

Opening to Everyone: From Wycliffite's Bible to the Authorized Version

OKUBO Tomohiro

The Authorized Version (AV), or the King James Bible (KJB), published in 1611, is one of the most important books in the history of early modern British translation. The fact that the Penguin Classics entitles it "The Bible" shows its authority both in name and reality and status of the representative English Bible for three centuries before modern times. It has attracted heaps of praise and censure, most of which is expected. It is praised for making a significant impact on English language and literature, and also criticized for being too literal, or the result of plagiarism. In particular, a factor in the development of English language, similar to the Luther Bible in that of German, was a series of printed books by William Caxton. In the seventeenth century, Shakespeare and Milton did not quote the AV but rather the Geneva Bible. Yet, attributing the work to plagiarism is an unjust accusation because the preface to the AV explains why it took over the earlier translated texts. The establishment of the authoritative English Bible was achieved by many translators, whose work is still reflected in the text and paratexts of the AV. This article discusses the translational and intertextual relations between the AV and preceding English Bibles, considering their prefaces and epitexts historically.

1

The author of the AV's preface—"the Translators to the Reader," is Miles Smith, a final reviser of the translation, who was born to a warehouse family and worked his way up to become a scholar at Oxford University. He writes the following content on the context behind English Bibles:

Truly, good Christian Reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one [...] but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against;

that hath bene our endeavour, that our mark. (Norton 2011b: xxxi)

The translators of the AV agreed to take advantage of existing translations, whose selection was determined in advance by complying with two of fifteen rules.

1. The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the 'Bishops' Bible', to be followed, and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit. [...]
14. These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible: Tyndale's; Matthew's; Coverdale's; Whitchurch's; Geneva. (Rhodes 2013: 179-181)

It is quite certain, since Smith criticized Catholic translation, that they had also referred to the Douay-Rheims Bible, a Catholic standard Bible. The beginning of the preface expresses definitive interest in their predecessors in biblical translation.

Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising anything ourselves, or revising that which hath bene laboured by others, deserveth certainly much respect and esteem, but yet findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcomed with suspicion in stead of love, and with emulation in stead of thanks: (Norton 2011b: xvii)

"Cold entertainment," "suspicion," and "emulation" are much moderate but he should have known what had happened to bible translators. Preceding translations were banned or termed as heretical while many of their translators and collaborators were executed. When writing this passage, his mind might have been cast back to their tragic fates.

The first organized vernacularization in the history of English Bibles was Wycliffite's Bible that was produced amidst confrontations between papists and royalists, such as the Western Schism, from 1378 to 1418. The first version (*c.*1382) and its revision (*c.*1395), however, were not developed by John Wycliffe but by his followers. John Purvey, a translator of the revised version, wrote "the General Prologue," which suggested a translation theory.

First it is to knowe, that the best translating is out of Latyn into English, to translate aftir the sentence, and not oneli aftir the wordis, so that the sentence be as opin, either openere, in English as in Latyn, and go not fer fro the lettre; and if the lettre mai not be suid in the translating, let the sentence euere be hool and open, for the wordis owen to serue to the entent and sentence, and ellis the wordis ben superflu either false. In translating into English, manie resolucions moun make the sentence open, as an ablatif case absolute may be resoluid

into these thre wordis, with couenable verbe, the *while, for, if*, as gramariens seyn; as thus, the maistir redinge, I stonde, mai be resoluid thus, while the maistir redith, I stonde, [...] and this wole, in manie placis, make the sentence open, where to Englissh it afir the word, wolde be derk and douteful. (Forshall and Madden 1850: 57)

His usage of the words open (opin) and dark (derk) is strongly metaphoric. Given that “sentence” means “intent” or “opinion” in Middle English, the above quotation argues that the translator should release the meaning of text from darkness and this task requires “couenable verbe” or suitable words. But this was not to be merely a “liberal translation” because Purvey cited syntax processing as an example:

Also a relatif, which mai be resoluid into his antecedent with a coniunccioun copulatif, as thus, *which renneth*, and *he renneth*. Also whanne oo word is oonis set in a reesoun, it mai be set forth as ofte as it is vnderstonden, either as ofte as reesoun and nede axen; and this word *autem*, either *vero*, mai stonde for *forsothe*, either for *but*, and thus I vse comounli; and sumtyme it mai stonde for *and*, as elde gramariens seyn. Also whanne riztful construccioun is lettid bi relacion, I resolue it openli, (Forshall and Madden 1850: 57)

The verb resolve (resolue) shows that the translator is to convert the untranslatable syntactic forms into correct English language expressions. This seems to be a guideline for translation or an elementary technique to assist modern interpreters. Purvey's emphasis on syntactic conversion is derived from problems concerning interlinear biblical translations such as the Lindisfarne Gospels. Bibles with English interpretation under each Latin word are useful for readers with expertise in Latin; but not for monolingual English readers. Wycliffite's Bible, at least, was designed for English-speaking users.

At the bigynnyng I [Purvey] purposide, with Goddis helpe, to make the sentence as trewe and open in English as it is in Latyn, either more trewe and more open than it is in Latyn; and I preie, for charite and for comoun profyt of cristene soulis, that if ony wiys man fynde ony defaute of the truthe of translacioun, let him sette in the trewe sentence and opin of holi writ, (Forshall and Madden 1850: 57)

Another important feature of Wycliffite's Bible is that it entrusted the task of perfecting translation to following generations. After translating the Bible, the followers of Wycliffe, or Lollards, faced threats of persecution under the Act for the Burning of Heretics in 1401 and the Constitutions of

Oxford of 1409 prohibiting the reading and translating of Bibles. Purvey was forced to abandon his religion and Wycliffe died in 1384; he was charged with heresy at the Council of Constance in 1415 and his dead body was burned after violation of his grave. However, their will to translate the Bible was expressed in the text itself. The first vernacularization guaranteed the inheritance of translation in subsequent Bibles, including the AV.

2

About a century later, William Tyndale ventured again into a forbidden field—translation of the Bible. He was to become one of the most famous biblical translators in history. After the appearance of the printed Gutenberg Bible and the Luther Bible inspired by Wycliffe, the papists and royalists had intensified their conflict during the reign of Henry VIII called “the Defender of the Faith.” In the 1520s, when the papists had a strong influence, Tyndale, then a young chaplain decided to translate the Bible from the original languages into English and tried to follow a formal procedure within the Church:

Then thought I, if I might come to this man[the Bishop of London]’s service, I were happy. And so I gat me to London, and through acquaintance of my master came to Sir Harry Gilford the king’s grace’s controller, and brought him an oration of Isocrates which I had translated out of Greek into English, and desired him to speak unto my lord of London for me, which he also did as he shewed me, and willed me to write an epistle to my lord, and to go to him myself which I also did, and delivered my epistle to a servant of his own, one William Hebilthwayte, a man of mine old acquaintance.[...]

Whereupon my lord answered me, his house was full, he had more than he could well find, and advised me to seek in London, where he said I could not lack a service. And so in London I abode almost a year, and marked the course of the world [...] I defer to speak at this time, and understood at the last not only that there was no room in my lord of London’s palace to translate the new testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England, as experience doth now openly declare. (Daniell 1992: 5)

“This man,” Cuthbert Tunstall, the Bishop of London, was a famous humanist in Renaissance England who was praised by Erasmus and was well known as the editor of a new Latin Bible. He seemed interested in the Lutheran movement; however, he was not to respond to Tyndale’s application under the Constitutions of Oxford. His euphemistic rejection is understandable given his position but Tyndale was disappointed at the churches in England and moved to Europe in

pursuit of a place for translation.

Arriving in Germany, Tyndale began to translate the New Testament. He had parts of it printed in Cologne in 1525 and a full version printed in Worms the following year. His epilog to the Worms edition shows that he was unfamiliar with the Wycliffite Bible.

Them that are learned Christenly I beseche: [...] that the rudnes off the worke nowe at the fyrst tyme offende them not: but that they consyder howe that I had no man to counterfet, nether was holpe with englysshe of eny that had interpreted the same, or soche lyke thinge in the scripture before tyme. [...] Count it as a thyng not havynge his full shape, but as it were borne afore hys tyme, even as a thing begunne rather than fynnesshed. In tyme to come (yf god have appoynted us thereunto) we will geve it his full shape: [...] (Cooper 2000: 554)

The phrase “in time to come” suggests his desire to revise and complete a translation of both the New and Old Testaments. His printed English Bibles were brought over the strait into England. This agitated the Bishop of London, who had ignored Tyndale’s appeal for translation. Soon after the publication, Tunstall provided clear instructions to immediately collect and burn any copies of Tyndale’s version.

By the deuty of our pastorall office, we are bounde diligently with all our power to forsee, prouide for, roote out and put away all those things, which seme to tende to the perill and daunger of our subiectes and specialy the distruction of ther soules, wherfor we hauing vnderstanding by the reporte of diuers credible persones, and also by the euident apparaunce of the matter, that many children of iniquitie maintainers of Luthers sect, blinded through extream wickednes, wandring from the way of truth and the catholike faith, craftely have translated the new testament into our English tongue, entermedling there with many hereticall articles and erroneious opinions, pernicious and offensiue, seducing the simple people, attempting by their wicked and peruerse interpretations to prophanate the maiestie of the scripture, whiche hetherto hath remayned vndefiled, and craftely to abuse the most holy word of God, and the true sence of the same, of the whiche translation there are many bokes imprinted, some with gloses and some without, conteyning in the english tongue that pestiferous and moste pernicious poyson dispersed throughout all our dioces of London in great nomber, whiche truely without it be spedely forsene without doubt will contaminate and infect the flocke committed vnto vs, with moste deadly poyson and heresy. [...] (Pollard 1911: 133-134)

A public burning of Bibles translated by Tyndale at St. Paul's Cross was carried out in such a way that only three copies of the 1526 version presently exist. As Tunstall recognized two thousand errors of Tyndale's version, it certainly was an imperfect translation. Tyndale's main critic and opponent was Thomas More, whose *Dialogue Concerning Heresies* attributed the corruption of the Church to married clerics, blaming Protestants and Protestant thought as its causes, and censured Tyndale's non-Catholic diction and careless interpretation.

The author showeth that the translation of Tyndale was too bad to be mended.

But yet he said that the faults might be by some good men amended, and then the book printed again if nothing letted but that.

"Surely," quoth I, "if we go thereto, the faults be, as ye see, so many and so spread through the whole book, that likewise as it were as soon done to weave a new web of cloth as to sow up every hole in a net, so were it almost as little labor and less to translate the whole book all new, as to make in his translation so many changes as needs must be, ere it were made good; besides this, that there would no wise man, I trow, take the bread which he well wist was of his enemy's hand once poisoned, though he saw his friend after scrape it never so clean."
(CTMS 2003)

More definitively repudiated any aid to Tyndale, although he indicated the possibility of a new translation. For his part, Tyndale reacted in the following manner concerning the burning and repudiation of his Bibles in the preface of Pentateuch published in 1530:

Notwithstanding yet I submit this book and all other that I have other made or translated, or shall in time to come, (if it be God's will that I shall further labour in his harvest) unto all them that submit themselves unto the word of God, to be corrected of them, yea and moreover to be disallowed and also burnt, if it seem worthy when they have examined it with the Hebrew, so that they first put forth of their own translating another that is more correct.
(Daniell 1992: 5-6)

He welcomed another, effective translation even after the burning, during a year when the prohibition against importing corrupt Bibles was promoted politically by the papists:

His Highnes hath therefore semblably there vpon consulted with the sayd primates, and vertuous, discrete, and well lerned personages in diuinite forsayde, 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, erroneous, and sedicious opinyons, with the newe testament and the olde, corruptely translated into the englisshe tonge, now beinge in print: And that the same bokes and all other bokes of heresy, [...] be clearly extermynate and exiled out of this realme of Englande for euer: his highnes entendeth to provyde, 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. (Pollard 1911: 167-168)

During the divorce and remarriage of Henry VIII, there was a substantial change in the politics between the papists and royalists in England. Having incurred the King's displeasure, More resigned as the Lord Chancellor and published *The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer* in 1532, which displayed his discomfort with shifting circumstances and the weakening of the power of the papists. Being outside England, Tyndale was unfazed by the changes there and his writing showed minimal concern for More's damning commentary on his writing, nor for the conflict among the Christian sects:

In the Old Testament the temporal heads and rulers of the Jews which had the governance over the lay or common people are called elders, as ye may see in the four evangelists. Out of which custom Paul in his epistle and also Peter, call the prelates and spiritual governors which are bishops and priests, elders. Now whether ye call them elders or priests, it is to me all one: so that ye understand that they be officers and servants of the word of God, unto the which all men both high and low that will not rebel against Christ, must obey as long as they preach and rule truly and no longer. (Daniell 1989: 10)

These sentences were printed in the revised version of Tyndale's New Testament in 1534. They recommend preservation of the Bible's original diction and syntax:

Here you have (most dear reader) the new testament or covenant made with us of God in Christ's blood. Which I have looked over again (now at last) with all diligence, and have weeded out of it many faults, which lack of help at the beginning, and oversight, did sow therein. If ought seem changed, or not altogether agreeing with the Greek, let the finder of the fault consider the Hebrew phrase or manner of speech left in the Greek words. Whose preterperfect tense and present tense is oft both one, and the future tense is the optative mode also, and the future tense is oft the imperative mode in the active voice, and in the

passive ever. Likewise person for person, number for number, and an interrogation for a conditional, and such like is with the Hebrews a common usage.

[...] If I shall perceive either by myself or by the information of other, that ought be escaped me, or might be more plainly translated, I will shortly after, cause it to be mended. Howbeit in many places, me thinketh it better to put a declaration in the margin, than to run too far from the text and in many places, where the text seemeth at the first chop hard to be understood, yet the circumstances before and after, and often reading together, maketh it plain enough etc. (Daniell 1989: 3)

3

The Act of Supremacy in 1534 separated England from the Roman Catholic Church establishing the Church of England, where key figures viewed Tyndale's biblical translation sympathetically. King Henry hoped that Tyndale's return would work to his best advantage, while Royalist and Protestant elites also recognized the necessity of English Bibles for their churches. Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, leaders of the English Reformation, requested Tyndale to create an official translation but Tyndale, whose vernacular versions had incurred the wrath and hatred of Catholics and Papists, was captured in Belgium in May, 1535. Henry VIII and Cromwell made several unsuccessful attempts to rescue him from execution. Later, they requested a biblical translation from Miles Coverdale, who was also exiled in Europe.

Coverdale, an exiled cleric, was also an important collaborator on Tyndale's Pentateuch. Coverdale's Bible, published in 1535, contained Tyndale's version of the New Testament as well as a newly added translation of the Old Testament from the Vulgate. In his dedication, he declared an ecumenical translation aimed at resolving domestic conflict:

I haue nether wrested nor altered so moch as one worde for the mayntenaunce of any maner of secte: but haue with a cleare conscience purely and faythfully translated this out of fyue sundry interpreters, hauyng onely the manyfest trueth of the scripture before myne eyes: [...]
(Pollard 1911: 201)

The ideal treatment of sectarian conflicts was transmitted from one English Bible to another later. It is certain that he remembered Tyndale and Wycliffe when he discussed "adversity" in "Unto the Christian Reader."

COnsideryng how excellent knowlege and lernyng an interpreter of scripture oughte to haue

in the tongues, and pondering also myne owne insufficiency therin, and how weake I am to perfourm the office of a translatoure, I was the more lothe to medle with this worke. Notwithstandynge whan I consydered how greate pytie it was that we shulde wante it so longe, and called to my remembraunce the aduersite of them, which were not onely of rype knowlege, but wolde also with all theyr hertes haue perfourmed that they beganne, yf they had not had impediment: consydering (I saye) that by reason of theyr aduersyte it coulde not so soone haue bene broughte to an ende, as oure most prosperous nacyon wolde fayne haue had it: these and other reasonable causes consydered, I was the more bold to take it in hande. (Pollard 1911: 202-203)

He and Protestants in England had no doubt that Tyndale was convicted by Catholics in Belgium aiming for his execution, but Coverdale who also worked on translation on the same continent could not use his friend and convicted criminal's name freely, and he could do so only indirectly through the word "adversity." The sorrow and chagrin of earlier translators remained encoded in succeeding translations.

Another collaborator friend of Tyndale's, fellow clergyman, John Rogers, successfully met Tyndale just before his execution and received the manuscript that he had secretly translated. After Tyndale was burned at the stake in 1536, Rogers published the latest version of Tyndale's New and Old Testament with Coverdale and Rogers's complementary translation in 1537, pseudonymously called "Matthew's Bible." It reflected revisions acceptable to conservatives and was the first translated Bible printed in London. Cranmer requested Henry VIII to provide a license and authorize their Bible:

Theis shalbe to signifie vnto the same, that you [Cromwell] shall receyue by the bringer herof, a Bible in Englishe, both of a new translacion and of a new prynte, [...] which, in myn [Cranmer's] opinion is very well done, and therefore I pray your Lordship to rede the same. [...] I pray you my Lorde, that you woll exhibite the boke unto the kinges highnes; and to obteign of his Grace, if you can, a license that the same may be sold and redde of euery person, withoute danger of any acte, proclamacion, or ordinaunce hertofore graunted to the contrary, vntill such tyme that we, the Bishops shall set forth a better translacion, which I thinke will not be till a day after domesday. (Pollard 1911: 214-215)

The underlying belief behind Cranmer and Cromwell's activism is very simple: The Bible is for everyone; hence, the goal is for everyone to be able to read the Bible. Cromwell's proclamation clearly expresses this objective:

Item, that ye shall provide on this side the feast of [...] next commyng, one boke of the whole Bible of the largest volume in Englyshe, and the same sett up in summe convenyent place within the said churche that ye have cure of, whereas your parishners may most commodiously resort to the same, and rede yt; (Pollard 1911: 261-262)

The culmination of their devotion is an authorized Bible, supposedly titled “Great Bible” (1539). Cranmer’s preface to its second edition (1540) insisted that the Bible was a tool for fighting and acted as a guardian against everyday suffering and sorrows, everyone had.

[T]hou that standest in the forefront of the host and nighest to thine enemies must needs take now and then many strokes, and be grievously wounded. And therefore thou hast more need to have thy remedies and medicines at hand. Thy wife provoketh thee to anger, thy child giveth thee occasion to take sorrow and pensiveness, thine enemies lieth in wait for thee, thy friend (as thou takest him) sometime envieth thee, thy neighbor misreporteth thee, or picketh quarrels against thee, thy mate or partner undermineth thee, thy lord judge or justice threateneth thee, poverty is painful unto thee, the loss of thy dear and well-beloved causeth thee to mourn; prosperity exalteth thee, adversity bringeth thee low: briefly, so divers and so manifold occasions of cares, tribulations, and temptations, besetteth thee and besiegeth thee round about. Where canst thou have armour or fortress against thine assaults? Where canst thou have salve for thy sores, but of Holy Scripture? [...] Wherefore, let us not stick to buy and provide us the Bible, that is to say, the books of Holy Scripture. And let us think that to be a better jewel in our house than either gold or silver. [...] Here may all manner of persons, men, women, young, old, learned, unlearned, rich, poor, priests, laymen, lords, ladies, officers, tenants, and mean men, virgins, wives, widows, lawyers, merchants, artificers, husbandmen, and all manner of persons of what estate or condition soever they be, may in this book learn all things what they ought to believe, what they ought to do, and what they should not do, as well concerning Almighty God as also concerning themselves and all other[s]. (Willoughby 1942: 41-44)

The idea that the Bible was for everyone is also reflected in successive biblical translations. The sentiments in the above quotation are echoed in the preface to the AV:

But now what piety without truth? what truth, what saving truth, without the word of God? what word of God, whereof we may be sure, without the Scripture? The Scriptures we are commanded to search. [...] If we be ignorant, they will instruct us; if out of the way, they will

bring us home; if out of order, they will reform us; if in heaviness, comfort us; if dull, quicken us; if cold, inflame us. 'Tolle, lege; tolle, lege', take up and read, take up and read the Scriptures [...] (Norton 2011b: xix-xx)

After this publication, however, the progression of English Bibles ran into difficulties. Thomas Cromwell, a leader in biblical translation, was executed in 1540 and Tyndale's and Coverdale's versions were burned in 1543. Under the cover of her Catholic faith, Mary Tudor, who was also known as "Bloody Mary," acceded to the throne in 1553, conducted an unrelenting purge of those involved in Bible translation: Rogers was killed in 1555 and Cranmer in 1556. To escape persecution, Anglicans and Protestants fled to Geneva, Switzerland, the homeland of Calvinism, where their translation movement accomplished new developments.

4

In Geneva, refugees encountered new translations in French or Latin and obtained a wide knowledge of the latest biblical studies. On the basis of this new information, the next project was planned by courageous people including Coverdale, a follower of Tyndale who survived beyond sixty years of age. In 1560, they completed "The Geneva Bible." William Whittingham, a biblical scholar, recalled their experience in its preface:

[W]e thought that we colde bestowe our labours & studie in nothing which colde be more acceptable to God and comfortable to his Church then in the translating of the holy Scriptures into our natiue tongue: the which thing, albeit that diuers heretofore haue indeuored to achieue yet considering the infancie of those tymes and imperfect knollage of the tongues, in respect of this ripe age and cleare light which God hath now reueiled, the translations required greatly to be perused and reformed. Not that we vendicat any thing to our selues about the least of our brethren (for God knoweth with what feare and trembling we haue bene now, for the space of two yeres and more day and night occupied herein) but being earnestly desired, and by diuers, whose learning and godynes we reuerence, exhorted, and also encouraged by the ready willes of suche, whose heartes God likewise touched, not to spare any charges for the fortherance of suche a benefite and fauour of God toward his Church (though the tyme then was moste dangerous and the persecution sharpe and furious) we submitted our selues at length to their godly iudgements, and seing the great oportunitie and occasions, which God presented vnto vs in his Church, by reason of so many godly and learned men; and suche diuersities of translations in diuers tongues, we undertoke

this great and wonderful worke (with all reuerence, as in the presence of God, as intreating the worde of God, whereunto we thinke our selues vnsufficient) which now God according to his diuine prouidence and mercie hath directed to a moste prosperous end. (Pollard 1911: 280)

Their new translation, created throughout their religious persecution, was mainly based on existing translated texts. Its features included improved interpretations of the original text and distinctive innovations in printing: more literal and grammatical translations, and interpretational insertions in italics, Roman typeface as the font of the body, and marginal annotations on sectarian readings. The description continues as follows:

And this we may with good conscience protest, that we haue in euery point and worde, according to the measure of that knollage which it pleased al mightie God to giue vs, faithfully rendered the text, and in all hard places moste syncerely expounded the same. [...] Yet lest ether the simple shulde be discouraged, or the malicious haue any occasion of iust cauillation, seeing some translations read after one sort, and some after another, whereas all may serue to good purpose and edification, we haue in the margent noted that diuersitie of speache or reading which may also seme agreable to the mynde of the holy Gost and propre for our language with this marke ^x. (Pollard 1911: 280-281)

Their Calvinistic notes were so copious and elaborate that their tiny letters almost occupied the vast margins. The well-edited Bible was popular both in England and Europe; in particular, it was later read and quoted by Shakespeare, Milton, Bunyan, and the Protestants in the seventeenth century. The accession of Elizabeth I and her moderate religious views in 1559 led to religious tolerance for biblical translation. The rigid Protestantism of the Geneva Bible, however, posed an obstacle for its official adoption by the Church of England. On the other hand, the Great Bible or Matthew's Bible had more flaws than the Geneva Bible. In 1565, Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote the following to William Cecil, Secretary of State:

For thoughte one other speciall bible for the churches be meant by vs to be set forthe as convenient tyme and leysor hereafter will permytte: yet shall it nothing hindre but rather do moche good to have diuersitie of translacions and readings. (Pollard 1911: 286)

Allowing the use of existing vernacular Bibles for personal reading, they intended to create a new English Bible for usage in Anglican churches. This Bible, commonly known as "The Bishops'

Bible," was produced by a number of bishops, who followed the rules proposed by Parker:

Firste to followe the Commune Englishe Translacion vsed in the Churches and not to receed from yt but wher yt varieth manifestlye from the Hebrue or Greke originall.

Item to vse such sections and devisions in the Textes as Pagnine in his Translacion vseth, & for the veritie of the Hebrue to followe the said Pagnine and Munster specially, And generally others learned in the tonges.

Item to make no bitter notis vppon any text, or yet to set downe any determinacion in places of controversie.

Item to note such Chapters and places as containeth matter of Genealogies or other such places not edefieng, with some strike or note that the Reader may eschue them in his publike readinge.

Item that all such wordes as soundeth in the Olde Translacion to any offence of Lightnes or obscenitie be expressed with more convenient termes and phrases.

The printer hath bestowed his thickest Paper in the newe Testament because yt shalbe most occupied. (Pollard 1911: 297-298)

The third rule referred to notes or controversies probably on the context of problems around the Geneva Bible's plentiful annotations. They avoided argumentative interpretations in order to prevent conflicts among sects in England, following the manner similar to the publication of Coverdale's Bible after religious unrest in England. However, people felt the Bishops' Bible was inferior to the Geneva Bible because of its poor quality due to hasty translation, inconsistencies resulting from too many translators, and unreadable texts due to poor editing.

In the meantime, Catholics keenly felt the need for English Bibles. The wide distribution of the Geneva Bible might have driven them to compete in biblical translation. Instead of Protestants, the Jesuits were forced into exile to Douay in the Netherlands and Rheims in France. William Allen, a famous founder of a Jesuit college, wrote about their motivations in his letter:

On every Sunday and festival English sermons are preached by the more advanced students on the gospel, epistle, or subject proper to the day. [...] In this respect the heretics, however ignorant they may be in other points, have the advantage over many of the more learned catholics, who having been educated in the universities and the schools do not commonly have at command the text of Scripture or quote it except in Latin. [...] Our adversaries on the other hand have at their fingers' ends all those passages of Scripture which seem to make for them, and by a certain deceptive adaptation and alteration of the sacred words produce the

effect of appearing to say nothing but what comes from the bible. This evil might be remedied if we too had some catholic version of the bible, for all the English versions are most corrupt. (Pollard 1911: 299-300)

This urgency led to the first English translation for Catholics, supposedly titled “Rheims Bible” (1582), whose translation goals were recorded by the chief translator, Gregory Martin, in the preface:

In This Our Translation, because we wish it to be most sincere, as becometh a Catholike translation, and have endeouored so to make it; we are very precise & religious in folowing our copie, the old vulgar approued Latin: not onely in sense, which we hope we alwaies doe, but sometime in the very wordes also and phrases, which may seeme to the vulgar Reader & to common English eares not yet acquainted therewith, rudenesse or ignorance: [...] yea and that al sortes of Catholike Readers wil in shorte time thinke that familiar, which at the first may seeme strange & wil esteeme it more, when they shal otherwise be taught to vnderstand it, then if it were the common knowen English. (Pollard 1911: 304-305)

Influenced by the Geneva Bible, Catholic translators adopted their sermons as commentary on the text in place of the notes or annotations in Protestant Bibles. In the same year, Martin published *A Discovery of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scripture by the Heretikes of our Daies*, where he condemned Protestant versions in the following five areas: righteousness, authority, interpretation, exactness, and mistranslation. Protestant rebuttals appeared in two books—*A Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue* and *Confutation of the Rhemist Testament* in 1589—written by William Fulke, a Puritan scholar in England, who thought that biblical translation was to be separate from each person’s belief. In fact, his careful repetition and criticism of Martin’s opinion introduced the achievements of Rheims Bible to England, rather than its failures. His suggestion, however, is very important in light of translation terminology such as calques, coinage or difficult words.

[A]uthorities prove, that the Holy Scriptures were ordained by God to be read and known indifferently of all, and therefore ought to be translated into the mother tongues of all nations, that all may read and know them. Another erroneous opinion they account it, to think, that the Scriptures can be easily understood of every one that reads or hears them in a known language, which if it were admitted, yet it follows not, that the Scriptures ought not to be in a known language because they cannot be easily understood of every one that reads or hears

them, but rather that every one that reads or hears them ought more diligently to study and exercise himself in them, more often hear and read them, and more fervently pray to God for aid of his Spirit, that he may understand them. And yet it is certain that albeit some places of the Scripture are not easy to be understood of all men, yet there are many parts of them, and so many, as are able to instruct us unto salvation, so plain and easy, as they may be understood of every one that reads or hears them. (Robinson 2002: 128)

Recognizing the significance of the Catholic translation, he argued that not every vernacular translation was always readable for everyone. His appeal for a “more plain and easy” version turned translators’ eyes to a new question: What is biblical translation that everyone can read? The history of translating the Bible had suggested many tasks in the areas of succession and improving translated texts, to which the translators of AV decided to respond sincerely.

5

One year after the arrival of James I in England from Scotland, the conference for new translation had taken place in the presence of the king, who was interested in theology and had no objection to producing an English Bible. The discussion between translation advocates and the conservatives ended with a compromise that the former should set forward the project under the following fifteen rules established by Richard Bancroft, a leader of the latter and Archbishop of Canterbury.

1. The ordinary Bible read 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 names of the Prophets, and the holy writers, with the other names of the text, to be retained, as near as may be, accordingly as they were vulgarly used.
3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word ‘Church’ not to be translated ‘congregation’ etc.
4. When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most of the ancient Fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place, and the analogy of the faith.
5. The division of the chapters to be altered, either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require.
6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot without some circumlocution so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text.

7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as shall serve for the fit reference of one Scripture to another.
8. Every particular man of each company, to take the same chapter or chapters, and having translated or amended them severally by himself where he thinketh good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree for their parts what shall stand.
9. As any one company hath dispatched any one book in this manner they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously, for His Majesty is very careful in this Point.
10. If any company, upon the review of the book shall doubt or differ upon any place, to send them word thereof, note the place, and withal send their reasons, to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the General Meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company, at the end of the work.
11. When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority, to send to any learned man in the land, for his judgement of such a place.
12. Letters to be sent from every Bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many skilful in the tongues; and having taken pains in that kind, to send his particular observations to the company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford.
13. The Directors in each company, to be the Deans of Westminster, and Chester for that Place, and the King's Professors in the Hebrew or Greek in either university.
14. These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible: Tyndale's; Matthew's; Coverdale's; Whitchurch's; Geneva.
15. Besides the said Directors before mentioned, three or four of the most ancient and grave divines, in either of the universities, not employed in the translating, to be assigned by the Vice-Chancellor, upon Conference with the rest of the heads, to be overseers of the translations as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the fourth rule above specified. (Rhodes 2013: 179-181)

The development of the AV was a national commitment that involved almost all the pre-eminent scholars of Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster as well as a well-educated rural clergyman. They organized six groups to carry out the translation:

Table 1 (Norton 2011a: 54-60)

No.1	10 translators		in Westminster	on Genesis to 2 Kings
No.2	8	〃	in Cambridge	on 1 Chronicles to Song of Solomon
No.3	7	〃	in Oxford	on the Prophets
No.4	7	〃	in Cambridge	on the Apocrypha
No.5	10	〃	in Oxford	on Gospels, Acts and Revelation
No.6	7	〃	in Westminster	on the Epistles

Throughout the long and careful translation process, the manuscripts from each group were collected in London and revised again by twelve representatives before a proofreading period of nine months in a printer's shop.

Conforming to the rules provided, the translators examined the relative merits of existing versions and determined the best text based on their arguments. According to Butterworth the following percentages of earlier translations were included in the AV:

Table 2 (バターワース 1980: 245)

Wycliffe and Wycliffite	4%
Tyndale (including Matthew)	18%
Coverdale (including Great)	13%
Geneva	19%
Bishops	4%
Others	3%
AV	39%

The removal of marginal notes provided sufficient accommodation for the various sects in England, avoiding problems of conflicting interpretation. The vocabulary of AV is plain and simple for lay readers, as is Miles Smith's preface:

Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the most holy place; that removeth the cover of the well, that we may come by the water, (Norton 2011b: xxi-xxii)

His metaphor composed of native words and short syllables is very readable and rhythmic, reflecting Wycliffite's Bible in the use of "open" and "light." Furthermore, this passage expressed that the subject of reading and considering the Bible is the reader himself. Smith and the other

translators consider translation only an aid for interpretation: Readers could eat the kernel of Biblical essence by themselves, as long as translation broke the shell for them.

Their literal translation, engraved with plain and simple words, guaranteed a diversity of readings because independent reading leaves interpretation up to readers. Early seventeenth century England was mainly divided into three sects: Catholics, Dissenters, and Anglicans, who varied widely from conservative to radical. The key for bringing the sects together was freedom of interpretation. If the translation never adopts a sectarian reading, they can read it in their favorable meaning without conflict. The roots of religious diversity in today's Anglican Church already started to appear in the AV. Moreover, free interpretation is preparation for religious liberty. Any literal translation of the AV had no intention, but multiple interpretations hold the secret seeds of new religions in England and the world, as is clear in history.

The AV was the first ecumenical Bible for the general public's independent reading and was built upon the achievements of preceding translations. In fact, it was not authorized by the King, though it was initiated at the court conference. After 1664, it became so popular that "to buy a new Bible" meant buying an AV edition (Norton 2011a: 138). Its "Authority" derives from the fact that innumerable people have read, interpreted, and believed this Bible freely.

Works Consulted

- Amos, Flora Ross (1920) *Early Theories of Translation*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Backhouse, Janet (1995) *The Lindisfarne Gospels*, London: The British Library.
- (1981) *The Lindisfarne Gospels*, Oxford: Phaidon Press.
- Braden, Gordon et al. [eds.] (2010) *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English, vol. 2: 1550-1660*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, John (1912) *The History of the English Bible*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, W. R. [ed.] (2002) *The Wycliffe New Testament (1388): An Edition in Modern Spelling with an Introduction, the Original Prologues and the Epistle to the Laodiceans*, London: The British Library.
- [ed.] (2000) *The New Testament Translated by William Tyndale: The Text of the Worms Edition of 1526 in Original Spelling*, London: The British Library.
- Copeland, Rita (1991) *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David [ed.] (2013) *Tyndale's Bible: Saint Matthew's Gospel Read in the Original Pronunciation*, London: The British Library Board.
- CTMS (The Center for Thomas More Studies) [ed.] (2003) *Dialogue Concerning Heresies, CW 6*, Dallas: The University of Dallas. <http://thomasmorestudies.org/Heresies_Concordance/framconc.htm>
- Daniell, David [ed.] (1992) *Tyndale's Old Testament: Being the Pentateuch of 1530, Joshua to 2 Chronicles of 1537, and Jonah; in a Modern Spelling Edition*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- [ed.] (1989) *Tyndale's New Testament: in 1534; in a Modern Spelling Edition*, New Haven: Yale

- University Press.
- Dove, Mary (2007) *The First English Bible: The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, Roger [ed.] (2008) *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English, vol. 1: to 1550*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forshall, Josiah, and Frederic Madden [eds.] (1850) *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*, 4 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, Jay P. [ed.] (1985) *The Interlinear Hebrew-Greek-English Bible*, 2nd ed., 4 vols., Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Kinney, Angela M. [ed.] (2013) *The Vulgate Bible: Douay-Rheims Translation*, 6 vols., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Norton, David (2011a) *The King James Bible: A Short History from Tyndale to Today*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [ed.] (2011b) *The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible with the Apocripha: King James Version*, rev. ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2000) *A History of the English Bible as Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pollard, Alfred W. [ed.] (1985) *The Holy Bible: An Exact Reprint in Roman Type, Page for Page of the Authorized Version Published in the Year 1611*, Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- [ed.] (1911) *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Purvey, John [tr.] (2011) *Wycliffe Manuscript New Testament: Circa A.D.1400*, Fallbrook: C.I.Y. Publishing.
- Rhodes, Neil. [ed.] (2013) *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, Cambridge: Modern Humanities Research Association.
- Robinson, Douglas [ed.] (2002) *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Rogers, John [ed.] (2009) *Matthew's Bible: A Facsimile of the 1537 Edition*, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Skeat, Walter William [ed.] (1878) *The Gospel According to Saint John in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions Synoptically Arranged: With Collations Exhibiting All the Readings of All the MSS*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Miles et al. [trs.] (2011) *Holy Bible 1611 King James Version: 400th Anniversary Edition*, Grand Rapid: Zondervan.
- Tregelles, S. P. [ed.] (1841) *The English Hexapla*, London: Bagster.
- Tyndale, William [tr.] (2008) *The New Testament: A Facsimile of the 1526 Edition*, London: The British Library.
- Walter, Henry [ed.] (1850) *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whittingham, William et al. [trs.] (2007) *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition*, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Willoughby, Harold R. [ed.] (1942) *The First Authorized English Bible and the Cranmer Preface*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wright, Chris [ed.] (2011) *The English Hexapla: The Gospel of John, Six of the Earliest Translations of the Bible into English*, Bristol: White Tree Publishing.

Wright, William Aldis [ed.] (1909/2010) *The Authorized Version of the English Bible 1611*, 5 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

共同訳聖書実行委員会 [訳] (1991) 『和英対照新約聖書 新共同訳／T E V』日本聖書協会

ギルモア, A、本多峰子 [訳] (2002) 『英語聖書の歴史を知る事典』教文館

齋藤勇 (1944) 『文學としての聖書』研究社

田川建三 [訳] (2013) 『新約聖書 訳と註 第五巻』作品社

田川建三 (1997) 『書物としての新約聖書』勁草書房

ダニエル, デイヴィド、田川建三 [訳] (2001) 『ウィリアム・ティンダル ある聖書翻訳者の生涯』勁草書房

寺澤芳雄 (1985) 『翻刻版『欽定英訳聖書』——文献学的・書誌学的解説——』研究社

永嶋大典 (1988) 『英訳聖書の歴史 付：邦訳聖書小史』研究社

バターワース, チャールズ・C、齋藤國治 [訳] (1980) 『欽定訳聖書の文学的系譜 (1340-1611)』中央書院

浜島敏 (2003) 『聖書翻訳の歴史——英訳聖書を中心に——』創言社

翻訳委員社中 [訳] (2014) 『文語訳新約聖書 詩篇付』岩波書店

ポブリック, ベンソン、永田竹司 [監修] (2003) 『聖書英訳物語』柏書房

八木谷涼子 (2012) 『なんでもわかるキリスト教大事典』朝日新聞出版