

same year, a third edition in quarto. On the title-page of the latter were added the words, "set forth with the Kynges moost gracious licence."

The words at first printed on the title-page, and subsequently cancelled, had been doubtless placed there by mistake. In his dedication to the king, Coverdale says, "I have with a clear conscience purely and faithfully translated this out of five sundry interpreters, having only the manifest truth of the Scriptures before mine eyes." These "five interpreters" would naturally be Bibles in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, and English,—the English being that with which Coverdale must long have been familiar, the Wickliffite version, together with the recent translations of Tyndale.¹

It should be added that Coverdale's Bible was the first in which the non-canonical books were collected out of the body of the Old Testament and placed by themselves at the end of it under a separate title. Coverdale entitled them "The Volume of the Book called Hagiographa," but this was changed to "Apocrypha" in the Great Bible of 1549.

Mat-
thew's
Bible,
1537.

The large sale of the New Testaments of Tyndale, and the success of Coverdale's Bible, showed the London booksellers that a new and profitable branch of business was opened out to them, and they soon began to avail themselves of its advantages. Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, afterwards the king's printers, were the first in the field, bringing out a fine and full-sized folio in 1537, the same year in which Coverdale's second edition appeared, "truly and purely translated into English by Thomas Matthew." This volume was prepared for the press at Antwerp by "John Rogers *alias* Matthew," who was for some time (1534-1548) chaplain to the Merchant Adventurers there, whose wife, Adriana Pratt, was a relative of Jacob Van Meteren, and who returning to England in 1548 became canon of St Paul's, and was the first of the sufferers at Smithfield in the reign of Queen Mary. It was not, however, "translated . . . by Thomas Matthew," but was a compilation from the translations of Tyndale and Coverdale, made under the editorship of Rogers, who revised them to some extent before sending them to press. The Pentateuch was printed from Tyndale's translation of 1531; and the books from Joshua to the end of Chronicles are said to have been translated by Tyndale also—a tradition corroborated by internal evidence (Westcott's *Eng. Bible*, p. 224)—and to have been left by him in the hands of Rogers. From Ezra to Malachi the translation is taken from Coverdale, as is also that of the Apocryphal books. The New Testament is a revised copy of Tyndale's edition of 1535. Thus, as the book consists of 1100 pages, more than half, or 600 pages, must be assigned to Tyndale, and the remaining 500 pages to Coverdale.

It is probable that the Matthew Bible was printed by Antwerp booksellers as a speculation, in the same manner as the New Testament had been brought out under the editorship of Joye by the "widowe of Christoffel of Endhoven," in 1534. But while it was at the press, Grafton and Whitchurch appear to have stepped in with an offer to purchase the work, their initials being found on a title-page which is placed before the prophecy of Isaiah. This view

¹ The above conclusion is not at all contradicted by Coverdale's statement in his address to the reader, that "To help me therein I have had sundry translations, not only in Latin, but also of the Dutch"—or German—"interpreters, whom, because of their singular gifts and special diligence in the Bible, I have been the more glad to follow for the most part, according as I was required." He thinks it quite unnecessary to say that he translated directly from the Hebrew and Greek, but adds, that he was far from rejecting all help and guidance as to the meaning of Hebrew and Greek words, gladly and humbly looking to see how others had interpreted the words into Latin and German.

is confirmed by the fact that in the following year, 1538, there was "Imprynted at Antwerpe by Matthew Crom" a New Testament in which the text of Coverdale was used, with the prologues of Tyndale,—a concordance, some annotations, and nearly 200 woodcuts being added by the enterprising printer. In whatever way the Matthew Bible originated, the edition of 1500 copies was purchased by Grafton for the sum of £500, equal to about £6000 of modern money; and, having obtained leave to place on the title-page "Set forth with the King's most gracious licence," he and his partner published it in the summer of 1537.

Grafton was afraid that rivals would step in and deprive him of the profits which he expected. He therefore entreated Secretary Cromwell that the sale of his Bible might be expedited by compelling every abbey to take six copies. He also complained that there were "Dutchmen dwelling within the realm, who can neither speak good English, nor write none, who yet will both print and correct such an edition, and who are so covetous that they will not bestow twenty or forty pounds on a learned man as editor." Perhaps the rival edition which he really feared may have been one which was published in 1539 by "John Byddell for Thomas Barthlet," with Richard Taverner, "a learned man, Taverner as editor." This was, in fact, what would now be called a "piracy," being Grafton's "Matthew Bible" revised by Taverner, a learned member of the Inner Temple, who had been one of Wolsey's students at Christ Church, and although a layman, had occasionally preached from the university pulpit. Taverner made many alterations in the Matthew Bible, and the rapidity with which he edited the work indicates that he must have used a Bible already annotated by himself as the basis of his labours.² Taverner's Bible was printed in folio with "Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum" on the title-page, and it was at the same time printed in quarto. In the same year folio and quarto editions of the New Testament alone were published, and in the following year, 1540, the New Testament in duodecimo. The Old Testament was reprinted as part of a Bible of 1551, but no other editions are known than those named.

It will have been observed that the translations of Holy Scripture which had been printed during these fourteen years (1526-1539) were all made by private men and printed without any public authority. Some of them had indeed been set forth by the king's licence, but the object of this is shown by a letter of Archbishop Cranmer to Secretary Cromwell, requesting that it might be given to Matthew's Bible. It is "that the same may be sold and read of every person, without danger of any act, proclamation, or ordinance heretofore granted to the contrary, until such time that we, the bishops, shall set forth a better translation, which I think will not be till a day after doomsday." This letter was written on August 4, 1537, and the impatient words at the end refer to an authorized version which had been projected several years before, and which was, in fact, at that very time in preparation, though not proceeding quickly enough to satisfy Cranmer.

In the year 1530 Henry VIII issued a commission of inquiry respecting the expediency and necessity of having "in the English tongue both the New Testament and the Old," the commission consisting of Sir Thomas More, the two archbishops, and the bishop of London, together with seventeen other "discreet and well-learned personages" taken from the two universities and "other parts of his realm," whose names are recorded, together "with many more learned men of the said universities in great number assembled then and there together" (Wilkins's *Conc.*, iii.

² Such Bibles of early date are not uncommon; one is now before the writer which is full of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin notes.

737). This commission, which included Hugh and William Latimer among its members, reported against the expediency of setting forth a vernacular translation until there was a more settled state of religious opinion, but states that the king "intended to provide that the Holy Scripture shall be, by great, learned, and Catholic persons, translated into the English tongue if it shall then seem to His Grace convenient to be" (*ibid.* 740). The convocation of Canterbury refreshed the royal memory on the subject by petitioning the king on December 19, 1534, "that His Majesty would vouchsafe to decree, that the Scriptures should be translated into the vulgar tongue by some honest and learned men, to be nominated by the king, and to be delivered to the people according to their learning" (*ibid.* 770). It was doubtless in response to this petition that the measures were taken of which a very slight historical record remains in some notes of Ralph Morrice, Cranmer's secretary. "First," he says, the archbishop "began with the translation of the New Testament, taking an old English translation thereof,"—the Wickliffite probably, for Tyndale's was only eight years old,—"which he divided into nine or ten parts, causing each part to be written at large in a paper book, and then to be sent to the best learned bishops and others, to the intent that they should make a perfect correction thereof. And when they had done, he required them to send back their parts so corrected unto him at Lambeth, by a day limited for that purpose; and the same course, no question, he took with the Old Testament." (*Camd. Soc. Narr. of Ref.*, p. 277.) A letter from Bishop Gardiner to Cromwell is preserved among the state papers, dated June 10, 1535, in which the former writes that he had translated St Luke and St John for his portion of the work, and that he had expended great labour upon them; and of the rest, with the exception of Stokesley, bishop of London, "when the day came," says Morrice, "every man sent to Lambeth their parts corrected." Some further steps of revision and preparation for the press would no doubt be taken, and the subject was again before convocation in 1536 (Burnet's *Ref.*, i. 314; Pococke's ed. 1865); but, as in the case of later revisions of the Bible, the detailed history is lost to us,—all that is known further relating to the printing.

The au-
thorized
version
of 1539.

For reasons not now known, it was determined that this authorized version should be printed by Francis Regnault, the Paris printer, who provided most of the service-books that were used in England. At the request of Henry VIII, "noster carissimus frater," a licence was granted to Regnault for this purpose by Francis the French king, while Coverdale and Grafton were sent over in 1537, the one as a learned editor the other as a practical printer, to superintend the work as it passed through the press. Portions of the printed sheets were sent home by Bonner who was then ambassador at the court of Paris, as ambassador's baggage, and were thus conveyed out of France free from any difficulties with the French authorities; but when the printing was far advanced, on December 17, 1538, its further progress was interdicted by the inquisitor-general, and orders were given to seize the whole of the impression. Coverdale and Grafton left Paris quickly, leaving a great number of finished sheets, which were condemned to be burned in the Place Maubert; but, through the connivance of the officer appointed to see this done, the whole of them were sold to a haberdasher as waste paper, and "four great dry vats" full of them sent over to England. As the licence to print them had been given at the special request of Henry VIII, it is probable that the escape of the men and the books was facilitated by the civil authorities to prevent any unpleasantness with the English king. A short time afterwards the types, printing press, and workmen followed the printed sheets, and the volume which had been begun in Paris in 1537 was completed in London, the

colophon stating that it was "Fynished in Apryll, Anno m. cccc. xxxix." It is a splendid folio "Bible of the largest volume," and was distinguished from its predecessors by the name of "The Great Bible." The title-page describes it as "The Byble in Englyshe, that is to saye, the content of all the Holy Scripture, bothe of the Olde and Newe Testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebreu and Greke texts by ye dylygent studye of dyverse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tongues. Prynted by Rychard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum, 1539." This was the first of seven editions of this noble Bible which issued from the press during the years 1539-41,—the second of them, that of 1540, having the important addition "This is the Byble apoynted to the vse of the churches" on the title-page. Seventy years afterwards it assumed the form ever since known as the "Authorized Version," but its Psalter is still embedded, without any alteration, in the Book of Common Prayer.

The "Great Bible" was, however, a dignitary among books, its size and its price (about £6 of modern money) making it comparatively inaccessible as a home volume for private use. The demand for the vernacular Scriptures which the supply of them had caused was at the same time so enormous that before the end of Edward VI's reign 26 editions of folio and quarto Bibles, and about double that number of editions of New Testaments, had been printed. This demand for household Bibles was effectually and unexpectedly met by one on the production of which the English refugees were engaged at Geneva during the last year of Queen Mary's reign and the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and which became the household Bible of the English middle classes for at least two generations. The Geneva Bible was not an original translation, but a revision of the Great Bible by Hebrew and Greek scholars, who were quite competent to compare the English translation with the original. It was begun in 1558 when Coverdale was at Geneva, and his ample experience was no doubt enlisted in the work; but after his return to England in the middle of 1559, the responsible editors were William Whittingham, afterwards lay dean of Durham, Anthony Gilby, afterwards for a short time dean of Christ Church and then prebendary of St Paul's, and Thomas Sampson, afterwards dean of Christ Church. The revision was carried on with such industry that the printing of the Bible was finished in April 1560. It became popular immediately on account of its handy size, usually that of a small quarto, and of its being printed in a readable Roman type instead of black letter. It also contained a marginal commentary, which proved a great attraction to the Puritans; and, above all, an improvement which Whittingham had already introduced into an independent English New Testament which he had published in 1557 was also introduced into the Bible of 1560, that of dividing the chapters into verses. Like all Bibles hitherto printed, and nearly all that were printed until the latter part of the 17th century, the Geneva Bible contained the Apocrypha, but copies are occasionally found from which it was omitted by the binder.¹ The popularity of

¹ The Geneva Bible has often been called the "Breeches" Bible from the translation of Gen. iii. 7, "They sewed fig leaves together and made themselves breeches." But this had been familiar long before, in Caxton's *Golden Legend* and in the Wickliffite Bible. An edition of Matthew's Bible, printed in 1551, is similarly called the "Bug" Bible, from the reading in Ps. xci. 5, "So that thou shalt not neede to be afrayed for any bugges by night;" but Coverdale's and Taverner's Bibles use the same word, equivalent to the modern "bugie." A Bible of 1631 has been called the "Wicked Bible," because the important little word "not" is left out of the Seventh Commandment, an accident which also happened in a German Bible of the last century; and another almost as wicked a volume is a small pearl Bible of 1653, in which St Paul is made to ask "Know we not that the unrighteous shall inherit the Kingdom of God?"

this Bible was so great that about 200 editions of it in various sizes from folio downward were published, often with the Prayer Book and metrical Psalms appended; and it gave way very slowly even before the present Authorized Version, which is much superior to it.

Soon after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, when the demand for Bibles was again pressing upon the printers, Archbishop Parker organized a revision of the Great Bible of 1539 by "able bishops and other learned men."

"1. To follow the common English translation used in the churches, and not to recede from it, but where it varieth manifestly from the Hebrew or Greek original. 2. To use sections and divisions in the text as Pagnine in his translation useth, and for the verity of the Hebrew to follow the said Pagnine and Munster specially, and generally others learned in the tongues.

Much labour was expended upon this revision, but the printing was completed, and the volume, a large folio, was ready for publication on October 5, 1568. Several editions of it were afterwards published, but it may be doubted whether it was ever cordially received.

The English Bible which is now recognized as the "Authorized Version," wherever the English language is spoken, is a revision of the Bishops' Bible, begun in 1604 and published in 1611. It arose out of the conference between the High Church and Low Church parties which was held by James I. at Hampton Court in 1604, being originally proposed by Dr Reynolds, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, the leader and spokesman of the Low Church party, and subsequently on the committee which revised the translation of the Prophets.

The present authorized version 1611.

Sir Henry Savile, the most learned layman of his time; and, to say nothing of others well known to later generations, nine who were then or afterwards professors of Hebrew or of Greek at Oxford or Cambridge. It is observable also that they were chosen without reference to party, at least as many of the Puritan clergy as of the opposite party being placed on the committees, and among them Reynolds and Chaderton, two of the four who had represented those clergy in the Hampton Court conference.

Table with 4 columns: Books, Writers, Best known as, and Committee. Lists members of various committees like Westminster, Cambridge, Oxford, and Westminister.

When this large body of scholars were set down to their work, a set of rules was drawn up for their guidance, which has happily come down to modern times among the very few records that remain of this great undertaking.

"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 high as may be, accordingly as they were vulgarly used.

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.

That the work was carried on in the spirit of these rules is shown by the quaint but instructive document which was appended to the Bible as a preface on its completion. It "hath cost the workmen, as light as it seemeth, twice seven times seventy-two days and more: matters of such weight and consequence are to be speeded with maturity; for in a business of moment a man feareth not the blame of convenient slackness.

One principal reason why the English Bible in this last form gives such general satisfaction to the English ear is that it speaks in a language of its own which is conventionally received as a Biblical tongue—a language which is thoroughly English, and which is yet separated by its archaic form from the colloquial English of every-day use on the one hand, and from the literary English of most other books on the other.

Fourteenth Century Version in Modern Spelling.

There was a rich man, and was clothed in purple and white silk, and ate every day shinningly; and there was a beggar, Lazarus by name, that lay at his gate, full of boils, and coveted to be fulfilled of the crumbs that fallen down from the rich man's board; and no man gave to him; but hounds came and licked his boils. And it was done that the beggar died, and was borne of angels into Abraham's bosom: And the rich man was dead also and was buried in hell. And he raised his eyes when he was in torments, and saw Abraham afar, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he dip the end of his finger in water, to cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. And Abraham said to him, Son, have mind, for Lazarus hath received good thing in thy life, and Lazarus also evil things; but he is now comforted, and thou art tormented. And in all these things, a great dark place is established betwixt us and you; that thou wouldst from hence pass to us, we cannot; neither can we pass over thither. And he said, Then I pray thee, Father, that thou send him into the house of my fathers; for I have five brethren; that he witness to them, lest also they come into this place of torments. And Abraham said to him, They have Moses and the prophets; hear them. And he said, Nay, Father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said to him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

Authorized Version, now in use.

There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table:

moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us which would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, Father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house, for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, Father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

That this remarkable continuity of expression has great practical value is shown by the fact that the only other English Bible which has ever lived beyond one edition, that of the Roman Catholics, has been imperceptibly approximating to the Authorized Version at every revision that it has undergone, since the original publication of the New Testament at Rheims in 1582, and the Old Testament at Douay in 1610. Nor, it is satisfactory to add, has the tender hand with which the Old English of the Bible has been touched in the course of revision led to any sacrifice of sound translation.

The question of revision of the Authorized Version has been frequently discussed, but it is only in very recent times that anything has been done which appears to call for particular mention here. In February 1870 the convocation of Canterbury, at the instigation of the bishop of Winchester, Dr Samuel Wilberforce, appointed a committee to consider the subject, which three months afterwards reported in the following terms:— "1. That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken. 2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings, and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version. 3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars such change is necessary, 4. That in such necessary

changes the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed. 5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong."

The report was adopted, and two companies were formed for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testaments respectively, consisting of members of convocation and other distinguished Biblical scholars. During the eight years that have elapsed since their appointment the two companies have devoted themselves assiduously to the discharge of the task assigned them, and it is understood that their work is now (1878) approaching completion, but no part of the new revision has yet been published.

There is still much to be learned respecting the bibliographical history of the English Bible, but several useful works have appeared among the many that have been written on the subject. The earliest attempt was *An Historical Account of the several English Translations of the Bible, &c.*, by Anthony Johnson, 1730. This was followed in 1731 by Lewis's *Complete History of the several Translations of the Holy Bible and New Testament into English*, which was, until recently, the standard work on the subject. Archbishop Newcome wrote *An Historical View of the English Biblical Translations, &c.*, with a list of the various editions from 1526 to 1776, which was published at Dublin in 1792. In 1821 Archdeacon Cotton brought out *A List of Editions of the Bible and parts thereof in English, from the year 1505 to 1820*, which has been republished in a corrected and enlarged form, and is a work of much value. The *Annals of the English Bible*, by Christopher Anderson, printed in two volumes in 1845, was a well-meant attempt to give a complete view of the subject, but is exceedingly diffuse, and is deficient in critical value. Far the most valuable account extant of the Manuscript English Bible is that which forms the preface to Forshall and Madden's edition of the Wicliffite Bible, published at the Clarendon Press in 1850. Taking equally authoritative positions as regards the printed English Bible are Westcott's *General View of the History of the English Bible*, 1863, and the exhaustive account given of the Authorized Version of 1611 in the introduction to Scrivener's *Cambridge Paragraph Bible*, 1873. More recently has appeared, in two volumes, Eadie's *The English Bible: an External and Critical History of the various English Translations of Scripture*, 1876, which is the fullest popular account extant of the whole subject. The most complete list of printed English Bibles is, however, that contained in *The Bibles in the Cotton Exhibition*, by Henry Stevens, 1878, where much valuable bibliographical information on the subject is to be found. (J. H. BL.)

ENGLISH LANGUAGE. In its widest sense, the name is now conveniently used to comprehend the language of the English people from their settlement in Britain to the present day, the various stages through which it has passed being distinguished as Old, Middle, and New or Modern English. In works yet recent, and even in some still current, the name *English* is confined to the third, or at most extended to the second and third of these stages, since the language assumed in the main the vocabulary and grammatical forms which it now presents, the oldest or inflected stage being treated as a separate language, under the title of *Anglo-Saxon*, while the transition period which connects the two has been called *Semi-Saxon*. This view, had the justification that, looked upon by themselves, either as vehicles of thought or as objects of study and analysis, Old English, or Anglo-Saxon, and Modern English are, for all practical ends, distinct languages,—as much so, for example, as Latin and Spanish. No amount of familiarity with Modern English, including its local dialects, would enable the student to read Anglo-Saxon, three-fourths of the vocabulary of which have perished and been reconstructed within 800 years; nor would a knowledge even of these lost words give him the power, since the grammatical system, alike in accident and syntax, would be entirely strange to him. Indeed, it is probable that a

¹ A careful examination of several letters of Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary gives in 2000 words (including derivatives and compounds, but excluding orthographic variants) 535 which still exist as modern English words.

modern Englishman would acquire the power of reading and writing French in less time than it would cost him to attain to the same proficiency in Old English (so that if the test of distinct languages be their degree of practical difference from each other, it cannot be denied that "Anglo-Saxon" is a distinct language from Modern English. But when we view the subject historically, recognizing the fact that living speech is subject to continuous change in certain definite directions, determined by the constitution and circumstances of mankind, as an evolution or development of which we can trace the steps, and that, owing to the abundance of written materials, this evolution appears so gradual in English that we can nowhere draw distinct lines separating its successive stages, we recognize these stages as merely temporary phases of an individual whole, and speak of the English language as used alike by Cynewulf and by Tennyson, just as we include alike King Alfred and Mr Bright as members of the English race.² It must not be forgotten, however, that in this wide sense the English language includes, not only the literary or courtly forms of speech used at successive periods, but also the popular and, it may be, altogether unwritten dialects that exist by their side. Only on this basis, indeed, can we speak of Old, Middle, and Modern English as the same language, since in actual fact the precise dialect which is now the cultivated language, or "English" par excellence, is not the descendant of that dialect which was the cultivated language or English of Alfred, but of a sister dialect then sunk in obscurity,—even as the direct descendant of Alfred's "Englisc" is now to be found in the neglected and non-literary rustic speech of Wiltshire and Somersetshire. Causes which, linguistically considered, are external and accidental, have shifted the political and intellectual centre of England, and along with it transferred literary and courtly patronage from one form of English to another; if the centre of influence had happened to be fixed at York or on the banks of the Forth, both would probably have been neglected for a third.

The English language, thus defined,³ is not "native" to Britain, that is, it was not found here at the dawn of history, but was introduced by foreign immigrants at a date many centuries later. At the Roman Conquest of the island, the languages spoken by the natives belonged all (so far as is known) to the Celtic branch of the Aryan family, modern forms of which still survive in Wales, Ireland, the Scottish Highlands, Isle of Man, and Brittany, while one has quite recently become extinct in Cornwall. Dialects allied to Welsh and Cornish were apparently spoken over the greater part of Britain, as far north as the Firths of Forth and Clyde; beyond these estuaries and in the isles to the west, including Ireland and Man, dialects akin to Irish and Scottish Gaelic prevailed. The dialect of the Picts in the east of Scotland, according to recent inquiries, presented characteristics uniting the British or Cymric with the Gaelic division.⁴ The long occupation of South Britain by the Romans (43–409 A.D.)—a period, it must not be forgotten, equal to that from the close of the Middle Ages to the present day, or to the whole duration of Modern English—familiarized the provincial inhabitants with Latin, which was probably the ordinary speech of the

² The practical convenience of having one name for what was the same thing in various stages of development is not affected by the probability that (Mr Freeman notwithstanding) *Engle* and *Englisc* were, at an early period, not applied to the whole of our Teutonic ancestors in Britain, but only to a part of them. The dialects of *Engle* and *Seaxan* were alike old forms of what was afterwards English speech, and so, viewed in relation to it, *Old English*, whatever their contemporary names might be.

³ As to the place of the Pictish, see Dr W. F. Skene's *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, I. vii., viii. Prof. Rhys says "the Picts, Mr Skene notwithstanding, were probably Kymric rather than Goidelic."—*Welsh Philology*, p. 12.

towns. Gildas, writing nearly a century and a half after the renunciation of Honorius, addressed the British princes in that language;⁴ and the linguistic history of Britain might have been not different from that of Gaul, Spain, and the other provinces of the Western Empire, where a rustic Latin giving birth to a neo-Latinic language finally superseded the native one except in remote and mountainous districts,⁵ when the course of events was entirely changed by the Teutonic conquests of the 5th and 6th centuries.

The Angles, Saxons, and their allies belonged to the Teutonic or Gothic branch of the Aryan family, represented in modern times not only by the English and their colonies, but by the populations of Germany, Holland, Denmark, and the Scandinavian peninsula, and found at the dawn of history located between and about the estuaries and lower courses of the Rhine and the Weser, and the adjacent coasts and isles. For more than 1000 years the Teutonic or Gothic stock has been divided into the three branches of the Low German, High German, and Scandinavian, of which the former represents the original stock, the two others being offshoots to the south and north respectively. To it also belonged the Mæso-Gothic, the tongue of certain Germans who, passing down the Danube, invaded the borders of the empire, and obtained settlements in the province of Mæsia, where their language was committed to writing in the 4th century; its literary remains are of peculiar value as the oldest specimens, by several centuries, of Teutonic speech. To the Low German division also belonged the dialects of the invaders of Britain. As we have no specimens of the language of these tribes for nearly three centuries after their settlement in this island, we cannot tell to what extent they agreed with, and differed from, each other; nor can we be sure whether the differences actually found at a later period, when we have opportunity of comparison, between northern and southern English, were due to original diversity, or to subsequent differentiation. However, as the dialectal differences afterwards discernible corresponded in the main to the areas historically assigned to Angles and Saxons respectively, it may be assumed that there was some difference of dialect to begin with, that of the Saxons being more closely allied to the Old Saxon of the Continent, of which Dutch is probably the nearest living representative, and the Angle dialect having more affinity with the Frisian, and through that with the Scandinavian. At the present day the most English or Angli-form dialects of the Continent are those of the North Frisian islands of Amrum and Sylt, on the west coast of Schleswig. It is well known that the greater part of the ancient Friesland has been swept away by the encroachments of the North Sea, and the *disjecta membra* of the Frisian race, pressed by the sea in front and encroaching nationalities behind, are found only in isolated fragments from the Zuyder Zee to the coasts of Denmark. Of the Geátas, Eótas, or "Jutes," who, according to Bæda, formed the third tribe along with the Angles and Saxons, it is difficult to speak linguistically. In the opinion of the present writer, the speech of Kent has ever been a typically southern or "Saxon" one, and at the present day its popular dialect is identical with that of Sussex, one of the old Saxon kingdoms; that of the Isle of Wight differs in no respect from that of Hampshire, nor does it show any special connection with that of Kent. Mr Henry Sweet has, however, shown⁶ that Kentish as early as the 8th cen-

tury differed from West-Saxon in one or two points of vowel pronunciation, and that the distinction was maintained as late as the 14th; though it cannot be said to have therein approached more closely to the northern dialect, which ought to have been the case had Bæda's "Geátas" been Jutlanders.

As it was amongst the *Angel-cynn* or *Engle* of Northumbria, that literary culture first flourished, and an Angle or *Englisc* dialect was the first to be used for vernacular literature,⁷ *Englisc* came eventually to be a general name for all forms of the vernacular as opposed to Latin, &c.; and even when the West-Saxon of Alfred became in its turn the literary or classical form of speech, it was still called *Englisc* or *English*. The origin of the name Anglo-Saxon is disputed, some maintaining very positively that it means a union of Angles and Saxons, others (with better foundation) that it meant *English Saxons*, or Saxons of England, as distinguished from Saxons of the Continent. Its modern use is mainly due to the little band of scholars who in the 16th and 17th centuries turned their attention to the long forgotten language of Alfred and Ælfric, which, as it differed so utterly from the English of their own day, they found it convenient to distinguish by a name which was applied to themselves by those who spoke it.⁸ To them "Anglo-Saxon" and "English" were separated by a gulf which it was reserved for later scholars to bridge across, and show the historical continuity of the English of all ages.

As already hinted, the English language, in the wide sense, presents three main stages of development—Old, Middle, and Modern—distinguished by their inflexional characteristics. The latter can be best summarized in the words of Mr Henry Sweet, in his *History of English Sounds*.⁹ "Old English is the period of full inflexions (*name, gifan, care*), Middle English of levelled inflexions (*naame, given, caare*), and Modern English of lost inflexions (*name, give, care = nām, giv, cār*). We have besides two periods of transition, one in which *nama* and *name* exist side by side, and another in which final *e* [with other endings] is beginning to drop." By lost inflexions it is meant that only very few remain, and these mostly non-syllabic, as the *-s* in stones, the *-ed* in loved, the *-r* in their, as contrasted with the Old English *stán-as, luf-ode* and *luf-od-on, pá-ra*. Each of these periods may also be divided into two—an early and a late; but from the want of materials this division may be waived in regard to the first. We have thus the following divisions, with the approximate dates, which, however, varied considerably for different dialects and parts of the country:—

Old English or Anglo-Saxon.....	to 1100
Transition Old English, or "Semi-Saxon"....	1100 to 1200
Early Middle English, or "Early English"....	1200 to 1300
Late Middle English.....	1300 to 1400
Transition Middle English.....	1400 to 1485
Early Modern English, "Tudor English"....	1485 to 1611
Modern English.....	1611 onward.

Many writers carry the Transition Old English down to 1250, Early Middle English thence to 1350, and Late Middle English 1350 to 1485, absorbing the Second

⁴ See also Earle's *Philology of the English Tongue*, p. 25.
⁵ Æthelstan in 934 calls himself in a charter "Ongol-Saxna cuning and Brytanwalda ealles thyses iglandes;" Eadred in 955 is "Angul-seaxna cuning and cæsere totius Britannie," and the name is of frequent occurrence in Latin documents. These facts ought to be remembered in the interest of the scholars of the 17th century, who have been blamed for the use of the term Anglo-Saxon, as if they had invented it. By "Anglo-Saxon" language they meant the language of the people who sometimes at least called themselves "Anglo-Saxons." Even now the name is practically useful, when we are dealing with the subject *per se*, as is *Old English*, on the other hand, when we are treating it historically or in connexion with English as a whole.
⁶ *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1878–4, p. 620.

¹ The works of Gildas in the original Latin were edited by Mr Stevenson for the English Historical Society. There is an English translation in *Six Old English Chronicles* in Bohn's Antiquarian Library.

² As to the continued existence of Latin in Britain, see further in Rhys's *Lectures on Welsh Philology*, p. 226–7.

³ "Dialects and Prehistoric Forms of English," *Transactions of the Philological Society* for 1875–6, p. 443.