

from prudential motives, lest his known connection with Tyndale should prove injurious to the undertaking. In favour of this view, which is accepted by most modern writers, is the fact that in the official record of the apprehension of Rogers he is described as "John Rogers, *alias* Matthew." It is possible, however, that the name is a real one, and belongs to some patron through whose aid the work was undertaken. Neither view is free from difficulty. If Matthew and Rogers were different men, it is singular that all knowledge of Matthew should so soon have been lost, and that in less than twenty years the name should have been supposed to be a mere *alias*. If but one person is signified, it is somewhat strange that both names should occur in the documents prefixed to the Bible. On any supposition the statement on the title-page is inaccurate.

Let us now examine the translation itself. The New Testament need not detain us long, for with very slight and occasional exceptions it is a reproduction of Tyndale's version. Where Tyndale's second and third editions differ, Matthew seems usually to agree with the third, that of 1535. In the Old Testament the case is not so clear. It will be remembered that in 1537, there existed in print the following versions of the Old Testament, or parts of the Old Testament: Tyndale's Pentateuch (1531, 1534), Jonah (1531), and "Epistles" from the Old Testament and Apocrypha (1534), and Coverdale's Old Testament and Apocrypha. If we compare the translations before us with each of these we meet with the following results:—

(1) The translation of Pentateuch is certainly Tyndale's. The changes introduced are very slight, hardly greater perhaps than the variations between the two editions published by Tyndale himself. * * *

(2) An example of Tyndale's "Epistles" from the Old Testament has been already given, and has also been compared with Coverdale's version. It is therefore only necessary to say that Matthew's Bible and Coverdale's are here perfectly in accord.

(3) In the books from Ezra to Malachi, not excluding the Book of Jonah, and in the Apocryphal books (with one exception, which will be referred to afterwards), Matthew's Bible is almost identical with Coverdale's. In 100 verses taken at random from various books within these limits, the difference in text between the two versions does not amount to eight words in a thousand. * * *

(4) We have now examined all the books of the Old Testament except nine—1. Samuel to 2 Chronicles. Here we should naturally expect that Matthew's Bible would give Coverdale's translation, as the only English translation then extant. The most cursory examination will show that this is *not* the case. This part of Matthew's Bible therefore is new. Who then is the translator? The statements of our authorities are conflicting. Foxe ascribes nearly the whole of Matthew's Bible to Tyndale and Coverdale, Rogers being the translator of some Apocryphal books and the "corrector to the print." Bishop Bale (writing about 1548) speaks of Rogers as translating the whole Bible, making use of Tyndale's version. Another writer, quoted by Lewis, tells us that to the end of the Books of Chronicles the translation is Tyndale's; and from thence to the end of Apocrypha, Coverdale's; and that the whole New Testament is Tyndale's. There can be no doubt that the last of these statements is almost literally true, and that Tyndale left behind him in manuscript a version of the books from Joshua to Chronicles, which was first given to the world by Rogers in Matthew's Bible. We know that Tyndale continued to labour on the Old Testament for months, if not for years, after the completion of his Pentateuch; and we can point to no one more likely than Rogers to be entrusted with the results of his labours. It is also clear that, if these books had been translated by Tyndale, the general principle on which Rogers acted would lead him to adopt this version in preference to Coverdale's. If we examine the translation itself, it lends evidence on the same side. * * *

The effect of such evidence as this, the accumulation of minute coincidences between Tyndale's acknowledged work and the work which tradition