

CAURIENSIA, Vol. XI (2016) 473-506, ISSN: 1886-4945

THE BIBLE TRANSLATION MOVEMENT IN RENAISSANCE FRANCE THROUGH AN EXAMPLE: THE ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN

ORNELLA CATTAI
Universidad de Córdoba

RESUMEN

Este artículo pretende estudiar cuatro traducciones francesas de las Escrituras, ubicadas en el periodo del Renacimiento, por intermedio del análisis de la Segunda Epístola de Juan, perteneciente al Nuevo Testamento. Su principal objetivo es investigar la *Bible d'Olivétan* o *de Serrières* de manera crítica comparando las técnicas ahí empleadas al texto original griego, del cual fue presumiblemente traducida y, en un segundo momento, contrastarla con tres versiones francesas contemporáneas: Las traducciones católicas de Lefèvre d'Étaples y Lovaina y la edición protestante de Calvino, de 1561. Una investigación comparativa intentará, por tanto, determinar las principales similitudes y diferencias traductológicas existentes entre estas versiones y si éstas proceden de factores ideológicos o puramente estilísticos.

Palabras clave: Bible de Serrières, Nuevo Testamento griego, traducciones bíblicas del siglo XVI.

ABSTRACT

This article aims to study four French Renaissance translations of the Scriptures through the analysis of New Testament's Second epistle of John. Its main purpose is to examine the *Bible d'Olivétan* or *de Serrières* translation critically comparing its

techniques to the original Greek text, from which it was presumably translated and, afterwards, to three French contemporary versions: The Catholic Lefèvre d'Étaples' and Leuven's translations; and the Protestant Calvin's 1561 edition. A comparative investigation will thus try to determine the major similarities and differences in translation among these versions and whether these discrepancies come from ideological factors or purely stylistic ones.

Keywords: 16th-century biblical translations, Bible de Serrières, Greek New Testament.

INTRODUCTION

From the second half of the fifteenth century, a long process of cultural, social, religious and political revival began in Europe. The boundaries of the major powers of the time began to consolidate, forming gradually the so-called national states. The end of the fifteenth and the whole of the sixteenth centuries represented thus the key to the development of modern Europe. The truth is that the fifteenth and especially the sixteenth centuries were characterized by four major events: Renaissance, Reformation, Counter-Reformation and the maritime explorations of new territories, which laid the foundations of modern capitalism¹. The most contradictory and perhaps violent of these events was undoubtedly the Church Reformation.

The Catholic Church, an institution that had hitherto possessed the monopoly of intellectual thought across Europe, looked invaded by an uncontrollable phenomenon: its dogmas' questioning by Martin Luther and, later, by personalities such as Calvin, Bucer, Melancthon, Farel or Knox. Many of them had French origins or were somehow related to the French Kingdom. The new movement's main instrument of defense was the Bible translated to vernacular languages.

Since the Middle Ages, translated versions of the Scriptures could be found in France and other European territories. In spite of the great amount of such productions, they were on the whole inaccurate and incomplete. Additionally, the ignorance of a population who wasn't able to read and write represented another factor which prevented bibles from reaching a larger public².

1 Richard Mackenney, *La Europa del siglo XVI: Expansión y conflicto* (Madrid: Akal, 1996).

2 Bernard Roussel and Guy Bedouelle, *Le Temps des Réformes et la Bible* (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1989), 17-18.

After approximately ten centuries of deficient translations and adaptations, the Protestant movement produced through one of its most active members, Pierre-Robert Olivétan, a more thorough version of the Scriptures, mostly translated from Greek and Hebrew texts. Although Olivétan's name remained mainly anonymous throughout the centuries and little is known about his life before the 1535 *Serrières'* edition, it's recognized that his work changed the biblical translation panorama in French-speaking territories. All of the subsequent Protestant versions of the Bible were in fact inspired by his work, which was revised and reorganized not only throughout the 16th-century, but would indirectly give birth to the most remarkable biblical translation of 17th-century France: The bible of *Port Royal*.

Calvin represented Olivétan's biggest critic and together with his associates, set himself the task of reforming his colleague's translation, an endeavor that would last more than 20 years and produce several editions more or less supervised by Geneva's most well-known minister. As for the Catholic Church, it didn't stay inactive, giving its own contribution to the so-called translation war through the publishing of Leuven's Bible, an extremely popular work among parishioners, which was reedited multiple times and directly inspired by the translation of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples.

This article intends thus to analyse the most representative of 16th-century French translations: Olivétan's (1535), Leuven's (1550), Calvin's (1561) and d'Étaples' (1534). On the one hand, it will try to verify if the discrepancies between Catholic and Protestant ideologies and their translated versions are indeed considerable. On the other hand, it will investigate the sources of these distinctions – the Greek New Testament and the Vulgate – and the consequent extension of these texts' influence over the translators.

For that, a determined method of comparison was employed. First, a general introduction to each of the studied translations and their main features was given to illustrate the translators' purposes in conceiving their work. Second, a specific book belonging to the New Testament was selected as a model for comparison: John's Second Epistle. The verses of Olivétan's translation were then confronted with the Greek original version and, occasionally, with the Vulgate³, of which it showed a slight influence. *Serrières'* verses were afterwards compared to the other French texts and the most important similarities and distinctions were commented on.

3 And in a very rare circumstance with Luther's translation.

Finally, a thorough analysis of the epistle permitted the author to find a significant affinity among translations belonging to different ideologies, a fact which often goes against the general conception of biblical translation in times of late Renaissance religious war.

I. FOUR BIBLE VERSIONS: THE TRANSLATION WAR

Between 1450 and 1455, Gutenberg and his associates connected Bible's history to the printed book revolution. The work, which was reserved only for the clergy and the nobility, could be free from its social chains and reach more readers. The Humanist movement was another factor that helped the expansion of knowledge and the rediscovery of the Classical world and its languages. Thanks to these profound changes, France suffered the influence of four major religious translations, which sought to reform the Church's medieval traditions: The New and Old Testaments of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (from 1523 and 1528, respectively); Pierre-Robert Olivétan's *Bible de Serrières*; Calvin's 1540 *Bible de l'Épée* and its multiple revisions, and 1550 Leuven's Bible.

1. LEFÈVERE D'ÉTAPLES' TRANSLATION

Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, born in 1435, was a humanist, philosopher, mathematician and expert in ancient languages, who began his career as a teacher at Cardinal Lemoine's *Collège* in Paris. At this time, he was already considered one of the biggest names of French Humanism, thanks to his extensive knowledge, his cultural experience due to undertaken trips to Italy and his talent as a teacher. Eager to live a contemplative life he takes refuge in the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, where he begins his translation labour⁴.

He worked primarily on the Epistles of St. Paul, which had suffered many distortions in the royal Jean de Rély's edition (1498). His translation and attached commentaries were, however, condemned by the Sorbonne and integrated into the Roman Index, which prohibited its reproduction and circulation under severe penalties. He decided then to move to Meaux, where his *Traduction française du Nouveau Testament* was first published (throughout the year of

4 Daniel Lortsch, *Histoire de la Bible en France, suivie de fragments relatifs à l'histoire générale de la Bible* (Paris: Société biblique britannique et étrangère, 1910).

1523)⁵. This version was still based on the Vulgate, but it contained many alterations from the original Greek, which converted it into a bridge between Catholic and Protestant traditions. It aroused many controversies as well, for whilst Lefèvre's 1528 *Bible d'Anvers*, a complete translation of the Old and New Testaments, was condemned by the clergy of Meaux and by the Sorbonne, it was widely accepted by the Church doctors of Antwerp⁶.

The New Testament's 1534 revised edition, also published in Antwerp, will be used in this article. It is the last of d'Étaples sacred editions, but not at all free from the Vulgate's influence. Its merits, therefore, are not of creating a final version of the Bible in French, but of introducing the study of biblical text in French-speaking territories.

2. SERRIÈRES' BIBLE

Although there were earlier versions of the Scriptures in French, the work of Pierre-Robert Olivétan is considered by many as the first French translation of the Bible and the first which does not follow the path marked by the Vulgate. While Lefèvre refused to entirely break with the Latin tradition and rather proposed a conventional translation, Olivétan spared no efforts to renew the Scriptures' image by a profound study of the Hebrew sources, a language that he mastered quite well. In addition, the 1535's edition, printed in the village of Serrières, which will be investigated in this article, served as a reference for the Calvinistic movement of the 1540's, 1550's and 1560's and gave birth to the Geneva's Bible or *Bible de l'Épée*⁷.

The main feature of Olivétan's 1535 work is its educational essence. The French reformer tried to create a "methodological Bible" with indications on how to read its contents. It also introduced the paragraph division in sacred works, a major publishing innovation for a time when editors used two compact columns of words with no distinction between paragraphs to emphasise the unity of the Scriptures, the so called *scripturae unitas*. Olivétan's work also presents explanatory notes related mainly to the textual variants found by him. These can

5 Pierre Lovy, "Lefèvre et son Nouveau Testament," in *Le Nouveau Testament de Jacques Lefèvres d'Étaples: édition intégrale de l'exemplaire de Nice*, ed. Antonin Blanchi (Nice: Serre Éditeur, 2005), 11-17.

6 Roussel and Bedouelle, *Le Temps des Réformes et la Bible*, 19.

7 Roussel and Bedouelle, *Le Temps des Réformes et la Bible*.

be identified in the text itself, which presents smaller letters added to the original paragraph that work as a rudimentary quotation system⁸.

Translating from Hebrew and Greek into French was no less than a herculean task. The French language went through a period of consolidation and, therefore, had an uncertain spelling and a changing syntax. Olivétan admits it himself in the introductory texts of the 1535's translation⁹.

Thus, the merit of the *Serrières* Bible cannot be denied as it was the first beacon to illuminate the following Protestant translations and would introduce a new era of publishing literary works, laying the grounds for a clearer arrangement of the contents of a volume.

3. LEUVEN'S BIBLE

The Catholic Church quickly recognized the unpopularity of the measures against Jacques Lefèvre's translation. Both Catholic and Protestants wanted a new Bible analysis for the Vulgate and Lefèvre seemed to be the perfect instrument for the renewal of the faith. Doctors of the Church decided, therefore, to counterattack and publish a translation of their own, a version that wouldn't go against the precepts of the ancient faith and, at the same time, would pacify a restive population, keeping the number of Catholic parishioners at a stable level as it was evident that the amount of the Church's members had decreased significantly since the emblematic year of 1517, when Luther published his 95 thesis.

The *Bible de Louvain* first appeared in 1550¹⁰. It was, of course, translated from the Vulgate. The *newly translated Bible into French, according to the*

8 Pierre-Robert Olivétan, *La Bible qui est toute la sainte escriture. En laquelle sont contenus, le Vieil Testament et le Nouveau, translatez en Francoys. Le Vieil, de Lebrieu: et le Nouveau, du Grec. Avec deux amples tables, une pour l'interpretation des propres noms: l'autre en forme d'indice, pour trouver plusieurs sentences et matieres. Le volume de tous les livres apocryphes, contenus en la translation commune, lesquelz navons point trouvez en Ebrieu ny en Chaldée* (Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 1535).

9 Roussel and Bedouelle, *Le Temps des Réformes et la Bible*, 449: Si voz persuasions... ne eussent estées plus puissantes que mes excuses, je ne devois jamais accepter telle charge, veu la grande difficulté de la besogne / et la debilite et foiblesse de moy / laquelle ayant bien congneue / avoir ia par plusieurs fois fait refus de me aventurer par tel hazard: veu aussi quil est autant difficile (comme vous scavez) de pouvoir bien faire parler a leloquence Ebraicque & Grecque / le languaige Francoys (lequel nest que barbare au regard dicelles) si que lon vouloit enseigner le doulx rossignol a chante le chant du corbeau enroue.

10 The 1550 edition will be the one investigated in this article: Bartholomy de Grave, Anthoine Marie Bergagne and Jean de Uvaen, *La Sainte Bible nouvellement translatee de latin en françois, selon l'édition latine, dernièrement imprimée à Louvain, reveue, corrigée & approuvée par gens sçavants, à*

Latin edition, revised, corrected and approved by scholars, as it was announced in its frontispiece, was a great success among the Catholic community and had a striking total of 200 editions. Its structure does not differ much from the translation of Lefèvre, though¹¹.

Those responsible for the publishing of Leuven's Bible in French were Nicolas de Leuze, who had a degree in theology, François de Larben, prior of the Celestine community in Heverlee, the theologian Pieter de Corte and the Dominican Godavaert Strijrode. Corte and Strijrode supported the appearance of a Dutch translation as well¹².

The last of Leuven's Bible editions was printed in 1608. Each edition had a series of modifications and improvements and had the full support of Charles V and of his successor, Philip II, who used it as an inhibiting measure against the popularity of unorthodox translations.

The safety of reading an official translation, approved by the main authorities of the time, was certainly the first reason for Leuven's Bible success, but not the only one. The credibility of its publishers and translators encouraged many other translations directly inspired by it¹³, which helped to maintain orthodoxy in the Catholic world.

4. CALVIN'S TRANSLATIONS: *BIBLE DE L'ÉPÉE*

In 1540, a new French translation appeared in the city of Geneva. It was no ordinary edition, but Genevas's greatest minister translation, Calvin's Sword Bible. This imposing name was due to the work's frontispiece, where one could contemplate a hand holding a shining sword, which represented the power of God against Satan¹⁴.

ce députez: à chacun chapitre sont adjouitez les sommaires, contenant la matière du dict chapitre, les concordances, & aucunes apostilles aux marges (Leuven: Bartholomy de Grave, 1550).

11 François Wim, "The Catholic Church and the Vernacular Bible in the Low Countries: A Paradigm Shift in the 1550s?," in *Discovering the Riches of the Word Religious Reading in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Sabrina Corbellini, Margriet Hoogveliet and Bart Ramakers (Groningen: Brill, 2012), 234-281.

12 Wim, "The Catholic Church and the Vernacular Bible in the Low Countries," 234-281.

13 For example, Mons New Testament.

14 Philip Benedict, "Calvin et la transformation de Genève," in *Calvin et le Calvinisme: cinq siècles d'influences sur l'Église et la société*, ed. Martin E. Hirzel and Martin Sallmann (Geneva: Éditions Labor et Fides, 2008), 15-32.

The 1540 edition is nowadays very rare and the most common editions are the ones of 1561 and 1562¹⁵. It is recognized though that the reformer couldn't have had enough time for a thorough revision of all of the editions, which was probably carried out by his closest collaborators, under his guidance.

Calvin's great fault would be his total ignorance of the Hebrew language. His frustration laid in the fact that he wasn't able to go beyond the Greek texts and had to base his translations on Olivétan's work or simply let his collaborators accomplish it¹⁶.

Calvin's efforts weren't more deserving because of that. They certainly allowed the population a considerable accessibility to the Scriptures. On the one hand, Geneva's Bible editions were what might be called today "pocket" editions with small Roman characters, thus enabling a low cost of production and, consequently, of sales. On the other hand, the writing style was simple, eliminating any unintelligible passage.

The work begins with a brief index of the books belonging to the Old Testament and the number of chapters corresponding to each one of them, followed by three pages devoted "to the reader" in which Calvin and his colleagues praise the Holy Scriptures' heavenly qualities¹⁷. In a very innovative section called *La Somme de tout ce que nous enseigne la sainte Esriture, le Viel & Nouveau Testament*, Calvin briefly explains the main teachings in both testaments in a simple and direct way, creating an introduction to Bible studies.

At the end of 1561 edition there are six major sections¹⁸. The first two sections are devoted to a list of key words from the Old and New Testaments. The third (*Passages qui doivent estre corrigez en ceste edition*) contains the translation mistakes found during editing. The *Recueil d'aucuns mots et manieres de parler difficiles du Nouveau Testament* represents a sort of dictionary of technical and uncommon biblical terms followed by another one, which contains biblical names: *Interpretations des noms propres Hebrieux, Chaldeens, & Grecs, qui se trouvent en la Bible*.

The last section is the *Indice ou Table des choses contenues és livres tant du Vieil que du Nouveau Testament*, where the translator exposes another list of concepts that appear in both Testaments and tries to demonstrate a logical

15 The 1561 edition was used for this article: Jean Calvin, *Le Nouveau Testament, c'est à dire, la nouvelle alliance de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ. Reveu de nouveau, et corrigé sur le grec par l'advis des ministres de Geneve* (Geneva: Richard Neudin, 1561).

16 Benedict, "Calvin et la transformation de Genève," 15-32.

17 Calvin, *Le Nouveau Testament*.

18 Calvin, *Le Nouveau Testament*.

linking between both works. It's an extensive twenty-page list and it certainly contributed to convert the Sword Bible into an admired and, at the same time, feared religious translation.

II. ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN

The main analysis method of John's Second Epistle consists in examining each of the versions previously mentioned, in two different investigation sections. In the first one, we proceeded to a study of Olivétan's translation comparing his techniques and main translational choices to the original Greek text. Both French and Greek versions were transcribed and analysed verse by verse, identifying possible influences of external texts such as the Latin Vulgate.

In the second section, Lefèvre d'Étaples', Leuven's and Calvin's translations are compared to Olivétan's text, employing the same system of research. Each text is reproduced and, then, studied according to the sources that were used in the translation, either the Greek New Testament or the Latin Vulgate and, sometimes, both. The observed Latin and Greek influences in the French translations were afterwards commented on and compared between themselves.

1:1

OV ¹⁹	GNT ²⁰
Lancien a la dame esleute et a ses enfans lesquelz iayme en verite: et non point moy seul mais aussi tous ceulx qui ont congneu la verite	ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐκλεκτῆ κυρία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, οὗς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν,

The contracted article *L* connected to the masculine noun *ancien* in the ancient French writing *Lancien*, i.e. 'the elder', corresponds completely with the definite article ὁ ('the') followed by the singular masculine adjective, used here as a noun, πρεσβύτερος, i.e. 'senior', 'elder'. The nominal syntagm in dative ἐκλεκτῆ κυρία, i.e. 'to the chosen lady', appears in OV as *a la dame esleute*. Olivétan uses the preposition *à* (in ancient French *a*) together with the feminine definite article *la* as a substitution for the dative declension of the adjective ἐκλεκτός and the noun κυρία.

19 Olivétan's version.

20 Greek New Testament: Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013).

The conjunction καὶ ('and') followed by the plural dative neuter article τοῖς ('to the'), the dative plural noun τέκνοις ('offspring', 'children') and the personal pronoun in feminine genitive αὐτῆς ('of her') is translated by Olivétan as *et a ses enfans*. The reformer converts, therefore, a personal pronoun into a possessive pronoun (*ses*), adapting the greek sentence to the French language, as the literal translation *et aulx enfans de elle* wouldn't be grammatically acceptable.

οὓς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, i.e. 'whom I love in truth' corresponds completely to OV: *lesquelz iayme en verite*. The same happens with καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος ('and not I only'), which appears in OV as *et non point moy seul*. Finally, in the sentence ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν ('but also all they that have known the truth'), Olivétan translates the conjunction καὶ as *aussi* and πάντες οἱ ἐγνωκότες as *tous ceulx qui ont cogneu*. As for the nominal syntagm τὴν ἀλήθειαν, it appears quite faithfully as *la verite* (*mais aussi tous ceulx qui ont cogneu la verite*).

EV ²¹	LV ²²	CV ²³
Lancien a la dame esleute et a ses enfans lesqlz iayme en verite et non point moy seul: mais aussi tous ceulx qui ont cogneu la verite,	L'ancien à la dame esleuë & à ses enfans, lesquelz i'ayme en verité, & non point moy seul, mais aussy tous ceulx qui ont cogneu la verité,	L'ancien à la Dame esleuë, & à ses enfans; lesquels i'aime en verité: & non point moy seul, mais aussi tous ceux qui ont cognu la verité,

It's interesting to notice that each one of the French versions, whether they are Catholic or Protestant, are extremely similar. Firstly, the sentence *Lancien a la dame esleute et a ses enfans*, which appears in OV, is also present in EV, LV and CV with slight orthographic differences: EV: *Lancien a la dame esleute et a ses enfans*; LV: *L'ancien à la dame esleuë & à ses enfans*; CV: *L'ancien à la Dame esleuë, & à ses enfans*. LV and EV follow, nevertheless, the Vg²⁴ (*senior electae dominae et natis eius*).

21 Étaples' version: Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Le nouveau testament de nostre seigneur et seul sauveur Jesus Christ. Les noms des livres contenuz au Nouveau Testament [table de 34 lignes]. Ce nouveau testament a esté de nouveau imprimé en telle grosse lettre que vous voyez, pour plus aysement et facilement lire une tant sainte lecture. Avec une briefve table des plus singulieres et necessaires matieres comprises en iceluy (Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 1534).

22 Leuven's version.

23 Calvin's version.

24 Vulgate: Michaela Tvvedale, ed., *Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam Clementinam* (London: The Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, 2005).

Another interesting feature in this sentence is the progression of the verb *élire* (*eslire*). In 1534 EV and 1535 OV, we can observe the form *esleute*, while in 1550 LV and 1561 CV the verb suffered an alteration to *esleuë*, which would develop to *élue* in modern French. The absence of apostrophes is verified both in EV and OV. The articles are connected directly to the nouns (e.g. *Lancien, iayme*) while in LV and CV we notice the use of separating apostrophes.

The sentence *lesquelz iayme en verite* coincide with the CV (*lesquels i'aime en verité*) and, at the same time, with the Catholic versions (EV: *lesqlz iayme en verite*; LV: *lesquelz i'ayme en verité*), which reproduce the Latin sentence *quos ego diligo in veritate*. Additionally, there is once more a small orthographic variation of the pronoun *lesquels*, which progresses from the form *lesqlz* in EV, to the form *lesquelz* both in OV and LV and, finally, to the modern form *lesquels* in CV. Another orthographic evolution can be perceived in the word *aime*, that appears in EV, OV and LV as *ayme* and it takes its modern spelling in CV (*aime*).

The last sentence *et non point moy seul mais aussi tous ceulx qui ont congneu la verite* is translated in the same way in EV (*et non point moy seul: mais aussi tous ceulx qui ont congneu la verite*), and in LV (*& non point moy seul, mais aussy tous ceulx qui ont cogneu la verité*). Moreover, these versions match the Vg perfectly (*et non ego solus sedet omnes qui cognoverunt veritatem*). As for CV, its translator proposes an identical translation (*& non point moy seul, mais aussi tous ceux qui ont cognu la verité*). There are important orthographic evolutions both for the pronoun *ceux*, which goes from the *ceulx* form (in EV, OV and LV) to its modern spelling in CV and for the past participle of the verb *connaître* (*conoistre*), which appears in EV and in OV as *congneu*, in LV as *congnu*, and, finally, as *cognu* in CV, very close to the modern version *connu*.

1:2

OV	GNT
Pour la verite qui demeure en nous et sera a tousioursmais avec nous.	διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

The conjunction *διὰ* ('through', 'on account of', 'for the sake of', 'because of') is translated by Olivétan as the preposition *pour*, which separately doesn't completely match the Greek conjunction, but has the same value in this precise context (*Pour la verite qui demeure en nous*). An example of an interesting

translation would be Luther's version *um der Wahrheit willen*, in which the expression *um...willen* means precisely 'for the sake of'.

Olivétan proposes a very faithful translation of the first sentence. In the first place, *verite* is equivalent to the feminine accusative singular noun ἀλήθειαν (nominative: ἀλήθεια). Secondly, the verb μένω is perfectly transferred to the French language as the verb *demeurer*. Moreover, the preposition ἐν followed by the dative personal pronoun in plural ἡμῖν is translated by the equivalent preposition *en* and the personal pronoun in plural *nous*. The second definite article in accusative τῆν is replaced by the relative pronoun *qui*, since an article wouldn't fit in the French subordinate sentence *qui demeure en nous*.

Olivétan uses the same copulative conector (*et*) that appears in the Greek version (καὶ). However, he inverts the Greek sentence μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ('shall be with us forever') to *sera a tousioursmais avec nous* for the sake of adaptation and spontaneity. Additionally, it's interesting to note the ancient form of the modern French adverb *toujours jamais*, which was transcribed as *touioursmais*, and in later years, *toujoursmais*.

EV	LV	CV
Pour la verite qui demeure en vous et qui sera a tousiours avec vous	Pour la verité qui demoure en nous, & qui sera à tousiours avec nous	A cause de la verité qui demeure en nous [Ou, en vous], & sera à iamais avec nous

The sentence *Pour la verite qui demeure en nous* in OV is translated identically in the LV (*Pour la verité qui demoure en nous*), which follows the Latin version *Propter veritatem, quae permanet in nobis*. It's interesting to notice, though, that Calvin's associates change the preposition *pour* to *a cause de*, which is equivalent to the preposition *propter* as well as to the preposition *διὰ* in the referred context. Another curious feature of both CV and EV is the substitution of pronoun *nous* for *vous*. In CV, the pronoun *vous* is given in a note as a possible replacement for *nous* (*Ou, en vous*), while in EV it appears directly in the verse (*Pour la verite qui demeure en vous*). This change, though, corresponds neither to the Greek (ἐν ἡμῖν) nor to the Latin (*in nobis*) versions.

The copulative sentence *et sera a tousioursmais avec nous* suffers variations in all of the French versions. We can divide these alterations into two groups: Catholic and Protestant translations. Firstly, both EV and LV propose the translation: *et qui sera a tousiours avec vous* (LV: *& qui sera à tousiours avec nous*), with small orthographic variations. The most important difference, though, is the use of the relative pronoun *qui*, following the Latin translation

(*quae permanet in nobis*), which also employs a feminine nominative relative pronoun (*quae*). The addition of the conjunction *et*, in spite of its omission in the Vulgate, is also relevant. Secondly, the personal pronoun disappears in both OV and CV (OV: *et sera a tousioursmais avec nous*; CV: *& sera à iamais avec nous*), according to the Greek translation (καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα).

There is another small variation in the use of the expression *a tousioursmais* (OV), which appears as *a tousiours* in EV and LV, and as *à iamais* in CV. They are, nevertheless, synonyms and there are no further alterations in the sentence's meaning.

1:3

OV	GNT
Grace misericorde et paix de par Dieu le pere et de par le Seigneur Jesus Christ le filz du pere en verite: et charite sera avec nous.	ἔσται μεθ' ἡμῶν χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη θεοῦ πατρός, καὶ παρὰ ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ.

The singular future form of the verb εἰμί (ἔσται) appears literally in Olivétan's translation as the future form *sera*. The preposition μεθ' followed by the personal pronoun ἡμῶν ('with us') is faithfully translated as *avec nous*. However, Olivétan places the verbal syntagm *sera avec nous* at the end of the period, instead of at the beginning.

The nouns χάρις ('grace'), ἔλεος ('mercy') and εἰρήνη, ('peace') correspond entirely to OV (*grace misericorde et paix*), where the conjunction *et* is also used for better understanding and spontaneity. Additionally, the preposition παρὰ ('beside', 'from', 'in the presence of') appears in OV as the Middle French expression *de par*, i.e. 'in the name of' (*de par Dieu le pere et de par le Seigneur Jesus Christ*, i.e. 'in the name of God, the Father and of Jesus Christ').

The copulative sentence καὶ παρὰ ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ is adapted in OV as *et de par le Seigneur Jesus Christ le filz du pere en verite*, where *en verite* corresponds entirely to ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. Nevertheless, Olivétan replaces the noun in dative singular ἀγάπῃ, i.e. 'love' for *charite*, i.e. 'charity'. The main reason for this occurrence is an interesting influence of the Vulgate, which proposes the translation *in veritate et caritate*.

Both ἀγάπῃ and *caritas* have similar meanings. However, it is highly probable that Olivétan had the Vg in sight when he opted for the noun *charité*, for *amour* and *charité* are not so close in meaning as it occurs in the Greek/Latin case.

EV	LV	CV
Grace/misericorde et paix de par Dieu le pere et de par nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ le filz du pere en verite: et charite soit avec vous.	Grace, misericorde & paix de par Dieu le pere, & de par Iesu Christ le filz du pere en verité, & charité, soyt avec vous.	Grace, misericorde & paix de par Dieu le Pere, & de par le Seigneur Iesus Christ le Fils du Pere, soit avec vous en verité & charité.

The sentence *Grace misericorde et paix de par Dieu le pere* is fully translated in EV (*Grace/misericorde et paix de par Dieu le pere*), LV (*Grace, misericorde & paix de par Dieu le pere*) and CV (*Grace, misericorde & paix de par Dieu le Pere*). It appears in the Vg as *sit nobiscum gratia Misericordia pax a Deo Patre*.

However, the copulative sentence *et de par le Seigneur Jesus Christ le filz du pere en verite*, is modified in the LV to *& de par Iesu Christ le filz du pere en verité*, according to the Latin version (*et a Christo Iesu Filio Patris*). LV suppresses thus the noun *Seigneur*, which is curiously present in EV. Apart from that, d'Étaples adds the possessive pronoun *nostre* (*et de par nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ le filz du pere en verite*), a technique which doesn't appear either in the French versions or in the original texts.

Moreover, Calvin modifies the sequence of Olivétan's translation (*et de par le Seigneur Jesus Christ le filz du pere en verite: et charite sera avec nous*) to *& de par le Seigneur Iesus Christ le Fils du Pere, soit avec vous en verité & charité*. Firstly, he substitutes the future form *sera* for the present subjunctive *soit*. This strategy is equally employed by LV (*soyt avec vous*) and EV (*et charite soit avec vous*). Secondly, he proposes a sentence sequence which is more faithful to the GNT (ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ). It is nevertheless curious that none of the reformers take into account the Greek noun ἀγάπη and show a singular dependence of the Vulgate when proposing the noun *charité* as a suitable translation.

1:4

OV	GNT
Jay este fort esiouy pource que iay trouve de tes filz cheminans en verite comme nous avons receu le commandement du pere.	ἐχάρην λίαν ὅτι εὔρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου περιπατοῦντας ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καθὼς ἐνόλην ἐλάβομεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός.

ἐχάρην λίαν is literally translated in OV as *Jay este fort esiouy*. The conjunction ὅτι ('that', 'because') appears in OV as the Middle French prepositional form *pource que* (*parce que*), which is entirely equivalent to the Greek conjunction in this precise context.

Olivétan uses the past form of the verb *trouver* (*iay trouve*) as a possible translation of the verb εὐρίσκω (εὔρηκα). Moreover, he transcribes the preposition ἐκ to a French equivalent (*de*), which doesn't match the Greek preposition in a separate context, but it's quite suitable for the context.

The nominal syntagm τῶν τέκνων σου correctly appears as *tes filz*, whilst the gerund form *cheminans* perfectly matches the Greek verb in accusative plural περιπατοῦντας. The equivalence is extended to the expression *en verite*, which fits exactly the preposition ἐν followed by the noun in dative singular ἀληθεία. The adverb καθὼς ('as', 'according to') appears as *comme*. However, the sentence καθὼς ἐντολήν ἐλάβομεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, i.e. 'according to the command we have received from the Father', suffers a small alteration in its order: *comme nous avons receu le commandement du pere*. It's interesting to notice that in verse 2, Olivétan translates the preposition παρὰ as *de par*, while in verse 3 he replaces it with the masculine article *du*.

EV	LV	CV
Jay este fort esiouy pource que iay trouve aucuns de tes filz cheminans en verite comme nous avons receu le commandement du pere.	I'ay esté fort esiouy, pource que I'ay trouvé aucuns de tes filz cheminans en verité: comme nous avons receu le commandement du pere.	I'ay esté fort esiouy de ce que i'ay trouvé de tes enfans cheminer en verité, comme nous avons receu le commandement du Pere.

The sentence *Jay este fort esiouy* corresponds to all of the French versions (EV: *Jay este fort esiouy*; LV: *I'ay esté fort esiouy*; CV: *I'ay esté fort esiouy*). The main reason for this equality between Catholic and Protestant translations is due to the similarity of the Greek (ἐχάρην λίαν) and the Latin (*gavisus sum valde*) versions.

While Olivétan proposes the translation: *pource que iay trouve de tes filz cheminans en verite*, which entirely corresponds to the GNT (ὅτι εὔρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου περιπατοῦντας ἐν ἀληθεία), both EV and LV exhibit a similar strategy using the indefinite pronoun *aucuns*, suppressed by Olivétan (EV: *pource que iay trouve aucuns de tes filz cheminans en verite*; LV: *pource que I'ay trouvé aucuns de tes filz cheminans en verité*). In Middle French, *aucuns* is synonym for *certain*, i.e. 'some' (*aucuns de tes filz*, i.e. 'some of your children'). It's

interesting to notice that there is no such an equivalent in the Vg, where it is simply stated that: *quoniam inveni de filiis tuis ambulantes in veritate*.

CV, however, eliminates the conjunction *pource que*, found as well in OV as in the Catholic versions, and replaces it with the structure *de ce que* (*de ce que l'ay trouvé de tes enfans cheminer en verité*, i.e. 'for having found your children walking in truth'). He also employs the noun *enfans*, instead of *filz*, which is, nevertheless, a synonym and doesn't alterate the sentence.

Finally, the sentence *comme nous avons recue le commandement du pere* is identically translated by EV, LV and CV, with no orthographic discrepancies. Once more, both the GNT (καθὼς ἐντολὴν ἐλάβομεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός) and the Vg (*sicut mandatum accepimus a Patre*) coincide.

1:5

OV	GNT
Et maintenant Dame ie te prie non point comme te escrivant nouveau commandement/ mais celuy que nous avons eu des le commencement: que nous aymions lung lautre.	καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία, οὐχ ὡς ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφων σοι ἀλλὰ ἦν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους.

The sentence καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία appears in OV as *Et maintenant Dame ie te prie*. The conjunction *et* is equivalent to the Greek conjunction καὶ, as well as the adverb *maintenant*, that entirely matches the adverb νῦν ('now'). The intransitive verb form ἐρωτῶ, in accusative, corresponds thoroughly to Olivétan's translation *ie...prie* ('I ask', 'I bessech'). The pronoun in the accusative case σε appears as the pronoun *te* (in *ie te prie*). The feminine noun in the vocative case κυρία is equally translated by Olivétan. Nevertheless, he places it after the adverb *maintenant*, instead of situating it at the end of the period.

The negative particle οὐχ corresponds entirely to the French composed negative particle *non point*. As for the adverb ὡς, it appears in OV as *comme*. Olivétan uses the gerund form *escrivant* to reproduce the Greek present active verb form in nominative masculine γράφων. It's important to notice that the pronoun *te* (*te escrivant*) coincides with the personal pronoun in dative σοι at the end of the period. As for the nominal syntagm *nouveau commandement*, it is completely equivalent to ἐντολὴν καινὴν, in the accusative case.

The adversative sentence ἀλλὰ ἦν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους ('but that which we had from the beginning, that we love one another') is reproduced literally in OV. Firstly, the adversative conjunction ἀλλὰ

corresponds entirely to the French conjunction *mais*. Secondly, Olivétan correctly translates the preposition in accusative ἦν by *celuy que*. Additionally, he translates εἶχομεν ('we had') by *nous avons eu*, which are similar in meaning. Fourthly, the preposition ἀπ' followed by the noun ἀρχῆς in genitive singular ('from the beginning') matches the French version *des le commencement*. Finally, he maintains the conjunction ἵνα, i.e. 'that' (*que*), in the sentence *que nous aymions lung lautre*. The present active verb form in plural ἀγαπῶμεν is fully translated as *nous aymions*. As for *lung lautre*, it is equivalent to ἀλλήλους.

EV	LV	CV
Et maintenant Dame ie te prie non point comme te rescrivant nouveau commandement / mais celuy que nous avons eu des le commencement: que nous aymions lung lautre.	Et maintenant dame, ie te prie, non point come t'escrivant nouveau commandement, mais celuy que nous avons eu déz le commencement: que nous aymions l'un l'autre.	Et maintenant, Dame ie te prie (non point comme t'escrivant nouveau commandement, mais celuy que nous avons eu dés les commencement) que nous aimions l'un l'autre.

It's important to notice that both the GNT and the Vg correspond to one another, which leads to identical translations of Catholic and Protestant scholars. In this precise verse, there are no significant differences between the four French versions. In the first place, the sentence *Et maintenant Dame ie te prie*, is exactly translated in the EV, LV and CV, with no orthographic distinctions besides the one found in the word *dame*, which is written in lower case letter in LV. Both Greek and Latin versions coincide as well (καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία / *Et nunc rogo te domina*).

The next sentence (*non point comme te escrivant nouveau commandement*) is also equivalent to LV and CV translations, but appears in EV as: *non point comme te rescrivant nouveau commandement*. D'Étaples substitutes the verb *escrire* by *rescrire*, an independent version that appears neither in the GNT (οὐχ ὡς ἐντολήν καινήν γράφων σοι) nor in the Vg (*non tamquam mandatum novum scribens tibi*).

The adversative sentence *mais celui que nous avons eu des le commencement* is equivalent both to the GNT (ἀλλὰ ἦν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) and to the Vg (*sed quod habuimus ab initio*). Therefore, there is a general consensus among the French translations, which are identical to OV and suffer small orthographic discrepancies.

Finally, the similiarity is maintained in the last sentence (*que nous aymions lung lautre*), as there is a continuous parallel between the GNT (ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους) and the Vg (*ut diligamus alterutrum*). There is also an orthographic development in the different versions (EV: *que nous aymions lung lautre*; LV: *que nous aymions l'un l'autre*; CV: *que nous aimions l'un l'autre*).

1:6

OV	GNT
Et ceste est la charite / que nous cheminions selon son commandement. Cestuy est le commandement / comme vous avez ouy des le commencement: que vous cheminez en iceluy.	καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ· αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστίν, καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ περιπατῆτε.

The sentence καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη is translated in OV as *Et ceste est la charite*. Although Olivétan maintains the simultaneity tone by conserving the conjunction *et* in the same way it's observed in the GNT, he continues to suffer an influence of the Vg by choosing the noun *charite*.

As the sentence ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, the conjunction ἵνα ('that') is rightfully transposed as the conjunction *que*. The verb περιπατῶμεν, declensed in present active plural, appears as *nous cheminions*, in subjunctive, as a result of the use of the conjunction *que*. The preposition κατὰ is translated as *selon* and, although the Greek version uses a plural noun (τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, i.e. 'his commandments') accompanied by the plural article in accusative τὰς and the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ in genitive, Olivétan employs a singular possessive pronoun and noun: *son commandement*.

As for the sentence αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστίν, it is presented as *Cestuy est le commandement*. The nouns ἐντολή and *commandement* coincide here completely (in number and case). The adverb καθὼς appears one more time as *comme*. Therefore, the sentence *comme vous avez ouy des le commencement* is a literal translation of καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

Finally, the subordinate sentence ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ περιπατῆτε is translated as *que vous cheminez en iceluy*, where the preposition ἐν followed by the personal pronoun in dative singular αὐτῇ entirely matches *en iceluy* and the verb περιπατῆτε appears in the subjunctive form (*vous cheminez*).

EV	LV	CV
Et ceste est la charite / que nous cheminions selon ses commandemens. Car cestuy est le commandement / que en telle maniere que vous avez ouy des le commencement / que vous cheminez en iceluy.	Et ceste est la charité, que nous cheminions selon ses commandemens. Car cestuy est le commandement, que comme vous avez ouy déz le commencement, vous cheminez en iceluy.	Et ceste est la charité, que nous cheminions selon ses commandemens: & le commandement est, comme vous avez ouy dés le commencement, que vous cheminez en luy.

The sentence *Et cest est la charite* appears identically in all of the French versions. It's interesting to notice, though, that Olivétan is the only translator who uses the singular form of the noun *commandement* in the subordinate sentence *que nous cheminions selon son commandement*. CV strictly follows the GNT (ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ) by proposing the translation of the noun *commandement* in plural (*que nous cheminions selon ses commandemens*). On the other hand, EV and LV follow the Vg, which, in turn, also employs the noun 'commandment' in the plural form (*ut ambulemus secundum mandata eius*). It's therefore unknown why Olivétan preferred to do otherwise.

The sentence *cestuy est le commandement* suffers multiple alterations according to each translation. In the first place, the Catholic versions add the conjunction *car* to the original phrase due to an influence of the Vg, whose translator proposes the following sentence: *hoc mandatum est*. Thus, the pronoun *hoc*, which in the accusative case means 'for this reason' is successfully replaced by the conjunction *car*. The translator could proceed, though, to the suppression of the pronoun *cestuy* and the reelaboration of the sentence to *car le commandement est*. Moreover, that is the strategy exhibited by Calvin (& *le commandement est*). He, however, substitutes the conjunction *car* for *et*, which doesn't appear in other translations.

While in OV and CV the Greek sentence καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is faithfully translated as *comme vous avez ouy des le commencement*, with a minor orthographic modification (*des* in OV and *dés* in CV), there is an interesting distinction between EV and LV. D'Étaples proposes the translation: *que en telle maniere que vous avez ouy des le commencement*. He replaces the conjunction *come* for *que en telle maniere*, which matches completely the Latin version *ut*

quemadmodum (ut quemadmodum audistis ab initio). On the other hand, LV's translator employs the sentence *que comme vous avez ouy déz le commencement*, in which *que* is a literal translation of *ut* and *comme* a not so faithful reproduction of the adverb *quemadmodum*.

Additionally, the last sentence (*que vous cheminiez en iceluy*) is reproduced as well by EV as by CV. It's though slightly different in LV (*vous cheminez en iceluy*), because of the previous subordinate sentence inflection (*que comme vous avez ouy déz le commencement*).

1:7

OV	GNT
Car plusieurs seducteurs sont entrez au monde [*Seducteurs yssus au monde] / lesquelz ne confessent point Jesus Christ estre venu [*Aucuns, qui viendra] en chair. Cestuy est seducteur et Ante-christ.	ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος.

The sentence ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον appears in OV as *Car plusieurs seducteurs sont entrez au monde*. Olivétan gives another possible translation in one of his margin notes: *Seducteurs yssus au monde*, i.e. 'deceivers gone out to the world'. This is an interesting translation because, whereas it matches both the GNT and the Vg (*Quoniam multi seductores exierunt in mundum*) it is also used in the Catholic translations. The choice of the noun *seducteur* not only in OV, but in common French translations to the detriment of other synonyms, such as *deceveur*, *abuseur* or *affronteur*, could mean a mass influence of the Vg, although this phenomenon cannot be properly verified.

As for the sentence οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί is similarly translated by Olivétan, who, though, employs the verb *venir* in past: *lesquelz ne confessent point Jesus Christ estre venu en chair*. He also gives a second possible translation of *estre venu*, stating that *some translators (Aucuns)* had proposed a difference sentence: *Aucuns, qui viendra*. It's impossible, though, to know which other translations Olivétan analysed.

Lastly, the third sentence οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος also appears in a literal translation: *Cestuy est seducteur et Ante-christ*.

EV	LV	CV
Car plusieurs seducteurs sont yssus au monde / lesqlz ne confessent point que Jesus Christ soit venu en chair. Cestuy est seducteur et antechrist.	Car plusieurs seducteurs sont yssus au monde, lesquelz ne confessent point que Iesu Christ soyt venu en chair. Cestuy est seducteur & Antechrist.	Car plusieurs seducteurs sont entrez au monde, lesquels ne confessent point Iesus Christ estre venu en chair: un tel homme est seducteur [Ou, abuseur, affronteur] & antechrist.

It is interesting to notice that both Catholic versions (EV and LV) propose a translation which is, at the same time, identical to the Vg (*Quoniam multi seductores exierunt in mundm*): *Car plusieurs seducteurs sont yssus au monde*, and to the translation offered by Olivétan in his notes.

Moreover, it is possible to divide the second sentence's translation into two distinct groups. Firstly, the Catholic versions, which use the verb *estre* in subjunctive (EV: *lesqlz ne confessent point que Jesus Christ soit venu en chair* / LV: *lesquelz ne confessent point que Iesu Christ soyt venu en chair*), thus, following the Vg (*qui non confitetur Iesum Christum venientem in carne*). Secondly, the Protestant versions, which use the past tense: *lesquelz* (*lesquels* in CV) *ne confessent point Jesus Christ estre venu en chair* to the detriment of the present tense used in the GNT (οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί).

The sentence *Cestuy est seducteur et Ante-christ* is also reproduced in EV and LV with minor orthographic differences (EV: *Cestuy est seducteur et anti-christ* / LV: *Cestuy est seducteur & Antechrist*). CV, however, replaces *cestuy* for *un tel homme* (*un tel homme est seducteur & antechrist*). He adds a margin note as well, offering possible synonyms for the noun *seducteur*: *Ou, abuseur, affronteur*. This fact reinforces the possibility mentioned in the previous analysis that the choice of the noun *seducteur* was part of a Catholic tradition. If so, Calvin wanted to break with it and propose other suitable translations in the same way Protestant bibles used to employ distinct terms for some Catholic words²⁵.

25 Olivétan, Calvin, Viret and other reformers used to replace some Catholic terms to more "neutral" ones. For example, the noun *apostre* was substituted by *ambassadeur* and the verb *evangelizer* by *annoncer*. There are many other occurrences as these both in the Old and in the New Testament.

1:8

OV	GNT
Prenez garde a vous mesmes: affin que ne perdions les choses lesquelles nous avons faictes: mais que nous recevions le plein salaire.	βλέπετε ἑαυτούς, ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσητε ἃ εἰργασάμεθα ἀλλὰ μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε.

The verb βλέπετε ('to look', 'to beware') is translated in OV as the verb in the imperative form *prenez garde a* ('to be careful with', 'to watch out'). Additionally, the reflexive pronoun in the accusative case *ἑαυτούς*, i.e. 'yourselves', appears as *vous mesmes*.

The conjunction ἵνα, which in the passage means 'in order to', is correctly translated as *affin que*. As for the negative particle μὴ, it also appears as the negative particle *ne*. It's followed by the verb in subjunctive *perdions* (*perdre*), which is equally reflected in the GNT, whose translator employs the verb ἀπόλλυμι, i.e. 'to lose', 'to destroy'.

The relative pronoun ἃ, i.e. 'which', is followed by the verb in the aorist case ἐργάζομαι ('to work', 'to perform', 'to do'). It is interesting to notice that Olivétan introduces, after *perdions*, the definite article *les* followed by the plural noun *choses*, even if none of them appears in the Greek translation, despite their implicit presence. A more faithful translation would be, thus: *affin que nous ne perdions ce que nous avons faictes*, in which *ce que* completely matches the pronoun ἃ.

The conjunction ἀλλὰ appears integrally as *mais*. As for the sentence μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε, it is translated as *que nous recevions le plein salaire*, in which the verb conjugation in subjunctive *nous recevions* is a literal translation of the verb ἀπολαμβάνω and *plein* is equivalent to the adjective in the accusative case πλήρη. Moreover, the noun *salaire* corresponds to the noun in the accusative case μισθὸν.

EV	LV	CV
Prenez garde a vous mesmes que ne perdez les choses que vous avez fait: mais que vous recevez le plain salaire.	Prenez garde à vous mesmes, que ne perdez les choses que vous avez fayt, mais que vous recevez le plein salaire.	Avisez à vous-mesmes: à fin que ne perdions ce que nous avons fait, ains que nous recevions plein salaire.

OV translation *prenez garde a vous-mesmes* is equally followed by Catholic and Protestant versions, with a small but unimportant distinction in CV. Instead of using the verb *prendre garde*, Calvin adopts the synonym *aviser* ('to notice', 'to perceive'), which doesn't alterate the sentence's meaning.

As for the sentence *que ne perdions les choses lesquelles nous avons faictes*, there is an important difference among Protestant and the Catholic versions. In the first place, Olivétan and Calvin employ the verb *perdre* in the first person plural (*nous perdions*), while EV and LV reproduce the Latin version *ne perdati* (EV: *ne perdez les choses que vous avez faict* / LV: *ne perdez les choses que vous avez fayt*). It is interesting to notice that although the Vg precisely matches the GNT in translating *ne perdati quæ operati estis*, EV and LV propose a translation which is similar to the one present in the Protestant versions, thus not entirely equivalent to any of the original texts.

It is important to emphasise the alteration of the personal pronoun, that is also present in the last sentence *mais que nous recevions le plein salaire*. While CV offers a similar translation, in which *mais* is replaced by the equivalent *ains que*, i.e. 'but instead' (*ains que nous recevions plein salaire*), LV and EV conserve the second person plural (*mais que vous recevez le plain salaire* / *mais que vous recevez le plein salaire*, respectively), according to the Latin version *sed ut mercedem plenam accipiatis*.

1:9

OV	GNT
Quiconque transgresse / et ne demeure point en la doctrine de Christ: il na point Dieu. Qui demeure en la doctrine de Christ / cestuy a le pere et le filz.	πᾶς ὁ προάγων καὶ μὴ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ χριστοῦ θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει· ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ, οὗτος καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει.

The adjective πᾶς ('all', 'every', 'whoever') is translated in OV as *quiconque* ('whoever'), whilst the article ὁ followed by the verb προάγω ('to lead forward'), in present active and in the nominative case (προάγων), appears as *transgresse* (*quiconque transgresse*).

Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that the conjunction καὶ, which gives the sentence καὶ μὴ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ αχριστοῦ a simultaneity tone, is preserved in OV by the use of the conjunction *et* (*et ne demeure point en la doctrine de Christ*). This conjunction is followed by the negative particle

μὴ and appears equivalently in OV as *ne...point*. Additionally, the verb μένω, i.e. ‘stay’, ‘remain’, entirely corresponds to the middle French verb *demeurer*. As for ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ χριστοῦ (‘in the doctrine of Christ’), it is fully translated as *en la doctrine de Christ*.

The sentence θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει (‘hath not God’) is presented in OV as *il na point Dieu* (‘he has no God’). The translator continues faithfully when he converts the sentence ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ χριστοῦ to *qui demoure en la doctrine de Christ*, in which *qui demoure* entirely matches the structure ὁ μένων, which appears at the beginning of the verse.

The demonstrative pronoun οὗτος completely corresponds to the pronoun *cestuy* (‘the one’). It is succeeded by the present conjugation of the verb *avoir* (*a*), which appears in the GNT at the end of the period as the verb ἔχω, i.e. ‘to have’ (ἔχει). The nominal syntagms τὸν πατέρα and τὸν υἱὸν appear equally reflected as: *le pere/le filz*. They are also connected by the conjunction *et* (*le pere et le filz*). Nevertheless, OV doesn’t maintain the double coordination of the GNT: καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, omitting one of the additive conjunctions (*cestuy a le pere et le filz*).

EV	LV	CV
Quiconque se depart / et ne persevere point en la doctrine de Christ il na point Dieu. Qui persevere en la doctrine / cestuy a le pere et le filz.	Quiconque se depart, & ne persevere point en la doctrine de Christ, il n’a point Dieu. Qui persevere en la doctrine, cestuy a le pere & le filz.	Quiconque trasgresse, & ne demeure point en la doctrine de Christ, n’ha point Dieu: q demeure en la doctrine de Christ, ha le Pere & le Fils.

While in OV, the translator uses the verb *transgresser*, which also appears in CV, and doesn’t quite match the Greek verb προάγω, both EV and LV employ the Middle French verb *se departir*. The Catholic versions get, thus, closer to both GNT and the Vg (*omnis qui praecedit*), where *praecedo* means ‘to go before’, ‘to lead the way’, and entirely corresponds to προάγω.

The simultaneity tone proportioned by the additive conjunction *et* is maintained in all of the three translations. Additionally, the sentence *et ne demoure point en la doctrine de Christ* is completely reproduced by Calvin (& *ne demeure point en la doctrine de Christ*), whereas in EV and LV it appears as *et ne persevere point en la doctrine de Christ*. Their version also matches the Latin text *et non manet in doctrina Christi*, although *perseverer* would be a more proper translation for *permaneo*, than for *maneo*.

Furthermore, both Protestant and Catholic versions offer the same translation for the sentence *il na point Dieu*. This is due to the recurring similarity between the GNT (θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει) and the Vg (*Deum non habet*).

It's interesting to note that EV and LV use the verb *perseverer* another time to translate the sentence *qui permanet in doctrina* (*qui persevere en la doctrine*), whereas OV maintain the verb *demourer* (*qui demoure en la doctrine*). Another important feature of the Protestant versions is that they conserve the Greek nominal syntagm τῆ διδαχῆ τοῦ χριστοῦ, which loses its modifier (τοῦ χριστοῦ) in the Vg: *Qui demoure en la doctrine de Christ*.

Finally, the sentence *cestuy a le pere et le filz* also appears in EV and LV with a minor orthographic distinction for LV (*cestuy a le pere & le filz*). It's curious to observe though that Calvin suppresses the pronoun *cestuy*, which is present both in the GNT (οὗτος) and in the Vg (*hic*).

1:10

OV	GNT
Si aucun vient a vous et napporte point ceste doctrine / ne le recevez pas en vostre maison / et ne le saluez point.	εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει, μὴ λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν καὶ χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε

The conjunction εἴ ('if') is literally translated in OV as *si*. Additionally, the indefinite pronoun τις ('someone', 'anyone') appears as *auncun*, which is equivalent to the Greek pronoun.

The deponent ἔρχομαι entirely matches the verb *venir*, although it doesn't appear in the passive form in OV. At the same time, the preposition πρὸς followed by the personal pronoun in the accusative case ὑμᾶς is correctly translated as *a vous*.

The simultaneity tone of the copulative sentence καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει is fully maintained in OV (*et napporte point ceste doctrine*), whilst the sentence μὴ λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν appears as *ne le recevez pas en vostre maison*, where the negative particles *ne* and *pas* correspond to μὴ and the verb in the imperative form *recevez* is equivalent to λαμβάνω (λαμβάνετε). In addition to that, the complement αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν coincides with *en vostre maison*.

The sentence καὶ χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε appears as *et ne le saluez point*, which doesn't entirely match the GNT. The verb χαίρω, i.e. 'rejoice', 'to be

glad' (χαίρειν) and the verb λέγω, i.e. 'to say', 'to speak' (λέγετε), is translated as *saluer* ('to salute', 'to greet').

EV	LV	CV
Si aucun vient a vous et n'apporte pas ceste doctrine / ne le recevez point en vostre maison / et ne le saluez point.	Si aucun vient à vous, & n'apporte pas ceste doctrine, ne le recevez point en la maison, & ne le saluez point.	Si quelqu'un vient à vous, & n'apporte point ceste doctrine, ne le recevez point en vostre maison, & ne le saluëz point [Ne luy faites pas d'accueil, & ne mostrez aucun signe d'accointance ne de conionction avec luy].

The sentence *si aucun vient à vous* appears unchanged in the three French versions²⁶, as both Greek and Latin versions coincide: εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς / *si quis venit ad vos*. Additionally, the copulative sentence *et n'apporte point ceste doctrine* is also reproduced by the French translations, with a minor alteration in the negative particle *ne...point*, which appears as the modern version *ne...pas* in EV and LV. It's interesting to notice that the similarities found in this sentence are also due to the affinity showed between the GNT and the Vg, whose translator proposes the version: *et hanc doctrinam non adfert*.

While Olivétan translates *ne le recevez pas en vostre maison*, according to the GNT (μὴ λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν), and is imitated both by EV and CV, the LV proposes the following translation: *ne le recevez point en la maison*. Its translators substitute the possessive noun *vostre* for the definite article *la*, which precisely matches the Vg: *nolite recipere eum in domum*, where *in domum* fully corresponds to *en la maison*.

The last copulative sentence (*et ne le saluez point*), which doesn't quite correspond to the Greek and Latin versions (*nec have ei dixeritis*), appears equally reproduced by Catholic and Protestant versions. It is important to emphasise the omission of the conjunction *et* in the Latin text, which is though present in EV and LV. Moreover, Calvin's translation has an additional margin's note, where a more faithful version of the Greek text is to be seen: *Ne luy faites pas d'accueil, & ne mostrez aucun signe d'accointance ne de conionction avec luy*.

26 Calvin uses a synonym: Si quelqu'un vient à vous.

OV	GNT
Car qui le salue il communique a ses oeuvres mauvaises.	ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτῷ χαίρειν κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς.

The GNT uses the definite article ὁ followed by the verb λέγω, which combined mean ‘the one who says’. Additionally, the preposition γὰρ (‘for’, ‘because’) is accompanied by the personal pronoun in the dative case αὐτῷ (‘him’ or ‘her’). At the same time, the verb χαίρω follows the personal pronoun, being placed at the end of the period (ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτῷ χαίρειν, i.e. ‘For he that biddeth him God speed’). The adverb *car* in OV is equivalent to the preposition γὰρ, while the pronoun *qui* succeeded by the pronoun *le* (in the GNT, αὐτῷ) and the verb *saluer* (in the GNT, expressed by the verbs λέγω and χαίρω) don’t entirely match the Greek version ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτῷ χαίρειν.

Nevertheless, Olivétan offers a faithful translation in the coordinate sentence *il communique a ses oeuvres mauvaises*. Firstly, the verb κοινωνέω (‘to share’, ‘to participate’) corresponds to *communiquer*, which, when accompanied by the preposition *a*, means ‘to take part in’, ‘to be part of’ or ‘to share someone’s opinions’. As for the nominal syntagm *oeuvres* and its premodifier *ses* and postmodifier *mauvaises*, they match the GNT perfectly: τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς.

EV	LV	CV
Car qui le salue il communique a ses oeuvres mauvaises.	Car qui le salué, il communique à ses oeuvres mauvaises.	Car qui le saluë, communique à ses oeuvres mauvaises.

It is interesting to observe that, although EV and LV strictly follow the Vg, they propose an exact reproduction of OV. The sentence *car qui le salue* is entirely translated both in EV (*car qui le salue*) and in LV (*car qui le salué*). Despite the equivalences between the GNT and the Vg, that cause the resemblances among different French translations, the verb *saluer* employed by both Catholic and Protestant versions, doesn’t quite match the Latin verb *dico* (‘to say’, ‘to state’) in the Vg: *qui enim dicit illi*, i.e. ‘for he who says unto him’.

The discrepancies are, however, confined to this single occurrence, considering that the second coordinate sentence of OV (*il communique a ses oeuvres mauvaises*), which appears in CV as *communique à ses oeuvres mauvaises*, is equally translated by both Catholic versions (EV: *il communique a ses oeuvres mauvaises* / LV: *il communique à ses oeuvres mauvaises*) and are also equivalent to the Vg: *communicat operibus illius malignis*.

1:12

OV	GNT
Combien que ieusse plusieurs choses a vous escrire: ie ne les ay point voulu escrire par papier et ancre. Mais iespere de venir a vous / et parler bouche a bouche: affin que nostre ioye soit accomplie.	πολλὰ ἔχων ὑμῖν γράφειν οὐκ ἐβουλήθη διὰ χάρτου καὶ μέλανος, ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσαι, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν πεπληρωμένη ᾖ.

The adjective in the accusative case *πολλὰ* ('many', 'much' or 'abundant') is translated as the nominal syntagm *plusieurs choses* ('many things'). It's interesting to observe that Olivétan begins his translation with the adverb *combien* of the expression *combien que*, which means 'although'.

The verb *ἔχω*, i.e. 'to have', in nominative singular (*ἔχων*), appears faithfully translated in the subjunctive form (*ieusse*). Additionally, the personal pronoun *ὑμεῖς*, in dative (*ὑμῖν*), corresponds to the preposition *a* followed by the personal pronoun *vous*. As for the verb *γράφω* ('to write'), it is also present in OV as *escrire: combien que ieusse plusieurs choses a vous escrire*.

The negative particle *οὐκ* appears as *ne...point*, whilst the verb *βούλομαι* ('to be disposed', 'to intend') is translated as 'to want' (*vouloir: ie ne les ay point voulu escrire*). The preposition *διὰ* corresponds to the preposition *par*. As for the nouns *papier* and *ancre*, they are fully equivalent to the nouns *χάρτης* (*χάρτου*) and *μέλαν* (*μέλανος*) in genitive.

Olivétan translates the adversative sentence *ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς* as *mais iespere de venir a vous*, maintaining its full meaning. Moreover, the copulative sentence *καὶ στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσαι* is also fully reproduced as *et parler bouche a bouche*. As for the last sentence, the conjunction *ἵνα*, which on this passage means 'in order to', appears as *affin que*. The nominal syntagm *nostre ioye* is equivalent to *ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν*. Finally, the verb *πληρῶω* ('to fulfill', 'to accomplish') entirely corresponds to *accomplir*, which, like the GNT, is used in the passive voice (*affin que nostre ioye soit accomplie*).

EV	LV	CV
Jay plusieurs choses a vous escrire: et ne lay point voulu escrire par ancre et papier: car iay esperance q ie seray avec vous et parleray bouche a bouche: affin q vostre ioye soit pleine.	Ayant plusieurs choses à vous escrire, ne l'ay voulu faire par encre & papier, car i'ay esperance que ie feray auprès de vous, & parleray bouche à bouche, à fin que vostre ioye soit pleine.	Combien que i'eusse plusieurs choses à vous escrire, ie ne les ay point voulu escrire en papier & encre: mais i'espere de venir à vous & parler bouche à bouche, à fin que nostre ioye soit accomplie.

The sentence *combien que ieusse plusieurs choses a vous escrire* is translated in an exact way in CV, with minor orthographic discrepancies (*Combien que i'eusse plusieurs choses à vous escrire*). It is interesting to notice that, although the adverb *combien* doesn't appear in the GNT, Calvin still reproduces it, taking mainly into account Olivétan's translation. Moreover, the GNT and the Vg coincide in this passage (πολλὰ ἔχων ὑμῖν γράφειν / *plura habens vobis scribere*), which makes LV and specially EV get closer to the GNT than the Protestant texts: LV: *Ayant plusieurs choses à vous escrire* / EV: *Jay plusieurs choses a vous escrire*.

Additionally, the coordinate sentence *ie ne les ay point voulu escrire par papier et ancre*, again fully reproduced in CV (*ie ne les ay point voulu escrire en papier & encre*), suffers some alterations in the Catholic translations. Firstly, LV proposes the translation: *ne l'ay voulu faire par encre & papier*, which almost entirely matches the Vg (*nolui per cartam et atramentum*), with the exception of the order of the nouns *encre* and *papier* (*cartam et atramentum*). As for EV, it maintains the same order of the nouns (*ancre et papier*) as in LV, but its translator repeats the verb *escrire* (*et ne lay point voulu escrire par ancre et papier*), a strategy employed by OV and CV as well, but which is present neither in the GNT nor in the Vg.

While Olivétan translates the Greek adversative sentence ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς as *mais iespere de venir a vous*, and is imitated by Calvin (*mais i'espere de venir à vous*), both EV and LV propose the translation: *car iay esperance q ie seray avec vous*. They suppress, therefore, the adversative conjunction *mais* and replace it for *car*, which is equivalent to the conjunction *enim* in the Latin text *spero enim me futurum apud vos*. Additionally, the verb *esperer* is substituted by *avoir esperance*.

As for the copulative sentence *et parler bouche a bouche*, which is the same in CV (*& parler bouche à bouche*), is translated in the future tense in EV and

LV (*et parleray bouche a bouche*), according to the structure used in the Vg (*spero enim me futurum apud vos et os ad os loqui*).

Finally, while Olivétan and Calvin translate *affin que nostre ioye soit accomplie*, which strictly follows the GNT (ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν πεπληρωμένη ᾖ), LV and EV replace the pronoun *nostre* for *vostre*, and the adjective *accomplie* for *pleine*, according to the Vg: *ut gladium vestrum plenum sit*.

1:13

OV	GNT
Les enfans de ta soeur esleute te saluent. Amem.	ἀσπάζεται σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς.

The deponent ἀσπάζεται (ἀσπάζομαι: ‘to greet’, ‘to salute’) followed by the personal pronoun σε (‘you’) entirely matches the French verb *saluer* preceded by the pronoun *te* (*te saluent*).

As for the nominal syntagm τὰ τέκνα, it appears as *les enfans*, while the genitive article τῆς succeeded by the noun in the genitive case ἀδελφῆς (τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου, i.e. ‘of your sister’) are correctly translated as *de ta soeur*. Moreover, the adjective *esleute* (‘the chosen one’) completely corresponds to the adjective in genitive ἐκλεκτῆς.

EV	LV	CV
Les enfans de ta soeur esleute te saluent. Grace avec toy. Amem.	Les enfans de ta soeur esleuë te saluent.	Les enfans de ta soeur Esleuë te saluënt. Amen.

It is interesting to observe that the French versions correspond to each other with minor orthographic differences (EV: *Les enfans de ta soeur esleute te saluent* / LV: *Les enfans de ta soeur esleuë te saluent* / CV: *Les enfans de ta soeur Esleuë te saluënt*). That is once more due to the equivalences between the GNT (ἀσπάζεται σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς) and the Vg (*salutant te filii sororis tuae electae*). It is nevertheless curious to notice that d’Étaples adds an extra sentence in his translation, which doesn’t correspond to any of the studied sources: *Grace avec toy*, i.e. ‘may the grace be with you’. A more profound research showed that the first complete French translation of the New Testament (the *Bible de Barthelemy de Buyer* from 1476, approximately)

presents the same structure (*et grace soit a toi*), whose translation probably dates back to medieval documents²⁷.

CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing analysis of St. John's Second epistle suggests that Pierre-Robert Olivétan used a Greek original as the source for his version. Nevertheless, there are some fragments which reveal a certain influence of the Vulgate. For instance, the end of the third verse (*et charite sera avec nous*), where the translator prefers to employ the noun *charite*, instead of *amour*, that is closer in meaning to the Greek noun ἀγάπη. This phenomenon is quite rare though, as Olivétan is extremely successful in conveying the message transmitted by the original Greek, adapting its phrase structure to the Middle French language, whose orthography and grammar were extremely instable at the time.

Moreover, it was verified that Calvin's translation resembles his colleague's work in a very precise way. Calvin imposed himself the task of reforming Olivétan's bible, according to his own words, but through an accurate scrutiny of this epistle, only a few differences between both versions were found. They were mainly placed in Calvin's margin notes, as though he didn't want to contradict Olivétan's work. The first of them appears in the third verse, where Calvin gives an alternative solution to Olivétan's translation *Pour la verite qui demeure en nous*, by replacing *en nous* for *en vous*. This version, however, matches neither the Greek text nor the Vulgate, but is curiously present in d'Étaples' text. The second modification appears in the seventh verse, where Calvin adds another margin note, giving a different translation for the adjective *πλάνοϛ* (*un tel homme est seducteur [Ou, abuseur, affronteur]*) and somehow avoiding the common Catholic word for the adjective *deceiver*.

Perhaps the most interesting and effective alteration made by Geneva's minister appears in verse 10 in another margin note, where he explains a translation proposed by him as well as by Olivétan (*ne le saluez point*). He gives therefore a very precise and thorough account of the Greek version by writing: *Ne luy faites pas d'accueil, & ne mostrez aucun signe d'accointance ne de conionction avec luy*. These discrepancies and other orthographic contrasts are not sufficient to call Calvin's work revolutionary. His pretensions of having improved the *Bible de Serrières* are, by the analysis of this book, unjustified.

27 See Jean Macho and Pierre Farget, *Bible*. N. T. Français: C'y commence le nouveau testament (Lyon: [Guillaume Le Roy pour] Barthélemy Buyer, 1478).

Therefore, his endeavors reside mainly in the revision and reorganization of Olivétan's production.

As for the Catholic versions, both Lefèvre d'Étaples' and Leuven's translations show a continuous dependency on the Vulgate. The two versions are quite faithful to Saint Jerome's work, according to the evidence found in almost all of the verses. There are, however, some disparities between them, in which Leuven's version show a more exact translation of the Latin text. A good example of this phenomenon is verse 12, where d'Étaples repeats the verb *escrire* twice, whilst Leuven's version uses it only once, exhibiting the same strategy of Saint Jerome.

Another interesting feature of d'Étaples translation is that he sometimes shows a certain influence of the Greek text, as it was verified in verse 10, where the sentence *ne le recevez point en vostre maison* is closer in meaning to the Greek sentence *μη λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν* than *nolite recipere eum in domum*, even though it represents a small modification compared to Leuven's version (*ne le recevez point en la maison*). Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise that distinctios of this type are rather scarce and unimportant in John's Second epistle, which, if extended to other New Testament's books, might discredit Sorbonne persecution to d'Étaples 1523 *Nouveau Testament* and 1528 *Bible d'Anvers*.

The comparison of all versions of John's Second Epistle shows that the French translations, despite their different background and the divergent intentions of their translators, do not exhibit major discrepancies in strategies, techniques and translational choices among them. The constant similarities encountered between the Greek New Testament and the Vulgate permit us to deduce that they represent the main cause of a lack of diversity among these specific translations, which can be found in the Old Testament. Thus, while Olivétan' text is quite similar to Calvin's, it also bears a strong resemblance to d'Étaples' and Leuven's translations, with generally few distinctions that, most of the time, coincide with the existing differences between the two original sources.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, Barbara and Kurt, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013.
- Benedict, Philip. "Calvin et la transformation de Genève." In *Calvin et le Calvinisme: cinq siècles d'influences sur l'Église et la société*. Edited by Martin E. Hirzel and Martin Sallmann. Geneva: Éditions Labor et Fides, 2008.
- Calvin, Jean. *Le Nouveau Testament, c'est à dire, la nouvelle alliance de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ. Reveu de nouveau, et corrigé sur le grec par l'avis des ministres de Geneve*. Geneva: Richard Neudin, 1561.
- Étaples, Jacques Lefèvre d'. *Le nouveau testament de nostre seigneur et seul sauveur Jesus Christ. Les noms des livres contenuz au Nouveau Testament [table de 34 lignes]. Ce nouveau testament a esté de nouveau imprimé en telle grosse lettre que vous voyez, pour plus aysement et facilement lire une tant sainte lecture. Avec une briefve table des plus singulieres et necessaires matieres comprises en iceluy*. Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 1534.
- Grave, Bartholomy de, Antoine Marie Bergagne, and Jean de Uvaen, ed. *La Sainte Bible nouvellement translatee de latin en françois, selon l'édition latine, dernièrement imprimée à Louvain, reveue, corrigée & approuvée par gens sçavants, à ce députez: à chascun chapitre sont adjouctez les sommaires, contenant la matière du dict chapitre, les concordances, & aucunes apostilles aux marges*. Leuven: Bartholomy Grave, 1550.
- Lortsch, Daniel. *Histoire de la Bible en France, suivie de fragments relatifs à l'histoire générale de la Bible*. Paris: Société biblique britannique et étrangère, 1910.
- Lovy, Pierre. "Lefèvre et son Nouveau Testament." In *Le Nouveau Testament de Jacques Lefèvres d'Étaples: édition intégrale de l'exemplaire de Nice*, edited by Antonin Blanchi. 11-17. Nice: Serre Éditeur, 2005.
- Macho, Jean, and Pierre Farget. *Bible. N. T. Français: Cy commence le nouveau testament*. Lyon: [Guillaume Le Roy pour] Barthélemy Buyer, 1478.
- Mackenney, Richard. *La Europa del siglo XVI: Expansión y conflicto*. Madrid: Akal, 1996.

- Olivétan, Pierre-Robert. *La Bible qui est toute la saincte escriture. En laquelle sont contenus, le Vieil Testament et le Nouveau, translatez en Francoys. Le Vieil, de Lebrieu: et le Nouveau, du Grec. Avec deux amples tables, une pour l'interpretation des propres noms : lautre en forme d'indice, pour trouver plusieurs sentences et matieres. Le volume de tous les livres apocryphes, contenus en la translation commune, lesquelz navons point trouvez en Ebrieu ny en Chaldée.* Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 1535.
- Roussel, Bernard, and Guy Bedouelle. *Le Temps des Réformes et la Bible.* Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1989.
- Tvveedale, Michael, ed. *Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam Clementinam.* London: The Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, 2005.
- Wim, François. "The Catholic Church and the Vernacular Bible in the Low Countries: A Paradigm Shift in the 1550s?" In *Discovering the Riches of the Word Religious Reading in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Sabrina Corbellini, Margriet Hoogveliet, Bart Ramakers. 234- 281. Groningen: Brill, 2012.