MAGDALENA CHARZYŃSKA-WÓJCIK
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
magdalena.charzynska-wojcik@kul.pl

FAMILIARITY AND FAVOUR: TOWARDS ASSESSING PSALM TRANSLATIONS *

It is the objective of this paper to analyse selected English Renaissance translations of the Book of Psalms in the light of their reception. In particular, I intend to illustrate how a strong preference for a familiar rendition over a new one (regardless of its quality and status) showed itself in the textual composition of the most important book of the Anglican Church – the Book of Common Prayer. Discussion of the Psalm translation selected for the five successive versions of the Book of Common Prayer against the backdrop of the emergence of new renditions of the Psalms leads on to formulating a desideratum for sound methodology which would express the level of similarities between texts in mathematical terms and in this way objectivise assessments of Psalter renditions. The paper offers a preliminary attempt at such methodology by applying the cosine distance method. The obtained results need to be verified on a larger corpus of data, but they are promising enough to consider this method an important step towards assessing Psalm translations.

Keywords: *Psalter translations, Book of Common Prayer, Renaissance, text comparison, cosine distance*

1. Introduction

Due to the special position of the Psalter in Christian spirituality, psalms have been translated more times than any other book of the Bible. The Psalter has been produced in a staggering multitude of copies both in the manuscript period and in the culture of print. However, the number of translations and the multitude of copies invites the question what determined which rendition(s) enjoyed greatest popularity. There are many ways in which translations can be assessed but in the case of vernacular renditions of the psalms one rather unexpected parameter seems to overshadow others. As psalms tended to be committed to memory (as a monastic injunction or a side-effect of frequent repetition), they colonised the hearts of those who relied on them in daily prayers. This is why in the case of psalms it seems that a favoured rendition is the one which is familiar, which – inevitably with time – becomes "better" because of being better loved. This is naturally an oversimplification, as an exception-less application of this proclivity would hinder the emergence of new renditions (apart from some purely pragmatic contexts). However, given linguistic equi-functionality of coexisting Psalter renditions, it is very likely that a new translation which is more accurate and closer to the original will not replace an older familiar form even if the new text overshadows the old one in scholarly terms.

A very early instance of this phenomenon is illustrated by the lack of popularity enjoyed by Jerome's *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* – a text he translated to Latin directly from the (pre-Masoretic) Hebrew Psalter, i.e. without the intermediary of the Septuagint (a Greek translation from the original Hebrew).[1] In effect, Jerome's *Hebraicum*, also known as Jerome's Hebrew Psalter, was only one step removed from the source text, i.e. as close as one can get to the original in translating. In contrast, the Latin Psalters available in the 4th-century prior to the emergence of the *Hebraicum* were two steps removed from the source, representing Latin renditions of the Greek translation (Septuagint) of the Hebrew source. The *Romanum* was a product of comparison of the varying manuscripts of the Latin Psalter which were in circulation at that time. The *Gallicanum* was a recension of the Latin version of the Psalter against Origen's Hexapla, which helped Jerome to establish the best Latin readings due to a comparison with as many as four Greek translations of the Hebrew Psalter.

In spite of the clear superiority of the *Hebraicum* over the *Romanum* or the *Gallicanum*, it never enjoyed any of the popularity and status accorded to the

---

[1] The task was all the more difficult because Jerome's was the first direct translation from Hebrew into Latin (Sutcliffe 1969: 91). In effect, there were no dictionaries, no concordances, and no grammars to assist the translator.

latter two.[2] As all three translations emerged at around the same time, being executed in the last quarter of the 4th century CE, the date of their emergence was not an important factor as far as their different reception history is concerned. It has to be noted, however, that neither the *Romanum* nor the *Gallicanum* was immediately embraced: in the 5th and 6th centuries they circulated side by side with the Old Latin text (Ewert and Metzger 1996: 1126). With time they ousted the Old Latin text, finding preference in different geographical locations[3] originally signified by the names associated with them. The *Gallicanum* prevailed to ultimately become the Psalter of the Vulgate.[4] It is worth emphasising at this point that the relative obscurity of the *Hebraicum* does not stem from the fact that it was unknown, or that its text was unavailable. Jerome's Hebrew Psalter was simply not embraced the way the other two texts were.

To illustrate the phenomenon of different reception of Psalter renditions coexisting in one geographical area, let me present the situation that obtained in Anglo-Saxon England, where all three versions of the Psalter were available but only the *Romanum* and the *Gallicanum* were used liturgically and enjoyed popularity, as evidenced by the extant Psalter manuscripts. "[I]n the wake of the Benedictine reform with its close contacts with continental reformed monasteries" (Gretsch 1999/2004: 23), the *Gallicanum* established itself in England displacing the *Romanum* in liturgical uses. One could call this a reasonable replacement: a more accurate text substituted a less accurate one. It is interesting, however, that given a comparison of the three Psalter versions and in view of the documented availability of all versions of the Psalter in England, it was the second best that was selected, not the most accurate one. True, the Benedictine reform clearly pointed at the *Gallicanum*, but the question remains why the *Gallicanum* was the preferred choice over the *Hebraicum*.

Observe that the *Romanum* and the *Gallicanum* represented the same textual tradition, both offering a Latin text translated via Greek from the original Hebrew, so the two texts were very close to each other. They were also both very close to the Old Latin versions which they ultimately replaced. It can be said that for a person familiar with the *Romanum*, the *Gallicanum* did not sound like

---

[2] Both the confines of this paper and its objectives preclude a more in-depth discussion of the status of the *Hebraicum* as circumventing the Septuagint, its presence in pandects and its total absence from the liturgy (cf. for example Keefer and Burrows 1990: 67). For the same reasons I do not discuss the authorship of the recension known as the *Romanum*.

[3] See e.g. Barrows (1867), Harden (1922), Steinmueller (1938), Loewe (1969), Sutcliffe (1969), Chupungco (1997), and Pratt (2007). For a brief overview of the chronological developments in this respect, see Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013: 10–14).

[4] The term *Vulgate* has had a wide variety of denotations over time (cf. Linde 2011). I use it here to refer to the Bible codified in 1546 during the Council of Trent, when the Church took a stand on the official version of the Bible and canonised both its contents and particular textual versions of the biblical books to be included in it. For more on that see Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).

a very different text.[5] In effect, the replacement of the *Romanum* by the *Gallicanum* did not spur controversy, though – as can be expected – it did produce some inevitable textual contamination (Hargreaves 1965: 133), precisely because of this similarity. In contrast, the *Hebraicum* offered a significantly different text – better in scholarly terms but unfamiliar, so not "better loved".

It is in this light that I am going to analyse selected English Renaissance translations of the Book of Psalms, i.e. from the perspective of their reception. In particular, I intend to illustrate how this strong preference for a familiar text of the psalms over a new rendition (regardless of its quality and status) showed itself in the textual composition of the most important book of the Anglican Church – the Book of Common Prayer. In order to fully appreciate the selection of a given rendition to be used in the Book of Common Prayer and reaffirmed in all successive versions of its text, it is necessary to properly assess the status enjoyed by the Book of Common Prayer. This will be done in Section 2, which offers a very general background on prayer books in (2.1) and the history of the Book of Common Prayer (2.2), with each of its versions discussed in a separate subsection (2.2.2–2.2.6). Discussion of the five successive versions of the Book of Common Prayer will be preceded with the discussion of the Primer of Henry VIII (2.2.1) to show the relationship of Psalms used in this publication to the Psalms used in the actual Book of Common Prayer, which came out four years later in 1549. Psalm renditions included in Henry VIII's Primer and in each of the five versions of the Book of Common Prayer will be illustrated with the text of Psalm 8 to make the discussion less abstract. To facilitate comparison between the different versions of Psalm 8 mentioned above and all other Psalter translations discussed in this paper, I juxtapose them in a table and present in the Appendix. Section 3 will offer interim conclusions referring to the first part of the title, i.e. how familiarity brings favour to particular Psalter renditions. Section 4 undertakes some lingering issues which lead on to articulating a desideratum for sound methodology for assessing similarities between texts, as signalled in the second part of the title. A preliminary attempt at proposing such methodology is offered in Section 5, while conclusions are articulated in Section 6.

---

[5] To illustrate the degree of similarity, let me quote Gretsch (1999/2004: 25), who observes that "an interlinear Old English gloss, originally designed for a *Romanum* text, could be copied into a *Gallicanum* psalter without causing major difficulties".

2. The Book of Common Prayer

2.1. The Prelude

The Book of Common Prayer is a multilayered and multifaceted phenomenon whose importance, popularity, and complexity can only be measured by the number of debates it spurred, the plethora of printed copies of its subsequent revisions,[6] and the amount of research devoted to it. Its significance extends far beyond the political, ecclesiastical, confessional, theological, and liturgical areas, stretching onto the devotional and educational levels, scoring no lower on the textual and linguistic planes. It is clearly beyond the scope of this paper to even attempt at an exhaustive overview of the history of the Book of Common Prayer[7] but it is nonetheless necessary to begin with a brief presentation of the most important points associated with it.

Although the official life of the Book of Common Prayer begins in 1549, its origins are to be sought much earlier, both functionally and textually. To properly assess its genuine raison d'être, we must approach it from the perspective of the basic human need to search help in communicating with the deity: both in articulating praise and intercessory prayer. This need has found various forms of expression in various religions, most of which have been (to some extent at least) ritualised and crystallised textually. Naturally, early devotional patterns of Christianity did draw from Judaism, with Christians at the same time distancing themselves from their Judaistic roots. The continuity applies especially to the place of the Psalter, which, as observed by Anlezark (2017: 198) "passed seamlessly into the life of the early Christian Church". In a similar fashion,[8] Protestantism in its English variant – Anglicanism – drew heavily on the devotional foundations of Christianity, whose direct liturgical legacy was revealed in the religious practices of the Church of Rome, from which Protestants searched definitive and clear-cut separation.

---

[6] As observed by Keane (2020: 5) on the authority of Cummings (2002) and Swift (2013), it is estimated that in the first 96 first years of its existence (i.e. between 1549 and 1645) the book was printed in about a million copies and, as noted by Green (2002: 277), "[n]o other version of prayer came near to having the same degree of penetration in the country at large, and among Protestants of all levels".

[7] Comprehensive information concerning the Book of Common Prayer can be found e.g. in Procter (1855), Procter and Frere (1901), Hole (1900), Cuming (1969/1982), Jacobs (2013), to mention but a few of the hundreds of publications devoted to it. For a comparison of the texts of three versions of the Book of Common Prayer, see Cummings (2011), who juxtaposes the versions from 1549, 1559, and 1662.

[8] I am not making any theological claims here, merely pointing to a historical similarity.

2.2. The history of the Book of Common Prayer

The most acute way in which Reformation affected the lives of ordinary people was the impact it had on the liturgy. As observed by Dyer, Levy and Conomos (2018: 23),[9] it "introduced to western Christendom a seismic fragmentation of liturgical practice". While continental reformers generally agreed that the service must be comprehensible for the congregation, i.e. in the vernacular, they fell into two major groups with respect to their approach to the mass: (i) the radical approach (represented by Calvin and Zwingli) deemed it necessary to remove the existing liturgy completely and build up a new form regulating communal worship: a preaching service;[10] (ii) the middle way represented by Luther and his followers chose to adapt the existing liturgy by purging it of elements which they found theologically unacceptable.[11] Regardless of the method, the resulting liturgy was simplified with the view to returning to its biblical and early Christian roots (not that much is known about that).

It is interesting to see where England belonged in this respect. Henry VIII – though generally associated with religious reform – earned this reputation mainly by his breach with Rome. In fact, he was conservative in matters of faith, though his "attitudes to purgatory, to pilgrimage, to the intercession of saints, and to the monasteries were nonetheless a significant departure from straightforwardly orthodox catholicism" (Bernard 2016: 201). It can be said that after the Act of Supremacy (1534), by which he declared himself head of the Church of England, Henry VIII's religious views were characterised by lack of consistency, both synchronically (with internal contradictions) and diachronically (as some of his new injunctions contradicted previous

---

[9] The paper is authored by Dyer, Levy and Conomos (2018) but the passages referred to in this paper all come from the part "Reformation and post-Reformation Liturgical Books" (pp. 23–35), which is marked as Joseph Dyer's contribution.

[10] Calvinists and Zwinglians did away with all traditional chants and polyphonies, replacing them with metrical psalmody – aesthetically a poor substitute for what was lost. Existing organs were destroyed and removed (Dyer, Levy and Conomos 2018). In this context, see also Whiting (2010: xvii) for a discussion on the function and placement of the organs in the pre-Reformation parish churches in England, their modified but largely continued use in the 16th century and "a drastic decline in their purchase and a widespread (though largely unauthorized) movement for their removal and destruction" (Whiting 2010: 180). Importantly, in areas less prone to radical and puritan forms of protestant piety, some pre-Reformation organs did survive (Whiting 2010: 169). As transpires from the extant documents, in Henrician England organ players continued to be hired. Then, Edward VI's rule (Whiting 2010: 168) wrought havoc to them, as evidenced by organ repairs in the reign of Mary I. However, the final blow to the church organs was dealt in the Commonwealth period, when in 1644 a parliamentary order was issued for the removal and destruction of all of them (Whiting 2010: 167).

[11] In effect, Luther's church retained some Latin, especially in the form polyphonies set to traditional Latin texts wherever choirs were available.

ones).[12] With respect to the liturgy, however, his approach was conservative enough not to fit into type (ii) mentioned above. It constituted a type of its own. However, it is under Henry's rule that the Book of Common Prayer, for all its conceptual and functional universality, actually originates, even though its first version was issued after his death.[13] The credit associated with the emergence of the Book of Common Prayer lies with the Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer. The first of his attempts saw light in 1538, when Cranmer prepared a first draft of an English liturgy. That work, as observed by Jacobs (2013: 2), was not received well by the few who saw it. The next step was Cranmer's 1544 Litany, and then came Henry's first personal contribution – an authorised Primer of 1545.

Primers, i.e. books of private devotions intended for the laity have a long and complicated history, predating Henry VIII's authorised Primer by hundreds of years (prayer books designed for laity began to appear in the thirteenth century; Kennedy 2014: 693). While this history cannot be tackled within the confines of this paper, an issue that needs to be addressed here is the place of psalms in books of personal devotions. These devotions were largely modelled on: (i) monastic services, which consisted of eight daily offices (Matins, Lauds, Vespers, Terce, Sext, None, Prime, Compline) and a mass; and (ii) services of the secular clergy. The latter tended to group their daily devotions into Matins and Evensong. Monastic *horarium* involved a weekly recitation of the whole Psalter. As noted by Cuming (1969/1982: 8), "[i]t was these services, especially the later accretions, which provided the laity with their chief help to devotion, the Primer, or Book of Hours [...]. Primers abounded in the later Middle Ages, first in manuscript, then in print, in which form they ran into many editions. There was no standardized content: some were in Latin, some in English, some in both languages." One thing, however, remained stable: their reliance on a selection of psalms, whether in Latin or in the vernacular (or both).

2.2.1. Henry VIII's primer (1545)

Butterworth (1953: vii) claims that Henry's primer was "a direct forerunner of the Book of Common Prayer", though Jacobs (2013: 12) is sceptical about Henry's contribution, describing the king's involvement in the whole project as

---

[12] Of particular interest here is Henry VIII's attitude to the Bible in English. In 1535 William Tyndale – an unrivalled translator of the Bible – was arrested and a year later executed for heresy by strangulation at the stake on the orders of Henry VIII. Henry's royal injunctions issued in 1538 required that 1539 Bible (based largely on Tyndale's translation) be purchased and made available in every English church (cf. Section 2.2.2). In 1543 Henry changed his views again and his Parliament passed the Act for the Advancement of the True Religion, which severely restricted lay reading of the Bible (cf. Daniell 2003: 228–229, Ferrell 2015/2018: 263).

[13] For the details of the conceptual and practical foundations of the Book of Common Prayer, see Jacobs (2013).

"a slow drift toward the Reformers, but that is the most that can be said". At first glance, Henry's compilation structurally adheres to the Sarum rite[14] (to which Henry added Cranmer's 1544 Litany *verbatim*), though there are some marked departures. A more detailed examination (Butterworth 1953) suggests that Henry's Primer was much more than a continuation of the Book of Hours. The Primer was clearly an attempt at unification of the forms of prayer which would be available (also in the linguistic sense) to all people in his realm. In an injunction printed together with the Primer, Henry VIII makes several important points. The ones most pertinent to this paper concern: (i) the importance of the vernacular, (ii) uniformity, and (iii) universality. Here come the relevant excerpts:[15]

(i)
oure people and subiectes whych haue no vnderstanding in the Latin tong and yet haue the knowledge of readyng, may praye in theyr vulgar tong, which is to them best knowne

(ii)
a. auoyding of the diuersitte of primer bokes that ar now abrod
b. and to haue one vniforme ordre ofal such bokes throughout al our dominions

(iii)
to be frequented and vsed in and throughout all places of oure said realmes and dominions, aswell of the elder people, as also of the youth, for their common and ordinari praiers

   In Henry VIII's lifetime (he died on January 28, 1547) the Primer went through ten editions in English, one in Latin, and two bilingual English-Latin editions (Butterworth 1953: 256). This is a remarkable achievement since the 13 editions came out in 20 months, with the first edition of Henry's Primer printed on May 29, 1545.
   Let me illustrate this Primer's psalm translation with the text of Psalm 8 (cf. (1) in the Appendix). As signalled in the Introduction, we will look at Psalm 8 in examining successive versions of the Book of Common Prayer and other

---

[14] Liturgical books possessed by late medieval English clergy (the Missal, the Breviary, the Manual, the Pontifical, and the Processional) varied according to local usage, as noted by Cuming (1969/1982: 13), with the Sarum rite (associated with Salisbury) clearly predominating, the York rite a distant second, and the Hereford rite represented only very scarcely. So, in the wake of the Reformation the liturgical books for the clergy were to a great extent based on the same rite – the Sarum – although this was by no means a general rule.

[15] The excerpts represent my own transcripts of the second edition of the Primer, which came out of Richard Grafton's printing house in London in 1545. All abbreviations have been expanded silently.

Psalm publications discussed here with reference to it.[16] The text in itself is not a new translation, as shown in (2) in the Appendix, where I quote Psalm 8 from a 1538 Primer for comparison. This corroborates Butterworth's (1953: 261) observation that the psalms in Henry VIII's 1545 Primer were derivative of earlier primers. They were for the most part "drawn from [...] the Reuen version, set forth in the Primer of 1536 and emended in the Redman Primer of 1537. Wherever the translation varies from that version, it is apt to show the influence of Cranmer's Bible of 1540, which the editor evidently felt free to consult." What Butterworth means by the 1540 Cranmer's Bible is the edition of 1539 Coverdale's Bible with Cranmer's preface – a text I will be referring to in the following sections on numerous occasions.

2.2.2. The Book of Common Prayer (1549)

As signalled above, Henry died in 1547. The final step of Cranmer's endeavours – the Book of Common Prayer – emerged in 1549[17] during the reign of Henry VIII's only surviving son and immediate successor, Edward VI (1537–1553). The coveted son was born by Henry VIII's third wife Jane Seymour, who died soon after the prince's birth, in fact as its immediate consequence. After Henry's death Edward was crowned king of England at the tender age of nine and died six and a half years later before reaching majority, so the whole realm was governed by a regency council.

The Book of Common Prayer prepared by Cranmer was authorised by the Act of Uniformity passed by the Parliament in 1549 (Jacobs 2013: 45). This text, however, satisfied neither traditionalists nor reformers (Jacobs 2013: 50). As noted by Harmes (2012: 203), "[t]he book's capacity to offend was deep-seated". It was revolutionary in offering an exclusively English text and in its approach to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which obviously dissatisfied traditionalists. But the formula of the book was perceived as a vernacularised and slightly adjusted version of the Sarum rite – the predominant late medieval liturgical form, as signalled above. In effect, it was clearly too Catholic and too traditional for the more radical Protestants. "Extensive textual analysis uncovers the extent to which Archbishop Cranmer left the theology and language of the prayer book delicately poised, perhaps accounting for the deep dissatisfaction it provoked" (Harmes 2012: 203).

---

[16] All Psalm quotations presented in this paper are my own transcripts from the original editions, except for Psalm 8 from the King James Bible (1611), which comes from the official website of this Bible: https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org. Abbreviations have been expanded silently and word divisions between the lines have not been preserved as irrelevant for this study.

[17] In preparation for introducing the first Book of Common Prayer some experiments were executed with respect to the actual performance of the service in English (cf. Frere 1900).

In (3) I quote the text of Psalm 8 as printed in the Book of Common Prayer from 1549. An analysis of this text confirms that it represents Miles Coverdale's Psalter from his 1539 Bible (cf. (4)), known as the Great Bible. Both excerpts are presented in the Appendix.

As for the remaining scriptural portions of the Book of Common Prayer, they were, as can be predicted, also drawn from the Great Bible (Jacobs 2013: 12). Not only was it (at that time) the sole Biblical translation authorised by the king, but Cranmer personally appreciated it (he wrote a Preface to the 1540 edition).[18] Importantly, by Henry's injunctions issued to the clergy in 1538 (i.e. prior to the actual publication of the first edition of this Bible, i.e. in anticipation of its availability), priests were obliged to read the Biblical passages scheduled for religious services in Coverdale's English. The relevant part of Henry's 1538 injunctions to the clergy goes as follows:

> ... that ye shall prouyde on this syde the feaste of [blank] nexte commynge one boke of the hole Bible, of the largest volume in englishe, and the same sette vp in some conuenient place within the sayd churche, that ye haue cure of, where as your parysheoners may moste commodiousely resorte to the same, and rede it. The charges of whiche boke shall be ratably borne betwene you, the person and the parisheoners aforesaid, that is to say, the one halfe by you, and the other halfe by them.

This was part of the gradual process of replacement of the all-Latin liturgy by the liturgy in the language understood by the entire congregation – English. In effect, the text of the Great Bible came to be deeply ingrained in the minds of Anglican congregations.[19]

2.2.3. The Book of Common Prayer (1552)

As a result of the shortcomings of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer mentioned in the previous section, its text very soon required a radical revision. The 1552 version, which came out towards the end of year, affected both the text and liturgical rubrics prescribing the rites and went in the Protestant direction. As Jacobs (2013: 51) reports, "whether the 1552 revisions were cosmetic or

---

[18] Coverdale's 1539 translation of the Bible came to be known as the Great Bible (because of its sheer size), the Chained Bible (it was chained to a desk to allow unlimited access of parishioners at the same time preventing theft), Whitchurch's Bible (after the name of its first English printer), Cranmer's Bible (because – as just noted – Cranmer's preface appeared in the second edition printed in 1540). Observe, incidentally, that the availability of the Bible for parishioners induced a visual rather than intellectual encounter as most of them would be illiterate anyway (cf. Roser and Ortiz-Ospina at https://ourworldindata.org/literacy, where literacy in England in the mid-15th century is estimated at 16%).

[19] See also Mézerac-Zanetti (2017) for insights concerning the relationship between Henrician innovations and the Book of Common Prayer.

substantive depends on one's theological point of view". Dyer, Levy and Conomos (2018: 30) assess the changes in the following way:

> The second version of the Prayer Book (1552) rearranged parts of the liturgy, moving English worship closer to the spirit of the continental reformers, though the language of the prayers was so crafted that it could be construed in ways that accommodated a wide spectrum of theological views, e.g. on the perennially controversial question among the reformers about what was actually received in Holy Communion. Cranmer also restructured the Divine Office to create the services of (1) Mattins, derived from Matins and Lauds, and (2) Evensong, a combination of Vespers and Compline. His mastery of older liturgical sources and his eloquent, rhythmic prose have long been admired. To the Calvinist party (Independents, Separatists, and Presbyterians) the Anglican liturgy hardly seemed 'reformed' at all: there was too little Scripture reading, the prayers were too brief, insufficient provision was made for extempore prayer, and there was entirely too much ritual solemnity.

Due to the unexpected death of Edward VI in July 1553, the 1552 book, "so passionately disputed in its making, ended up lasting about six months" (Jacobs 2013: 57). As a matter of fact, it lasted twice as long, as shown below, and reemerged after a period of suppression, albeit in a slightly different form (cf. Section 2.2.4).

One of the first acts of Edward VI's Catholic successor Mary I (1516–1558),[20] the deceased king's half-sister and the only surviving child of Henry VIII's first wife Catherine of Aragon was her First Statute of Repeal (*An Act for the Repeal of certain Statutes made in the time of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth*),[21] which she introduced in the autumn of 1553. This act did not immediately deauthorise the Book of Common Prayer but set a date (20 December) when this deauthorisation should come into force. In effect, as observed by Buchanan (2016: 54), it formally confirmed that Edwardian 1552 Act of Uniformity, which imposed the use of the new Book of Common Prayer over the old one, remained valid in the first months of Mary I's reign.[22] The 1553 Statute declared that after the set date, all divine services and administration of sacraments were to return to what they were in the last year of the reign of Henry VIII. More ardent Protestants fled the country to escape prosecution, thus

---

[20] I skip the short royal episode of Lady Jane Grey, Henry VIII's younger sister Mary's granddaughter, as irrelevant here.

[21] Mary's First Statue of Repeal "involved renunciation of the chief results of Cranmer's efforts during the preceding reign – the Reformed Liturgy, the First and Second Books of Common Prayer, the administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, and the recognition of a married clergy" (Tanner 1930: 121).

[22] Cuming (1969/1982: 87) observes that north of the border the 1552 Book of Common Prayer continued in general use, uninterrupted until 1559.

establishing communities in exile, where they "had to to have their form of service licensed" (Cuming 1969/1982: 87).

Psalm 8 in the 1552 version of the Book of Common Prayer represents practically the same text as the one printed in the first Book of Common Prayer (cf. (3) in the Appendix), so I do not separately quote it. However, its exact similarity to Psalm 8 from the first Book of Common Prayer will be addressed in Section 5, where Table 2 expresses similarities between these texts in numerical terms.

2.2.4. The Book of Common Prayer (1559)

Mary I's rule proved even shorter than her half-brother's and after her death in 1558 the Book of Common Prayer re-emerged by the order of Mary's Protestant successor and half-sister, Elizabeth I (1533–1603), the only surviving child of Anne Boleyn. Elizabeth's sympathies seemed tied to the original Cranmerian 1549 version of the Book of Common Prayer, but her advisors, including William Cecil,[23] convinced her that the 1552 version was "the more politic choice" (Jacobs 2013: 58),[24] so the queen decided on the 1552 text with some reversions to the 1549 version. In effect, the 1559 version reintroduced some traditional elements and gave up on some radical aspects.[25]

The 1559 Book of Common Prayer was adapted only two more times in the changing political and religious circumstances of the 17th century: in 1604 by James I (1566–1625) and in 1662 by Charles II (1630–1685) after the restoration of monarchy in 1660. There were some other attempts at introducing a new version of the Book of Common Prayer but none of them was successful until the 20th century.[26]

---

[23] Thomas Cranmer was dead by this time, having been executed in 1556.

[24] Cf. Loach (1980: 22) and Cross (2017) for the political circumstances of this decision.

[25] Some of these included prescribing the use of traditional liturgical vestments to Morning Prayer, the elimination of the contentious black rubrics, and the reintroduction of ambiguous language of the Communion rite of 1549. Jacobs (2013: 54) explains that the controversy concerning the kneeling during Communion was resolved only after the 1552 text had left the press. It was decided that a disclaimer had to be printed separately to supplement each exemplar. These rubrics, as a separate text, were printed in black instead of the usual red, which made the instructions stand out from the other text. Consequently, the instructions came to be known as the black rubrics.

As for the ambiguous language associated with the Communion, Jacobs (2013: 54) notes that "it allowed worshippers to believe that Christ was in some way, not specifically defined, truly present in the bread and wine. This was crucial to traditionalist acceptance of the rite, both at that moment and later in Anglican history. It is noteworthy that the Elizabethan book also deleted the Litany's reference to the 'detestable enormities' of the pope."

[26] The most important of these attempts was made after the so-called Glorious Revolution of 1688, which deposed James II (Charles II's Catholic brother and successor) and placed on the throne his eldest daughter Mary II (1662–1694) together with her husband William of Orange

As was the case with the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, the 1559 version also relies on the Psalter selected for the first Book of Common Prayer, so Psalm 8 represents the same text (cf. (3)). The actual extent of its similarity to Psalm 8 from the 1549 and 1552 versions of the Book of Common Prayer is expressed in numerical terms in Section 5, Table 2.

2.2.5. The Book of Common Prayer (1604)

James I's accession to the throne of England after the death of Elizabeth (1603) was the first change of sovereign in a long time which did not entail a change of religion. Before issuing a new version of the Book of Common Prayer the king held a conference at Hampton Court in 1604. The conference was occasioned by the Millenary Petition, but its most important and lasting outcome was commissioning a new translation of the Bible (1611) and discussing some changes to be introduced to the Book of Common Prayer. The new Book of Common Prayer, printed in 1604, known as the Hampton Court Book, was essentially the 1559 version with only minor revisions. Therefore, as can be expected, Psalm 8 continues in the tradition of Coverdale's Psalter of the Great Bible (cf. (3) and (4) in the Appendix), so it is not quoted separately.

The Commonwealth period witnessed the execution of Charles I's (1600–1649), James I's son and immediate successor, the exile of his successor Charles II, and the abolition of the Book of Common Prayer. The book was replaced with the Directory for the Public Worship of God, also known as the Westminster Directory (Davies 1948) – a new standard form of liturgy prepared by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, being an English Parliamentary Commission consisting almost exclusively of Presbyterians and a few independents (Dyer, Levy and Conomos 2018: 31). The text was published in London in March 1644–45 as *A Directory for the Publique Worship of God throughout the three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland* (McNally 1958). As noted by McNally (1958), a study of the Westminster Directory shows its textual and structural indebtedness to both the Genevan-Scottish Book of Common Order[27]

(1650–1702; son of James II's elder sister Mary), both of them staunch Protestants. Albeit failed, the attempt to introduce their own version of the Book of Common Prayer testifies to the status of this book and – consequently – of its text.

[27] The activities of John Knox (d. 1572), a Scottish reformer and founder of Presbyterianism need to be mentioned here to explain the origins of the Book of Common Order, its textual composition and later fate. Knox left England, (to which he was exiled from Scotland in 1549), upon Mary I's accession to the throne. After a brief stay in Frankfurt, he moved to Geneva (Dawson 2009: 57–58), where he took on a leading role in the Anglo-Scottish congregation. There in 1556 he published *The Forme of Prayers and Ministration of Sacraments*, which owed much both to Calvin's *Forme des prières* and Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer. The publication was in English and Latin to ensure its wide accessibility (Dawson 2009: 60). In 1560

and the Book of Common Prayer. The author also emphasises the influence of "the unwritten traditions of English Puritanism and, more especially, of Scottish Presbyterianism" (n.p.).

2.2.6. The Book of Common Prayer (1662)

The restoration of monarchy in 1660 came 11 years after the execution of Charles I. The late king's eldest surviving son Charles II (1630–1685) was enthusiastically welcomed to a nation both divided and traumatised (Collett 2004: 108), which needed consolidation and peace. "Consolidation meant a return to former fixed values" (Daniell 2003: 487). A way to achieve this was by restoring the supremacy of the Anglican Church, reinstating ecclesiastical structures and staff, and reintroducing the Book of Common Prayer. The first was achieved when "'properly Anglican' clergy came back into the parishes, old bishops reclaimed their sees and new bishops were nominated by the monarch to newly restored cathedral chapters" (Buchanan 2016: 56), and the new version of the Book of Common Prayer was brought out in 1662.

This new version of the Book of Common Prayer, which remained unchanged for 300 years, introduced several hundred changes with respect to the 1604 text (satisfying neither Laudians nor Presbyterians), the most important of them for our discussion here being the replacement of the Biblical material, which, as stated in Section 2.2.2, had so far been imported from the Great Bible, by the text of the King James Bible (1611), "giving that version more recognition" (Daniell 2003: 488). The replacement, however, did not affect the psalms, which were retained in Coverdale's rendering. The 1662 version also saw the replacement of obsolete phrases, introduction of some new collects, a slight elaboration of the ritual.

Reliance on the text of the King James Bible in 1662 seems natural from the perspective of the status this translation enjoys today. It is important to realise, however, that this was not an "authorised version", contrary to how it has been referred to since the 19th century. The only translations of the Bible which were authorised in England were the Great Bible and the Bishops' Bible (Daniell 2003: 429). Moreover, as pointed out by Daniell (2003: 429), "contrary to what has been confidently asserted for several centuries, this version was not universally loved from the moment it appeared".

This translation, as stated in Section 2.2.5, was commissioned in 1604 and the final product of this commission was a result of punctilious work of 54 translators appointed by the king (cf. Daniell 2003: 436), organised into six companies, each of them headed by a director. The translators were issued with 15 instructions. These

---

it was adopted in Scotland, where it was known as the Book of Common Order. It remained in use until replaced with the Westminster Directory.

were of various kinds, touching issues as diverse as continuity, language, marginal notes, and the architecture of the whole process. The whole Biblical text was divided so that a portion was allotted to each company. Each member of each company was to work on a given passage individually and then all members would meet and compare their texts. When a text was agreed upon by the whole company it was sent to the remaining other companies to discuss, so each company supervised the work of other ones. In effect, each book of the Bible was first approached by an individual translator, then discussed together within a company, then the text agreed upon was sent to all other companies and if it was considered in need of any further changes, heads of all companies met to decide on the final version. This working scheme entailed as many as four winnowing processes for every chapter of the Bible. Although there were some other elements of text control, the ones discussed above are enough to show that nothing was left to chance in the production of this translation (which is not to say that the whole process was implemented exactly as architectured).

As already mentioned, stress on continuity was explicit and it is crucial with regard to the topic pursued here. Rule 1 pointed to the Bishops' Bible as the *model* to follow as much as possible, although it was considered inferior to the Geneva Bible. The Bishops' Bible, however, was the authorised Bible of the Church of England, which infused it with authority. Instruction 14 refers translators to other biblical versions if these expressed the text better than the Bishops' Bible, Coverdale's Bible being among them. Observe that insistence on continuity in effect changed what was to be a translation project into a carefully designed process of revision (Daniell 2003: 440). As the Bishops' Bible was to constitute the base text for this revision it is necessary to step back for a moment and look briefly at this version, especially with regard to the Book of Psalms.

The Bishops' Bible grew out of necessity for a new translation which would overcome the problems of the Great Bible, whose deficiencies with respect to the Hebrew original were becoming increasingly obvious in the light of the Geneva Bible. The latter suffered from other problems, which are impossible to even briefly discuss here. The need for a new translation was voiced in 1561. The Biblical books were divided between the appointed translators, with the Book of Psalms entrusted to the Bishop of Rochester. However, in the final list which associated books of the Bible with particular translators there is "no mention [...] of the Psalms, nor of the Bishop of Rochester. The Psalms as printed are over the initials T.B.", identified as Thomas Blickley (Daniell 2003: 340).

The Bible was printed in 1568 and immediately an attempt was made for it to be licenced for reading in the churches for the sake of uniformity. In 1571 the Bible was authorised to be read in English churches. Importantly, as pointed out by Daniell (2003: 341), "[c]hoirs could continue to use the Great Bible Psalter, in that Bible second edition of 1572, which had already established itself (was 'much multiplied') in the liturgies; if they wanted to change to the Bishops', they could".

It is interesting to note in this context that the 1568 text of the Bishops' Bible was revised in 1569 and reissued in 1572. However, the Psalter was excluded from the general revision of the text. Instead, a decision was made to print the Psalms as they appeared in 1568 prepared for the Bishops' Bible alongside the *familiar* translation from the Great Bible. In effect, the edition which came out in 1572 contained two versions of the Psalms. Offering a Biblical book in two versions called for an editorial decision concerning how to present them. Such decisions always carried with them a message concerning the mutual status of the two texts. The culture of early print – to ascertain its success – strove to preserve the manuscript conventions (cf. e.g. Pettegree 2010: 16, 28, 33, Needham 2020: 499, 504, 505) so that the mise-en-page of the printed book seemed familiar to the reader accustomed to the manuscript experience. Placement of the text on the page, choice of script type and its size, etc. were an inherent part of the message speaking to the reader from the page.[28] It is in this complex web of relationships that one needs to view the editorial decisions concerning the two Psalters printed in the Bishops' Bible in 1572.

The standard typeface used in Bibles printed in England in the second half of the 16th century was black letter (cf. e.g. Bland 1998: 94, Hotchkiss and Robinson 2008: 10). Accompanying textual material was either presented in smaller size or in a different type (roman type), which indicated its subsidiary role with respect to the stately Gothic of the main text. In effect, the mutual hierarchy[29] of these script types when they met on the same page reflected the priority of the text printed in black letter.[30] As indicated above, the black-letter type of the Bishops' Bible published in 1572 was the practice of the day, but the decision to print in black letter the Psalter from the Great Bible rather than the translation from the 1568 text

---

[28] On the hierarchy between the text of the Bible and its commentary, which was expressed by an interplay of scripts, their placement, and size see e.g. Dinkova-Brun (2020) and Tesnière (2020).

[29] The practice of juxtaposing different scrips on the same page originates in Anglo-Saxon England, from where it spread to the Continent, "where it fostered the development of a new concept – that of a hierarchy of scripts" (Parkes 2008/2016: 130). As observed by Sawyer (2019: 269), the hierarchy of scripts needs to be viewed as "a live historical process rather than a set interpretative tool".

[30] In the first decades of the 16th century there developed an association between language and typeface, which influenced typographical practice. "Roman type was recurrently used for Latin; italic for romance languages, such as Italian and French; Gothic, or black letter, for English and Teutonic languages" (Shrank 2004: 297). It is pointed out by Preece and Wells (2020) that black letter was in continued use for non-Humanist texts, such as ecclesiastical works. The application of this tendency to English printing houses is confirmed by Hotchkiss and Robinson (2008: 10), who remark that English printers matched typefaces to subject matter or function. For general remarks on typeface in early printed books and their relationship to the manuscript hands see Needham (2020).

(for which roman type was selected) was telling in itself,[31] especially that in this Bible roman type was relied on for marginal annotations.

To conclude this excursion, while the text of the Bishops' Bible was revised and corrected after 1568, no such corrections were aimed at the Psalms, which were instead replaced with the familiar form, i.e. the Psalter of the Great Bible. A comparison of the 1568 and 1572 texts of Psalm 8 of the Bishops' Bible Psalter confirms that the two texts are identical, save for typical spelling, punctuation, and capitalisation differences. I quote Psalm 8 from the 1568 edition of the Bishops' Bible in (5) in the Appendix.

Consequently, if the Bishops' Bible was to be the starting point of the King James Bible, then, as shown above, as far as the Psalms were concerned, that starting point lay with the Great Bible of Coverdale. But although it was its starting point, it was not its final product, as transpires from a comparison of Psalm 8 from the Great Bible (example (4)) and the King James Bible from 1611, shown in (6). It has to be admitted, though, that the 1611 text shows a high degree of similarity to its supposed base.

3. Interim conclusion

Much more can be said about the intricacies of the textual history of the Psalms of the Book of Common Prayer but the confines of this paper preclude any further investigations. What is crucial, however, is that Psalm renditions offered by Miles Coverdale seem to have been just about the only stable element in the liturgy of the tumultuous times that followed Henry VIII's breach with Rome in 1533. The vicissitudes of the 16th and 17th centuries described above were accompanied with the emergence of many alternative Psalter renditions, with particular interest placed on versified psalms, yet it was Coverdale's translation of the Book of Psalms that was deeply ingrained in the hearts and minds of the English.

The text of the Psalter relied on in the Book of Common Prayer continued to represent this textual tradition down to the 20th century, remaining indifferent to the emergence of new English translations of the Bible. It withstood replacement even after the King James Bible achieved the popularity no other Biblical version ever enjoyed. The later Stuart reign witnessed the continued use of the Book of Common Prayer, featuring the Biblical texts in two distinct traditions. The first of them was represented by the Psalms, which came from the Great Bible (Jacobs 2013: 182), i.e. Miles Coverdale's version of 1535 "*slightly modified* [emphasis mine] in 1539 for the Great Bible, [which] went from there into the first

---

[31] Cf. Hotchkiss and Robinson (2008) on the timing and function of the introduction of the roman type to England.

service-book of the new Church of England in 1549, the Book of Common Prayer – and stayed there in all Anglican churches worldwide, until the 1960s" (Daniell 2003: 189). The second textual tradition was represented by the King James Bible (1611), which was the source of all the remaining, i.e. non-psalmic Biblical text in the Book of Common Prayer.

As far as the Bishops' Bible is concerned, the history of its (almost anonymous) translation of the Psalms and their ultimate replacement by Coverdale's rendering poses a series of puzzling questions. Why were Coverdale's Psalms not relied on in the first place? Why did the Psalms of the Bishops' Bible from 1568 not undergo a revision together with the rest of the translation? And, first and foremost, why were they replaced in 1572, i.e. in the second edition of the Bishops' Bible, by the familiar renderings of Coverdale? Both here and in the case of the Book of Common Prayer, we seem to be dealing with a familiar text of the Psalms, which was clearly not considered better but it was certainly favoured over any other one.

4. Lingering issues

This much is clear by now, but there is an issue which has been bothering me throughout the time I worked on analysing the textual lineage of the psalms contained in the Book of Common Prayer. In particular, statements describing relationships between particular versions of Psalm translations lack accuracy in being inherently impressionistic. Let us take up a passage from Jacobs (2013: 182) quoted above, where the relationship between Coverdale's 1535 translation of the Psalms and the one which appeared in his 1539 Bible is described as "slightly modified". Norton (2000: 29) and Ferguson (2011: 138) also call the 1539 version of the Psalms a revision of the Psalter of his 1535 Bible. Yet when Coverdale's translational work on the Psalter is approached, it is stated that Coverdale produced four complete Psalters (excluding his *Ghostly Psalmes*) but three of them are said to represent different translations and one a revision, which is confusing in itself. To elucidate this, let me briefly review Coverdale's work on Psalm translations.

It needs to be emphasised at the outset that (for lack of skill) Coverdale did not translate the Psalter from Hebrew. His first translation was based on a new Latin translation of the Hebrew Psalter prepared by Johannes Campensis (printed in 1532). The English translation was published anonymously in 1534 or 1535[32] (cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013 for a discussion). In (7) I present a transcript of Psalm 8 from the 1539 edition of this translation, which is the only copy I could

---

[32] Modern research attributes the translation to Miles Coverdale, cf. e.g. Mozley (1953) and Ferguson (2011). The original attribution is due to Bale (1902).

access. In 1535 Coverdale presented another translation of the Psalms, this time as part of his first complete Bible, in Coverdale's own words: "faithfully and truly translated out of Douche [i.e. German] and Latyn". Psalm 8 from this rendition is shown in (8). The text is referred to as Coverdale's second translation of the Psalms, while his next text, which appeared in 1539, also as part of a complete Bible, is referred to as his third Psalter, but, as already observed, is classified as a *revision* of his 1535 text. As noted before, Psalm 8 from this version is presented in (4). This text is said to have undergone further revision, which appeared in print in 1540 (cf. excerpt (9)) and this revision "provided the norm, which was reproduced with only trifling changes in succeeding editions" (Haugaard 1998: 181). Coverdale's fourth and final go at Psalm rendition appeared in 1540. This time the source text was the Vulgate and the translation appeared in a bilingual, i.e. English-Latin edition. Psalm 8 from this rendition is shown in (10).

The four texts of Psalm 8 mentioned above, presented in (7)-(10), naturally invite linguistic comparison, just as do the remaining six versions of Psalm 8 discussed in Section 2, presented in (1)-(6). Similarities and differences observed among these ten versions are obviously viewed in the context of the information concerning the textual history of every excerpt. Whatever they may be, such observations tend to be phrased in very inaccurate terms. Compared renditions are usually referred to as "different", "similar", "slightly revised", "based on", etc. Statements of this type are certainly insufficient, as they ultimately aspire to linguistic claims concerning the mode of text production and transmission. However, they are invariably articulated in the literature on the topic in terms of descriptive statements relying on fuzzy categories and while "revision" is understood as a corrected version of a translation, it is hard to draw a line between texts which are "slightly revised", "revised", and "substantially/extensively revised". In effect, it is often an arbitrary decision of a researcher whether to refer to a given text as an extensive revision or a new translation.[33] For any observation concerning the degree of a text's indebtedness to another one to be linguistically valid it is necessary to propose tools for an objective assessment of textual affinity. These tools need to be firmly based on textual features which would definitively measure a degree of difference between any two texts, while the interpretation of the obtained results should take into account those aspects of the renditions which by necessity entail a certain degree of inherent similarity between them.

---

[33] See for example Dutcher (1911: 244), who calls Richard Challoner's mid 18th-century revision(s) of the Douay-Rheims Bible (first published in 1582 NT and 1609/1610 OT) so extensive that "so far as the text is concerned his efforts resulted in what was almost a new translation".

It is clear by now what has been the troubling me in throughout this investigation. While it is certainly true that (1), (3), (5), (7), (10) present different texts and we can talk of different translations, it is not obvious how to draw a line between (4) and (8) and decide whether they represent revisions of the same text or similar independent renditions. As signalled above, the difficulty is compounded by the fact that they are based on the same source text translated for the same audience at the same stage of the development of the language and within the same register. Moreover, translation of the Biblical material is governed by principles whose application is bound to produce similar texts. Indeed, all these translations are similar and sometimes it is not crucial whether a particular version is called a revision or a new rendition, especially when it comes to the same author. In such cases the discussion is to a great extent terminological and does not bear on the issue at hand. This, however, is not always the case. At the opposite end of the scale are independent renditions made from the same source text by different authors but executed in a similar period in the history of the language, by virtue of which they are bound to show a high degree of similarity to each other. A case in point is, for instance, a Psalter rendition produced at the exiled court of James II (1633–1701), younger brother of Charles II, which was published in 1700 (and reissued in 1704). The rendition was prepared by John Caryll and David Nairne as an *independent translation*, as I argue in my 2019 paper, but Scott (2004: 275) claims that the 1700 rendition constitutes a *revision* of the Douay-Rheims text of the Psalms. The Douay-Rheims Bible is the first (and for a very long time the only) Catholic translation of the Bible. The Psalter of this Bible was first published in 1610. Scott (2004) remarks that the text of this Bible was outdated by 1700, so the 1700 text offered an awaited revision. Extralinguistic clues are strong enough in this case to argue that the 1700 text represents an independent rendition but the production of most renditions cannot be reconstructed to such a degree of minute historical detail as to affirm their status as (in)dependent translations. As noted above, it is necessary to propose a methodology enabling an independent objective comparison of any given texts which would express the assessment in mathematical terms. A very preliminary attempt at measuring a degree of indebtedness of one text to another and expressing it in mathematical terms is offered below.

5. Preliminary proposal

Text similarity measurement selected for this analysis relies on the "bag of words" model, which is one of the two main ways of analysing and comparing texts, the other one being syntactic parsing. The two methods differ in complexity and approach, with each of them having its strong and weak points. For one thing, syntactic parsing is much more complex and the obtained results

provide much more information. In contrast, the bag of words model is much simpler and "treats every word [...] as a unique feature of the document. Word order and grammatical word type are not captured in a bag of words analysis" (Kwartel 2017: 21). These latter parameters, however, do not seem crucial in comparing different translations or versions of what is ultimately the same source text. In the bag of words model "sentences have attributes assigned only by word tokenization [...]. The frequencies of terms [...] are recorded in the matrix" (Kwartel 2017: 23). So, the bag of words model selected for this examination focuses on analysing word selection and use and therefore promises to offer the most relevant data for the purposes of the examination pursued in this paper.

However, there are many ways in which the bag of words model can be applied to text analysis. One of them, which expresses text similarity in mathematical terms is based on measuring similarity through "measuring length distance, which uses the numerical characteristics of the text to calculate the distance length of vector text" (Wang and Dong 2020: 2). Cosine distance, which is one of the many available methods of measuring length distance, seems most suitable for the task at hand. It calculates text similarity "by measuring the cosine of the angle between two vectors" (Wang and Dong 2020: 3). The application of this method was mediated via statistical analysis software R (R Core Team 2020), with the use of the quanteda package (Benoit *et al*. 2018). Before measuring the distance between the texts, full normalisation of the 16th-century spellings had to be performed to ascertain that orthographical differences do not contribute to the final result of text comparison. Obviously, I am aware of the sample put under scrutiny being too small to warrant reliable conclusions. However, as this examination was inspired by the need to compare the excerpts presented here, a comparison of the text of Psalm 8 was my natural starting point. The results, shown in Table 1 below, are promising enough to inspire further investigation of the applicability of this method to more extensive textual analyses. To make the discussion easier to follow, alongside references to excerpt numbers, which are the same throughout the text and in the Appendix, I additionally provide in Table 1 an abbreviated reference to each quoted version, with the codes to these abbreviations presented in the Appendix.

To ascertain that the proposed method works, similarity of a given text to itself, which is 100%, should be expressed as such. The method applied here expresses it as 1.000 and Table 1 below shows the ten such scores in grey. The remaining 90 scores express similarities between 90 pairs of texts, with each pair naturally doubled, as the measure of similarity between (2) and (3) is the same as that between (3) and (2). This leaves us with 45 results. It is more than obvious that they cannot be taken as measuring anything else than the similarity between the ten different versions of Psalm 8 rather than aspiring to any generalisations concerning larger portions of the Psalter, or the Psalter as a whole.

Table 1. Similarity scores (cosine distance) between the analysed versions of the text of Psalm 8

	(1) 1545HP	(2) 1538P	(3) 1549BCP	(4) 1539GB	(5) 1568BB	(6) 1611KJB	(7) 1535CPC	(8) 1535CB	(9) 1540GB	(10) 1540CPV
(1) 1545HP	1.000	0.981	0.917	0.914	0.922	0.933	0.850	0.925	0.909	0.940
(2) 1538P	0.981	1.000	0.909	0.902	0.915	0.924	0.859	0.912	0.898	0.930
(3) 1549BCP	0.917	0.909	1.000	0.993	0.972	0.974	0.862	0.967	0.986	0.959
(4) 1539GB	0.914	0.902	0.993	1.000	0.970	0.975	0.856	0.970	0.990	0.955
(5) 1568BB	0.922	0.915	0.972	0.970	1.000	0.969	0.871	0.947	0.966	0.951
(6) 1611KJB	0.933	0.924	0.974	0.975	0.969	1.000	0.859	0.957	0.968	0.966
(7) 1535CPC	0.850	0.859	0.862	0.856	0.871	0.859	1.000	0.850	0.858	0.860
(8) 1535CB	0.925	0.912	0.967	0.970	0.947	0.957	0.850	1.000	0.963	0.957
(9) 1540GB	0.909	0.898	0.986	0.990	0.966	0.968	0.858	0.963	1.000	0.948
(10) 1540CPV	0.940	0.930	0.959	0.955	0.951	0.966	0.860	0.957	0.948	1.000

The results fall into two groups with the cesura established by the greatest gap in the obtained scores. The first group of scores ranges between 0.993 and 0.898, the second group ranges between 0.871 and 0.850. The relative closeness of these results is unsurprising, as each of the ten examined texts represents the same Psalm, all renditions were executed within a relatively short period of time, with the latest text (1611) representing a conscious attempt at linguistic archaisation. In effect, the differences are largely reduced to the immediate source text, the target text being an independent enterprise, result of a revision or a re-edition, and the intricacies of the textual history of the renditions.

The highest score i.e. 0.993 expresses similarity between the Book of Common Prayer (3) and its immediate source, i.e. the Great Bible from 1539 (4). The next score – 0.990 is obtained when the 1539 text (4) is compared to its 1540 version (9), described as a revision (cf. Section 4), which in turn shows similarity of 0.986 with Henry VIII's 1545 Primer (3). The lowest values of similarity range between 0.850 and 0.871. All of them represent the similarity of Coverdale's translation from the Latin of Campensis (7) to the nine remaining texts. Clearly, the similarity expressed in mathematical terms confirms the differing pedigree of the text.

Encouraged by the fact that the above scores confirm what we independently know about the compared texts, I turned to see what the cosine distance method can tell us about the pedigree of the least well-known text from the set, in particular Psalm 8 from the first edition of the Bishops' Bible (5). As transpires from Section 2.2.6, it was to be a new translation, not a revision. The similarity of (5) to the eight remaining texts (I exclude (7) from this comparison) is expressed by values ranging from 0.915 – 0.972, with the highest scores (0.972 and 0.970) obtained for the first Book of Common Prayer (3) and its source text the Great Bible (4) respectively, suggesting that Coverdale's rendition must have strongly influenced the translator of the Psalter for the Bishops' Bible, if only by daily/weekly exposition to the text of the Book of Common Prayer. It could of course be argued that a more correct result would be obtained by comparing Psalm 8 from the Bishops' Bible of 1568 with the Book of Common Prayer from 1559, whose text had been in daily use for several years by the time the translation known as the Bishops' Bible emerged. I have signalled in the course of the discussion that the text of Psalm 8 is practically the same in all versions of the Book of Common Prayer. However, to verify this impression a comparison of Psalm 8 in all versions of the Book of Common Prayer that were issued prior to the emergence of the Bishops' Bible (i.e. 1549, 1552, and 1559[34]) and Psalm 8 of

---

[34] The actual text of Psalm 8 submitted for comparison comes from the 1562 edition of the Book of Common Prayer with the Psalter printed in the appendix. The References correctly represent the printing date, but as the 1562 edition represents the text of the Book of Common Prayer from 1559, this is how I will be referring to it in the discussion.

the Bishops' Bible was performed.[35] The results (shown in Table 2 below) confirm that the text of Psalm 8 in the three versions of the Book of Common Prayer were very close to each other, with the similarity of the 1549 text to its later versions ranging between 0.997 (for the 1552 text) and 0.996 (for the 1559 text). The similarity of the 1552 and 1559 texts is even higher, scoring 0.998. The similarity between the Bishops' Bible and the Book of Common Prayer is 0.972 for the 1549 version of the latter, 0.973 for the 1552 version, and 0.969 for the version from 1559, so – as could be expected – the differences between the measured similarities are minute, with the amplitude of 0.004.

Table 2. Similarity scores (cosine distance) between selected printings/versions of the text of Psalm 8

	1568	1549	1552	1559
1568	1.000	0.972	0.973	0.969
1549	0.972	1.000	0.997	0.996
1552	0.973	0.997	1.000	0.998
1559	0.969	0.996	0.998	1.000

I would like to raise one more issue associated with text similarity measured by the cosine distance method. It addresses the nature of the relationship between the Psalters of Coverdale's two complete Bibles and the revision of the latter (i.e. (8), (4), and (9) respectively). Observe that what Jacobs (2013), Norton (2000), and Ferguson (2011) call a ("slight") revision, i.e. the relationship between 1535 Coverdale's Bible (8), i.e. Coverdale's second translation of the Psalms and the 1539 text of the Great Bible (4) is assessed at 0.970, while the similarity of (4) to its revised version, i.e. (9) is much higher, i.e. 0.990. This objectivises the difference between Coverdale's 1539 and 1540 Bibles: what scholars refer to as Coverdale's revision or his third translation of the Psalter (the 1539 Great Bible) differs from the text it revises (the 1535 Bible) to a much larger degree than the 1539 Great Bible differs from its 1540 revision, which is never counted among Coverdale's separate translational attempts. It has to be emphasised, however, that the terminology is confusing, to say the least, as both the 1539 and the 1540 Bibles of Coverdale are referred to as *revisions*, which incorrectly levels them down to the same status.

---

[35] Note that the texts of Psalm 8 from the Bishops' Bible of 1568 and the 1549 Book of Common Prayer are quoted in the Appendix as (5) 1568BB and (3) 1549BCP respectively. The texts of Psalm 8 from the Book of Common Prayer from 1552 and 1562 have not been quoted here.

Returning to our data, the textual history of Coverdale's 1540 Bible (9), which is a revision of a revision of his own 1535 Bible suggests that the similarity between the two texts should score lower than the similarities between (8) and (4) on the one hand, and (4) and (9) on the other. This is indeed borne out by the results of the calculation, with the similarity score at 0.963, exactly as expected.

There are many more questions that spring to mind upon analysing the results of the cosine distance method performed on the excerpts examined in this paper. Not all of them can receive as neat an answer as the issues addressed above, but they have to await further study, in particular the verification of the proposed method on a much larger corpus of data and an attempt at interpreting the results as signposts to further investigations.

6. Conclusion

As a result of comparing each text of Psalm 8 to the remaining nine (cf. (1)-10) in the Appendix) I obtained numerical data, where similarity between the texts is expressed in terms of values ranging from 0.850 – 0.993. All values below 0.898 correctly express the observations formulated while reading the text of Psalm 8 in Coverdale's rendition of the Latin of Campensis and comparing it to the remaining nine texts. This is a desired result, since the translation of Campensis was not a source text for any other Psalm rendition analysed here. Interestingly, the remaining nine texts quoted here score strikingly high in terms of numerically expressed similarity. This suggests that the source texts of the remaining nine excerpts were relatively close to each other, indicating the indebtedness of all versions (save excerpt (7)) to the Vulgate. If we focus on those versions which are known from extratextual data to have been based *exclusively* on the Vulgate, i.e. (1) and (10), and to represent independent translational endeavours, we obtain interesting results. The similarity between (1) and all the remaining texts expressed in numerical terms confirms the pedigree of the translation: (1) bears the highest degree of similarity, i.e. 0.981 to (2), which was its direct source, with the second score at 0.940, expressing similarity to (10). This result is particularly inspiring when compared with the degree of similarity that obtains between the Douay-Rheims Bible Psalter (1610) to the translation of John Carryl and David Nairne (1700). As mentioned above, it is posited by Scott (2004) that the latter text represents a revision of the former, while extratextual data point to the two texts representing independent renditions. A comparison of the two texts measured by the cosine distance method applied here shows the degree of similarity between Psalm 8 in the two renditions at 0.941. This resembles the similarity between (1) and (10) being two independent translations based on the same source, rather than the similarity of a text and its

revision. The latter is the case with Coverdale's revision (8) of his own translation (4) assessed at 0.970 or the similarity of the King James Bible (6) to the 1539 text of the Great Bible (4), which was its starting point, at 0.975.

As stated at the outset of Section 5, the results obtained from analysing such a small sample of data cannot aspire to a methodological postulate. A corpus of a substantially larger size needs to be analysed to confirm the validity of the results obtained by measuring text distance relying on the method applied here. An undeniable asset of the proposed analysis is that it presents the degrees of similarity observed between compared texts in mathematical terms, and so allows us to objectivise discussions concerning Psalter renditions. The major finding of Section 5 is that the application of the proposed method of data analysis generally agrees both with our linguistic intuitions and the pedigrees of the compared texts. The results need to be verified by an examination performed on a larger corpus, which may either confirm our preliminary results or significantly correct the final picture. It is also possible that a refinement of the selected method will appear necessary. Whatever the final result of this verification, the assets of the results obtained by the application of the cosine distance method for comparing texts are promising enough to consider this method an important step towards assessing Psalm translations in mathematical terms.

References

Primary Sources (in chronological order):

Coverdale's Bible 1535 = *Biblia the Bible, that is, the holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe*. Cologne: Printed by E. Cervicornus and J. Soter?], 1535. STC (2nd ed.) / 2063.

Coverdale's Psalms (from 1535) 1539 = *A paraphrasis vpon all the Psalmes of Dauid, made by Iohannes Campensis, reader of the Hebrue lecture in the vniuersite of Louane, and translated out of Latine into Englysshe*. London: Prynted in the house of Thomas Gybson, 1539. STC (2nd ed.) / 2372.6.

The Primer 1538 = *Thys prymer in Englyshe and in Laten is newly translatyd after the Laten texte*. Rouen: [N. le Roux for J. Marchant], 1538. STC (2nd ed.) / 16006.

Henry VIII's 1538 injunctions to the clergy = *Iniunctions exhibited the [blank] day of [blank] anno. M. D. XXXVIII*. London: by Thomas Berthelet, 1538. STC (2nd ed.) / 10087.

The Great Bible 1539 = *The Byble in Englyshe that is to saye the content of all the holy scrypture, both of ye olde and newe testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by ye dylygent studye of dyuerse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tonges*. Paris: Prynted by [Francis Regnault, and in London by] Rychard Grafton [and] Edward Whitchurch, 1539. STC (2nd ed.) / 2068.

Coverdale's Psalter translated from the Vulgate 1540 = *The Psalter or boke of Psalmes both in Latyn and Englyshe. wyth a kalender, & a table the more eassyer and lyghtlyer to fynde the psalmes contayned therin*. London: Ricardus grafton excudebat, 1540. STC (2nd ed.) / 2368.

The Great Bible 1540 (with Cranmer's preface) = *The Byble in Englyshe that is to saye, the content of all the holye scrypture, bothe of the olde and newe Testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by the diligent studye of dyuers excellent lerned [men e]xperte in the fore[saide] tongues*. London: by [Thomas] Petyt, and [Robert] Redman, for Thomas Berthelet, 1540. STC (2nd ed.) / 2069.

King Henry VIII's Primer of 1545 = *The primer set foorth by the kynges maiestie and his clergie*. London: vvithin the precinct of the late dissolued house of the graye Friers, by Richard Grafton printer to the Princes grace, 1545. STC (2nd ed.) / 16035.

The Book of Common Prayer 1549 = *The booke of the common prayer and administracion of the Sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies of the Churche: after the vse of the Churche of England*. London: in officina Edouardi Whitchurche [and Nicholas Hill], 1549. STC (2nd ed.) / 16270a.

The Book of Common Prayer 1552 = *The booke of common prayer and adminystracion of the sacramentes, and other rytes and seremonies in the Churche of Englande*. London: in officina Edovardi whitchurche [sic], 1552. STC (2nd ed.) / 16288.

The Book of Common Prayer 1562 = *The booke of common prayer, and administration of the sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies in the Churche of England*. London: in officina Richardi Iugge & Iohannis Cavvood, 1562. STC (2nd ed.) / 16295.

The Bishops' Bible 1568 = *The holie Bible*. London: by Richard Iugge, 1568. STC (2nd ed.) / 2099.2.

The Bishops' Bible 1572 = *The holie Bible*. London: In Powles Churcheyarde by Richarde Iugge, 1572. STC (2nd ed.) / 2107.

The Book of Common Prayer 1604 = *The booke of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church of England*. London: By Robert Barker, 1604. STC (2nd ed.) / 16327.

The King James Bible 1611 = THE HOLY BIBLE, Conteyning the Old Testament, *AND THE NEW: Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former Translations diligently compared and reuised, by his Maiesties speciall Comandement*. London: by Robert Barker. https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org

The Book of Common Prayer 1662 = *The book of common prayer*. London: printed by Iohn Bill & Christopher Barker, 1662. Wing (CD-ROM, 1996) / B3622A.

Secondary Sources:

Anlezark, D. 2017. The Psalms in the Old English Office of Prime. In T. Atkin and F. Leneghan (eds.), *The Psalms and Medieval English Literature. From the Conversion to the Reformation*, 198–217. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer.

Bale, J. 1902. *Index Britanniae scriptorum quos ex variis bibliothecis non parvo labore collegit Ioannes Baleus, cum aliis. In John Bale's Index of British and Other Writers, edited by Reginald Lane Poole with the help of Mary Bateson*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Barrows, E.P. 1867. *Companion to the Bible*. New York, NY: American Tract Society. http://christianbookshelf.org/barrows/companion_to_the_bible/index.html

Benoit, K., K. Watanabe, H. Wang, P. Nulty, A. Obeng, S. Müller, and A. Matsuo 2018. quanteda: An R Package for the Quantitative Analysis of Textual Data. Journal of Open Source Software 3(30): 774. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00774.

Bernard, G.W. 2016. Henry VIII: 'Catholicism without the Pope?' History 101(345): 201–221. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-229X.12230

Bland, M. 1998. The Appearance of the Text in Early Modern England. *Text* 11: 91–154.

Buchanan, C. 2016. Parliament and the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 18: 53–66.

Butterworth, Ch.C. 1953. *The English Primers, 1529–1545: Their Publication and Connection with the English Bible and the Reformation in England*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. 2013. *Text and Context in Jerome's Psalters: Prose Translations into Old, Middle and Early Modern English*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.

Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. 2019. The Psalter over the water – A multidisciplinary account of originality. *Linguistica Silesiana* 40: 7–22. DOI: 10.24425/linsi.2019.129398

Chupungco, A.J. 1997. *Handbook for Liturgical Studies. Introduction to the Liturgy*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.

Collett, B. 2004. Civil war, communal guilt and reconciliation in England: The book of Common Prayer of 1662. *Parergon* 21(2): 107–126. https://doi.org/10.1353/pgn.2004.0001

Cross, C. 2017. The political enforcement of liturgical continuity in the Church of England 1558–1662. *Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique* 22(1): 1–13. DOI: 10.4000/rfcb.1215

Cuming, G.J. 1969/1982. *A History of Anglican Liturgy*. Basingstoke and New York, NY: Palgrave.

Cummings, B. (ed.). 2011. *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cummings, B. 2002. *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daniell, D. 2003. *The Bible in English. Its History and Influence*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.

Davies, H. 1948. *The Worship of the English Puritans*. London: Dacre Press.

Dawson, J. 2009. Scotland and the example of Geneva. *Theology in Scotland* 16(2): 55–73.

Dinkova-Brun, G. 2020. Text and gloss. In F.T. Coulson and R. G. Babcock (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Latin Paleography*, 924–942. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dutcher, O. 1911. The Douay version. *The Biblical World* 37(4): 240–246.

Dyer, J, K. Levy and D. Conomos 2018. Liturgy and liturgical books. *Groove Music Online*. https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.40071

Ewert, D., and B.M. Metzger 1996. Texts, versions, manuscripts, editions. In P.J. Achtemeier (ed.), *The HarperCollins Bible Dictionary. Revised edition*, 1113–1130. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers.

Ferguson, J.H. 2011. Miles Coverdale and the claims of paraphrase. In L.P. Austern, K. Boyd McBride, and D L. Orvis (eds.), *Psalms in the Early Modern World*, 137–154. Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.

Ferrell, L.A. 2015/2018. The Church of England and the English Bible, 1559–1640. In K. Killeen, H. Smith, and R. Willie (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c. 1530–1700*, 261–271. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frere, W.H. 1900. Edwardine Vernacular services before the first prayer book. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 1(2): 229–246.

Green, I. 2000. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gretsch, M. 1999/2004. *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harden, J.M. 1922. *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Faith / New York and Toronto: The Macmillan Co.

Hargreaves, H. 1965. From Bede to Wyclif: Medieval English Bible translations. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48: 118–140.

Harmes, M. 2012. The Book of Common Prayer: The texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662 (review). *Parergon* 29(1): 202–204 (Review). https://doi.org/10.1353/pgn.2012.0048

Haugaard. W.P. 1998. Miles Coverdale. In D.K. McKim (ed.), *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, 179–184. Downers Grove, IL and Leicester, UK: InterVarsity Press.

Hole, Ch. 1900. *A Manual of the Book of Common Prayer: Showing its History and Contents for the Use of Those Studying for Holy Orders, and Others*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Hotchkiss, V., and F.C. Robinson 2008. *English in Print from Shakespeare to Milton*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Jacobs, A. 2013. *The Book of Common Prayer. A Biography*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Keane, D.N. 2020. An examination of the Book of Common Prayer as technical writing for an oral–aural culture. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 50(1): 3–34.

Keefer, S.L., and D.R. Burrows 1990. Hebrew and the "Hebraicum" in Late Anglo-Saxon England. *Anglo-Saxon England* 19: 67–80.

Kennedy, K.E. 2014. Reintroducing the English books of hours, or "English primers". *Speculum* 89(3): 693–723. http://www.jstor.com/stable/43577033

Kwartel. T. 2017. *Text Mining in Practice with R*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Linde, C. 2011. *How to Correct the Sacra Scriptura? Textual Criticism of the Latin Bible between the Twelfth and the Fifteenth Century*. Oxford: Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature.

Loach, J. 1980. Conservatism and consent in Parliament, 1547–59. In J. Loach and R. Tittler (eds.), *The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540–1560*, 9–28. London: Palgrave.

Loewe, R. 1969. The medieval history of the Latin Vulgate. In G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, 102–154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McNally, F.W. 1958. *The Westminster Directory: Its Origin and Significance*. Unpublished Phd. University of Edinburgh.

Mézerac-Zanetti, A. de. 2017. A reappraisal of liturgical continuity in the mid-sixteenth century: Henrician innovations and the first Books of Common Prayer. *Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique* 22(1): 1–11. DOI: 10.4000/rfcb.1218.

Mozley, J.F. 1953. *Coverdale and His Bibles*. London: Lutterworth Press.

Needham, P. 2020. Early printing and paleography. In F.T. Coulson and R.G. Babcock (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Latin Paleography*, 499–507. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Norton, D. 2000. *The History of the English Bible as Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parkes, M. 2008. *Their Hands Before Our Eyes: A Closer Look at Scribes. The Lyell Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford 1999*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.

Pratt, D. 2007. *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Preece, W.E., and J.M. Wells 2020. *Typography*. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/technology/typography.

Procter F., and W.H. Frere 1901. *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer with a Rationale of its Offices*. London: Macmillan.

Procter, F. 1855. *History of the Book of Common Prayer with a rationale of its Offices*. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.

Sawyer, D. 2019. Pedant's revolt: Dissent in the hierarchy of scripts. *Journal of the Early Book Society* 22: 269–80.

R Core Team. 2020. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/

Roser, M., and E. Ortiz-Ospina 2013/2018. *Literacy*. https://ourworldindata.org/literacy

Scott, G. 2004. James III's preceptor: John Betham. In E. Corp (ed.), *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689–1718. With Contributions by Edward Gregg,*

Howard Erskine-Hill, and Geoffrey Scott, 265–279. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shrank, K. 2004. "These fewe scribbled rules": Representing scribal intimacy in early modern print. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67(2): 295–314.

Steinmueller, J.E. 1938. The history of the Latin Vulgate. *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 252–257.

Sutcliffe, E.F. 1969. Jerome. In G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, 80–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swift, D. 2013. *Shakespeare's Common Prayers: The Book of Common Prayer in the Elizabethan Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tanner, J.R. 1930. *Tudor Constitutional Documents, A.D. 1485–1603 with an Historical Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tesnière, M.-H. 2020. The Mise-en-page in western manuscripts. In F.T. Coulson and R.G. Babcock (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Latin Paleography*, 619–632. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wang, J., and Y. Dong 2020. Measurement of text similarity: A survey. *Information* 11, 421. https://doi.org/10.3390/info11090421

Whiting, R. 2010. *The Reformation of the English Parish Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX: Psalm 8 in the different versions discussed in the paper

(1) 1545 Henry VIII's Primer 1545HP	(2) 1538 The Primer 1538P	(3) 1549 The Book of Common Prayer 1549BCP	(4) 1539 The Great Bible 1539GB	(5) 1568 The Bishops' Bible 1568BB
O Lord, whiche art our lorde howe merueylous is thy name ouer all the yearth?	O Lorde, whiche arte oure lorde. howe merueylous is thy name ouer all the earthe.	O Lord our gouernour, how excellent is thy name in all the worlde:	O Lorde oure gouernoure, howe excellent is thy name in all the world,	Oh God our Lorde, howe excellent is thy name in al the earth?
For thy magnyfycence is exalted aboue the heauens.	For thy magnyfycence hathe ben exalted aboue the heuens.	thou that haste set thy glory aboue the heauens?	thou that hast sett thy glory aboue the heauens?	for that thou hast set thy glory aboue the heauens.
Thou hast aduanced thy praise by the mouthes of infantes and suckyng babes, in dyspite of thine enemyes, for to confound the aduersary and the reuenger.	Thou hast aduanced thy prayse by the mouthes of infantes and suckynge babes, in despyte of thyne enemyes, for to confounde the aduersarye, and the reuenger.	Out of the mouth of very babes and suckelynges, hast thou ordayned strength, because of thyne enemies: that thou mightest still the enemye and the auenger.	Out of the mouth of very babes and sucklynges hast thou ordeyned strength because of thyne ene-myes, that thou myghtest still the enemye and the auenger.	Out of the mouth of very babes and sucklinges thou hast layde the foundation of thy strength for thyne aduersaries sake: that thou mightest styll the enemie and the auenger.
For I shall beholde the heauens, which are the worke of thy fingers, the mone and the sterres which thou hast ordayned.	Wherfore I shall beholde thy heauens, whiche are the workes of thyne handes, the Moon and the starres, whiche thou hast set in ordre[.]	For I will considre thy heauens, euen the woorkes of thy fyngers: the Moone and the starres whiche thou hast or-dayned.	For I wyll consydre the heauens, euen the worcke of thy fyngers: the moone and the starres which thou hast ordeyned.	For I will consider thy heauens, euen the workes of thy fingers: the moone and the starres whiche thou hast ordayned.
What is man, that thou arte so myndeful of hym or what is the sonne of man, that thou so regard-est hym?	What thynges is man, that thou arte so myndefull of hym or what is the sone of Adam that thou so regardest hym.	What is man that thou art so myndefull of hym: and the sonne of man, that thou visitest him?	What is man, that thou art myndfull of him? and the sonne of man, that thou visytest hym?	What is man that thou art myndfull of him? and the sonne of man that thou visitest hym?

(1) 1545 Henry VIII's Primer 1545HP	(2) 1538 The Primer 1538P	(3) 1549 The Book of Common Prayer 1549BCP	(4) 1539 The Great Bible 1539GB	(5) 1568 The Bishops' Bible 1568BB
Thou hast made him not much inferior to Angelles, thou hast crouned hym wyth glorye and honoure, and haste made hym lord vpon the workes of thyne handes.	Thou hast made hym not moch inferieour to aungels: thou hast crowned hym with glorye and honour, and hast made hym lorde vpon the workes of thy handes.	Thou madest him lower then the Angels: to croune him with glorye and wor-ship. Thou makest hym to haue dominion of the workes of thy handes:	Thou madest him lower then the aungels, to crowne him with glory and worshippe. Thou makest him to haue do-mynion in the workes of thy handes:	Thou hast made hym somthyng inferiour to an-gels: thou hast crowned him with glory and wor-ship. Thou makest him to haue dominion of the workes of thy handes:
Thou hast put all thynges in subieccion vnder hys feete: all maner of shepe and oxen: yea, moreouer the cattel of the felde	Thou hast cast all thynges vnder his fete, all maner of shepe and oxen: ye moreouer, the cattell of the fylde.	and thou haste put all thynges in subieccion vnder his feete. All shepe and oxen: yea, and the beastes of the fielde.	and thou hast put all thynges in subieccion vnder his fete. All shepe and oxen, yee and the beastes of the felde.	and thou hast put all thinges [in subiection] vnder his feete, All sheepe and oxen, and also the beastes of the felde:
foules of the ayre and fishes of the sea, whych walke in the pathes of the se.	Fowles of the ayer, and fysshes of the see, which swymme in the waters of the se.	The foules of the ayre, and the fishes of the sea: and whatsoeuer walketh thorowe the pathes of the seas.	The foules of the ayre, and the fyssh of the see, and whatsoeuer walcketh thorow the pathes of the sees.	the foules of the ayre, and the fishe of the sea, and whatsoeuer swymmeth in the seas.
O Lorde, whiche arte oure lorde, howe merueilous is thy name ouer all the yearth.	O lorde, whiche art our l orde, howe marueylous is thy name ouer all the earthe.	O Lorde our gouernoure: howe excellent is thy name in all the worlde.	O Lorde oure gouernoure, how excellent is thy name in all the worlde.	O God our Lorde: howe excellen great is thy name in all the earth?
(6) 1611 The King James Bible 1611KJV	(7) 1535 Coverdale's Psalm translation from the Latin of Campensis's (his first translation) 1535CPC	(8) 1535 Coverdale's Bi-ble (his second translation of the Psalms) 1535CB	(9) 1540 The Great Bible with Cranmer's preface (Coverdale's translation) 1540GB	(10) 1540 Coverdale's last translation of the Psalms (based on the Vulgate) 1540CPV

(1) 1545 Henry VIII's Primer 1545HP	(2) 1538 The Primer 1538P	(3) 1549 The Book of Common Prayer 1549BCP	(4) 1539 The Great Bible 1539GB	(5) 1568 The Bishops' Bible 1568BB
O Lord our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!	O Lorde, thou that art Lorde of vs all, how worthely is the noble voyce of thy name spred abroad thorow out the whole world?	O Lorde oure gouernoure: how wonderfull is thy name in all the worlde?	O LODE our gouernour, howe excellente is thy name in the worlde,	O Lord our Lord, how wonderful is thy name in al the erth.
who hast set thy glory aboue the heauens.	the thinges that appeare in heauen are tokens of thy glory and greate maiesty.	how excellent is thy glory aboue the heauens?	thou that haste sette thy glory aboue the heauens?	For thy glory is extolled aboue the heauens.
Out of the mouth of babes and sucklinges hast thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemie and the auenger.	Morouer it is a maruelous thing that in stede of a wapen agaynst thy enemyes, thou vsyst only the cryenge of babes and soche as yet do but suck mylck, and that thou shewynge so playne an euydence of thy almighty power, hast wyth so weake an instrument distroyed thyne enemye, and hym whych as one that wolde be auenged, had set hym selfe agaynst the.	Out of the mouth of the very babes and sucklinges thou hast ordened prayse because of thine enemies, that thou mightest de-stroye the enemie and the auenger.	Out of the mouthe of verye babes and suck-lynges hast thou ordeyned strength because of thyne enemyes, that thou myghtest styll the enemye and the auenger.	Out of the mouth of babes and sucklinges hast thou ordeyned prayse, because of thyne enemyes, that thou mayst destroye the enemy and auenger
When I consider thy heauens, the worke of thy fingers, the moone and the starres which thou hast ordained;	As oft as I loke vpon thy heauens the workes of thy handes, the mone and the other starres which thou hast set in them after a maruelous goodly ordre.	For I considre thy heauens, euen the worke off the fyngers: the Moone and the starres which thou hast made.	For I wyll consydre thy heauens, euen the worke of thy fyngers: the Mone and the Starres whiche thou haste ordeyned.	For I wyl considre the heauens the workes of thy fyngers, the Mone and starres whych thou has made.

(1) 1545 Henry VIII's Primer 1545HP	(2) 1538 The Primer 1538P	(3) 1549 The Book of Common Prayer 1549BCP	(4) 1539 The Great Bible 1539GB	(5) 1568 The Bishops' Bible 1568BB
What is man, that thou art mindfull of him? and the sonne of man, that thou visitest him?	Then I thynke by my self gracious GOD, what is a miserable man that thou takest soche care for hym, or what is the posteryte of sonn, that thou woldest ___ ste hym, and to be frendes wyth hym.	Oh what is man, that thou art so myndfull of him? ether the sonne of man that thou visitest him?	What is man, that thou arte myndeful of hym? and the sonne of man that thou vysitest hym?	What is man that thou art myndfull of hym: or the sonne of man that thou visitest hym?
For thou hast made him a little lower then the Angels; and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to haue dominion ouer the workes of thy hands;	Thou hast almost made hym God wyth glorye and honoure hast thou crouned hym.	After thou haddest for a season made him lower then the angels, thou crownedest him with honour and glory. Thou hast set him aboue the workes off thy hondes:	Thou madest him lytle lesse then the aungels, to crowne him with glorye and worshyppe. Thou makest hym to haue dominyon in the workes of thy handes:	Thou madest hym som-what inferiour then the angels: with glorye and honoure hast thou crowned hym, and set hym aboue the workes of thy handes.
thou hast put all things vnder his feete. All sheepe and oxen, yea and the beastes of the field.	Thou hast made hym lorde of thy worckes, for thou hast cast all thynges vnder hys fete. Shepe and oxen all together, ye and all other catell whom the felde noryssheth.	thou hast put all thinges in subiection vnder his fete. All shepe and oxen, yee and the beastes of the felde.	and thou haste put all thynges in subiectyon vnder his fete. Al shepe and oxen, yee and the beastes of the felde.	All thynges hast thou subdued vnder his fete, al shepe and oxen, ye and the beastes of the felde.
The foule of the aire, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoeuer passeth through the paths of the seas.	The byrdes that flye in the ayer, the fisches that swymme in the see, and what soeuer lyueth in any waters,	The foules of the ayre: the fysh of the see, and what so walketh thorow the wayes of the see.	The foules of the ayre, and the fishe of the see, and what soeuer walketh thorowe the pathes of the sees.	The byrdes of the ayre and fysshes of the see, which walke thorowe the pathes of the see.
O Lord our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!	O Lorde, thou that arte Lorde of vs al, how worthelye is the noble voyce of thy name spred thorowe all the worlde.	O Lorde oure gouernoure, how wonderfull is thy name in all the worlde?	O Lorde our gouernour, howe excellent is thy name in all the worlde.	O Lorde our Lorde, howe wonderful is thy name in al the earth?