appropriate Santali word raised a critical issue in John 15 : 13ff. The Taljhari word, *gate,* is chiefly used of friendship between young people, and it may mean no more than 'a companion'. The Benagaria version uses *pera,* which means 'friend' and also 'kinsman' — ('friend' in vernacular Scots often connotes 'kinsman') — and it is used verbally in the sense of 'to give hospitally to'. φίλος does not mean 'kinsman', but is it reading too much into John 15 : 14 to suggest that when Jesus said, "Ye are my friends", he meant also, "Ye are my kinsmen"? Santal opinion is divided on this point, and both *gate* and *pera* will have to be preserved, one being given as a marginal reading.

The revisers have tried as far as possible to avoid the *pis aller* of a marginal reading, but sometimes it is the only solution, as in the case of the word for 'Spirit'. Benagaria uses *Jiu* and Taljhari has *Atma.* No amount of argument will settle the controversy here, and Santal opinion is divided, strong preference being expressed in favour of the word familiar to the reader in his own translation of the New Testament and in the liturgies and hymns of his Church. We have had to follow the opinion of the majority in this instance, and *Jiu* will be used in the text of the revised version, *Atma* being given in a list of alternative readings of key words at the beginning of the book.

Of the Epistles only Ephesians has been revised so far. The problem of translating Pauline language and thought into Santali is no easier than it is in the case of the language of other so-called primitive people, which, as Dr. Nida has pointed out in a recent article in *The Bible Translator,* are by no means 'primitive'. Both the older translations have preserved the long sentences from the Greek original, a procedure which is quite foreign to the genius of Santali. The revisers have tried in Ephesians to break these up wherever possible into more readily intelligible passages, on the lines of the modern English versions. In doing so strict vigilance is necessary to avoid the cardinal errors of doing violence to the Greek and of interpreting instead of translating. The new version of Ephesians seeks to fulfil these conditions, and it has been well received as being more digestible than either of the old versions.

This work of revision is a stimulating experience in every way, and the harmony that pervades the meetings of the revisers even in the midst of their controversies is a demonstration of what the fellowship of the Spirit can mean.

'I' and 'We' in the Pauline Letters

W. F. Lofthouse

(Reproduced by permission from The Expository Times, *May 1953.)*

In a short article, published in *The Expository Times,* lviii, 179 [April, 1947], I called attention to the rapid transitions in the Pauline Epistles from the first personal singular pronoun to the first plural, and *vice versa,* for which there often seemed to be no reason at all. Singular and plural

are not, indeed, to be regarded as interchangeable, as Milligan (*Thessalonians,* 131ff.), Dodd (*Romans,* 137), and Selwyn (*1 Peter,* 15ff.) agree; but the existence of some reason for the transitions, apart from carelessness or caprice, has seldom been taken very seriously. It is the purpose of this article to show grounds for thinking that there is always a discernible reason for the use of 'I' or 'We', even though the writer himself may not have been conscious of it. That is to say, when Paul wrote 'I', he was thinking of himself as distinct from his companions, his hearers, and the Church in general, and of experiences which others could not share; when he wrote 'we', he was thinking of himself as one of a number, either the little band of his companions, or his readers, or the whole company of believers always in the background of his mind. The circle expands or contracts; but it is always there when the plural is used; never when it is not.

For one who wrote so quickly and often so passionately as Paul — the most self-conscious of all the writers of the New Testament — we might almost say of all great letter writers — expansion and contraction chase one another across the page. Indeed, so rapidly does his mood change that the very moment after he has been exhorting or rebuking his readers, he may be placing himself in their midst, identifying himself with them or them with himself, proud that they were, or longing that they might be, in everything as he was; in experience, in hope, in triumph.

He has not seldom been wounded in the house of his friends. We have looked on him as a composer of treatises, sitting in a library with ample leisure to verify his references and polish his periods. We may be quite sure that his mind was as profound as that of any of his commentators; but it is clear that he or his amanuensis wrote *currente calamo,* when a man reveals his inner emotions as he cannot when he weighs every word. That he never confused singular and plural naturally cannot be proved. But if we find that the plural is never used, as the singular is regularly used, for what can only apply to himself, we may take it that the plural bids us look for the circle, larger or smaller, in which the Apostle is setting himself. If this proceeding is successful, it should throw light not only on his thought, but on his more emotional relations with his friends, by which we may know not the writer merely, but the person — deep, perhaps, calling unto deep.

When we turn to the actual language of the Epistles, we shall find that the passages which might make us doubt this principle are relatively few. The first singular, save in two passages, in Galatians 2 and Romans 7, to be noticed later, will cause little trouble. And only in a minority of the instances of the use of the plural are we likely to ask whether the Apostle does not really mean the singular, or, if he refers more definitely to himself, who it is that he is linking with himself. Here the most useful method will be to assume, until the assumption should defeat itself, that the rule is being obeyed, and to ask the cause of its apparent neglect.

If we turn to the earliest of the Epistles — I and II Thessalonians and Galatians, whichever we put first in point of time, we find a striking contrast. In I Thessalonians 1 Paul couples with himself in his first sentence Silas and Timothy; and he uses the plural throughout, even

speaking to his readers as imitators "of us" (1 : 6). We would take no advantage of you, he says, like Christ's apostles (2 : 7; could he very well have said 'I' here?), and so through the letter. Yet in three places the first singular forces its way in. "We wished to come to you — I, Paul, twice over — but Satan hindered us" (2 : 18). "I could wait no longer, so I sent Timothy to you" (3 : 5) — previously, *we* sent Timothy; in 3 : 1 all three feel the same anxiety and all three decide that Timothy should visit the Church. Timothy comes back to *us*. At the end (5 : 27), *I* place you under oath to read this letter. His consciousness of his own leadership will out.

It might indeed be contended that Paul was using a virtual singular in the letter. But against this are the facts that he starts by mentioning his companions; that he speaks of the trio as he could hardly have spoken of himself without ostentation; and that more than once he sharply distinguishes between the 'we' and the 'I'. Save for these three instances there is nothing self-assertive, nothing that does not suit the little band of evangelists as a whole.

The second letter also is sent from the three. The plurals occur from the second sentence on. But the eschatological warnings given the Church were his own (2 : 5). He was evidently, as in Lystra, the chief speaker. Then he reverts to the plural, even in 3 : 10. He signs the letter; it is his usual custom, 3 : 17, though unmentioned in I Thessalonians 5.

When we come to Galatians, the whole atmosphere is changed. Paul names no companions, though he couples vaguely all the brothers who are with him (1 : 2), but they are at once left out of account, and from 1 : 5 onwards the singular alone is used. He is speaking for himself, and committing no one else, although the gospel which the Galatians have so sadly neglected is one which we preachers proclaim (1 : 8f.). What the missionaries had told them before (all had, it seems, felt the warning to be necessary), Paul has now to emphasize ('we' 'I', *v.* 9). It is no invention of the Apostle himself, and is therefore to be treated with the more respect, though, as he reminds them, he had been specially entrusted with it, and could therefore expect the more attention. In the second of these two autobiographical chapters he is accompanied to Jerusalem by Barnabas and Titus, and perhaps others. All of them resist the temptation of the "false brethren" (2 : 4ff.). But Paul has little to say of Barnabas; was he thinking of the lapse of *v.* 13, and the breach which revealed itself over young Mark? The 'pillars' think of the two as together, (though note the order — "to me and Barnabas" *v.* 9); but Paul only mentions his own readiness to obey the regulation about the poor. In the speech at Antioch, which he quotes, he claims that Peter is on his side (*vv.* 14-17), a claim which Peter, remembering Cornelius, could not well ignore. The sudden change to the singular (*v.* 18) suggests a further break in the narrative of what happened at Antioch. The four verses, 18-21, are hardly suitable (though not impossible) in an argumentative address. The suggestion so vigorously repudiated in *v.* 17 seems to drive the writer back on himself. It is his own discovery, his own experience; a piece of inner autobiography, a soliloquy. And whether the revealing words were spoken to Peter and the rest, or written for the Galatians, he is laying bare, as he only does when the singular is used, "the hidden man of the heart".

The 'I say', 'I wish', 'I inform' at the beginning of a section always have a note of authoritative insistence about them, like the 'verily I say' of the Gospels. But this is frequently expanded by the addition of 'brothers', and sometimes the singulars are softened to the plural, when the relation between writer and reader is felt or desired to be more intimate.

In chapter 3 he is debating with the Galatians, but in *vv.* 23-25 he describes the experience meant for all believers; hence the first plural, which immediately passes into the second, thus making it quite clear that these are no 'epistolary plurals'. The same is true of "we" (4 : 5f.); 'we human beings' and 'you too', you Galatians, who as redeemed are not sinners but sons. In the plurals, 4 : 26-5 : 1, Paul regards the Galatians as members of the redeemed community like himself; he follows them with a personal and final warning in 5 : 2-15. Then the tone changes, passing from warning to exhortation, when a tactful first plural takes the place of the more natural second, as every preacher will understand; and the Apostle ends with personal messages naturally conveyed in the first singular. There are no plurals in the letter to suggest that he has companions with him to share in his closing greetings.

So far Paul's practice is clear. There appears no trace of confusion. The first singular stands for distinctness, the plural for some measure of identification. What of the subsequent Epistles? In I Corinthians Paul joins Sosthenes (cf. Acts 18 : 17) with him; and he is in close touch with Timothy, Apollos, and others. At the close, he sends greetings from "the churches of Asia". Being, for the most part, a series of replies to requests for advice and guidance, Paul takes the whole responsibility for what is asked upon himself, and naturally uses the first singular; but he does not forget the Christian experience which he shares with them (I Corinthians 1 : 30). In 2 : 6 he passes from his own programme to that of the whole band of missionaries and even of believers in general; so in 3 : 8f. ('we' the builders, along with God; 'you', the building). In 4 : 1 -13 (note *v.* 6) with a characteristic touch in *vv.* 3f., he speaks of the whole apostolate, or of those who would be known, like Apollos, to the Corinthians; though, as may be readily surmised from, for example, 4 : 10f., he is thinking specially of his own position. Chapter 5 is naturally personal; yet sometimes, whenever he can, he draws his hearers to his side (*vv.* 7*b*. 8; *v.* 13 repeats *v.* 7*a*).

In chapter 6, after the vigorous appeal in *vv.* 1-11 (note *v.* 3) he puts himself in their midst as an example (*v.* 12); he passes, by way of *v.* 14 ("shall raise us"), from a sharp personal touch (*v.* 15) — a reminiscence? — to the interrupted exhortation; now he is distinct from them; now one of them. Chapter 7 calls for no comment save on *vv.* 12, 25, "I, not the Lord", a distinction defended in *v.* 40; but the dramatic intensity of his mood is shown in the reiterated 'I want', 'I say this'.

The tension, we may say, or the obscurity, is relaxed in chapter 8. He is thinking with his hearers (or they with him) rather than directing them. In chapter 9 he is back where he was in chapters 3 and 4; but here he is conscious of a direct attack on himself (*v.* 3); hence the more passionate tone. He appeals in *vv.* 4-11 to the general position of the apostolate; then he launches himself on a statement of his own principles and practice

(*vv.* 15-27) though he cannot forget that the garland he runs to win is for them also (*v.* 25); his austerity is his own, not theirs. Even when he thinks of himself as one of a number, he is constantly detaching himself under stress of emotion.

The mood changes again in chapter 10; he passes to a warning, stern though affectionate. He repeats the "all is lawful" of 6 : 12 (*v.* 23), but this time without the limiting 'for me'; he is still the fellow-believer (*v.* 22), but also the example (10 : 33-11 : 1). Chapters 11 and 12, with the exception of 11 : 2 and 17, are written throughout in the calmer mood of direction; they are a statement of the common experience; hence the plurals, first or second. The "ye know" of 12 : 2 answers to 3 : 16, etc. The whole letter is full of such appeals. In chapter 13 the first singular, used throughout, gives to the section the effect almost of a meditation, like Galatians 2 : 18ff. and Romans 7 : 15ff., but with a unique, poetic construction, broken only by the thought of the blurred vision of this life in *v.* 12 ("we see", like "one sees"); but resumed in the confident antithesis of *v.* 12*b* ("then shall I"). The tone changes sharply in the imperatives of chapter 14. The first singular in *vv.* 11, 14 suggests a growing urgency of manner, as does the second singular in *vv.* 16f. In *v.* 18, as in *v.* 15, he is again the example, the pattern. The 'glossolalists' evidently form a section of the Church with which he feels he must deal firmly. But the returning more familiar and affectionate tone (as in 10 : 14, 12 : 1) is marked by the repeated "brothers" (*vv.* 20, 26, 39 and 15 : 1).

In the long chapter 15 Paul begins with the *kerygma* of the Christian hope of the resurrection which belongs to him, to them, and to the apostolate as a whole (*v.* 11; so *v.* 15). The risks of the Christian life are great for them all; greater for him (*vv.* 30, 32). Otherwise, why not obey the general maxim, 'let us eat and drink'? The vivid personal reminiscence, *v.* 32, though the "in Ephesus" is puzzling in one who was writing from Ephesus, is quite in the Apostle's eager manner. The exposition proceeds in broad lines, except for the tension of the second singular in *vv.* 35ff. Did the "someone" refer to an actual opponent? But the Apostle is in calmer waters again in *v.* 49 and the full tide bears him home to their heart. Chapter 16 is full of personal details, and the first plural does not occur. But, unlike Galatians, the letter ends with full and ample salutations.

In II Corinthians, Paul's colleague in authorship is Timothy, with "all the saints in Achaia". He begins with an exalted passage on the consolations vouchsafed to "us" (*vv.* 1-14). The plural here has been generally assumed, if it has been noticed, to be epistolary; but for no compelling reason; there is nothing in these verses which Paul could not think of as being shared with so close a companion as Timothy, as in I Thessalonians 3; cf. *v.* 19; and the solitary singular in the parenthesis in *v.* 13 gains in meaning. On the other hand, when we consider the sudden change of mood, and the transition to the singular in the extremely personal passage that begins in *v.* 15, Paul seems to be following his usual practice of employing the singular for what concerns himself. This, too, will explain the isolated plurals in 2 : 11 and 2 : 14-17; *v.* 11, "you and I"; *vv.* 14-17, "we missionaries". In chapter 3, passing from his own plans and actions to the apostolical experience, and again, it may be, conscious of Timothy at

his side, and Titus (7 : 6), he reverts to the plural, in which, finally, his readers come to take their place (*v.* 18). He continues this vein in the next four chapters. Here, he is clearly unbosoming himself; speaking heart to heart. Yet he uses the plural throughout, even in such passages as 6 : 11, 7 : 3 and, above all, 5 : 11-21. Does the plural mean more than the singular here? We cannot, obviously, be certain. He may be laying aside for some reason his usual style. But it is noteworthy that we have a little group of singulars (7 : 7-16: "I must", "I am not sorry", "I was proud", "I wrote"). Here he is dealing with his own personal feelings. Yet even here the plurals step in when they can, in *vv.* 13f., though he cannot conceal his own private delight in the last words of the paragraph. Comparing this with the preceding, it is surely fair to conclude that both in the anxiety over the mission of Titus and the spirit of the whole apostolic preaching, Paul insists on being the spokesman of his group. Hermes (Acts 14 : 12) will not have his companions forgotten; yet that he knows himself to be Hermes is clear from the tell-tale parenthesis in 6 : 13.

Here, as in chapters 10 and 12, his experiences are not special revelations to him as they are in chapter 11; it is natural to him to try to join others with him and his colleagues. This will account for the plurals in 6 : 11-13, 7 : 2; and if the singulars in the rest of the chapter are noted (*vv.* 7, 8, 9, 14, 16), we can see how Paul's personal feelings force themselves on him at point after point.

Chapter 10 : 1 is now generally regarded as the beginning of a distinct document in which the boasting motif, as it may be called, presses itself with a unique persistence on the writer's mind. It is worth observing that Paul's reference to his own boasting (whether kept under or not) occurs only in II Corinthians, Galatians 6 : 14, and I Corinthians 13 : 3. They are out of all proportion in the three chapters II Corinthians 10-12. But the transitions from singular to plural and back again are more puzzling in this section than elsewhere; and the temptation to think that they are accidental or at least irrelevant is great. In the central passages, from 11 : 7 to 12 : 18, the plural is absent altogether, even in 12 : 6. In chapter 10 the plurals are predominant; in *vv.* 7, 11 they invade what seems here the territory of the singular; they reappear towards the end of chapter 12 and take possession from 13 : 5 on.

But must we necessarily conclude that no reason can be given for the variation? Paul is here on the defensive, and all that we know of him shows that he would never shun responsibility; still less shelter himself behind his companions. Yet he never pushes them aside; his gospel is theirs; so are his relations to the churches which they had founded together. Hence the plurals in 10 : 1-7; and though the accusations were aimed at him alone, and he treats them as such (*vv.* 8-10) he still thinks of himself as one of the band (*vv.* 11-15). As he comes nearer to his critics, however, the decks as it were are cleared for action; he faces them alone; yet it is still the gospel of them all (*v.* 4) and, surprisingly, though he is a mere amateur (*v.* 10) their attitude is perfectly clear (*v.* 6).

Naturally, when Paul comes to his *apologia pro vita sua,* he does not employ the plural, and it was he, and not the little company with him, who despatches Titus and the brother (12 : 18). Yet he cannot even here forget

that he is their mouthpiece (*v.* 19). His forthcoming journey to Corinth he looks on as his alone (13 : 1f.); but in a moment he links his friends with him (*vv.* 6ff.). Theirs is the hope for reinstatement; his is the stern action that may be necessary for its accomplishment.

Space forbids attempt at a like treatment for the remaining Epistles. But the principle can be seen without serious difficulty in Romans, where a personal note such as that in the five Epistles we have dealt with would be out of place, but where the writer, whatever we may think of chapter 16, associates no one with himself. The plural in chapter 1 : 5 (contrast *v.* 9), following the mention of Jesus, is natural as referring to his gift to the Apostles in general. In 3 : 7 ("my falsehood") the first singular may be called dialectical (like one's own); it clearly refers to Paul and his preacher colleagues. The plurals in *v.* 9 are again dialectical ("we who are arguing together"). So *vv.* 19, 28, 4 : 1 and 6 : 1. In chapters 5, 6, 8 Paul is describing the Christian experience, the very essence of which is its character of being shared. The common point of view between himself and his hearers is not always easy to maintain, as in 7 : 4; but it is restored in *vv.* 4b-6. The remainder of the chapter is in the first singular. If we are to take it as Paul's rule to confine the singular to what was personal in the sense of individual, it seems broken at the end of chapter 7. The whole point of his 'I' here is that it is typical. This classical passage is the proof of the need of all for salvation, not merely from the gross sins of chapters 1 and 2, but from the misery of perpetual frustation. We have seen already, however, that Paul can think of himself, now as one of a number, now as the recipient of some special gift, even though another moment's thought will remind him that his own experience is not really unique. So in I Corinthians 14 : 18 and Galatians 2 : 19, already noted. 'I do this or experience that; and let all do the same'. So, it would appear in Romans 7; the first singular is best understood as neither primarily autobiographical nor imaginary nor generalized. The experience is something of which he has been conscious through his life, now more and now less sharply. Doubtless he felt it while under the law; doubtless when confronted by the possibility that the crucified Jesus was the Messiah, with the accompanying discovery of *v.* 25*a*, as it is elaborated in chapter 8. It is not something which could not have happened to any one else, like the rapture into the third heaven, or the agony of the stake in the flesh. But neither is it something which all believers would be expected to share, like the plurals in the Epistle to the Ephesians. It is his own misery, his own perplexity, his own triumph, of which he is thinking. The "me" of 8 : 2 passes to the "us" of *v.* 4, and after a kind of personal appeal in *vv.* 9, 11, he reaches the broad and shining planes of the assured Christian confidence.

In the next section (chapters 9-11) the Apostle is stating his own views on the persistent puzzle of the rejection of the Jews. The first singular and the second plural are inevitable, while in 11 : 17-20 he concentrates his attention dramatically, as it were, on a single opponent, as in Galatians 2 : 14. The objector, he feels, will come from only a part, perhaps quite a small part, of the assembly, and the recognition of the mystery (11 : 25) belongs to them all, as they listen to him. In chapter 12 he is the teacher and the pastor, though when he can, as in *vv.* 4-6, he again puts himself in their

midst; at the end of the chapter, influenced no doubt by the language of the Torah to which he was alluding, he breaks again into the second singular. The rapidity of the transition from the teacher to the fellow-believer is shown in the last verses of chapter 13.

Chapters 14 and 15 illustrate the same transition; occasionally he seems to detect the presence of the disputatious or the recalcitrant (14 : 4, 10). But he is anxious to turn again to the whole company and to imagine himself sitting with them, as in 14 : 19. The second half of chapter 15 and chapter 16 call for no comment, save that anything like an epistolary or authoritative plural is conspicuously absent.

We can deal more briefly with the remaining Paulines. In Philippians, that most intimate of his letters, when he is talking as friend with friend, he uses the first singular throughout (the presence of Timothy in 1 : 1 is forgotten) save in 3 : 15-21. He has set his own life so fully before them as an example; but "us" in *v.* 17; has he there in mind those to whom he refers in 4 : 21? Now he surrounds the thought of their appreciation in *v.* 15 with two encompassing first plurals. Few passages in all the letters are more touching than the personal appeals in chapter 4; his companions have faded into the background.

In Colossians there is not quite the same intimacy; and Timothy (1 : 1) was possibly better known at Colossae than at Philippi. Tychicus and other close friends alike of the Colossians and of Paul were with him (4 : 7ff.). He passes easily from the 'we' of 'I and those who are with me' to the 'we' of 'all of us believers'. This transition is seen at its best in 4 : 2ff.; all the little Apostolic band needs the prayers of the Colossian Church; but specially I, the prisoner, of whom I am taking care that you shall have the news I know you long for.

The impersonal character of Ephesians is well known. Paul here has no coadjutor, though Tychicus is still with him (6 : 21). The first plurals all belong clearly to the experience of the whole Church. In 1 : 15f. Paul is as it were introducing himself personally to his readers. But in chapter 3, the personal note is heard more urgently. Paul is the prisoner (cf. Colossians 4 : 8), the possessor of a special revelation, and as such he can make a special claim to their obedience. In chapter 4 he is back again from the singular to the plural in the universal Christian experience; it is worth noting that the first plurals always appear when he has the Church in mind; the Apostle never isolates himself then from his flock. At the end occurs the same appeal that we heard in Colossians. Ephesians would seem to answer more fully to the character of a circular letter than does Colossians, though Colossians, too, had its circulatory mission, as had other letters (Colossians 4 : 16); and Tychicus is going to bring personal details to the recipients as to Colossae (6 : 21). Whatever we are to think of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, this small but not unimportant character of pronominal usage, common to both Epistles, as to the rest of the Pauline corpus, is not without its bearing on the vexed question.

In the letter to Philemon, Paul joins Timothy with him in his first words. In the plea for Onesimus which is the object of the letter, Paul

does not associate the rest; he thinks only of Philemon and himself. There are no plurals, but intimate personal greetings.

It would thus appear that in Paul's use of the singular and plural there is neither caprice nor carelessness. When he says 'I', he means 'I' — there can be no doubt about that. But the barrier between singular and plural is constantly breaking down. So far from being self-centred or occupied with himself, the Apostle habitually links himself with others; the friends at his side, the recipients, whether they will welcome his letters or criticize them, or the whole company of the faithful through all the world. The one identification never expressed in so many words — reverence would forbid it — is that with God the Father or the Lord Jesus Christ. When we follow these almost lightning transitions, we find him letting out the secret of his intense sympathies by a door the handle of which he never consciously turned. The usage is as unique in the New Testament as it is illuminating for the passionate invasiveness, as we may perhaps venture to call it, of one who sought to be all things to all men, though he never ceased to be either himself or the servant of Jesus the Christ.

Salute to Translators

R. A. Ward

(Reproduced by permission from Interpretation, *Volume VIII, No. 3, July 1954.)*

In the "Prologue to the Reader" of the Coverdale Bible (1535), Coverdale states that "he has been unwilling to set himself up as translator of the Bible, feeling himself unequal to the work . . . It is a good thing to have a multitude of translations. In the early ages they had many versions, and the church was never in better health. We ought to thank God for the men of our day who undertake this great task, and not least in our own language. A translator may not always hit the mark, yet one man may improve on another. Differing interpretations bring the truth to light, and if only a man is doing his best he should be commended and encouraged".[1]

Two years later Archbishop Cranmer wrote to Cromwell to commend to him a new Bible — the so-called Matthew Bible. "You shall receive," he writes, "by the bringer hereof a Bible in English . . . And as for the translation, so far as I have read thereof, I like it better than any other translation heretofore made, yet not doubting but that there may and will be found some faults therein, as you know no man ever did or can do so well but it may be from time to time amended".[2]

This reluctance to regard any translation as the last word is reiterated by Coverdale in the short "Prologue to the Reader", following the dedication to Cromwell, in the Paris edition of the Coverdale diglot (1538):

[1] J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles* (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 69.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 125.