OUR ENGLISH BIBLE.

By the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D., St. John's Hall, Highbury.

(This article does not aim at giving a detailed history of the English Bible, which has been well done in accessible books; but at giving a general impression of its development, correcting some prevalent errors.)

1. Early Versions in other Languages.

THE Early Church believed thoroughly in Bible-reading, public and private. (See Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, ch. vii, with his quotations from Chrysostom.) Hence it was soon translated into vernacular languages; translations into Latin and into Syriac date from the second century. The Latin version was probably made originally for the Christians of North Africa—the modern Algeria and Tunis; but this was soon revised, or another translation made, for Italy. A number of other translations were made in the East; there are early versions in several Egyptian dialects, also in Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian; but unfortunately none into Arabic before the rise of Islam. A translation was also made into Gothic, by Ulfilas, the evangelist of that nation, while they were still in the old province of Dacia (Roumania or Bulgaria); its remains are our earliest specimens of a Teutonic language.

But nothing of the kind was done in the West. Here the native languages were not literary, and were supplanted by Latin not only for literature, but in speech, as is shown by the "Romance" languages—Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, etc., all descended from a popular form of Latin. The one language which could be called literary was the Punic in North Africa. It is unfortunate that no translation into this was ever made; as the Latin influence shrank here, Christianity shrank with it. It may be taken for granted that no *British* translation was made in Roman times.

2. English Translations before Wycliffe.

There were several translations of portions into Anglo-Saxon. That of Bede has not survived. But, besides inter-lineal glosses in Latin manuscripts (the Lindisfarne and the Rushworth), we still have several manuscripts of a Wessex translation of the Gospels (about 900); and Ælfric, Abbot of Eynsham, who died in 1050, wrote a paraphrase of much of the Old Testament and homilies on the Sunday Gospels, mostly with a translation prefixed. We have also a translation of part of the Psalter.

Our language had altered greatly when Richard Rolle of Hampole made his translation of the Psalms, together with a commentary, before 1350.

The general ecclesiastical opinion in the later Middle Ages, except to some extent in Germany and the Netherlands, was against vernacular versions, except for great men. It was not thought

wrong to translate Scripture; but to popularise Bible-reading was thought most dangerous; it was so likely to be misused. Even Sir Thomas More was only in favour of the Bishop giving an English Bible, or portion, to such of the faithful laity as he thought fit, to be returned on the death of the recipient. There is something to be said for this position; the open Bible is, like most other good things, not an *unmixed* blessing; but the good side was practically ignored. In particular it would have been well if the parochial clergy, whose knowledge of Latin was often very inadequate, had been provided with an English Bible. In practice English Bible-reading, though allowed to nuns (who were not supposed to know Latin, and were under direction) as at Sion and Barking, and to the highest classes, by individual licence, was regarded as forbidden to the laity.

Sir Thomas More declared that not only was the whole Bible translated into English long before Wycliffe's days, but that he himself had seen such Bibles approved of the Bishop, and left in the hands of men and women whom he knew to be good Catholics. Cardinal Gasquet made much of this as showing that our existing manuscripts are not Wycliffite at all. But Miss Deanesly has shown conclusively that these books must have been either Anglo-Saxon Gospels, or more probably Wycliffite Bibles, without the prologue and so without suspicion of their origin. This version was from the orthodox Vulgate; there were no notes and nothing suspicious in the renderings. Her book, *The Lollard Bible*, is invaluable for its accounts (1) of the attitude of the medieval Church towards vernacular Bible study, (2) of pre-Wycliffite Bible study, and (3) the history of the Lollards and their Bible.

3. Wycliffe's English Bible.

Wycliffe's doctrine was that all men were in immediate relation to God, and owed Him righteousness and obedience; hence they needed to study His law personally. The essential novelty of the Wycliffe translations was that they were intended for a wide public and a lower social class. There are two versions; the first follows the Latin order nearly exactly, so producing obscure English in some places; the other, of which more copies are preserved, translates more freely. The first was made largely by Nicholas Hereford; perhaps John Purvey, Wycliffe's secretary, completed it. The latter was certainly by Purvey.

The provincial Council of Oxford, 1397, under Archbishop Arundel, among other constitutions dealing with Lollardy, ordained that no one should in future translate on his own authority any text of Scripture into the English or any other tongue, "nor read publicly or secretly any such composed in the time of Wycliffe or later, unless the translation be recognised and approved by the diocesan or by a provincial council." But Lollardy continued till the Reformation, as is shown by Bishops' Registers, and possession of English Biblical books was a common mark of Lollardy (see Deanesly, 366, 370).

4. Tyndale's Version.

The first translation from the original languages was made by William Tyndale. There is no room here for a full account of his life and work, for which see Demaus, *William Tyndale*. His translation of the New Testament and the first part of the Old forms the basis of ours. The New Testament was printed in 1525, at Cologne and Worms; two later editions were revised by himself at Antwerp, and there were several other editions by enterprising printers. His translation of the Pentateuch appeared in 1530–1; that of the Book of Jonah probably in 1531; and his revised New Testament of 1534 included the liturgical epistles from the Old Testament. He was arrested at Antwerp in 1535, and strangled at the stake at Vilworde, October 6, 1536. He was working at his translation to the last; in a letter from prison he asks for his Hebrew Bible, Grammar, and Dictionary. This later work is probably preserved in "Matthew's Bible."

A few points call for notice.

(*a*) Tyndale's original idea was to make his translation in the palace of the Bishop of London, Cuthbert Tonstal, no doubt hoping that it might be published with his sanction. Tyndale was at the time greatly influenced by Erasmus, and thought that Tonstal, of whom Erasmus spoke warmly, might share his views on the popularisation of the Scriptures. But Tonstal, always a cautious man, would show him no favour; he recognised afterwards that he was mistaken in his plan, and that it was providential that Tonstal would not take him in. Any translation made under these conditions would have been a very timid one; it would have had to keep close to the Vulgate; and when completed it would probably have gone no further.

(*b*) In the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October, 1935, is an article on "Tyndale's Knowledge of Hebrew," by Mr. J. F. Mozley. He examines Tyndale's renderings in his translation of Jonah, comparing with Luther, the Vulgate, and Pagninus. His conclusion is:

> "This list proves up to the hilt Tyndale's knowledge of Hebrew and his independence of the other versions. Throughout he is his own master, and what is more, he usually comes down on the right side. . . . In essential accuracy to the Hebrew he is superior to Luther, the Vulgate, and the LXX, and not inferior to Pagninus. . . . We may well honour Tyndale not only for his vision, his courage, and his constancy, but also for his scholarship."

(*c*) In his *Obedience of a Christian Man* he deals with the current objections to Bible translations into English:

> "First, God gave the children of Israel a Law by the hand of Moses in their mother tongue, and all the prophets wrote in their mother tongue, and all the Psalms were in the mother tongue. What should be the cause that we may not see as well at noon, as they did in the twilight? . . . How can we (apply) God's Word when we are violently kept from it and know it not? . . .
>
> "They will say haply, 'The Scripture requireth a pure mind and a quiet mind; and therefore the layman, because he is altogether cumbered with

worldly business, cannot understand them. If that be the cause, then it is a plain case that our prelates understand not the Scriptures themselves; for no layman is so tangled with worldly business as they are. . . .'

" ' If the Scriptures were in the mother tongue,' they will say, ' then would the lay-people understand it every man after his own ways.' Wherefore serveth the curate but to teach him the right way? Wherefore were the holy days made, but that the people should come and learn? . . . If ye would teach, how could ye do it so well and with so great profit as when the lay-people have the Scripture before them in the mother tongue? . . . But, alas! the curates themselves for the most part wot no more what the New or Old Testament meaneth, than do the Turks; neither know they of any more than that they read at Mass, Matins, and Evensong, which yet they understand not. If they will not let the layman have the Word of God in his mother tongue, yet let the priests have it; who for a great part of them do understand no Latin at all, but sing and say and patter all day with the lips only that which the heart understandeth not.

" St. Jerome translated the Bible into his mother tongue; why may not we also? They will say it cannot be translated into our tongue, it is so rude. It is not so rude as they are, false liars. For the Greek tongue agreeth more with the English than with the Latin. And the properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the English than with the Latin. . . . In a thousand places thou needest not but to translate it into the English, word for word, when thou must seek a compass in the Latin.

" Nay, say they, Scripture is so hard that thou couldst never understand it but by the doctors. That is, I must measure the mete-yard by the cloth. Here be twenty cloths of divers lengths and of divers breaths; how shall I be sure of the length of the mete-yard by them? What is the cause that we damn some of Origen's works and allow some? how know we that some is heresy and some not? By the Scripture, I trow."

He refers to Erasmus, *Paraclesis*, and Preface to the *Paraphrase of Matthew*.

(*d*) The reasons for the bitter opposition of the authorities were:

(i) The Vulgate was " the Bible "; any variation from it was objectionable. Tyndale had translated from the original languages.

(ii) Tyndale's version was manifestly influenced by Luther; common report exaggerated this. His Prologues are largely from Luther, but without blind dependence. And some of the editions, though not most, were furnished with controversial notes.

(iii) But what roused the most opposition was the rejection of the traditional ecclesiastical terms. This was the chief point in the criticisms of More and of Robert Ridley (Pollard, 122, 126). Tyndale sought to get behind these terms and their associations, using more general terms; e.g., for " church," " priest," " grace," " charity," he had " congregation," " senior " (later " elder "), " favour," " love." More offers to show two or three false translations and that every one is more than thrice three in one, being often repeated; *priests*, the *church*, and *charity*.

5. Coverdale's Bible.

This appeared near the end of 1537, the first complete English Bible since Wycliffe. Miles Coverdale was not a scholar like Tyndale, and his work did not profess to be an independent translation from the original; it was " translated out of five sundry inter-

preters." Of these, two were Latin—the Vulgate and the new translation of Sanctes Pagninus, a Dominican, made with papal sanction; two were German—Luther's version and the German-Swiss Zurich Bible by Zwingli and Leo Juda; the fifth was probably Tyndale's translation as far as it went. Coverdale's use of each in the Psalms may be seen in Mr. Clapton's *Our Prayer Book Psalter*; he prints on one side the Psalter in Coverdale's Bible with the renderings of its sources; on the other side, that of the "Great Bible," Coverdale's revision of his own work, in which he used also a new source, the translation of Sebastian Münster, Professor at Basel, and sometimes followed the Vulgate more closely. To anticipate somewhat, the Great Bible (1540–1) was the standard Church version when the Book of Common Prayer was framed in 1549, and during its revisions of 1552 and 1559; hence its Psalms were taken from this version. It is often said that the Prayer-Book Psalter is a translation from the Vulgate; but those who assert this can never have studied the two consecutively, or indeed know much of the Vulgate Psalter. Coverdale sometimes, indeed, follows the Vulgate closely, but much more often one of his other authorities. But there are in the Great Bible, and so in the Prayer-Book, some phrases from the Vulgate without Hebrew authority; these Coverdale did not like to omit, but printed in smaller type, within parentheses. They are all in square brackets in the official books of 1662, but the brackets have since been dropped. For a list, see Driver's *Parallel Psalter*, xix–xx. They are mostly very short phrases, but include Psalm xxix. i, "bring young rams unto the Lord," another rendering of the Hebrew; and xiv. 5–9, from Romans iii. 10–12. According to Mr. Clapton, the Great Bible in the Psalms follows the Vulgate against the Hebrew in some fifty passages, whereas in over three hundred it goes against the Vulgate.

Coverdale was a master of English prose; where his version differs from the Authorised Version it is often more vigorous and fluent, though less exact. See, e.g., the last verse of Psalm cxx.; Authorised Version and Revised Version translate exactly, "I am for peace, but when I speak they are for war"; but Coverdale renders, "I labour for peace, but when I speak to them thereof, they make them ready to battle."

Coverdale's Bible was reprinted by Nicholson at Southwark in 1537 in two editions, one of them stating that it was "set forth with the King's most gracious licence." But it was very soon superseded.

6. Matthew's Bible.

In 1539 a composite Bible was printed at Antwerp. The Pentateuch and New Testament were Tyndale's translation; Ezra to the end of the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha, was Coverdale's; Joshua to 2 Chronicles was a new translation, probably from an unpublished MS. of Tyndale; this is somewhat borne out by a comparison of his renderings of some of the Epistles from the Old Testament (see Westcott, *History of the English Bible*).

There was new introductory matter, largely from Olivetan's French Bible, and a number of notes. John Rogers, who had been chaplain at Antwerp, had much to do with this edition; at least he corrected it for the press. But it was entitled "truly and purely translated into English by Thomas Matthew." This name is a mystery. One view is that "W. T.," the initials of "William Tyndale," was reversed as "T. M.," and this expanded into "Thomas Matthew"; the more usual view is that "Matthew" was a pseudonym (or possibly a by-name) of Rogers, the true editor; but it is possible that some obscure man of this name had something to do with it. Thomas Matthew of Colchester, a man of some substance, had been in trouble for Lollardy or Lutheranism in 1527–8; he had two years before purchased a New Testament in English for four shillings. He was on the Council at Colchester for many years except in 1535; this suggests he *may* have been abroad then.

This edition was dedicated to the King. Cranmer was delighted with it. He is reported to have said that the news of it did him more good than the gift of ten thousand pounds. He wrote to Cromwell August 4, 1537, asking him to exhibit the book to the King, and to obtain, if possible, a licence that it might be sold and read to all, "until such time as we, the Bishops, shall set forth a better translation, which I think will not be till a day after domesday!" Cromwell did so, and Cranmer wrote on the 13th to thank him.

Richard Grafton, one of the publishers, sent Cromwell six copies, and asked for a licence under the Privy Seal. This was thought not necessary; but he feared lest other printers should reprint and undersell him. 1500 copies had been printed, and he had laid out £500. He asked that no one should be allowed to reprint until these copies were sold; or else that every "curate" should be bound to get one, and every abbey six.

This version lies behind all later ones, though it was naturally soon replaced. As Dr. Pollard says (*Records of the English Bible*, p. 16):

> "With a light heartedness which is really amazing, official sanction was given to a Bible largely made up of the work of Tyndale, and which included his markedly Protestant prologue to Romans (based on Luther) and equally Protestant side-notes. . . . No doubt in 1537 the King had moved a long way in the direction of Protestantism—for the moment—but considering his character the whole transaction bore a remarkable resemblance to playing with gunpowder."

7. The Great Bible.

Cromwell now secured Coverdale to make the due revision for a new version, with Grafton and Whitchurch as publishers. It was to be printed in Paris, by Regnault, who had previously printed service books for England. In this revision much use was made of Münster's Latin version (see above). But about the end of 1538 a quarrel broke out with France, and the French ambassador suggested that the book should be seized as heretical. This was

done; but a few copies had been lodged with the English ambassador (Bishop Bonner). Some of the rest were burnt; others sold as waste-paper "for a haberdasher to lap in caps," but apparently bought up. But ultimately Cromwell seems to have secured the rest, and brought over skilled printers, so that the book was finished in London. The first edition appeared in April, 1539; others in 1540, and down to December, 1541. Cromwell's Injunctions, issued before the dispute with France, had enjoined that a Bible of the largest volume should be set up in every parish church. This end was secured by a Royal Proclamation, May 6, 1541; all parishes without a Bible were to procure one by All Saints' Day under penalty of the heavy fine of forty shillings a month. The price was fixed at ten shillings unbound, twelve shillings well bound and clasped. People were to read meekly and reverently, not to interrupt services by reading with a loud voice. Laymen were not to take upon them to dispute or expound, but every such layman should humbly, meekly and reverently read the same for his own edification, instruction and amendment of life.

Coverdale was very anxious to include some notes, but this was thought too risky. The title-page is said to have been designed by Holbein. The King is depicted as giving the Bible to Cranmer to distribute to the clergy, and to Cromwell to distribute to the laity, while all cry "Vivat rex!"

8. Taverner's Bible.

While the Great Bible was printing in 1539, Taverner's version appeared, apparently promoted by Cromwell in case the printing of the Great Bible failed and some attack was made on Matthew's. Richard Taverner, of the Inner Temple, a good Greek scholar, who became "Clerk of the Signet," revised "Matthew," making more use of the Vulgate; he retained the preliminary matter, but toned down the notes. Though a good version, it was quickly replaced by the Great Bible, and is not in the direct ancestry of the Authorised Version.

Taverner also edited a series of "Postils"—homilies on the liturgical epistles and Gospels—by various authors, whose names are not given; two of these were included in the *Second Book of Homilies*—those on the Passion and the Resurrection.

A reaction set in during Henry's last years. All translations bearing the name of Tyndale were proscribed; and later also Coverdale's New Testament; also most classes were forbidden to read the Bible either publicly or privately. Apparently a great destruction of Bibles now took place, and probably the Great Bible was largely ejected from churches. But under Edward VI the order for setting it up in churches was renewed, and there was great reprinting of it and other versions; there were thirteen editions of the Bible, and thirty-five of the New Testament. Under Elizabeth *three* new versions appeared, all based upon the Great Bible (or Matthew), one Puritan, one Official, and one Roman.

9. The Geneva Version.

This was the work of a company of exiles at Geneva in Mary's reign, headed by William Whittingham, afterwards Dean of Durham, who contributed largely to the "Old Version" of the Psalms (Sternhold and Hopkins). A version by him of the New Testament appeared in 1557; this was then revised and the Old Testament taken in hand with the help of Anthony Gilby and Thomas Sampson. When at Elizabeth's succession the bulk of his fellow exiles flocked to England, Whittingham remained to complete and bring out this Bible in 1560. This shared several distinguishing features with the New Testament of 1557; it was of convenient size, not intended primarily for church use; it was no longer in "black letter"; it was the first to use italics for explanatory words and phrases; and, above all, it was the first to be divided into *verses*. Our division into *chapters* was probably the work of Stephen Langton, of the University of Paris (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), about 1200; but that into verses appeared first in Estienne's (Stephanus) Greek-Latin Testament of 1551. It was made on a ride between Paris and Lyons. This division, while most valuable for exact reference, is too often regarded as essential and sacrosanct; it encourages the tendency to make Scripture consist of detached sayings and phrases, a collection of *texts* and not one of books, and to ignore connection and context; so the introduction of the familiar feature was not an unmixed blessing. Many notes, mostly quite short, are added. "We have endeavoured," they say, "both by diligent reading of the best commentaries, and by conference with godly and learned brethren, to gather brief annotations," not only to explain what is obscure, but also "for the application of the text as may most appertain to God's glory and the edification of His church." Most of these are simple and useful, but some are controversial; James I strongly objected to two of them at the Hampton Court Conference: (1) The note on Exodus i. 17–19, "Their disobedience herein was lawful, but their dissembling evil." He objected to teaching the lawfulness of disobedience to kings. (2) On 2 Chronicles xv. 16, Asa deposed his mother or grandmother because she had made an idol: "Herein he lacked zeal, for she ought to have died, both by the Covenant and the law of God; but he gave place to foolish pity."

In the translation fresh use was made of the versions of Pagninus, Leo Juda, and Münster, and, in the New Testament, of Beza's French Testament. The Geneva version was the popular Bible for over a generation.

10. The Bishops' Bible.

Archbishop Parker now revived the project which had fallen through under Henry VIII, of an official version by the Bishops. (Actually one or two deans and prebendaries also took part.) Parker himself took all the preliminary matter, Genesis and Exodus, Matthew and Mark, and all the Pauline Epistles except Romans and 1 Corinthians. In October, 1568, he sent a bound copy to

Cecil for presentation to the Queen, enclosing a list of the revisers and a statement of the principles on which they worked. They were to follow the common English translation used in the churches (i.e., the Great Bible), and not to depart from this except where it varied manifestly from the original; to follow especially Pagninus and Münster and generally others learned in the tongues; to make no bitter notes upon any text nor yet to set down any determinations in places of controversy. The work was parcelled out among a number of independent revisers, though Parker probably exercised some supervision and made final corrections. It is said that the New Testament is done better than the Old, probably because Greek was better known than Hebrew. The book was a handsome one, with many woodcuts, and with portraits of the Queen, the Earl of Leicester, and Lord Burghley. Convocation in 1571 enjoined that every archbishop and bishop should have a copy, and deans were to have one in their cathedrals and for their households; a copy was to be placed in every church "if it could conveniently be done." Parker, having the control of Bible printing, had nothing but the Bishops' Bible printed during the rest of his life, and that apparently only in large size for churches. Immediately after his death editions of the Geneva Bible appeared under the influence of Walsingham, and the printing of the Bishops' was neglected. Under Whitgift the balance was more even, but for years the Bible read in churches differed generally from that read at home.

II. The Rheims New Testament.

This appeared in 1582, the work of members of the "English College" there. This "seminary" was originally established at Douai, but owing to political troubles moved to Rheims in 1578, returning to Douai in 1593. Both Old and New Testaments were undertaken together, but owing to shortness of funds the Old was not published till 1609–10, so that it, unlike the New Testament, had no influence upon our Authorised Version. The combined book is usually known as the Douay Bible. It was revised in 1750 and 1764 by Bishop Challoner, borrowing largely from the Authorised Version. A letter from Cardinal Allen, Head of the College, in 1578, says that they had felt the want of such a translation, as learned Catholics do not commonly have at command the text of Scripture except in Latin. Thus when they are preaching to the unlearned and are obliged on the spur of the moment to translate some passage into the vulgar tongue, they often do so inaccurately and with unpleasing hesitation, because the words of any English version do not at once occur to them; whereas our opponents have at their fingers' ends from some heretical version all the passages of Scripture which seem to make for them.

The great translator of this New Testament was Gregory Martin, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; his version, which took him three and a half years, was corrected by Allen himself and Richard Bristow. The Preface, largely given by Dr. Pollard,

is important. They give reasons for translating from the Vulgate, not from the original. But as they also understood and used the Greek, they avoid some of the obvious dangers of translating from a translation. When there were variants in the Latin they selected those which agreed with the Greek (the authorised editions of Sixtus and Clement had not yet appeared). And when the Latin was ambiguous they let the Greek interpret; so in particular they recognise the force of the Greek article and translate it better than other versions, though there is no article in Latin. They defend themselves for sometimes retaining original words rather than translating, e.g., "Amen, amen," instead of "Verily, verily." If "Pentecost" be transliterated, why not "Pascha" (Passover), "Azymes" (unleavened bread) and "Parasceve" (preparation)? They name a number more, some of which are now familiar English, while others seem strange Latinisms. Taken as a whole, it is a much better version than it is commonly said to be; much of it being quite straightforward, and bearing a strong family likeness to the other English versions. Thus in 1 Corinthians xiii. 1, the Bishops, the Geneva and the Rhemish all have, "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." It is furnished throughout with notes, some of them long, guarding passages against the misinterpretations of heretics.

Dr. William Fulke, Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, published in 1589 his *Text of the New Testament translated by the Papists of the traitorous Seminary at Rhemes*, giving their version and the Bishops' Bible in parallel columns, thus making comparison easy; then giving their notes in full, subjoining to each his own confutation. It was probably from this work that the translators of 1611 gained their detailed knowledge of this version, which they used freely, though without acknowledgment.

12. The Authorised Version.

The Authorised Version of 1611 had as its starting-point the Hampton Court Conference, 1603–4. The Puritan representatives there asked for a new translation, pointing out mistakes, not very important, in the older ones, e.g., Psalm cvi. 30, "Then stood up Phinees and *prayed*." Bancroft objected that if every man's humour should be followed, there would be no end of translating; but the King took up the idea warmly. (The co-existence of two rival versions was objectionable; yet neither could be expected to drive out the other.) The King required that the translation should be made by the best learned in both universities; after this to be reviewed by the Bishops and the chief learned of the Church; then to be presented to the Privy Council, and lastly to be ratified by the royal authority, and so the whole Church be bound to it and none other. Also that there should be no notes; he particularly objected to some of the Genevan.

On July 31, Bancroft wrote to the other Bishops, enclosing a letter from the King of the 22nd, that learned men to the number of fifty-four be nominated. There are various lists, but no one

of them names more than forty-seven ; others add one or two more, and fresh names occasionally crop up. Among the names are Andrewes, Overall, Saravia, Abbott, Spencer, and two of the Puritan representatives at Hampton Court, Reynolds and Chaderton. "The choice of the revisers seems to have been determined solely by their fitness, and both parties in the Church were represented by some of their best men" (Pollard).

They were divided into six companies, two meeting at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge. Genesis to 2 Kings was assigned to the first Westminster company; Chronicles to Canticles to the first Cambridge ; the Prophets to the first Oxford ; the Apocrypha to the second Cambridge ; the Gospels, Acts and Apocalypse to the second Oxford ; the Epistles to the second Westminster. Eighteen rules were drawn up to be observed in translating, the most important being :

(1) The ordinary Bible used in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit.

(2) The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, e.g., the word "church" not to be translated "congregation."

(6) No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew and Greek words which cannot without some circumlocution so fitly and briefly be expressed in the text.

(8) Every man of each company to take the same chapter or chapters, and having translated or emended them severally by himself where he thinketh good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree what shall stand.

(9) As any one company hath despatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest to be considered of seriously and judiciously.

(10) Any differences (finally remaining) to be compounded at the general meeting of the chief persons in each company at the end of the work.

(14) These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible,—Tindale, Matthew, Coverdale, Whitchurch [Great], Geneva.

But it does not seem that all these rules were precisely followed ; probably experience led to some modifications. Thus the rules as stated at Dort say that no notes were to be placed in the margin, but only parallel passages to be noted ; where a Hebrew or Greek word admits of two suitable meanings, one was to be expressed in the text, the other in the margin ; so with various readings in the original. The more difficult Hebraisms and Grecisms were also placed in the margin.

It is strange that we know so little of the actual course of proceedings. The Preface (by Bishop Miles Smith) tells us of the principles followed, but little of the proceedings, except that the translators took above three years and three-quarters, probably omitting the preliminary work. (Bois' biographer speaks of four

years' work, besides nine months' revision in London.) Apart from isolated notices, we have only two connected accounts:

(1) That given at the Synod of Dort (Dordrecht) 1618. One of the four English delegates there, Dr. Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney College, Cambridge, and Archdeacon of Taunton, had been one of the translators. The important points in the account are that there were seven or eight distinguished men in each of the six companies. After each section had finished its task, twelve delegates, chosen from them all, met together and reviewed and revised the whole. Finally Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, together with Miles Smith, now Bishop of Gloucester, who had been engaged in the whole work from the beginning, put the finishing touches to this version.

(2) The other account is by Anthony Walker (on whom see *Churchman*, July, 1935) in his *Life* of his grandfather, Dr. John Bois, rector of Boxworth, Cambridge, and afterwards Canon of Ely, written about 1646, though not published till long after (in Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*). He came up to Cambridge for the work, only visiting Boxworth for the Sundays; he was entertained by his old College, St. John's. Part of the Apocrypha was allotted to him, but Walker could not remember what part. "When he had finished his own part, at the earnest request of him to whom it was assigned he undertook a second." This suggests that Rule 8 was not fully observed by this company, but that in the first place the books were divided among the members. But Walker's words have been taken to mean that the Apocrypha committee finished first, and then Bois was attached to the other Cambridge committee. "Four years were spent in this first service; at the end whereof . . . a new choice was to be made of six in all, two out of every company, to review the whole work." For this, Downes and Bois were sent for to London; Downes would not go till he was either fetched or threatened with a pursuivant. They went daily to Stationers' Hall, and in three-quarters of a year finished their task. All which time, and only then, they each had thirty shillings weekly from the Stationers' Company. "Whilst they were employed in this last business, he (Bois) and he only, took notes of their proceedings, which notes he kept unto his dying day" (Jan. 14, 1643/4). Walker seems ignorant that there were two committees in each place, and that each committee sent two members to the final revision, twelve in all. This is plain from the report to the Council of Dort. Bois and Downes were both members of the second Cambridge committee.

Besides earlier English versions, the revisers made use of the Latin translation of the Old Testament by Arias Montanus, and that of the whole Bible by Tremellius and Junius; also French, Italian and Spanish versions. These are mentioned in Selden's notice of the translation. "They met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or French, Spanish, Italian, etc. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on."

There are several current misconceptions of this version:

(1) That all the forty-seven members, or whatever the number was, took part at the same time and place, perhaps at one table. Actually, until the final revision, not more than seven or eight met together, and then only twelve.

(2) That it was an absolutely new translation; the title is largely responsible for this. But their instructions were to follow the Bishops' Bible as far as possible, only making changes as faithfulness to the original required, and then using, if possible, one or other of the older translations. Hence there is not much absolutely new, though they used great judgment in selecting from these sources. Speaking roughly, it may be said to be in the New Testament for the most part a revision of the Bishops' from the Genevan, with occasional use of the Rhemish.

There is no evidence that the new book received any special authorisation. It succeeded to the Bishops' Bible, which was "authorised and appointed to be read in churches." This Bible was no longer printed, and after a few years the printing of the Genevan was discountenanced; but it was not till near the middle of the century that this was finally displaced.

The Churchwardens' Account at Bishops Stortford shows that thirty shillings was paid for a new Bible in 1569 (the "Bishops'"); forty-eight shillings and eightpence in 1612 for a new Bible and its carriage from London.

13. The Revised Version

of the New Testament appeared in 1881; of the Old Testament, in 1885; of the Apocrypha, not till 1895.

The project of revision first took definite shape early in 1870 when the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a committee to go into the matter. In May a resolution was passed recognising the desirability of a revision, to include not only marginal renderings but necessary emendations in the text in the opinion of competent scholars. Convocation nominated a number of its members, eight from each House, "who should be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship to whatever nation or religious body they might belong." Nearly forty were so nominated, a few of whom declined. Approximately there were usually twenty-five members on each committee. The New Testament committee met in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster, Bishop Ellicott being Chairman; the Old Testament at first in the Chapter Library, Bishop Wilberforce Chairman.

A breakdown was narrowly averted near the start. Dean Stanley invited all the revisers to a Celebration in Westminster Abbey; there were among them about sixteen non-Anglicans, including a Unitarian, Dr. Vance Smith. Hence arose a great outcry against the "Westminster Scandal"; there was much indignation among High Churchmen, who appealed to the Confirmation rubric. The Bishops were carried away by it, and passed a resolution that no person who denies the Godhead of Our Lord Jesus

Christ ought to be invited to join either company, and any such person now on shall cease to act. But Bishop Thirlwall regarded the resolution as mischievous and likely to discredit the honesty of the revisers' work, and sent in his resignation at once, with the effect that the obnoxious resolution was practically withdrawn.

Two similar revision companies were formed in America, and the committees on both sides of the Atlantic regularly communicated their provisional decisions to one another.

The method adopted was to go through the whole twice. At the first revision changes in the text might be made by a bare majority; but at the second only by a two-thirds majority. Hence it sometimes happens that a change approved by the majority did not get beyond the margin; which may be sometimes, especially in the Book of Job, superior to the text.

The first revision of the New Testament took six years; the second about two and a half; various delays brought the whole period to ten years and four months. The Old Testament did not appear till four years later. The expenses were borne by the University Presses in return for the assignation of the copyright; they stipulated that the Apocrypha should be included, as in all other English Bibles, including the Genevan. This was revised by four small companies of revisers after their main work was finished; it appeared in 1895, with a preface by Dr. Moulton.

The Old Testament committee held 85 sessions, most of ten days each, of about six hours a day. The New Testament, 101 of four days each and one of three, 407 in all.

The Prefaces to both the Old and the New Testament should be read, as explaining the principles followed, and the reasons for change in important words or clauses.

The Revised New Testament was received with a storm of criticism. It must be remembered that to many people the Authorised Version *is* "the Bible," and any deviation from it jars. This feeling cannot have been so strong when more than one version was in circulation. A more literary form of the same feeling is that the Authorised Version being rightly regarded as an English classic, a model of language and style, any change seems to deface it. The tendency is to forget that we are dealing with a *translation*, and to ignore the importance of faithfulness to the original.

Sir Frederic Kenyon (Schweich Lectures, 1932) says that the Revised Version, though continuing in steady use, especially by careful students of the Bible, has never become popular. But it has been attacked on two totally distinct grounds: (1) That the Greek text on which it is based is wrongly chosen; it was an error to depart from the "received text." This was the main point of Dean Burgon's attack on the version. But at the present time "it must be taken as an assured result that the text underlying the Revised Version is superior to that underlying the Authorised." (2) That in English style it is inferior to the Authorised, and is guilty of pedantic neglect of idiom and imperfect comprehension of the differences of New Testament Greek from Classical. Here

the charges are partially made out; there was a tendency to over-press tenses, and not to allow enough for the colloquial character of some books, or for the changed meaning of words in later times. (Instances will be found in Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*; and Turner, *Commentary on St. Mark*.)

But much of the prejudice is due to preference of custom to truth.

There was no such outcry on the appearance of the Revised Old Testament, probably partly because the language was not so familiar, partly because the changes in the text were fewer. It is often thought that the reception of the New Testament made the revisers of the Old cautious in their final revision, so that many changes failed to get a two-thirds majority, and were relegated to the margin. This is the case with many real improvements.

A very good account of the history of the Revision and the character of the changes made is to be found in *Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scripture*, by Bishop C. J. Ellicott, Chairman of the New Testament Revision Company.

The New Testament revisers truly say that the foundation of our English New Testament was laid by William Tyndale. His translation was the true primary version. The Versions that followed were either substantially reproductions of Tyndale's translation in its final shape, or revisions of Versions which had been themselves almost entirely based on it.

Bishop Westcott says that it is even of less moment that by far the greater part of his translation remains intact in our present Bible, than that his spirit animates the whole.

Longmans, Green & Co. issue the *Annual Charities Register and Digest* for the year 1936 (price 8*s.* 6*d.*). This is one of the most useful books of reference for the Clergy and social workers generally. Commencing with the Charity Organisation Society it covers both home and foreign organisations. The Register then goes on to a list of the institutions for special cases, which include the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb, Cripples, Mentally Defectives, Inebriates and Epileptics. Lists are given of Hospitals, Surgical Homes, Convalescent Homes, Nursing Institutions in London, Homes for Old People, and numerous other Institutions for various departments of social work. Under the heading General and Special Relief Agencies considerable space is given to numerous Religious Institutions. The value of the work is considerably enhanced by the full Index with which it is provided.

THIS IS THE VICTORY. By Janie Langford. *Thynne & Co.* 3*d.*

The story of a young girl who by consistent faith overcomes difficulties and saves the life of the man whom she ultimately marries.

H. D.