VII. — NOTES ON THE LITHUANIAN LORD'S
PRAYER AND CHYLIŃSKI'S BIBLE. By
LEONARD C. WHARTON.

[Read at the Meeting of the Philological Society on March 5, 1909.]

THE whole question of Chyliński's Bible is too large for me to deal with here or anywhere at present, but a part of it may be discussed in the light of my own investigations.

Apart from Mr. Steele's more recent contributions in the "Library" and elsewhere, the best accessible summary of the whole matter up to the end of the year 1895 is by H. Reinhold, and is in Heft 20 of the *Mitteilungen der Litauischen Literarischen Gesellschaft*. It begins by an analytic account of the references to this Bible in the bibliographies and elsewhere from the year 1672 onwards, in which the question of the evidential value of the references for the Lord's Prayer arises in the case of Adelung and others. But as I cannot at present find time to verify all these references and the others which I have myself collected, I must ignore all that Reinhold says on the bibliographical side of the matter.

His special study of the Lord's Prayer problem arose out of a discussion in the *Academy* and the *Athenæum* in 1891. In the course of the correspondence Mr. W. R. Morfill quoted a text of the prayer from "Oratio Dominica πολυγλωττος" of 1700, p. 43, accompanied by statements afterwards corrected by a letter from Dr. Neubauer. At last, on June 13, 1891, one "T. B. R." wrote to the *Academy* that this version of the Lord's Prayer might be in Chyliński's Prospectus of 1659, a view which Reinhold honours by repetition on his own account. Neither of them appears, however, to have seen a copy, which I have done myself, and hence this paper. For, while I found no such thing as our friends supposed, but merely an appeal endorsed by influentially signed testimonials by persons who could have known nothing of the matter in hand, what I did find will appear later.

Reinhold, whose summary should be read, says the first appearance of this Lord's Prayer is in Bishop Wilkins of Chester's "Essay towards a real Character and a Philosophical Language," 1668,

folio, where it is no. 35 in the specimens beginning at p. 435. The Bishop's sources (cf. p. 434) are "Gesner's Mithridates," "Megiserus his Specimina, &c." The first has no Lithuanian according to Reinhold, who has not seen the second. This Megiserus of 1603 has no Lithuanian, but no. 39 is "Livonice & Werulorum lingua," which agrees with some scribal variants with the "Livonian" of Wilkins's no. 36. Opposite no. 36, indeed, in Wilkins, in the margin of p. 435, we see M., i.e. Megiserus. But elsewhere M. wavers and stands opposite the Lithuanian line. I would gladly know whether the first or second edition of Megiserus' "Specimina" or of any other work of his contains a Lithuanian text.

The second work ("Ludeken") mentioned by Reinhold started the connection with the Bible, but this I ignore at present of set purpose, but from it Le Long and his copyists got their date of 1660. The book of 1700 quoted by Mr. Morfill is a reprint of this "Ludeken" book, and this accounts for its adoption of all Wilkins's misprints, and indeed the "Chamberlaynius" of 1715 is said by some to be, like the 1700 book, a posthumous work by Wilkins.

The later history I propose to ignore as far as possible; like the whole question, no one has touched it without ornamenting it, not always with truth.

Reinhold, in his summary, attributes the appearance of this version of the Lord's Prayer to the year 1668, which was also that of Chyliński's death. The dialect, he says, is mainly that of the Bible. It must, he thinks, have been taken from the Sermon on the Mount and from the manuscript of the translation of the New Testament, then in preparation, whoever prepared it. This, however, may be ignored, as it leads to no result for the Lord's Prayer and belongs to the larger question of the Bible. Still, on Reinhold's showing, Chyliński may have done all the Letto-Slavonic and some other parts of Wilkins's collection of versions, in which the Letto-Slavonic element bulks very large.

Next, a remark quoted above sent me to Chyliński's Prospectus again. On p. 4, I find, he says that the Lithuanians had already got the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, a Catechism for the young, and some other religious books in the vulgar tongue. This is definite enough and sent me to look for the Lord's Prayer, and that brought me to Luther's "Kleiner Catechismus" and a provisional solution.

Now, in 1547 appeared a Lithuanian translation of Luther's "Kleiner Catechismus," a Lettish one being issued two years later. The second edition in Lithuanian was issued in 1579 and the third in 1700, the very year of publication of the "Oratio Dominica πολυγλωττος," from which Mr. Morfill quoted. (It may be as well to add that Luther's "Kleiner Catechismus" gives the text of the Lord's Prayer followed by an exposition of each clause, though editions vary.)

Abstracting the later editions, Wilkins's form of the Lord's Prayer in no. 35 in his "Essay" bears a very close relation to the form in Luther's "Kleiner Catechismus" of 1547, as given in Bezzenger's reprint. So much is this the case that it may be easiest to state it by mentioning variants only, when the original date is given for Bezzenger's reprint (and for any other edition casually quoted), and W. stands for "Wilkins' Essay," no. 35, and the "Oratio Dominica πολυγλωττος" of 1700, with which it appears in the table for comparison before you. The variants follow in the order of their occurrence :—

W. has a dot over the first *e* in *Tewe*.

1547 *kuris*; W. *kursey* (the more emphatic form).

1547 *essi*; W. *esi*.

1547 *dangusu*; W. *danguy*.

1547 *Schweskiese*; W. *Szweskis*.

1547 *tawa*; W. *tawo*.

1547 *ateik*; W. *ateyk*.

1547 *tawa*; W. *tawo*.

1547 *Buki tawa walia*; W. *Buk wala tawo*.

1547 *kaip dagui, taip ir ssemeic*; W. *Kayp and daugaus teyp*
ir andziam es.

1547 *Dona*; W. *Donos*.

1547 *wyssudienu*; W. *wisu dienu*.

1547 *dodi mumus nu*; W. *dok mumus szedien*.

1547 *atleid*; W. *atlayisk*.

1547 *mumus*; W. *mums*.

1547 *kaltibes*; W. *kaltis*.

1547 *kaip*; W. *kayp*.

1547 *mes*; W. *ir mes*.

1547 *atleidem musu kaltimus*; W. *atlaydziam sawiemus*
kaltiemus.

1547 *newed*; W. *Ir newesk*.

1547 *mus*; W. *musu*.

1547 ingi pagundima; W. ing pagúndynima.

1547 gielbek mus; W. gíaf bekmus.

1547 nogi wysa pikta. Amen; W. nog pikto. Amen.

As to these the following remarks may be made :—

I. Weinreich, the printer of the 1547 Catechism, had, and the printer to the Royal Society had not, got the types for expressing the nasals, of which *dagui* and *đangusu* in 1547 are separate, and sufficient examples, as against W.'s *danguy* and *dangaus* respectively.

II. W. has *y* where 1547 has *i*, e.g. *kayp*, *kaip*, *teyp*, *taip*.

III. W. has, however, dotted the first *e* of *Těwe*, although his copyists do not appear to have always seen it. It is interesting to note that 1579 has *Tiewe*, which is equivalent to *Těwe*, the scribal practice being in this case Polish and in the other Bohemian, so far as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are concerned. On this point, however, Lithuanian grammarians have a special theory of their own. It is also interesting to see that the 1579 Catechism has *dangui*, which contrasts with *đangusu* in 1547.

IV. Note that 1547 has *essi*, W. *esi*, when the *ss* is the German equivalent for the same sound for which *s* is the English and Letto-Slavonic scribal form.

V. 1547 *Schwęskiese*; 1579 *Schwenskisi*; W. *Szweskis*. Here the difference is that of East *versus* West, i.e. *Sch* is the German and *Sz* the Polish script for the same sound. But *ie* is the Polish and also the German expression for two kinds of *i* sounds. *e* is nasal in Polish fashion, *en* is the same otherwise expressed, or else the earlier non-nasal form. *e* and *i* as terminations are more difficult to reconcile, especially as W. has *Szweskis*, where the *e* is plain for the reason given above at I.

VI. Note that W. has (like modern Lithuanian) *o* for the *a* of 1547 in *tawo*, *tawa*. 1861 presents some interesting variations here and in the last petition. The difference between *pikto* and *pikta* is much more important than a mere scribal variant, for on it turns the question whether the translator thought the deliverance was to be from the Evil One or from evil.

VII. Now, in the third petition the order of the first part in 1579 agrees with that of W. as against 1547. The spelling of *wala* depends upon circumstances; if the printer have a hard 'l' in his fount, *l* will readily stand for soft *l*. If not, *l* must stand for hard 'l' and *li* may stand for soft *l*, though in W. *l* stands for soft *l* in spite of the fact that he has no hard 'l' in this Lithuanian

Lord's Prayer. For *a*, *o* see above, VI. 1579 agrees with W. in having *Buk* against *Buki* in 1547.

VIII. The differences in the rest of this petition are mostly dependent on principles explained above, but something remains over. It is simplest to take the later difficulty first, because Reinhold lays so much stress on it. This is the famous ghost-phrase *andziam es*. Let us note first that the printing of it in W. is hopelessly distorted, for the words meander up and down above and below the line anyhow, so that, although *es* is correctly aligned and also separate from *andziam*, there is nothing to prove that the manuscript from which the printer or Wilkins worked did not contain *and žiames*, which at once lightens our task; for this would agree with the reading *taip ir ant žėmes*, which occurs in the third edition of the Catechism (1700). The difference is almost purely scribal, though one might say that it was partly due to the dialect and the kind of transcription employed, but this need not trouble us here. Compare also V above. The typographical failure is common throughout these specimen pages of Wilkins (e.g. the M. alluded to above as at p. 435 [p. 2]), and one need not be surprised, for it is very small type, set on a bed of Procrustes, and must have been a source of great difficulty to the most skilled compositor. The same applies to the table illustrating these notes.

This would help to explain the difficulty in the previous part of the same petition, i.e., the compositor's eye ran on to the later *and* before *ziames*, and put one before *dangui*, a very easy mistake in all the circumstances, especially if the 'copy' were written by a Lithuanian.

IX. The contrast of *dona*, *donos*, is hardly to be explained by W.'s liking for *o*, as the *s* comes in and the form *dona* is supported by *dūna* in 1579. Yet this need not trouble us much, for Bezzenberger (according to Bechtel) heard seven or eight different pronunciations of this sound among the pupils of one school.

But W.'s *wisu dienu* is supported by *wissu dienu* (with variant *diena*) in 1579. The edition of 1700 has *dieniszka*. W. is further supported in having *dok mumus szedien* against the *dodi mumus nu* of 1547 by 1579, with its *dūdi mumus schę diena*, and 1700 (the Catechism) with its *dūk mums ir sze diena*.

X. The next case is very interesting. The example in II would prepare one for a very fine confusion in phonetics, and here we have it. The fifth petition in 1547 is "Ir atleid mumus musu

kaltibes, *kaip mes atleidem. musu kaltimus*"; in 1579, "*Ir atleid mumus musu kaltes kaip ir mes atleidzem* [variant, *atleidem*] *musu kaltiemus*"; in the Catechism of 1700, "*Atleisk mums musu kaltes, kaip mes atleidziam sawiemus kaltiemus.*" From these forms it is easy to justify W.'s "*Ir atlayisk mums musu kaltes kayp ir mes atlaydziam sawiemus kaltiemus,*" though W. is much earlier than the last quoted. In the detailed comparison which follows I only comment on cases where W. differs from 1547. Thus *atlayisk* in W. has a partial parallel in *atleisk* of 1700. For *e* = *ay* see further on, *atlaydziam*. W.'s *mums* is justified by the corresponding *mums* with *atleisk* in 1700, against the *mumus* and *atleid*, of the others. 1579 and 1700 support W.'s *kaltes* against the *kaltibes* of 1547. *Kayp*, see later, *atlaydziam*. W.'s *Ir mes* is supported by 1579 against the other two. "*Atlaydziam, atlayisk, kayp.*" The phonetic confusion signified by the examples under II has been already adverted to, but it is a useful solvent of difficulties here. In II the same text was inconsistent about *e*, *a*, and consistent about *i*, *y*. Although all the others are against W., one may take *ei* = *ay* as a safe though not certain equation. Thus Bretkun's Postilla of 1591 has *kaipo*, *keip*, *kaip* (p. 275, pt. 2, and p. 185 *apud* Bezzenberger with catechisms). Before dropping this point, it may not be inapt to make a quotation from Klein's "*Grammatica Lithuanica*" in Bezzenberger's "*Beiträge*," p. 3. Thus he says: "*Dicunt enim unt dungaus ir ziames bus zinklai pro ant dangaus ir zèmes bus zénklai; Ir tadu ifswis sunu žmogaus ataiunti debefy ſu galyby didžin ir Majestotu pro Ir tada ifswis Sunu žmogaus atenti debefy fu galybe dide ir Majestotu.*—Luc. 21³." According to the note³ referred to, this passage might seem to be taken from Szyrwid's *Punktay Sakimu*. At p. 5, "*Curoni dicunt Deewu Teewu pro Diewa, Tiewa.*" This is assigned to imitation of the *Latvisci seu Curetes*. The Lettish *ee* is generally regarded as akin to the Russian *ѣ*, I may add. The change of *a* and *o* is discussed as a dialectal peculiarity in these pages, besides reference being made to the fact that *ě* sometimes stands for *é*, while *ǣ* is equivalent in another form to *û*, and is variously represented by *a*, *o*.

There remains *-dziam*, for which the Catechism of 1700 is a parallel, and 1547 and 1579 too, if we remember the consideration noted at VIII relative to *ziames* = *zèmes*. Next, the usage *sawiemus* is supported by the Catechisms of 1700 and 1861, and partly (*sawo*) by the version of the Lord's Prayer given in Brand's "*Reysen*" (1702) against the others.

e = *ie* or *ĭ* has been already mentioned at III above.

XI. W.'s "Ir newesk musu ing pagúndynima" is partially supported by 1700, with its "Ne-dūk mus west y pikta pagundima," where the final *-a* is nasal as in 1861, though it is signified in a different way. In all cases the exceptional use of *ing* occurs, for, though *ingi* occurs in 1547, it does not make any difference. The alternative construction is to use the case ending with an *-n*.

XII. Here we have to consider the famous *giáf bekmus* passage, where 1547 has the correct forms "Bet gielbek mus nogi wysa pikta," while 1579 has "Bet gelb mus nūg pikta," and the catechism of 1700 has "Bet gelbek mus nū (wisso) pikto."

Here, 1579 gave rise to the error by 'gelb,' and the rest of the errors are accounted for on principles already stated, whether phonetic or typographic. Even the late copyist of 1715, "Chamberlaynius," has *gelbek*, from whom Fritz, "Sprachmeister," gets it according to Reinhold.

And here Wilkins and all up to and including Müller's "Ludeken" book of 1680 (which I have not seen) desert us with an 'Amen.'

But, as Reinhold says, in Vater's edition of Adelung's "Mithridates," vol. ii (Berlin, 1809), we have a Lord's Prayer quoted from the "Altorius Duchawnas" of 1802, which I have not been able to verify, nor have I seen Vater-Adelung. Except *ij* for *ii*, or *i* singly in one or two cases, there is no violent divergence from the texts discussed above, but he adds a doxology alleged to be taken from the text taken from the Lithuanian Bible, where his quoted words, as I think, forbid any idea that Vater made any pretence to have seen such Bible. The "Altorius Duchawnas" must have been compared by him with one of the above-named texts, whence the doxology came. The one he probably copied was Fritz's "Sprachmeister," of which he possessed one copy, at least so Reinhold states. There are some mistakes in copying too. Thus Fritz (with the *ij* restored to *i*) must have had "Nes tawo ira karaliste, ir galibe ir sslowe, ant amsziu." Reinhold says Fritz got this from Johannes Chamberlaynius (1715), who is quoted by Reinhold as having "Nes tawo ira karaliiste ir galiibe (ir macis) ir szlowe (or rather sslowe) ant Amziu. Amen."

According to Reinhold the origin of this doxology is unknown; we have not explained everything till we have discovered the origin of the doxology too.

In the preface to "Chamberlaynius" (1715) it is said that the

Lithuanian and Verulian Lord's Prayer are from W. Lazius, "De migrationibus gentium," where the Livonian but not the Lithuanian occur. Another book quoted for Lettish is "Brandtii Itinerarium," which I found after some trouble, and in it the Lithuanian, Lettish, and other versions of the Lord's Prayer and other formularies as specimens of the languages. Brand's form of the Lord's Prayer will be found between Wilkins and the "Oratio Dominica" of 1700, and that of Chamberlaynius of 1715 in the table. It will further be found to contain a doxology, as does the much earlier Catechism of the Dissidents of 1680.

In this last one may notice *kursai*, for which compare *kursai* in 1715, and I have found in the Bible of 1660 (?) the word *kursey* and elsewhere *kaypo*. (I have not succeeded in finding Kunik's study of the phonetics of this Bible yet, or I could probably give much more numerous parallels than I have collected for myself in scanty leisure.) Compare also W.'s *kursey* and *esi* here as in W. Then we find *danguja*, for which compare the apostrophe and the third clause (as elided) of 1715.

The first petition in 1680 does not differ substantially from the wording of W., "Oratio Dominica πολυγλωττος," and 1861. Yet three of the *a*'s have dots over them, for which we have already quoted Klein.

The next clause agrees with W., "Oratio Dominica," 1700, and 1861 as against the others in having *y* for *i* in *ateyk*, otherwise resembling the later forms. Yet 1680 has a turned comma over each *a* in *karaliste*.

In the third petition note how interestingly 1680 agrees with and differs from earlier and later forms, incidentally using the Bible (1660 ?) form of *teyp* as correlative to *kayp*. Note also that the order follows Willent and agrees with 1861. The same sort of fact meets us in the next petition. In the next clause are some new appearances of *y*, and, what is of great interest, the word *sawiemus*, which only occurs before in W. In the next clause the absence of *ir* is all that we need notice. In the last petition we have the well-marked type and what may well account for 'giaf bekmus,' namely, 'giafbek mus' with the hard 'f.'

But the best of all is that it is one of the five versions that possess the doxology or ἐκφώνησις at the end, which has crept into the Textus receptus out of the liturgies and got inserted in the Scotch Prayer Book of 1637 and the English of 1662, while in the seventeenth century it became the Continental way of distinguishing

Protestants from others, because they alone added it, though the Roman rite, while rigidly and rightly rejecting it at the end of the Lord's Prayer, where it takes up the "*Libera nos a malo*" and proceeds to expand it (as St. Francis did), actually puts in words to the same effect at the end of the expansion.

Note that the form in 1680 only differs from that in 1861 in lengthening the *a* in *ira* and the other as in *káráliste*, *dnt*, and *amžiu*. The *ir macis* of the other two forms is hard to explain, unless it be because the word it follows applies properly to physical strength only, and is therefore theologically indefensible.

It is interesting to see how "Chamberlaynius" has changed it, and in fact the double *i* (to represent *y* in modern spelling) led one later copyist to print umlaut *ü*!

Further, at pp. 19, 20 of the 1700 edition of Luther's "Kleiner Catechismus" in Lithuanian, we have a version of the Lord's Prayer with *doxology*. The version of 1547 reprinted by Bezzenberger had none, even in the two versified expansions (pp. 21 sq.), the first of which, however, has "*ant amssiu amssia*" at the end. At p. 36 of the same book is "*ant amssinoiu amssiu*." The edition of 1579 is also without a doxology. The 1700 edition has "*Nesa tawa yra karalyste. stiprybe. macis ir garbe nūgamžiu ikki amžiu amžinuju. Amen.*" Here *nūgamžiu* in one word is a misprint for the two words *nūg amžiu*. Here "Chamberlaynius" and the Catechism of 1700 agree in the first four words except for slight variants. Afterwards it is hard to identify, for the high emphasis of the one ending contrasts with the simplicity of the other, which recalls the Polish *na wieki* of the Roman Catholic version as printed in the New Testament of 1890.

Certain features of the text of the 1700 edition of the Catechism suggest misprints, as will be seen later.

One may translate this doxology thus: "For thine is the kingdom, the power, the strength, and the glory from everlasting to eternal everlasting. Amen."

The one in 1715 may be translated thus: "For thine is the kingdom and the power (and the strength) and the glory for ever. Amen."

Taking the words in detail we find the following facts: *Nes* and *nesa* are parallel forms of equal value in neo-Lithuanian. *Yra* is a more consistent way of writing the word *yra* with a long *i*, for which *y* stands in the best modern orthography. This applies to *stiprybe*, *karalyste* as well.

1715, it may be noticed, adds *ir* for *and* where the 1700 Catechism has none, and also places *ir macis* in parentheses. *Stiprybe* and *garbe* are used as synonyms of *galybe* and *szlowe*.

The trouble, as aforesaid, arises from the ending. *Ant amžiu*, in fact, exactly corresponds to the Polish *na wieki* (and to the early instance of *ant amsiu* cited above), while the other is more like our own 'for ever and ever' (and the longer form from the early paraphrase cited above).

Nūg = modern *nuo*, 'from.'

amžiu = genitive of the word 'eternity.'

ikki is a preposition = 'till.'

amžinuju is the genitive of the adjective 'everlasting,' with the second *amžiu*. So we reach Amen, or Omen, as in Brand, who, it may be noted, has the vocative address to the Deity in this doxology, viz. *Pone*.

Putting aside Adelung-Vater's remarks, it is at least remarkable that the 1700 edition of the Catechism is one of the first with a doxology, and that Chamberlaynius in 1715 also produces one. His indication of a source is also unluckily unsatisfactory. If one could see the "*Altorius Duchawnas*" and the manuscripts on which the works of Chamberlaynius and Adelung-Vater were based, one could be absolutely sure.

Meantime one may assume as a working hypothesis at present as to the doxology, that the author of '1715' got his form of it from the "*Kleiner Catechismus*" of 1700 indirectly through a friend, who made such alterations as are not mere copyists' vagaries. Fifteen years is at least ample time. The copyist must, I think, have been influenced by the Dissidents' Catechism of 1680.

As to the main matter, I think it may be taken as proved that the main part of the Lord's Prayer is, directly or indirectly, as we get it in W. in 1668, from Luther's "*Kleiner Catechismus*" in Mażwyd's Lithuanian translation of 1547. There is, I conceive, no doubt that the person responsible for W., as he adopted some of its variants, must have known of the version of 1579 by Willent.

It is certainly not proved, though barely possible, that Chyliński, the self-styled translator of the Bible of 1660 (?), had a hand in the copying or even adapted the Lord's Prayer to the dialect he spoke and wrote.

Finally, as is made clear above, no proof exists in the matter of the doxology, whose history, apart from this question of the Lithuanian version, is not a little obscure. I think it is quite

clear, however, that it has nothing whatever to do with the Bible in Lithuanian.

Still, it is at least interesting to put down the dates of its appearance in order—

1680. Catechism of the Dissidents.

1700. Luther (M.). Der Kleine Catechismus, Deutsch, Polnisch, Litauisch, etc.

1702. Brand (Adam). Reysen, etc.

1715. Chamberlaynius (Johannes), i.e. Oratio Dominica in diversas . . . linguas versa . . . Editore J. Chamberlaynio.

1861. Katechizmus. Ev. Ref.

Moreover, extremely early materials exist for its ending in a similar connection.

The table in front of you has nine columns, containing respectively the following items:—The Latin form of the Lord's Prayer from the Sermon on the Mount, from the Clementine Vulgate (Bagster), supplemented by the doxology taken from the Preces of St. Paul's School. Next the form from Bezzenberger's reprint of Mażwyd's version of Luther's Catechism, 1547. After this comes the form picked out of Willent's version of the same, 1579. (Willent was, by the way, a cousin of Mażwyd's.) Next comes the Catechism of the Dissidents, printed at Königsberg in 1680. Next came Luther's Catechism of 1700. Next comes Wilkins, 1668, combined with Oratio Dominica πολυγλωττος of 1700. Then comes the form from Brand's Reysen of 1702. Next Chamberlaynius in 1715. Next (1861) comes the Catechism of the Evangelic Reformed Church.

POSTSCRIPT.

It has been suggested that as I have written my paper I have plunged too much *in medias res*, and that I should point out the bearing of the problem before us from a literary point of view.

Our data are, then—(1) A tradition of varying content that a Bible translated into Lithuanian and printed before that by Quandt existed, i.e. that of 1662, to which Quandt himself refers and accompanies the reference by selections. (I might add that Quandt refers, also in the preface, to the Catechism of 1547 and two "Old Prussian" ones in 1545, besides Bretke's Bible and a New Testament of 1701.)

(2) That this bore interestingly on the history of England, Poland, Russia, and Sweden.

(3) A vague quotation is given as authority for certain versions of the Lord's Prayer, which are attributed to the Bible of 1662.

(4) One Chyliński came to England to translate or rather revise a translation of the Bible into Lithuanian for the Königsberg Synod, and he is sometimes supposed to have translated the Lord's Prayer.

On these points I may comment as follows: (1) Tradition of varying content is a *μειωσις* for the following state of affairs: A stoutly believes in the Bible. B denies its existence *in toto*. C says he believes in it for quite different reasons from those of A and for a different date. So also others. As to this Mr. Steele has now proved that such a Bible was (in part at least) produced, and has given us figures whence we can calculate the whole issue. (Mr. Steele's article is on pp. 57-62 of vol. viii, new series of The Library, and my deductions at the end of this postscript.) The date is also practically fixed by the same means; but all this belongs to the intricate bibliography of the whole matter, into which I am deliberately not going in the present instance.

(2) It will be found from the dates of Mr. Steele's interesting discoveries (by which, indeed, I was put on the track of the whole question) that the patronage of the British Government for the time being was assured to the enterprise of translation (if it can be called so) within a period roughly corresponding to the years 1658-62. Now this is to say that Charles II. on the Restoration publicly continued a policy of Oliver Cromwell's which the anti-Cromwellian Presbyterians had also continued, a very shrewd stroke of policy on his and their part. (It may be noted that the tacit restoration of Episcopacy and the failure of Ussher's 'new model' nearly coincide with the end of our period.)

To this there is an interesting historical pendant. During the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell the then Warden of Wadham College, Oxford, was ejected by the Parliamentary Commissioners and Warden Wilkins intruded in his place; and the intruder was a splendid success, as witness his patronage of Wren and the brilliant company of what was to be the Royal Society, and the uncompromisingly Royalist Cambridge Professor of Astronomy, who found a haven of rest at Wadham (like many others of his party) in Wilkins's time. Now Wilkins got leave to marry, which was barred by college statute, and about this there is a pretty

legend. Further, non-residence was statute-barred, and he got leave to absent himself while in attendance as chaplain on the late king's exiled brother-in-law, Frederick, of the Palatinate and Bohemia. After Oliver Cromwell's death he was made Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, from which, however, he was shortly expelled, at the Restoration. Very soon after this he was made Bishop of Chester, and held that office from 1668 to 1673, when he was succeeded by Pearson, the expositor of the Creed.

The political situation is at least sufficiently mixed here, and Wilkins's interest in Letto-Slavonic studies appears in the paper.

The version of the Bible was commended to English purses because of the devastating effect of the warfare of Muscovy, Poland, and Sweden, which was only ended by the Treaty of Oliva at Dantzic, the Westphalian Treaty of the Northern Powers, in regard to which England and France shared the honourable office of peacemakers.

(3) The quotation for the Lord's Prayer is the theme of the paper. I might add that I have felt, in common with almost all who have dealt with this matter, the hypnotic effect of the method of quotation of the Lord's Prayer. So much was this the case that it was only three or four weeks before the reading of my paper that I looked up Quandt's version and others, on which I have something to say below.

(4) On Chyliński I have said my say in the paper, and I think I have now said enough to show the great general interest of the subject.

In passing to the other versions which I desire to discuss, I am anxious to point out one feature of the table already given, viz., that the seventh clause in 1579 contains the word *nūg*, where the *ū* is a script form whose first appearance is credited by Nesselmann to the middle of the eighteenth century, though we have four examples in this table alone before 1703. (I may perhaps travel still further from the point by quoting Nesselmann's etymologizing over *karálus*, which he derives from Lithuanian *káras*, while he has parallel neighbouring forms like Polish *król*, Magyar *király*, and Russian *королю* before him.)

This same table was described at p. 199, and to this I would add the information applicable to the table on p. 202. The four columns before us are taken from the following three books.

- (1) "Biblia, tai efi Wiffas Szwentas Ráfstas," etc. Karaláuczuje, 1755; 8vo. [A reprint of Quandt's first edition of 1735.]

- (2) "Biblia, tai esti: Wiffas Szwentas Ráfztas," etc. [Edited, with additions, by L. J. Rhesa.] Karaláučiuje, 1816; 8vo.

In my table I have combined these two, merely noting the differences in Rhesa's edition.

- (3) "Naujas Istatimas Jezaus Christaus Wieszpatices Musu Lietuwiszku Ležuwiu Iszgulditas par Jozapa Arnulpa Kunigayksztį Giedrayti Wiskupa Žiemayciu, Ženklinika S. Stanislowo." [For the use of the Roman Catholics. From the Vulgate.] Wilniuje, 1816; 4to.

QUANDT, 1755, AND RHESA, MATT. VI, 9 SQ.	QUANDT, 1755, LUKE II, 2 SQ.	GIEDRAÝTIS, R.C. BISHOP OF SAMOGITIA: DIALECT VERSION OF N.T. FROM THE VULGATE, 1816. MATT. VI, 9, ETC. LUKE II, 2 SQ.	
Tėwe musū, kurris essi danguje. Buk [te essie] szwen- czamas tawa wardas. Ateik [te ateine] tawo karalyste. Buk [tenussidūde] tawo walle kaip danguje, taip ir ant žemės. Dūnā musū dieniskā dūk mum's ir sze dienā. Ir atleisk mum's musū kaltes, kaip mes atlei- dzam sawo kaltiemus. Ir ne wesk mus i pa- gundimā. Bet gėlbėk mus nū pikto. Nėsa tawo yra karalyste, ir macis, ir garbė ikki amžū. Amen.	Tėwe mufū dangujėfis. Buk [teeffie] szewn- czamastawo wardas. Ateik [te ateine] tawo karalyste. Buk [tenuffidūde] tawo wale, ant žemės, kaip danguj? Dūk mums mufū die- niškā dūnā wiffados. Ir atleik mums mufū griekus, nės ir mes atlėidzam wiffiems sawo kaltiems. Ir ne wesk mus i pa- gundimā, bet ifsgėl- bėk mus nū pikto. (Amen.) No doxology. Rhesa has [te ateina] and [te nuffidūda], but does not differ other- wise.	Tewe musu, kursay esi danguose: Szwenskiwardas tawo. Ateyk karaliste tawo. Buk wala tawo kayp danguy teyp ir ant ziames. Duonos musu wisu dienu duok mums szendiena. Ir atlayisk mums kaltes musu, kaypo ir mės atlaydziam sawiemis kaltiemis. Ir ne wesk mus ing pagundinima, bet gialbek mus nuog pikto. Amen.	Tewe, szwenski wardas tawo. Ateyk karaliste tawo. Duonos musu wisu dienu, duok mums szėdiena. Ir atlayisk mums nusidejmus musu. Nes ir mes atlaydziam kiekwienam mums kaltam. Ir newesk mus ing pagundinima.

As to the table, note that the words in [ ] are additions imported from notes. Note that Quandt and Rhesa have no doxology in Luke ii, and the Bishop of Samogitia has none at all.

Notice how close the doxology of Quandt-Rhesa is to the form in the Luther Catechism of 1700. As a matter of fact, a comparison of the two versions clause by clause would show how remarkable

is the resemblance throughout. Notice the modern tendency to sprinkle 'and's' about.

Note further that Quandt-Rhesa has *sawo* in the fifth clause, like the Dissidents of 1680.

Note Rhesa's slight difference in col. 2, and compare p. 194 of my paper above for the point as to the spelling *e* or *a*.

What is, however, most remarkable is the fact that the Roman Catholic Bishop, working to counteract Protestantism (Lutheran in the main) and translating from the Vulgate, shows such a striking resemblance in his version of both passages to the form of the Dissidents of 1680, and, in contrast with Quandt (who resembles Brandt with his *sawo kaltiemus*), is like those versions of the fifth clause which read *sawiemus kaltiemus*, viz., Wilkins (1668), the Dissidents (1680), Luther, Catechism III, and "Oratio Dominica πολυγλωττος" (1700), Chamberlaynius (1715), and the Calvinist Catechism of 1861.

It must further be most forcibly remarked that Bishop Giedraýtis agrees in both his versions of the sixth petition with Wilkins and "Oratio Dominica," 1700, in reading *pagundinima*. I except the question of *i* or *y*, on which see above, p. 197, the last paragraph.

As to my remarks on p. 189, I learn that I am ambiguous; the correction by Dr. Neubauer (who was not a Lithuanian scholar) was a bibliographical one.

I may perhaps add that the 1680 Catechism in the copy which I have seen contains a vocabulary made by an early owner in the seventeenth century, I believe, who arranged it in alphabetical order and inserted it at the beginning of the book, with a note that it is in "the Livonian Language." This note he has subsequently corrected by drawing his pencil through "Livonian" and pencilling above it "Lithuanian." I tried to connect this with the Chamberlaynius of 1715, but failed, as the writing is not that of Chamberlain, and Wilkins (who died in 1673) is out of the question. I have not, however, given up the attempt to trace it.

I would suggest, in conclusion, that anyone who desires to check my theories and get an idea of the chronological order of events should adopt the following plan.

Remember that the first table has nine columns and the second has four, and mentally number them one to thirteen. The actual chronological order will then be : 1, 2, 3, 6, 4, $\left. \begin{smallmatrix} 5 \\ 6 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$, 7, 8, 10 (11), 12 (13), 9. Of course, had I had all these forms before me at once,

I should have set the thing out in proper order; as it is, I got at them in three instalments.

I think it safe to affirm that the set form of the Lord's Prayer in Lithuanian was set down and thus permanently established in the sixteenth century in the same way that the English version (of far greater antiquity) was fixed by the Authorized Version of the Bible and the Prayer Book and Primer before that. It is very possible that the form is older than 1547, as the Church in far pre-Reformation days certainly did ordain the teaching of the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Creed in the vulgar tongue. This is, of course, the matter of the Primer.

Mr. Steele's figures: 42 reams printed, 158 unprinted. A ream has 516 sheets, i.e. 42×516 sheets were printed = 21,672. pp. 1-176 (= to Joshua xv, 63) = 11 sheets. The longest known copy goes to Psalm xl (p. 416). 416 pp. = 26 sheets. The proportion between the two parts of the Bible concerned is as 11 sheets to 26. The fullest form took 26 sheets, and therefore at least $\frac{21672}{26}$ copies were printed and returned to the Synod, i.e. *c.* 833-4 copies. Only three copies are known, and the longest of these does not exceed 26 sheets. It is obvious that the printing was broken off in the middle; for the reason see Mr. Steele's article.

March 28 - April 1, 1909.