the committee of 12 had completed its review, the translation work was then reviewed by two senior Anglicans. Archbishop Bancroft, head of the Anglican Church, retained for himself a final role, allowing him to make additional edits.

Approximately 50 scholars were involved in the translation process. As with the Hampton Court conference, the teams were stacked in favor of the Anglican establishment, and the Puritans included were not radicals. In general, though, those who worked on the project were renowned scholars, and they appeared to approach their tasks seriously and diligently, most of them without an overt political agenda.

After approximately seven years of work, the King James Version of the Bible was adopted in 1611 as the official Bible of England.[[14]](#footnote-14)

\*\*\*\*\*

As we think about the work and process that led to the creation of the King James Bible, several questions present themselves.

First, other than perhaps being an interesting history lesson, what does any of this have to do with us today, in our time? I think plenty.

Like King James, we are living in a time of intense populist challenge to the authority of government officials and international elites. The challenges today are coming from both the political right and the political left. In many instances today, as in James’ time, arguments to support or oppose a given matter of public policy are made with a religious, or religious-like, fervor that is grounded in the firm belief that their view, and their view alone, constitutes what is moral and just.

Further, in our time, as in James’s, the revolt against authority has been triggered and fueled by technological change that has empowered the general public to bypass government-sanctioned experts: the Guttenberg printing press then; the internet and social media now. Whether for good or ill, almost every day I hear questions—asked with righteous indignation—that echo those asked in James’s time: “Why should I listen to you and do what you say, just because you and the system you represent are in power and claim to have the right to rule?”

Moreover, like James, we are living in a time when fundamental questions are being asked about who should rule—kings or the people—and when it is uncertain how those questions will be answered. For most of my life, I have believed that the march of history is toward popular rule—democracy. However, autocratic leaders like Russia’s Putin and China’s Xi rule in a king-like fashion, and they are serving as role models for others who have autocratic tendencies. We have seen the rise of autocratic leaders even in countries that are part of the EU and NATO, people like Viktor Orbán of Hungary, for example. What does this move away from democracy and toward centralized, one-person rule mean for the world? What does significant support in segments of our own country for that kind of autocratic leadership mean for the United States?

King James was well aware of the tensions facing England when he took the throne. He ordered the new translation of the Bible in part to try to reconcile the factions in his realm. And it worked—for awhile. James became King of England in 1603, the Hampton Court Conference took place in January of 1604, and the new translation was not finished until 1611. However, the peace it bought was temporary, not permanent. The English civil war—a battle between Royalists and Parliamentarians that had its roots in many of the same types of issues as those dividing Anglicans and Puritans at the time of James’s coronation—started in 1642, during the reign of James’s son, King Charles I. In other words, the process leading to the King James Version of the Bible helped ease for a time the intense underlying political tensions that were threatening to tear the kingdom apart, but it did not resolve those tensions. It took a civil war to do that.

The new translation also did not resolve even the more specific and limited question of which translation of the Bible would be used for public and private worship. Although the King James Version became the official Bible of England, the Puritan-printed Geneva Bible continued to be the version used by most English-speaking Christians in their private worship.[[15]](#footnote-15) The story of how the King James Version achieved final acceptance is outside the scope of this paper. For our purposes, suffice it to say that wide-spread disputes as to the legitimacy and primacy of the King James Version persisted for approximately 200 years after its initial publication.

Putting the larger political and religious questions aside, another question presents itself: was the King James Version successful on its own terms, as a translation?

That’s difficult to answer. For those of us who grew up reading the King James Version of the Bible, we tend to think of it as “the Bible,” not as “just one translation of the Bible, fraught with errors like any other translation.” But the King James Version was not viewed as “the Bible” at the time. As I mentioned, the Puritan’s Geneva Bible remained the most widely-used translation. Further, numerous errors have been noted in the King James Version, including errors noted immediately after its publication.

Most of the errors in the King James Version can be thought of as falling into one of three categories.

The first category of errors pertained to challenges presented by the nature of the underlying texts.

The Old Testament was written primarily in Hebrew;[[16]](#footnote-16) the underlying New Testament texts were mostly written in Greek.[[17]](#footnote-17) Both the Hebrew and Greek texts presented translation challenges.

As just one example, in ancient Hebrew, no vowels were used, only consonants.[[18]](#footnote-18) Also, there were no spaces between words, and no punctuation. All of these things led to translation errors. In ancient Hebrew, for example, the words “Adam,” “earth,” and “red” all have the same consonants. Using an English example, suppose the translators were to see the letters “btr” in a text. Do those letters mean “better,” “batter,” “butter”? Picking the right word would be even more difficult if those three letters were part of a string of consonants such that it was not clear where certain words began and ended or even where entire sentences began and ended. Scholars today have uncovered a number of instances where they believe the words selected by the King James translators were not the correct ones.

As to the New Testament, one of the primary translation challenges was due to the fact that the scholars involved were experts in formal, Classical Greek. However, the New Testament texts were written many years after that time, in a sort of everyday, colloquial Greek. As a result, the “tone” of the King James Version of the New Testament is more stodgy, old-fashioned and formal than is the language of the underlying Greek texts.

The second category of translation errors is a product of the information the translators had available to them at the time they were doing their work. For our purposes, it is important just to describe briefly the differences here between the Old and New Testament texts.

Because the original Hebrew texts that comprise the Old Testament had been written so long before the King James translators did their work, there was general consensus at the time as to what constituted the authoritative original, source version of those texts.

The situation was different with the New Testament. At the time of the King James work, several versions of the Greek texts that comprise the New Testament were known. Those versions conflicted with each other in certain aspects, so decisions had to be made as to which should be considered the definitive versions for the purposes of making the King James translation. In deciding what version of the texts to translate, the King James translators relied heavily on a synthesis of Greek texts prepared by the scholar Erasmus. However, Erasmus himself recognized that his work was flawed.[[19]](#footnote-19) For example, Erasmus based his work on only a few of the Greek texts known at the time. He did not attempt to synthesize all of the texts that were then known. And scholars today have access to many more New Testament texts, including earlier and more complete ones, than what was known at the time of Erasmus. As a result, the work of the King James translators was not based on what some scholars then believed, and on what most scholars today believe, to be the most accurate synthesis of the universe of Greek New Testament texts.

The third category of errors plaguing the King James Version, at least in its early years, was the simple problem of typos. Type-setting a printing of the Bible was an enormous task, and typographical errors were bound to happen. Exacerbating the problem was that, although King James ordered the new translation, the Crown did not contribute any funds toward it. Rather, the entire process was funded privately, essentially through a venture capital process. With costs being high and sales uncertain, those funding the printing of the new translation kept looking for ways to reduce costs, and one of the easiest was to cut the number of proof readers.

When the first edition of the King James Version was published in 1611, dozens of typographical errors were discovered. Those errors were pounced on by those who wanted to challenge the translation, and the errors certainly undercut the Anglican’s argument that the King James Version was a superior translation that should supplant the Puritan’s Geneva Bible.

Subsequent editions of the King James Version also contained numerous typographical errors, including many new ones. We have to remember that the process then was completely different from today. Today, with a Word document, we can keep all of the accurate text and change only the errors, thereby perfecting the text over time. In the 1600s, however, each new printing required that type be set anew for each and every page of the more than 1,000 page Bible. As a result, even though some of the errors from previous editions might be fixed, new ones would occur as the typesetters spent hundreds of hours in the mind-numbing task of putting letter after letter into a printing frame, with their work overseen by only a limited number of also over-worked proof-readers. Typographical errors in the King James Version of the Bible persisted for many years.

I’ll close my paper with just one example, which I hope you find both illustrative and amusing. The title of my paper—“Thou Shalt”—references an edition printed in 1631 that contained a misprint causing that edition to be nicknamed “the Wicked Bible.” In that edition, the printers unfortunately left out the word “not” from one of the 10 commandments. So immediately after commandment # 6, Thou Shalt Not Kill, and immediately before commandment # 8, Thou Shalt Not Steal, sat commandment # 7,[[20]](#footnote-20) with clear instructions for all Christendom: “Thou Shalt … Commit Adultery.”[[21]](#footnote-21)

1. In general, when I refer to the “Anglicans,” I mean the Anglican Bishops and other such Anglican establishment figures. Many of the lower-level functionaries in the Church of England were more open to Puritan, Presbyterian and other such ideas than were the Anglican Bishops. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. There were a number of different Protestant sects that were anti-Anglican, with the two most significant being the Puritans and the Presbyterians. The generic word “Puritan” was often used at the time to cover all such anti-Anglican groups. I decided to use the term “Puritan” in my paper both because it was used at the time and to make my story easier to follow—a battle between the “Anglicans” and the “Puritans.” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Tyndale later, in 1530, also published an English translation of the first five books of the Old Testament (the Pentateuch). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Published in 1560. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Published in 1568. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Elizabeth was of Protestant leanings, but she did not want to alienate the Catholics. She also sensed that the Protestants could easily split into warring factions. Further, she was more practical than religious in her outlook. She found a way to constrain the religious tensions and maintain a tenuous peace by her adoption of something called the “Settlement of Religion Act,” which served as a series of checks and balances that prevented any one faction from taking full control of all religious activities in England. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. While King of Scotland, James also had a very disturbing personal experience with radical Puritans. In 1596, he got into a heated discussion with a group of Scottish churchmen. During that discussion, one of the senior Scottish Puritans physically assaulted James, calling him “God’s silly vassal.” The Scottish Puritans told James they might pretend to the world, in public, that he was King, but that they all knew, in private, that Christ was the true King of Scotland and that Christ’s commandments, and not James’s, were the ones they needed to obey. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. And as were Martin Luther’s 95 theses. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. An incident while on James’s way from Scotland to London, just after he had been selected as King James I of England, appeared to confirm the joys of the Puritans and the dismay of the Anglicans at his selection. During that journey, in response to Puritan lobbying, James had agreed to eliminate a financial practice known as “impropriate tithes.” The specifics do not matter for the purposes of this paper. However, those tithes had been a key way that Anglican Bishops had been funded. Upon arriving in London, James realized the folly of cutting funding for the key functionaries of Church and State, and he changed course, reestablishing the practice of such tithes. However, his action of initially eliminating the practice had made the Anglican establishment deeply suspicious of James, confirming their belief that, as a native Scotsman, he sided with the Puritans. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. January 1604. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. It is unclear exactly what his reasoning was in doing so, but most believe that he did it for some combination of three reasons: (1) to throw the Puritans a bone since he had rejected each of their initial proposals, (2) to buy time as he worked to consolidate his authority as King—the new translation would take years, and (3) perhaps even with the faint hope that, by working together, the Anglicans and Puritans could reach at least some compromises that would cut some of the tension between them. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Another key rule was Rule 6, which prohibited the inclusion of commentaries with only a few, limited exceptions, primarily that, if the Hebrew or Greek word being translated did not have a clear counterpart in English, then a brief margin note could be added to provide alternate translations and to indicate why the translators viewed the word selected as the best option. The relative lack of commentaries in the Bible itself meant that interpretation of its passages would be left to the church authorities, who were predominately Anglican. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Although the project was described as the preparation of a new translation, the people involved thought of their task primarily as one of revising or reconciling existing translations rather than one of creating a new translation from scratch. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The first edition contained a lengthy preface from the translators describing that they had done, and why, and setting out various difficulties they had dealt with in making the translation. I’ll quote just one portion of it, which describes how the translation came into being:

    *The very Historical truth is, that upon the importunate petitions of the Puritans, at his Majesty’s coming to this Crown, the Conference at Hampton Court having been appointed for hearing their complaints* [meaning the Puritan’s complaints]*: when by force of reason they* [the Puritans] *were put from other grounds* [meaning, when James had rejected their other requests]*, they had recourse at the last, to this shift, that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the Communion book* [which was based on the Bishops’ Bible]*, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated, which was as they said a most corrupted translation. And although this was judged to be but a very poor and empty shift* [you can tell this was written by the Anglicans]*; yet even hereupon did his Majesty begin to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and presently after gave order for this Translation which is now presented unto thee.* [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The Geneva Bible was less expensive than the Bishops’ Bible, it was smaller and more usable in size, it was printed on better paper, and it used a more modern and legible typeface than did the Bishops’ Bible. In addition, to the great consternation of the Anglican Bishops, most readers greatly valued having the explanatory commentaries. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. With some passages in Aramaic. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. With minor Aramaic words or phrases. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Another example of the translation difficulties for teams working on the Old Testament pertained to Hebrew idioms. Should the specific words used be translated literally, which might make them nonsensical and confusing to English readers or should those idioms be changed to what the translation teams thought would be equivalent English idioms even though that would mean that the words in the translated text would deviate fairly significantly from the Hebrew words actually written? Although the translators went both ways here, they tended to literally translate the idioms, with the result that, over time, many of those Hebrew idioms became English idioms. A few examples:

    * “a man after his own heart” (1 Samuel 13:14)
    * “the skin of my teeth” (Job 19:20)
    * “to put words in his mouth” (Exodus 4:15; Deuteronomy 18:18; 2 Samuel 14:3; 2 Samuel 14:19; Jeremiah 1:9)
    * “like a lamb to slaughter” (Isaiah 53:7)

    [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Erasmus himself stated that what he did in coming up with his synthesis—which he translated into Latin and published in 1516—was “truly more rushed than edited.” [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Exodus 20:14. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. The 1886 *Reports of Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission* noted an additional "gross[ ] error" in the Wicked Bible, among "divers other faults."  The other is a misprint appearing in Deuteronomy 5: the word "greatness" appearing as "great-asse," leading to a sentence reading: "Behold, the LORD our God hath shewed us his glory and his great-asse." (At the time, “asse” meaning, of course, a mule or donkey, not the anatomical part brought to mind today). Two other examples of typographical errors in other printed editions: (1) Numbers 25:17-18 of the Hebrew Bible warns the Israelites to be wary of the Midianites because of the Midianites’ wiles—i.e., a sort of “kill them because of their wily ways”-type statement. However, one of the printed translations read, “Vex the Midianites, and smite them: For they vex you with their wives.” (So vexing wives, not vexing wiles). (2) The second printing by the Oxford University Press, 1682, contained hundreds of typographical errors. It has been nicknamed the “Vinegar Bible” because of one of them. Instead of Jesus teaching using the “Parable of the Vineyard,” the printed Gospel of St. Matthew says that Jesus taught using the “Parable of the Vinegar.” [↑](#footnote-ref-21)