

Sunday, February 9, 2025—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*
Lesson 253 Assessing the Printed History of the King James Text (Blayney & The 1769 Oxford Text)

Introduction

- Since Lesson 249 we have been looking at the editorial work of F.S. Parris upon the text of the King James Bible. All told we have considered the following aspects of his work:
 - Changes in noun from singular to plural. ([Lesson 249](#))
 - Restored definite articles that had been omitted in 1611. ([Lesson 249](#))
 - Changes in definite articles to a possessive pronoun. ([Lesson 249](#))
 - Addition of apostrophes and possessive forms. ([Lesson 251](#))
 - Idioms & Modern Forms ([Lesson 251](#))
 - Changes In “You” & “Ye” ([Lesson 252](#))
 - Titus 2:13, Numbers 7, & Other Misc. Readings ([Bonus Lesson](#))
- In this Lesson we want to conclude our discussion of F.S. Parris and pivot towards a discussion of Benjamin Blayney and the Oxford edition of 1769. In order to accomplish this task, we will be covering the following two points:
 - Final Thoughts On F.S. Parris
 - Benjamin Blayney & The Oxford Text

Final Thoughts On F.S. Parris

- Professor Gordon Campbell concludes his discussion of F.S. Parris by stating the following:
 - “The folio Bible that Parris produced from Cambridge University Press in 1743 was an important edition because of the principles on which it was edited. The full implementation of those principles, however, was not accomplished until an Oxford editor assumed the task, and produced what is in effect the modern text of the KJV.” (Campbell, 136)
- Dr. David Norton also comments on these developments in *A Textual History Of The King James Bible*. He concludes his discussion of Parris by referring to the judgment of F.H.A. Scrivener.

- “Parris worked mainly on scholarly textual correction, italicization, and marginal notes and cross-references, doing more, as Scrivener observed, to bring these into their modern state than the better known Oxford edition of 1769 [See page 29 in Scrivener’s [The Authorized Edition of the English Bible \(1611\)](#).].” (Norton, 105)
- Judging from these statements, it seems fair to conclude that Blayney completed what Parris started in terms of editing the text.
- Before officially passing the torch to Benjamin Blayney, the next major editor to impact the text, some conclusory thoughts on F.S. Parris are in order. Referring to Parris’ 1743 edition, Wikipedia cites David McKitterick in support of the following statement,
 - “this edition was reprinted in 1747 and 1752. Still not satisfied, Parris made substantial further alterations for the prolonged 1756-58 edition. Parris’s revision of the text culminated a little before his death in the 1760 octavo edition. This was reprinted without further changes in a 1762 folio edition, printed by Joseph Bentham.” ([Wikipedia](#))
- Wikipedia offers McKitterick’s *Four Hundred Years Of University Printing* by Cambridge, University Press from 1984 as the source for the above statement. While I cannot find the contents of the citation in the source cited by Wikipedia, I consider the information to be generally correct regarding the life and career of F.S. Parris, judging by clues gleaned from A.S. Herbert’s *Historical Catalogue Of Printed Editions of The English Bible, 1525-1961* (See pages 265, 267, 272, & 274).

Benjamin Blayney & The Oxford Text

- Professor Gordon Campbell, author of *Bible: The Story of the King James Version, 1611-2011* introduced his readership to Benjamin Blayney in the following paragraph.
 - “Benjamin Blayney is little known today, but he might rightly be regarded as the single most important individual in the history of the KJV, because the twenty-first century text of the Bible is essentially Blayney’s text. Blayney was a clergyman, a Hebraist, and an academic with a fellowship at Hertford College, Oxford. Blayney was asked by the University Press to prepare a corrected edition of the KJV. The impetus for this project was the work of Parris at Cambridge, and the instructions of the Oxford delegates specified that the Cambridge editions of 1743 and 1760 should be used as part of the scholarly underpinning of the new Oxford edition. These two editions were to be collated with the first edition and with Lloyd’s folio of 1701. In stipulating that the first edition (described as ‘the original and most authentic edition’) should be an integral part of the process, the delegates were introducing an important principle, but there was a difficulty: they did not know which was the first edition. They therefore decided to consult Thomas Secker, the archbishop of Canterbury. The archbishop was uncertain, but thought that it was probably the roman-type folio of 1612.

Blayney volunteered to edit the Oxford edition (for which he was paid £350) [According to Eric Nye's *Pounds Sterling to Dollars: Historical Conversion of Currency*, £350 in 1769 is equal to \$87,590.81 in 2025.] and an account of principles is embodied in his report to the vice-chancellor and the delegates, which was a sufficient public interest to be published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in November 1769." (Campbell, 136-137)

- In his *Textual History*, Professor Norton also comments on the circumstances that culminated in Benjamin Blayney editing the text for Oxford University. Dr. Norton writes:
 - "This Oxford edition, the third of the outstanding folios, propagated and, especially in matters of spelling and grammar, developed Parris's work. Presumably in response to the developments manifest in the Cambridge folios, Oxford had determined in October 1764 that the lessee of its Bible Press should

provide . . . one or more Copies of the Bible accurately collated with the Original or most Authentic Edition of the present Translation, and... these and no other shall hereafter be used in correcting the Books to be printed by virtue of this Lease, making due Allowance for modern Variations in mere Orthography. [See page 356 of Harry Carter's *A History of the Oxford University Press: Volume I.*]

Explicit concern for 'the Original or most Authentic Edition' is something we have not seen in the century since Kilburne's campaign. The Delegates did not know what text to take, so the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Secker, was asked 'what Copy of an English Bible his Grace would recommend as a proper Standard for the University Printer'. Secker too did not know; he thought the first edition was the 1612 Roman folio, and replied that he had heard that Parris 'took great Pains in the same good work' (Carter, p. 358). This was not to be the last time one of the University Presses found itself ignorant of the basis of its text: the present book comes from a similar inquiry made by Cambridge University Press in 1994.

Given such meagre information, the Oxford Delegates ordered a collation of the Cambridge editions of 1743 and 1760 with the first edition and Lloyd's 1701 folio, and they sought an editor: Benjamin Blayney, later to be Regius Professor of Hebrew, volunteered. His report to the Vice-Chancellor and Delegates (reproduced in appendix 7) gives a good sense of what he did, and the problems and labour involved." (Norton, 105)

- In Appendix 7 of *A Textual History* Professor Norton reproduces in its entirety the piece that Blayney published in the November 1769 issue of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. The following is a reproduction of Blayney's article as it appears in Appendix 7 of Norton's book on pages 195-197. Please see Appendix A for screenshots from the original article.
 - "Appendix 7
Blayney's 'Account of the collation and revision of the Bible' *The Gentleman's Magazine*, volume 39,

November 1769, pp. 517–19

The Editor of the two editions of the Bible lately printed at the Clarendon Press thinks it his duty, now that he has completed the whole in a course of between three and four years close application, to make his report to the Delegates of the manner in which that work has been executed; and hopes for their approbation.

In the first place, according to the instructions he received, the folio edition of 1611, that of 1701, published under the direction of Bishop Lloyd, and two Cambridge editions of a late date, one in Quarto, the other in octavo, have been carefully collated, whereby many errors that were found in former editions have been corrected, and the text reformed to such a standard of purity, as, it is presumed, is not to be met with in any other edition hitherto extant.

The punctuation has been carefully attended to, not only with a view to preserve the true sense, but also to uniformity, as far as was possible.

Frequent recourse has been had to the Hebrew and Greek Originals; and as on other occasions, so with a special regard to the words not expressed in the Original Language, but which our Translators have thought fit to insert in Italics, in order to make out the sense after the English idiom, or to preserve the connexion. And though Dr Parris made large corrections in this particular in an edition published at Cambridge, there still remained many necessary alterations, which escaped the Doctor's notice; in making which the Editor chose not to rely on his own judgment singly, but submitted them all to the previous examination of the Select Committee, and particularly of the Principal of Hertford College, and Mr Professor Wheeler. A list of the above alterations was intended to have been given in to the Vice Chancellor at this time, but the Editor has not yet found time to make it completely out.

Considerable alterations have been made in the Heads or Contents prefixed to the Chapters, as will appear on inspection; and though the Editor is unwilling to enlarge upon the labour bestowed by himself in this particular, he cannot avoid taking notice of the peculiar obligations, which both himself and the public lie under to the Principal of Hertford College, Mr Griffith of Pembroke College, Mr Wheeler, Poetry Professor, and the late Warden of New College, so long as he lived to bear a part in it; who with a prodigious expence of time, and inexpressible fatigue to themselves, judiciously corrected and improved the rude and imperfect Draughts of the Editor.

The running titles at the top of the columns in each page, how trifling a circumstance soever it may appear, required no small degree of thought and attention.

Many of the proper names being left untranslated, whose etymology was necessary to be known, in order to a more perfect comprehension of the allusions in the text, the

translation of them, under the inspection of the above named Committee, has been for the benefit of the unlearned supplied in the margin.

Some obvious and material errors in the chronology have been considered and rectified.

The marginal references, even in Bishop Lloyd's Bible, had in many places suffered by the inaccuracy of the Press; subsequent editions had copied those *Errata*, and added many others of their own; so that it became absolutely necessary to turn to and compare the several passages; which has been done in every single instance, and by this precaution several false references brought to light, which would otherwise have passed unsuspected. It has been the care of the Editor to rectify these, as far as he could, by critical conjecture, where the copies universally failed him, as they did in most of the errors discovered in Bishop Lloyd's edition. In some few instances he confesses himself to have been at a loss in finding out the true reference, though the corruption was manifest in the want of any the most distant resemblance between the passages compared together. Cases of this sort indeed did not often occur; so that a very small number only of the old references are, with the sanction of the Committee, omitted, and their places more usefully supplied.

It had been suggested by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, that an improvement might be made in the present editions of the Bible, by taking in a number of additional references, of which many useful ones, as he supposed, might be furnished from other editions referred to by him, and particularly from a Scotch edition, of which the present Vice Chancellor was kind enough to lend a Copy. The references found in it, which were indeed very numerous, having been severally turned to and examined, such of them were selected as the Editor judged most pertinent, together with others that occurred from his own reading and observation. In doing this he has endeavoured to keep clear of mere fanciful allusions, of which too many presented themselves in the before named Scotch edition; and to adhere as near as possible to the plan marked out in the former collection made by Bishop Lloyd; pointing out such passages chiefly, where the same history or the same name was introduced, the same matter treated of, or sentiment expressed, or at least where parallels might fairly be drawn; and sometimes where a similar use of a particular word or expression tended to illustrate the application of it, on another occasion. The number of References being thus augmented considerably, the Collection upon the whole will, it is hoped, be regarded as useful in the light of a Concordance, material as well as verbal, always at hand.

In this state the Quarto Copy was sent to press; and the first proofs carefully collated with the Copy, both text and margin; after which the second proofs were again read, and generally speaking, the third likewise; not to mention the frequent revisions of proofs besides, which are common in correcting the press. This proved indeed a very tiresome and tedious task; but was not more than was absolutely necessary in order to attain the degree of accuracy that was wished. A particular attention was required with respect to the figures belonging to the marginal References, where errors were continually creeping

in after a manner that would appear highly astonishing to those, who have never been concerned in correcting multitudes of figures, as they came from the press.

When the Quarto Sheets, were printed off, the Forms were lengthened out in order to make up the Folio Edition; in doing which the parts were often so jumbled together, and such Confusion introduced by misplacing the References, and mistaking the Chronology, that nothing else would suffice than a fresh Collation of the whole with the Quarto Copy, and a repetition of almost the same trouble and care in the revisal, and in making up the running Titles anew, as had been used before. But the Editor thinks he has just reason to congratulate himself on the opportunity hereby given him of discovering and correcting some few trivial inaccuracies, which in spite of all his vigilance had escaped his notice in the Quarto Edition. So that the Folio Edition is rendered by this somewhat the more perfect of the two, and therefore more fit to be recommended for a standard Copy.

The Editor humbly hopes this Account of his proceedings will not be unacceptable to the Board; and will think his time and pains not ill bestowed, if he shall have succeeded in his desire of giving satisfaction to those who honoured him with the employment, and of contributing in any wise to God's honour, and the public utility.

B. Blayney

Hertford College, B. Blayney
Oct. 25, 1769”

- Regarding Blayney's *Gentleman's Magazine* report, Gordon Campbell wrote the following:
 - “The report courteously acknowledges the corrections made by Parris, and presents the new edition as a continuation of his endeavors. Blayney explains that he has lavished time on the chapter summaries, on the italics, on the running heads at the top of the columns on each page, and on the corrections to the chronology of Bishop Ussher. He also translated proper names in the margins ‘for the benefit of the unlearned’; this was a period at which Greek and Hebrew were taught in England's schools as well as universities, anyone without this basic linguistic competence were deemed the unlearned. The edition of Bishop Lloyd is taken to task for fanciful or inaccurate cross-references, which Blayney was able to correct by resource to a Scottish edition “of which the present vice-chancellor was kind enough to lend a copy’. The result of his labours, in Blayney's immodest estimation, was a text ‘reformed to such a standard of purity, as, it is presumed, is not to be met with in any other edition hitherto extant’.

The observations, at once deferential and triumphalist, are almost entirely concerned with the apparatus surrounding the text of the Bible, which makes the report more interesting for its silences than for its assertions. It does not mention what the delegates had described in an Olympian phrase as ‘modern variation in mere orthography’, and it is silent on the subject of grammar, including word order and punctuation. Ironically, it is

the change in these unspoken areas that make Blayney's folio edition of 1769 the most important text since 1611, the edition that was to become the authoritative text for subsequent editions." (Campbell, 137-138)

- Professor Norton states the following regarding Blayney's published report:
 - "'Mere Orthography' gets no attention, punctuation a passing comment, and all that he says of the readings is that the text was collated (as instructed), and 'reformed to such a standard of purity, as, it is presumed, is not to be met with in any other edition hitherto extant'—acclaim too vague to be helpful. The one quasi-textual item that is commented on in some detail is the revision of the italics. For the rest he is concerned with extra-textual matters, the chapter summaries and running titles, the notes, cross-references and chronology. Finally, he relates the care with which the work was seen through the press. In spite of these claims to have given most attention to editorial aids to the understanding of the text (the italics are one such aid rather than a genuine matter of the text), his most significant contribution was to the spelling and, in some respects, the grammar of the text.

It will be no surprise to find that Blayney's claims exceed his achievement. Neither the work on the text nor the vaunted attention to the correctness of the printing was perfect: Scrivener (with none of the charity that an editor ought to accord to a predecessor if for nothing more than the fear of being found similarly fallible) judges the latter 'conspicuously deficient', and adds that 'the commonly estimated number of 116 such errata would seem below the truth'.

A quarto (H1196) was prepared at the same time as the folio, but, in spite of the blemishes, Blayney considered the folio 'somewhat the more perfect of the two, and therefore more fit to be recommended for a standard Copy' (below, p. 197). Carter reports that it

was for many years the standard by which Oxford Bibles were corrected; that is to say, Blayney's [folio] as corrected in manuscript by many hands in course of time. The folio volume kept for reference has hardly a page, except in the Apocrypha, without a corrector's mark carefully written in ink. All but a few of these amendments are of slight significance: a capital instead of a small letter in a reference, a comma added, an English spelling modernized. (Carter, p. 358)

As well as Oxford, most other printers at home and abroad took Blayney as standard, so that the text as now generally found is not that of the first edition but something that evolved unevenly over a century and a half before becoming nearly fixed by the standards of the 1760s imperfectly applied." (Norton, 105-106)

- Campbell and Norton both point to an annotated copy of Blayney’s 1769 edition in the possession of Cambridge University as a tool in understanding the scale of the changes made by the Oxford editor.
 - “The sheer scale of the changes wrought by Blayney on the text can be seen in a copy of his editions owned and annotated by a clergyman called Gilbert Buchanan who collated Blayney’s folio with what he thought was the first edition of the KJV but was in fact the second edition known as the ‘She Bible’. Thousands of changes in italics, spelling, punctuation, chapter headings, and cross-references are noted, and the cumulative effect is quite overwhelming.” (Campbell, 138)
 - “One of the more extraordinary copies of the Bible I have seen is the Cambridge University Library’s copy of Blayney’s folio.⁸ It was purchased by Gilbert Buchanan in 1822 for nine guineas and minutely annotated throughout for its variations from what he takes to be the first edition, though it is clear from some of the variations that he was using the second edition. At the beginning he notes that ‘the variations are chiefly in the pointing, and Italic words, or to the Text; but the Contents of the chapters are very much altered: And besides the obsolete spelling, many of the proper names are differently spelt’. The annotations constitute an overwhelming mine of information. Most verses elicit several annotations, so that as a whole Buchanan’s labours give a strong visual impression of the multitudinous variations in minutiae by which Blayney’s Bible (and, following it, modern KJBs) differs from the original.” (Norton, 106-107)
- Before dealing with examples of the changes made by Blayney, Dr. Norton offers the following summative statement:
 - “I note ninety-nine surviving textual variants from Parris and fifty-eight from Blayney; in addition to the usual possibilities of error in such figures, there now arises the difficult question of distinguishing textual variants from orthographic variations. The most significant thing is that the majority of the variants are matters of the English of the translation. Three-quarters (seventy-four) of Parris’s variants and nearly three-fifths (thirty-three) of Blayney’s are of this sort.” (Norton, 107)
- In the next Lesson we will begin looking at examples of the editorial work of Benjamin Blayney.

Works Cited

Campbell, Gordon. *Bible: The Story of the King James Version, 1611-2011*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Herbert, A.S. *Historical Catalogue Of Printed Editions Of the English Bible, 1525-1961*. London: the British & Foreign Bible Society, 1968.

Norton, David. *A Textual History Of The King James Bible*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Nye, Eric W. *Pounds Sterling to Dollars: Historical Conversion of Currency*, accessed Monday, February 10, 2025, <https://www.uwyo.edu/numimage/currency.htm>.

Wikipedia.com [Francis Parris](#).

Appendix A

Blayney's 'Account of the collation and revision of the Bible' *The Gentleman's Magazine*, volume 39, November 1769, pp. 517-19

The Gentleman's Magazine:

St. JOHN'S Gate.



London Gazette
Daily Advertiser
Public Advertiser
Public Ledger
Gazetteer
St James's Chron
London Chron.
General Evening
Whitehall Even.
London Evening
Lloyd's Evening,
Monday, Wednesday, Friday.
Oxford
Cambridge
Reading
Northampton
Birmingham 2
Bath 2 papers
Coventry 2
Bristol 3

York 2 papers
Dublin 3
Newcastle 2
Leedes 2
Edinburgh
Aberdeen
Glasgow
Ipswich
Norwich
Exeter
Gloucester
Salisbury
Liverpool
Sherborn
Worcester
Stamford
Nottingham
Cheke
Manchester
Canterbury
Chelmsford

For NOVEMBER, 1769.

CONTAINING,

More in Quantity and greater Variety than any Book of the kind and Price.

| | | | |
|---|-----|--|--------|
| Advices from the Continent of America | 554 | Copies of two orig. letters to Lds of Treasury | 533 |
| Character of a former Lord Mayor of London, and Court of Aldermen | 515 | Speech of Serjeant W—t on a late Trial | 536 |
| Acc. of the late collation, correction, and revision of the <i>English Text</i> of the Bible, at Oxford | 517 | —The Replication by Serjeant G—nn | 535 |
| Copy of the Exeter Petition to his Majesty | 119 | Challenge to Junius for a charge founded on a late rescue—The Reply | 537-38 |
| A general method of constructing Sun-dials | 120 | Particulars of the Fire at St John's in Antigua | 539 |
| Reports of an approaching War discredited | 120 | A trading Country Justice; a novel character | 120 |
| Necessary Explanations to the Copper Plate | 120 | Huygens and Robins, their calculations | 540 |
| Observations on the Angina Maligna, or Ulcerated Sore Throat | 521 | Meteorological Account of the Weather | 541 |
| Neal's Interpolation defended—His Life | 523 | REVIEW of BOOKS.—Speech of a Rt Hon. Genl. on the motion for expelling Mr Wilkes | 542 |
| Letter from a young Lady who lately eloped, to her Mother | 525 | —A Fair Trial of the important Question | 544 |
| An historical Memorandum to those in Power | 120 | —Treatise upon Coal Mines | 546 |
| Remarkable discovery at Cathell in Ireland | 526 | Catalogue of Books; with Remarks | 548 |
| Genuine Copy of the Yorkshire Petition | 120 | POETRY.—The Alliance; inscribed to Mr Foote. | |
| Inscription on a Cannon of Henry VIII. | 527 | Ode, ad Amicum Navigatum | 550 |
| Remarks on the Druid Temple near Drogheda | 120 | —On the appearance of the late Comet | 551 |
| Curious acc. of the late eruption of Vesuvius | 528 | —Ode to Spleen.—To a Lady, on her Birthday.—The humble Petition of Dick. | 552 |
| Letter to the M—r on his treatment of the Duke of R—land | 529 | HISTORICAL CHRONICLE.—Murder of Lord Eglington—Trial of Wilkes against Ld Halifax—of the Pirates—Peace in India—Choi-seu's letter to Mahon, on the confinement of his Lady—Robbery of the Irish Mail—Procession of the Lord Mayor, &c. | |
| Letter from Dr Solander, now on his voyage round the world | 530 | Lists of Births, Marriages, Deaths, &c. | |
| Ancient Record respecting the Election of a Member of Parliament for Galis | 531 | | |

Illustrated with a curious Quarto Copper Plate, exhibiting Six different Views of the Appearance of Mount VESUVIUS, and one of its present Form, occasioned by the Eruption in 1767.

By SYLVANUS URBAN, Gent.

LONDON, Printed for D. HENRY, by J. LISTER, at St. John's Gate; and Sold by P. NEWBURY, at the Corner of St. Paul's Church Yard.

Having already given an account of Dr Kennicott's Collation of the Hebrew Text of the Bible, to the end of the year 1768, the following Letter, we hope, respecting the Collation and Correction of the English Text, will not be thought an improper supplement.

To the Rev. the Vice Chancellor, and the other Delegates of the Clarendon Press.

THE Editor of the ~~new~~ edition of the Bible lately printed at the Clarendon

518 *Account of the Collation and Revision of the Bible.*

Clarendon Press thinks it his duty, now that he has completed the whole in a course of between three and four years close application, to make his report to the Delegates of the manner in which that work has been executed; and hopes for their approbation.

In the first place, according to the instructions he received, the folio edition of 1611, that of 1701, published under the direction of Bishop Lloyd, and two Cambridge editions of a late date, one in Quarto, the other in octavo, have been carefully collated, whereby many errors that were found in former editions have been corrected, and the text reformed to such a standard of purity, as, it is presumed, is not to be met with in any other edition hitherto extant.

The punctuation has been carefully attended to, not only with a view to preserve the true sense, but also to uniformity, as far as was possible.

Frequent recourse had been had to the Hebrew and Greek Originals; and as on other occasions, so with a special regard to the words not expressed in the Original Language, but which our Translators have thought fit to insert in Italics, in order to make out the sense after the English idiom, or to preserve the connexion. And though Dr Paris made large corrections in this particular in an edition published at Cambridge, there still remained many necessary alterations, which escaped the Doctor's notice; in making which the Editor chose not to rely on his own judgment singly, but submitted them all to the previous examination of the Select Committee, and particularly of the Principal of Hertford College, and Mr Professor Wheeler. A list of the above alterations was intended to have been given in to the Vice Chancellor at this time, but the Editor has not yet found time to make it completely out.

Considerable alterations have been made in the Heads or Contents prefixed to the Chapters, as will appear on inspection; and though the Editor is unwilling to enlarge upon the labour bestowed by himself in this particular, he cannot avoid taking notice of the peculiar obligations, which both himself and the public lie under to the Principal of Hertford College, Mr Griffith of Pembroke College, Mr Wheeler, Focny Professor, and the late Warden of New College, so long as he lived to bear a part in it; who with a prodigious expence of time, and inexpressible fatigue to themselves,

judiciously corrected and improved the rude and imperfect Draughts of the Editor.

The running titles at the top of the columns in each page, how trifling a circumstance soever it may appear, required no small degree of thought and attention.

Many of the proper names being left untranslated, whose etymology was necessary to be known, in order to a more perfect comprehension of the allusions in the text, the translation of them, under the inspection of the above named Committee, has been for the benefit of the unlearned supplied in the margin.

Some obvious and material errors in the chronology have been considered and rectified.

The marginal references, even in Bishop Lloyd's Bible, had in many places suffered by the inaccuracy of the Press; subsequent editions had copied those *Errata*, and added many others of their own; so that it became absolutely necessary to turn to and compare the several passages; which has been done in every single instance, and by this precaution several false references brought to light, which would otherwise have passed unsuspected. It has been the care of the Editor to rectify these, as far as he could, by critical conjecture, where the copies universally failed him, as they did in most of the errors discovered in Bishop Lloyd's edition. In some few instances he confesses himself to have been at a loss in finding out the true reference, though the corruption was manifest in the want of any the most distant resemblance between the passages compared together. Cases of this sort indeed did not often occur; so that a very small number only of the old references are, with the sanction of the Committee, omitted, and their places more usefully supplied.

It had been suggested by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, that an improvement might be made in the present editions of the Bible, by taking in a number of additional references, of which many useful ones, as he supposed, might be furnished from other editions referred to by him, and particularly from a Scotch edition, of which the present Vice Chancellor was kind enough to lend a Copy. The references found in it, which were indeed very numerous, having been severally turned to and examined, such of them were selected as the Editor judged most pertinent, together with others

that

Petition of the Citizens of Exeter to the Throne. 519

what occurred from his own reading and observation. In doing this he has endeavoured to keep clear of mere fanciful allusions, of which too many presented themselves in the before named Scotch edition; and to adhere as near as possible to the plan marked out in the former collection made by Bishop Lloyd; pointing out such passages chiefly, where the same history or the same name were introduced, the same matter treated of, or sentiment expressed, or at least where parallels might fairly be drawn; and sometimes where a similar use of a particular word or expression tended to illustrate the application of it, on another occasion. The number of References being thus augmented considerably, the Collection upon the whole will, it is hoped, be regarded as useful in the light of a Concordance, material as well as verbal, always at hand.

In this state the Quarto Copy was sent to press; and the first proofs carefully collated with the Copy, both text and margin; after which the second proofs were again read, and generally speaking, the third likewise; not to mention the frequent revisions of proofs besides, which are common in correcting the press. This proved indeed a very tiresome and tedious task; but was not more than was absolutely necessary in order to attain the degree of accuracy that was wished. A particular attention was required with respect to the figures belonging to the marginal References, where errors were continually creeping in after a manner that would appear highly astonishing to those, who have never been concerned in correcting multitudes of figures, as they came from the press.

When the Quarto Sheets, were printed off, the Forms were lengthened out in order to make up the Folio Edition; in doing which the parts were often so jumbled together, and such Confusion introduced by misplacing the References, and mistaking the Chronology, that nothing else would suffice than a fresh Collation of the whole with the Quarto Copy, and a repetition of almost the same trouble and care in the revision, and in making up the running Titles anew, as had been used before. But the Editor thinks he has just reason to congratulate himself on the opportunity hereby given him of discovering and correcting some few trivial inaccuracies, which in spite of all his vigilance had escaped his notice in the Quarto Edition. So that the Folio Edition is rendered by this somewhat the more perfect of the two, and there-

fore more fit to be recommended for a standard Copy.

The Editor humbly hopes this Account of his proceedings will not be unacceptable to the Board; and will think his time and pains not ill bestowed, if he shall have succeeded in his desire of giving satisfaction to those who honoured him with the employment, and of contributing in any wise to God's honour, and the public utility.

Hertford College, B. BLAYNEY.
O^r. 25, 1769.

To the King's most Excellent Majesty. The humble Petition of the Mayor, Freemen, Freeholders, and Inhabitants of the City of Exeter.

" May it please your Majesty!

" **I**N this season of general anxiety for the constitution of government in this realm, with hearts full of untainted loyalty, and with hopes of redress founded on justice, as well as on your Majesty's gracious and frequent declarations of your constant care for the happiness of your People, we presume to look up to the Throne for relief.

" It is with surprize, sorrow, and resentment, that we perceive one of the essential principles of our liberties—the most sacred of the rights of your Majesty's freeborn subjects! threatened with destruction.

" We have seen, with the deepest concern, a determination of the House of Commons, which would render a man ineligible into that House, who, by the Law of the Land, was eligible: We have seen them refuse that Man a seat in the House, although he was chosen by a great majority of votes, confessedly legal; and we have seen them admit another, as a representative of the county of Middlesex, contrary to the sense of the Freeholders, and contrary to a great majority of legal votes at the election.

" Permit us, Royal Sir, to declare, that we know no House of Commons but of the People's electing; that we know no Representative but such only who is chosen by the majority of legal votes. This right of election is inherent in your Majesty's subjects: A right which they cannot forfeit; it is of the Essence of Government, and prior to every delegated authority whatsoever; to counteract it, therefore, is highly injurious to the subject; it is repugnant to the true honour of the Crown, for it tends to confusion, it threatens the very being of the British Constitution.

" It is with great and indignation that we