

The Bishops' New Testament, issued by itself, fared no better, for the last series of editions had the Bishops' notes removed, and those of Jugges Tyndale of 1552 substituted. Strange to say, the portions of the Old Testament at the end of these books, ordered 'now to be read' as Epistles on certain days of the year, are taken, not from the Bishops' version, nor from the Great Bible, but from Matthew's version of 1537. This obtained down to the octavo of 1619, eight years after the introduction of our present Bible, commonly but incorrectly called 'the Authorised Version.'

Changes were not made as early in the history of the Roman Catholic version. The first Testament was printed by John Fogny, Rhemes, in 1582. Owing to 'our poor estate in banishment,' the Old Testament, which had long been ready for the press, was not printed until 1609-10. The second edition was printed at Antwerp, 1600, by Daniel Veruliet in quarto; the third in 1621 by J. Seldenslach in 12mo.; the fourth by J. Cousturier, 1633, 4to size. All these are exact reprints, given without any intentional variation from the original; but when the rage for revision set in, more and greater changes were made in the English Roman Catholic Bibles than in any others.

Some of these changes are much to be regretted, as the revised Testament of 1881 agrees more nearly with the early Roman Catholic editions than with modern ones, owing to the Vulgate (of which the 1582 is an accurate translation) having been taken from the sources from which the earliest existing MSS. were copied. Most people think that no change has been made in our present Bible since it came from the press in 1611, but this is a great mistake. If any one will take the trouble to compare a recently printed Bible with either of the two folios of 1611, or with the Roman-letter quarto of 1612, few pages will be found to correspond. This applies not only to the punctuation and spelling, but to the text and heading; e.g. all the early editions have over the 149th Psalm, 'The prophet exhorteth to praise God for His love to the Church, (5) And for that power which He hath given to the Church to rule the consciences of men.' All Bible Society Bibles omit the last six words.

At various times new readings have been introduced without authority. Printers' errors have gained a footing, and been repeated through a large series of editions, and whole verses have been omitted. Still, when we consider that 274 years have elapsed since the Bible was revised, we must be thankful that the text remains as pure as it is.

Many of the early editions are popularly distinguished by peculiar readings, or the introduction of some quaint word. Thus 'Bugge' Bibles derive their name from a verse in the 90th Psalm of Coverdale, or 91st of Matthew's Bible, and its reprints, 'So that thou shalt not nede to be afrajd for any bugges by night.' This word has given rise to some controversy, but a passage in the prologue to Exodus in Tyndale's Pentateuch explains its meaning: 'He which hath the Spirit of Christ is no more

a child, he neither worketh, nor learneth now any longer for payne of the rod, nor for feare of bogges or pleasure of apples.'

The Great Bible has obtained the name of Cranmer's version, because the Archbishop wrote a preface to the edition of April 1540; but he had nothing whatever to do with the translation. The Genevan version is known as the 'Breeches' Bible, from a word used in Gen. iii. 7. The first Genevan folio is called the 'Whig' Bible, because one of the beatitudes reads, 'Blessed are the place makers.' No single Bible can claim the title of the 'Treacle' Bible, as this rendering is common to Coverdale's, Taverner's, Matthew's, the Great Bible, and the Bishops'. From 1535 to 1608 the last part of the eighth chapter of Jeremiah reads, 'For there is no more Treacle in Galaad.' The Douay gives, 'Is there noe rosen in Galaad?' So early Roman issues are known as 'Rosen' Bibles. The 'He' and 'She' Bibles are those reprinted from the first two issues of our present version, in one of which, Ruth, iii. 15, reads, 'He went into the city,' and the other 'She went.'

Although every effort was made by the authorities of Church and State to circulate the revision of 1611, nearly fifty years elapsed before it took the place of the versions to which the people of England had become attached. No edition of the Bishops' Bible was printed after 1606, so for five years before our present Bible was issued no authorised edition was printed. Still, in his visitation articles of 1628, Archbishop Laud had to require that churches should be supplied with King James' translation. To reconcile the people to the new book, R. Barker, who had the sole right of printing all copies, in consideration of his having paid the expenses of the revision, got up the book to resemble as closely as possible versions it was intended to replace, by using the identical type, head-pieces, and blocks that had been employed in printing former versions, and were endeared by old association. Even the Genevan notes were occasionally added down to the beginning of the present century.

We must not, therefore, be surprised that the Revised Testament of 1881 has been so coldly received, nor expect that during our lifetime the Bible, the advent of which is so near, will be generally accepted.—*Church Bells.*

OVER-PRODUCTION.

OCCASIONALLY we hear that all the trouble from which manufacturing centres from time to time suffer, arises from a superabundance of the articles of commerce they manufacture, or, in other words, over-production. Is this a correct statement of the case?

There can be no doubt that, under our modern conditions of life, enormous difficulties attend the due regulation of the supply and demand in any trade. Circumstances are favourable to the development of some particular branch of industry, and it is forthwith developed. It goes on supplying the wants of the world's market; it adds to the means by which those wants may be most readily met

and supplied; it induces, by its very success, a varied and powerful competition with itself; and then, like the flowing and onward current of a mighty stream, it knows not how or where to stop. If production is still continued it becomes production at a loss, and with the slow consumption of capital; or if, on the other hand, there is an entire cessation of production we have one of those manufacturing crises which seem ever hanging over the heads of a great trading community such as fills England at the present time.

We need not wonder, then, that men should advocate now one system, now another, as a panacea for evils which are very open and apparent. England, for instance, has, on the whole, prospered, during the last half century, under what is known as Free Trade and Unlimited Competition. These words, however, are often used in a more or less artificial sense. No country is entirely a Free Trade country, any more than it is entirely Protective. The basis of what is called Protection is the conservatism and development of home industry. But the countries most favourable for the working of such a system are those which have a wide extent of territory, like America, where a considerable trade can be carried on with all the different parts of a common empire. In England, the encouragement of home industry is a necessity, yet not an entire necessity, for our population is larger in comparison with the area we occupy, and therefore we must look more to the world at large than if we could supply all our own wants, and create a sufficient demand for all our own manufactures.

The uncertainty, however, as to what other nations will take of us, or, in other words, our chances of trade in neutral markets, is a constant source of anxiety to home manufacturers, and, as most frequently happens, the loss, when it is a loss, falls most heavily on the 'workers.' The capitalist tries to save himself—so far as he can—in time; the workers have, more often than not, to experience the total deprivation of their wonted employment. This, for them, is a serious aspect of the matter, as it is by no means easy for workpeople who have been trained for a lifetime, perhaps, in a particular branch of industry to turn their hand to something else, even if that something could be found. The bane of many of our manufacturing callings is that they unfit the workman for proficiency in any other kind of occupation. The operative who has laboured in the heated factory, or the ironworker, or shipbuilder, cannot exactly take to agricultural tasks. To dig, to sow, to reap, belongs to a sphere different from that to which they have given their skill and handicraft. In good times, when the work of the mill or the 'yard' was over, recreation absorbed the remaining hours at their disposal. They have lived, perhaps, in closely inhabited courts and streets, and have only seen the products of nature in the public parks, or when taking a day in the country. How, then, can such as they become all at once labourers or ploughmen; supposing, that is, that agricultural labour should be in ample request and demand?