ISSN 1392-737X

Archivum Lithuanicum 19

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETAS
LIETUVIŲ KALBOS INSTITUTAS
LIETUVOS ISTORIJOS INSTITUTAS
ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETAS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO
VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS
VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETAS

ARCHIVUM *Lithuanicum* 19

LIETUVOS ISTORIJOS INSTITUTAS

VILNIUS 2017

Turinys (Contents)

Straipsniai (Articles)

Publikacijos (Publications)

Recenzijos (Reviews)

Diskusijos, apžvalgos, pastabos (Discussions, Surveys, Notes)

Archivum Lithuanicum 19, 2017
ISSN 1392-737X, p. 339–348

Robert Frost
University of Aberdeen

Review of:

Samuelio Boguslavo Chylinskio Biblija 3. *Chylinskio Biblijos istorijos šaltiniai,*

ed. Gina Kavaliūnaitė

Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas,
2015, lxiiii, 561pp. ISBN 978-609-459-628-5

This sumptuously produced volume is a companion piece to the magnificent facsimile edition of the first printed translation of part of the Old Testament into Lithuanian by Samuel Boguslav Chylinski (Samuelis Boguslavas Chylinskis; Samuel Bogusław Chyliński; 1633–1666), which was reviewed by Ingė Lukšaitė in this journal in 2008. Although it is volume three in the planned cycle, it is the second to be published. Its task is to make available the known sources concerning the fraught circumstances surrounding the translation completed by Chylinski after his arrival in England in 1657, and its failure to emerge from the hands of the printer. Although Chylinski completed his translation, only part of the text was printed, and the whole Bible was never published, which ensured that it remains extremely rare. The British Library holds the only surviving copy of those parts that were printed, which it acquired in 1893, as well as the manuscript of Chylinski's translation of the New Testament, which was never printed, and which it acquired in 1933.

Chylinski probably began his translation while still in the United Provinces, before his arrival in England, and had completed the Old Testament by 1659; it is possible that he had done so by October 1657. An inscription in the seventh volume suggests that he began the translation of the New Testament in that month, as Gina Kavaliūnaitė, the project's editor, argues. The British Library copy of the printed text only contains the first few books of the Old Testament, breaking off in the book of Joshua. Another copy, which was in Berlin until 1939, was nearly twice as long, reaching the book of Job, while a copy last seen in St. Petersburg in 1918, broke off in the middle of the book of Psalms. The whereabouts of these two versions is currently unknown.

Kavaliūnaitė has convincingly demonstrated that Chylinski's translation was primarily based on the Dutch *Statenvertaling*, commissioned by the Synod of Dort in

1618 to provide a new translation based on the original sources, which was widely recognized in Protestant Europe as the most faithful translation available. Chylinski, who was a talented linguist, had studied in the Franeker Academy in the United Provinces, and knew Dutch well. The text was influenced to some extent by the 1632 Polish Danzig Bible, but the main source was the *Statenvertaling*.

By 1660 enough of the translation was complete for Chylinski to turn his attention to the problem of publication. It was a good moment to secure moral and financial support in an England that had undergone a fundamental political transformation following the Stuart Restoration in May of that year. Under Cromwell's Protectorate, England had been aligned with Sweden against Poland-Lithuania during the Second Northern War (1655–1660), but while the Restoration government was still suspicious of a largely Catholic power after the return of the monarchy in May 1660, Charles II—who was not as hostile to Catholicism as his subjects and who may well have died a Catholic—remembered that the Sejm had condemned the execution of his father and had voted a 10 percent tax on all Scottish merchants in the Commonwealth to support the exiled Stuarts, which had raised a considerable sum of money. In the country at large, tales of exile and Protestant suffering abroad touched a nerve: in late 1661 thousands turned out to attend the funeral in Rochester Cathedral of a man who called himself Cossuma Albertus and who claimed to be an exiled prince of Transylvania. The English remembered that Bethlen Gábor, the Calvinist prince of Transylvania, had been the one European ruler to offer military support to Elizabeth Stuart, queen of Bohemia in 1618–1620. As it turned out, Cossuma Albertus was a con man: together with his accomplices, he had been touring provincial England where he was feted by town councils taken in by his charm and rich attire. He was murdered at Gad's Hill in Kent by his accomplices, who had to act as his servants and who were disgruntled that he took a greater share of the gifts and money they had acquired. They were arrested in London and hanged for their crime; the trial records reveal that the supposed Transylvanian prince was an obscure Polish nobleman.[1]

Chylinski was no con man, and in such a climate he was able to attract considerable support for his translation. He was a capable self-publicist. In 1659 he published an *Account of the Translation of the Bible into the Lithuanian Tongue*, which was reissued in 1660 in Latin in an amended edition that included testimonials from a number of leading Oxford academics whose support he had attracted, helped by the recommendations of members of the network of Scottish and English merchants and scholars with links to the Commonwealth, in particular Samuel Hartlib and John Dury. The most notable and influential backers Chylinski attracted were John Wallis, Savilian Professor of Mathematics at Oxford, and Robert Boyle, the influential natural scientist, whose religious convictions had persuaded him to support translations of the Bible into as many world languages as possible and who had already launched

1 The story was investigated by Gabriel Ronay in a BBC 2 Timewatch program, "Affairs of State" broadcast on September 16, 1987.

a fund to support translations into Irish Gaelic and Algonquian.[2] Hartlib persuaded his Oxford connections to establish a similar fund specifically to support the publication of Chylinski's translation in the interests of promoting Protestant unity.

Despite this glittering array of supporters, the campaign ultimately failed. Jan Krzysztof Krainski, an agent sent by the Vilnius Synod to raise money for the war-ravaged Lithuanian Protestant churches, and to monitor Chylinski's progress, was not enthusiastic about the translation and fell out with Chylinski. He refused to clear Chylinski's debts or to pay the printer; Chylinski's appeals to the Vilnius Synod to continue its support were in vain. His translation was never published, and the disillusioned Chylinski died a pauper in London in 1666, where he is buried in the church of St. Giles Cripplegate.

Historians have long been interested in the first printed translation of the bible into Lithuanian, but until the British Museum's acquisition of its version in 1893, and the discovery of the Berlin and St. Petersburg versions, they were able to do little more than speculate as to its nature. The significance of the text, both printed and manuscript, for scholars interested in the development of the Lithuanian language is substantial. Chylinski was not the first translator of the Bible into Lithuanian: Jonas Bretkūnas had produced a full translation between 1579 and 1590, based largely on Luther's German Bible, but it had never been published, and the manuscript remained in Königsberg in the Duchy of Prussia. Chylinski knew of the Bretkūnas translation, but he made no mention of it in his *Account*, not wanting, presumably, to affect his chances of raising money to publish his own version.

Volume three of Kavaliūnaitė's monumental undertaking will greatly assist everyone interested in this complex story. She has scoured libraries and archives to unearth a large amount of material in several languages that give us a detailed picture of the circumstances in which the translation was conceived, produced, and failed to be published. The range of this material is truly impressive; while some of the documents were already known to scholars, and some have been published before, Kavaliūnaitė has unearthed a number that are published here for the first time and brought together a wealth of material for the first time. The documents are arranged in chronological order, which is sensible, as it gives the reader the opportunity to follow the development of the story as it unfolded. Each item is printed in the original language, alongside a high-quality facsimile reproduction. The scene is set by brief introductions in Lithuanian and English, which pick up the themes discussed at greater length in volume one. Detailed summaries of the content of each document are given in English, with full translations into Lithuanian. The texts are accompanied by extensive and helpful notes, and the volume is illustrated throughout with handsome plates by the well-known Lithuanian graphic artist Šarūnas Leonavičius.

2 Kavaliūnaitė, citing Stanisław Kot, claims that Boyle provided funds for the translation of the Bible into Welsh, but Michael Hunter, the leading expert on Boyle, suggests that this is a misunderstanding, and that he was only interested in the subscription method used for the Welsh translation, as he wished to apply it for the translation into Irish Gaelic. I am grateful to Professor Hunter for pointing this out.

Altogether 102 documents are reproduced. Not all are given in full, but this is a sensible decision: the editor has concentrated on passages that directly concern the translation. The documents include relevant correspondence of Chylinski, Krainski, Hartlib, Boyle, and other prominent supporters of the project. There are records of the English Privy Council, of the General Synod of the Vilnius province, of the Kėdainiai Provincial Convocation, and of the Kėdainiai Reformed congregation, which Chylinski had attended before leaving for the United Provinces. An interesting cache of documents details the sums raised in response to the appeal for the Lithuanian Reformed Church by individual parishes. Chylinski's own *Account of the Translation of the Bible into the Lithuanian Tongue* in both its English and Latin versions, is given in full, as is Krainski's 1661 *Relation of the Distressed State of the Church of Christ Professing the Protestant Religion in the Great Dukedom of Lithuania*, published to garner support for his mission, and his detailed 1663 account of his dealings with Chylinski prepared for the Synod in which he justified his approach to the matter.

The material produced here is of great interest, and will provide the basis for much fruitful discussion. One can look forward with interest and anticipation to the publication of volume two, which will contain a series of scholarly studies on the Chylinski Bible. The editor deserves considerable praise for the high scholarly value of the volume. The translations, by Kavaliūnaitė, Eugenija Ulčinaitė, Stephen Rowell and Axel Holvoet, are excellent, and read well. There is very little with which one might take issue, although the presentation of the dispute between Chylinski and Krainski raises certain questions. Chylinski is very much the hero of the book; from the perspective of modern Lithuanian history, and the history of the Lithuanian language, this is understandable: his determined efforts to produce and publish the entire text of the Bible in Lithuanian were heroic, even if the planned work never reached fruition. Its rediscovery has given scholars the opportunity to study the Lithuanian language at a vital period in its development, and Chylinski deserves to be honoured as one of the Protestant pioneers who ensured that Lithuanian became fully established as a written language in a period when its very existence was under threat.

While Chylinski is the hero, there is little doubt who are the villains in the story presented by Kavaliūnaitė: Jan Krzysztof Krainski and the Vilnius Synod. Krainski in particular is criticized for his role in blocking the publication of the Bible despite the support of so many leading figures in English society. It is, however, worth considering whether he deserves to be vilified. For when Krainski arrived in London he was the envoy of a church in crisis. Chylinski had left Lithuania in 1653 to study in Franeker. Although the Cossack revolt that shook the Commonwealth to its foundations had been rumbling on since 1648, the flames were burning far from Biržai and Kėdainiai, and Chylinski was safely ensconced in the United Provinces by the time that war broke out with Muscovy in 1654 and with Sweden in 1655. These conflicts dramatically affected the situation of the Protestant churches across the Commonwealth as a whole, and in the Grand Duchy in particular. Vilnius fell to the Muscovites in August 1655, and their armies treated the civilian population ruthlessly across Lithuania. While Krainski may have exaggerated somewhat in his *Relation* to secure the sympa-

thy of English Protestants, there is no doubt that the sufferings of Lithuanians, both Protestant and Catholic, were considerable: Chylinski's own father Adrian, former court preacher to Krzysztof II Radziwiłł, and a leading Reformed cleric, was himself murdered by the Muscovite forces; he was roasted alive, according to Krainski.

It was the Swedish invasion in July 1655 that was ultimately more damaging to the position of Lithuania's Protestants, however. As resistance to the Swedes in Poland melted away, the Wielkopolska noble levy surrendered in July, the Crown army capitulated in October, and king John Casimir fled to Silesia. The signing of the treaty of Kėdainiai in August, and of a union treaty with Sweden at Kėdainiai in October were understandable reactions to the crisis, but whatever the motives of Janusz Radziwiłł, the Lithuanian Grand Hetman, in negotiating with the Swedes—a matter of considerable controversy—the consequences were serious for Lithuanian Protestants. The Biržai branch of the Radziwiłłs had long been the major protectors and patrons of the Reformed church in the Grand Duchy, but Janusz's actions cast a dark shadow over its future prospects. The Kėdainiai treaties—in particular the October union treaty—were largely signed by Radziwiłł's clients and supporters, many of whom—though by no means all—were Protestants. Although other Lithuanian magnates had flirted with the Swedes, by the time John Casimir returned from exile to lead the growing resistance to the Swedish armies in January 1656, the tide had definitively turned. Most of the Lithuanian elite joined the resistance to the Swedes, and Janusz Radziwiłł died in December in Tykocin, widely reviled across the Commonwealth as a traitor. The estates of the Biržai Radziwiłłs were confiscated and occupied by the Lithuanian army, and Janusz's cousin, Bogusław—now the last of the Biržai branch in the male line—had taken refuge in the Duchy of Prussia, where he served his cousin, elector Frederick William, as governor. As the resistance to the Swedes and the Muscovites in the Commonwealth took on a distinctly Catholic patriotic hue, Protestants were widely condemned as traitors, and in 1658 the Sejm expelled the Antitrinitarians—who had long been protected by the Biržai Radziwiłłs—from Poland and Lithuania.

It is, therefore, at least understandable that by late 1660, when Krainski was dispatched to London, the publication of a new translation of the Bible into Lithuanian had slipped down the list of priorities of the Vilnius Synod since 1653, when the Synod had awarded Chylinski the Martin Švoba scholarship and packed him off to Franeker as its rising academic star. In 1660, deprived of its magnate protectors, and of their finances, the Reformed Church in Lithuania was facing a bleak future, and its members were suffering persecution and ostracism. As Krainski observed of the Swedes in his *Relation*:

> by their coming into the Countrey, they made us lyable to be more hated by those of the *Roman religion* than before. . .Our very *Neighbours* do hate and persecute the *Remnant* of us still, with as much eagerness, as our *foreign Enemies* did: they deprive us of our *Churches* yet remaining: those *Lands*, which were given for the maintenance of *Ministers*, and *Scholes*, they give away as if they had been their own: our *Ministers* are banished; and such, as remain are beaten, and misused: the Threatenings of our total *Exilement* are encreased (vol. 3, no. 29, pp. 87, 89).

However much one might regret the failure to publish Chylinski's Bible, it is hard to criticize the Vilnius Synod for preferring to raise money to restore its churches and support its ministers, rather than to subsidize a publication in an expensive foreign country. The Lithuanian Reformed church had managed for a century without a Lithuanian translation of the Bible. It possessed catechisms in Lithuanian for teaching the faith to those of its flock who did not understand Polish, and Lithuanian-speaking ministers to preach the word of God. While a Lithuanian text of the Bible would be useful for the preparation of sermons and instruction, it was not, in the circumstances, essential. The church elite was Polish speaking, conducted its business in Polish, and no doubt felt it could wait for more propitious times before agreeing to support publication of a text that some of them would themselves have been unable to read.

Krainski was well aware of these circumstances when he arrived in London, where he was faced with the delicate task of raising money to support the Lithuanian churches without alienating those who had put their efforts into raising funds to support the translation. He was unenthusiastic about the translation from the outset, and he ultimately took the decision to refuse to pay any more funds to the printer, for which he is attacked in a long, critical letter of March 14, 1661, to Robert Boyle from John Wallis (vol. 3, no. 44, p. 147, 149). It is, however, open to question as to whether Krainski was as deceitful as Kavaliūnaitė alleges. She bases this accusation on a claim that in his report to the Vilnius Synod of May 23, 1663, Krainski deliberately "misconstrued for his own benefit" the text of the Royal Letters Patent of July 12, 1661, under which Charles II, following representations from Krainski, decreed that funds be raised to support the Lithuanian Protestant churches and to support Chylinski's translation.

Kavaliūnaitė argues that in his report to the Synod, Krainski "construes the purport of the Royal patent quite differently from what is expressed in the text itself."[3] Krainski wrote:

> zeby tym sczodrobliwsze oswiadczyli *beneficium afflictis Ecclesijs Lithvan*[*iae*] y zeby *ad fervidiora pietatis ac liberalitatis studia plebem Anglicanam* zagrzac mogli; *Necessitatem Biblior*[*um*] *Lithvanicor*[*um*], *et gloriam inde, specialiter* recommendowali *populo*, ztą clausulą, zeby kazde sto funtow do skarbu wniesione, do Litwy odesłane *ex nunc* było *in subsidium pauperum*, iake *expresse* miec chce *Regium diploma* (vol. 3, no. 51, p. 175).

Kavaliūnaitė translates this as:

> In order that they should offer the most generous support to the afflicted churches of Lithuania, and in order that the common people of England should be inflamed to the most fervid exertion of piety and liberality, they especially recommended to the people the necessity of a Lithuanian Bible, and the glory to be derived from it; stipulating that, henceforth every hundred pounds, collected by the Treasury, should be sent to Lithuania towards the relief of the poor, as the Royal patent expressly states.[4]

3 Kavaliūnaitė 2008, xc.

4 Kavaliūnaitė 2008, xc.

Kavaliūnaitė claims, however, that the Letters Patent stipulate that "only the sums left over from the printing of the Bible were to be sent to Lithuania," which implies that the main purpose of the document was to fund the Bible, and that the relief of the Protestant Churches was a secondary consideration.[5]

What did the Royal Patent "expressly state"? It stipulated that:

> And Our further will and pleasure is, that they, the said Edward Fenn and John Fenn,[6] as they shall receive any Sum, amounting to the Sum of One hundred pounds or above, do forthwith send, or by Exchange make over the same into the parts beyond the Seas, for the Relief and Sustenance of the said Poor distressed Churches, beside such Sum as shall be necessary for the finishing of the said Pious Work of Translating and Printing the said Bible here in Our City of London, and for the maintenance of the said John de Kraino Krainsky, Deputy of the said Churches, or any other Deputy of the said Protestants, for the futhering of the said pious works in such a manner, as for their care, faithfulness, and discretions they will be answerable to Us for the same (vol. 3, no. 27, p. 71).

The use of "beside" in this extract is, to be fair to Kavaliūnaitė, rather ambiguous, but as the rest of the document makes clear, the main purpose of the Letters Patent was not, as Kavaliūnaitė specifically claims in the English summary (vol. 3, p. 377), "first of all" to fund the bible translation, but 'first of all' to provide relief and succour for the Lithuanian Protestant churches, the state of which is discussed and deplored at length in the first half of the document. The Letters Patent were issued in direct response to Krainski's mission, and the stipulation concerning the funding of the Bible translation was added following intensive lobbying by the printer, who was owed considerable sums of money, and by Chylinski's supporters, as Krainski makes clear in a later passage in his report, in which he writes that there had originally been no mention of the Bible in the draft of the Letters Patent; the stipulation had been inserted later, after representations by Chylinski's supporters.[7] With regard to the disbursement of the funds, the Letters Patent state clearly:

> That a general Collection be made throughout this our Realm of England and Dominion of Wales for the Relief and support of the said Protestant Churches in Lithuania, and for the furthering and finishing of the said pious Work of translating and printing their Bible (vol. 3, no. 27, p. 71).

The order in which the two purposes are mentioned is significant, and supports Krainski's contention that the clause concerning the translation was added later. Krainski, who was politically astute, nevertheless concluded that:

5 Kavaliūnaitė 2008, xci.

6 The commissioners appointed to disburse the funds raised.

7 'Chociazby Biblia niebyla wspomniona *in Diplomate Regio, Typographus lucri causa per condictam* z Chylinskim, supplicowali by byli, y przekupili, aby *pecunia in subsidium Pauperum* conferowana, na Biblia raczey obroconoa było, jako to y po dzis dzien praktikuią' (vol. 3, no. 51, p. 17).

> This having been decided, it would have been impolitic for me to have opposed the wish of the King and the Commissioners, and sought to remove mention of the Bible from the Letters Patent.[8]

Krainski did not, therefore, as Kavaliūnaitė claims, deliberately mislead the Synod in his report. He mentions the translation in the extract she quotes, and if he did not mention in that particular extract that this was to be covered by the fund, he makes it abundantly clear elsewhere in the report that this was the case. His report was in any case prepared two years after the events he was describing, by which time the circumstances had changed.

It is also unfair of Kavaliūnaitė to speculate, on the basis of her contention that his report misrepresented the Letters Patent, that Krainski "must evidently have misconstrued other circumstances for his own benefit as well," a contention for which she offers no evidence.[9] The one specific charge she brings claims that Krainski misrepresented Chylinski's printing expenses as private debts.[10] This contention rests on a reading of the documents that sees the matter entirely through Chylinski's eyes. There was good reason for Krainski's concern. As he pointed out, by the time the Letters Patent were issued, Chylinski had already submitted accounts showing that he owed £148 to the printer, who was pursuing Krainski round London to secure payment. Since publication would involve further substantial payments to the printer—in 1662 he was paid £146/1s. for the printing of a mere 42 sheets—it was clear that to go ahead with it would substantially reduce the amount of money available for relief of the Lithuanian church, which, for Krainski and the Synod, was the main purpose of the collection.

It is also, perhaps, unfair of Kavaliūnaitė to suggest that Krainski misleadingly claimed that Chylinski's expenses were private debts: in addition to his printing bills, Chylinski had run up considerable debts with regard to his accommodation and living expenses, which he expected to be paid from the fund raised, and which it does seem reasonable for Krainski to have regarded as private. Finally, Krainski observes—in a passage not cited by Kavaliūnaitė in her discussion of the matter—that several members of the Privy Council, who were both aware of the situation with regard to the translation, and who were sympathetic towards the plight of the Lithuanian Church, agreed with him that the moneys collected should not be used to pay off Chylinski's debts or to fund further printing costs, which casts considerable doubt on her contention that the principal purpose of the Letters Patent was to fund the translation (vol. 3, no. 51, p. 175).

By the time Krainski wrote his report, his actions had ensured that publication had already ground to a halt. There was a further reason for this decision. In August 1661 Chylinski returned to Lithuania to plead his case, and to present his translation to the Synod. He was initially well received, but when the Synod—quite understandably—asked Jan Borzymowski and Teodor Skrocki, both of them distinguished linguists, to read the translation, they expressed their doubts as to its quality. Borzymowski in-

8 '*Hisce ita sancitis* niełza mnie było woley Krolewskiej y Commissarzow contrarari, aby *Biblia expunerentur ex Diplomate Regio*' (vol. 3, no. 51, p. 177).

9 Kavaliūnaitė 2008, xc.

10 Kavaliūnaitė 2008, lxxxvii.

formed Krainski of his opinion, and although Krainski's observation that there were as many errors as there were lines in the translation was certainly an exaggeration that does indicate his growing hostility to a man he regarded as arrogant and incompetent, the issue of the quality of the translation did not emerge as the result of personal animus against Chylinski, either on the part of Krainiski, or of the Synod.

Language mattered. The Reformed Church had based itself on the authority of Scripture ever since Martin Luther had rejected the claims to authority of the papacy and church tradition. It was of crucial importance that the language of the translation was pure and embodied the true sense of the Bible; it was for this very reason that Chylinski chose the *Statenvertaling* as the basis of his translation. It was not just Krainski who had doubts about the quality of Chylinski's rendering of the text. The report of Skrocki and Borzymowski concluded that the translation was 'littered with errors' (*scatet mendis*), and it was on their report that Krainski based his conclusions (vol. 3, no. 53, p. 197). The Synod was so concerned that it approached Bogusław Radziwiłł, then governor of Ducal Prussia, to secure his approval for the sending of the manuscript of the Bretkūnas Bible to Lithuania in order for it to be checked against Chylinski's version, Radziwiłł agreed, stipulating that the manuscript be returned in good condition (vol. 3, no. 52, p. 193).

The issue of language perhaps deserves more attention than it receives in the introduction to volume one, or in the notes that accompany volume three. Lithuanian had never been a written language before the sixteenth century, and had therefore never developed a high literary written form. As became abundantly clear in the nineteenth century, when nationalists anxious to emphasize the separate nationhood of peoples such as Ukrainians or Belarusians sought to construct high literary languages from a series of different local dialects, the task was by no means an easy one, and disputes as to what constituted the pure form of the language were common. This was precisely the problem that led to the dispute over the quality of Chylinski's translation. Lithuania was composed of various dialects, and it was by no means clear in the mid-seventeenth century what high literary Lithuanian might look like. By the mid-seventeenth century, most of the Lithuanian noble elite used Polish as their literary language, and there was no agreement on what the criteria for the establishment of a literary form of the Lithuanian language might be. As the interesting section on the linguistic sources of Chylinski's translation in volume one makes clear, Chylinski had to make frequent recourse to Polish and other languages to supply words that Lithuanian lacked, since it was by then largely a language of lower-class discourse.

Chylinski's translation is written in a central Lithuanian dialect from around Kėdainiai that was termed 'Low Lithuanian' by Ludwig Rhesa in his 1816 *Geschichte der litthauischen Bibel*, in which the author claimed that it was therefore unsuitable for use in Lithuania Minor. Jerzy Plater reproduced the opinion of Jerzy Grużewski, who observed in September 1805 that it was written in the 'Žemaitijan language.'[11] It is therefore, perhaps, unfair of Kavaliūnaitė to reprimand Jokūbas Kregždė for accepting the opinion of the Synod on this matter.[12] Members of the Synod desired the transla-

11 Kavaliūnaitė 2008, xcvii, cvi.

12 Kavaliūnaitė 2008, cii.

tion to be in the dialect Chylinski used, which was prestigious at the time. While its conclusion that Chylinski's translation was poorly accomplished is certainly open to question, the fact that they believed it to be so raises important issues concerning the form of Lithuanian that was appropriate to a biblical translation. It is to be hoped that this important matter will be discussed in the essays in volume two.

The defence of Krainski and the Synod undertaken here is in no way intended to suggest that Chylinski was himself a villain. He fought tenaciously for the publication of his Bible, and was able to secure considerable support for it from leading members of British society: despite the impression given by Kavaliūnaitė, Robert Boyle honoured the promise he had made to provide further funds in 1661.[13] It is the differing opinions of contemporaries over the merits of translation that provide historians, linguists, and literary scholars with a unique opportunity to consider the development of Lithuanian at a crucial stage for its establishment as a written language. Chylinski had worked long and hard in exile to produce his translation, and it is entirely understandable that he should fight with all the resources at his disposal to secure the publication of his bible. That he died of consumption, alone and destitute in a foreign land, is one of History's tragedies. His struggle with Krainski, and the dispute over the quality of his translation are but two of the many issues that spring to mind in reading this outstanding scholarly work. There are many more, and Gina Kavaliūnaitė is to be congratulated on opening up the way in such a spectacular and accomplished manner to further scholarly debate. The story is a fascinating one, and its publication in this form will be welcomed not just by linguists and historians of Lithuania, but by the many scholars interested in the problem of international Protestantism in the age of the Counter-Reformation.

References:

Kavaliūnaitė, Gina (ed.), 2008: *Samuelio Boguslavo Chylinskio Biblija* 1. *Senasis Testamentas. Lietuviško vertimo ir olandiško originalo faksimilės = Vetus Testamentum Lithvanica Lingva donatum a Samuelo Boguslao Chylinski, una cum texto belgico*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

The Correspondence of Robert Boyle 1636–1691 3, ed. Michael Hunter, Lawrence M. Principi and Antonio Clericuzio, London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001.

Robert Frost
Department of History
University of Aberdeen,
Room 112 Crombie Annexe,
Meston Walk,
Aberdeen AB24 3FX
el.p.: robert.frost@abdn.ac.uk

Gauta 2017 m. birželio 24 d.

13 Further letters from Chylinski to Boyle are known to have existed in the eighteenth century; the description of one of these, dated February 1, 1666, reveals that its content was: 'Thanks for (the) money': *The Correspondence of Robert Boyle 1636–1691*, 2001, 47. I am grateful to Professor Michael Hunter for drawing my attention to this letter.