BABELAO 14 (2025), p. 131-149

Archbishop Parker, the Bishops' Bible (1568) and the Book of Psalms

By

Robert J. Wilkinson*

Valley House, Temple Cloud, Somerset, United Kingdom

It was a frequent practice from Tyndale through to the Revised Version (1885) of the English Bible, and indeed beyond, to mark in these several English translations the occurrences of the Name of God (the Tetragrammaton, יהוה *yhwh*) in the Hebrew Bible by the word LORD(E) in capital letters. This practice, common to Tyndale (Pentateuch, initially in 1530), Coverdale (1535) and, in time, to the King James Version (1611) – though unsurprisingly not found in the Catholic Douay-Rheims translation of 1609/10 - was derived from Luther's practice. These conventions were presented in a text of Christoffel Walter the corrector of the printer Luffts in 1563: HERR capitalised represented the Tetragrammaton used of God alone; where other names are used, like אדוני *ʼadonai* (Lord) or אלוהים *ʼelohim* (God) which may also be used of angels and men, HErr was used, half capitals and half lower-case. For אדוני יהוה *ʼadonai yhwh,* so characteristic of Ezekiel, HErr HERR was adopted.[1] William Tyndale gave a similar account of his English usage in his *Table Expounding Certain Words* at the end of his translation of Genesis, though he was also prepared to use *Iehouáh* on occasions, a form which subsequently commended itself to English Protestants, but is not found in Coverdale's 1535 translation.[2]

* I am indebted to David Phillips, Andrew Walker and Pilar Bertuzzi Rivett for reading and commenting upon drafts of this article.

[1] For full details see WILKINSON 2015, pp. 354-355.

[2] *Ibid,* pp. 355-357.

Those Bibles which did not use the convention of capital letters for the divine name, the Great Bible, issued under Cromwell's auspices (1539), the Geneva Bible (1560) and, indeed, for the most part, the Bishops' Bible itself, together with Douay-Rheims, nevertheless systematically used the word 'Lord' to mark the Tetragrammaton, and 'God' to mark *ʹelohim.* This almost universal practice goes back to the early Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible (the Septuagint) which put κύριος (*kyrios,* Lord) for the Tetragrammaton and θέος (*theos,* God) for *ʹelohim.* The Latin Vulgate followed suit using *Dominus* for the Tetragrammaton and *Deus* for θέος */ʹelohim.*

Against such a universal custom, the perversity of the translator of the Bishop's Bible Psalter is striking. He systematically reverses ancient and established practice, and uses 'God' for the Tetragrammaton and 'Lord' for *ʹelohim.* Perhaps the most vivid way to appreciate this deviation is to examine a parallel English Psalter, where the singularity of the Bishops' Psalter in this respect is striking.[3] Occasional agreements between the Bishop's Psalter and the others following the universal practice should not mislead, and can be seen to occur for stylistic or other reasons. Psalm 4 in the Bishops' Bible begins with "Heare me when I call O God of my righteousness:" which agrees with all others. But subsequent mentions of the Lord in the Psalm (where the Tetragrammaton appears in the Hebrew Text) are also rendered 'God', with the result that the whole Psalm evokes 'God' alone, without any mention of 'Lord'. Psalm 33.12 appeared in Coverdale as "Blessed are the people that holde the LORDE for their God". The Great Bible had "Blessed are the people whose God is the Lord Jehouah". The Bishops' Psalter though verbally very close, inverts the two terms as is its usual practice: "Blessed is the nation that hath God to be their Lorde". The net result of this aberration is that in the Bishops' Psalter 'Lord' is always a title or an office, and 'God' is the only name by which the Deity is addressed. All suggestion of the Tetragrammaton as the personal name of God is thereby simply eliminated.

The following article is an examination of this strange deviation and of the unhappy Psalter in which it is found, what may be said about it and its speedy eclipse. We shall then assess why Archbishop Parker, effectively the editor-in-chief, may have tolerated such a psalter, permitted the growing printing and use of metrical psalms, and why he subsequently appeared complacent in its eclipse. On the basis of recently available manuscript evidence, we shall suggest a long-standing aspiration for his own on-going Psalter project may have lain behind the archbishop's policy in the area of Psalter translation.

1. The Bishops' Bible

The Bishops' Bible was an Elizabethan revision of the Great Bible of 1539 - (reprinted in 1540 with a preface by Cranmer) - by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, and his fellow bishops.[4] During Edward VI's reign (1547-1553), seven editions of Matthew Bible, five of the Great Bible and two of Coverdale's Bible had been printed. But at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign (November 17, 1558) no bible had been printed in England since 1553, prior to the reign of Mary Tudor (1553-1558). The extent to which these earlier printings had survived Mary's attempt to destroy them is not known, though evidently there was a shortage of bibles. The new reign, therefore, saw further printings of the Great Bible in 1561, 1562, 1566

[3] WRIGHT 1911 is suitable.

[4] For a modern over-view: DANIELL 2003, pp. 338-347. The only modern monograph is LEWIS 2016. POCOCK 1882 is eloquent (and often incontrovertible) on the demerits of the version. Similarly, HAMMOND 1983, p. 141, describes the Bishops' Bible as lazy and ill-informed, borrowed or, when original, the product of third-rate scholars and second-class writers.

and 1568.[5] Archbishop Parker, no doubt by then, well aware of the Geneva Bible's superiority over the Great Bible, announced the completion of the Bishops' Bible in a letter to William Cecil (1520-1598), Elizabeth's Secretary, of September 22, 1568.[6] Parker had hoped to present the bible to the Queen at Hampton Court himself, but ill health prevented him, so he wrote to Cecil again on October 5, 1568.[7] In that letter he partially explained his procedure in producing the bible, asked Cecil to get a special privilege for the printer Richard Jugge from the Queen, and to seek from her a licence for the use of the bible in churches.[8] It is important to note that he did not seek to change the Psalter used in the liturgy: as he wrote to Cecil on that occasion: "The Psalteres might remain in the quires as they be much multiplied". He included in the letter an address to the Queen herself.[9] Parker also gave his reasons for producing the bible in his six-page preface to the Old Testament (splendidly adorned with his coat of arms as Archbishop of Canterbury): the shortage of bibles in churches; the opportunity to print more accurately and to improve where possible upon the Great Bible which was by and large followed.[10] His letter to Cecil of October 5,1568 moreover indicated that the notes of the widely circulating Geneva Bible (1560) also made a new translation desirable.[11] He did not attempt to suppress that version, but rather to compete with it[12]; attempts at suppression were not likely to be successful. Though the continental Geneva Bible was not published in England until 1576, after Parker's death,[13] he himself wrote to Elizabeth's secretary in 1565 to advise the extension of Bodley's patent to do so.[14] In this respect, we should note that the Bishops' Psalter did initially embrace

---

[5] DARLOW, MOULE 1963, nos. 110, 117, 120, 122.

[6] POLLARD 1911, pp. 291-292; BRUCE, PEROWNE 1853, pp. 333-334. All that was awaited was 'some ornaments': specifically the engraved title-page with a portrait of the Queen attributed to Francis Hogenberg and portraits of Leicester and Burghley (Cecil himself).

[7] POLLARD 1911, pp. 292-294; BRUCE, PEROWNE 1853, pp. 334-337.

[8] "… that the edicion might be Licensed and only commended in publike reading in Churches, to drawe to one uniformitie, yt weare no greate cost to the most parishes…" POLLARD 1911, pp. 292-294. The request is that the Bible be licensed to be read in churches, that is for private individuals to go and read it there, as had been the Great Bible of 1540 (with Cranmer's Preface) under Henry VIII (in fact, the Queen never granted a licence). Parker continues "The Psalters might remain in Queres as they be much multiplied (these are the Psalms of the Great Bible's second edition of 1572 by Coverdale which had already established themselves in the liturgy) but where of their owne accord they would vse this Translation, Sir, I pray your honor …" indicating that he was not suggesting that the Bishops' Bible (and its Psalter) be used in the liturgy. Ultimately Parker appointed that Bible to be placed in all cathedral churches, and in the household of every bishop, dean, and other dignitary of the Church to be read by their family and strangers. This was in the Convocation of Canterbury April 3 1571 where it was called *amplissimum volumen nuperrime Londini excusum*. From this enactment for casual use in churches, it is reasonable to conclude that at this date it had not been used for public reading during Matins and Evensong as specified in the Book of Common Prayer.

[9] POLLARD 1911, pp. 294-295. Here he also mentions that "…in many Churches they want their Bookes".

[10] Also found in STRYPE 1821, 3, pp. 248-249.

[11] "… notis which might well have ben also well spared" BRUCE, PEROWNE 1853, p. 338. POLLARD 1911, p. 295.

[12] DANIELL 2003, p. 339, argues that the Bishops' Bible was intended to provide scholarly competition for the Geneva Bible without entirely repudiating it: it was meant specifically to block "the advance of the Geneva Bible into churches" (p. 342) – a concern that might well account for some aspects of the layout of its psalter we shall discuss below.

[13] DANIELL 2003, pp. 346-347.

[14] In 1565, together with Edmund Grindal, Bishop of London, Parker recommended to the Queen that John Bodley's licence to print the Geneva Bible be extended for another twelve years: "For thoughe one other special bible for the churches be meant by vs to be set for the as convenient tyme and leysor hereafter will permytte: yet shall it nothing hinder but rather do moche good to have diversitie of translacions and readinges". (POLLARD 1911,

certain conventions of the Genevan Psalter.[15] The psalters appearing in Bishops' Bibles of the 1560s and 1570s amalgamate conventions associated with both calendrical and occasional reading.[16] The Bishops' Psalter prints numbers for the days of the month in its page headings and "Morning prayer" and "Evening prayer" in the heading and margin. As Specland observes "This layout marries the paratextual efforts of the Geneva prose psalter with those of the Common Prayer psalter. It implies that the psalms of the Bishops' Bible are meant to be read both calendrically and occasionally; the reader is to work through them in accordance with a uniform method while also applying individual psalms to personal situations. In this sense, it provides a compromise. Perhaps usage was mostly confined to the priest, but the Bishops' Bible was to be available in church (perhaps the Geneva edition might be available at home?). We shall notice the development of in this compromise in the 1572 edition below.

The Bishops' Bible was printed nineteen times during Elizabeth's reign, and the New Testament thereafter until 1633, but the last edition of the whole bible was a folio from R. Barker in 1602, a year before her death.[17]

2. Who Translated the Psalter?

Matthew Parker's procedure in producing the Bishops' Bible was essentially a successful resurrection of an early plan of Cranmer to parcel out the whole bible amongst the bishops to produce a single carefully orthodox revision acceptable to authorities of the new Church of England.[18] It would appear, however, that Parker's principal eagerness was to produce a New Bible rather than a New Psalter. We have seen he had no intention to rival Coverdale 'in the quires' - the letter to Cecil states this explicitly; the Preface to the whole 1568 Bible apologises for the Psalter in the light of Coverdale's prose translation[19]; and the speed with which it was replaced in the later printings of the Bible all reinforce this. We shall subsequently suggest a further reason which we shall examine more extensively. Though the Bishops' Bible has never received the accolade of subsequent generations, Parker put a lot of work into it personally as the editor, writer of the preface, translator of Genesis, Exodus, Matthew, Mark and most of the Paulines[20], all this alongside the general demands of his high office, and another ongoing project we shall discuss which has recently come to light. Parker acted himself as supervisory editor for the work completed by the various translators, but allowed translation practice to vary greatly from book to book. Hence, in most of the Old Testament (as is standard in English versions) the Tetragrammaton *yhwh* is represented by "the LORD", and the Hebrew *ʼelohim* is represented by "God". But in the Psalms, as we have seen, the practice is reversed.

The letters of invitation to the bishops are lost, though from Parker's own list (which he included in his letter to Queen via Cecil October 5 1568) we know of over a dozen who worked on the enterprise. John Strype, Parker's eighteenth-century biographer, in his *Life of Parker*

---

p. 286). He expresses a similar view in his Preface to the Bishops' Bible. But in both cases, he speaks of diversity between translations, rather than standardising texts which appear more than once in any one given translation. His attitude to diversity we shall find further illustrated below by his own psalter.

[15] Verse numbers were used for first time: they also appear in two-column 1572 edition of the Bishops' Bible Psalter for the Prayer Book Psalter.

[16] The observations which follow here and below draw heavily on SPECLAND 2001.

[17] For a comprehensive list LEWIS 2016, pp. 139-141.

[18] For Cranmer's unsuccessful attempt in the convocation of 1542, LEWIS 2016, pp. 4-6.

[19] See below, p. 139.

[20] The books that Parker himself worked on are fairly sparingly edited from the text of the Great Bible, while those undertaken by Grindal of London emerged much closer to the Geneva text.

prints extracts of letters to him from five bishops involved in the project:[21] the letter he preserves from the Bishop of Rochester, Edmund Guest, who was initially given the Psalms will occupy us further. Parker also invited Cecil himself to join in the project.[22]

Parker's list of contributors accompanied the letter to Cecil on the occasion of the presentation of the completed bible. It is supplemented by tabulating the initials which follow some of the biblical books in the folio editions, or are found printed in or under the ornamental capitals with which a book or chapter begins. Parker explained that the names were 'partlie' attached so that the contributors might be 'more diligent as answerable for their doings.'[23] The situation with respect to the Psalter is a little more complex. Parker gives no indication in his list to whom the work was allocated. However, we do have a letter of Edmund Guest,[24] Bishop of Rochester, probably from 1565, as he returned his portion.[25] He says:

> "I have not altered the translation [of the Great Bible] but where it giveth occasion to error, as in the First Psalm at the beginning, I turn the preterperfect tense into the present tense, because the sense is too hard in the preterperfect tense."[26]

Subsequently he remarks:

> "Where in the New Testament one piece of a psalm is reported, I translate it in the Psalms according to the translation thereof in the New Testament, for the avoiding of the offence that may arise to the people upon divers translations."[27].

(The folly of this practice, as we shall shortly see, has unanimously been denounced by subsequent commentators.) Bishop Cox of Ely in a letter May 3 1566 expressed an interest in the project with which he hoped Parker was well forward.[28] After advising against 'ink-horn' vocabulary, he remarks: "The translation of the Psalms to be used uniformly in one tense". Possibly this is the same point as Guest had made.

The initials Parker placed at the end of the Psalter were, however, 'T.B.' and no acknowledgement was made of Guest's work. John Strype supposed these initials to refer to Thomas Becon (1512-1567). Aldis Wright, however, suggested Thomas Bickley (1518-1596), one of

---

[21] STRYPE 1821, 3, pp. 415-417; POLLARD 1911, pp. 288-291.

[22] POCOCK 1882, p. 35, corrects the date of this letter from 1566 to 1565, which would make it earlier than the others. It was possibly merely a gesture of courtesy.

[23] For the lists and the bishops there mentioned: LEWIS 2016, pp. 21-55.

[24] Edmund Guest (Geste) (1518-77), educated at King's Cambridge; D.D.1571; in hiding under Mary; Chaplain to Parker in 1559 and participated significantly in the revision of the Prayer Book in 1552; Archdeacon of Canterbury 1559; installed Parker as Archbishop December 15 1559; Bishop of Rochester 1560; Bishop of Salisbury 1571. BRADBURY, 1890, pp. 316-318; DUGDALE 1840. For a reconstruction of his library: SELWYN 2017. His Library appears well stocked to perform the task which Parker had asked of him, *ibid* p. 31. Though no edition of the Hebrew Bible has been detected, *ibid*, p. 63, there are several grammars, *ibid* p. 64 n. 89.

[25] BRUCE, PEROWNE 1853, p. 250. The conjectured date is theirs.

[26] STRYPE 1821, 3, p. 208. The Vulgate, Luther, Coverdale and the Geneva Bible had already made this adjustment. Tyndale in his Prologue to the 1534 New Testament remarked that in Hebrew "the preterperfect tense and the present tense is oft both one".

[27] Parker himself had previously remarked to Cecil and the Queen: "yet shall it nothing hinder but rather do moche good to have diversitie of translacions and readinges". (POLLARD 1911, p. 286) *cf.* note 14 *supra.* We shall see Parker's attitude to diversity displayed on several occasions below; it will account in some part in his rejection of Guest's translation of the Psalter, the eclipse of the Bishops' Psalter after 1572, and, I suggest, the abiding aspiration for his own translation.

[28] STRYPE 1821, 3, p. 208. COOPER 1858, p. 332, reports that Bishop Cox writing to Cecil on 10 January 1561-2 proposed a new translation of the Bible and repeated the proposal 3 May 1564 p. 440.

Parker's chaplains, very much involved in the revision of the Prayer Book of 1552 and afterwards Bishop of Chichester; and, indeed, Wright persuaded Pollard of this.[29]

It so happens that Thomas Becon, amongst his many works, has left us a piece from 1542, *Dauids harpe ful of moost delectable armony, newlely stringed and set in tune by Theadore Basille,*[30] which was the pseudonym Becon used at the time. The text is a homiletic devotion built around the metaphor of David's harp and its several strings.[31] It ranges widely over Scripture, but not infrequently cites the Psalms and ends with Psalm 145. This is cited after the Great Bible, with Becon's own independent introduction of capital letters for several occurrences of Lord(e). There is no trace of discontent with the translation of the Psalter, or unhappiness at the traditional marking of the Tetragrammaton in English bibles, nor is there anything I have been able to detect in Becon's earlier work which might suggest an interest in such matters. If Guest's work (accompanying his letter, conjectured to be from 1565) was subsequently handed to Becon, he (Becon) was just two years before his death, and died a year before the appearance of the Bible.

Thomas Bickley (1518-1596) was educated at Magdalen College Oxford and became its vice-president. He was Chaplain at Windsor to Edward VI, but obliged to go into exile under Mary. Under Elizabeth he became chaplain to Parker, he signed the Articles of 1562 and went on to enjoy a distinguished career, finally becoming bishop of Chichester in 1585 where he served until his death. It is difficult to find any indication of why he might have wished to treat the divine name in the Psalter in such an unusual way. A tablet and a coloured statue of him kneeling in prayer was erected in a classical-style aedicule in the Lady Chapel in the Cathedral after his death 26 April 1596. Above the figure one reads: *In Vita et In Morte Iehova mecum*: perhaps an unlikely epitaph for one who is supposed to have attempted to eliminate the divine name from the Psalter.

We may ask why Parker apparently did not recognise Guest's contribution[32]: when writing to the Queen he gave no name to the translator of Psalms, and he placed the initials 'TB' in the final printed bible. Unfortunately, we do not know what Guest's draft looked like, but it seems reasonable to conclude that Parker found it inadequate for some reason. He may have considered the revision too superficial. The adjustment from 'preterperfect' to present in appropriate places remained after the work of 'TB', as a comparative reading of the Great Bible and the Bishops' Bible over the first twenty Psalms will show. But it is hardly a striking change, or an extensive revision. Guest's second remark, about ensuring identical rendering of quoted verses in both Old and New Testament, has provoked little other than derision. It is unimaginable as a modern editorial practice, though Guest obviously considered not disturbing the reader (should they be attentive enough to notice the discrepancies in a large lectern bible) sufficient motivation. He also seems unaware of the possibility of the New Testament quotations originally being taken from the Greek Scriptures rather than the Hebrew. It is moreover not entirely clear what he means: is he talking of instances where there is textual variation between the Hebrew Psalter

---

[29] POLLARD 1911, p. 32.

[30] BASILE 1542. Also to be found AYER 1843, pp. 262-303.

[31] Thomas Becon declared the book of Psalms to be 'the treasure house of the Holy Scripture' because 'it containeth whatsoever is necessary for a Christian man to know. There is nothing in the law, nothing in the prophets, nothing in the preaching of Christ and his apostles, that this noble minstrel, king and prophet [David] doth not decant and sing with most goodly and manifest words' (BECON 1560-1564, III, 144v).

[32] We have suggested, note 27 *supra*, that the two men had different ideas about diversity of translation: perhaps it was the bizarre practice of conforming Old Testament passages to New Testament ones which led Parker to reject Guest's work.

and the Greek New Testament, or merely of occasions where there is a verbal dissimilarity in translation between the Psalter and its later quotation? We may also ask: if it is correct to date Guest's letter to 1565, with what did he compare the Psalter? Did he conform the Psalter's text to the New Testament quotations already to be found in the Great Bible? It is very difficult to imagine he had access to or detailed knowledge of the drafts of the New Testament Books then currently being worked on by several bishops.

With respect to a significant difference in the meaning of the text, we may consider Ps 68.18: "Thou wentest vp on high,[33] thou hast led captivitie captive, thou hast received gifts for men" following all the English versions. Ephesians 4.8, in the Bishops' Bible citing this verse has: "Wherefor he saith: when he went up an hye, he led captivitie captive, and gave gyftes unto men" where the Great Bible of 1539 also has 'and gave gyftes unto men'. Clearly the Psalter has not been conformed to the text of Ephesians, but the difference has been left as apparent as it was in the Great Bible. With respect to the harmonisation of passages where the underlying Hebrew or Greek text itself is not in question, we may take a sample from first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews which has many quotations from the Psalms. Discrepancies between the Psalter and the New Testament are underlined in both.

Hebrews 1.5 Thou art my sonne, this day have I begotten thee (which follows the Great Bible): Psalm 2.7 thou art my sonne, this day I have begotten thee (with the Great Bible).

Hebrews 1.7 he maketh his Angels spirites, and his ministers a flambe of fyre (which follows the Great Bible): Psalm 104.4 He maketh his angels spirites: and his ministers a flaming fire (with the Great Bible).

Hebrews 1.8 Thy seate O God, [shalbe] for ever and ever: the scepter of thy kingdome [is] a scepter of righteousnesse (the Great Bible has: is a right scepter): Psalm 45.6 Thy throne O Lorde endureth for euer and euer: the scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdome. (The Great Bible has: Thy seate (O God) endureth for euer: the scepter of thy kingdome is a right scepter.)

Hebrews 1.9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquitie: Therefore God, even thy God, hath annoynted thee with the oyle of gladnesse above thy fellows (which follows the Great Bible): Psalm 45.7 Thou hast loued iustice and hated vngodlynesse: wherefore the Lorde, even thy Lorde hath annoynted thee with the oyle of gladnesse more than thy felowes. (The Great Bible has: Thou hast loued righteousnesse, and hated iniquite: wherefore God (euē thy God) hath anoynted the with the oyle of gladnes aboue thy felowes.)

Hebrews 1.10 And, Thou Lorde, in the begynnyng hast layed the foundation of the earth: And the heavens are the works of thy hands (with the Great Bible): Psalm 102.22 Thou [vacat] hast before tyme layde the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the worke of thy hands. (The Great Bible has: Thou Lord in the begynnyng hast layed the foundacyon of the earth, and the heauens are the worcke of thy hands.)

Hebrews 1.11 They shall perishe, but thou endurest, and they shall ware olde as doth a garment (with the Great Bible): Psalm 102.23 They shall perishe, but thou wylt remayne styll: they all shall waxe old as doth a garment. The Great Bible has: thou shalt endure).

Hebrews 1.12 And as a vesture shalt thou folde thē up (The Great Bible has: shalt thou change them), and they shalbe changed: but thou art the same (The Great Bible has: euen the same) and thy yeres shall not fayle: Psalm 102.23 and as a vesture thou wylt chaunge

[33] Coverdale, the Great Bible and Geneva, all here prefer "Thou art gone vp an hye/ an hye/on high…".

them, and they shalbe chaunged. (24) But thou art [vacat], and thy yeres can not fayle. (The Great Bible has: and as a vesture shalt thou chaunge them, and they shalbe chaūged).

Hebrews 1.13 sitte [vacat] on my right hande, tyll I make thyne enemies thy foote stoole (with the Great Bible): Psalm 110.1 sit thou on my right hande, vntyll I make thyne enemies thy footestoole (with the Great Bible).

It is sadly impossible to know how thorough and systematic Guest was in conforming the Psalter to the New Testament, but the few examples from the 1568 printed Bishops' Bible above show no evidence *at all* of any attempt at such conformity. Sometimes (Hebrew 1.10) the Bishops' Psalter even departs from the Psalter of the Great Bible to introduce discordance with the New Testament. Sometimes (Hebrews 1.12) the Bishops' Psalter merely follows The Great Bible and does *not* take an opportunity to introduce greater conformity between the Psalter and the New Testament. We may further observe how the perversity of the Bishops' Psalter's treatment of the Tetragrammaton (in Hebrews 1.8 and 1.9) introduces greater discrepancy with the New Testament, even when it chooses merely to miss the divine name out (Hebrews 1.11). On these grounds we may safely conclude that Guest's programme was *not* carried out in this respect. On the other hand, our small sample also indicates (Hebrews 1.8, 1.9, 1.10) that the Bishops' Psalter, as we now have it, *does* make changes to the Great Bible's Psalter. Such a comparison is easily done more systematically, but will not be documented here.

It is possible Parker passed Guest's work on to 'T.B.' or 'T.B.' may have started again from scratch: all the work may be his and the adjustment of 'preterperfect tense' something commonplace he also thought appropriate to do. Unfortunately, this gives us no clue as to who was responsible for the perverse treatment of the divine name. Did 'T.B.' introduce this into his revision of the Great Bible, which was arguably more thorough than Guest's? Or, did he inherit a sheaf of annotated pages from a dismantled Great Bible from Guest in which the treatment of the divine name had been systematically reversed, but then baulked at the idea of having to correct them all back again?[34] Was such a programmed change part of the clearly expressed desire of Guest for uniformity, to be achieved here by simplifying the endless alternation between 'the Lord' and 'God' in the Psalter to produce a text which spoke consistently of only 'God', occasionally acknowledged as 'Lord'? An examination of 140 pages of Guest's work does indicate a tendency to replace 'Lord' with 'God' in English, though naturally the distinctions are maintained in citing the Vulgate in Latin[35]: thus in quoting 2 Chron 29.30 he tells us that Ezechias commanded the Levites to praise God (not the Lord), but shortly thereafter cites "*nomen Domini in Sion*".[36] In citing Prov. 24.21, he puts 'God', for the Tetragrammaton[37]; and in citing Lam 3.22 *Domini* in Latin is rendered 'God' in English; and 'God' (not the Lord)

[34] When Edwin Sandys, bishop of Worcester, had finished his assignment (he initially revised 3 and 4 Kings (1 and 2 Kings) and Chronicles), he sent it to Parker with a letter (POLLARD 1911, pp. 288-289; BRUCE, PEROWNE 1853, pp. 256-257). In it he described returning "the book" and with it the clerk "whose hand I used in writing forth the corrections and marginal notes". He offered that when Parker got one of his chaplains to review the work, the said clerk should also attend "to make it plain to him, how my notes are to be placed". This suggests that the bishop had himself dictated the corrections and marginal notes and the clerk had had the task of recording these on a text of the Great Bible. It also indicates the expectation that the revision would be done by one of Parker's chaplains and not by himself.

[35] These are taken for convenience from the appendices in DUGDALE 1840, who gives the text of otherwise unpublished work.

[36] DUGDALE 1840, p. 152. Argument against the first Papist Proposition at the Dispute with Marian divines in Westminster Abbey, Spring 1559, when the new Religious Settlement was being worked out.

[37] *Ibid*, p. 191. 1560 sermon citing scripture in Latin and English.

commands the blasphemer be stoned[38]. On the other hand, Guest was evidently capable of putting 'Lord' for *Dominus*. He cites the commandment as "Thou shalt love the lord thy god…"[39]; *Dominus* in the story of Korah is rendered 'the Lorde'[40]; in Ecclesiasticus 5.8, *Dominum* is given as 'Lorde'[41]; in his early, and only published work, *Treatise against the Prevee Mass* (1548), he cites Gen 4.4 as "The Lorde looked unto Abel (sayth Moyses) and to his offering…"[42]; later on he cites Malachi 1.10 as "I have no wyl to you sayth the Lord of Hosts and I wyl not receave of your hande a sacrifice."[43] Such evidence suggests Guest was indifferent to how he rendered the Tetragrammaton, though this leaves open the possibility that he was motivated by a concern for uniformity in the case of his translation of the Psalter. But if this was not Guest, what could we even imagine motivated 'T.B.'? Sadly, there does not seem to be a way of deciding this issue: we do not know who was responsible for the aberration, nor why they did it.

3. The Fate of the Bishops' Psalter

The Bishops' Psalter has found little acclaim. A somewhat apologetic comment of Parker in his Preface to the whole 1568 Bible, seems to indicate that he himself entertained reservations about the Psalter, or had, at least, heard criticisms from others:

> Let the gentle reader have this Christian consideration within himself that though he findeth the psalms of this translation following, not so to sound agreeable to his ears in his wonted words and phrases, as he is accustomed with, yet let him not be much offended with the work, which was wrought for his own commodity and comfort.

The first editions of the Bishops' Bible were printed by Richard Jugge, and carry his mark of the pelican feeding her young. The artwork of the first edition is remarkably elegant.[44] Jugge died in 1577. The first edition (DM 89 STC 2099[45]) was a folio in black letter type with headings in Roman type. It carried a Preface by Parker, a reprinting of Cranmer's Prologue from the 1540 Great Bible, and the Psalter was introduced by a passage from John Chrysostom, plus a shorter one from Augustine. A revised quarto edition appeared in 1569 (DM 93 STC 2105) with scholarly revisions by Lawrence.[46] What is of great interest here is that, as we shall see below, Sternhold and Hopkins' version metric psalter was published bound as a supplement within this 1569 Bible and thereafter.

---

[38] *Ibid*, p. 188. 1560 sermon citing scripture in Latin and English.

[39] *Ibid*, p. 183. 1560 sermon citing scripture in Latin and English.

[40] *Ibid*, p. 191. 1560 sermon citing scripture in Latin and English.

[41] *Ibid*, p. 195. 1560 sermon citing scripture in Latin and English.

[42] *Ibid*, p. 100.

[43] *Ibid,* p. 105.

[44] At the beginning of Genesis in the 1568 edition there is a depiction of Eden with a Hebrew Tetragrammaton represented on the Sun: the unique aversion to the marking of the divine name found in the Psalter is not found in the rest of the edition. A similar Tetragrammaton is found in the illustration of Eden in Christopher Barker's 1583 folio edition.

[45] The annotation denotes here and below: DM – DARLOW, MOULE 1963, here # 89*;* STC – POLLARD, REDGRAVE 1926, here # 2099.

[46] For the scholarly revisions to the New Testament text by Giles Lawrence, Professor of Greek at Oxford, see STRYPE 1821, 2, p. 223; EADIE 1876, pp. 79-83. WESTCOTT 1905, pp. 230-44, identifies Lawrence differently and takes a different view. For the Bishops' Bible's Old Testament readings, see PARTRIDGE 1973, pp. 86-94.

In 1572 another folio edition appeared (DM 96 STC 2107) with revision in Old and New Testament, but did not make use of the corrections of 1569.[47] This third edition 1572 is of particular interest to us as the Great Bible Psalter (*i.e.,* essentially Coverdale's Psalter which appeared in the Prayer Book[48]) was printed in parallel columns with the Bishops' Psalter – presumably because the Bishops' Psalter was either impossible to sing, or no one wanted to. The first column in black letter has: *The translation used in common prayer*, the second in roman type: *The translation after the Hebrews*[49]. This is a clear recognition of inadequacy: it suggests that the Bishops' Psalter had failed to make inroads into the worship of the Established Church. It also shows Jugge's enterprising response to established appreciation by the laity of Coverdale's Psalter and, after 1569, the increasing inroads into the worship of the Church of England made by 'Sternhold'. It is unimaginable that Parker was not aware of what Jugge was printing: his acquiescence in this side-by-side presentation is probable.

In including the two parallel texts in the third edition of 1572, Jugge observes the distinction between the two methods of psalm reading (we discussed above) while recognizing the validity of both. Calendrical reading works through the psalter in accordance with church prescription; its practitioner therefore makes use of the black letter text on the inner side, the text used in church services since the reign of Edward VI. Occasional reading seeks accuracy and understanding; its practitioner turns to the outer side, to the corrected and annotated text in roman type. Within the context of the church, to which this expensive folio would have been mostly confined, one imagines the priest reciting the common prayer psalms for morning and evening prayer but studying and meditating upon the Bishops' Psalms. Both reading methods have their place within the new layout of the page. In addition, the 1572 psalter invites a third kind of psalm reading: comparative reading. It apportions verse numbers to the common prayer psalms, only the second time this had ever been done.[50] The numeration facilitated easy comparison between versions, as a reader could easily find the passage in the Geneva Bible. Perhaps this indicates acquiescence also in the general use of the Geneva Bible outside the liturgy, or maybe it was an attempt to improve the Bishops' Bible offering, or indeed both.

Thereafter, all printings of the Bishops' Bible carried the Great Bible Psalter (*i.e.* the Psalter as it appeared in the Prayer Book) and not the Bishops' Psalter,[51] with the sole and rather puzzling exception of Christopher Barker's 1585 folio (DM144 STC 2143). The Bishop's Psalter had but a short life. The Archbishop allowed it to fade away, with no apparent protest from any party. The legacy of its compromise on reading systems, and its ability to capitalise on reader independence lived on, culminating in texts that encouraged comparative reading across multiple translations, such as the two-text psalter (Geneva and Prayer Book) arranged in parallel

---

[47] For a tabulation of the differences between the Bishops' Psalters of 1568 and 1569 see WRIGHT 1911, pp. 387-389.

[48] If Coverdale's rendering of the Psalter in his 1534 Bible is combined with the copies of the bibles of 1539 and April 1540, both of which he edited, everything (not negligible) in the Prayer Book Psalter will be found traceable to these. See WRIGHT 1911, pp. 379-381. For the differences between Coverdale's Psalters of 1535, 1537, 1550, *ibid,* pp. 379-381. For a comparison of the differences between Cranmer's bible editions 1540-1 with that of 1539 with respect to the Psalter, *ibid*, pp. 382-386. Also, WRIGHT 1906, pp. 270-272.

[49] Rather optimistic perhaps: little positive can be said about the Bishops' Bible's new correction from the Hebrew: WESTCOTT 1905, p. 238; PARTRIDGE 1973, pp. 86-94.

[50] The first time was in the first 1568 edition of the Bishops' Psalter, see note 15 *supra*.

[51] The title page to the Psalter as it appears in Christopher Barker's 1584 folio has: *The Psalter or Psalms of David after the translation of the great Bible as it shall be sung or said in Churches Anno Domini 1584.*

columns of the first large folio Geneva Bible, published in 1578, three years after Parker's death.[52]

4. Metrical Psalms

Miles Coverdale's 1535 translation of the Psalter was in prose. He revised this for inclusion into the Great Bible which was the Bible officially promulgated at the time of the first Book of Common Prayer in 1549,[53] which the Act of Uniformity that year made the sole legal form of worship in England[54]. Initially this new liturgical work, though legally requiring that 'the psalter be read through once every month' in every parish, did not contain within it the psalms themselves, nor did it specify exclusive use of the Great Bible Psalms (1539) with the Prayerbook.[55] Printers, however very quickly started to produce volumes similar in size and size to the Prayerbook which contained Coverdale's Psalms separately. The 1662 revision of the Prayerbook then specifically selected Coverdale's prose psalter for the printing, though all other biblical quotations therein were conformed to the 1611 King James Version. The Book of Common Prayer commonly used Coverdale's prose Psalter. The combination was popular and stable and endured essentially unchanged during Elizabeth's reign, even lasting into the 1662 revision after the Restoration.

But Coverdale had previously, perhaps in 1535, produced an English metrical psalter.[56] This was a genre popular on the Continent and used there for congregational singing. It became popular in England and Scotland also at this time. Arguably, the man with most influence upon sixteenth-century psalmody was Clement Marot who began his work with Psalm 6, the first of the Penitential Psalms.[57] By his death in 1544 he had composed more than fifty psalms and Theodore Beza took over versifying the rest. These were published in Strasbourg in 1549 and became popular in the country and rather scandalously so at court (Marot had dedicated his *Psalms de David* to King François)[58] but also appeared with Calvin's liturgy in 1553. The final 1562 version (with Theodore Beza's versification of those psalms which not been done by Marot) had one hundred and twenty-five tunes.

Coverdale described his 1535 metrical translation in *Goostly Psalmes and Spirituall Songs* as a substitute, he said, for 'foul and corrupt ballads'. The first complete English metrical psalter and the first to include musical notation was *The Psalter of Dauid newely translated into*

---

[52] SPECLAND 2001, pp. 838-839.

[53] See CLAPTON 1934.

[54] The 7th section of the 1st Act of Uniformity in the reign of Edward VI, 1549, authorizing the use of the Prayer Book, enacted "that it shall be lawful for all men, as well in churches, chapels, oratories, or other places, to use openly any psalm or prayer taken out of the Bible at any due time; not letting or omitting thereby the service, or any part thereof, mentioned in the said book." Notice that these should be taken from the Bible.

[55] Which has led to speculation that metrical psalms may sometimes have been substituted, TEMPERLEY 1979, 1, pp. 46-47; QUITSLUND 2008, pp. 245-6. In 1641, the revisers of the Prayer Book declared that "singing of hymns in metre is no part of the liturgy," and therefore they refused to consider them, as not in their commission.

[56] *Goostly psalmes and spirituall songes drawen out of the holy Scripture: for the co[m]forte and consolacyon of soch as loue to reioyse in God and his Worde* (London: imprynted by me Iohan Gough.) The only complete copy is in Queen's College, Oxford. Also found in: PEARSON 1846, pp. 534-590. Coverdale's Epistle to the Psalms here includes margin references (e.g. Mat.4. c. (*1v)) that correlate to the paragraph marks in his Bible: LEAVER p. 67.

[57] PRATT 1933. KING'OO 2012 traces the history of these penitential psalms as a touchstone for devotion from the 14th until the early16th century.

[58] CAMPBELL 1959, pp. 36-38 (p. 37 for the court).

Englysh metre in such sort that it maye the more decently, and wyth more delyte of the mynde, be reade and songe of al men. Printed in 1549, it was the work of Robert Crowley and was printed by him, Richard Grafton and/or Stephen Mierdman. Crowley's Psalter is a rare example of two-colour printing (red and black on the first four leaves) in this era, which makes it visually resemble medieval manuscript psalters. A full collection of all the psalms, usually known as the Sternhold and Hopkins version appeared in 1562.[59]

Thomas Sternhold had published his first, short collection of nineteen psalms, *Certayn Psalmes,* between mid-1547 and early 1549, the year of Crowley's Psalter. In December 1549, his posthumous *Al such psalmes of Dauid as Thomas Sternehold ... didde in his life time draw into English Metre* was printed, containing thirty-seven psalms by Sternhold and, in a separate section at the end, seven psalms by John Hopkins. This collection was taken to the Continent with the Protestant exiles during the reign of Mary Tudor, and editors in Geneva both revised the original texts and gradually added more over several editions. In 1562, the publisher John Day, a man patronised by both Parker and the Privy Council, brought together most of the psalm versions from the Genevan editions and many new psalms by John Hopkins, Thomas Norton, and John Markant to make up *The Whole Booke of Psalmes, Collected into English Meter*.[60] In addition to metrical versions of all 150 psalms, the volume included versified versions of the Apostles' Creed, the *Magnificat*, and other biblical passages or Christian texts, as well as several non-scriptural versified prayers and a long section of prose prayers largely drawn from the *English Forme of Prayers* used in Geneva. The changes in titles and format of the psalms apparent in John Day's successive printings show the 1560 volume gradually being taken up by the Elizabethan church until 1566. By any objective measure of circulation Sternhold and Hopkins's psalter was a success.[61] As a separate volume, it was re-printed more than 200 times between 1550 and 1640; in addition, the psalms in this form were included as a supplement in most editions of the Geneva Bible, and also attached in most versions of the *Book of Common Prayer*. They continued to be in regular use in some congregations until the late eighteenth century. All of these, from Coverdale on, were intended for public congregational use, and even before the Sternhold and Hopkins collection was complete, eager and enthusiastic crowds gathered in 1559 and 1560 at Exeter Cathedral and St. Paul's Cross to sing metrical psalms after the service.[62]

5. Matthew Parker

Matthew Parker was a reluctant Archbishop and as late as June 1559 had written to the Queen to be excused appointment in Reginald Pole's stead, and pleading ill-heath following a fall from a horse while on the run under Queen Mary.[63] Appointed the 70th Archbishop of Canterbury, he faced considerable difficulties: a Queen who disliked married clergy; pro-Catholic peers and

---

[59] For this English tradition, ZIM 1987, and QUITSLUND 2008.

[60] The title page tells us that the psalter is "very mete to be vsed of all sortes pf people priuately for their solace & confort, laying apart all ungodly songes and ballades, which tende only to the nourishing of vyse, and corrupting of youth". In The 1566 edition, John Day added: "faithfully perused and allowed according to thordre appointed in the Quenes Maiesties injunction". This has no reference to ecclesiastical singing but to the licence for publication, QUITSLUND 2008, p. 201.

[61] HAMLIN 2000, pp. 37-51. For a vigorous, though informed, defence of the legality and propriety of 'Sternhold and Hopkins' see, TODD 1822.

[62] HAMLIN 2004, pp. 19-50 shows more extensively the psalter was used by 'all sortes of people'.

[63] STRYPE 1821, 3, pp. 69-70; p. 59 for the fall.

clergy; and Protestants divided bitterly on all sorts of doctrinal matters. The Church had to be steered through these powerful currents.

We may notice two of his activities which are relevant to our developing discussion: his studies in bibliography and his abiding interest in the Psalms. Part of the motive for Parker's Library[64] and his history of books was that the Queen had charged him with a mandate to establish an English Church which would be utterly secure, legal and completely irrevocable. To this end, Parker's sought to justify the Elizabethan English Church by referring to historical precedent; looking far back into early English History to find evidence of an early English Church, independent of Rome but under Kings, of which the Church of England might be considered a legitimate successor. Justifying vernacular bible translation was part of that programme.[65] His search was the fundamental stimulus for Anglo-Saxon Studies in in the Sixteenth Century. He also took a great interest in the Psalter, and this was often consolidated by book-hunting. He borrowed The Vespasian Psalter (an eight-century manuscript of Jerome's revision of the Psalter with a mid-ninth-century interlinear Anglo-Saxon translation)[66] from William Cecil. He returned the volume in 1566, though reluctantly.[67] Also found in his Library, in a fine large fourteenth-century hand, is a manuscript (CCCL ms 278) containing two versions of the Psalter, one in Middle English and the other in Anglo-Norman, thought to be from Norwich Priory.

We have seen examples of the archbishop's permission, if not active encouragement, of a diversity of biblical translations. He similarly allowed a diversity of Psalters. He was undoubtedly a favourer of Metrical Psalmody, and evidently tolerated the intrusion of such music into the English Church in the case of *The Whole Booke of Psalmes, Collected into English Meter*, though they were not to be intermingled in the public Liturgy.[68] He had not suppressed the Geneva Bible or Psalter, but recognised diversity, though careful about not upsetting the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer as he had to be.

Yet in spite of the popularity of Coverdale's prose Psalter, and into the wave of increasingly popular metrical congregational singing, Parker himself, favourable to metrical arrangement, had launched the unfortunate and abortive prose Psalter of the Bishops' Bible, replete with its eccentricities, which had already passed out of use by 1577. We may reasonably ask why.

A forceful initial answer may be that his brief was to revise the Great Bible Psalter. That was in prose and recasting it into metre could hardly be considered a revision. It would have to be a re-writing. Such a change would also give rise to controversy over the propriety of metrical singing, the question of the extent of inspiration in metrical translations, and would take time. The Bishops' Psalter was the best that could be done reasonably, and, one suspects, Parker had a reason to even wish it to fail.

---

[64] On Parker's library see: GRAFTON 2017; GRAHAM 2006, pp. 322-41; and PAGE 1993.

[65] SPILANE 2022, considers the Prefaces of the Bishops' Bible as a contribution to this programme. Parker also oversaw an edition of the Gospels in Anglo-Saxon published by John Foxe which had the text of the Bishops' Bible printed in parallel. Foxe's Preface describes the early work of translating the bible into English, just as do Parker's Prefaces to the Bishops' Bible.

[66] Cotton MS Vespasianus A1.

[67] He remarked the Psalter is "remitted again to your library: in the riches whereof, *videlicet* of such treasures, I rejoice as much as they were in my own". *Matthew Parker to William Cecil,* 24 January 1565/66: Lansdowne MS 8, f. 190r.

[68] See RUSH 2015 pp. 57-81 for discussions of the inspiration of metrical psalters and the propriety of more literary translations.

6. Matthew Parker's Metrical Psalter

In the same year Parker announced the completion of the Bishops' Bible in a letter to William Cecil in September 1568, the Stationers' Register for 22 July 1567—22 July 1568 has: "Receyvd of John Daye for his Lycense for prynting of a boke intituled the hole Psalter translated into englesshe myter… xiiij^{d}". [69] The volume is without date or author, but there can be little doubt that is by Matthew Parker: in the metrical preface to Ps 119, the initial letters spell out *Mattheus Parkerus.*[70] The appearance of the volume at the same time as the Bishops' Bible Psalter is surely significant.

It has generally been supposed that this was the belated publication of the text mentioned in Parker's Latin Diary for his birthday, probably in 1555.[71] It has also been held that that this printed psalter, appearing a decade after being written, was never commercially published, but merely given away to friends.[72] This later contention appeared to be supported by a fine copy in the Lambeth Palace Library in which Margaret Parker dedicates the volume "To the right vertuouse & honorable Ladye the Cowntesse of Shrewesberye from your loving frende Margaret Parker".[73] A memorandum there from Bishop Kennet of Peterborough, whose book it was, says that though the book was anonymous, the Archbishop allowed his wife to present it to several of the nobility.[74]

These convictions, however reasonably held in the past, have now been challenged by the appearance of Einar Bjorvand's splendid edition of Parker's own manuscript of the work (Inner Temple Library Miscellaneous MSS No.36 (MS)).[75] This manuscript disproves the contention that Parker in 1568, published the same text as he finished in 1555. It shows us rather Parker continuously correcting, emending and revising his work. His translation was an on-going preoccupation throughout all of the period before the appearance of the unfortunate Bishops' Psalter.

Professor Bjorvand has also questioned the assumption that the Psalter was only printed for private circulation.[76] Several positive considerations tell against this: Parker had troubled to obtain a ten-year licence for the book,[77] hardly necessary for restricted private circulation. One should also note the amount of work which went into the preparation of the printed volume. The prefatory matter in particular contains an elaborated defence of both metrical psalms and

---

[69] ARBER 1895, p. 96.

[70] The title is: *Matthew Parker, The vvhole Psalter translated into English metre, which contayneth an hundreth and fifty Psalmes. The first quinquagene*. To which is added: '*printed at London by lohn Daye, dwelling ouer Aldersgate, beneath S, Martyns, CVM GRATIA ET PRIVILEGIO Regie maieftatis, per Decennium'*. Parker's own copy is in the Corpus Christi College Library, Cambridge.

[71] ZIM 1987, p. 139. The entry reads: *Et adhuc, hoc 6 Augusti, A^{o}. Dni. 1557 [1555 ?].persto eadem constantia, suffultus gratia et benignitate Domini mei, et Servatoris Jesu Christi, quo inspirante absolvi Psalterium versum metrice lingua vulgari.* BRUCE, PEROWNE, 1853*,* ix, 483. The entry before this is dated 1554 and the one after 1555. It is generally assumed that the date 1557 is an error.

[72] AMES, HERBERT 1786, 1, pp. 678-679; HAWKINS 1776, 3, pp. 502-503;

[73] Shelfmark: xxE1440.P2, verso of title page, A1v.

[74] HAWKINS 1776, 3, pp. 502-503.

[75] BJORVAND 2015.

[76] *Ibid* p. xxxiii-xxxvi

[77] See note 70.

vernacular translation from the Bible, the Fathers (more than thirty-eight pages) and History.[78] The book is also carefully organised: each Psalm comprises Argument, Psalm, and Collect (the later being taken from Ludolph of Saxony's Psalter).[79] Finally, we may note that the Archbishop arranged the Psalms to be sung to eight tunes by Thomas Tallis of the Chapel Royal. It is very difficult to believe this was done for private circulation.[80] Indeed, we may well ask why it was done at all. Sir John Hawkins [81] concluded that the Psalter was intended by the author to be sung in Cathedrals, since Parker adhered to the characteristics of the eight "ecclesiastical tones". Henry Todd pointed out, on the other hand, that Parker did not seek authoritatively to promote his own work and, as we have seen, at the same time was tolerating the Sternhold Version and allowing it to appear in Bishops' Bibles after 1569: he also continued to patronize John Day who printed that version.[82]

7. Concluding Reconstruction

Is it possible at this point to conjecture a rationale, however improvised, behind Matthew Parker's several dealings with the Book of Psalms? We should start with the clear evidence from Professor Bjorvand's work, that Parker had for over a decade before the appearance of the Bishops' Bible maintained a continuous private project of producing his own psalter. With learned defence of metrical psalmody and vernacular translation, careful organisation, it was also fitted to Tallis' tunes, so that it could be sung.

Parker produced his psalter at the same time as the Bishops' Bible became available in Churches as an academic rival for the already circulating continental Geneva Bible. Why did he not substitute his own usable version into the Bible? First, because his brief was merely to revise the Great Bible, and in no way could his own psalter be merely that. (We have seen how superficially Edmund Guest initially treated the revision of the Psalms.) Second, we should remember that metrical psalms were not part of the liturgy and that, although no psalms were legally prescribed for the Book of Common Prayer, Coverdale's prose 'Prayer Book Psalter' was increasingly popular, and, indeed, remained so.

But the use of metrical psalms outside of the liturgy was growing, and there is no doubt that Parker supported this innovation. Sternhold and Hopkins' Psalter, completed in 1562, was becoming increasingly popular, and the Archbishop may well have offered his psalter as a rival, though not assertively. He published anonymously, and was at the same time acquiescent in the inclusion of the Sternhold Psalter in the Bishops' Bible after 1569 - it was after all the work of many, not a single individual. Why not publish under his own name and with the full authority of his office? It would appear that by conviction Parker was happy with diversity of translation. He had not attempted to suppress the Geneva Bible (though he did not like its notes), nor did he dissent from the aims of the 'Calvinist' Sternhold and Hopkins' Psalter in facilitating popular congregational psalm-singing. But with the growing popularity of Sternhold and Hopkins, to use his authority to promote his own psalter would undoubtedly create dissent and factionalism.

---

[78] BJORVAND 2015, pp. xxxvi-xl. Parker's own views on diversity appear when he specifically invites the reader 'to think of the English text as unfixed'. NORTON 1993, p. 118.

[79] BJORVAND 2015, pp. xl-xliii

[80] BJORVAND 2015, pp. xliii-xlix for metrical variety in Parker's Psalter. Not all the Psalms can be sung to Tallis' tunes. Also: MILSON 2016, pp. 207-218.

[81] HAWKINS 1776, 3, p. 503 note.

[82] TODD 1822, p. 37.

Suppressing books was not a good idea, and Parker had to live with his fractious church. Perhaps he had hopes that the merits of his version would be recognised and it would grow in popularity without him promoting it openly. If so, he was disappointed.

If, in conclusion, we return to the Psalter of the Bishops' Bible, we may perhaps understand not only why Parker apologised for it in his Preface, but was happy to see it eclipsed subsequently by Coverdale's. Apparently, he had difficulty in finding someone to do it well. Guest appears not to have been up to scratch and was dropped, whether or not he bequeathed his perverse treatment of the divine name to T. B.. It was the best Parker could get together within his brief and in the time allowed. No doubt he thought his own metrical version would be ideal for the developing needs of the church, but he could not force the issue without causing harm, and in the end popular taste was content with Sternhold and Hopkins.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AMES J., HERBERT W., 1786: *Typographical Antiquities or an Historical Account of the Origins and Progress of Printing in Great Britain and Ireland … From the Year MCCCCLXXI to the Year MDC. Begun by the late Joseph Ames… Considerably augmented, … By William Herbert in 3 vols,* London.

ARBER E. (ed.), 1895: *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London:1554-1640 A.D.,* London.

AYER J. (ed.), 1843: *The Early Works of Thomas Becon … Being the Treatises Published by Him in the Reign of King Henry VIII*, Cambridge.

BASILE T., [Beacon T.], 1542: *Dauids harpe ful of moost delectable armony, newely strynged and set in tune by Theadore Basille*, *Imprynted at London in Botulph lane at the sygne of the whyte beare, by John Mayler for John Gough, Anno Domini 1542*, London.

BECON T., 1560-1564: *The worckes of Thomas Becon which he hath hitherto made and published into three tomes,* London.

BJORVAND E., 2015: *David's Blissful Harp A Critical Edition of the Manuscript of Matthew Parker's Metrical Psalms (1-80) Edited with a Introduction and Commentary,* Tempe, Arizona.

BRADBY E.T., 1890: "Edmund Guest", *Dictionary of National Biography* vol 23, pp. 316-318, London.

BRUCE J., PEROWNE T.T., 1853: *Correspondence of Matthew Parker… Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from A.D.1535, to His Death A. D. 1575* (The Parker Society Publications 33), Cambridge.

CAMPBELL L.B., 1959: *Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth-Century England,* Cambridge.

CLAPTON E., 1934: *Our Prayer Book Psalter, Containing Coverdale's Version from His 1535 Bible and the Prayer Book Version by Coverdale from the Great Bible 1539-1541 Printed Side by Side*, London.

COOPER H.C., COOPER T., 1858: *Athenae Cantabrigienses* vol.1 1500-1585, Cambridge.

COVERDALE M., 1535: *Goostly psalmes and spirituall songes drawen out of the holy Scripture: for the co[m]forte and consolacyon of soch as loue to reioyse in God and his Worde*, London.

DANIELL D., 2003: *The Bible in English Its History and Influence*, London.

DARLOW T.H., MOULE H.F., 1963: *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society* 2 vols, New York.

DUGDALE H.G., 1840: *The Life and Character of Edmund Guest S.T.P.,* London.

EADIE J., 1876: *The English Bible: An External and Critical History of the Various English Translations*…, vol 2, London.

GRAFTON A., 2017: "Matthew Parker: The Book as Archive", *History of Humanities* 2.1 pp. 15-20; also in *Idem,* 2020: *Inky Fingers The Making of Books in Early Modern Europe* pp. 128-151, Cambrige Mas.

GRAHAM T., 2006: "Matthew Parker's manuscripts: an Elizabethan library and its use", in LEEDHAM-GREEN E., WEBBER T. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, Volume 1: To 1640,* Cambridge, pp. 322-41.

HAMLIN H., 2000: ""Very Mete to be used of all sortes of people": The Remarkable Popularity of the "Sternhold and Hopkins" Psalter", *The Yale University Library Gazette*, Vol. 75, No. 1/2, pp. 37-51.

—, 2004: *Psalm Culture and Early Modern Literature*, Cambridge.

HAMMOND G., 1983: *The Making of the English Bible*, New York.

HAWKINS J., 1776: *A General History of the Science and Practice of Musi*, vol. 3, London.

KING'OO C.C., 2012: *Miserere Mei: the Penitential Psalms in Late Mediaeval and Early Modern England*, Notre Dame, Ind.

LEAVER R.A., 1991: *Goostly Psalmes and Spirituall Songes: English and Dutch Metrical Psalms from Coverdale to Uterhove 1535-1566,* Oxford.

LEWIS J.P., 2016: *The Day after Domesday: The Making of the Bishops' Bible*, Oregon.

MILSON J., 2016: "Tallis, the Parker Psalter, and some known unknowns", *Early Music* 44/2 pp. 207-218.

NORTON D., 1993: *A History of the Bible as Literature. Vol.1 From Antiquity to 1700*, Cambridge.

PAGE R.I., 1993: *Matthew Parker and his Books: Sandars lectures in bibliography delivered on 14, 16 and 18 May 1990 at the University of Cambridge*, Kalamazoo, MI.

PARKER M., [1568]: *The vvhole Psalter translated into English metre, which contayneth an hundreth and fifty Psalmes. The first quinquagene*, London.

PARTRIDGE A.C.,1973: *English Biblical Translation,* London.

PEARSON G., 1846: *Remains of Myles Coverdale ... Containing Prologues to the translation of the Bible. Treatise on death. Hope of the faithful. Exhortation to the carrying of Christs's cross. Exposition upon the twenty-second Psalm. Confutation of the treatise of John Standish. Defence of a certain poor Christian man. Letters. Ghostly psalms and spiritual songs. Edited for the Parker Society,* Cambridge.

POLLARD A.W. (ed.), 1911: *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611,* London.

POLLARD A.W., REDGRAVE G.R., 1926: *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640,* London.

POLOCK N., 1882: "The Bishops' Bible" *Bibliographer* 1, pp. 33-37, 67-71, 111-116, 148-9.

PRATT W.S., 1933: *The Significance of the Old French Psalter Begun by Clement Marot in 1532. An Address before the Hymn Society at its Decennial Celebration at Union Theological Seminary, New York, November 12, 1932,* New York.

QUITSLUND B., 2008: *The Reformation in Rhyme: Sternhold, Hopkins and the English Metrical Psalter,* Aldershot.

RUSH R.M., 2015: "Authority and Attribution in the Sternhold and Hopkins Psalter", *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 57-81.

SELWYN D.G., 2017: *Edmund Geste and his Books,* London.

SPECLAND J., 2001: "Competing Prose Psalters and their Elizabethan Readers", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 74/3, pp. 829-875.

SPILANE H., 2022: "A Matter Newly Seene": The Bishops' Bible, Matthew Parker and Elizabethan Antiquarianism", *Reformation* 27/2, p.107-124.

STRYPE J., 1821: *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker the First Archbishop of Canterbury* 3 vols., Oxford.

TEMPERLEY N.,1979: *The Music of the Parish Church* 2 vols., Cambridge.

TODD H.J.,1822: *Observations upon the Metrical Version of the Psalms made by Sternhold, Hopkins and Others…,* London.

WESTCOTT B.F.,1905: *A General View of the History of the English Bible*, London.

WILKINSON R.J., 2015: *Tetragrammaton: Western Christians and the Hebrew Name of God From the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century*, Leiden.

WRIGHT W.A.,1906: "The Prayer Book Psalter", *Journal of Theological Studies*, 7/ 26, p. 270-272. With corrections JTS 7 /28, p. 629.

— (ed.), 1911: *The Hexaplar Psalter Being the Book of Psalms in Six English Versions,* Cambridge.

ZIM, R., 1987: *English Metrical Psalms: Poetry as Praise and Prayer 1535-1601,* Cambridge.

ABSTRACT

This article begins with an investigation of the Psalter of the 1568 Bishops' Bible and its several unhappy features. The Psalter is then placed in the history of Reformation English Bibles and the growth of English metrical psalmody. Finally, an attempt is made to reconstruct the rationale of Archbishop Matthew Parker's dealings with the Psalms over several years in the light of his own 1568 metrical translation.

KEYWORDS

1. Archbishop Matthew Parker
2. The Bishops' Bible (1568)
3. English Psalmody
4. The Psalter

How to cite: R.J. WILKINSON, "Archbishop Parker, the Bishops' Bible (1568) and the Book of Psalms", *BABELAO* 14 (2025), pp. 131-149.