

published, almost all of these containing the whole Bible. There are some singular differences of text and many other variations in the several editions. The edition of 1572, for example, contains two translations of the Psalter in parallel columns—one properly belonging to this version, the other taken from the Great Bible. Other editions—those of 1575, 1595, for instance—contain only the latter version of the Psalms. Sometimes Parker's preface is omitted, so that Cranmer's stands alone, giving to a hasty reader the impression that he has before him a copy of the Great Bible. The last edition of the Bishops' Bible bears the date 1608.

As to the character of the translation very different views have been held. As the Genevan version and the Bishops' Bible represented widely different ecclesiastical opinions and sympathies, we can hardly wonder that many a critic has given a partisan's opinion instead of a sober judgment. We are, moreover, confronted by a difficulty which has not hitherto existed. The revision was entrusted to many hands; each reviser seems to have acted independently, and the superintendence exercised by the archbishop and others could not possibly render uniform the results of the separate action of many minds. The version must therefore be examined in various parts; one book cannot be taken as representing others. It need hardly be said that the basis of the translation is the Great Bible; a glance is sufficient to make this certain. The merits of the Genevan Bible are so great, that, without losing sight of the Hebrew and Greek scholarship of the revisers, or of the aids which they (in common with the Genevan translators) possessed and used, we may be content to try the Bishops' Bible in most instances by one simple test—how far have the revisers of the Great Bible availed themselves of the corrections and the improvements which are found in the Genevan version? Less could scarcely be expected than that those changes which were real improvements, and which could be adopted without sacrificing the style and spirit of the older translation, should be taken into the text.

The conclusion from such an investigation is not very favourable to the Bishops' Bible. In the Old Testament, it is clear, Cranmer's Bible was too closely followed, and improvements which were ready to the hand of the translators were not appreciated. What is original in this version does not often possess any great merit; nor does it appear that the revision of 1572 produced much effect in the Old Testament.

When we come to consider the New Testament, it is more important to distinguish between the two editions of the Bishops' Bible. Lawrence's criticisms, already spoken of, bring before us some thirty passages which stood in need of correction. All the renderings to which Lawrence raised objection are to be found in the first edition of the Bishops' Bible: his corrections, with the exception of one, are almost literally adopted in the revision of 1572. In two or three instances the faulty rendering is found in the Bishops' Bible alone; thus in Matt. xxi. 33 we read "*made a vineyard*," where almost all other versions rightly have "*planted*;" and in Col. ii. 13 we find "*dead to sin, and to the uncircumcision of your flesh*." The latter is so serious a mistake, both as a translation of the Greek and in the sense conveyed, that charity would require us to regard it as a misprint if the preposition "*to*" were not repeated. In most of the passages the renderings to which Lawrence takes exception are simply retained from the Great Bible and other early versions. Lawrence's criticisms are very interesting, and in most points unquestionably just. We owe to him several readings in our present Bibles—for example, *armies* in Matt. xxii. 7; *besides* (instead of *with*) in Matt. xxv. 20; *seize upon* in Matt. xxi. 38 (Lawrence's suggestion was, "*take possession or seize upon his inheritance*"); *bramble bush* (instead of *bush or bushes*) in Luke vi. 44. The last words of Mark xv. 3, "*but he answered nothing*," were introduced at his suggestion from the Greek text of Stephens (1546); this clause, however, is probably not genuine.

In judging of the merits of the translation of the New Testament, we must take the version in its corrected form, as it appeared in 1572. The verdict of