

5. May we not with many commentators, translate L.k. iii, 23 thus: “(Jesus), being the supposed son of Joseph (but, in reality, son) of Heli”? So translated, of course, we should have to understand “son of Heli” as meaning “grandson of Heli” and assume that the name of Mary, His Mother, has been missed out.

## A NOTE ON THE CHALLONER REVISION

CANON BURTON in his chapter on Bishop Challoner’s Edition of the Bible (*The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner* I, pp. 270 ff.) was not able to throw much light on the methods used in the long and heavy work of revision, nor on the assistance the Bishop received from other clergy in doing it, and indeed he suggests that it was a work for individual enterprise. In our day mechanical aids to writing and duplicating make it easy to forget the physical labour involved. An edition is most easily corrected by the insertion of alterations in a printed copy, and so far as the New Testament is concerned there existed a two version edition by Fulke containing in parallel columns the Bishop’s Bible version and the Rheims version. It would certainly have been a handy edition to use. Anyone who has handled the small but most fascinating group of ancient bilingual manuscripts in Greek and Latin or the mediaeval manuscripts containing the different Latin versions of the Psalter knows how a scribe tends to “contaminate” juxtaposed versions. It is probable that careful examination on these lines could provide several clues to Bishop Challoner’s methods. We have no information but it does seem improbable that the whole Bible was written out by hand; it is far more likely that a corrected copy of a printed edition was sent to the printer.

Who was the printer? Canon Burton (p. 287) suggests it was Thomas Meighan, although he mentions another suggestion. Yet Canon Burton himself edited along with Father Pollen in 1909 Dr. John Kirk’s *Biographies of English Catholics in the Eighteenth Century* and that contains an item which does not seem to have been generally noticed. Under the name Typper he quotes a letter from Mr. Thomas Berington written in November 1743: “You desire my opinion and that of others about the intended edition of the Bible. The best light I can give is to let you know the parties concerned in the birth and then you may judge for yourself better than I. Mr. Typper has been pregnant some time and is now in labour. Dr. Challoner *lambendo formabit*; Needham,

*Bibliopola in lucem edet. Tres ex Clero seculari magnis sane meritis piisque in Dei vinea laboribus insignes.* Messrs R. et C. approved the same, but added with Bishop G.'s consent Laurence Mayes and Mr. Townley."

This rather obscure item could be commented on at considerable length. Mr. Typper's real name was Robert Pinkard. Needham, the London bookseller, was his cousin; an item under the name Pinkard in Gillow's *Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics* should be consulted. Laurence Mayes is a well-known name; he was agent in Rome for the English Bishops from 1709 till his death in 1749, and it is not clear how he could have assisted directly as he was continuously in Rome. However, further comment must be left to those who have access to the manuscript records cited in Gillow's Dictionary. But this item in Kirk does suggest that the heavy work of revising the Bible was done by the Rev. Thomas Pinkard and that Dr. Challoner "licked it into shape" by a final revision, and typographical experts with access to eighteenth century Catholic books might consider the claim of Needham to be the publisher of Challoner's revision.

It would seem that we may exclude the Carmelite Father Simon Stock of the Blessed Trinity (whose family name was Francis Blyth) from a share in the revision of the Douay Bible. Notices of him will be found in Kirk, in Gillow and most fully in Father Benedict Zimmerman's *Carmel in England* pp. 373 ff., London, 1899. He collaborated with Dr. Challoner in producing the Rheims New Testament edition in folio in 1738. Collaboration was not so easy after 1741 when Challoner became a Bishop, nor after 1742 when Father Simon Stock became Vicar-Provincial of his order. The dispute between the Vicars Apostolic and the Regulars was going on and indeed we have positive evidence of the way in which Bishop Challoner wrote about Francis Blyth. Canon Burton (*Life of Challoner* I, p. 267) quotes a letter written by Bishop Challoner 16th March 1748-9, to Bishop Stonor in which he says: "At least I know your friend Blyth was in consult with him (i.e. Mr. Englefield) last Sunday se'en night." Biblical revision was going on at that very time and Blyth along with the Benedictines, Franciscans, Jesuits and Dominicans had just declared their submission to Mr. Abram's (i.e. the Pope's) second orders "tho' in a way somewhat awkward" (see Burton I, p. 263 n.). It would not have been easy for Bishop Challoner and Father Simon Stock to have collaborated then, and we may be quite certain they did not.

Another problem may be added. If the date of Mr. Thomas Berington's letter is correct, the time taken in the revision is much longer than Canon Burton suggested. It had been going on for some time in 1743. Who is Bishop G.? Is he Bonaventura Giffard who died in 1733-4? If so, the project was of long standing.

WILLIAM JAMES ANDERSON.