University of Pennsylvania Press

Chapter Title: THE CRITICAL POINT: 1534

Book Title: The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340-1611
Book Author(s): CHARLES C. BUTTERWORTH
Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press. (1941)
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv4v32hg.9

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

University of Pennsylvania Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340-1611*

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Chapter VI

THE CRITICAL POINT: 1534

BACKGROUND OF ENGLISH NATIONAL AFFAIRS 1530–34

THE ten years from 1530 to 1540 comprise the most crowded and momentous period in the history of our subject. During this decade the English Bible passed from outlawry to the status of royal recognition. Some half-dozen versions of primary importance were published, as well as several others of less note. During the same period national affairs in England underwent historic changes, and the story of our Bible is so entwined with these that it can hardly be comprehended very clearly without some understanding of the political background.

In the first half of the reign of Henry VIII, the course of English affairs had been shaped and impelled largely by Thomas Wolsey, who had become the Lord Chancellor. Wolsey was also Archbishop of York, and a cardinal, and as the Papal representative in England his influence was greater than that of Thomas Warham, the aged Archbishop of Canterbury, who was the nominal head of the English Church. By 1529, however, it had become clear that Wolsey's influence was waning. By that time the King had fully determined to marry young Anne Boleyn and to have his marriage to his present Queen annulled. It was Wolsey's task to gain the sanction of the Pope to this annulment, but to this the Pope would not agree. Furthermore, Henry's Queen, Catherine of Aragon, was not friendless; for the secular head of the Roman Empire was her nephew, Emperor Charles V. Learned arguments in favor of the divorce were advanced by Thomas Cranmer, and Wolsey did what he could through diplomatic intrigue and political alliance to bring pressure upon the Pope, but to no avail. The King's displeasure was aroused and Wolsey was constrained to give up his royal post and retire. In October 1529, Sir Thomas More was made Lord Chancellor, and

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

about a year later Wolsey died while on his way to answer to a charge of treason.

During 1530, two new figures begin to emerge as persons of prominence because of their fitness to assist the King in the project of his new marriage. These are Thomas Cranmer, who suggested that the scholars of Europe be invited to render their opinions on the propriety of the proposed divorce, and Thomas Cromwell, who had learned something of statecraft under Wolsey. It became the policy of Cromwell to establish the King in such a position of supremacy within his realm that he could afford to defy the censure of the Pope in the matter of his divorce. It is difficult to judge whether it was Cromwell or the King who was the driving force behind this bold design.

Meanwhile, the clergy had been much disturbed by the spread of heretical opinion in England and by the importation of "Lutheran" books and the translations of Tyndale. In the spring of 1530 they represented to the King the need for checking the increase of heresy. Under the supervision of More, who (it will be recalled) was one of Tyndale's chief antagonists, a conference of bishops was held on May 24, at which they roundly condemned all of Tyndale's translations and ordered them to be burnt, while at the same time they recognized that the growing demand for an English Bible could not be ignored indefinitely. Following this, on June 30 the King issued a proclamation against the importing of heretical translations, and in the course of it he said:

> His highnes hath therfore . . . consulted with the sayd primates . . . and by them all it is thought, that it is not necessary, the sayde scripture to be in the englisshe tonge, and in the handes of the commen people: . . . All be it if it shall here after appere to the kynges highnes, that his saide people do vtterly abandon and forsake all peruerse, erronious, and sedicious opinyons, with the newe testament and the olde, corruptly translated in to the englisshe tonge nowe beinge in print: And that the same bokes and all other bokes of heresy . . . be clerely extermynate and exiled out of this realme of Englande for euer: his highnes entendeth to prouyde [i.e., *intendeth to provide*], that the holy scripture shalbe by great lerned and catholyke persones, translated in to the englisshe tonge, if it shall then seme to his grace conuenient so to be.

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

This carefully qualified intention was not carried out for some years to come, but the burning of the Tyndale translations was effected immediately—the most famous burning taking place at St. Paul's in London upon the order of Cuthbert Tunstall, who was made Bishop of Durham during this same year.

The next year, 1531, while Cranmer was sent on diplomatic missions to the Continent, Cromwell began engineering his plan by undermining the civil authority of the clergy. With the help of a subservient Parliament that was strongly tinged with anti-clerical resentment, King Henry forced the clergy to acknowledge him as the supreme head of the Church in England. Archbishop Warham, in protest, managed to insert the clause, "so far as the law of Christ allows"; but the gesture was ineffectual, for the next year the clergy were stripped of all their temporal authority, and were made subordinate to a royal council. In 1532 also, Parliament enacted a law whereby certain ecclesiastical fees which had been considered payable to the Pope should henceforth be turned over to Henry's royal treasury. Sir Thomas More, foreseeing the trend of affairs towards the King's marriage to Anne and being unable to reconcile himself to the proposed divorce from Catherine, resigned his office as Lord Chancellor and spent his time in defending the orthodox position in controversy with Tyndale and his supporters. Cromwell was raised to the dignity of Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Tyndale was apparently in Antwerp at this time. Indeed, one of Henry's agents, Stephen Vaughan, seems to have made some overtures of reconciliation, suggesting that Tyndale should renounce his writing and return to England; but he would not. No doubt he was afraid to trust the King's promise of safeguard, in view of the many executions for heresy that had been taking place in England.

By 1533, the King had assumed such great powers that he felt himself safe to proceed as he pleased. Accordingly, in January he secretly married Anne Boleyn, and shortly afterward he recalled Cranmer from Germany to fill the post of Archbishop of Canterbury, which had become vacant by the death of Warham the summer before. Cranmer, whose sojourn in Germany had

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

inclined him to favor the more liberal ecclesiastical party, was made archbishop in March, and brought Queen Catherine to trial in May, when her long marriage to Henry was annulled on the pretext that she had been the widow of Henry's brother and therefore her contract with Henry was not valid. Anne Boleyn was crowned as Queen on the first of June, and in September she gave birth to a daughter, the future Queen Elizabeth.

Thus the momentous year of 1534 began with Cromwell in control of Parliament and with Cranmer in the post of Archbishop of Canterbury. After much delay, the Pope finally pronounced his judgment on Henry's marriage, and (as was expected) he upheld the validity of Catherine's rights and denounced the marriage with Anne. This was accompanied by threats of excommunication. The answer of the English clergy was given by the Convocation of Canterbury in the declaration that the Pope, as Bishop of Rome, had no more authority in England than any other foreign bishop. The answer of Parliament in its spring session was to pass an Act of Succession declaring Elizabeth to be the heir to the throne and debarring Catherine's daughter, Mary. This Act included also the declaration that the marriage with Catherine was not valid, and required that an oath to this effect be administered to all public officials. When Thomas More refused to subscribe to this portion of the oath, he was cast into prison. The Parliament proceeded further to strengthen the King's position by reaffirming him to be the supreme head of the Church of England, without qualification, and by enacting a statute concerning treasonable practices that was so broad in its scope that even those who declined to commit themselves in support of Henry's policies and marriage could be held guilty of treason by implication. Cromwell was made the Secretary of State.

Henry's pathway was thus cleared of all obstacles to the most absolute assumption of monarchy. If anyone was opposed to his policies who could be convicted of holding to Lutheran opinions, he was subject to execution for heresy. If, on the other hand, his loyalty to the Church of Rome made him scrupulous about en-

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

dorsing the King's marriage, then he could be convicted of treason.

JOYE'S TRANSLATION OF JEREMIAH

It is small wonder that Tyndale preferred to remain in Antwerp, where he was safely housed in the home of one of the English merchants residing there. In Antwerp also was George Joye, who during this same year of 1534 began unloosing the flood of English translations of the Scriptures that was to continue and increase for seven plenteous years.

Joye published his version of Jeremiah "in the monethe of Maye," the volume containing also "The lamentacions of Ieremye" and the Song of Moses at the Red Sea. It was entitled, "Ieremy the Prophete translated into Englisshe: by George Ioye: some tyme felowe of Peter College in Camebridge." Concerning the Lamentations, which in the original Hebrew were in the form of an alphabetical acrostic similar to that used in the 119th Psalm, Joye calls attention to this feature: "Euery verse hauinge before it orderly an Hebrew letter aftir their .A.B.C." According to the title-page of the book, "The songe of Moses is added in the ende to magnif ye [*sic*] our Lorde for the fall of our Pharao the Bisshop of Rome." To one of Joye's intense—not to say fanatical—disposition, the decision of his native land to throw off its allegiance to the Pope was cause for fervent rejoicing. Wherefore, "To supplee the lefe" (that is, to fill up the remainder of the last sheet in his book) he bids us "take here (Crysten reder) that goodly and godly songe of Moses."

Like all of Joye's translations, this of Jeremiah is free rather than scholarly. We do not know how widely it was used. Only two copies are available, one in the University Library at Cambridge, the other in the British Museum. Although the work was issued in time for Coverdale to have made use of it, it is not certain that he did so. There are instances of parallel phraseology to be found in Joye's Jeremiah and in Coverdale's Bible, but there are also wide divergencies between them. For a sample of the style of the work compared with Coverdale, I submit this specimen from the tenth chapter (verses 3–5), adding lastly the version of the King James Bible:

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

(GJJ)—For the rytes and lawes of the gentyles ar very
(Cov)—Yee all the customes and lawes of the Gentiles are nothinge,
(KJ) —For the customes of the people are

vanite. They will go cut downe a tre frome the wode and
but vanite. They hewe downe a tre in the wod
vaine: for one cutteth a tree out of the forrest

fasshion it withe the handis & axe of the artificer/
with the hondes of the worke man, and fashion it with the axe:
(the worke of the handes of the workeman) with the axe.

than is it made gaye with golde or syluer/ and fastened with
they couer it ouer with golde or syluer, they fasten it *wt*
They decke it with siluer and with golde, they fasten it with

hamers and naylis that it moue not nor go not a waye. It
nales and hammers, that it moue not. It
nayles, and with hammers that it mooue not. They

standeth as stiffe as the palme tre/ it speketh not/ it gothe not/
stondeth as stiff as the palme tre, it can nether speake ner go,
are vpright as the palme tree, but speake not: they must needes

but is borne onely. Be not a frayd of siche thingis:
but must be borne. Be not ye afrayed of soch,
bee borne, because they cannot goe: be not afraid of them,

for they may do nether good nor harme.
for they can do nether good ner euel.
for they cannot doe euil, neither also *is it* in them to doe good.

Later in the same chapter (verse 9) the Authorized Version describes the ornamentation of the idols in the words, "blue and purple *is* their clothing." Likewise, according to Joye they are "cled with byse and purple," in which "byse" is an old spelling of bice, an artists' term for azure. But Coverdale, apparently following some other authority, surprises us with the translation, "clothed with yalow sylck and scarlet."

JOYE'S PSALTER OF 1534

The next of Joye's productions was his Psalter: "Dauids Psalter/ diligently and faithfully translated by George Ioye/ with breif Arguments before euery Psalme/ . . ." At the end of

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

the Psalms comes a statement of the date of the publication: "The yere of our lorde M.D. xxxiiii. *ye* moneth of Auguste." The printer's name is given in the colophon: "Martyne Emperowr. 1534." This is, of course, Martin de Keyser of Antwerp, with his name ("Kaiser") translated into English.

This little volume, which is preserved in the Cambridge University Library, is not very different in its set-up from the Psalter of 1530, but the version that it contains is quite different, as we have pointed out. Because of this, it has been assumed that the earlier Psalter was not of Joye's composing; yet it was not uncommon, we know, for a person to translate the same passage of Scripture differently at different times. Such a practice would not seem strange to Joye, of all persons, since his manner of translation was not especially precise. Furthermore, Lewis in his *History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible* (1739) is authority for the statement that this Psalter of 1534 was based on a Latin text by Friar Felix, whom he identifies with a scholastic of the Order of the Eremites of St. Austin. If this be true—for it has been called in question—it offers an additional reason for the variations between this Psalter and the one published in 1530, which had been based on the Latin text of "Feline" (Martin Bucer).

As a matter of fact, there are many curious parallels in the renderings of these two English Psalters, which indicate that at the least George Joye must have had some cognizance of the earlier version. In the opening Psalm, for instance, where the version of 1530 read, "sitteth not in the seate of *ye* pestelent scorners," Joye's Psalter enlarges on the theme thus: "sitteth not downe in the chaier with the peruerse pestelent skorners." This is typical of Joye, who apparently delighted in adding unnecessary emphasis. Again, in the twenty-third Psalm, where the Psalter of 1530 had this somewhat unusual rendering, "thou shalt souple [i.e., *make supple*] my hed with oyntment/" the reading of 1534 follows closely with, "thou sowplest my head with oyntment." Finally, consider these two readings from the ninetieth Psalm (verse 9): the earlier version reads, "All owre dayes (thou being Angre) shall slyde awaye: owre yeares go

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

awaye lyke a thoughte"; while the later version reads, "Thou being angre/ al our dayes are slyden awaye: our yeares ar gone in a thought." This is the passage which concludes thus in the version of the Prayer Book Psalter: "we bring our years to an end, as it were a tale that is told."

These were Coverdale's words. Turning now to the relationship between Joye's Psalter of 1534 and the Coverdale Bible of the following year, it is clear that there is some connection between them, but it is not so clear just what it is. Whether Coverdale was familiar with Joye's version of the Psalms, or whether he was acquainted simply with the version of 1530, which Joye also knew, it is hard to say; but there is plenty of evidence to prove some sort of bond between these three translations. Probably the most spectacular bit of evidence centers about the celebrated use of the word "bugges" in the ninety-first Psalm (verse 5). The name "Bug Bible" has been applied to various Bibles using the word in this passage, all of which derive their text of the Psalms from the Coverdale Bible. "Bugge" (as in *bugbear* or *bugaboo*) is another form of the word "bogey" (which, by the way, is still commonly pronounced "boogey"), and the verse in which it occurs is translated thus in the Authorized Version: "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day." In the Coverdale Bible the first part of this verse reads: "So that thou shalt not nede to be afrayde of eny bugges by night." How interesting it is, then, to find this same word used in *both* the earlier Psalters! Joye's translation of 1534 reads: "So that nether by night thou shalt not be afrayed of night bugges/ nor yet by daye feare their fleynge arows." And the Psalter of 1530 (progenitor of the others?) has, "Thou shalt not nede to be a frayede of nyght bugges: nether of the Arowes that flee be daye."

As in other of his publications, so in his Psalter of 1534, Joye now and again astonishes us with a reading that comes very close to the wording finally selected for the King James Bible. At the close of the twenty-third Psalm, for instance, it is only in Joye's Psalter that we come upon the combination of "goodness and mercy," which is used in the Authorized Version, though Joye

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

obscures the resemblance by his context: "Thy goodnes therfore & thy benigne mercye ar with me through all my lyfe that I myght dwell in thy house for euer." And in the ninetieth Psalm (verse 2) the crudity of his wording does not by any means prevent the likeness to the King James Bible from shining through: "Before the mountayns or the erthe were brought forthe: before the rounde worlde was made: frome euer vnto euerlastinge thou art god."

Perhaps the reader will be pleased to try for himself what comparisons he can discover in these few verses from the 107th Psalm (25,27,30), which are here presented in all four translations, namely, 1530, 1534, Coverdale, and King James:

(P30) —For at his commaundement cometh forthe the stormye
(GJP)—For at his commandement the wyndye stormes
(Cov)—For at his worde, the stormy wynde
(KJ) —For he commandeth, and raiseth the stormy

wynde: and lifteth vp the waves of the see. . . . They are throne
aryse/ and lyfte vp hir waues. . . . They rele
aryseth, and lifteth vp the wawes therof. . . . They rele
winde: which lifteth vp the waues thereof. . . . They reele

here and there/ they are tossed/ they rele lyke dronken men:
and stagger lyke dronken men/ and
to and fro, they stacker like a droncken man, and
to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man; and

they are at their wittis ende: . . . Then are thei glad that they
are all at their wittes ende: . . . And then thei reioyse for their
are at their wittes ende. . . . Then are they glad because they
are at their wits end. . . . Then are they glad, because they

are at reste: and he leadeth them forthe vnto
quietnes geuen them agen/ and eftesone he bringeth them vnto
be at rest, & so he bryngeth them vnto
be quiet: so he bringeth them vnto

their plesaunte haven.
their desyered hauen.
the hauen where they wolde be.
their desired hauen.

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

TYNDALE'S REVISIONS OF HIS NEW TESTAMENT

In the same month that his Psalter appeared—August 1534—Joye also put through the press a New Testament. This was practically a reprint of the version that Tyndale had issued in 1526. Joye maintained that a corrected edition was needed because of the many errors that had crept into the text through the ignorance of the Flemish printers, who had been publishing the Testament for the English trade. He also claimed to have made some improvements. Nevertheless, Joye's edition made very few changes and was certainly not free from errors of its own. He gave neither his own name nor Tyndale's to the book, but furnished it with this curious title:

> The new Testament as it was written/ and caused to be written/ by them which herde yt Whom also oure saueoure Christ Iesus commaunded that they shulde preach it vnto al creatures.

The volume was printed by the "wydowe of Christoffel of Endhouen" and is now a great rarity, only one copy being known, the one in the British Museum.

Reprehensibly enough, Joye had issued this Testament in Antwerp without Tyndale's knowledge or consent, thus precipitating a controversy between them. Tyndale waxed indignant because Joye had taken occasional liberties with his text without seeing fit to label the product with his own name. What irked him especially was that Joye had used some such expression as "the life after this" instead of the word "resurrection." In the Gospels particularly Joye did this, though by no means invariably. Indeed, variety might well be called the spice of George Joye's literary modes.

Whether in self-defense or not, Tyndale undertook at this time a thorough revision of his own New Testament and published it in November of this same year. It had been eight or nine years since his earlier version was first published, and they had been years of controversy during which his translations had been raked by the fire of criticism; so that he was able to find a good many details in which he could effect improvement.

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Consequently, though the alterations are not very fundamental, they are fairly plentiful and constitute a marked advance over his earlier effort.

This volume, according to its second title-page, was "Imprinted at Anwerp by Marten Emperowr." The first and fuller title-page reads:

> ¶ The newe Testament/ dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke by Willyam Tindale: and fynesshed in the yere of oure Lorde God. A. M. D. & .xxxiiij. in the moneth of Nouember.

There are three prologues: the first, an address, "W. T. vnto the Reder"; the next, "A prologe into the iiii Euangelystes shewynge what they were & their auctoryte"; and the third, "Willyam Tindale yet once more to the christen reader," dealing none too gently with the pirated edition of George Joye. In it he taxes him in these words:

> But of this I chalenge George Ioye that he dyd not put his awne name thereto and call it rather his awne translacion: and that he playeth boo pepe, and in some of his bookes putteth in his name and tytle, and in some kepeth it oute.

At the end of the New Testament the volume includes a section of "Epistles taken out of the olde Testament which are red in the church after the vse of Salsburye vpon certen dayes of the yere." These will be dealt with later.

It is now in order to present some comparison between this New Testament and the earlier version of 1525–26. One alteration we have already had occasion to notice, in the eleventh chapter of Matthew (verse 29), the new version reading, "and ye shall fynd rest vnto youre soules," where the older one had "fynde ease." A good example of Tyndale's capacity as a reviser of his own work is supplied by the first chapter of the Epistle of James, a few verses of which (2–5) are shown here, first from the version of 1526, next from the revision of 1534, and then from the King James Bible:

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

(T26)—My brethren/ count it excedynge ioye when ye faule into
(T34)—My brethren/ count it excedynge ioye when ye faule into
(KJ) —My brethren, count it all ioy when ye fall into

divers temptacions/ remembrynge howe that the tryinge off
divers temptacions/ for as moche as ye knowe how that the tryinge of
diuers temptations, Knowing *this*, that the trying of

youre fayth bringeth pacience: and let pacience have her parfect worke/
youre fayth bringeth pacience: and let pacience have her parfect worke/
your faith worketh patience, But let patience haue *her* perfect worke,

that ye maye be parfect and sounde/ that nothynge be lackynge vnto
that ye maye be parfecte and sounde/ lackinge nothinge.
that ye may be perfect, and entier, wanting nothing.

you. Yff eny that is amonge you lake wisdom/ let hym axe off God
Yf eny of you lacke wysdome/ let him axe of God
If any of you lacke wisedome, let him aske of God,

(which geveth to all men with outen doublenes/ and casteth no man
which geveth to all men indifferentlie/ and casteth no man
that giueth to all men liberally, and vpbraideth not:

in the teth) and it shalbe geven hym:
in the teth: and it shalbe geven him.
and it shalbe giuen him.

This passage shows what might be termed a maximum of revision as exemplified in the New Testament of 1534. It will be understood that the changes throughout the volume were not all so thoroughgoing as this, but were largely incidental improvements, leaving most of the former version intact. Yet they marked a distinct step toward the text of the Authorized Version.

In January of the next year, Joye issued yet another Testament, a reprint of his former venture, but with certain corrections and with an additional section of Old Testament "Epistles" such as Tyndale had included in his volume. At the close of these "Epistles" comes an address "Vnto the Reader," which is in reply to the "vncharitable pistle agenst me" that Tyndale had printed in his November edition. The title-page of this second edition of Joye's is missing in the only copy extant, which is in the British Museum, but the colophon tells us that the printing was done at the same press as the first edition. It reads:

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Prynted now agayne at Antwerpe by me Catharyn wydowe in the yere of oure lorde .M.CCCCC, and xxxv, the ix. daye of Ianuarye.

After this publication Joye evidently did not feel that his vindication was complete, for in February he brought forth an elaborate statement in his defense, reciting the history of the controversy with Tyndale and stating his side of the argument. In the course of this "Apology" he takes occasion to say:

But I doubt not/ but that aftir T. and me bothe/ there be or shal come/ which shall mende bothe our translacions and paraduenture cal them theirs/ which I pray god sende vs/ and I/ for my parte shal geue place vnto siche one with grete and many thankis.

Tyndale also was not idle. Some time in the early part of this year he brought out what proved to be his last revision of the text of the New Testament. On account of the trade mark of the publisher, Godfrid van der Haghen, which appeared on the second or inner title-page, this edition is generally spoken of as the "G–H" edition. The first title-page reads as follows:

The newe Testament yet once agayne corrected by Willyam Tindale: Where vnto is added a Kalendar and a necessarye Table wherin easely and lightelye maye be founde any storye contayned in the foure Euangelistes and in the Actes of the Apostles.
Prynted in the yere of oure Lorde God .M.D. & xxxv.

This "G–H" edition follows closely the text of the "Emperowr" edition of the preceding November, but introduces slight changes and improvements here and there. For example, in the twelfth chapter of Romans (verse 13) the King James Bible reads, "Distributing to the necessitie of Saints; giuen to hospitalitie." In Tyndale's earliest translation he had said, "Distribute vnto the necesitte off the saynct*es*," and had omitted the next part. When George Joye came upon this, he added the missing clause in this form: "Distribute vnto the necessite of the saynctis kepe hospitaliter." Tyndale's revision of 1534 gave the passage thus: "Distribute vnto the necessite of the saynctes & diligently to harboure." This clumsy rendition was then improved in the "G–H" edition to read, "Distribute vnto the necessite of the saynctes & be readie to harboure."

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Aside from such smoothing of the rough places, however, this latest revision was practically the same as the "Emperowr" edition already described. On the other hand, it does have the distinction of having been recognized as Tyndale's most authentic effort, and as such it formed the basis for nearly every subsequent edition of his New Testament. Within the year other editions were brought out, of which there is one, "fynesshed in the yere of oure Lorde God A. M. D. and .xxxv," which is remarkable for its outlandish spellings, evidently the result of the attempt of some Flemish compositor to set up type in the unknown English tongue. In the following year, 1536, still other editions came forth, and Tyndale's place had been firmly established.

THE SO-CALLED "EPISTLES" FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

At the end of the New Testament, it will be recalled, the "Emperowr" edition of 1534 had introduced a number of selections from the Old Testament representing "Epistles" that were read in the church services on certain days. Not to be outdone, Joye also included these in his second issue (January 1535), offering his specimens for comparison with Tyndale's:

> Here folow the Pistles taken out of the olde Testament/ to be red in the chyrche certayn dayes thorowt the year/ translated by George Ioye/ & compared with the Pistles pointed forth and red in the messe boke/ and also withe the chapiters alleged in the Byble so that nowe here they maye be founde easlyer then euer before. Which thys my laboure . . . whether yt be more diligent then hathe ben shewd hitherto/ Let the indifferent reders be iuges.

As a matter of fact, most of Joye's "Pistles" are plainly copied from those in the Tyndale Testament, although a few show signs of independent workmanship.

These excerpts from the Old Testament are of interest for two reasons: first, when compared with the same passages in Tyndale's other published translations from the Old Testament, these show considerable variation in wording, illustrating again how free the pioneers felt when rendering their original texts into English; second, they give us some inkling of Tyndale's style of translation in those portions of the Bible which he never suc-

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

ceeded in translating as a whole, namely, the Poetical Books, the Prophets, and the Apocrypha.

The "Epistles" from the Pentateuch, for instance, do not agree word for word with the corresponding passages in Tyndale's published Pentateuch of 1530. In the story of Joseph approaching his brethren in the fields of Dothan (Genesis 37 : 18–20),* the published Genesis of 1530 reads as follows:

> And when they sawe him a farr of before he came at them/ they toke councell agaynst him/ for to sley him/ and sayde one to another/ Beholde this dreamer cometh/ come now and let us sley him and cast him in to some pytt/ and let vs saye that some wiked beast hath deuoured him/ and let us see what his dreames wyll come to.

In the second edition of the Genesis (1534) the "wiked beast" was changed to "cruell beast." But in the "Epistle" taken from this chapter, as given at the close of Tyndale's New Testament of 1534, the passage reads:

> And when they sawe him a farre of/ and yer [i.e., *ere*] he drue nye them/ they contryved to sle him. And they sayd one to another: beholde/ this dreamer cometh. But now come & let vs kyll him and cast him into a sand pitte/ & saye some cruell beast hath deuoured him/ and let vs se wherto his dreames will come.

These two versions show, of course, such similarity as would be expected in works by the same author, but there is plainly no attempt at mere verbal agreement between them. They are independent renderings. The item of the "sand pitte" was probably a misprint; for in the same "Epistle" as it was printed in the "G–H" edition of the following year, the wording is changed back to "some pitte." When George Joye came upon this "sand pitte" in making his version of the "Epistle" he transformed it, for no apparent reason, into "some blynde pytte." Also, Joye changed the Tyndale wording, "they contryved to sle him," into the more modern-sounding words, "they co*n*spyred hys dethe." Here the word "conspired" finally emerged as the reading favored in the King James Bible, which says, "And when they saw him a farre off, euen before he came neere vnto them, they conspired against him, to slay him."

* For the selection in full, see Appendix I.

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Is this mere coincidence? or did the translators of 1611 actually see these obscure "Epistles" and make use of them? The answer to such queries is too uncertain to venture upon. Yet in another of these "Epistles" there is a curious instance of agreement with the text of the Authorized Version. It is taken from the Song of Solomon, and an excerpt is here given because this "Epistle" represents a text that Tyndale did not otherwise translate, and also because the version that Joye gives is somewhat different from his. First we show the Tyndale version as printed in the "Emperowr" New Testament of 1534, then the "pistle" of Joye as printed in January 1535, and lastly, for comparison, the King James version (Song of Solomon 2 : 1–4):

(T34)—I am the floure of *ye* felde/ & lylyes of the valeyes.
(GJ2)—I am the flower of Saron and the lylee of the valyes/
(KJ) —I *am* the rose of Sharon, *and* the lillie of the valleys.

As *ye* lylye amo*n*ge the thornes so is my loue amonge *ye*
As the roose emonge the thornes/ so is my spowese amo*n*g the
As the lillie among thornes, so *is* my loue among the

daughters. As the appletre amonge the trees of *ye* wood so is my
daughters/ As the appletree emong the trees of the wode/ so is my
daughters. As the apple tree among the trees of the wood, so *is* my

beloued amonge the sonnes/ in his
beloued housbonde emo*n*g the sonnes: & I sate vnder the
beloued among the sonnes. I sate downe vnder his

shadow was my desyer to syt/ for his frute was swete to
shadewe of him who*m* I had desyred whose frute is swete vnto
shadow with great delight, and his fruit *was* sweete to

my mouth. He brought me into his wyne seller: and
my throte. This kynge led me into hys wyne celler/ and
my taste. Hee brought me to the banketting house, and

his behauer to mewarde was louely.
spred the baner of his loue ouer me.
his banner ouer mee, *was* loue.

Here we find that neither Tyndale nor Joye is at home in the Poetical Books of the Bible: Tyndale has not the knack of poetry ("his behavior to me-ward"), and Joye will be specific at all

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

costs ("spouse" and "husband"). But comparing these versions with the King James Bible, what amazes us is the coincidence that only in George Joye's "pistle" among all the predecessors of the Authorized Version do we find the word "Saron" instead of "field"; and in this same passage of Joye's (verse 4) occurs the first use of the word "banner," which was utilized later in the Cranmer Bible of April 1540, and thereby introduced into the lineage of the King James Bible.

THE GODFRAY EDITION OF PROVERBS AND ECCLESIASTES

This is a convenient place to bring to the reader's notice a rare and little-known version belonging to this period, but having neither date nor author by which to be identified. The only known copy of this work was in the collection of the late Sir Robert Leicester Harmsworth, and through the courtesy of his librarian I am enabled to make known a few details concerning it. The translation comprises the two books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes in companion volumes, which were no doubt originally issued to be bound together. The title-page of the first reads simply: "The proverbes of Solomon newly translated into Englyshe." Its colophon merely divulges that it was "Printed at London by Thomas Godfray." The title-page of the other volume reads as if it were a continuation of the former, for it says, "Here foloweth the boke of Solomon called Ecclesiastes (which is to say in Englishe a precher)." It too has a colophon that tells but little: "Imprynted at London by Tho. Godfray. Cum priuilegio."

It has been supposed that these unique volumes were printed as early as 1532, but although Godfray was engaged in publishing the works of Chaucer in that year, he would have been bold indeed if he had ventured to issue in London, and over his own name, any portion of the English Scriptures at so early a date. Moreover, we have no assurance that this edition of Godfray's was the first edition of this version; it is the only edition known, but there may have been an earlier one issued on the Continent, as was the case with the "Argentine" Psalter, of which Godfray

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

himself brought out a later edition in a larger size. In view of the troubled conditions in England, I doubt if such a work as this could have been published in London before 1535.

The translation contained in these two volumes is different from any other English version that we have of the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. We immediately desire to know who wrote it. The answer must be gathered by conjecture. In his scholarly work on *Editions of the Bible and Parts Thereof in English* (1852), the Reverend Henry Cotton makes no mention of "The proverbes of Solomon" or the Ecclesiastes as published by Godfray; but he does have this to say in a footnote on page 4:

> Bale affirms, in his 'Illustres Britanniae Scriptores,' (p. 239, edit. 1548,) that in addition to Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Psalms . . . Joye translated into English the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. I have not ascertained whether either of these last were printed, or whether they are yet existing any where in manuscript.

The statement which Cotton here attributes to John Bale, if trustworthy, opens up the fascinating possibility that the volumes from the Harmsworth collection contain the actual version that George Joye produced, which Cotton had not seen. The allurement of this conjecture lies in this: We have already noted that Joye translated the Psalms and Isaiah and Jeremiah, and we have remarked that his "pistle" from the Song of Solomon was quite different from that of Tyndale. If now we were to add the likelihood that Joye translated the Proverbs and the Ecclesiastes, we would set up a strong probability that Joye accomplished the translation of a considerable part of the Old Testament, that is, the books from Psalms to Lamentations consecutively.

From such passages in the Harmsworth volumes as I have been able to study, I am led to conclude that the style of the version is similar to Joye's, and that these volumes were in fact written by him. Some of the same characteristics appear in them as in the other of his works which we have been discussing. Consider a sample or two. In the eighth chapter of Proverbs, Wisdom is declaring her prerogatives. According to the King James Bible (verses 14–16) she says:

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Counsell *is* mine, and sound wisedome: I *am* vnderstanding, I *haue* strength. By me kings reigne, and princes decree iustice. By me Princes rule, and Nobles, *euen* all the Iudges of the earth.

The wording of the Coverdale Bible (1535) is almost as simple as that:

I can geue counsell, and be a gyde: I haue vnderstondinge, I haue strength. Thorow me, kynges reigne: thorow me, princes make iust lawes. Thorow me, lordes beare rule, and all iudges of *ye* earth execute iudgment.

Here, then, is how the passage reads in the edition printed by Godfray:

If any man wyll have counsell & the prosperouse spede therof/ let him fetche it at me. I am the selfe vnderstanding/ and with me is there power. By me/ kynges raigne: & princes decre iust lawes. By me lordes rule: & all iuges of *ye* erth execute iugement.

The first sentence of this shows the same tendency that we have noted in other writings of Joye's to strike out into strange and offhand methods of expression. At the same time we find, as we have found before, that one phrase—"princes decre iust lawes"—comes very close to the established text of the King James Bible. Likewise, in the final clause, be it noted that Joye's wording is identical with that of the Coverdale Bible.

In the Ecclesiastes similar effects are to be observed. Where the King James Bible (chapter 9, verse 10) says, "Whatsoeuer thy hand findeth to doe, doe it with thy might:" the Godfray edition reads in a manner typical of Joye: "What so euer good dede is offred vnto thy hande/ do it constantly/ spedely/ & boldely." Perhaps, in view of the oblivion in which these unique volumes have remained, the reader might like to see a selection several verses long; and accordingly one is offered from the end of this same chapter of Ecclesiastes:

Also I consydered wysely yet another thinge vnder the sonne/ & me thought it no small wysedom. I saw a cite/ nat very gret nor yet full of people/ & yet was there a kinge of no smal puisaunce beseging it & castyng vp bulwerkes & bankes against it. In which cite there was a certain simple pore wyse man/ by whose wisdom the lytle cite might

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

haue ben defended & delyuered from their enmies: but no man regarded him: & here a non iuged I/ wisdom to be better than strength. Natwithstanding yet was this pore mannes wysdom neglected/ no man in the cite heryng him. Wherfore/ ye wordes of ye wise ar of more weight/ although they be softely spoken than the lowde noyse of an vnwise prince. Wherfore wysedom is better than all their armour & harnes. And one ydle vnthrifty man troubleth many good men/

By way of explanation, "a non iuged I" is, of course, "anon judged I," and "heryng" is for "hearing."

In the Coverdale Bible of 1535 this same selection ends with these words: "For wyszdome is better than harnesse: but one vnthrift alone destroyeth moch good." While this is quite different from the foregoing, it stirs us to inquire how both these versions hit upon the idea of "unthrift," which is rendered "sinner" in the Authorized Version. Was there any connection between them? And which one preceded the other? The answers to such questions are not yet at hand. Perhaps, as has been hinted, both Coverdale and Joye (if it was Joye) were being influenced by some third translation, such as a Lutheran version to which they both had access. It is doubtful that there was any dependence between them; for certainly in many instances their workmanship is very different. Where one is direct, the other is apt to be diffuse, and vice versa. For example, in the selection just cited from Ecclesiastes, where the author of Godfray's edition writes:

In which cite there was a certain simple pore wyse man/ by whose wisdom the lytle cite might haue ben defended & delyuered from their enmies: but no man regarded him:

the Coverdale Bible of 1535 has this:

And in the cite there was founde a poore man (but he was wyse) which wt his wyszdome delyuered the cite: yet was there no body, yt had eny respecte vnto soch a symple man.

The balancing of the clauses in these two renditions is altogether opposite: Coverdale expands in the final clause where the other version is most compact; and in the second or middle clause, where Coverdale uses few words, the Godfray edition deliberately enlarges on the theme.

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

A more convincing piece of evidence for the independence of the two translators occurs in the thirtieth chapter of Proverbs.* Here (in verses 30 and 31) are listed "four things" that are "comely in going." According to the Authorized Version, first the lion is mentioned and then: "A gray-hound; an hee-goate also; and a king, against whom there is no rising vp." There is a note in the margin explaining that the greyhound might also be a horse, the Hebrew meaning simply "girt in the loynes." Now, the Latin Bible took this phrase to mean a cock girded for fighting; so in the Coverdale Bible we find this translation: "A cock ready to fight: A ramme: And a kynge yt goeth forth wt his people." But when he came to edit the Great Bible of 1539, Coverdale changed this passage to read thus: "A grehounde stronge in the hynder partes: A ramme also and a Kyng, agaynst whom no man aryseth vp." It is therefore somewhat surprising to find this alteration anticipated in the Godfray edition of the Proverbs, which read: "A grayhounde well spared & knitte behynde. A ramme/ & a kynge whom no man may resyste." In this particular instance, the version in Godfray's book is nearer to the Bible of 1539 than to the Coverdale Bible of 1535.

Summing up such evidence as lies before me, I think it very likely that George Joye is the author of the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes that were in the Harmsworth collection; and that these volumes, which may have been later than the first edition, were probably not published before 1535, or until such time as Queen Anne Boleyn had been firmly, though briefly, seated on the throne by Henry VIII. Also it is unlikely that Coverdale consulted this version at the time when he was preparing his Bible of 1535, in spite of the many details in which the two versions may agree.

CHANGE OF SENTIMENT TOWARD THE SCRIPTURES IN ENGLISH

The British Museum possesses a special copy of Tyndale's New Testament of 1534 which was printed on vellum and was apparently presented by him as a gift to Anne Boleyn after she had become Henry's Queen. There is reason to believe that

* See the selection in Appendix I.

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Anne was sympathetic toward those who were furthering the cause of the English Bible, for she is credited with having addressed a letter to Thomas Cromwell on May 14, 1534, in behalf of a "good and honest merchant," one Richard Harman, whose chief offense was that in Wolsey's time he did "help to the setting forth of the New Testament in English."

From this it need not be inferred that Henry VIII was likewise favorable to the Reformers: indeed, it is very probable that he was not. For back in 1521, he had been rewarded by the Pope with the title of "Defender of the Faith" for having entered the lists of controversy with a pamphlet directed against the claims of Martin Luther. There is little basis for supposing that Henry was personally, or by religious conviction, at variance with the doctrines of Catholicism; but he was minded to be supreme in his own realm, and his minister, Cromwell, was astute enough to see that if Henry opposed himself to the Pope in the matter of his marriage, he would inevitably be drawn into some sort of political alliance with the Lutheran party in Germany. What Cromwell's personal attitude may have been, it is difficult to judge. Whether from his own disposition and choice or from motives of political expediency, he did in fact adopt a sympathetic stand toward the Reformers and toward the project of translating the Bible.

Henry had been acknowledged as the head of the Church of England, and he was pleased to make the most of his independent position, not subject to the authority of Rome on the one hand, and not under any obligations to the Protestant Princes on the other. On the nineteenth of December, 1534, the Convocation of Canterbury, under the friendly influence of Thomas Cranmer, took the logical step of requesting of the King that the English Church might have a Bible in the English tongue. The proposal met with opposition from the more conservative of the clergy, but it was passed and presented to the King. In Latin terms it asked that his royal Majesty "would deign to decree, that the Holy Scripture should be translated into the common English tongue by certain upright and learned men to be named by the said most illustrious King, and should be delivered and given

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

out to the people according to their learning" (or perhaps "for their education"—*pro eorum eruditione*).

With the support of Cromwell some effort was made toward this end, but nothing came of it—certainly, no new translation actually resulted. One of the bishops, Gardiner of Winchester, in spite of his opposition to the entire project, reported that he had finished the parts of the New Testament that had been assigned to him for revision. Another, Stokesley of London, refused to have anything to do with the translation. Nevertheless, one great advance had been made: the way had been prepared for the authorization and publication of an English version of the Bible. The bars of antagonism were being melted down.

Unhappily, William Tyndale was able to derive no advantage from this change in sentiment. Not only had his controversial stand embittered the clergy of England, but much more he had offended the authorities of the Holy Roman Empire, who were then in control of the country in which he was living. In their eyes he was a notable heretic, safe from their hands only so long as he was sheltered by his English friends inside the city limits of Antwerp. At last, in May of 1535, he was induced to leave his place of shelter under the guise of some friendly persuasion, and, once outside the city walls, was arrested and taken to Vilvorde, near Brussels, where he was kept in prison for a year and a half.

It is a strange commentary on the vicissitudes of life under a despotic government, that during that very summer in England, where Cromwell had been made Vicar-General with full powers to act for the King, Sir Thomas More was beheaded for steadily refusing to admit the validity of the King's divorce from Catherine. So far had the pendulum swung in England that some effort was made on the part of Vaughan and Cromwell to secure the release of Tyndale from prison; but the Imperial authorities were not now on friendly enough terms with Henry VIII to feel any obligation to turn over their prisoner. Instead, he was kept in confinement until at last he was brought before the Inquisition to be tried for heresy. His condemnation was practically a foregone conclusion, and accordingly he was put to death on October 6, 1536.

This content downloaded from 70.15.24.152 on Wed, 12 Mar 2025 19:17:10 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms