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Abstract
In Reformation studies, the printed Bible has long been regarded as an agent of change. This dissertation interrogates the conditions in which it did not Reform its readers. As recent scholarship has emphasized how Protestant doctrine penetrated culture through alternative media, such as preaching and printed ephemera, the revolutionary role of the scripture-book has become more ambiguous. Historians of reading, nevertheless, continue to focus upon radical, prophetic, and otherwise eccentric modes of interaction with the vernacular Bible, reinforcing the traditional notion that the conversion of revelation to print had a single historical trajectory and that an adversarial relationship between textual and institutional authority was logically necessary. To understand why printed bibles themselves more often did not generate unrest, this study investigates the evidence left by a subset of Bible readers who remained almost entirely unstudied -- that is, early modern Catholics. To the conflict-rich evidence of ecclesiastical prohibitions, court records, and martyrologies often employed in top down narratives of the Counter-Reformation, this project introduces the alternative sources of used books and reading licenses. What these records reveal is that Catholic lay readers were not habituated to automate critical reading practices in the presence of biblical texts; what they demanded from ecclesiastical authorities and publishers instead were books that could provide them with access to their church's sacred rituals and to its public expression of exegesis. The liturgical context of appropriation apparent in these Catholic books became visible in their evangelical counterparts enabling a cross-confessional history of sacred reading. This broader story is situated within the annotated Bible of one Catholic reader, Thomas Marwood (d.1718). The components of his book expose his overlapping reading communities and the disparate social and institutional contexts that structured them. Contextualizing each part illuminates the extent to which the conditions and traditions for reading the scriptures were shared across confessions and contested within them. This dissertation recovers a place for Bibles and their readers not only within early modern Catholicism, but within the Reformation era generally.
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ABSTRACT

OPENING THE BOOK OF MARWOOD:
ENGLISH CATHOLICS AND THEIR BIBLES IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE

Daniel Cheely
Margo Todd

In Reformation studies, the printed Bible has long been regarded as an agent of change. This dissertation interrogates the conditions in which it did not Reform its readers. As recent scholarship has emphasized how Protestant doctrine penetrated culture through alternative media, such as preaching and printed ephemera, the revolutionary role of the scripture-book has become more ambiguous. Historians of reading, nevertheless, continue to focus upon radical, prophetic, and otherwise eccentric modes of interaction with the vernacular Bible, reinforcing the traditional notion that the conversion of revelation to print had a single historical trajectory and that an adversarial relationship between textual and institutional authority was logically necessary. To understand why printed bibles themselves more often did not generate unrest, this study investigates the evidence left by a subset of Bible readers who remained almost entirely unstudied -- that is, early modern Catholics. To the conflict-rich evidence of ecclesiastical prohibitions, court records, and martyrologies often employed in top down narratives of the Counter-Reformation, this project introduces the alternative sources of used books and reading licenses. What these records reveal is that Catholic lay readers were not habituated to automate critical reading practices in the presence of biblical texts; what they demanded
from ecclesiastical authorities and publishers instead were books that could provide them with access to their church’s sacred rituals and to its public expression of exegesis. The liturgical context of appropriation apparent in these Catholic books became visible in their evangelical counterparts enabling a cross-confessional history of sacred reading. This broader story is situated within the annotated Bible of one Catholic reader, Thomas Marwood (d.1718). The components of his book expose his overlapping reading communities and the disparate social and institutional contexts that structured them. Contextualizing each part illuminates the extent to which the conditions and traditions for reading the scriptures were shared across confessions and contested within them. This dissertation recovers a place for Bibles and their readers not only within early modern Catholicism, but within the Reformation era generally.
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INTRODUCTION

In the study of the Reformation, the Bible has long been regarded as an agent of change.¹ When made accessible to the laity in printed vernacular editions, the sacred scriptures, it was known, fueled both the demolition and reconstruction of the institutional church, such that by 1637, the former Catholic-turned-Reformed divine, William Chillingworth, could triumphantly exclaim that “the Bible only is the Religion of Protestants!”² The Book, according to the conventional view, spurred a pan-European Reformation and the democratization of critical thought.³ More recently, scholars with a less sanguine view of modernity have equated evangelical appropriation of the Bible not with progressive enlightenment, but with violent fundamentalism.⁴ In either rendering, however, the revolutionary history of this book is assumed.

“The book”, however, is being displaced from its own throne. As recent scholarship has emphasized how Protestant doctrine penetrated culture through

---

¹ Elizabeth Eisenstein, The Printing Press as an Agent of Change (Cambridge, 1979), 303-453. While it emphasized the essential affinity between Protestantism and the printed word, especially the Bible, this powerful synthesis did recognize some of the Catholic campaign for religious print as well.


³ For recent popular expositions of the original thesis, see Paul Arblaster, Gergely Juhász, and Guido Latrê, ed., Tyndale’s Testament (Brepols, 2002); Benson Bobrick, Wide as the Waters: the Story of the English Bible and the Revolution it Inspired (Penguin, 2002); Alister McGrath, Christianity’s Dangerous Idea: The Protestant Revolution – a History from the Sixteenth Century to the Twenty-First (HarperOne, 2008).

⁴ See David Katz, God’s Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism (Yale, 2004) and James Simpson, Burning to Read: English Fundamentalism & its Reformation Opponents (Harvard, 2007).
alternative media, such as preaching and printed ephemera, the revolutionary role of the scripture-book has become more ambiguous.\(^5\) No one would deny the centrality of the Bible to Protestant identity; yet it seemed it was no longer required for explaining the schisms within Christianity and the rise of Protestant regimes.\(^6\) How should it fit back into a narrative of the early modern era? If historians of the book were best positioned to address the question, many turned first to thoughtful critics, zealous dissidents, or those who would have become so had they not been repressed by the disciplinary mechanisms of the confessionalized state. These “marginal”, “revolutionary readers” tend to reinforce the traditional notion that an adversarial relationship between textual and institutional authority was logically necessary.\(^7\)


The starting point for this study is not the Bible, but *Biblia* – that is, the plural form of the many volumes that ultimately received a unitary designation. To understand how these different Bibles were functioning if they were not continually generating unrest, this study will focus on a neglected set of sources, those scripture-books that were never intended to Reform their readers, which in turn will lead to a reconsideration of even those books that were. This broader story will be situated within the annotated Bible of one Catholic reader: the components of his book expose overlapping reading communities and the disparate social and institutional contexts that structured them. Contextualizing each part will illuminate the extent to which the conditions and traditions for reading the scriptures were shared across confessions and contested within them. It will help to recover a place for Bibles and their readers not only within early modern Catholicism, but within the Reformation era more generally.

There are two basic ways to narrate a history of Catholics and the Bible during the long Reformation period. The first is remarkably coherent. It can bind two centuries together by latching onto the immovable signposts of church discipline: repression begins with the Council of Trent (1545-1563) and the Roman Index (1564), tightens with

---

the Inquisition’s prohibitive *Observatio* (1596), locks with the papal bull *Unigenitus* (1713), and finally releases in 1757 when Benedict XIV acknowledges the futility of an absolute ban on the vernacular scriptures. This story is by no means dependent on prescriptive evidence alone, but its top-down process of narration largely determines its selection of case studies. When Catholic readers of the Bible are gathered only from inquisitorial trials, papal condemnations, and Protestant martyrologies, they necessarily represent a heroic challenge to an intransigent monolith.9 Penal codes and mug shots are indispensable sources, but alone they are insufficient to reconstruct the multiple possibilities available to a variety of Catholic readers.10

The second history begins instead with used books.11 How readers possessed and bequeathed, parcelled and rebound, annotated and manipulated, venerated and defaced

---


10 This is not to say that top-down accounts are not valuable. For the preeminent account of the Bible in the sixteenth-century Catholic world based upon a rigorous investigation of the archives of the Roman Inquisition before that archive even opened, see Gigliola Fragnito, *La Bibbia al rogo* (Mulino, 1997).

these books is just as critical for understanding how they were appropriated as is the evidence of attempts to confiscate them. Each book is a material witness to the process of its own production and distribution. Historians can follow its signs back through the webs of intentions and relationships that brought it into being. This alternative approach can recast the history of Catholic Bibles and their early modern readers in four critical ways. First, the readers derived from their traces in the margins and flyleaves of books are new historical subjects operating in a range of contexts that include but are not limited to direct confrontation by the policing mechanisms of the church. Second, the pathways leading from the approbations and prefaces of books back up to the authorities and institutions that conferred them reveals just how difficult it is to classify the central authority figures of the Catholic story. The binary labels of evangelical and hard-liner are wholly inadequate in part because they are constrained by the assumption again that the Bible is a singular entity, for access to which only a yea or nay vote is possible.12 Third, the mobility of books and their readers leads us to consider the shared conditions of reading across multiple regional contexts – and to reconsider national borders as the natural boundaries of historical study.13 Fourth, by analyzing the activities of Catholic exceptions. The most recent is Elizabeth Morley Ingram’s “Dressed in Borrowed Robes: The Making and Marketing of the Louvain Bible (1578)” in The Church and the Book, ed. R. N. Swanson (Boydell & Brewer, 2004), which will be considered in Chapter 6. The second exception is Dominique Julia’s essay “Reading and the Counter-Reformation,” in A History of Reading in the West, eds. Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), which briefly synthesizes Chédozeau’s description of the French hierarchy’s attitudes toward lay Bible-reading.12 For a discussion of how the terms evangeli and intransigenti control categories of analysis in early modern Italian historiography, see John W. O’Malley, Trent and all That (Harvard, 2000), 87-91.13 Ronnie Po-Chia H’sia reorganized the Catholic reading landscape by eschatological categories, adducing the Church Triumphant (France, Spain, and Italy), the Church Suffering (the British Isles, Scandinavia, and the reformed territories of Germany), and the Church Militant (the mission fields outside Europe). This brilliant scheme makes possible analyses of printing in the Catholic world that are more difficult when the world is conceived as an undifferentiated whole; yet its consequent identification of certain ecclesiastical
readers alongside those of their more well-studied Protestant neighbors, we can more competently evaluate the extent to which sacred reading practices were confessionally determined.

The techniques of book history are the tools for prying open the stories of early modern Bibles, yet they do need to be employed with some circumspection. Manuscript annotations, for instance, offer a high-resolution lens for examining the historical interaction of peoples and texts. But reader marks frequently bear no obvious relation to the text at all. That is why scholars hunting for deeply personal or incendiary marginalia often feel frustrated and betrayed when they become bogged down in a swamp of apparently useless pen tests, scribbles, recipes, accounting records, and genealogies. Confronted by this problem, some scholars have promoted the study of printers as readers. The evidence of their attempts to select, construct, and reshape texts is etched more permanently into every copy that left their presses. These scholars are right. Printers both anticipated and monitored their commercial audience. By recording what they deleted, added, or changed in consecutive editions we can identify more clearly what they believed their communities were willing to approve and their readers willing to buy. That approach guides my analysis in Chapters 3, 4, and 6.

That does not mean, however, that we ought to abandon the evidence left by other readers. On the contrary, the “irrelevant” or non-discursive marks are just as necessary as structures with certain reading possibilities obscures the realities of exchange between these “churches”. See his World of Catholic Renewal (Cambridge, 2005), 172-182. 14 See, for instance, Zachary Lesser, Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade (Cambridge, 2004), 1-25.
sustained commentary for appreciating the function of Bible books in the homes and communities of early modern Catholics.\textsuperscript{15} I have compiled, for that reason, a database of the 570 copies known to be extant of the English Catholic Bibles and New Testaments published between 1582-1635. The database records my categorical notes upon 341 of them, as well as whatever catalog information was available about the others.

While this study is undergirded by a systematic examination of English Catholic Bibles, it is organized as a microhistory of one.\textsuperscript{16} That one book introduces the variables of language, region, ecclesiastical structure, socio-economic status, confession, gender, and time. Each one will become a window through which to reflect upon the results of the broader survey. But this Bible also binds together a series of inter-related stories about the patterns and possibilities for sacred reading, which will lead us ultimately to a contextual understanding of the elusive reader who begins and ends the story as both its subject and bookend, Thomas Marwood.

\textsuperscript{15} See Sherman, \textit{Used Books}, chapter 4. By making John Dryden’s lament about the “The Book thus put in every vulgar hand” stand in for the reaction of Catholics, however, this section does not leave space for considering the extent to which the reading practices that Sherman catalogs transcended confessional divisions.

\textsuperscript{16} Jacques Revel and Giovanni Levi argued that microhistory has no monopoly on distorted conclusions. When the scope is too large critical factors can become blurred. See Levi, “On Microhistory”, in Peter Burke, ed., \textit{New Perspectives on Historical Writing} (Penn State, 2001), pp.99-113; Revel, “Microanalysis and the Construction of the Social”, in \textit{Histories: French Construction of the Past} (New Press, 1995) pp. 492-502. Since I both “reduce the scale of observation” and enlarge it at various junctures in my project, I hope to avoid distortion as much as possible. By combining a systematic survey with the interpretive depth of microhistory, this study aims to address the question of how early modern Bibles were read with a responsible, multi-dimensional narrative.
The book that opens and structures the project is Marwood’s meticulously annotated vulgate Bible (Antwerp, 1605). Thomas Marwood (d.1718) was a well-educated servant of a Norfolk gentry family, the Bedingfelds of Oxburgh Hall. It was a journey for him to get there. While it appears that he descended from a line of notable gentlemen-physicians in Devonshire, he never confirmed his family history in the loose diary entries that he left behind. What he did confirm as the decisive portal between his past and present was his conversion. It led him to reject the Church of England, flee the family that conformed to it, and cast his lot with a prominent recusant household.

Unlicensed “papist” tutors risked life imprisoned, as Parliament confirmed while Marwood was in service. Yet Marwood doubled- and tripled-down, defying the laws against unlicensed continental travel and education abroad when he accepted his next charge as governor to his patron’s only son, Henry Arundel Bedingfeld (later 3rd Baronet), on his half-decade tour through Jesuit academies in Flanders and France. He remained in the Bedingfeld’s service for almost four decades and in residence even after his death, with the family bearing the costs to have him buried in their own chantry chapel.

17 *Biblia sacra Vulgatae editionis Sixti V Pont. Max. ivssv recognita atque adita* (Antverpiae: Ex officina Plantiniana apud Ioannem Moretum, 1605), University of Pennsylvania, Van Pelt Library, Rare Book & Ms Library BS 75 1605, hereafter referenced as MB.
18 The family’s archival records were published as one of the first volumes of the Catholic Record Society: J.H. Pollen, ed., “Miscellanea VI: Bedingfeld Papers, & c.” *Catholic Record Society* (London,1909), 7: 43. The Bedingfeld Papers are hereafter referenced as BP.
19 See Chapter 7.
20 BP 41.
Marwood’s memoranda illustrate that he was willing not just to take risks for his Catholic patrons, but to embrace their religious and social customs, too. This included recreation, above all “shooting”, for which Marwood’s diary does not confess a particularly well-developed proficiency before he arrived to Oxburgh. Twice his memoirs record near catastrophic accidents for which he was culpable: the first time he literally shot himself in the foot (the left one), which left him a cripple (claudus) for the next two months.\(^{22}\) His travel journal during his governorship (1699-1704) is packed with social engagements with foreign elites and leading English exiles, both inside and outside conventual life. He followed his host family’s devotional life as well; in fact he may have excelled them in zeal. When he was summoned to compose the 2\(^{nd}\) Baronet’s epitaph in 1704, he threw caution to the wind in a robust statement of the deceased’s commitment to preserve the Catholic faith and to hand it down to his children.\(^{23}\) After receiving it, the baronet’s more circumspect relatives elected to ask for an epitaph from someone else. In the flyleaves of one of his devotional books, Marwood inscribed his New Year’s resolutions from 1689-1698: Beads, Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 7 Penitential Psalms; striking his breast, fasting three days a week, and absolutely abstaining from wine; all accompanied by pious pledges to, among other things, “constantly watch and faithfully await the coming of the Lord.”\(^{24}\) Quite demanding spiritually and emotionally, and impeccably traditional, they exhibit the effort not of an

\(^{22}\) BP 41, 122.  

\(^{23}\) BP 241.  

\(^{24}\) BP 41-3.
actor fancying a new role to play, but, as he put it himself, of a “convert” diving into a new life.\textsuperscript{25}

Marwood’s sources all seem to fit together easily to represent his new community of faith, except for one – his Bible. That was \textit{not} impeccably traditional devotion, at least not for a layman. How did Marwood integrate it into his Catholicism? Was it a holdover from his Protestantism? “Search the Scriptures” (John 5:39) was a classic scriptural prooftext that Protestant apologists leveled against the Catholic Church and its restrictive bible-reading policies. Marwood returned to that verse as a Catholic, underlining it in his Vulgate, and annotating it in this way:

\begin{quote}
\textit{That the authority of the Church is necessary for understanding the true sense of the Scriptures St Aug. teaches in his book de utilitate credendi, where among other things he says ... There are three types of men who everyone ought to condemn and reject: One cares neither to know nor seek; another indeed knows himself ignorant, but does not therefore seek in order to find; the third thinks he knows, but indeed is ignorant. And among the first type are those who make no}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{25} Conversion is both a rich and highly fraught subject of early modern history. See Ethan Shagan, \textit{Popular Politics and the English Reformation} (Cambridge, 2003), which begins with the explicit assumption that religious conversion is always a rare phenomenon, and that historians ought to search for other reasons that their early modern subjects’ changed faith than those “metanarrative of conversion” originally proposed by the reformers themselves. My approach is to avoid interrogating the reasons for conversion altogether, which no doubt will be overdetermined and in almost all cases irreducible to a single cause or set of causes that a historian can detect. Leaving the \textit{why} of conversion in mystery, historians can more profitably unpack the \textit{how} – in this case, the \textit{how} is Marwood’s effort to participate in Catholic community. For more recent scholarship in the field, see David M. Luebke, ed., \textit{Conversion and the Politics of Religion in Early Modern Germany} (New York, 2012); Craig Harline, \textit{Conversions: Two family stories from the Reformation and Modern America} (Yale, 2011). The Arts and Humanities Research Council recently sponsored a three-year project at the University of York, “Conversion Narratives in Early Modern Europe”, the achievements of which are available here: \url{http://www.york.ac.uk/crems/conversion/}. 
difference among believers, which among them may be a Christian, and therefore they remain in whatever part that they are born.

Here, in a single note, Marwood uses the occasion of a notorious scriptural place against his Church to (a) vindicate his Church’s interpretive authority over the scriptures and (b) “condemn” his former coreligionists for not genuinely “searching the scriptures” that they touted. Reading the scriptures thus may have been a way to address a Protestant challenge, but was it the way that the authorities of Marwood’s church would have approved? Would they have opposed this reader handling and disputing the Bible at all, no matter how orthodox his belief? How did the Catholic Bible that Marwood was reading get authorized in the first place? These questions, which surround the confessionalized reading experience not just of Marwood but of early modern Catholics broadly, will be addressed in Part I by opening Marwood’s book

Part I. The Frontmatter: Reading with Authority

The story of his book would be of limited utility for a broader project on the role of the Catholic Bible in early modern Europe if it could be framed entirely within an English context. It cannot. A thick contextualization of the signs embedded in this book’s frontmatter leads back to the central institutions that authorized and produced Catholic Bibles. The title page of Marwood’s book identifies it as the official Bible of

26 All Marwood’s Vulgate annotations are inscribed in Latin unless otherwise indicated. All English translations are my own.
the Church, the “authentic” version of the scriptures ratified by the Council of Trent. Between this ratification of a generic version at Trent, however, and the publication of this particular edition at Antwerp in 1605 is an intervening gap of nearly six decades and the length of Europe. Within that space, and buried within the frontmatter, is a series of moves and countermoves among Roman prelates vying for their own conceptions of what kind of book the authentic Vulgate should be. Re-reading the frontmatter will lay bare the multiple possibilities for the Vulgate, the contingent processes by which each one came to be authorized, and the dependence of even Roman pontiffs on the regional magistrates and publishers whose interests also had to be met for any “authentic” book to be manufactured.

The ratification of the Vulgate was not the Council of Trent’s only decree on the Scriptures. Notorious among the rest was its decree concerning the “use of the Sacred Books.” While it did not prohibit vernacular editions outright, it did impose strict conditions on the printing of all Bibles, and “to check unbridled spirits”, mandated punishment of all readers who “relying on their own judgment… presume to interpret the scriptures contrary to the sense held by holy mother church” or those who would “twist and turn the scriptures to all kinds of profane usages.” The suspicion of Bible-readers soaked into this conciliar decree, however, did not drip onto the title page of this Bible, even though it was supposed to be the one authorized at the same conciliar session. The central image at the bottom of the title is a depiction of Revelation 10, in which the tenth angel of the apocalypse presents St. John with the scroll of wisdom and instructs the

evangelist to consume it (see figure below). In this image the angel dons a papal tiara: although that was traditional iconography for representations of God the Father, it visually transplants divine authority to the Pope for the transmission (or restriction) of the sacred scroll. If this graphic message would seem to coincide well with the pretensions customarily ascribed to a Counter-Reformation Church, the rest of the angel’s vestments would not. Draped across the angels shoulders is a humeral veil – an ornamental white gown worn exclusively when the priest was exposing the Eucharist for liturgical adoration. Does this scene endow the Bible, represented here by the scroll, with that highest sacrality reserved for the Communion feast? John, the recipient of the scroll, was a standard icon for the church as a whole – a match reinforced by the miniature church at his feet. The angel’s command to him “Accipe et Devora” (Take and Devour) approximates indeed accentuates the formula of Eucharistic consecration – “Accipite et Manducate” (Take and Eat). If it is true that the church, as in the entire people of God, now are being asked to chew on and swallow the Sacred Scripture, then it appears that the voracious bible-reading practices of the layman Thomas Marwood have an institutional warrant. The scene’s confessional signs are, therefore, attenuated and absorbed within its revolutionary analogical scheme - that of communicating to the people of God the sacramental act of reading Scripture.
The assimilation of reading the Bible to receiving Communion is a process that will continue to be explored in Chapters 3-5. The question that this title page poses for the rest of Chapter 1 is whether the rest of this Bible gainsays the restrictive policies of the Church that authorized it. The page immediately following the title is the *Praefatio ad Lectorem*, anonymously authored by Cardinal Roberto Bellarmino, SJ. Notorious for his executive service in both the Roman Inquisition and the Roman Index, for his controversial rearticulation of papal political power (*potestas indirecta*), and, most of all, for his prosecution of Galileo, Bellarmino has been regarded as icon of the counter-reformation.28 While his revision of the Clementine Vulgate has been well-studied, his

---

28 For Bellarmino as icon, see William Bouwsma, *The Waning of the Renaissance, 1550-1640* (Oxford, 2000), 181-5; and Guy Bedouelle, *The Reform of Catholicism, 1480-1620*, trans. James K. Farge (Toronto, 2008), 104-106. This standard description of Bellarmino as “the very embodiment of Tridentine Catholicism”, which was given its definitive form by Eric Cochrane in 1970, is a representation that Stefania Tutino endeavoured to deconstruct, at least with respect to Bellarmino’s political thought in her
ambivalence in promoting and distributing both this Latin Bible and certain kinds of vernacular translations of it has not. Bellarmino’s proposals for scripture-books are traced back to the Council of Trent, which is normally depicted as an intractable battleground between advocates and opponents of vernacular bible access. Revisiting the conciliar minutes introduces instead a broad framework for consensus about how to produce and disseminate vernacular scripture-books, which Bellarmino then publicly defended in his magisterial work of anti-Protestant polemic, *The Controversies*, and privately developed while working to revise the Index and grant *licentiae legendi* through the Inquisition. Here in the *Praefatio* of Marwood’s Vulgate, Bellarmino authorized the new Bible and conceded that "it would not be forbidden" to insert in the blank margins some useful commentary, as long as it was limited. Marwood seized the privilege. Little blank space remains in the book. As much as Bellarmino’s *Praefatio* invites a reassessment of the *intransigent* label of its author and of many of the prelates and institutions he represented, Marwood’s response illuminates the reading space available to early modern Catholics between ecclesiastical prohibition and approval.

---

The second chapter turns to Bellarmino’s religious order, the Society of Jesus, and the vast network of education that it spread across the early modern Catholic world. Bellarmino’s role was crucial, again, in building consensus about the place of the Bible in the Jesuit colleges during the laborious process of framing and reframing the Society’s official plan of education, the Ratio Studiorum (1586-1599). Determining how the official policy on Bible instruction and use was actually communicated in the Jesuit colleges is crucial, in turn, for assessing the reading habits of Thomas Marwood, who had prolonged contact with the Jesuit College of La Flèche and the Jesuit chaplain at Oxburgh Hall. Marwood’s interactions with central organs of the Catholic Church, therefore, were not limited to the sacred page. Reexamining how these institutions conceived and conveyed Bibles will allow us to appreciate better the reading conditions for all early modern Catholics.

II. The Margins: Reading across the Reformation in England

Marwood’s England was a Protestant realm. To its established Church, he at least had conformed during his youth. Was Marwood’s approach to his Catholic Bible an

---

extension of the reading habits broadly diffused across the English Protestant landscape? In his controversialist commonplacing of the scriptures, Marwood appears guilty of the charges that John Locke famously levied against English Puritans and their Geneva Bible: that, by versifying the book, they ‘minc’d and chopp’d’ the story into ‘distinct Aphorisms’ and furnished the material cause for doctrinal wrangling and schism in the church. Yet, in Chapter 3, the English Bibles surveyed from before and after the Reformation had begun are notable instead for the persistent efforts of both readers and producers to construct them as liturgical texts. Studying these liturgical modes of interaction, and the exegetically deferential postures they fostered, will render intelligible the dominant cross-confessional phenomena of socially conservative reading. It will return printed Bibles to the narrative of the Reformation -- not as much to the moment of causation as to the longer story of consolidation.

The English Catholic Bibles of the post-Reformation must find their place in this narrative, too. Since the ecclesiastical machinery for enforcing Roman Catholic discipline had been dismantled in England, it should seem an obvious place to locate and explore Catholic readers of the Bible. What should seem strange is the relative neglect that they have received. Historians of early modern England are well aware of the Rheims New Testament (1582) and the Douai-Rheims Bible (1609-10), English Catholic versions of the scriptures that had together proceeded through at least seven editions before the start of the English Civil War; yet until recently they have been preoccupied with the polemical intent and philological skill (or lack thereof) of the Catholic

---

production team rather than with the consumption of Catholic readers. Alexandra Walsham’s pioneering work in the field mapped out the variability of ecclesiastical attitudes, both Catholic and Protestant, toward Bible-reading when political and pastoral contexts changed: generally, preaching was favored by the establishment, manuscript appropriated by those who had to communicate outside of it, and print was the contested medium in between. With this multi-directional capacity, the printed Douai-Rheims Bibles that entered England alongside the missionary Jesuits were intended to fortify the authority of the Roman Catholic Church and undermine the legitimacy of the Church of England. It is suggested in the end, however, that they may have undermined the traditional authority of both churches, further releasing the Catholic laity from the mediation of their priests and their reliance upon the sacraments. The survey of extant copies of Douai-Rheims Bible in the fourth chapter shows that it was the sacramental context itself that bound Catholic readers to their new Bibles. If Bibles ultimately made their readers more “typographical” and less liturgical, distancing them from traditional forms of Catholic community, it was only after readers entered into the relationship seeking the opposite. These books were appropriated by Marwood’s coreligionists for communion more than conflict, despite the notoriously vitriolic printed annotations that

engulfed the text and captured the attention of contemporary authorities and modern historians alike. Controversial, theological annotation, on the other hand, does appear to characterize the Bible-reading activity of Thomas Marwood. Whether the apparent difference between Marwood’s reading and that of other English readers, both Catholic and Protestant, therefore depends more upon culture than confession, the language of the text than the religion of the book, will be assessed in Chapter 5.

III. The Paratext: Direction in Early Modern Bibles

The attention of Chapter 5 is devoted to analyzing the reading prescriptions embedded in Bibles themselves from the medieval through the early modern period and across confessional and linguistic divisions. While the provocative scholarship of Richard Gawthrop and Gerald Strauss and others shed light on a reaction against lay Bible-reading in Lutheran Germany after the early years of the Reformation, there remained no question that there were more whole New Testaments and whole Bibles produced in the early modern Reformed world than in the Catholic one, especially in the sixteenth century.\(^{37}\) The question that did remain was whether the scripture-books that were produced in each tradition instructed readers to read in similar ways. Tracing the metaphor of scripture-consumption encoded on the title page of Marwood’s Vulgate back from discrete scriptural texts up to the Ordinary Gloss and through the Reformation era

---

will illuminate a shared scripture-reading discourse as well as the subtle variations that cropped up within it. The continuities will allow us to discern the aspects of reading that united early modern Catholic and Reformed Bibles, as well as their surrounding pedagogical and paratextual frameworks, if the scale of production divided them. The variations will reveal the discursive maneuvers undertaken by certain Catholic theologians to cope with Reformation challenges to both their vernacular Bible policies and their theology of the Eucharist. Together these patterns will enable us to evaluate the extent to which Marwood’s Bible was consonant with any tradition or was itself developing something new.

If there was no contest in the volume of production between Catholic and Reformed Bibles in the sixteenth century, in the seventeenth century at least French Catholics began to mount a challenge in what has been referred to as “un siècle d’or de la Bible en France.” While Jansenists have been cast, rightly, as the motors behind the movement, there were many others involved who were promoting competing versions of the scriptures. No one, in other words, could promote access to the scriptures in the abstract, but only to particular forms of scripture-books. One form was the Moral Reflections on the New Testament, which was produced by the Jansenist Pasquier Quesnel. One who opposed this form and has been cast as an outright enemy of the Scriptures was Michel Le Tellier, S.J. (1643-1719), who became the Professor of Holy

---

38 See Bernard Chédozeau, Port-Royal et la Bible: un siècle d’or de la Bible en France, 1650-1708 (Nolin, 2007).
Scripture at the College of La Flèche shortly after Thomas Marwood departed from it. Before taking that academic post, Le Tellier was the Jesuit Provincial Superior of Paris, the last royal confessor to Louis XIV, and the reputed “Architect of Unigenitus”, the notorious papal bull of 1713 that allegedly suppressed the Jansenist Bible-reading program. Decades before Unigenitus, however, Le Tellier had been issuing vernacular instructions for reading the scriptures as well as his own vernacular editions of the New Testament. Le Tellier has attracted minimal scholarly interest, yet his campaign for a “bare text” translation of the Vulgate is important because it reveals that he and the Unigenitus crisis itself was less about whether the Bible should be read, but rather how readers should read which scripture-books. The types of Catholic scripture-books that were possible and that were compelling in the Marwood era will be illuminated in Chapter 6 by following the Quesnel Bible affair from France to England where his versions were issued in both Catholic and Protestant editions. Studying these two kingdoms together will reveal the considerable linkages among Bible-readers on both sides of the Channel, as well as the relative impact of an intact Catholic hierarchy upon the conditions and constraints of reading. It will allow us, finally, to move beyond the regular comparison of incommensurate objects -- Protestant Bibles and Catholic Indexes

39 The Jesuit scholars that have attempted to rehabilitate Le Tellier against the Memoires of his contemporary political adversary, the Duc de Saint-Simon, have focused narrowly on Le Tellier’s activities as royal confessor. See Pierre Bliard, S.J., Les Mémoires de Saint-Simon et le père Le Tellier, Confesseur de Louis XIV (Paris: Libraire Plon, 1891) and more recently, Joaquín Domínguez and Charles O’Neill, eds., Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús (Rome: IHSI, 2001), 4:2309-2310. The substantial chapter on Le Tellier in Lucien Ceyssens and J. A. G. Tans, L’Autour de L’Unigenitus (Leuven: Peeters, 1987), 333-400, lists Le Tellier’s publications as a biographical prelude. They suggest to Ceyssens only that Le Tellier’s record as a Jesuit apologist and anti-Jansenist mudslinger should suffice to explain his quest to suppress Quesnel as soon as he gained power over the king’s conscience.
...in order to understand more precisely what early modern readers shared and what they did not.

IV. The Conclusion: Thomas Marwood: Convert Tutor, Revolutionary Reader?

The different parts of Marwood’s book have offered points of entry to the bible-reading landscape of the early modern world. Chapter 7 places Marwood himself within the world that his book opened. This convert tutor reconstructed his Bible as a scholastic textbook. His efforts to render the scriptures impersonal, however, did not conceal his personal priorities. By selectively matching verses to authoritative commentators he made the scriptures address the political, social, and confessional issues he was facing. His available diaries and correspondence, furthermore, allow us to observe how the book functioned in his life and in his community.

Marwood’s annotations exhibit creativity within the constraints that he perceived his new community had imposed. They borrowed from a number of printed commentary templates but were bound to none. Proven patristic and scholastic authorities were his preference, but by his paraphrases, translations, omissions and additions, he made contemporary vernacular theologians draw orthodox doctrine from the scriptures, too, and aggressively so. Through his finessed authoritative commentaries, Marwood’s Bible reliably denounces Protestant reformers, even at scriptural places only tenuously related to Reformation controversy and especially with commentators who died long before the controversies originated. The Counter-Reformation identity that Marwood fashions
himself does not fit into the standard “confessionalization thesis”, which credited the newly vigorous alliance of church and state with the imposition of social discipline upon a passive or unwilling populace. The scholarship of Marc Forster on Speyer and of Charles Parker on the Dutch Republic has suggested that, on the contrary, a counter-reformation identity becomes most pronounced in areas where the institutional Catholic church either lacks practical authority or is prohibited outright. Marwood's notes corroborate this revision even at the turn of the eighteenth century, which was an era of English Catholic history that was supposed to have followed a “devotional” and “modernist” turn away from confessional conflict and toward the “essential secular values of the society they lived in.” On the contrary, the books, diaries, and letters of Marwood and his pupil, Henry Arundel Bedingfeld, reveal that religious and political conflict, however “soft”, was inescapable for their household. How they navigated between quiescence and military rebellion illustrates the possibilities available to a confessionalized Catholic community in the wake of the Glorious Revolution.

Whether Marwood’s combative glosses and illegal activity made him a “revolutionary reader” will be evaluated in the conclusion of Chapter 7. The answer is yes, if qualified by three strict senses of the term: (1) he read and taught within the revolutionary era of 1688; (2) he resisted that revolution when it became the establishment, defying the laws of the church and the kingdom; (3) he sought to revolve – to turn back – against what he perceived to be the pattern of Protestant Bible-reading, though that pattern turned out to overlap in significant ways with the flow of vernacular Bible-reading in the early modern Catholic world as well. By the same token then, Marwood can be conceived as a counter-revolutionary, which was unintentional toward the religious communities he was attempting to enter but deliberate toward the communities that he was striving to leave behind. He represented “Protestant” reading as more intrinsically revolutionary than it was or than we will encounter it in Chapters 3, 5, and 6. Historians, too, are guilty of these misrepresentations when the teleological narratives of modernity that they adopt, whatever their valence, uncritically reproduce the fears expressed by early modern regimes about the radical, “anabaptistical” reading they heard rumors of abroad.  

44 Yet these same regimes also frequently considered illiteracy as the handmaiden to heterodoxy, as the scholarship of Keith Thomas and Femke

---

44 See, for instance, Richard Taverner’s preface to his edition of Epistles and Gospelles ... from after Easter tyll Advent (1540), ff. [-A1v]–A1r [STC 2968]. Its concern to present a scripture book that would teach “no lawles lybertie to do what you luste, but obedience to god & to hys commaundementes, obedience to the kynges majestie and to hys laws, obedience to the holsome traditions of the church” is explicitly a reflection of the anxieties of the author and his licensors about “these diverse sects of Anabaptistes, of sacramentaries, & other heretiques” who “swarme abrode” – and not evidently a result of his own experience with any of these sectaries.
Molekamp has reiterated. Marwood demonstrated how his Latin literacy enabled him to construct strident orthodoxy out of all the scriptural places he touched. That achievement of building a new authoritative theological commentary may indeed be his most revolutionary, since he refused to let his status as a layman prevent him from doing the work of a Catholic theologian. That same achievement, on the other hand, conceals the problem of the conceptual framework of “revolutionary reading”, both for Marwood and for his contemporaries. It was through their oppositional glosses, whether theological or liturgical, that they sought to reforge community within their fractured world.

---

PART I:

THE FRONTMATTER: READING WITH ROME
CHAPTER 1

Reading with Rome:
The Frontmatter of Marwood’s Bible

I. Title Page, Privilege, Approbation: Making a Tridentine Bible

Before asking “who permitted Thomas Marwood to read the Bible?” or “how did Marwood read the Bible?”, we should begin instead with questions that do not presume a stable, uniform sacred text. We should begin with books: “Which Bible was Marwood reading?” and “How did that book get recognized as the Bible?” By opening Marwood’s book, we will find the answers that Marwood and his contemporaries encountered. To these readers, the pages that they grasped and examined communicated as much about the meaning of the Bible as the normative statements inscribed in conciliar acts and papal edicts. To be satisfied with the latter and to discount the palpable experience of early modern readers with their books is to prefer more of a legal knowledge of the era than a historical one.

What the learned reader confronts on the first printed page is an engraved title that proclaims the unequivocal identity of this stout quarto volume: *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis* [See Fig. 1.1]. This particular collection of sacred books is the Vulgate – that is, the one version formally and irrevocably proclaimed “authentic” by the Council of Trent. It was “reassembled and edited”, so the title continues, “by the command of Sixtus V Pontifex Maximus.” The appellation celebrates the Roman heritage of the papal office. Immediately below, however, is the unmistakable compass pressmark denoting
that, although it was a Roman pontiff who fashioned the text into the Vulgate, it was the
Plantin-Moretus printing house of Antwerp that made the Bible this book. It was clear
already that Rome could not act alone.

If a reader were not sure which books this Vulgate contained, another section of
frontmatter was supposed to leave no doubt. Right after the preface was a sheet entitled:
“De Canonicis Scripturis Decretum Ex Concilio Tridentino Sessione Quarta.” [See
Fig.1.3] Here the canon solemnly ratified by the Council of Trent was communicated
through the conciliar decree itself. It named seventy-two books, including the seven in
the Old Testament demoted from the canon by magisterial Calvinist and Lutheran
Reformers, as well as by some eminent Catholic humanists like Erasmus and Cardinal
Cajetan. Those proponents of an alternative canon were addressed next:

If anyone does not accept as sacred and canonical the aforesaid books in their
entirety and with all their parts, as they have been accustomed to be read in the
Catholic Church and as they are contained in the old Latin vulgate edition, and
knowingly and deliberately rejects the aforesaid traditions, let him be anathema.\footnote{46}

The printed decree then was not just a table of contents for this Bible, but an index for
judging the authenticity of all “Bibles” that claimed the title. Biblical collections that
deviated from the canon inscribed here were thereby invalidated and their compilers
condemned.

Careful readers then may have become troubled upon discovering that this
conciliar list did not exactly match the divisions of the Bible it introduced. The change in
the title of one book from “Parabolae” to “Liber Proverbiorum” probably was less

\footnote{46 H.J. Schroeder, trans. The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (Rockford, IL: Tan, 1978), 18;
Marwood’s Biblia Sacra, \(†3v\).}
difficult to reconcile than the change in the total number of canonical books from seventy-two to seventy-four. This vulgate edition subdivided Jeremiah into three distinct books: the “Prophetiae”, “Lamentationes”, and “Oratio” of Jeremiah. While this ordering strayed from that of the decree, it followed that of earlier Latin Bibles both Catholic and Protestant. The same is true for the books that this Bible added after the canon. Upon the conclusion of the “Apocalypsis Ioanni Apostoli”, three books appear that had no place in the conciliar list: “III Esdrae”, “IV Esdrae”, and “Oratio Manassae.” A brief prefatory note to them explained, however, that their inclusion was meant in no way to challenge the canon codified by Trent, but only to preserve a record of these books that “are cited now and again by a number of holy Fathers and that can be found in some other Latin Bibles, in print as well as manuscript.”

Taken altogether, the discrepancies between the decree and this Bible’s contents are slight. They do not defy the Tridentine canon despite the uncompromising language in which the canon was proclaimed. The decree, nevertheless, does not serve as a reliable table of the books that would follow. That the producers of this volume chose to use it as such anyway requires an explanation.

The decree imperfectly mirrors the structure of this book, because it was not “the old Latin vulgate edition” to which the decree immediately referred. *This Vulgate*, published in 1605, did not yet exist when the fourth session of the Council authenticated “the vulgate” in 1546. The Tridentine decree did not identify its conceptual vulgate with any existing edition. Conciliar delegates decided instead that “in the future the Holy Scriptures, especially the old Latin vulgate edition, ought to be printed in the most correct

---

47 Marwood’s *Biblia Sacra*, f.aa[1r]: “Oratio Manassae, neon Libri duo, qui sub libri Tertii & Quarti Esdrae nomine circumferuntur, hoc in loco, extra scilicet seriem Canonicon Librorum, quos sancta Tridentina Synodus suscepet, & pro Canonices suscipientes decrevit, sepositi sunt, ne prorsus interirent, quippe qui a nonnullis sanctis Patribus interdum citantur, & in aliquibus Bibliis Latinis tam manuscriptis quam impressis reperiuntur.”
manner possible.”  As the council proceeded, these delegates continued receiving advice about which Latin Bibles they should not authenticate. The theology faculty of Paris and the first Roman Index of Paul IV (1559) uniformly condemned the foundational versions of Robert Estienne. A pontifical council did not begin remaking the Vulgate until forty years had passed since the session that declared it authentic. In the meantime, within seven months of that same session, an imperial privilege for a new Latin Bible had been secured by a publisher from the Spanish Netherlands, Bartholomaeus Gravius. In 1547 he rushed out the first folios of what become known as the Louvain Bible on account of both the place of its publication and the approval it received from the Theology Faculty of the University of Louvain. Its text had been edited by one of their own, the Dominican Jan Henten, whose preface anoints Robert Estienne “king printer of Paris” and praises him for “handing down to us the most accurate and well-corrected Bible ... which indeed we have followed in many ways.” Henten only regretted that Estienne could not be followed in everything, since “those pseudochristians had invaded his pure textual soul chiefly through marginal annotations, prefaces, and indices just like

48 Schroeder, Canons and Decrees, 19.
49 The faculty charged him with “alteration of the sacred text”, but the Roman Index banned all his works. See Index Avctorum et Librorvm, qui ab officio s. Rom. & vniuersalis inquisitionis caveri ab omnibus & singulis in vniuersa Christiana Republica mandantur, sub censuris contra legentes, vel tententes libros prohibitos in bulla... (Romae: Ex Officina Saluiana, 1559), B7v, C4v, C9r, C11v. See also Elizabeth Armstrong, Robert Estienne, Royal Printer: An Historical Study of the Elder Stephanus (Cambridge, 1954), 72-78, 165-210.
51 Biblia ad Vetustissima Exemplaria Recens Castigata Bartholomaei Gravi Typographi, Lovanii, Anno. M. D. XLVII. [Ohlhausen Collection, Houston, TX]: “F. IOHANNIS HENTENII NECHLIENISIS IN BIBLIA Lovanii Anno M.D.XLVII. excusa atque castigata, PRAEFATIO: ... Nemo est enim qui nesciat, ut unum pro multis in mediu[m] adferam, quantam diligentiam, quantasq[ue] impensas tulerit Robertus Stephanus, regius apud Lutetiam typographus (quem honoris causa nomino) ut accuratissima & castigatissima nobis Biblia traderet: propter quod plurimum etiam illi debent quotquot sacrarum literarum lectioni sunt: quem ob id etiam in multis sequiti sumus.”
rapacious wolves hiding under sheepskin.”\(^{52}\) Later scholars have insisted, nevertheless, that Henten’s Louvain Bible is, aside from a few adjustments, “practically a reprint of R. Stephanus’s Bible of 1538-40.”\(^{53}\) It included the books of III and IV Esdras, named above, and embraced the Oratio Manassae, which Estienne’s Bibles were the first to print.\(^{54}\) Despite these ties to a condemned Bible, the Louvain version, sanctioned by the Holy Roman Emperor and an alternative theology faculty, served as the \textit{de facto} Catholic vulgate until nearly the end of the century though it was never formally canonized as such.

The title-page of Marwood’s vulgate, however, claimed origin not in the Louvain Bible but in “the command of Sixtus V”. It was this pope who in 1586 finally convened an assembly of cardinals and scholars to produce “the most emended” vulgate demanded by the Council of Trent. That assembly was the Sacred Congregation of the Index. Sixtus reinvigorated it also to revise and update the Tridentine \textit{Index Librorum Prohibitorum} \textit{Prohibitorum} first issued in 1564. Both of its offspring, the Sixtine Vulgate and the Sixtine Index, emerged stillborn. In the case of the Vulgate, the Congregation labored over their emendation for more than two years. With skilled hebraists and classical scholars among them, they compared the Louvain Bible with other printed versions and vulgate manuscripts, including the earliest surviving one, the Codex Amiatinus. When the Latin texts did not agree, the Congregation preferred the Hebrew and Greek versions. Sixtus was shocked by the final draft. Judging it to be almost an abandonment of the common version, he dismissed the assembly and assumed personal responsibility for

\(^{52}\) Henten, \textit{Praefatio}: “Et tamen candido huius pectori imposuerunt hi pseudochristiani, & sub ovina pelle latentes lupi rapaces: maxime in marginum annotationib[us], praefactionibus, ac indice sententiaru[m].”


\(^{54}\) Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2.2: 930.
reforming the book. Along with only two assistants, Angelo Rocco and Francisco Toledo, Sixtus brought the text back more closely in line with the revised Louvain version of 1583. On the other hand, he was unable to resist some of his own more eccentric visions for shaping the vulgate, just as he had indulged in numerous philological liberties while emending the commentaries of Ambrose several years earlier.\textsuperscript{55} He first deviated from tradition: he altered the psalm incipits that for centuries had been the mnemonic devices that enabled religious congregations to recall and recite the liturgy of the hours. He also abandoned more recent developments, rejiggering the verse divisions that Estienne’s Latin Bible of 1555 had standardized for all confessions.\textsuperscript{56} Anything set upon the text that he deemed not intrinsic to it, whether it be liturgical tradition or modern convention, Sixtus resolved to correct.

What impelled Sixtus was what he believed was his divine burden, imposed by his pontifical office, to produce the definitive Vulgate text, stripped down to its Tridentine essentials. \textit{De Canonicis Scripturis} was his command. The Oratio Manassae and III-IV Esdras were stricken from the book because they were absent from the decree.\textsuperscript{57} He removed anything that he thought might compromise the version’s “authentic” appearance. Conventional subheadings, which designated that certain passages in Daniel were not evident in the Hebrew texts, disappeared. Sixtus then

\textsuperscript{55} Peter Godman, \textit{The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index} (Brill, 2000), 64.
\textsuperscript{56} Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2.2: 959. The Estienne versification scheme is what John Locke notoriously blamed for chopping the scriptures into those discrete chunks that obscured the substantive narrative and introduced doctrinal wrangling into the church.
\textsuperscript{57} The Tridentine decree merely affirmed the “wide canon” already proclaimed by the Council of Florence in 1441. It did not attempt to defend the canonicity of certain books doubted by contemporary reformers or humanists, nor did it attempt to reconcile certain disagreements among the Latin Fathers, notably Augustine and Jerome, as many of the Tridentine delegates had pleaded. It did not mention at all Books III-IV Esdras and the Oratio Manssae in order to leave open the question of their precise status. It did not demand that those books and prayers be excluded henceforth from all Latin Bibles, as Sixtus determined. For more on the debates about the canon at Trent, see Hubert Jedin, \textit{A History of the Council of Trent}, trans. Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B. (Edinburgh, 1961), II: 55-57.
eliminated the variant readings that his Congregation of the Index, following the model of the Louvain Bible, had inserted.\footnote{Franz Kaulen, \textit{Geschicte Der Vulgata} (Mainz, 1868), 457.} He was suspicious of interpretive paratext too, just as King James VI/I would show himself to be in the following decade during the preparation of England’s Authorized Version.\footnote{Kaulen, \textit{Geschicte}, 450-2. King James, however, was not similarly opposed to variant readings, which he did allow to be represented in the Authorized Version of 1611.} Setting a precedent for this AV, Sixtus ensured that the margins of his vulgate were purged of all commentary, glosses, and scholia.\footnote{Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2.2: 958.} Sixtus even jettisoned the traditional Hieronymine prefaces attached to many of the canonical books. While Sixtus rejected \textit{sola scriptura} as a theological principle, he embraced it as the format for his Bible.

Sixtus composed the bull \textit{Aeternus Ille} (1590) to endow the Bible that he had disciplined with the exclusive authority of Trent. The bull advanced beyond Trent, however, in defining the Vulgate’s authority – to the conciliar term “authentica”, he added “vera”, “legitima”, and “indubitata.”\footnote{Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2.2: 958.} To ensure the stability and uniformity of his Texts, he created a Vatican Press, operated by Aldus Manutius the younger, to produce them exclusively. After ten years, other presses might be granted permission to print his Vulgate as well provided that “not the least particle would be changed, added, or subtracted.”\footnote{Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2.2: 959.} A refusal to accept this command would merit excommunication. So that no one could plead ignorance, the bull \textit{Aeternus Ille} was to be packaged together with each book, representing and imposing Sixtus’s papal authority upon it. The bull did not

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[58] Franz Kaulen, \textit{Geschicte Der Vulgata} (Mainz, 1868), 457.
\item[59] Kaulen, \textit{Geschicte}, 450-2. King James, however, was not similarly opposed to variant readings, which he did allow to be represented in the Authorized Version of 1611.
\item[60] Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2.2: 958.
\item[61] Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2.2: 958. Other Roman Prelates, like Guglielmo Sirleto, had raised concern much earlier that even the more circumscribed formulation of Trent could be interpreted erroneously in much the same way that Sixtus does here. See Jedin, \textit{History of the Council}, II: 92-96. We will see Bellarmino raise the same concerns later.
\item[62] Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2.2: 959.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
appear, however, in the frontmatter of Marwood’s Vulgate. Despite its Sixtine title, it was not the Vulgate that Marwood possessed.

The page that did follow the canonical decree exhibited a new bull, in which a different pope authorized a different publisher in a different region. Entitled “CLEMENS PP. VIII. DILECTO FILIO IOANNI MORETO TYPOGRAPHO ANTVERPIENSI” [See Fig. 1.4], it acknowledged that only a few years earlier Pope Sixtus V “of happy memory” had sought to preserve inviolate the text of the vulgate edition by entrusting its publication “to none except the Typographia Vaticana” – and by threatening all others with “explicit penalties.”

His successors had become aware, however, of the “distant locations, onerous tariffs, and other grave difficulties and expenses” that made such a monopoly impractical. How could this book function as the authentic Bible of the whole Catholic Church if “it hardly could reach Germany and other ultramontane regions”? Clement VIII believed it could not, so he delegated a “transalpine” publisher. The selection process was simple. For the last half-century, the acclaimed Officina Plantiniana of Antwerp had been receiving papal privileges for official Catholic service books, including breviaries, missals, and martyrologies. Christophe Plantin also graciously accepted the right to publish an Index Librorum Prohibitorum, though at the same time he was relying on anonymous and false imprints to sneak out the heterodox

[63] “Cum itaque alias, Apostolica auctoritate, sub poenis tunc expressis, cautum fuerit, ne sacrorum Bibliorum vulgatae editionis iussu felicis recordationis Sixti Papae Quinti praedecessoris nostri recognitorum textus, alibi, praeterquam in Typographia Vaticana, imprimi posset, prout in litteris Apostolicis desuper expeditis, & in ipso Bibliorum volume impressis, latius continetur: ...”

[64] “... Cumque ob locorum distantiam, & portorii onera, & ob alias graves difficultates, & impensas, sacrorum Bibliorum in dicta Typographia impressorum volumina, ad Germaniae praesertim, & alias ultramontanas regiones deferri vix possint: ...”

reflections of his spiritual guides, Hendrik Niclaes and Hendrik Janssen. The office’s current director, Jan Moretus I, continued to acquire these lucrative contracts from Rome. Clement’s bull reported that “testimony of [Moretus’s] faithfulness in printing volumes, especially those of the sacred authors,” had been coming to him “on a daily basis.” So, Clement, “as desirous of accommodating those Catholics from other areas as of continuing to grant [Moretus] special favors and privileges” decided to rewrite the relevant section of the Sixtine bull. Addressing his “beloved son Jan” in 1597, Clement promised to uphold “whatever excommunications, suspensions, interdicts, and other Ecclesiastical sentences, censures, and punishments” that printers would have incurred from violating these terms of Aeternus Ille, except “for You alone across the Alps for the next ten years.” Clement’s permission relinquished the exclusive Roman control over vulgate production that Sixtus had envisioned and even had mandated, but only to preserve Sixtus’s aspiration for a Bible that was authentic everywhere.

It was not just from the Sixtine prohibitions, however, that the new bull was designed to protect Jan Moretus. It also was supposed to shield him from “any other authority that might impede, molest, or disturb” him from executing his new commission, or from reaping its benefits. This stipulation may be read more accurately as an

---

66 Voet, Golden Compasses, II:277.
67 “Quae de tua in imprimendis sacrorum praecipue auctorum voluminibus fide, & diligentia, quotidiie ad nos testimonia deferuntur, ea nos inducant, ut te specialibus favoribus & gratii libenter prosequamur ....”
68 Nos, tam commoditati Catholicorum illarum partium consulere, quam Te specialibus favoribus & gratii prosequi volentes, & a quibusvis excommunicationis, suspensionis, & interdicti, aliisque Ecclesiasticis sententiis, censuris, & poenis, a iure, vel ab homine, ... ad dilectorum filiorum nostrorum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalium Congregationis Typographiae nostrae sententia, Tibi soli trans Alpes, ut durante decennio proximo, Biblia vulgatae editionis huiusmodi, iuxta exemplar in dicta Typographia impressum...”
69 “licentiam & facultatem concedimus & indulgemus, Teque dicta sacra Biblia excludere, vendere, ac venalia exponere, lice, ac sine ullo censuariis Ecclesiasticariis, aut aliarum poenarum incursu, posse, nec de super a quoquam quavis auctoritate impediri, molestari, vel perturbari, sicque per quoscupque ludices ordinarios, & Delegatos, etiam causarum Palati Apostolici Auditores, ac Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinales, sublata eis, & eorum cuilibet, quavis alter iudicandi & interpretandi facultate,
aspiration. Beyond the Alps there were other jurisdictions – regional and imperial, ecclesiastical and secular – in which papal control of print could be contested. Other publishers might seize upon these weakly enforceable, extra-territorial dispensations as invitations to compete. In fact, they created ideal conditions for piracy. For this reason the initiative for press control so often originated not from church-state establishments, but from the vulnerable publisher wishing to safeguard his investment.\textsuperscript{70} This case is no different. The \textit{Officina Plantiniana} of Antwerp was situated within two overlapping principalities – the Habsburg Empire of Philip II and the Duchy of Brabant. Technically, a privilege from the former was superior to one from the latter. The Council of Brabant, however, was jealous of its local autonomy. So, even though each privilege cost money, the Plantin-Moretuses were accustomed to petitioning both authorities independently. The next page of Marwood’s Bible reveals that Jan Moretus did so here.

Under the title “SVMMA PRIVILEGII REGIS CATHOLICI, ET PRINCIPVM BELGARVM” \textsuperscript{[See Fig. 1.5]}, Moretus excerpted the favorable responses he received from the two administrations. Together they were indeed a supreme privilege, as the title suggested, because their scope was far broader than any of the privileges granted by the popes. Simon de Grimaldi, secretary to Philip II’s Privy Council in Brussels, authorized Moretus to print the Sacred Books “exactly as they have been corrected before, or as they perhaps might be corrected in the future.”\textsuperscript{71} Grimaldi’s statement shrouds the agent of these corrections with the passive voice, allowing some flexibility to the Vulgate-

\textsuperscript{70} For Plantin, see Voet, 2: 257; For a more recent articulation of the argument, see Jane McLeod, \textit{Licensing Loyalty: Printers, Patrons and the State in Early Modern France} (Penn State, 2011).

\textsuperscript{71} “prout correcta ea iam pridem sunt, aut in posterum forte corrigentur,ullo modo imprimat” (italics added).
producers. What the statement reveals, however, is that the commitment expressed in *Aeternus Ille* to preserve an unalterable vulgate text had been loosened dramatically. Grimaldi also signed off on Moretus’s bold request to publish the *Biblia Sacra* “as much in Latin as in other languages.” The Officina Plantiniana had been printing French versions of the “Louvain Bible” since 1578, and Moretus apparently seized this opportunity to solidify his claim upon them here in 1598. Grimaldi committed the government “to punish with grave penalties” all others except Moretus who printed these bibles “in these lower dominions of Germany” or had them printed elsewhere to be imported and sold there. It is worth noting that the minister of the “Catholic King of Spain”, as the privilege acclaimed him, did not cede Moretus any authority to print Bibles for Spain. His policy on printing vernacular scripture was bifurcated along linguistic rather than confessional boundaries. What was forbidden in hispanophone territories was permitted elsewhere, and Moretus capitalized on living elsewhere.

Moretus then placed the signature of Ioachim De Buschere, secretary to the Council of the Duchy of Brabant, adjacent to that of Grimaldi, with the date of 1598 following both names. These temporal privileges normally lasted three to six years. Before Marwood’s Vulgate was printed in 1605 then, it was due for another. Buschere and Moretus enjoyed a long history of collaboration. In the past the one had advanced a

---

72 This “Louvain Bible” was derived not from the Latin Louvain Bible mentioned earlier, but from Rene Benoist’s translation, which first was published in 1566, then condemned by the Sorbonne in 1567, and finally salvaged by four theologians from the university of Louvain and the publisher Christopher Plantin. See Chapter 6 below.

73 “PHILIPPPVS Dei gratia Hispaniarum & c. Rex Catholicus, Diplomatibus suis sanxit, ne quis praeter Ioannis Moreti, Typographi Antuerpiensis voluntatem, Biblia Sacra, tam Latina, quam alius linguis, prout correcta ea iam pridem sunt, aut in posterum forte corrigentur, ullo modo imprimat, aut alibi terrarum impressa, in has inferiores Germaniae ditiones importet, venaliáve habeat. Qui secus sanxit, confiscatione librorum, & alia gravi poena multabitur: uti latius patet in litteris, datis Bruxellae, XVI. Maii, M.D. XCI. iisdemque confirmatis ac innovatis, XXV. Februarii, M.D.XCVIII. / Signat. S. de Grimaldi. / Et in Consilio Brab. / I. de Buschere.”

privilege to the other even before a work had passed the censor’s review. Buschere, accordingly, made no trouble about renewing Moretus’s Bible privilege in 1601. Moretus then reprinted Buschere’s signature as a surrogate for the confirmation of “Albertus and Isabella, the Archdukes of Austria, Dukes of Burgundy and Brabant, as well as of the Highest Prince of the Belgians, the aforesaid Catholic King.” By abstracting and arranging these privileges altogether on the same page, he exhibited unanimity among secular and ecclesiastical authorities. Moretus thereby warned the competitor that the Bible was his to produce, and at the same time assured the patron that this Vulgate was not his own, but rather the one, authentic version of the Church.

If then the reader became convinced that this book and the Sixtine Bible were the same Vulgate, he or she might not question whether they also were the same text. For despite the potential space for revision created by the Grimaldi statement, the privilege of Clement VIII only authorized Moretus to reprint the Vulgate edition “according to the exemplar issued to him from the Typographia Vaticana, with no addition or diminution.” And yet there were nearly five thousand differences within the canonical texts of the two books. Outside the canon, Moretus’s volume returned the books of III-IV Esdras and the Oratio Manassae, all of which the Sixtine version had rejected outright. If Moretus was faithful to his papal commission, he must have received an

---

75 Voet, Golden Compasses, II: 268-9.
76a. ALBERTVS & ISABELLA Archiduces Austriae, Duces Burgundiae, Brabantiae, & c. Ser. Belgarum Principes, supradicta REGIS CATHOLICI ...
77 “Tibi soli trans Alpes, ut durante decennio proximo, Biblia vulgatae editionis huiusmodi, iuxta exemplar in dicta Typographia impressum, & tibi traditum, quam emendatissime tamen, & summa cum fide, nullaque facta additione, aut imminutione, imprimere valeas...”
78 Darlow & Moule, Historical Catalogue, 2.2: 962-3.
79 The Praefatio (†3r) explained that these parts were placed behind the canonical books because III-IV Esdras were not enumerated by the Tridentine decree and the Oratio Manassae could not be found in the most ancient Latin, Hebrew, and Greek manuscripts. It did not explain why there were included in this Bible at all. That they continued to be printed in the Louvain Bibles is instructive.
exemplar other than the Sixtine Bible of 1590, for all these changes along with the re-
imposition of Estienne’s familiar scheme of versification make his Bible more similar to
the Louvain Version of the Vulgate than the Sixtine version that had been intended to
improve and replace it.⁸⁰ The Praefatio ad Lectorem, wedged in between the Sixtine
title-page and the Moretan Privileges, suggests indeed that something had happened to
the Vulgate before it was sent to Antwerp.

This preface, which introduced Catholic vulgates until the late twentieth century,
first accompanied an edition published in 1592 [See Fig. 1.2.]. The text does not reveal
its author, but scholars then and since have attributed authorship to the consultore
Roberto Bellarmino, who indeed confirms that attribution in his autobiography.⁸¹ The
starting point of the preface is the “most grave Tridentine decree.” It rehearses the
decision of the Council, when confronted with “the great variety and diversity of Latin
versions that were begetting so much confusion in the Church of God”, to “declare
authentic the one, old, vulgate version.”⁸² Then, with a measure of foreshadowing, it
observes that the conciliar delegates also sought to control the publication of this “most
emended, old vulgate edition” lest it be “corrupted either by the abuses of the times or the
carelessness of the printers or the audacity of those rashly emending it.”⁸³ The reader is

⁸⁰ Darlow & Moule, Historical Catalogue, 2.2: 963; Guy Bedouelle, ed., Le Temps de Reformes et la Bible
⁸¹ Gustavo Galeota, S.J., ed., Roberto Bellarmino: Autobiografia (1613) (Brescia, 1999), 60. See also
Godman, Saint as Censor, 139.
⁸² “In multis magnisque beneficis, quae per sacram Tridentinam Synodum Ecclesiae suae Deus contulit, id
in primis numerandum videtur, quod inter tot Latinas editiones Divinarum Scripturarum, solam vetere[m] ac
vulgatam, quae longo tot saeculorum vsu in Ecclesia probata fuerat, gravissimo Decreto authenticam
declaravit. Nam, ut illud omit-tamus, quod ex recentibus editionibus non paucae ad haereses huius
temporis confinmandas licenter detortae videbntur: ipsa certe tanta versionum varietas atque diversitas,
magnam in Ecclesia Dei confusionem parere potuisse.”
⁸³ “Ceterum ne tam fidelis translatio [...] vel injuria temporum, vel impressorum incuria, vel temere
emendantium audacia, ulla ex parte corrupteretur, eadem sacrosancta Synodus Tridentina illud Decreto
suo sapienter adiecit, ut haec ipsa vetus ac vulgata Editio emendatissime, quoad fieri posset, imprimeretur:
led to anticipate that the integrity of the vulgate may be violated in any one of these three ways, but only once the text has left the closed, officially sanctioned community of correctors.

Exactly when the definitive emendation happened is what the preface must explain next. Without explicitly acclaiming the Louvain Bible, the author acknowledges the “excellent labors that the Theologians of the most worthy Academies performed upon the vulgate edition restoring it to its original brilliance.” But that the author of the preface actually preferred the Louvain version to the one Sixtus produced is only faintly discernible here and in the sentences immediately following when he notes in the passive voice that, ultimately, emending the Vulgate “was thought to pertain most especially to the Apostolic Seat.” The preface then unfolds the emendation process initiated by Pius IV and continued by Pius V, who

entrusted that duty to the most excellent Cardinals of the holy Roman Church and to other men as learned in the Sacred Scriptures as they were in its various tongues, so that with the most ancient manuscript codices consulted, with the Hebrew and Greek sources of the Books inspected, and finally with the commentaries of the elder Fathers considered, they might correct the Latin, vulgate edition in the most accurate way possible.
Despite its auspicious beginnings, the biblical congregation dissolved on account of “various, most grave matters” that demanded the attention of the Holy See. Sixtus V emerges as the hero, since “having been called forth by divine providence to the high priesthood, he recalled the congregation.” But then the description contracts. That Sixtus suddenly dissolved the congregation again and elected to make the vulgate’s authenticity depend heavily upon his own editorial efforts goes unmentioned. The preface instead skips ahead two years to the finished manuscript that in 1590 Sixtus committed to the typists. The reader must presume that the “most emended” Vulgate finally has arrived. It is when the printed sheets are said to return that the narration re-expands:

But after it already was pressed out, and sent forth into the light, the work was appraised by the same Pontiff who, noticing not a few things that had crept into the sacred Bible through the fault of the press and seemed to require careful revision, thought and moreover resolved (decrevit) that the whole work should be recalled. He was unable to accomplish it, however, having been prevented by death. [So] Gregory XIV, who succeeded Sixtus after the twelve-day pontificate of Urban VII, pursuing the soul’s intention [i.e., that of the deceased Sixtus], undertook to perfect [the Bible] with some most distinguished Cardinals and other learned men deputized for it once again [...]; finally under the initiative of Pope Clement VIII, who now holds the government of the universal church, the work for which Sixtus V had strangled (intenderat) has been accomplished with God assisting.  

---

87 Quod cum iam esset excusum, & ut in lucem emitteretur, idem Pontifex operam daret, animadvertens non paucâ in sacra Biblia preli vitio irrepisse, quae iterata diligentia indigere viderentur, totum opus sub incudem revocandum censuit atque decrevit. Id vero cum morte præeventus praestare non putuisset, Gregorius XIII. qui post Vrbani VII. duodecim dierum Pontificatum Sixto successerat, eius animi intentionem executus, perficere aggressus est; ampliss-imis aliquot Cardinalibus, alissique doctissimis viris, ad hoc iterum deputatis. Sed eo quoque, & qui illi successit, Innocentio IX., brevissimo tempore de hac luce subtractis; tandem sub initium Pontificatus Clementis VIII., qui nunc Ecclesiae vniversae gubernacula tenet, opus, in quod Sixtus V. intenderat, Deo bene iuvante perfectum est.
These words have incited a fiery and unquenchable controversy about the integrity of their author, from the late sixteenth century through the twentieth when Bellarmino was canonized. They acknowledge that the text changed between the first edition of 1590 and the second of 1592, but by blaming the “faults of the press” for the difference, they suggest that Sixtus’s consistent intention makes the two Vulgates one. As we have observed above, the Aeternus Ille bull that Sixtus drafted to promulgate his 1590 Vulgate does not anticipate further emendation, and in fact condemns it. Separating the two editions, however, are the nearly five thousand changes. Hardly any of these can be traced back to misprints of the Typographia Vaticana. Paradoxically then, and no doubt intentionally so, the preface’s carefully worded attribution of “not a few errors” to the press could be the truth. This passage also conceals its author’s own privileged place among “the most distinguished Cardinals” who were deputized to “pursue the intention of [Sixtus’s] soul”. Within this next congregation, Bellarmino himself lobbied to fix the Vulgate by undoing many of Sixtus’s textual changes and returning the paratextual apparatus of Louvain. Within the same congregation he also volunteered to correct the Sixtine Index, which had condemned his own master work of apologetics to the list of prohibited books. Bellarmino did not hesitate to expurgate his former pontiff on either count, protecting both their reputations and the continuity of the post-Tridentine vulgate.

What ultimately matters for us here is not the question of Bellarmino’s sanctity, which exercised previous scholars, but the fact that the exemplar that Moretus received and published was something other than what his frontmatter suggested – that is, the

88 James Brodrick traced this controversy in his hagiography, The life and work of Blessed Robert Francis Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J., 1542-1621 (New York: P.J. Kennedy, 1928), I: 269-309. Peter Godman revisited it at the turn of the next century in his Saint as Censor, 139-154. Note that Brodrick composed his biography to promote Bellarmino’s canonization, which was officially declared in 1930.

89 Godman, Saint as Censor, 148-152.
book *that Pope Sixtus declared* the authentic Vulgate of Trent. Replacing *Aeternus Ille* in the frontmatter was the *Praefatio*, in which Bellarmino mildly praised the Louvain version without ever disclosing that he struggled to make Sixtus’s Vulgate conform to that version. Immediately following was the Tridentine decree on the biblical canon, even though the books it named did not exactly match the names of the books that this volume contained. Moretus’s title page was the most adamant about his Vulgate’s Sixtine identity. It explicitly proclaimed its origins “in the command of Sixtus V” and reinforced its claim visually, imitating all the engravings that appeared in the original 1590 edition of the *Typographia Vaticana* [See Fig. 1.6]. Moretus labored to present the one, stable Sixtine text because the whole process of editing, compiling, licensing and publishing his book signalled instead that there was and would continue to be more than one way to make the Vulgate.

All these introductory pieces together illuminate a series of negotiations that determined the form and definition of this book as Bible. These contests among and between popes, printers, cardinals, emperors and their privy councils, theology faculties, publishers of varying reputation, censors, and municipal governments all preceded and structured that one most privileged negotiation between reader and text. The inclination to pursue the negotiating reader is a good one. It proceeds from the efforts of historians of reading to expand the deposit of intellectual history, analyzing the meaning of texts from the perspective of consumers as well as from producers, paralleling the efforts of social historians to reveal the people who shaped politics but whom traditional political historians have ignored. As these pages have revealed, however, there are other readers besides the ones who acquired and marked the textual commodity. The latter were not
absolute sovereigns over the text anymore than any of the others who participated in the construction and reconstruction of the book. To ignore them by assuming their hegemony can lead scholars to misunderstand and indeed circumscribe the interpretive possibilities available to each reader. When Bible-readers are approached primarily through inquisitorial records, for instance, the analytical model of resistance can become an interpretive straitjacket – did the reader accept or reject the control wielded by the ecclesiastical guardians of the text? When we approach the reader through the book, however, we encounter her within the multi-layered process of configuring meaning. Despite the appearances of this book, neither its text nor its producers formed a stable, united front, so that the reader might enter through any one of its fissures. Thomas Marwood did just that. To understand whose invitation he may have been accepting and whose interference he may have transgressed, we now need to examine the book not just as it was created and authorized, but also as its producers intended it to be read.
Fig. 1.1: Title Page, *Biblia sacra Vulgatae editionis Sixti V Pont. Max. ivssv recognita atque edita* (Antwerp: Ex officina Plantiniana apud Ioannem Moretum, 1605), Kislak Center for Special Collections, Rare Books and Manuscripts, University of Pennsylvania (BS75 1605). Hereafter, *Marwood Bible or MB.*
Fig. 1.2: Bellarmino’s “Praefatio” in Marwood Bible, †2r-†3r.
Figure 1.3: Tridentine Decree on the Vulgate, Marwood Bible, [†3v]
Figure 1.4: Letter of Clement VIII to Jan Moretus, Marwood Bible, [†4r]
Figure 1.5: Two Privileges, Marwood Bible, [†4v]
Figure 1.6: Two Title Pages

Vulgate, Typographia Vaticana, 1592

Vulgate, Officina Plantiniana, 1605
II. From the Preface to the Vulgate Reader: Who and How?

Bellarmino’s explanation of what this book is leaves unexplained what and to whom it is for. At the end of his selective history of the emendation process of this “old, vulgate Edition of Sacred scripture”, Bellarmino instructs the reader simply to “Take it” (“Accipe, Lector”, †2v). He then proceeds not to describe how this Bible should be used, as Bible prefaces typically do, nor to tout the ways in which this new edition facilitates the reader’s interaction with the text, as do virtually all contemporary prefaces of any kind. This preface emphasizes instead that the book does not contain any supports – that is, “no concordances in the margins (which are not forbidden to be added here afterward), no notes, no diverse readings, no prefaces, and no arguments at the beginning of books will be noticed.”90 In other words, it is just The Text “without anything non-canonical, foreign, or extraneous added.”91

The purpose of a bare, chastened text had been adumbrated at the beginning of the preface. There the author affirmed the wisdom of Trent to set forth a standard Bible version amidst all the competing versions, of which “not a few seemed to have been distorted quite liberally in order to confirm the heresies of the present time.”92 If this Bible is supposed to be an antidote to heresy, however, it would not have been considered a very potent one by contemporary measures. Inscribing orthodox annotation in the margins of the text was a preferred defense against novel interpretations.93 Leaving the

90 Praefatio, †3r: “& nullae ad marginem concordantiae (quae posthac inibi apponi non prohibentur) nullae notae, nullae variae lectiones nullae denique praefationes, nulla argumenta ad librorum initia conspiciantur.”
91 Praefatio, †3r: “Porro in hac Editione nihil non canonicum, nihil adscititium, nihil extraneum apponere visum est.”
92 Praefatio, †2r: “Nam, ut illud omittamus, quod ex recentibus editionibus non paucae ad haereses huius temporis confirmandas licenter detortae videbantur.”
93 See Chapter 6 below.
margins vacant, on the contrary, invited other interpreters to occupy them. Since only so much commentary could fit in the margin, however, Sixtus was wary of enshrining particular interpretations when establishing his one correct biblical text for all time. And if Sixtus agreed with Bellarmino that “The Word of God is the rule of faith out of which doctrine can be judged”, then establishing this biblical text would be the prior, more urgent step for resolving theological controversy. In sum, Sixtus was making a book only to monumentalize his purified text. All considerations of the book’s usefulness for individual readers were to him secondary and indeed distracting from its central purpose of stabilizing the scriptures in saecula saeculorum.

When this Sixtine Bible finally emerged, however, its claim to establish that text had been compromised, as we have seen above. While the frontmatter concealed the emendations to the text that Sixtus had promulgated, it did countenance future emendation. The privilege that Grimaldi, Philip II’s secretary, granted to Moretus authorized him to publish the text “as it might be corrected hereafter.” Grimaldi was a secular official, and his permissiveness here might be attributed to his distance from the agenda of the Roman Curia. Bellarmino, however, was situated at the center of it, and his preface actually reinforced the sentiment of Grimaldi. Bellarmino insisted that this vulgate was corrected with as much diligence as it was ever possible to summon, and yet he admitted that it would “be difficult to affirm on account of human frailty that it is more complete, corrected, and pure than all the others which have come forth to the

94 Franz Kaulen, Geschichte Der Vulgata (Franz Kirchheim: Mainz, 1868), 450.
95 Roberto Bellarmino, Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini Politiani, Societatis Iesv, De Controversiis Christianae Fidei, Adversvs Hivis Temporis Haereticos, Tribus Tomis comprehensae. …. INGOLSTADII, Ex Officina Typographica Davidis Sartorii. Anno Domini M.D. LXXXVI. “Praefatio”, f.**6r: “Convenit autem inter nos & omnes omnino haereticos, verbum Dei esse regulam fidei; ex qua de dogmatibus iudicandum sit.”
The cardinals and biblical scholars who comprised the vaunted papal commission, he suggested, were mortal and capable of editorial mistakes. User error was not the only trouble spot either. Sources posed problems too, since “it is quite possible that our ancestors, who made the Latin versions from the Hebrew and Greek sources, might have had a copy of better, more accurate books than the ones that have survived until our own age.” For these reasons, Bellarmino advocated philological humility.

While Bellarmino was the one who proposed that the emended Bible assume the identity of the Sixtine Vulgate, he at the same time rejected the exclusivity of the Sixtine approbation. Before the “Sixtine Vulgate” that he emended was printed and promulgated in 1592, he pleaded with Pope Gregory XIV for a different sort of approval than *Aeternus Ille*, one that might accept the possibility of textual changes in the future and even tolerate the company of variant Latin Bibles in the present. Bellarmino’s petition presented those reasons against an exclusive approbation – the potential insufficiency of the sources and the inherent fallibility of the editors – to which his preface would later allude, but it also included a series of warnings. First, it would be “no slight injustice” to suppress the Latin editions prepared by the faculties of Paris and Louvain, whose “sweat and pious labors” yielded versions that “dissent from ours in only the smallest matters,

---

**Praefatio, †2v:** “quam quidem sicut omnibus numeris absolutam, pro humana imbecillitate affirmare difficile est, ita ceteris omnibus, quae ad hanc usque diem prodierunt, emendatiorem, purioremque esse, minime dubitandum.”

**Praefatio, †3r:** “sanctus Hieronymos non semel admonuit: tum quod facile fieri posse credendum est, ut maiores nostri, qui ex Hebraeis & Graecis Latina fecerunt, copiam meliorum & emendatorum librorum habuerint, quam ii, qui post illorum aetatem ad nos pervenerunt.” Elsewhere, in his polemical treatise *De Verbo Dei* (1585), Bellarmino makes the same point more strongly about extant copies of the Greek Septuagint text (“the LXX”): “Jerome testified in his own time that almost all Greek codices of the LXX version had parts intermingled with the Theodotion version ... so that it was impossible to judge what in these books was of the LXX and what truly of Theodotius. ... It is not credible that this version, which contracted so many blemishes (maculas) in the first 300 years of its existence, should then have been preserved inviolate and entire for the remaining 1200 years.” (SCS 132, 2nd column)
and in nothing pertaining to faith and morals.”  

Second, bible production was costly and producers already had sunk significant capital into these other editions. It would be “dangerous” for the Pope to forbid all vulgate commerce outside the Typographia Vaticana. Even many Catholic bookdealers, he feared, would not compromise their livelihood in order to comply. In short, Bellarmino was sensitive to print commerce. The Vulgate could never be an abstract text – it always was a book, or rather a variety of books, that different Catholics and erstwhile allies had invested their time, wealth, and reputations to produce. Bellarmino recognized, as a result, the limits of the Vatican’s efficient authority to govern a “text”, and he struggled to make the pope aware of the same. Gregory died, however, before the matter could be settled.

To the next judge, Clement VIII, Bellarmino presented his case again, only this time his list of reasons expanded from five to seventeen. He included the theoretical problems and practical considerations that the former list posed, but demoted them to the bottom of the order. Bellarmino began his second effort instead with the irrevocable commitments of the council:

First, the 4th session of the Council of Trent certainly approved the vulgate edition as authentic, yet it did not reject other Latin editions nor prohibit them. Rather, it is clear from that same decree of the council and from the 3rd Rule of the Roman Index under Pius IV, that edited versions of even condemned authors might be permitted provided that they contain nothing against sound doctrine; so much


99 Bellarmino, “Expedire, ut edantur Bibliä”: “Praeterea periculum esset ne propter nimios sumptus, qui in novis biblis emendis faciendi essent, gravissimamque jacturam tot librorum excusorum, multi decreto Pontificio non parerent. Neque fortasse deessent qui luci causa hanc unam editionem, suppressis caeteris, a summo Pontifice approbatam fuisse jactarent.” Le Bachelet, Bellarmin, 140.
more then these vulgates, which exist in forms other than this emendation, ought to be permitted.\textsuperscript{100} To avoid prohibiting other vulgates is no longer just prudent – now, by the law of the church, it is necessary. Bellarmino’s significant rhetorical shift here is matched in his subsequent reasoning about the value of accepting multiple legitimate translations. Some variety in rendering the Hebrew and Greek sources, in cases “where the truth is not apparent”, is not just tolerable but indeed good – even “a matter of God’s providence” – “on account of the multiple senses intended by the Holy Spirit, which cannot be expressed in a single edition.”\textsuperscript{101} Bellarmino then contended that an exclusive approbation, on the other hand, “might cause scandal.”\textsuperscript{102} He already had advised Gregory XIV against prohibiting alternative Catholic versions of the Vulgate because it would seem to strengthen the heretics’ accusation that the Pope forbids the Bible.\textsuperscript{103} Here in his letter to Clement VIII, the Collegio Romano’s former Chair of Controversies anticipated more polemical backlash: if we reject all prior Latin versions that we used to depend on, then the charge of continual change that we levy at Protestants will be returned to convict us.\textsuperscript{104} Rather than invite more resistance to the Church, Bellarmino’s letter insisted, this Bible should welcome diversity. In the end, the preface that

\textsuperscript{100} Bellarmino, “Non videtur a summo Pontifice ita probandum esse editionem vulgatam bibliorum nuper recognitionam, ut prohibeantur editiones caeterae etiam vulgatae, vel ut earum auctoritati aliquid derogetur”: “Primo. Quia Concilium Tridentimum Sess. IVa pro authentica approbavit editionem vulgatam ut irrefragabilem, non tamen rejectit caeteras latinas editiones neque prohibuit. Quin potius, ut patet in indice romano regula IIIa sub Pio IV et decreto ipsius concilii edito, permittuntur versiones a damnatis auctoribus etiam auctoribus editae, dummodo nihil contra sanam doctrinam contineant; multo igitur magis ipsae vulgatae, licet in aliquibus variae ab ista emendatione, permitti debent.” Letter reproduced as Document VII in Le Bachelet, Bellarmin, 142.

\textsuperscript{101} Bellarmino, “Non videtur a summo Pontifice ita probandum”: “Tertio. Quia forte credi potest magna Dei optimi maximi providentia factum ut diversae aliquando sint editiones etiam vulgatae inter se ob multiplices sensus a Spiritu sancto intentos, qui unica tantum editione exprimi non possunt.” Le Bachelet, Bellarmin, 142.

\textsuperscript{102} Le Bachelet, Bellarmin, 143.

\textsuperscript{103} La Bachelet, Bellarmin, 140.

\textsuperscript{104} La Bachelet, Bellarmin, 143.
Bellarmino was permitted to attach to the Clementine Vulgate made no definitive statement on whether other Catholic Vulgates remained legitimate. Compared to the uncompromising stance of *Aeternus Ille*, however, this non-statement spoke clearly enough.

If then Bellarmino rejected Sixtus’s plan for the Vulgate, that it establish the text once and for all, what purpose did he leave for it to fulfill? The end of the preface suggests one answer: simply to satisfy the demands of Trent. After piling qualifiers upon the superiority of the new emendation, effectively burying Sixtus’s claim, he finally conceded that the Vulgate “may now be printed in superlatively emended form according to the Decree of the Ecumenical Council.”

His autobiography submits another reason for publishing a newly corrected Vulgate: “saving the good name of Pope Sixtus.” Bellarmino did not want other readers to uncover the discrepancy between the philological skill with which Sixtus emended the Bible and the authoritative pronouncements with which he cloaked it, especially if that revelation might provoke more challenges to papal infallibility. Both reasons are fundamentally defensive, aimed to protect the authority of the institutions behind the vulgate. Neither expresses a positive vision of the Bible as book, or how the book itself might promote and shape interactions with the emended text. So while Bellarmino may have discarded Sixtus’s statements about the status of this vulgate, Sixtus’s mimimalist design for it was left intact. The new “Sixtine” version, the one Bellarmino corrected, first emerged in 1592 with the same absence of prologues, paratexts, and appendices as the original one.

---

105 Praefatio, †3r: “... ut quam emendatissime imprimeretur iuxta Concilii Oecumenici Decretum...”
If the book remained only a monument of the naked text, however, it was not because Bellarmino wanted it that way. He lobbied for paratexts in that first letter to Gregory XIV. A desire to use paratexts to ensure interpretive control and exegetical uniformity might not be so surprising to find in Bellarmino, who had been engaged in anti-Protestant polemic for the past two decades. Two decades later, he was the one designated to warn Galileo not to teach Copernicanism, because the consensus of patristic testimony upon particular scriptural passages describing the movement of the sun taught otherwise.107 His judgment may not even have been shared by the leading natural philosophers and astronomers of his own order, the Society of Jesus, but it was by no means idiosyncratic.108 It derived from the Council of Trent itself, which had codified the principle in order “to repress that boldness” whereby printers and readers would interpret bibles “contrary to that sense which Holy Mother Church... has held and does hold, or contrary to the unanimous agreement of the fathers.”109

That conciliar rhetoric inflected Bellarmino’s admonition to Galileo, but it was entirely absent in his admonition to Gregory XIV. There Bellarmino’s first concern was to craft a book that customers would buy: “It is not expedient to print bibles without any marginal notes... since, first of all, such bibles may not sell easily; whereas everyone so willingly buys bibles which are more full and substantial.”110 What exactly Bellarmino believed these Bibles should be filled with is revealed in reasons two through five: not so much interpretive commentary, as variant readings – that is, exactly those textually

unsettling paratexts that Sixtus had been most zealous to excise. That was Sixtus’s mistake, Bellarmino argued, because the marginal variants were the key to market success: “Experience testifies that the Plantin editions are never refused in any place or on account of any high price if only they contain the notable variety of readings assembled by the Louvain theologians.”

Why did readers value them so much? Because they transformed Bibles into “libraries” from which at one glance the most ancient manuscripts could be consulted. Both St. Jerome and St. Augustine, he avowed, believed that diverse readings aided understanding, especially of the more obscure places whose meaning could be assessed only after sifting multiple renderings.

Bellarmino dismissed Sixtus’s fears that these paratexts weakened religious authority. They reinforced it instead. To a Church that staked its authority upon a particular scriptural version, the variants allowed more wiggle room: “if perhaps one reading should become less easy to defend against the calumnies of heretics, then it is possible to take refuge in the other.” Bellarmino favored these paratexts then for a variety of academic and pragmatic reasons. None of them, throughout this personal correspondence with the pope, were about interpretive control or exegetical uniformity. Those were the concerns of Sixtus V, who wanted just the text, pristine and bare. Bellarmino wanted instead a useful and appealing book.

111 Bellarmino, “Expedire, ut edantur Biblia”: “Quarta, quoniam experientia ipsa testatur editionem Plantinianam non alia de causa magno in precio semper semper fuisse et non uno in loco saepius recusa, nisi quod opera Theologorum Lovaniensium insignem lectionum varietatem habeat.” Le Bachelet, Bellarmin, 141.
112 Bellarmino, “Expedire, ut edantur Biblia”, in Le Bachelet, Bellarmin, 141.
113 Bellarmino, “Expedire, ut edantur Biblia”, in Le Bachelet, Bellarmin, 141.
114 Bellarmino, “Expedire, ut edantur Biblia”: “Sexta denique, quod non solum ad explicandam, sed etiam ad propugnandam editionem vulgatam lectionum varietas multus prosit; nam cum utrque sit vulgata lectio, et quae in corpore, et quae ad latus cernitur, si forte altera minus commode defendatur ab haereticorum calumniis, promptum est refugium ad alteram.” Le Bachelet, Bellarmin, 141.
Bellarmino was overruled. He later lamented the result in consecutive letters to François Luc de Bruges, a theologian at Louvain and one of the compilers of the Louvain Bible paratexts. Those were the same paratexts, Bellarmino recounted in 1603, that he had sought for the vulgate that he was emending, especially the “variant readings”, which still appealed to him then as substitute libraries. “But,’ he concluded, ‘it was not pleasing to others to add them to the first edition.” That 1592 Vaticana edition, as we have seen, emerged without paratexts. The preface that Bellarmino managed to append to it, however, carried a loophole through which paratexts could be inserted later. While proceeding through the litany of paratexts that the reader will not find in this Bible, the preface pauses momentarily, interjecting a parenthetical qualification about the absence of all these notes, concordances, variant readings, arguments, etc., “(which are not forbidden to be added hereafter)”. This back-door clause might allow subsequent publishers to add the reader supports that Bellarmino preferred, but which he was unable to have inscribed in the official Vulgate of 1592. Just in case this loophole was not sufficiently wide, Bellarmino elected to open another, more obvious one – the final sentence of the preface. He concluded then with this permission:

The Apostolic Seat does not damn the industry of those who have inserted concordances of places, various readings, prefaces of Saint Jerome, and other elements of this kind in other editions; likewise, it does not prohibit the future inclusion of supports of this type, provided that they appear in different characters than those of the Vatican edition itself, for the convenience and utility of the

---

studious; nevertheless, various readings should be noted least of all in the margin of the Text itself.\textsuperscript{116}

The begrudging, ambivalent tone in which Bellarmino wraps his permission must have been meant to appeal to his colleagues on the biblical commission who were more closely aligned with the thinking of Sixtus V. It turned out to be no less appealing to the publishers and readers who annotated the text thereafter. To “not be damned” was to be invited. Concordances of places, prefaces of Jerome, and the three standard appendices of the Louvain Vulgate – the\textit{ Interpretatio Nominum, Index Testimonialorum, and Index Bibliicus} – populated the 1605 Antwerp Vulgate that Thomas Marwood marked and rarely went missing from Sixto-Clementine Vulgates published afterward.\textsuperscript{117} Even the variant readings, though the preface affirmed that they were to “be noted least of all”, appeared in many authentic vulgates both before and after the 1605 Antwerp edition.\textsuperscript{118} The pages of the Tridentine Vulgate of 1592 then may have looked as bare as those of the original, abortive version of 1590, but the preface that Bellarmino attached to them reversed the Tridentine mandate for which the Bible had been commissioned. That is, Bellarmino’s

\textsuperscript{116} “Praefatio”, f. †3r: Sed sicut Apostolica Sedes industriam eorum non damnat, qui concordantias locorum, varias lectiones, praefationes sancti Hieronymi, & alia id genus in alis editionibus inseruerunt: ita quoque non prohibet, quin alio genere characteris in hac ipsa Vaticana editione eiusmodi adiumenta, pro studiosorum commoditate atque utilitate, in posterum adiiciantur; ita tamen, ut lectiones variae ad marginem ipsius Textus minime annotentur.”

\textsuperscript{117} All three appendices were printed in the 1580s Louvain Bibles. See 1583 octavo, D&M 2.2, no.6170. They were included in most Clementine editions thereafter, even the 1618 Rome edition, which appears to be the first one printed in Rome after initial editions in 1592, 1593, and 1598. See D&M 2.2, no.6205. All three 1608 editions recorded in D&M 2.2: 968 (Antwerp, Frankfurt, and Venice) contain the Index Testimonialiorum, Nominum Interpretatio, and Index Bibliicus. The same is true for the 1631 Antwerp edition (4to) and for the 1639 Biblia Sacra (16mo, 6vols), published in Cologne, which D&M call "one of the smallest Latin Bibles ever printed" (p.973). The 1653 Paris quarto has the same series, and so on with the 1669 Lyons folio, with an index of epistles and gospels. The 1670 Paris 16mo has the same 3 appendices, as does the 1685 Lyons 8vo and 1702 Venice folio. In short, those three appendices are standard through the 17th century (at least).

\textsuperscript{118} The very “lectiones diversae” of François-Luc de Bruges, the ones Bellarmino valued so highly, were bound as an appendix to the Sixto-Clementine Vulgates published in Antwerp (1603 folio, 1608 octavo, and 1618 quarto, 1624 folio, 1630 folio, etc.), as well as in Lyons (1604 octavo), Paris (1618 quarto), and Mainz (1609 quarto).
preface inaugurated a policy for “repressing the boldness” not of readers to interpret nor
of printers to choose paratexts, as the 4th session of the Council had instructed; rather, it
only repressed the Vulgate’s officially-commissioned, ecclesiastical editors themselves
from determining the meaning of text through stable paratexts. The commission just
reissued the “bare text” – they left it to others, in effect, to produce the apparatus that
could establish what the texts meant and how the bibles functioned. While the form of
the book had remained relatively sturdy, what had been forged as an unalterable Text
emerged as a malleable template. The plan for Roman centralization had been sabotaged
in Rome, by the one who has been regarded as “the very embodiment of Tridentine
Catholicism”.119 The principle of subsidiarity thus was planted at the founding moment
of the Tridentine Vulgate, and it ultimately would characterize the story of the Catholic
Bible in Europe throughout the early modern era.

III. Preface to the Other Readers?

Bellarmino discarded Sixtus’s perpetual Text concept because he believed textual
flexibility was necessary – true. But neither the Text nor flexibility was his primary
concern as he was trying to secure the vulgate’s paratexts. Bellarmino wanted to fashion
a particular book for a particular set of readers. As the last line of his preface makes
plain, the scriptural package that he envisioned would be “for the convenience and utility
of the studious” (pro studiosorum commoditate atque utilitate). In other words, he was

---

representation that Stefania Tutino endeavoured to deconstruct, at least with respect to Bellarmino’s
political thought in her recent monograph, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian
Commonwealth* (Oxford, 2010), see esp. 3-7.
targeting Latinate readers with academic interests who could afford to buy a “more full and substantial” codex. Even the trimmed down folio version, stripped of paratexts, that emerged from the commission in 1592 still might deter non-targeted readers on account of its language and bulk. How learned readers with personal wealth, patrons, or ecclesiastical resources appropriated the Tridentine Vulgate will be addressed later. What must be addressed now is the majority of readers that the form and idiom of this book appear to exclude – and the design that Bellarmino desired might have excluded them even further. Was there supposed to be a codex Bible for unlearned, vernacular readers further down the contemporary social hierarchy?

This version was intended for them, even if this book was not. One of the privileges included in the frontmatter was that of King Philip II’s Privy Council authorizing Jan Moretus in 1598 to publish this Bible “as much in Latin as in other languages.” The permission of the reigning secular authority to have this Vulgate translated, therefore, was displayed in the book itself. Less evident in the frontmatter was a position of the Catholic Church on vernacular translation. It was from elsewhere, from the appointed guardians of the book, that the clear message was supposed to have been transmitted within that first decade-and-a-half of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate’s existence, between when Bellarmino first composed his preface (1591) and when that preface was printed in Marwood’s Bible (1605). So it was in 1596 that the Index Librorum Prohibitorum proscribed vernacular Bible translation. It might be expected, given Bellarmino’s longevity within the Index and Inquisition and given the circumscribed audience that Bellarmino’s codicological design was targeting, that this blanket prohibition of vernacular scripture was consonant with the will of the biblical
commission and, in particular, with that of Bellarmino himself. A closer examination reveals an alternative story for the Bible’s preface-writer, as well as for the Church that he aimed to represent and for its Bible policy that he attempted to reconstruct.

**********************************************

Vernacular Bibles from the Council of Trent (1545-1563) to the “Tridentine Index” (1564)

Whether Bellarmino’s Church had an official policy on biblical access before the 1596 prohibition should be considered first. That question was addressed, in fact, in the opening months of the Council of Trent. After reaffirming the biblical canon that the Council of Florence had established in the previous century, the delegates at Trent weighed the status of the “received Vulgate” version and the permissibility of other versions and translations. Just one week before the Council solemnized its answer to these two interrelated questions, a revealing exchange between two of the delegates happened that would vindicate Bellarmino’s subsequent representation of the Council’s position on other Latin Bibles, which was quoted above (pp.27-9). Cardinal Pedro Pacheco, the bishop of Jaén in southern Spain, questioned the draft decree on the authenticity of the Vulgate that a conciliar subcommittee had prepared. To his mind, it was too tight-lipped. It approved the Vulgate, but it said nothing about other versions. Would that not lead, he asked, to the misunderstanding that other versions were
permitted?\textsuperscript{120} The Italian bishop of Fano, Pietro Bertano, who had helped draft the decree, immediately assumed the responsibility of explaining it. He could “resolve these problems easily”, he explained, because the “misunderstanding” that Cardinal Pacheco feared was actually the very interpretation that the drafters intended! The subcommittee indeed had recognized one common version for the purposes of “disputation, interpretation, and preaching”; yet they had refused to reject other versions besides the Vulgate, including even the translations of heretics, because they were “unwilling to restrict Christian liberty.” This position was not simply their own either, but rather the “example of the ancient church.”\textsuperscript{121} That the term “authentic” was not supposed to mean “exclusive” was thus made clear in 1546 when the council decided the matter. Yet since the council’s final decree generally preserved the abbreviated formulation of the original draft, some subsequent church authorities, not excluding Sixtus V, were able to interpret “authentic” in a more restrictive sense than Bellarmino believed legitimate.\textsuperscript{122}

Was this permission of other versions of the sacred scriptures supposed to extend to vernacular translations? On this more specific question, the Council delegates openly disagreed. Their conflict is depicted regularly as a clash of irreconcilable positions. Historians analyze it through value-laden categories derived from Italian Counter-Reformation scholarship: \textit{intransigenti} vs. \textit{evangeli} and \textit{spirituali}, with the latter pair promoting progress and reform in the Church, as the former persecutes them for doing just that.\textsuperscript{123} Here they focus on Cardinal Pacheco and his theologian Alphonso de Castro,

\textsuperscript{121} Merkle, \textit{CT}, 1: 42
\textsuperscript{123} John O’Malley showed that early modern Italian historiography (esp. Massimo Firpo) relies on this distinction, as does Anglophone synthetic history that relies on this scholarship. See O'Malley, \textit{Trent & All
OFM, as the representatives of an “intransigent” anti-vernacular party, while Cristoforo Madruzzo, the cardinal-archbishop of Trent and the council’s episcopal host, serves as the leader of the spirituali and the rallying point for lay access to scripture. These categorizations are not arbitrary. Certainly, these speakers were the loudest and most vigorous on any side. To Pacheco, the “innumerable heresies that have erupted throughout Christendom” can be traced back “to no other cause than the conversion of the sacred books into the vernacular.”

Appalled by presumptions of peasants and plebs to wrest the scriptures for themselves, Pacheco concluded, axiomatically, that it was “of the laity to learn and not to teach.” Madruzzo, on the other hand, in a speech that one historian designated “the high water mark in the history of the Bible in the Catholic Church”, promoted universal scripture access.

That (Harvard, 2000), 83-84. He did identify two English monographs that challenged the verifiability of a sharp distinction between these two labels: Elisabeth G. Gleason, Gasparo Contarini: Venice, Rome, and Reform (Berkeley, 1993) and William V. Hudon, Marcello Cervini and Ecclesiastical Government in Tridentine Italy (Dekalb: Northern IL Univ. Press, 1992).

124 Gigliola Fragnito, La Bibbia al rogo (Mulino, 1997), 75-95. This is the example par excellence of accounts that depict a Tridentine conflict between two implacable foes (the spirituali/evangeli vs. the intransigenti) through the notorious two figures: Pacheco vs. Madruzzo: "Fin dalle prime battute si delinearono due schieramenti fortemente contrapposti: l'uno - guidato dall'arcivescovo di Jaen, il cardinale spagnolo Pietro Pacheco - profondamente ostile alle traduzioni della sacra scrittura nelle lingue volgari; l'altro - che si riconobbe nel vescovo di Trento, il cardinale Cristoforo Madruzzo- favorevole alla loro diffusione tra i fedeli (p.75). Represented as completely opposed (76-79). Guy Bedouelle, Le temps des Réformes et la Bible (1989), 347-348, 468: briefly represents the debate at Trent as a "conflict based upon two conceptions of the Scripture and of the Church, or more exactly two traditions", one of the Spanish & French, "partisans of strict prohibition" (represented by Pacheco & Castro), and the other of the Germans, Italians, Poles, and doubtless other countries (represented by Madruzzo who "announced that the word of God ought to be communicated directly to every race, language and nation"). Even O'Malley’s own latest magisterial account of the Council, Trent (2013), 94, simplifies the debate to Madruzzo and those who thought scripture should be generally permitted vs. Pacheco and those who believed that vernacular scripture was the font of all heresies and should be banned.

125 CT I: 519
126 CT I: 520, 37, 43.
and promiscuously.” Even interpretation of the scriptures, through the publication of commentaries, should not be foreclosed to those who have no place in the hierarchy. The rhetorical contrast between the positions of Madruzzo and Pacheco could hardly be more stark.

The inclination to make these two cardinals represent two opposing camps comes not only from what they said, but from where they are from. Prior to the Council of Trent, access to vernacular bibles and testaments varied within the Catholic world. Civil and ecclesiastical policies were more restrictive in the lands of Spain and France than in Germany, Italy, and Poland. The President of the Council himself, Cardinal del Monte (the future Pope Julius III), recognized the divided landscape on this issue, and tried to communicate that to Pacheco in order to moderate him. The Spanish cardinal was uncowed. He disputed del Monte’s assessment of the Italians, who still comprised the majority of the delegates. He readily accepted del Monte’s assessment of Germany, however, because the specter of the German Reformation was, he believed, his strongest argument for a ban on vernacular scripture. Pacheco’s diagnosis of the Reformation—that the printed, vernacular bible was the decisive catalyst—would coincide with contemporary Protestant accounts and with most modern English historians who relied upon them, from John Foxe to A.G. Dickens. Madruzzo, on the other hand, did not find this explanation convincing. His bishopric of Trent was closer to Switzerland than Rome and he, along with the emperor Charles V, had determined to host the Council “within

129 CT I, 42-43; McNally, “Trent and Vernacular Bibles,” 222, 2224.
130 CT I: 518-19.
131 CT I: 519-520.
German lands.”\textsuperscript{132} How could Pacheco be an expert on what happened on Madruzzo’s side of the empire? He recalled his upbringing, when “every German father taught his son the dominical prayer, the symbol of faith, and many other things in German, and no harm has ever come from that.” Infuriated by the suggestion that it was lay contact with the scriptures that caused the schism in his native land, Madruzzo shifted the blame upon the learned: “The descent of wayward Hebrew and Greek professors upon the flock had caused so much misery in Germany.”\textsuperscript{133} The contrast between these two diagnoses of the cause of the Reformation goes some way toward explaining why Madruzzo supported the policies in Catholic Germany for the toleration of the vernacular Bible, while Pacheco supported the constraints on vernacular bible-reading in the kingdom of Spain. It also helps explain why these two cardinals are selected as the perfect representatives of a fundamental conflict between evangelicals and reactionaries.

Before we subscribe to the two warring-camp model, we ought to locate some of the other personages within it and listen to their voices. Tommaso Campeggio, bishop of Feltre in the Veneto region, expressed no doubt about what constituted the “greatest abuse of the scriptures”: it was “the unlearned and unstable distorting the scriptures to the destruction of themselves, just as St. Peter had said.”\textsuperscript{134} “Thus in Germany”, he claimed, advocates of communion under both species, clerical marriage, the renunciation of monastic vows, and the abrogation of fasting and eucharistic veneration have all matched “places of sacred scripture to bad interpretations.”\textsuperscript{135} This is not, however, Campeggio’s final word on the subject. His unmistakable contempt for the pretensions of the \textit{indocti}

\textsuperscript{132} See O’Malley, \textit{Trent}, 23-24, 75: Madruzzo was always identified in the conciliar documents as “Germanus.”
\textsuperscript{133} CT I: 37 (translation available in McNally, 214-15).
\textsuperscript{134} CT I: 503-504. For McNally’s discussion of Campeggio, see McNally, 210-211.
\textsuperscript{135} CT I: 502.
notwithstanding, Campeggio was yet unwilling to designate the translation of the scriptures into the vernacular languages as itself an abuse. He believed that the history of the church gave him no right to do so. For after all, he recalled, St. Jerome himself had issued a translation of the Mass in the Illyrian tongue.\textsuperscript{136} Campeggio’s conflation of precedents for vernacular scriptures and liturgies is no accidental slip. For he proceeded to describe how liturgical texts like offices, responsories, and the hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary might be better compiled and translated. He said nothing more about reading the entire Bible or New Testament because he believed that unnecessary. The liturgical texts are saturated with the scriptures, so that to permit translation of the one is tantamount to permitting it for the other. Moreover, he believed that attention to liturgical texts was more pressing. These were the sets of biblical passages and prayers that ordered the sacred rituals and, in effect, the community of the church. They also provided the matter for public exegesis – that is, for homilies. It is at this point in his oral remarks that Campeggio hints at the principle that distinguishes him from Pacheco. It seemed that the two of them had bundled together the German Reformation and vernacular bible-reading. Campeggio had not. He disaggregated reading from preaching, and it was the false preaching, the \emph{depravant} of the scriptures that most troubled him.\textsuperscript{137} That is why his final recommendations to the congregation all deal with the weeding, training, testing, licensing, and supporting of preachers. Imposing regulations on reading was not something that this Italian bishop and supposed member of the Pacheco camp expressed any interest in doing here.

\textsuperscript{136} CT I: 503. See also CT I 503 n.3 for a discussion of this translation’s authenticity, which Bellarmino disputed forty years later here: Bellarmino, “De Verbo Dei” in his \textit{Opera Omnia} (1870), I: 164.

\textsuperscript{137} CT I: 504.
The same could not be said for the Dominican theologian, Ambrosio Catharini. Catharini was invited to the council of Trent not by virtue of his office, since he was no bishop, but only by his former pupil Cardinal del Monte, on account of his theological expertise. One of the areas in which he claimed expertise was this exact subject. He published a treatise only six years later on “The Expediency of Transferring the Scriptures into the Maternal Languages.” Unlike Campeggio, Catharini directly opposed vernacular bible-reading. The sacred scriptures, he asserted, are difficult for anyone to understand. Grasping the true sense of the text, through all its figures and tropes, is even more difficult for the unlearned, let alone for the many readers who approach the text with evil intentions. As a result, what was necessary for the evangelical nourishment of all the faithful was not the general diffusion of scriptural translations so much as good preaching.\textsuperscript{138} Here his emphasis is the same as Campeggio’s. The word choice in the title of Catharini’s treatise, however, is highly significant: \textit{expedit transferri}. The ultimate purpose of this treatise was not to evaluate in absolute terms the rightness or wrongness of vernacular translation, though indeed he spilled most of his ink contending the latter. What he believed he ultimately needed to determine was what should be done given the contemporary circumstances of a fractured Christendom. Could the Catholic Church afford to “give heretics the occasion for denigrating us and pretending that we want to suppress the evangelical truths”?\textsuperscript{139} In this highly undesirable situation, Catharini decided, permitting vernacular translation would be the lesser evil. It would be akin to

\textsuperscript{138} Bedouelle, \textit{Le temps}, 472-3.
\textsuperscript{139} Ambrosius Catharinus Politus, “An expediat scripturas in maternas lingus transferri”, \textit{Enarrationes ... in quinque priora capita libri Geneseos} (Rome, 1552), fol.329-339, quoted in French in Bedouelle, \textit{Le temps}, 473: “Si on me conseillait de ne pas supprimer les traductions deja editees, sauf celles qui seraient fautives ou truquees, ou rendues scandaleuses par l’addition de scolies heretiques, voila pourquoi j’acquiescerais: ne pas donner aux malpensants l’occasion de nous denigrer et de pretendre que nous voulons supprimer les verites evangeliques.”
the Mosaic law allowing divorce, temporarily and under prescribed conditions, “on account of the hardness of hearts.” Catharini then sketched three conditions for approving vernacular bibles:

1. The translator’s name should be clearly visible. Anonymous or false imprints obstructed the execution of justice. It was too difficult to find someone to punish for errors discovered post-print, if a responsible party was not designated from the beginning.

2. Each edition should be inspected and should carry a certificate of approval from “competent, authentically Catholic men.” Perhaps surprisingly, Catharini said no more about whether these men should have a position within a Catholic university or within the hierarchy.

3. The scriptural text should be accompanied by sound paratexts. That meant that heretical glosses were forbidden, of course, but Catharini sought not simply to purge the paratexts, but to make them remedial. In his judgment, approved bibles should carry “a note of Catholic interpretation in the margins disputed by heretics.” In addition, prefaces should be added that would warn readers of the ease with which scripture could be misinterpreted, admonishing them instead to “observe all the customs of the Church, in obedience and conformity to the rules and traditions enunciated by the Fathers.”

Catharini, therefore, beckoned for paratexts that would both (a) secure the orthodox meaning of controversial passages and (b) command a deferential approach to scripture as a whole.

---

140 Catharinius, ibid., quoted in Bedouelle, *Le temps*, 473: “C’est, de ma part, une façon de tenir compte de la dureté des moeurs, ce n’est pas une recommandation.”

141 Catharinius, ibid., quoted in Bedouelle, *Le temps*, 473: “Quant a autoriser...discutes par les heretiques.”
Compared to Campeggio, Catharini was the more deliberate opponent of lay scripture-reading. Yet it was Catharini who formulated a specific plan for the approval and general circulation of Catholic vernacular Bibles. In either case, however, there was much more room for these Bibles among the anti-vernacularists than an emphasis on Pacheco’s hostile rhetoric would lead one to believe.

In fact, there was room for agreement even between Pacheco and Madruzzo. When we refuse to ignore the details hidden underneath their grand pronouncements, we find that the positions of these two champions also defy easy categorization. When Cardinal del Monte, the President of the Council, privately asked Pacheco to avoid another confrontation with Madruzzo, Pacheco revealed that he was not quite the absolutist on this subject that he purported to be in public. He might try to shift the center of debate by demanding a universal ban on vernacular scripture during the general congregations. Outside of that forum, however, he could acknowledge that no one on his side would forbid some books of the bible, like “the Proverbs of Solomon, the Psalms, the Acts of the Apostles and similar books.” At the same time, he observed, no one on the other side would “consent to place in the hands of peasants, laborers, and petty women (muliercularum) the Apocalypse of John, the Epistles of Paul (especially to the Romans), Ezekiel, and other sacred books that even the most consummate doctors of theology are not ashamed to admit that they do not understand.”

Pacheco was claiming that a general consensus already existed. Everyone at the council allegedly understood that

---

142 CT I, 520: “Nam neque qui affirmativam defendunt, consentient unquam apocalypsim Ioannis, epistulas Pauli, praesertim ad Romanos, Ezechielem et huiusmodi scripturae libros, qui adeo in quibusdam nobis obscuri sunt, ut ne doctores quidem consummatissimique theologi illos non intelligere asserere non erubescant, in manibus plebis, rusticorum et muliercularum tradi. At proverbia Salominis, psalmi, actus apostolorum et similes neque qui negativam asserunt prohibebunt unquam.” (My own translation; also translated by McNally, 218)
vernacular readers would not benefit from scrutinizing those books composed of abstract theology and obscure prophecies. Casual encounters with these scriptures frequently resulted in heresy and social unrest. These outcomes were more than unwelcome and could be avoided by reading instead what was supposed to be, in effect, a safe, inner canon featuring moral wisdom, prayers, and stories of holy men and women. The debate, Pacheco ultimately conceded, was not about whether the vernacular Bible would be banned, but about which books would be circulated.

Pacheco’s concession downgrades the anti-vernacularist position into something more like an inclination. This inclination was grounded in an acute awareness of the difficulties of scriptural interpretation, in the traumatic experience of a schism linked to scriptural reinterpretation, and in a theologized attachment to contemporary ecclesiastical, social, and gendered hierarchies. Yet, in the ascetical tradition, inclinations often required discipline or redirection. The anti-vernacularists surveyed here recognized that the inclination to restrict scriptural access had to be resisted if it interfered with worthy, religious ends. They expressed these ends in different terms. Pacheco emphasized moral and devotional growth while Campeggio focused on the liturgy and Catharini sought catechesis and the reunion of Christendom. Yet they all determined at Trent that an absolute ban on the vernacular scriptures would be either unreasonable or unjustifiable. It was not simply a proposal that they lacked the votes to enact.

The truth of Pacheco’s claim about the pro-vernacularists is another matter. Were most of them really committed to prohibiting vernacular editions of the “obscure” books? The extant sources do not resolve the question. What cannot be disputed is that
Madruzzo explicitly rejected that proposition in his famous “high-water mark” speech: no one should be denied access to any part of the Bible on account of any personal condition. During that same speech, however, Madruzzo interjected some other significant policy recommendations. First, he endorsed the use of the “old catechisms of the saints” as a way of imparting “evangelical rudiments” to children. The scripture-codex was not the most appropriate vessel of the Word for everyone nor for all functions. Second, acknowledging that some “places of the scriptures are ambiguous and difficult”, he confessed that “it would please him indeed” if “annotations and scholia would be added” to those places. And it was not just anyone who would author these glosses. There would have to be a formal, ecclesiastical commission. In fact, the annotators would be “learned and pious men selected from this venerable and ecumenical synod” – that is, from the Council itself. Third, the Church should exercise quality control over scriptural translations too, “forbidding all vernacular editions that have been corrupted.” Madruzzo appreciated the extensive ecclesiastical oversight that this proposal required: there would have to be licenses before any translation could be printed and more licenses before any printed edition could be sold. At the close of Madruzzo’s encomium to the vernacular Bible then, there was space for catechisms and authoritative annotations as well as approbations and even censorship. These qualifications have attracted much less attention in scholarly efforts to represent the pitched battle over the vernacular Bible at Trent. Recognizing their consonance with the practical solutions of anti-vernacularists like Catharini, however, is essential for understanding why this debate at the council ended not in a stalemate, but in consensus.

143 CT I: 530.
144 Despite quoting from Madruzzo’s oration at length, McNally omits this crucial concluding passage which might have altered his otherwise careful, systematic analysis of the vernacular bible debate at Trent.
It is also important to recognize that over the course of the Council, Madruzzo and Pacheco were much more likely to unite against other delegates. They banded together as reforming bishops of the Empire determined to root out notorious abuses such as episcopal absenteeism and pluralism (though only Pacheco could wage this battle of reform without irony, as Madruzzo possessed multiple sees and benefices). Together they resisted those Italian prelates whose role in the curia invested them in these very practices, and they fought back against the efforts of the legates to translate the Council into the papal domain. In sum, “reform” at the Council did not have a single trajectory. Both Pacheco and Madruzzo sought reform, but the rigid analytical categories imposed upon them obscures the extent to which they regularly did so together, even ultimately on the subject of the Bible. In the last general congregation, one day before the session in which the decrees on the canon and on the abuses of the scriptures were solemnly ratified, the secretary registered that “the greater part of the fathers approved the opinion of [the bishops of] Trent and Jaén.” Madruzzo and Pacheco, therefore, together affirmed the following remedies for contemporary scriptural abuses: (1) The Vulgate: that the Vulgate be “held as authentic” and henceforth “printed in the most correct manner possible; (2) Private Interpretation: that those who presume to interpret sacred Scripture contrary to the sense of the Church or the unanimous consent of the fathers – on matters of faith and morals -- be punished with the penalties established by law; (3) Accountability for Authors and Printers: that no edition of the sacred books be

145 See O’Malley, Trent, 81, 100.
146 See O’Malley, Trent, 110, 173. Here it should be noted that one category of Italian Counter-Reformation that actually emerged during the Council itself, the zelanti, was used to designate those delegates that would brook no challenge to curial privileges. Both Pacheco and Madruzzo were, nevertheless, regularly levying challenges.
147 CT I: 47-48.
printed or even circulated in manuscript if it is anonymous or if it has not been granted an approbation from the local Ordinary; (4) *Profanation of the Scriptures* - that penalties be renewed for those who treat the Scriptures irreverently, twisting it “to things scurrilous, fabulous, vain, to flatteries, detractions, superstitions, impious and diabolical incantations, sorceries and defamatory libels.”\(^{148}\) Despite the resonances of the last item, the vernacular scriptures were not recorded as a remedy or as an abuse. On that subject, each bishop would be left to determine the policy best suited to the needs of his own flock, just as Cardinal del Monte had advised. The principle of subsidiarity was affirmed here with the vernacular scriptures, as it would be later with the presentation of the Vulgate, and it was not so much the result of an ideological impasse as it was a reflection of the lack of absolutism on any side at Trent.

One final statement to consider on this subject is that of the pro-vernacularist, Gentian Hervet. Unlike the Italian representatives surveyed above, Hervet did not come to the Council from a realm in which vernacular bibles were circulating freely and legally. They had been condemned in whole or in part by French Catholic authorities in the church, the state, and the university throughout the first half of the sixteenth century.\(^{149}\) Hervet’s support of the vernacular bible, as well as Campeggio’s suspicion and Catharini’s qualified opposition, upsets easy identifications of positions on this subject with geopolitical allegiances. It suggests that the debate on the vernacular bible was not determined by an ineluctable conflict between France and Spain on the one hand.

---

\(^{148}\) For the decree, see Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees* (1978), 18-20.

and Germany, Italy, and Poland on the other – all the more so because Italy and France appeared to switch sides after the Council ended.

Hervet is better known among historians of ideas for what he did outside the Council of Trent. Occupying a firm place in both the canon of the “French Counter-Reformation” and the “history of skepticism”, Hervet was the one to inject the ancient skeptic Sextus Empiricus into Catholic-Protestant controversy. Having the Hypotyposes and the Adversus Mathematicos published together in Paris in 1569, Hervet transformed this first Latin edition of Sextus’s summative work into a “machine de guerre” against the epistemologies of his Protestant opponents. According to the preeminent historian of post-classical skepticism, Hervet formed “an alliance between the Counter-Reformers and the nouveaux pyrrhoniens” that for the next seventy-five years challenged the capacity of Calvinists to derive truths of faith simply by reasoning from the scriptures. Such reasoning would end always in doubt. It was necessary instead, Hervet concluded, to defer to the interpretive authority of the Church.\(^\text{150}\)

When Hervet appears in scholarship on the Council, however, his noteworthy career as innovative and aggressive counter-reformation polemicist is left unmentioned. He is introduced instead as a “learned humanist theologian” whose defense of the vernacular scriptures is an “excellent specimen of humanist theology.”\(^\text{151}\) Hervet entered the Council of Trent as a secretary to Cardinal Cervini. Cervini was one of the three papal legates directing the Council, and one of the two to vote with Madrzzo. The other, Cardinal Reginald Pole, who is identified as one of the most prominent “spirituali”

\(^\text{150}\) Henri Estienne published his own Latin translation of Sextus’s Hypotyposes first in 1562. Hervet combined Estienne’s text with his own translation of Adversus Mathematicos for the publication of 1569. See Richard S. Popkin, The History of Scepticism from Savonarola to Bayle (Oxford, 2003), 36-37, 66-75.

\(^\text{151}\) O’Malley, Trent (Harvard, 2013), 214; Bedouelle, Le temps, p.348.
of the whole era, also is identified as the “familier” of Gentian Hervet, in effect naturalizing Hervet’s commitment to lay Bible-reading. In sum, what is missing from our encounter with Hervet through the narrative of Trent is the important recognition that he might be counted among the “intransigenti” as well as among the “spirituali.” These categorical lenses, whether conceptual or geographical, here and elsewhere obscure as much as they illuminate. They predetermine conflict where a broad degree of consensus was possible and was, in fact, achieved.

That is not to say that Hervet’s defense of the vernacular scriptures was tepid or restrained. Far from it. In fact, in a number of critical places his pro-vernacular rhetoric even exceeded that of Madruzzo. The cardinal prelate of Trent had maintained that no personal condition at all would justify depriving someone of the scriptures. The French lay theologian, on the other hand, focused not upon the potential handicaps of non-traditional readers, but upon their supernatural nobility. Rejecting the classic biblical allusions with which some members of the council had attempted to denigrate them, Hervet declared that the unlearned were not the “swine” before whom Jesus had warned his disciples not to cast their pearls; rather, he continued, they were among the anointed ones whom the apostle Peter called a “royal priesthood” and a “holy nation.” If even the pagans could draw out the saving gospel message from reading the scriptures, as the eunuch did in Acts, so much more then these ones “who already have been redeemed by the very blood of Christ and reborn by the most holy waters of baptism”, should be permitted “to drink Christ from Christ himself.” Sacramental metaphors for scripture-

---

152 Bedouelle, Le temps, 348.
153 CT 12: 535: “Sed, qu[a]eso, videamus, quibusnam tandem argumentis suam tueantur sententiam. Dicunt, non esse margaritas porcis obiciendas (Matt 7:6); quasi vero porci dici debeat, qui Christi
reading emerged from the scriptures themselves. Laden with multivalent meanings, they were re-appropriated across the Reformation divide in the sixteenth century, as we shall see later in chapter four. Within the Catholic context, they could signify the centrality of the scriptures to Christian life and devotion, in the way that the “body and blood of Christ” so routinely was. On the other hand, the metaphors also could signify that just as the Eucharist is to be consecrated in church by priests only, periodically conferred by them to the laity, and otherwise solemnly shrouded in mystery and reverence, so also the scriptures are mediated exclusively by the clergy and ought to be received infrequently in ritualized spaces with awe and humility.

This hierarchical rendering, however, might be troubled by two elements of Hervet’s metaphor – the verb and the agent. First, “to drink Christ”, or to receive the sacramental chalice, was not a privilege ordinarily presented to the laity. In fact, it had become an explosive issue in the church, as reformers declared it to be not a privilege but a scriptural mandate. The controversial resonance of Hervet’s language would not have escaped many council members, who had just been reminded by Campeggio that the first of the most notable distortions of scripture was precisely this “mandate.” Second, and more importantly, Hervet’s metaphor encouraged non-traditional readers to drink Christ “from Christ himself”. The priestly mediator appears to be not just absent, but negated. Hervet reinforces this transgressive approach to lay reading when comparing the scriptures to manna. The comparison in itself is traditional. It was Hervet’s explanation of it that might have provoked some of the conciliar delegates: “as manna, scripture

\[\text{sanguine redempti in sanctissimo regenerationis lavacro renati sunt, quos cum Petrus “regale sacerdotium” et “gentem sanctam” (I Peter 2:9) appellet, non est quod quis eos non modo porcos, sed ne prophanos quidem existimet.} \]
suffices for everyone according to each person’s own capacity.”\textsuperscript{154} The Bible was self-modulating. No longer necessary then, it seems, is the ecclesiastical teacher or preacher, who relied on knowledge of persons and local conditions to differentiate – to assort the scriptures into varied, digestible portions and then carefully distribute each one among an unevenly prepared congregation. No, the scriptures themselves would satisfy the reader hungering for knowledge just as thoroughly as they filled the reader desiring virtue and righteous living.\textsuperscript{155} Here was an authentic member of the “spirituali”, an evangelist par excellence, a disciple of Madruzzo perhaps even greater than his master.\textsuperscript{156} Here also is the problem. How did it happen that after Trent this “humanist theologian” argued, quite vigorously, for the insufficiency of scripture alone?

The solution to the problem is not just chronological. That Hervet discovered the manuscripts of Sextus years after he touted the vernacular Bible at Trent is true, but that does not mean the discovery incited in him a fundamental change of heart. In fact, his positions before and after the Council are fundamentally compatible, and a further review of his proclamation on the vernacular scriptures will illustrate that. “The spiritual knowledge” that Hervet believed would come to readers of the vernacular bible was knowledge for spirituality – that is, for a relationship with the subject of the Bible, or for developing an intimate familiarity with God, especially by encountering the person of

\textsuperscript{154} CT 12: 536: “Mann[a]e certe cuiusdam instar est scriptura, que unicuique abunde pro captu suo sufficit.”

\textsuperscript{155} CT 12: 536: “Nam, et qui divino ingenio freti rerum ab omni materia abstractarum contemplationi se dedunt, habent quo suam scientie famem, prout homini datum est, ad satietatem expleant, et qui ad res agendas accedunt, habent in omni virtutis genere quo suo recte et honeste vivendi desyderio satisfaciant.”

\textsuperscript{156} In the introduction to his French translation of the decrees of the Council of Trent, Hervet singles out Madruzzo for his most effusive praise: “Et comme ainsi soit, que depuis trente ans en ca: & d’avantage, preque toute l’Allemagne ait esté par tout esbranslee de divers fôts de sectes & nouvelles heresies: neantmoins par la diligence & vigilance de tres-illustre, tres-religieux, & tres-humain Cardinal & Prince son Evesque Christofle madruce & autres tres-religieux Prelats qui l’ont precede, elle est demeuree ferme & stable en la foy, qu’elle a tousiers conservee entiere depuis sa conversion”. See Hervet, ed., \textit{Le saint, universel et general concile de Trente} (Paris, 1584), f.a4r.
Jesus in the Gospels. This knowledge then was not systematic theology let alone answers to the doctrinal controversies that were rupturing Christendom in 1546 as much as in 1569. These were not the proper objects of independent scripture reading. Doctrinal knowledge was taught and guaranteed by the Church. It was obscured when the Church was not teaching it. That was precisely the problem that Hervet identified at the Council. The clergy were supposed to be vindicating good doctrine by their example and preaching; instead, they were spreading vice and ignorance. How easy it was, then, for false preachers to come and steal the sheep that the pastors had abandoned. How would the sheep be saved? Not by snatching away their scriptures and starving them, Hervet objected. No, the sheep just needed to be tended again. Their episcopal pastors had to fulfill their duty to instruct them. And “if the bishops are who they ought to be,’ Hervet concluded, ‘then the Christian people will drink Christ out of his own sacred letters.” Hervet never softened his commitment to vernacular scripture reading. Likewise, his decisive commitment to the exegetical authority of the bishop -- and his belief that disastrous consequences followed when that authority was not exercised -- long preceded his meeting with Sextus.

157 CT 12: 535: “ipsi denique nostre religionis coryphei, qui virtutis exempla vulgo esse deebant, avaritia, ambitione, libidine, teterrimis humani generis pestibus refterti et propemodum obruti essent, perversorum autem dogmatum autores in cleri vitiiis, que negari non poterant, exponendis ad populi aures aditum munirent, que quidem ita audiebantur, ut non leviter eorum aures preterveheretur oratio, sed in eorum animis penitus insideret: facile fuit heresiarchis hoc iacto fundamento valida impiorum suorum domnatum moenia superstrue.”

158 CT 12: 535: “Quodsi perniciosissime huius secte, que magnam hodie Europe partem, pro dolor, occupavit, veram velimus causam et originem investigare, quod, cum pauci admodum episcopi suo officio fungerentur et partim gregem suum non solm non pascerent, sed etiam deglubarent, partim modo populum suis predicationibus et exhortationibus in officio non continerent, sed nec quis esset aut ubi esset grex suus, nossent...”

159 CT 12: 536: “Quod quidem meo certe iudicio tum demum pulchrre procedet, si ii sint qui debent antistites, et christianus populus ex ipsis sacris litteris Christum hauriat.”
Hervet diagnosed the Reformation in the same way that Madruzzo and Campeggio did. Lay bible-reading was not at the root of it. Negligence was. Reformers planted heresy while bishops were absent from their dioceses and lax clergy were homilizing “old wives’ tales.”\footnote{CT 12: 535: “presbyteri “scientiam Domini repulissent” (Osea 4:6), qui ad populum concionabantur, vel verbum Domini cauponarentur, vel pro Christi doctrina eam, que est “secundum huius mundi elementa” (Coloss 2:8), philosophiam vel aniles etiam fabulas (I Tim 4:7) docerent...”} To thwart the heretics then, the solution was episcopal residence, clerical training, and evangelical preaching. This remedy appealed to the Council, even to anti-vernacularists like Catharini who had been disputing the diagnosis. That is why Bishop Musso of Bitonto, only three days before the decrees on scripture were scheduled to be ratified, introduced three new reform measures that he believed should precede the list of four abuses – and the three measures dealt with different aspects of residency, training, and preaching.\footnote{McNally, “Trent and the Vernacular Bible”, 224; for Musso’s subsequent efforts to make these resolutions a reality in his post-Tridentine reform efforts, see Emily Michelson, “The power of the pulpit and the transmission of Trent in sixteenth-century Italy: Cornelio Musso and Franceschino Visdomini in the 1550s” in Languages of Power in Italy (1300-1600), ed. Daniel Bornstein and Laura Gaffuri, in press at Brepols (forthcoming, 2013). I am grateful to Dr. Michelson for allowing me to read an early draft of this publication.} Since it was quite late in the term, they ultimately were not proclaimed in the fourth session. They were not discarded, however; on the contrary, they set the reform agenda for the sessions thereafter. In the very next one, the Council established lectureships in Holy Scripture and penalties for bishops who did not discharge their obligation to “preach the holy Gospel of Jesus Christ” at least on Sundays and festivals, “lest that be fulfilled: The little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them [Lamentations 4:4].”\footnote{ Schroeder, Canons and Decrees (1978), 24-28.} This pastoral approach to nourishing the hungry people of God was effectively ratified as the primary way to address the cause of the Reformation.
Reading the vernacular scriptures wrongly then was only a problematic symptom of starvation. The *extent* to which reading rightly would be designated as part of the treatment depended on local evaluations and prescriptions. Madruzzo advocated general access to the sacred books provided that the institutional Church exercised rigorous control over their translation, printing, and exegesis, with the last affixed to the sacred page so as to command the reader’s attention and assent. Catharini’s proposal for the sacred books, as a way of addressing contemporary ills, was not much different. As an alternative, Campeggio accepted scripture-reading through the medium of liturgical manuals. Pacheco instead countenanced the circulation of some books for edification and devotion, but not others. All these modes of feeding the malnourished with the scriptures, Trent affirmed, *could be* accommodated to the different circumstances that bishops encountered in their own dioceses. In the meantime, however, the undernourished had been fed with false preaching, so now they *must* be succored with sustained preaching of the true Gospel. This was a historical judgment as much as a normative one, and it was one to which even delegates who believed that no one should be deprived of the sacred books could subscribe. The Council’s reform decrees of the fourth and fifth session then must be interpreted together. It was not simply a matter of punting on the vernacular bible in the face of irreconcilable conflict and clutching instead onto the one place where the warring parties would not disagree; rather, both decrees reflected substantive agreements that the majority of the delegates reached about the spiritual origins of Reformation divisions and about the guidelines for filling the pastoral deficits that these divisions exposed.
These substantive agreements at Trent were lost on Pope Paul IV, a zealous reformer of another stripe, who was elected after the 4th and 5th sessions and did not attend any part of the Council at all. In 1559, the Roman Index of Prohibited Books that he promoted and which later bore his name enacted tight restrictions on the circulation of sacred scriptures in the vernacular: if a bishop permitted them in his diocese, a reader still required a written license from his pastor or local inquisitor. When the Council of Trent reconvened, it was prepared to revisit the Index. Consumed with other matters, however, the delegates ran out of the time and will to prosecute this one; so, they remanded it to a papal commission of the Roman Index, which virtually recodified the Pauline license system in 1564. These systems were the policy of the Catholic Church, it was engineered and ratified not by the ecumenical council but by the Roman Index, which then a half-century later (1596) prohibited the vernacular Bible outright. Throughout the second half of the sixteenth century, Catholic sees outside of Rome embraced the conciliar principle of subsidiarity in determining the extent to which reading vernacular scripture would be a recognized part of their pastoral programs. “Tridentine Catholicism”, therefore, accurately described divergent policies of scriptural access in France, Spain, Poland and across the early modern world. Bellarmino, however, was operating in Rome and on the Index. Did this authority behind the Marwood Bible desire to restrict vernacular Bibles as much as did the Index of 1564, or even that of 1596? This question targets an individual person, but its answer should illuminate the extent to which the Roman Curia executed a unified and consistent vernacular Bible policy. The answer also will continue engaging the why question – not

163 Schroeder, Canons and Decrees (1978), 274-5.
just *why restrictions*, but why or for what purposes were Catholic authorities addressing the vernacular Bible at all.

The Vernacular Bible in Bellarmino’s *Controversies*

Fortunately for historians, Roberto Bellarmino published a lengthy statement on this very subject. Ten years before the Index’s absolute prohibition of vernacular bibles was released, Bellarmino issued the first volume of his magisterial defense of the Catholic Church, known as *The Controversies*. The volume begins with what Bellarmino believed was the most crucial issue of the Reformation controversy – not Justification and not Papal Supremacy, but rather “The Word of God.” He does not address the question of vernacular scriptures immediately. His preface begins, rather, with a central doctrine that he believes should unify Catholics and Protestants: that “the Word of God is the Rule of Faith.”

Bellarmino thoroughly explained how this point of agreement breaks down across the Reformation divide on the matter of biblical interpretation, but not until he returned to that subject in chapter three. The first chapter, instead, reemphasized the general concord amongst the Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists on the biblical canon, rallying these oft-opposed sides together against the “Anabaptists”, “Schwenkfeldians”, and “Libertines”,

who privileged the private illumination of the spirit over the dead letter of the book.\footnote{164}{Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini Politiani, Societatis Iesu, De Controversiis Christianae Fidei, Adversus Huius Temporis Haereticos, Tribus Tomis comprehensae. Editio Secunda Priore Correctior. Ad S.D.N. Sixtum V. Pont. Max. Cum Pont. Max. Caesar. Maiest. & Reip. Venetae Gratia & Privilegio. INGOLSTADII, Ex Officina Davidis Sartorii. Anno Domini M.D. LXXXVIII [1588]. Hereafter cited as Bellarmino, Controversiis. Hathitrust 1588 edn, pp. 1-2.} That is not to say that Bellarmino is irenic in this discursive coalition-building campaign. He does not spare his non-Catholic interlocutors, including Martin Luther and John Calvin, from caustic asides even while stressing their shared commitment to at least some notion of an authoritative scriptural canon. When he arrives at chapter two, however, and addresses the vernacular scriptures, he acknowledges right away that Catholics and Protestants disagree on this one.

“There is a controversy,’ Bellarmino begins, ‘between Catholics and heretics on whether it is right, or at least expedient, to have common use of the sacred Scriptures in the vulgar language.’ It is not possible to drive a wedge between magisterial Protestants and Anabaptists here: “all heretics of this age consent that the Scriptures should be permitted to everyone, and circulated in every native language even for the public recitation and singing of the divine offices.” Often enthusiastic about identifying differences among various groupings of Protestants, here he cites Calvin, Brentius, and Kemnitz to establish “what all heretics teach.”\footnote{165}{Bellarmino, Controversiis, 138 (HathiT); SCS Copy p.153.} Then Bellarmino assumes a defensive posture: he clarifies what the Catholic position is not. “The Catholic Church indeed did not prohibit vernacular translations altogether, as Kemnitz so impudently lied.”\footnote{166}{Bellarmino, Controversiis, 138 (HathiT); SCS Copy p.153.} It did impose some restrictions, however,
and for these Bellarmino explicitly affirms Rule Four of the Roman Index (1564) as the official statement:

The reading of those books will be conceded to those who can make fruitful use of them -- that is, those who have obtained the faculty from the ordinary. It is prohibited, nevertheless, that reading be conceded to all people, everywhere, without discrimination; and it is prohibited that the Scriptures may be recited (legantur) or sung publicly, for the common use of the Church, in the vulgar languages.\textsuperscript{167}

Bellarmino’s clarification then is that the Catholic Church says no both to an absolute prohibition and to a general permission, yes to vernacular reading licenses, and no to vernacular liturgy. Only the first two items of this series can be connected to the Rule that he cites. The third one, significantly, cannot. So where does it come from?

For the alleged ban on vernacular scriptures in the liturgy, Bellarmino invokes the Council of Trent. He also produces citations: Session 22, Chapters 8-9. What he does not produce are the relevant texts that accompany these citations:

Session 22:8: Although the mass contains great instruction for the faithful people, \textit{nevertheless, it has not seemed expedient to the Fathers that it should be everywhere (passim) celebrated in the vulgar tongue}.\textsuperscript{168} Wherefore, the ancient usage of each Church, and the rite approved of by the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches, being in each place retained; and, that the sheep of Christ may not suffer hunger, \textit{nor the little ones ask for bread, and there be none to break it unto them} [Lam 4:4], the holy Synod charges pastors, and all who have the cure of souls, that they frequently, during the celebration of mass, expound either by themselves, or others, some portion of those things which are

\textsuperscript{167} Bellarmino, \textit{Controversiis}, 138 (HathiT); SCS 153.

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur}.
read at Mass, and that, amongst the rest, they explain some mystery of this most holy sacrifice, especially on the Lord's days and festivals.

Session 22:9, Canon 9: If any one saith, that the rite of the Roman Church, according to which a part of the canon and the words of consecration are pronounced in a low tone, is to be condemned; or, that the mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue only (tantum); or, that water ought not to be mixed with the wine that is to be offered in the chalice, for that it is contrary to the institution of Christ; let him be anathema.

These two texts establish a more flexible position than the one Bellarmino put forth. The first proposes that mass should not be celebrated *everywhere* in the vernacular languages, and the second that mass should not be celebrated *only* in the vernacular. Neither one prohibits the vernacular liturgy, as Bellarmino suggests. Instead, they simply *permit* the ancient languages. All that the Council formally prohibits is the universal rejection of Latin, Greek and Hebrew.

Bellarmino may or may not have been aware that the conciliar decrees could not quite do the work that he expected them to do. His omission of the text is indeed suggestive. Perhaps to fill this evidentiary deficit for what he claimed was the position of the Church, he supplied other weighty authorities. First, the patristic-era bishop, St. Hilary of Poitiers, whose preface to the Psalms decided that the three languages with which Pontius Pilate proclaimed “Jesus of Nazareth King of the Jews” were the same three with which “the Sacrament of God’s Will and the coming of God’s Kingdom” chiefly (maxime) are preached. This dictum offers some ecclesiastical support for Bellarmino’s historical judgment that Latin, Hebrew, and Greek were the languages for

---

169 *aut lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere*
the sacred books since their inception. It might even reinforce his qualitative judgment that they outshine all other languages by virtue of their seniority, fullness, and gravity. 171 It, however, does not ratify Bellarmino’s own judgment as canonical or binding in the way that he represented it.

To make that case, he turned to two contemporary expositors of the Council. Both were involved, in varying degrees, with Bellarmino’s own order, the Society of Jesus. The first was the Polish Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius, bishop of Warmia, who welcomed the Jesuits into his diocese, entrusted to them several educational institutions that he had founded, and even kept a Jesuit confessor himself. That he maintained close ties with the order was not the only reason that this author of an oft-printed treatise On the Expresse Word of God was a likely source for Bellarmino here. 172 Hosius had also been a President of the Council of Trent, having been commissioned as one of the five papal legates for the third and final period (1562-1563). That meant, crucially, that he was not presiding (or even present) during the first period, when the Council debated and enacted the decrees on sacred scripture catalogued above. Hosius’s treatise did consider vernacular scripture reading in conjunction with the causes of the Reformation, yet it did not exhibit the range of opinions on the matter that had been ventured by the conciliar delegates before him. Considered an intransigento by some 173, he linked the spread of the Reformation with the circulation of the vernacular scriptures just as Pacheco had, though he did not follow Pacheco in countenancing the general circulation of certain books of the Bible deemed especially conducive to growth in virtue and piety. Hosius’s

171 Bellarmino, Controversiis, 139 (HathiT); SCS 154.
172 Hosius, De Expresso Verbo Dei (Dillingen, 1558), which was translated into German and Polish, as well as into English by Thomas Stapleton as The Expresse Word of God (Louvain, 1567).
173 O’Malley, Trent, 175.
conclusion instead anticipated the Fourth Rule of the Roman Index (1564), favoring general restrictions on reading the Bible but permitting licenses. He also lobbied King Sigismund to make no concessions to the Protestants, particularly with respect to offering the Eucharistic cup to the laity. Though he devoted almost a third of his treatise specifically to that, which certainly is integral to the liturgy of the mass, Hosius did not address the subject of the vernacular liturgy directly. The second expositor that Bellarmino selected, however, did so at great length.

Bellarmino introduces Diego Ledesma, S.J., one of his colleagues at the Collegio Romano, as “Presbyter of our Society.” Until his death in 1575, Ledesma was undertaking the construction of a uniform curriculum for Jesuit education, known ultimately as the Ratio Studiorum (more in Chapter 2). His working drafts on the study of the humanities “express[ed] the reactionary sentiments of the anti-paganizing school [within the Order]”, according to one prior historian.174 Ledesma inserted into his curriculum a short catechism, which he composed himself, for the teaching of both grammar and Christian doctrine. It was his treatise on the vernacular scriptures, however, that determined Bellarmino’s approach to the same subject in his Controversies. Bellarmino cited Ledesma without naming his treatise, though the title of the treatise itself proved decisive: *On the Holy Scriptures, which should not be read everywhere (passim) in whatever tongue; and likewise on the Sacrifice of the Mass and other offices in the Church of Christ, which should be celebrated only (tantum) in Hebrew, Greek, and

---

Latin, contrary to the Heretics of our time (Cologne, 1574). The phrases here are familiar, because they mirror the language of the Council of Trent’s Session 22, chapters 8 and 9, which were reproduced above. That is why they are misleading; for the second part of the title reflects chapter 9 but inverts its meaning. The canon of chapter 9 condemns those who maintained that the Mass and other offices should be celebrated in the vulgar only (tantum). That legitimates the celebration of the liturgy in non-vernacular languages, particularly Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. The title goes much further: by switching the referent of the modifier tantum, it appropriates the conciliar formula to declare these languages not just legitimate, but exclusive. The Council had held that the Mass should not be celebrated in the vernacular everywhere; by Ledesma’s reckoning, Trent now held that it should be so celebrated nowhere. The latter becomes Bellarmino’s starting point.

As Bellarmino proceeds to justify his Church’s alleged prohibition of the vernacular liturgy and restriction of vernacular bible-reading, he draws from Ledesma’s treatise both content and structure. Like Ledesma, he begins by showing that the decrees of the Council and the rules of Index coincide with the consistent practice of the universal church to make Hebrew, Greek, and Latin the scriptural languages, rather than the vernaculars. They first summon scripture to be its own witness, since they believe it testifies to a history of liturgical reading only in one of these three languages, even though the vernacular for the Jewish people had become Chaldean or Syriac since the Babylonian Captivity. The “universal people”, hence, could not understand the book of

175 Diego de Ledesma, De Divinis scripturis quavis passim lingua non legendis: simul et de Sacrificio Missae, caeterisque officiis in Ecclesia Christi, hebraea tantum, graeca, aut latina lingua celebrandis, adversus nostrae aetatis haereticos liber unus, Cologne, 1574.
the Law when it was read to them in 2 Esdrae 2:8, until Esdras and Nehemias interpreted it for them.\textsuperscript{176} The same held true for the Jews presently, both Bellarmino and Ledesma maintained, where in every synagogue the Scriptures are read in Hebrew though Hebrew is not the vulgar language of a single nation.\textsuperscript{177} The appeal to contemporary Jewish practice is somewhat bold. The two Catholic theologians would have known that locating veritas in hebraica would resonate with their learned Protestant counterparts in matters of biblical exegesis, but not as much for determining the forms of Christian piety.\textsuperscript{178} More likely the opposite, since they frequently appropriated the Pauline rebuke of Judaizing against contemporary Catholic devotion. With that in mind, perhaps, they argued that the evangelists themselves did not offer a precedent for superceding Jewish practice here. They invoke various places where Jesus’s direct speech approximates Syriac (Mk 4, Mk 14, Mt 27), confirming that language as the vernacular of his community, whereas the language of his synagogue was Hebrew and that of the Gospels was Hebrew or Greek.\textsuperscript{179} This bifurcation of scriptural and vulgar languages perdured throughout the apostolic and patristic ages, when “the Church was founded in the East, in Libya, Egypt, Hispania, Germany, and the lands of Italy and Gaul.”\textsuperscript{180} That is evidenced, they submit, by the absence of all evidence to the contrary: despite the wide variety of maternal languages of all these people, “not one vestige of apostolic writing is extant,

\textsuperscript{176} Bellarmino, Controversii, 139 (HathiT); SCS Copy 154; Ledesma, Divinis Scripturis, 27.
\textsuperscript{177} Bellarmino, Controversii, 139-40 (HathiT); SCS 154; Ledesma, Divinis Scripturis, 27-31.
\textsuperscript{178} The concept was not embraced by other eminent Catholic theologians either, including Melchior Cano, which Bellarmino acknowledged. See Bellarmino, Controversii, 87 (HathiT); SCS 121.
\textsuperscript{179} Bellarmino, Controversii, 139 (HathiT); SCS Copy 154; Ledesma, Divinis Scripturis, 20-27.
\textsuperscript{180} Bellarmino, Controversii, 140 (HathiT); SCS Copy 154; Ledesma, 9-20.
except in Greek; and nothing of the fathers unless in Hebrew, Greek or Latin. Besides, Paul did not use Latin when it was the vernacular – he wrote to the Romans in Greek.”

Bellarmino then delivers collections of positive testimony, pausing in each region where the Church was established to show that the vernacular language was something other than the language in which the scriptures were circulated and read publicly. In North Africa, for instance, where Augustine and Jerome testified that the spoken word was Punic or Phoenician, the same likewise affirmed that the Psalms were sung in Latin in Church and the prefaces of the Mass were recited in Latin (Sursum corda; Habemus ad Dominum; Dignum et Iustum est; etc.) along with the Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels.

In Spain, similarly, where a variety of Greco-Gothic languages allegedly flourished, Isidore recorded that Latin was for the “public use of the Scriptures”, that is “singing the Psalms in Mass, in Lessons, and in other ecclesiastical offices.” Bellarmino skips rather briskly across England, where he makes a passing nod to the possibility that Bede indeed might have accepted some translations in maternal languages; be that as it may for a few people, he decides, the Latin edition of the Scriptures was still used by all.

Bellarmino extracted the kernel of this geographic excursus from Ledesma, but grew it from two paragraphs to fifteen. Throughout this terrain, Bellarmino emphasized the absence of vernacular liturgy even more than vernacular scripture-books, again exemplifying the relative importance of the former issue to him.

Then followed the “so what” question. Bellarmino anticipated that he could not satisfy his interlocutors by showing that it was the common practice of the Church to

---

181 Bellarmino, *Controversii*, 140 (HathiT); SCS Copy 154-155.
182 Bellarmino, *Controversii*, 141-2 (HathiT); SCS 155-6.
183 Bellarmino, *Controversii*, 142 (HathiT); SCS Copy 156.
184 Bellarmino, *Controversii*, 142-3 (HathiT); SCS 156.
reserve the Scriptures in Latin. He also would be asked to explain why it should continue to be. One approach was to push forward Augustine, and allow him to chide the questioner for having “the most insolent insanity” to dispute the universal consent of the Church.\textsuperscript{185} He did that first, but then he tried offering a positive argument. Latin is necessary for the sake of unity: “if the \textit{public use} of the Scriptures be not in the common tongue (i.e., Latin), then the communion of the Church will be dissolved” (my emphasis).\textsuperscript{186} But ecclesial unity had been compromised already. And as the holder of the Collegio Romano’s Chair of Controversies in the decades after Trent, Bellarmino had been recalling the church’s divisions with every lecture. Hence, his acute sense of the need for unity within the Church that remained, unity expressed publically and mystically through the liturgy. He lamented that if there was no common language for the scriptures, then neither the learned nor the unlearned would go to Church outside their own homelands, because the bonds across them would have broken. He even suggested that General Councils would be impossible – “that is, unless all Fathers of the Council were given the gift of tongues.”\textsuperscript{187} Bellarmino’s sudden jest, his attempt to dismiss the public use of non-Latin languages through \textit{reductio ad absurdum}, only underscores the gravity with which he weighed the Latin liturgy. It was that aspect of the question of vernacular scriptures that fundamentally shaped his response here.

That does not mean that his \textit{Controversies} never addressed vernacular translation in any supra-liturgical context. He just got there in a roundabout way, through the liturgy. For he next addressed the objection that while there might be unity if the

\textsuperscript{185} Bellarmino, \textit{Controversiis}, 140 (HathiT); SCS Copy 155.

\textsuperscript{186} Bellarmino, \textit{Controversiis}, 144 (HathiT); SCS Copy 157. Cf. Ledesma, 121-126.

\textsuperscript{187} Bellarmino, \textit{Controversiis}, 144 (HathiT); SCS Copy 157.
scriptures are read and the mass celebrated in Latin, there will not, however, be understanding. He begins his extended response to this objection, which extends through the next two chapters and forms the subject of his treatise’s next tome in its entirety, with what appears to be another flippant remark: “The people certainly will not understand the Prophets, Psalms, and other texts that are read in the Churches even if they are translated in the mother tongues. For indeed those of us who know Latin still cannot understand the Scriptures on that account, unless we read or hear expositors on them.” With this statement, it seems that at best, Bellarmino is expressing his consistent desire for glossed bibles that would resurface through his later observations about the prospective form of the Tridentine Vulgate. At worst it seems an artful dodge of what should be an obvious truth – that one can understand a foreign text at least marginally better when it is read or recited in a language that one actually knows. It was not a dodge, however, because Bellarmino did not recognize it as true – not for this text. In his next tome on scriptural interpretation, Bellarmino emphasized the supine “obscurity of the scriptures” regardless of language. They were “not open in themselves” for the finite human mind to draw out of them the resolutions to the doctrinal controversies that had sundered Christendom. Following Gentian Hervet and the new strain of pyrrhonian skepticism in post-Tridentine apologetics, Bellarmino attempted to show that reasoning from the scriptures alone produced only doubt. Authoritative interpretation instead was the way to understanding. Tight restrictions on bible-reading, however, did not necessarily coincide with this epistemological position; Hervet embraced Sextus Empiricus while at
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189 Bellarmino, Controversiis, 157-198 (HathiT); SCS 167-193.
190 Bellarmino, Controversiis, 157 (HathiT); SCS 167.
191 For more on this subject, see Daniel Cheely, “‘Can it be that a sole authority remains?’ Epistemological Conundrums in Post-Reformation Polemic”, The European Legacy, 2014, 19 (7): 819-832.
the same time promoting general circulation of the vernacular scriptures. For if Latinists could gain understanding by reading or hearing the scriptures with expositors, then why not the *vulgus*, too? Nothing in Bellarmino’s major premise here ruled out the conclusion of Hervet’s hero, Cristoforo Madruzzo, that the vernacular scripture-books could be distributed widely *with* authoritative expositions affixed to them.

Bellarmino required a minor premise, therefore, and immediately delivered it: “the scriptures become *even more obscure* when transferred into the pilgrim languages.” 192 The pilgrim languages, he claimed, were still immature and relatively unstable. Since they change with every generation, “as Horace reports and experience shows”, every generation would require a new translation. 193 Finding suitable, authoritative interpreters to re-translate the scripture so frequently in every language is difficult. Committing errors during the process, however, is easy, and the damage done thereby is not easily undone. It is dangerous, therefore, to rely on the vernacular languages “*when the sacred Scriptures are publicly read.*” 194 Here again Bellarmino situates his criticism of the vernacular within a liturgical context, leaving more ambiguous his position on reading the vernacular scriptures outside of it.

That ambiguity dissipated throughout the rest of this chapter, however, where Bellarmino considers the limitations not so much of the vernacular language, but of the vernacular reader. Bellarmino’s debt to Ledesma’s treatise is especially visible here. Ledesma’s first section, just as Bellarmino’s, attempted to show *that* the scriptures, especially in liturgical contexts, had not been read or recited in the vernacular throughout
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192 Bellarmino, *Controversiis*, 145 (HathiT); SCS 157; Cf. Ledesma, 149-152.
193 Bellarmino, *Controversiis*, 146 (HathiT); SCS 158.
194 Bellarmino, *Controversiis*, 146 (HathiT); SCS 158.
the history of Judaism and Christianity. His second section set out to explain why it is not expedient that “either the sacrifice [of the Mass] or the divine office is celebrated everywhere in the vernacular.”

Ledesma establishes a liturgical scope for this whole section, and his first chapter within it (Chapter 17) therefore fittingly proposes that the public reading of scriptures in one language (Latin) promotes and protects unity.

Bellarmino began the same way. Ledesma’s next two chapters within this same section on the liturgy (Chapters 18-19), however, seem to shift to a setting outside of it, considering the unlearned, or idiotae, as readers. What is deficient now is not the vernacular language per se, but the reading strategies of those who have access to it.

Ledesma claims that they “cannot distinguish among tropes, parables, and figures of speech”; they consider instead “every single piece separately without knowing how to confer with what comes before or after, such that they are easily able to err.”

This myopic literalism is especially destructive when the vulgar reader encounters two passages that “appear contrary, which indeed are many.”

Ledesma then recounts a formidable list of these apparent contradictions (and professes that he “could add six hundred more”), which lead these readers “to doubt, vacillate in faith, or rashly reject another part of scripture as heretics often do.”

If heresy is one problem, immorality is another. Because they tend to focus on the letter, the unlearned often extract only the “carnal sense”, and lose the spiritual one. At the end of another long list of scriptural
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195 Ledesma, *Divinis Scripturis*, 121 (H5r).
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passages featuring fornication, lying, theft, drunkenness, and murder, Ledesma affirms the testimony of Paul (2 Cor 3) that “the Letter kills, but the spirit gives life.” 199

Proceeding apace with Ledesma, Bellarmino asks, “what if the people draw not only fruit from the Scriptures, but also harm?” 200 He first covers the same historical ground tread by Ledesma’s treatise in order to substantiate the provocative claim that he frequently attributed to Luther, that Scripture is the “book of heretics.” 201 His next step is to argue that misunderstanding Scripture leads not just to heresy, but to irreligion. He reproduces the same passages adduced by Ledesma, showcasing the “adultery of David, the incest of Thamar, the deceit of Judith, and the inebriation that Joseph planned for his own brothers.” 202 These and numerous others “provoke the simple either to imitate or to scorn the holy Patriarchs.” 203 Neither option, he feared, was good for Christianitas. Bellarmino here interjects his own story about a Calvinist minister who “in his temple read Ecclesiastes 25 in the vernacular, where much is said concerning the viciousness of women. At this point, one woman rose up and said: Is this really the word of God? It sounds to me more like the word of the devil.” 204 Bellarmino’s own example returns again to the liturgical setting, where he fears that a faith in vernacular scriptures might lead the simple “to believe nothing.” 205

Bellarmino appends a final subsection to his chapter on the vernacular scriptures, entitled “Responses to the objections of the heretics.” None of these responses escape his
liturgical framework for proceeding. Returning to John Calvin’s objection that “there is nothing useful in prayer not understood,” he responds that, on the contrary, Calvin understands nothing about prayer. “The prayer of the Church,” he contends, ‘is not directed fundamentally to the people, but to God on behalf of the people.” So, it matters not that the rusticus understands it. If God understands the petition of his intercessor, then it is still profitable to him. Bellarmino envisions the liturgical prayer of the Church very much within a sacerdotal intercessory context. When the scriptures are integrated in that prayer, they are no longer a text – at least not one for the purpose of human understanding. That means that the priority for Bellarmino in reciting them is not accessibility but reverence, and he believes that the vernacular language is not conducive to that second end. The Church has always believed the same, he reports, because even when various dioceses were permitted to celebrate Mass in the vernacular, it was only a temporary dispensation until the infant missionary church trained up ministers adequately in Latin, as was the case in Slavonia. It is not that popular understanding should never be prioritized in church, just not in the rituals of worship, which includes the recitation of the Scriptures. The homily is different: it is not read as a set formula, but must be accommodated to the listeners. Just as Jesus preached in Aramaic, so too the

206 Bellarmino, Controversiis, 150 (secundo obiectio), repeated 153 bottom (HathiT); SCS 161, 163.
207 Bellarmino, Controversiis, 151 (HathiT); SCS 161. Bellarmino added two more explanations, which worked at cross-purposes, on the profitability of Latin prayers for the one who understand only the vernacular. The first invoked the metaphor of medicine – it cures whether or not one understands how it works. The second inverts, unwittingly it seems, the same image. What matters is not the words of the prayer, even if it be corrupted and “full of poison”, but the affectus of the one who prays. These two explanations cannot both be true about the same object. That Bellarmino employs one right after the other underscores how urgently he sought to defend non-vernacular prayer with any discursive weapon that came to hand.
208 Bellarmino, Controversiis, 146 (HathiT); SCS 158.
209 Bellarmino, Controversiis, 153, 155-158 (HathiT); SCS 162-3, 164-5.
priest must explain the gospel in the vernacular. In the homily, the sacerdotal interpreter ruminates on the scriptures in order to deliver it to people “pre-chewed” (praemansum), in digestible portions, before moving on to the liturgy of the Eucharist, where he similarly breaks up the consecrated host for his people’s consumption. The homily then is the place for understanding, since understanding comes, as Bellarmino argued before, through authoritative exposition.

In short, Bellarmino declares that the vernacular does not belong in the sacred rites of the church, and the public recitation of the scriptures is a constituent part of those rites. It is clear that the liturgy is his emphasis in this treatise; yet it does not wholly contain the anti-vernacular sentiments that sometimes overflow, spilling out on all sides. For instance, when responding to Kemnitz’s argument that there is nothing particularly special about Latin that might not also be said of other languages, Bellarmino offers what might be a surprising concession. He agrees. “We do not say,” he clarifies, ‘that it is holy or serious in an intrinsic way, with respect to its own words, but that it is more worthy of being revered because it is not the vernacular.” Even English, for that reason, could become an acceptable liturgical language, but only when and where it was no longer spoken commonly. What is especially important to Bellarmino are the “many sacred mysteries that ought to be kept secret.” Bellarmino’s obvious referent here would be to the “Secret” of the Mass, including the words of consecration, which the liturgical rubrics instructed the priest to mumble privately. That the people might usurp
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these sacred formulas for magical or profane purposes had long vexed the hierarchy. But Bellarmino’s anxiety about the encroachments of the vulgus, as expressed in the paragraphs that immediately followed, appeared to be more far-reaching. He quotes the testimony “of two of the most grave Fathers, Basil the Greek and Jerome the Latin”, against the position “that all men without discrimination should handle (tractarent) the Scriptures.” In the first case, Basil rebukes the “prefect of the kitchen” for carrying forth on the Scriptures: “It is yours to reflect upon the dishes, not to cook the divine dogmas.” The second is selected from Jerome’s Letter to Paulinus, which was a standard preface in virtually every edition of the vulgate printed in the early modern era:

The medics deal with what is of medicine and the carpenters with the materials of their own craft; the art of the Scriptures is the only one that all people everywhere claim for themselves. Everyone, whether learned or not, dares to write poetry; this garrulous hag, this delirious old man, this voluble sophist, this whole universe presumes to teach and to mangle before they have learned.

In both places, Bellarmino appears to make language a proxy for discriminating between different sorts of people. Latin should serve as a barrier to scriptural access, whatever the context, so that the vulgar do not sully the divine by their treatment of it. Bellarmino here expresses a more totalizing opposition to the vernacular, anticipating to some extent
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the general lament upon the “book thus placed in every vulgar hand” offered up by the English poet John Dryden in the following century.\textsuperscript{218}

After reviewing Bellarmino’s consideration of vernacular scriptures in his \textit{Controversies}, two questions remain. First, how do we account for the more general antipathy toward vernacular translation that Bellarmino ultimately displays? Second, why was he disproportionately focused on the liturgical context of vernacular scripture-use until then? To address this second question first, we might recall the reasons that Bellarmino adduced for the Latin liturgy: it unifies Christendom; it better preserves the public text from the potential corruptions that accompany frequent translation into volatile languages; it enhances the sacrality of the text and reverence for its divine author during solemn acts of worship; it safeguards sacred mysteries from profanation; it protects the \textit{vulgus} from direct contact with discrete passages which might lead to confusion, heresy, immorality, or irreligion; and it prevents them from usurping the priestly role of authoritatively interpreting the scriptures from the pulpit. All of these reasons suggest the centrality of the liturgy to Catholic thought and piety during this era, which should come as no surprise; but it also suggests that the question of the “vernacular scriptures” was thoroughly embedded within this liturgical imagination, and could not be easily dissociated from it. The main event, at least for Bellarmino, was what was happening in church and in ritual. The democratization of private, silent, domestic scripture reading was, furthermore, an impossibility of contemporary education and literacy rates. To the extent that we prioritize the search for official policies or responses to a transhistorical question of Scripture Access -- where Scripture is conceived as the

entire text (and only the text) of the Bible packaged in a single codex and where Access is conceived as the capacity for autonomous interactions in private spaces between individual readers and the books in their hands -- we prioritize ahistorically. It is not that Bellarmino and contemporary ecclesiastical authorities could not even conceive of this notion; they certainly could. Bellarmino explicitly rejected it. It is just not what he devoted much space to disputing. It was not his primary concern, nor that of the other churchmen whom he was following. Is that because it also was not the primary concern of those they sought to pastor, including the readers among them, both Latinate and vernacular?

That crucial question -- whether Catholic authorities like Bellarmino, who framed the question of the vernacular scriptures liturgically, were responding to the urgent concerns of other early modern Christians or whether they were out of touch with the same -- cannot be fully answered from this source. Appreciating the genre of the Controversies is important. It certainly was a polemic, in that the author was attempting to debate and discredit those whom his title labeled “the heretics of our time.” It was not supposed to be, however, only a polemic. Bellarmino scorned “mere controversialists”, those who satisfied themselves tearing down the systems of others without solidifying their own.219 The Controversies, then, was also and perhaps more fundamentally an apologia. Against the objections and accusations of his interlocutors, Bellarmino tasked himself with supplying the public defense of the Catholic Church, which included those voices within the established spectrum of orthodoxy who demanded more severe restrictions than anything ratified at Trent. He defended the Roman Index’s restrictive

program of reading licenses for vernacular bibles. Then on the vernacular liturgy he defended an even more restrictive position – an absolute prohibition – which two of his trusted colleagues had espoused. If he could legitimize the positions most antithetical to those of his Protestant interlocutors, then he could vindicate the whole of Catholicism. While that recognition makes it possible to read the *Controversies* as something of a guide to the hard-line position on vernacular scriptures in the contemporary Roman Catholic world, it makes it much more difficult to rely upon as the standard of official Roman policy, let alone as a measure of Bellarmino’s own commitments. Still, there is selectivity in Bellarmino’s focus that requires further interpretation. It is clear that the sources he chose to rely upon while composing his chapters on the vernacular scriptures privileged a liturgical framework for considering them. How committed was Bellarmino to the more general anti-vernacularism surrounding that framework, which he allowed to enter with it into his own treatise?

To determine whether Bellarmino was more open to vernacular Bibles than he revealed in his public defense of the Church, we would need to find other sources, likely internal ones, where he expressed himself differently. There is an obvious place to look for them. We should recall that Bellarmino held multiple jobs over the course of his ecclesiastical career. Before ever becoming bishop or cardinal, he indeed occupied the Collegio Romano’s newly formed Chair of Controversies from 1576 to 1588. He served there quasi-officially as the champion of Catholicism, especially once his *Controversies* were first published in 1586. Only one year later, however, and before he left his teaching post at the College, he began serving as a censor for the Roman Index. It was in that capacity that he was invited to join the papal commission of Sixtus V to emend the
“authentic” Vulgate, to retract and re-emend it for Clement VIII, and to compose the well-known preface that organized the Bible read by Thomas Marwood. It was in that capacity, too, that he was charged with handling those requests for reading licenses inaugurated by the “Tridentine Index” of 1564. So it is there that we should find evidence for how Bellarmino reckoned with individual vernacular readers, outside the public eye.

*******************************************************

The Vernacular Bible in Bellarmino’s Manuscripts

If forbidding books was a vital component of Counter-Reformation catechesis, so too was selectively permitting them. The enormous task of expurgating books in order to make them “safe” again for circulation was inconceivable for the limited staff of the Roman Index without the massive support of unpaid, non-curial readers. Vernacular bibles, therefore, were not the only books for which the reading license system was established. Before attempting to understand how Bellarmino dealt with bible requests then, we ought first to appreciate the contexts in which other forbidden books were made available. Pope Pius IV promulgated the Tridentine Index in 1564 and authorized Cardinal-Inspectors the same year to dispense licenses for reading prohibited books. Seven years later his successor, Pius V, created the Congregation for the Index in order to perform many of the functions that the Inquisition was determined to retain. Although the licensing practices of these two notorious institutions of church discipline often
conflicted, they still converged around a few general guidelines. The formula printed on the licenses of the Index stipulated that all privileged readers “should be considered learned, sound, prudent, and moreover pure in the Catholic faith.” Holy orders, religious vows, or social position – none of these were included among the conditions for access. “Learning”, however, frequently but not always served as a proxy for all three. These readers, furthermore, also were enjoined to use their books *clam et sine aliorum scandalo*, or “secretly and without scandalizing others.” These licenses, in other words, were not supposed to be a way for the church to allow a broad readership of potentially dangerous texts, excluding only the segment of at-risk readers; rather, in the perception of the general populace, these books were meant to remain completely forbidden.

Different genres of prohibited books translated into different requirements for access. Astrological, natural philosophical, and legal texts, which had been withdrawn *donec corrigatur* (“until corrected”), could be dealt to vouched-for medics and lawyers, as one license stated, “not from a desire for vain and pernicious knowledge but only for that which concerns their profession.” These professional terms of dispensation, however, were irrelevant when it came to lascivious literature. Contemporary hierarchies of gender and education could be inverted, in this case, as the “novellas” of Ariosto and Boccaccio were denied Francesco Bernardini, the theologian of the Collegio Ambrosiana
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di Milano, but granted during the same temporal cycle to the reclusive gentlewomen Angela Bianca and Battina Spinola in order to distract them from illness.\textsuperscript{223} When confronted with requests for both these professional and literary works, censors made certain items from the Index temporarily available for a private end; and that end was supposed to be consonant with the book’s fundamental purpose, whether it was to impart practical knowledge or to entertain.

The opposite was true for theological treatises deemed heretical. For these higher risk privileges, ecclesiastical authorities demanded a higher return. Roberto Bellarmino, who served in both the Index and the Inquisition, licensed Catholic polemicists to read heretical works for the public discursive function that their refutations were expected to perform.\textsuperscript{224} He also permitted some trustworthy pastors to read the ones disturbing and scattering their flocks in order to usher them back into the fold with the force of counter-argument.\textsuperscript{225} In short, condemned theological works were entrusted only to renowned, dissident readers. They would read them against the purpose of their authors in order to confound them. To which category of reader and reading did licenses for vernacular Bibles belong?

The Tridentine Index of 1564 formulated a model answer: obedient, pious readers for private, devotional benefits. Its Rule Four stipulated that “the bishop or inquisitor may with the advice of the pastor or confessor permit the reading of the Sacred Books

\textsuperscript{223} ACDF, Indice IX, Licentiae Legendi Nonnullos Prohibitos, To.IV, 1628-1632. Angela Bianca [Mellabarba, nobile di Pavia], ff.31r, 38v; Battina Spinola [del s\textsuperscript{a} Franco, Nobile di Genova] ff.65r, 83v; Francesco Bernardini, section F2 (notes, Licenses 2, 1628-32, p.9)
\textsuperscript{224} ARSI Opp. NN. 242, n.109-110; NN.243.I, ff.33, 44; NN.246, f.89+. Godman did not discuss any licenses issued by Bellarmino himself (it appears that he did not locate the records scattered throughout his correspondence at ARSI), but he does provide similar examples from censors and inquisitors other than Bellarmino. See his \textit{Saint as Censor}, 329-330.
\textsuperscript{225} ARSI Opp. NN. 240, n.143-144; NN. 243.I., ff.17-19, 48.
translated into the vernacular by Catholic authors to those whom they know will derive from such reading not harm but rather an increase of faith and piety.” This rule extricated vernacular bible licenses from the category of heretical theological works, because it determined that only requests for officially approved Catholic editions of the scriptures would be considered. The criteria for obtaining a vernacular bible license shifted accordingly. They would be for personal devotion, not for debate.

Whether the ideal bible reader constructed by this rule coincided with the ones actually authorized is difficult to determine. In all the volumes of the Roman Index’s *licentiae legendi* that predate the 18th century, there is not even one request for a Catholic vernacular Bible. That is because the earliest extant volume begins in 1596, the same year that the Sisto-Clementine Index upgraded the status of the vernacular Bible from a restricted book to a forbidden genre. Surviving license records for the 32 years between the moment of restriction and prohibition are scattered about episcopal archives and the *decreta* of the Roman Inquisition. The few uncovered by the pioneering scholar Gigliola Fragnito have demonstrated that the Inquisition was more miserly in its dispensations than was warranted by Rule 4.226 Fragnito argued further that the Inquisition was the party responsible for dismantling the whole bible license system.227 How the Congregation of the Index otherwise might have exercised its prerogatives for making vernacular bibles available is manifest in its prior attempts to revise the 4th Rule.

When in 1587 Pope Sixtus V reinforced the Congregation of the Index with the appointment of several eminent churchmen, he was seeking to wrest control of the

226 Fragnito, *La Bibbia al rogo: La censura ecclesiastica e I volgarizzamenti della Scrittura (1471-1605)* (Il Mulino, 1997), 139-142; Fragnito, *Church, Censorship, and Culture*, 34 n.68.

process of prohibiting and unprohibiting books from the Inquisition. The first task of the rejuvenated Congregation was to revise the Tridentine Index along with its Ten Rules. On the revision of Rule 4, however, not all of the new appointees dissented from the severe interpretations of the Inquisition. Giovanni Francesco Bordino, the Oratorian priest responsible for compiling the constitution of St. Filippo Neri, demanded that vernacular scriptures be denied not only the simple laity, but the regular clergy too. The vulgarization of the holy books in Germany, he claimed, popularized the private interpretation of scripture and resulted in solipsistic chaos, which was the interpretation propounded by Cardinal Pacheco at Trent and Cardinal Hosius afterward. He also recycled Basil the Great’s acidic rejoinder to the would-be exegete of the imperial kitchen, which Bellarmino had inserted into his *Controversies*. To seal his case against the profanation of the sacred, Bordino coupled this patristic commonplace with an analogy from an older religious tradition. If the Jews revere even the Antiquities of Josephus so much that they do not sell the books openly or carry them about, he reasoned, how can we adopt a permissive attitude to the Holy Bible, considering the majesty of the Lord? He concluded with the simple statement that “vernacular bibles should be absolutely forbidden.”²²⁸ The Dominican Enrico Veralli likewise requested that all such reading licenses be rescinded, allowing for exceptions only in the case of an “evident necessity.”²²⁹ These two opinions, however, did not represent the majority.

Most of the discussants opposed an outright ban on the vernacular scriptures, favoring instead the licensing system originally sketched out in Rule 4. The Canon Marius Alterius acknowledged the fulfillment of the prophecy in 2 Peter 3:1 that many

²²⁸ ACDF, Indice, Protocolli B, ff.333v-334v, 391v-392v: “Biblia vulgaris penitus interdicenda.”
²²⁹ ACDF, Indice, Protocolli B, ff.321r, 386r.
had profaned the scriptures, twisting and turning them to their own damnation; yet, invoking the authority of Jerome and John Chrysostom, he maintained that the scriptures also bear fruit within pious and moderate readers. Timotheus Rimoldus, general procurator of the Carmelites, feared that the revocation of the licensing system would allow the church to be accused of “withdrawing bread from children.” That was a bolder statement, since that reference to Lamentations had been associated at Trent not with scripture-reading, but with hearing scripture preached. The classicist Pierre Morin, an associate of the acclaimed humanist publisher Paolo Manuzio, rejected the rhetoric of Rimoldus. He lamented, instead, the recent turn to vernacular letters as the betrayal of the literary heritage of antiquity, which just had been in the process of revival. He conceded, however, that in Protestant territories, Catholic vernacular editions ought to be produced so that the faithful were not left reading heretical ones.

It was Bellarmino who attempted to organize some of these conflicting sentiments into a coherent pastoral program. More intent on suppressing what he considered lewd letters than the sacred ones, he designed a two-track model of scriptural access that was premised on the divided confessional geography of Europe. In the regions where heresies flourish -- including Germany, Poland, Pannonia, and England -- he recommended that faithfully translated and annotated Bibles be permitted to everyone. Embattled Catholics in these areas would use their approved bibles not only to avoid the translations of the heretics, from which they otherwise would “suck venom”, but to contest them as well. In the “other regions, which are Italy and Spain”, the licensing
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system ought to remain intact. He added though that even in these Catholic realms, “some of the easier parts of the bibles” might be made broadly accessible among the simple folk (*fidelibus idiotis*). Specifically, he named the books of Tobias, Maccabees, and the gospels and epistles read during Mass as the parts “in which there is nothing harmful and from which no meager fruit might be drawn.” This inner biblical canon, composed of the apocrypha and the lectionary, would be a safe revelation from which the unlearned could draw forth moral and spiritual profit.

Here, within the internal memos of the Index, Bellarmino does not exhibit the disgust for the “vulgarization” of the scriptures that he communicated across the printed pages of the *Controversies*. We can only assume that, here, he does not feel burdened with the responsibility of defending those churchmen, some Jesuits and their supporters among them, who were most vocal about that disgust. Legitimizing the extreme hard-line position within the spectrum of Catholicism was the labor of the author of the *Controversies*. The task of this consultor of the Index was to shift the center of Catholicism toward his own position, which was less strict than that of the Tridentine Index (let alone the *Controversies*). The world of the vernacular bible that Bellarmino tried to mold here would not be so definitively shaped by reading licenses. It would be shaped instead by the type of vernacular scripture-books that would be circulating freely. The different types, he believed, would assist in the formation or protection of different Catholic communities. Privileging the translation of the liturgical lections – that is, “the gospels and epistles read during the Mass” – in these memos appears to be another striking departure from the *Controversies*, yet it upsets his overwhelming antipathy for
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the vernacular liturgy not at all. Rather, by granting vernacular readers broad access to the very texts that were read publicly in Latin and then interpreted in the common tongue, Bellarmino might expect to satisfy the lettered faithful and diminish agitation for the vernacular *celebration* of the liturgy. These readers might furthermore be invested in the same texts and interpretations that integrated the universal Catholic community, which was Bellarmino’s mission to sustain.

Cardinal William Allen, Abbot Marcantonio Maffa, and other members of the Congregation followed the logic of Bellarmino’s proposal, and a consensus around it is reflected in the manuscript revisions of the Ten Rules. It indeed was a reflection of that original consensus that emerged among Pacheco, Madruzzo, and the other conciliar delegates at Trent, but which had been disrupted by the intervening indices of 1559 and 1564: the vernacular scriptures were to become a controversialists’ book in the lands infected with heresy, while they were to become a devotional or liturgical book in the lands already cleansed. Again, it became neither, technically, when the Inquisition defeated these revisions in 1596. All books of vernacular scripture were prohibited according to the letter of the “Observatio” on the 4th Rule of the Sisto-Clementine Index.

The *Observatio*’s destructive impact on the supply of Italian *bibbie integrali* is undeniable. Its victory over Bellarmino’s scriptural program, however, warrants
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further consideration. Despite the Observatio’s absolute prohibition of vernacular scripture-books, the seventeenth century records of the Roman Index reveal that some types of bible-reading licenses continued to be granted. All of these requests were for liturgical scripture-books: the lezionari of Remigio Nannini and the various salmi of Panigarola, Pinelli, and Aretino.\textsuperscript{239} These liturgical texts escaped the general prohibitions of the 1596 Index only because of the widespread refusal of Italian readers to surrender them and the corresponding willingness of executors to relent.\textsuperscript{240} The same year that the new Roman Index was released, it was revised to exclude from condemnation these bible books of the safe inner canon.\textsuperscript{241} The Spanish Index followed suit in 1612, banning all vernacular scripture-books with the exception of lectionaries accompanied by sermons or annotations.\textsuperscript{242} Publishers long before had discovered Italian vernacular lectionaries to be especially lucrative commodities: even before the conclusion of the Council of Trent, these books outprinted bibbie integrali in Italy by a ratio of more than 2 to 1.\textsuperscript{243} The lectionaries of Nannini, in particular, were reprinted every year since their debut in 1567 until the end of the century; demand for them continued unabated after the Observatio.
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with Venetian presses issuing 61 editions in the 17th century. Scrapping Bellarmino’s sacred reading program in Italy turned out to be easier to achieve on paper than in practice. Though it was intended to demolish the entire bible license system, ultimately the Sisto-Clementine Index only reinforced the dominance of the liturgical reading tradition.

The survival of Bellarmino’s program outside the Italian and Iberian peninsula – that is, outside the kingdoms in which an Inquisition was operating – is just as evident. In “the lands where heresies flourish”, whether the state was officially Catholic or not, Bellarmino recommended that approved Catholic translations of the scriptures accompanied by annotations be accessible generally. Since the Council of Trent, that had been the case already for editions in French, Dutch, German, and English; it would continue to be the case for all these languages plus Polish as the Clementine Index was being drafted and revised; and it would remain the case after the Index was enacted, as the accessible languages extended to Hungarian in 1626.

The theological faculties of Paris, Douai, and Louvain, continued to authorize Catholic editions of the entire New and Old Testament, albeit with some starts and stops. One of the more notorious episodes of oscillating prohibitions and approvals featured the French translation of the Catholic controversialist Renée Benoist, which will be considered in Chapter Six. What should be noted now, however, is Bellarmino’s own role in the approval process, or rather in the rescue. Though the Benoist New Testament first emerged in 1566 with a battery of royal licenses and theological approbations, it was condemned by the Sorbonne in 1567 and again in 1569 as well as by Pope Gregory XIII

244 Garaviglia, “I lezionari”, 383.
in 1575. When King Henri IV promoted Benoist to the bishopric of Troyes in 1594, the status of his New Testament re-emerged before the Index and Inquisition. Bellarmino, who had been a consultor for the former and soon would become one for the latter, was summoned for an opinion. Despite the uncompromising letter of the Observatio, Bellarmino offered a rather favorable review. In his extant notes, he applauded the book’s Vulgate-based canon, its preface that expressed deference to the papacy, and especially its annotations that confirmed so many places “that the heretics abused.”

What Bellarmino did not appreciate were the summaries that “seemed to be extracted from the bibles of heretics”, including some expressions peculiar to Protestant doctrines. That was not a minor charge. Yet it was the only point against Benoist’s New Testament; preceding it were twenty-two points “pro Renato Benedicto”, whose translation was and would continue to be the standard template for the French Catholic New Testament over the next half century.

That the Observatio would have little impact in the British Isles might be expected; that it did not even deter central Roman authorities from abetting vernacular bible-reading there might be more of a surprise. Clement VIII and subsequent popes certainly did not allow it to stop them from renewing the privileges of missionaries there to read prohibited books and to license others to read them. In fact, Bellarmino directly engineered the transmission of the English Catholic New Testament from the very beginning. In 1578 the Inquisition granted the former Oxford don Gregory Martin a license to read prohibited books because, according to the record, “the Jesuit Belarminus


\[\text{246 ARSI, Opp. NN. Bellarmino.243.II.n.294; Le Bachelet, Auctarium Bellarminium, 670.}\]

\[\text{247 APF, SC Anglia I, 1627-1707, ff.54r, 391r-392r.}\]
provided us with a testimony of his life.”248 That same year Martin began translating the New Testament into English and composing the anti-Protestant annotations and treatise on heretical corruptions that were meant to accompany it. Coordinating the entire publishing campaign was Cardinal William Allen, whose agreement with Bellarmino on the controversial purpose of the Catholic bible in pluralistic confessional zones has been noted already. The late Tudor and Stuart governments sought to prohibit, confiscate, and publicly refute this Bible of the “Rhemish Jesuits” precisely because they believed that Bellarmino, Allen, and Martin all had calculated its polemical function accurately. Historians have read the phenomena of the English Catholic Bible the same way: that it was conceived as a temporary expedient for persecuted Catholics and their missionary priests to engage their Protestant interlocutors in disputation. The problem is that this interpretation, based upon Allen’s memos, Martin’s preface, and government counter-policy, overshadows and hides non-prescriptive forms of evidence that suggest that the purpose of the book and its function did not so neatly coincide. Did the two-track vernacular bible policy that Bellarmino proposed for a confessionally divided Europe -- and which he managed to achieve despite the public policy of the Index and Inquisition to the contrary – ultimately structure the reading habits of those upon whom it was imposed? The biblical reading culture of the land into which this Rheims Testament and the Vulgate of Thomas Marwood were introduced will be the subject of Part Two.

Before turning to England, however, we should reconsider Rome. We have seen that disciplinary legislation and published apologetics do not clearly reflect how the leading Catholic authorities governed Bible-reading. Opinion was fractured at the center,

---

248 ACDF, S.O. Decreta, ff.80v-81r, 98r.
and not at all neatly. On the question of access to the Bible, there were not two entrenched camps divided pro and con. Ecclesiastical attitudes broke, instead, along a multiplicity of axes within that broader subject, making dissension more varied while at the same time making allegiances more flexible. That is why the diversity of opinions could coalesce at Trent into what might be considered a negative agreement against a uniform Bible policy and into a series of more limited agreements that favored the regulation of bible-printing, the regional diversification of bible-circulation, and the universal commitment to scriptural-preaching. The more thoroughgoing hard-line elements that temporarily occupied the papacy and dominated the Inquisition should not obscure the perdurance of the conciliar consensus that Bellarmino was able to cultivate and adapt in order to set policy from the Roman Index -- policy that the Index helped sustain even after its own public pronouncements indicated the reverse. “The Clementine Index” represented a victory for Bellarmino in the same way that the “Clementine Vulgate” did. In both cases, Pope Sixtus V determined to impose different policies than Bellarmino. Sixtus resolved to establish the authentic Vulgate as an exclusive, unalterable, naked text; Bellarmino’s preface revealed that a reformable and glossable Latin Bible, which would not outlaw any other, was authorized instead. The same pope’s attitude to vernacular bibles was similarly uncompromising. Before he became Sixtus V, Felice Peretti da Montalto performed the role of inquisitor for the Holy Office in Venice, where in 1558 he voted for a ban on scripture-books in Italian.\footnote{Fragnito, \textit{Bibbia al rogo}, 84, citing Paul Grendler, \textit{Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Press} (1977), 115.} The new index that he commissioned three decades later was intended not only to make that ban universal but to prohibit the \textit{Controversies} of Bellarmino as well. The outcome on both counts was
decidedly different because Bellarmino intervened. He could only intervene successfully, however, on account of the broad support he experienced inside and outside the curia. To be sure, he could not salvage the *bibbia integrale* – not in Italy, anyway. Those books burned. Or they were otherwise withdrawn from circulation. But it was never Bellarmino’s object to protect *that* scripture-book. He did not oppose lay scripture-reading itself, despite the inclination he displayed for a more bulky, scholarly Vulgate and despite the apparent disdain for the vulgus that he seemed to express in his *Controversies*. He just would have been satisfied with the old licensing system in his native land. What he really promoted were different bible-books for different communities, based upon the different needs, duties, functions, desires, dangers, and reading capacities that he attributed to each one. The philologically glossed Vulgate he thought would be of greatest utility and greatest appeal to theologians, pastors, and the broad community of the learned. For the “Church Suffering”, or the Catholics whose geographical position ensured regular interaction with heretics, the doctrinally glossed vernacular bible was supposed to be expedient. For the “Church Triumphant”, or those Catholics whose faith was guaranteed by their government, clergy, and proximate community, then liturgical scripture books and certain “moral” books within the traditional canon were the ones Bellarmino considered ideal. In the end, Bellarmino did not propose or oppose the *Bible*. He sought to propose and regulate different books constituted by the scriptures. The extent to which any of Bellarmino’s proposals were embraced depended upon the actions of all the producers, mediators, and consumers that the frontmatter of Marwood’s Bible made visible. The only proposal here that he did consistently oppose was the vernacular liturgy. That for him was a much more central
matter for the Church. If we miss that, we also mistake the priorities of many early modern Catholics with respect to the Bible, if not those of early modern Christians generally, as we will continue to observe.
CHAPTER 2

Teaching the Bible?
Setting the Curriculum and Studying the Scriptures in Jesuit Schools

One hypothesis for Marwood’s distinctive reading habits was that the Jesuits were responsible. They were the new intellectual elite of the post-Reformation Church and they spread their schools for the laity across Europe and indeed the rest of the early modern Catholic world. There is no doubt that Marwood and his student, Henry Bedingfeld, were intimately familiar with them. Not only were Jesuits among the family chaplains at the Bedingfeld estate, Oxburgh Hall, but Marwood supervised Bedingfeld at one of the Society’s most renowned colleges on the Continent, the College of La Flèche. It was the Jesuit Bellarmino, finally, whose preface introduced Marwood to the very Bible that he glossed. Perhaps then the Jesuits are the key not only to Marwood’s book, but to opportunities for Catholic bible reading across the early modern world. Whether contact with them enabled an exclusive or at least peculiar form of access to the Bible that other Catholics simply did not have is the central question that this chapter will answer.

I. Defining Jesuit Education: the *Ratio Studiorum* (1586 1591 1599)
“[T]he study of Aquinas [was] more profitable than that of the Bible.” The late William Bouwsma equated this judgment, which he attributed to Roberto Bellarmino, with the Jesuits’ educational priorities – new priorities that reflected the “waning of the Renaissance” and the onslaught of the cross-confessional Counter-Reformation. Bellarmino’s position seemed fundamentally anti-humanist: *ab fontes* and *ad summas*. Despite his ubiquitous presence in the relevant historical records, however, Bellarmino was not the only spokesman for Jesuit education. In fact, the first *Ratio Studiorum* (1586), or the general curriculum of the Society of Jesus, proposed the inverse of Bellarmino’s alleged recommendation. That, at least, is how it appeared to many Catholic contemporaries, both Jesuit and non-Jesuit. First, it reevaluated and even undermined the authority of Thomas Aquinas in scholastic theology; second, it challenged the subordination of scriptural study to scholastic theology. The original *Ratio* made clear that the relative academic positions of Aquinas and the Bible were highly contestable. The triumph of neo-Thomist scholastic theology in Jesuit schools, if that is indeed what happened, was not foreordained by Ignatius’s *Constitutions*, the Council of Trent, an anxious and increasingly absolutist papacy or any collective campaign for order among these three notoriously nebulous “Counter-Reformation forces.” An analysis of how the *Ratio Studiorum* evolved in the thirteen years from its initial drafting to its confirmation will reveal the contingent processes by which the triangular relationship between Aquinas, scholastic theology, and Scripture became codified, if not wholly determined, in Jesuit pedagogy.

---

A commitment to the *Summa Theologica*, moreover, was not the only way to marginalize Scripture study. The leading historian of the early modern Jesuits, who emphasized the overwhelming secularity of their college curriculum, claimed that “they knew their Cicero better than their Bibles.”\(^{251}\) This observation, when coupled with Bellarmino’s, seems to solidify the inferior place of biblical study in Jesuit schools. In fact, it ought to communicate the opposite. Sacred Scripture was supposed to be part of the theology curriculum, along with Hebrew, Cases of Conscience, and Scholastic Theology; and this whole theology curriculum existed at the apex of the “higher faculties”, above Mathematics and Philosophy. Few students ever progressed beyond the lower faculties of grammar, humane letters, and rhetoric unless they were pursuing ordination; and even then, the Jesuit students, known as “scholastics”, frequently did not complete an entire theology curriculum before they were summoned for some pastoral work, which often meant teaching the “lower faculties” themselves.\(^{252}\) Despite its “superior” status in the curriculum, “Sacra Scriptura” apparently was outpaced by other studies, whether scholastic or classical. The question is whether the process of constructing the *Ratio Studiorum* featured a reconsideration of the place of the Bible in either of the faculties. The second part of this chapter will explore the lower faculties –


\(^{252}\) For the system of review and regulations that tightly limited those who would advance through the higher faculties, see Ladislaus Lukacs, S.J., ed., *Monumenta Paedagogica Societatis Iesu* [hereafter MPSI] (Rome: IHSI, 1986), V: 358-364 (1599 *Ratio Studiorum*’s Rules for the Provincial #9-29).
that is, lay contact with the Scriptures in the Jesuit schools. The part to which we will
turn next investigates the guidelines for theology, which are more frequently neglected by
scholars in favor of the humanities curriculum, but which generated a considerable
amount of interest and conflict among the Jesuits themselves. The guidelines spurred
intense debate among the order’s different provinces, prompted the meeting of General
Congregations, and probably delayed the final ratification of the Ratio almost a decade.
Here we will ask not so much how the liberal arts got confessionalized, but rather how
classicism penetrated theology. What we will examine more specifically is the extent
(a) to which philological methods were incorporated into scriptural pedagogy, (b) to
which bibliophilia affected the hierarchical relationship between scholastic theology and
biblical study, and (c) to which Thomism controlled theology as a whole. By responding
to these questions we will be better equipped to understand what modes of scriptural
contact were made possible by Jesuit schools.

****************************************************************************************

Delectu Opinionum: On the Selection of Opinions

Claudio Aquaviva, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, selected six
Jesuit professors to draft the Ratio Studiorum in 1586. They submitted this provisional

253 For the liberal arts in the Jesuit colleges, the literature is immense, but some classic studies include
Allan Farrell, Liberal Code of Jesuit Education (Bruce, 1933); F. Charmot, S.J., La Pedagogie des Jesuites:
Ses Princes – Son Actualite (Paris: Spes, 1951); Aldo Scaglione, The Liberal Arts and the Jesuit College
254 For strikingly different responses to the first question, compare the discussion of O’Malley in the works
cited in fn.2 alongside Erika Rummel, Confessionalization of Humanism in Reformation Germany (Oxford:
Oxford University Press, 2000), 6, 46-49, and Margo Todd, Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social
edition to every Jesuit province for comment. After assessing this feedback, the original
drafters under the direction of Aquaviva revised and resubmitted the *Ratio* in 1591.
When Aquaviva approved the definitive edition in 1599 only one of the six who
composed the original *Ratio* was still alive – and there were significant changes in its
final program of theology.

The ultimate *Ratio* of 1599 seemed to profess the same exclusive commitment to
the theology of Aquinas that has been ascribed to Roberto Bellarmino. In the “Rules for
the Professor of Scholastic Theology”, Jesuit doctors were enjoined to “absolutely follow
the teaching of St. Thomas”. The *Ratio* recapitulated the decree that Ignatius of
Loyola instituted in the Society’s *Constitutions* – that Aquinas was the primary
theological authority for their order. That did not mean, the *Ratio* clarified, that
professors “should consider themselves so restricted to his teaching that they cannot
depart from him on any single point.” In fact, they were commanded to follow his
opponents on two points -- the immaculate conception of Mary, and the solemnity of
vows. Besides these “more commonly held” doctrines, however, the *Ratio* permitted
Jesuit professors to follow other scholastic authorities only on matters in which Aquinas
either had not spoken or had not spoken clearly. Since the curriculum was itself the
*Summa Theologica*, the likelihood that Aquinas was silent on any question was rather
slim. Whatever window of opportunity was opened by Aquinas’s potential ambiguity
on any question seemed to be shut by Rule 13, which commanded either that “Thomas be

---

Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005), 62 (Rule 7.2).
256 Pavur, *Ratio Studiorum*, 62 (Rule 7.2)
257 Pavur, *Ratio Studiorum*, 62-3 (Rule 7.3).
258 Pavur, *Ratio Studiorum*, 63 (Rules 7.4-5).
259 Pavur, *Ratio Studiorum*, 64-66 (Rule 7.7)
defended or the question omitted." The *Ratio* of 1599 did countenance deviations from Aquinas, therefore, but then all but prohibited them.

This strict adherence to Aquinas, however, in no way was meant to detract from the study of Sacred Scripture. The final *Ratio* discussed the latter before scholastic theology as well as before every other discipline. Though the *Ratio* required professors of Sacred Scripture to be “well-versed in scholastic theology”, it explicitly forbade them to employ scholastic methods to expost the text. Professors of Sacred Scripture were supposed to be trained more rigorously and more broadly than all others. They had to be “expert in [ancient] languages (for this is absolutely indispensable)” and fully conversant in “other branches of learning, in history, in intellectual culture of different kinds, and, to the extent that it is possible, in the art of eloquence.” Professors of Sacred Scripture were encouraged to consult with Hebrew and Greek exemplars to reconcile discrepancies in the Latin text or to illuminate its idiomatic expressions. Since the *Ratio* prescribed systematic training in these ancient languages, the students would be expected to follow the philological expositions. The students were to be introduced to the language and grammar of the Hebrew Scriptures in advance during Hebrew class. In fact, the professors of Hebrew were supposed to double as professors of Sacred Scripture. The *Ratio* also shares the position of humanists and reformers on scriptural hermeneutics,

---

261 Pavur, *Ratio Studiorum*, 9 (Rule 1.5), 59 (Rule 5.13).
262 Pavur, *Ratio Studiorum*, 9 (Rule 1.5). See also the observations of Pereyra upon which this rule was based, MPSI VII (Rome: IHSI, 1992), Mon 15(1), 122-123.
263 Pavur, *Ratio Studiorum*, 56 (Rule 5.4).
266 MPSI V: 358 (Rules for the Provincial #7).
elevating the literal or historical over the allegorical and moral sense.\textsuperscript{267} It is important to remember that the \textit{Ratio Studiorum} is a prescriptive text, not a descriptive one; not all the provisions it listed were actually implemented either before or after, as well shall see. The present concern is to identify what the \textit{Ratio} and its compilers were trying to establish: they designed a program to prepare theology students to appreciate the philological and doctrinal expositions of the professor of Sacred Scripture.

Not all aspects of the program would be immune from potential humanist criticism. The \textit{Ratio} ordered professors to defend the Vulgate translation and to borrow sparingly from the scholarship of rabbinical exegetes, as well as from those Christian interpreters “who have followed the rabbis far more than they should have.”\textsuperscript{268} It also commands the professor to uphold the interpretations defined by popes and councils; yet upholding these standard confessional responsibilities was not thought to undermine the professors’ obligation to “very diligently promote the study of sacred texts.”\textsuperscript{269} For on the other hand, the professor was instructed to avoid doctrinal controversies generally so that he may be “mindful of what he has been commissioned to do, namely, teach nothing other than Sacred Scripture.”\textsuperscript{270} The stated commitment of the \textit{Ratio} of 1599 to promote the study of the Bible, especially in a philologically and historically sensitive way, may be surprising for those who expected the \textit{Summa} to dominate the Scriptures. If this

\textsuperscript{267} Pavur, \textit{Ratio Studiorum}, 55 (5.1), 59 (5.15). While it is clear that Jesuits, Reformers, and humanists were all breathing the same sixteenth century air (and that there was plenty of category overlap among these three), it also should be clear that the drive to privilege the literal sense long preceded them all. In the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas had emphasized a form of literal exegesis and Nicholas of Lyra developed it. Lyra’s method was widely disseminated in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when his scriptural commentaries were featured in printed glossed bibles. And Thomas Aquinas, of course, was the one whom all Jesuit students were required “to consider their own teacher.”
\textsuperscript{268} Pavur, \textit{Ratio Studiorum}, 58 (Rule 5.10).
\textsuperscript{269} Pavur, \textit{Ratio Studiorum}, 9 (Rule 1.5).
\textsuperscript{270} Pavur, \textit{Ratio Studiorum}, 59-60 (Rule 5.16).
curriculum does not directly question Bellarmino’s apparent judgment about which study should be held in greater esteem, it at least does not reinforce it. The final Ratio, nevertheless, does consolidate the authority of Aquinas over Jesuit professors of scholastic theology.

The original Ratio of 1586, however, framed both issues in a fundamentally different way. Before returning to the relationship between Sacred Scripture and scholastic theology, we must first understand how the authority of Aquinas was originally presented in the Jesuit curriculum and then gradually reshaped. The chapter on scholastic theology, which in 1599 opened with a statement of almost unqualified allegiance to Thomas, is preceded in 1586 by a section entitled “De opinionum delectu in theologica facultate.”271 Here the Ratio introduces the principles, extracted from the Constitutions of Ignatius, that will guide the selection of theological propositions: first, soliditas which is defined in opposition to rashness or blindness; second, consensio, “that the many contentions of our professors have shaken not a little”.272 The scope of these principles is

271 The basic chronological outline of the De opinionum delectus controversy has been sketched by John W. Padberg, S.J. (“The Development of the Ratio Studiorum” in Vincent J. Duminuco, ed., The Jesuit Ratio Studiorum: 400th Anniversary Perspectives [New York: Fordham University Press, 2000], 81-100), and Ladislaus Lukacs, S.J. (“Introductio Generalis” in Ratio atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Iesu (1586 1591 1599) in MPSI V, ed. Ladislaus Lukacs, S.J. [Romae: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1986], 6*-9*, 20*-22*, 27*-29*). Both Padberg and Lukacs traced the early inclusion and final excision of the section on “free” and “defined” theological propositions from the Ratio Studiorum. Padberg narrated the process as a struggle between due academic freedom and the reasonable demands of orthodoxy. But neither scholar offered close textual comparisons and analyses of different editions of the Delectu Opinionum; neither consistently appreciated the internal divisions undergirding (and at times undermining) each revision; and neither explored the indeterminacy of subsequent editions, particularly those claimed to be definitive. For another attempt to trace this controversy with greater emphasis on how the Jesuits’ theology curriculum became “conformed to the necessity of the times”, see Anita Mancia, “La controversia con i protestanti e i programmi degli studi teologici nella Compagnia di Gesu, 1547-1599,” Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu (Rome: IHSI, 1985), 54: 3-43 (Part I), 209-266 (Part II).
outlined in the first four rules without any reference to Aquinas. The *Ratio* prohibited professors from teaching anything incompatible “with the sense of the church or received traditions” and from “harboring new doctrine” -- “unless,’ an important qualifier inserted in Rule 10, ‘it proceeds from received and solid principles’.

That stipulation was not an especially high bar for a scholastic to jump, even though he was supposed to receive prior approval from the provincial father before expounding new doctrine. Rule 5 is the closest model for the profession of faith in Aquinas, which was instituted in rules 2, 3, 4, and 13 of the *Ratio* of 1599. It begins: “In theology, our men follow the teaching of St. Thomas, as it is stipulated in Part 4, Chapter 14 of the Constitutions, except in small matters… .” The *Ratio* of 1599 then discreetly listed two points in which Jesuits should follow “the more commonly held” doctrines, without even acknowledging that these constituted disagreements with Aquinas; in this place, the original version proceeded instead to enumerate forty-nine propositions from the *Summa* that “our men may not be compelled to defend”.

These range from God’s potencies and foreknowledge to human volition and merit – issues that arguably are much more central to the tradition of scholasticism than the nature of religious vows and the immaculate conception.

---

273 “De opinionum delectu” in *Ratio studiorum (1586)* in MPSI V: 6, 13. Quotes: « Regula prima - … Nemo igitur quicquam doceat, quod cum Ecclesiae sensu receptisque traditionibus non bene conveniat…. Regula secunda – Expedit etiam, ubi nullum pietatis et fidei periculum imminet, suspicione vitare studii res moliendi novas aut novae condendae doctrinae…. Regula decima – In iis quae sunt fidei, non facile nostri vel congruentes doctorum rationes refellant vel novas excogitent, nisi ex recipis iam solidisque principis. »


275 “De opinionum delectu” in *Ratio studiorum (1586)* in MPSI V: 7-9. For instances of the first two subjects, see “Ex prima parte S. Thomae: … 3.Repugnare secundam absolutam Dei potentiam, ut a beatis Deus videatur per speciem impressam, quamvis de facto non sic videatur. 4.Praevide Deum futura contingentia in eorum reali coexistencia cum sua aeternitate.” For instances of the second two see “Ex Prima Secundae: … 4.Bonitatem et malitiam moralem esse differentias essentiales actus interioris
Rule 6 then follows in an understandably conciliatory manner, forbidding professors to withdraw from Thomas except in those questions that are excepted “here”. But “here” does not refer to the previous list of undecided points, but to a whole new catalog of propositions from the *Summa* that the *Ratio* declares erroneous. Rule 6 assures its readers that the Society’s points of difference with Thomas are “truly very few”, and then enumerates seventy-eight of them. The combinations of these two lists appear to effect a serious diminution in the authority of Aquinas. What remained of the Jesuits’ “special doctor” beyond that honorary title? Some church authorities, especially in Spain, thought very little survived; one of them delivered the document to the Inquisition, complaining that it constituted a blanket repudiation of Aquinas. Downplaying the substance of this conflict, one historian suggested that, whatever criticism of this section on scholastic theology there may have been, relatively few changes to it were included in the revised editions. But certainly the 1586 *Ratio* is a few rounds of editing away from the injunction of 1599 that “Thomas should be followed or the question omitted.”

Three professors from the Jesuit College in Rome wrote to General Aquaviva that the program of education was consistent neither with the authority of Aquinas nor with the decrees of Ignatius that mandated allegiance to Aquinas. They accused the drafters of the *Ratio* of flouting the Ignatian theological principles of *soliditas* and *uniformitas*,

---


277 Farrell, *Liberal Code*, 231. Bellarmino himself acknowledged that “the Dominican fathers were clamoring, not without cause, that teaching of Saint Thomas has been condemned by our Society.” See Lukacs, ed., MPSI VII: 43. The *Delectu Opinioum* also was reviewed by the Roman Inquisition in 1592: MPSI VII: 86-87.

notably not *consensio*, the principle that the drafters had pledged to uphold.\(^{279}\) One of these drafters, Stefano Tucci, also a classicist and theologian at the Collegio Romano, issued a response to his colleagues in 1589, challenging their attempts to shift the terms of debate. Tucci’s accusers held that *uniformity* entailed no internal disagreement over teaching or doctrine; Tucci countered that “[t]he Constitutions never dreamed of such uniformity, nor does it mention a single word about it.”\(^{280}\) In defense of the position of the *Ratio*, he now wrote in much less guarded language than he had in 1586: “It should be added that it is the common conception of all to be able to depart from Thomas in many things without any sacrifice to uniformity. For any professor may weave together his theology in part from the opinions of Thomas, in part from Scotus, and in part from others; and nevertheless each one considers himself able to speak harmoniously. It is this uniformity having been supposed of which our Constitutions speak.”\(^{281}\) Strict uniformity, according to Tucci, was theoretically unsupported by Ignatius and the theological community of the Church. But it also would be practically impossible to impose.\(^{282}\) Jesuit teaching would be less “solid” and more suspect if it were more selective than the

\(^{279}\) “Iudicum Trium Patrum Collegii Romani De Formula Servanda in Delectu Opinionum” (1589) in MPSI VII: 29-33: «Primum, scopum seu finem huius delectus esse debere uniformitatem et securitatem doctrinae, ut videlicet sit in Societate nostra una doctrina, et ea solida atque secura, ac proinde cesset sectorum varietas et periculum errandi. Secundum, hanc unam et solidam doctrinam esse debere Sancti Thomae, eam nimimum quam habet in Summa theologica. »

\(^{280}\) P. Stephanus Tucci, S.I., “Responsio ad ea quae Collegii Patres Censuisse Dicuntur circa Rationem Studiorum” (1589) in MPSI VII: 33. Quote: «quarum prima sit, aequivocare Collegii patres in nomine uniformitatis; eam namque interpretantur ita, ut nostrae doctrinae partes inter se non habeant repugnantiam. Hanc uniformitatem numquam somniorunt Constitutiones, neque de ea ullum verbum faciunt; … »

\(^{281}\) Tucci, “Responsio” (1589) in MPSI VII: 34. Quote: «Adde, quod est communis omnium conception, sine huius uniformitatis iactura posse in multis a S. Thoma discendi. Nam quilibet professor suam context theologiam partim ex opionibus S. Thomae, partim Scoti, partim aliorum; et tamen unusquisque cohaerenter se loqui existimat. Hac igitur uniformitate supposita, de ea loquar, de qua Constitutiones nostrae.»

\(^{282}\) Tucci, “Responsio” (1589) in MPSI VII: 34. Quote: Haec omnimoda conformitas quamvis optanda sit, conandum etiam ut aliquando redigatur in praxim id tamen nunc effici non potest. … tum quia si omni uniformiter essent definienda, opus id esset multorum annorum ; tum quia plerunque adhuc sunt ita dubia propter contrarias doctorum rationes et authoritates, ut nostril seculi non sit ea decernere.»
common schools. In sum, Tucci concluded, “we embrace the truth whether we claim it from S. Thomas or from beyond Thomas.” To this drafter of the Ratio, therefore, Thomas Aquinas was an authority, not the authority. Highly-placed Jesuits like Tucci were able to frame the principles of their founder in order to expand or constrain the determinative power of Aquinas within the curriculum.

If the revised Ratio of 1591 is any indication of who won the uniformity dispute, it was not Tucci’s interlocutors. The Delectu Opinionum, with its catalogs of free and erroneous propositions, remained. In fact, there were additions. Now underneath each “free” position of the Summa was a delineation of opposing authorities that apparently neutralized the authority of Thomas. One might expect that for these Jesuits only the opinions of the Latin and Greek doctors of the church would have enough weight to counterbalance Aquinas. Sure enough, Augustine, Gregory IV, John Chrysostom, and Gregory Nazianzen are all present among the objectors – but each one only once or twice. Far more frequent are the medieval scholastics whose opposition is, surprisingly, equally effective. Among these are John Duns Scotus, Gregory of Rimini, Gabriel Biel, and William of Ockham even though the nominalist via moderna, especially of the latter two, was supposed to have been discredited and abandoned in confessionalized Europe. The Council of Trent itself was employed twice in the

---

283 Tucci, “Responsio” (1589) in MPSI VII: 37. Tucci discusses the perils of slavishly following Thomas when his sole authority was not universally professed. Quote: «Adde quod multae provinciae monibus scripserunt, extra Hispaniam non esse magnum S. Thomae authoritatem… Quare ridiculum est dicere, Societatis nostrae consensum, praesertim innixum communi doctrinae, non posse S. Thomae authoritati esse aequalen aut etiam superiorem.»


margins against Aquinas. It would shock no one that these Jesuits considered Trent an authority, but it should be very surprising that its alleged opposition only made this proposition “free”, not binding. On a particular issue, the authority of Trent could be counter-balanced by the ambiguity of its decrees; hence, the weight of the Council did not always determine an issue. Just as there was no necessary trajectory from the Constitutions of Ignatius to the Ratio of 1599, neither was there a single unalterable path for the Jesuits from Trent. Considerable room was left to maneuver in theological speculation and discipline.

If not simply by the Council of Trent or codified Ignatian spirituality, how do we explain the disappearance of the Delectu Opinionum in the Ratio of 1599, a manifestly significant revision? We could resort to another conciliar event – the Fifth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, which was convened from 1593-4. The story could unfold as follows: As the bitter controversy between Jesuits and Dominicans on predestination threatened to aggravate and expose theological disunity within Catholicism, superiors of the Society locked together in the spirit of the Counter-Reformation in order to enforce unprecedented levels of uniformity. The Congregation did in fact compile guidelines on teaching scholastic theology and then mandated that they be inserted unchanged into the definitive edition of the Ratio Studiorum. Thomas Aquinas was to be followed with only the two exceptions already mentioned in the Ratio of 1599. Furthermore, anyone holding a chair of theology who was not devoted to the

287 “Catalogus” in Ratio Studiorum (1591) in MPSI V: 323-4.
288 “Acta Congregationis Generalis Quintae De Ratione Studiorum” in MPSI VII: 348. «Deinde congregatio regulas quasdam, ab iisdem deputatis confectas pro delectu opinionum tam in rebus theologicos quam philosophicos, in libro de Ratione studiorum recensendas esse decrevit, ut a nostris professoribus exacte servarentur.»
doctrines of Aquinas “might be ejected from the office of teaching.” Only one of the original six drafters of the *Ratio* participated in this Congregation, and that one was not Stefano Tucci.

An alternative narrative to the one just recited may be suggested, however, by the notes of one of the Congregation’s participants, whose name is already very familiar – Roberto Bellarmino. There may not be any novel or radical insights within his introduction that adequately explain the Congregation’s decision to resolidify the authority of Aquinas. Included among the many reasons for that decision were the injunctions of the *Constitutions* (which, as we have seen, could be employed to support a range of positions on the authority of Thomas) and the exhortation of the “highest pope” (whose judgments at times Bellarmino took it upon himself to recast). Bellarmino then proceeded to discuss the removal of the *Delectu Opiniorum* directly. He writes that the catalog of “free” propositions was excised because no one could agree on which points to include. Instituting a definitive catalog, therefore, might end up restricting intellectual liberty rather than augmenting it. His reasons for abandoning the catalog of “condemned” propositions reflect this judgment:

---

289 “Acta Congregationis Generalis Quintae” in MPSI VII: 348. Quote: «Sequantur nostri doctores ins scholastica theologia doctrinam Sancti Thomae; neque deinceps ad cathedras theologicas promoveantur, nisi qui Sancto Thomae bene affecti fuerint; qui vero eiusdem auctoris parum studiosi, vel etiam ab eo alieni sunt, a docendi munere repellantur. De conceptione autem B. Mariae ac de solemnitate votorum sequantur sententiam, quae magis hoc tempore communis, magisque recepta apud theologos est. »

290 Roberto Bellarmino, “Relatio deputatorum pro studiis” in MPSI VII: 351. Quote: «Sequendum esse a nostris Sanctum Thomam, tum quia Constitutiones (P. 4 c. 14 §1) eum nobis commandant, tum quia Summus Pontifex ad idem nos hortatur; tum quia re vera Sanctus Thomas communiter habetur et est princeps theologorum, et eius doctrina secura et solida omnium consensu. » Le Bachelet suggests that the expressed desire of the newly elected pope, Clement VIII, to see the authority of Aquinas held unimpeachable by the Jesuits and by his own theologian, Bellarmino, indeed did play a decisive role in the removal of the *Delectu Opinionum*. See Xavier La Bachelet, *Bellarmin avant son Cardinalat*, 1542-1598 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1911), 496-499.

It is not expedient to make a particular catalog of propositions that are defined or prohibited. For it is hardly possible that we should agree among ourselves on that matter, and it is dangerous lest we compel some proposition to be defined that is later revoked; and we would offend other regions, if we condemn opinions, which the writers of those regions teach; and we seem to arrogate too much authority to ourselves; and finally we have the example of other academies, which have defined propositions here and there that were subsequently scorned or refuted, or even ridiculed.  

This line of thought should now be as familiar to us as its author. The delegates of the 4th Session of the Council of Trent also opted not to define a precisely articulated policy for universal enforcement; in their case the issue was vernacular scripture access, and they agreed that local authorities would determine which regulations would be expedient for their own regions. Bellarmino did not participate in that session (he was born only three years before it), but he demonstrates a similar commitment to broker a lasting consensus by hesitating to over-define. This temporal humility, or fear of being embarrassed later, coincided with a policy of geographical subsidiarity, which nevertheless was better left understated in official documents so as not to compromise the representation of universal agreement among ecclesiastical authorities. That universality, or the very “catholicity” of the Catholic Church, was a crucial element of anti-Protestant polemic, and Bellarmino

---

292 Bellarmino, “Relatio deputatorum” in MPSI VII: 352. «Non expedire ut in particulari fiat catalogus propositionum quae definiantur vel prohibeantur. Nam et vix fieri posset, ut inter nos de hac re consentiremus, et periculum esset ne cogeremur aliquando propositionem aliquam definitam revocare ; et offenderemus alias religiones, si opiniones damnaremus, quas earum scriptores docuerunt; et videremur nobis auctoritatem nimiam arrogare ; et denique habemus exemplum aliquarum academiarum, quarum propositiones definitae passim contemnuntur vel refutantur, vel etiam irriudentur.» Stephanio Tucci, who transcribed Bellarmino’s oral observations on this same subject several years earlier, noted that Bellarmino identified the University of Paris as that overzealous academy which was later ridiculed for overdefining propositions – Bellarmino refrained from recording that same observation in his own notes. See MPSI VII: 44.
was more sensitive than anyone else of its need to be protected. As the author of the
*Controversies* and former Chair of Controversies at the Collegio Romano, Bellarmino
had derided congregations of Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zwinglians for believing that
they, as “private men”, could establish universal doctrine while their own disagreements
were fully manifest.293 Fully aware, in turn, of widespread disagreement among
contemporary Catholic theologians on salient issues of grace, free will, and
predestination, Bellarmino articulated doctrines of papal infallibility and spiritual
supremacy that paradoxically reduced the amount of doctrine that he needed to defend as
universal and irrevocable.294 Diverse bodies of Bellarmino’s church adopted many
different positions at different times, whereas popes had solemnized comparatively few.
Bellarmino wished to keep it that way. His angst that other magisterial communities
within the Church, including his own Society of Jesus, were attempting to play the pope
by defining numerous propositions as universal Catholic doctrine that no pope had ever
so defined is revealed in observations that he made about the *Delectu Opinionum* just a
few years earlier. He registered few complaints about the catalogue of “free” opinions,
but did not hold back about the list of ones “defined”. Referring to the drafters of that
catalog, who were distinguished members of his own order, he called it “odious” that
“private men define propositions.”295 To his mind, they were making it difficult for

293 Roberto Bellarmino, “De Verbo Dei”, in *Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini Politiani, Societatis Iesv, De
Controversiis Christianae Fidei, Adversvs Hvivs Temporis Haereticos, Tribus Tomis comprehensae*. ....
(Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1586), 187-88.
294 For Bellarmino on papal infallibility, see his “De Summo Pontifice” in *Disputationes Roberti
Bellarmini... De Controversiis Christianae Fidei* (Ingolstadt, 1586), esp. 971-982. See also Terry Tekippe,
Press of America, 1983), 54-57; and Peter Godman, *Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine between
Inquisition and Index* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 189-190, 228-323. For medieval exponents of infallibility see
295 MPSI VII: 44: “[Q]uia odiosum esse solet tum acedemiis, tum inquisitoribus, quod privati homines
definiant propositiones.”
Catholics to withstand the fundamental objections that he was levying against Protestants; and mandating that only certain positions could be held and taught, when the contrary of them could be defended “without any danger”, would only “sow abundant discord in the Society.”

Unity required definitional restraint. Papal infallibility, as Bellarmino had formulated it, necessitated considerable autonomy and flexibility on non-papally-defined matters for local authorities, religious communities, and even individual professors. Subsidiarity was the general law, therefore, and it was established again in the central Roman administration rather than piecemeal out of dissent from the periphery.

If that is an accurate assessment of the Congregation’s reasoning and ultimate decision, what should be discernible in the Ratio of 1599 is a structural plan that avoids those questions from the catalog, rather than resolving them unequivocally in favor of Aquinas. Does support for this strategy exist in Rule 13? “Either Thomas should be defended or the question omitted” -- that rule certainly sidesteps the issue of Aquinas’s authority on disputed questions; however, it certainly does not preserve that freedom to “defend the contrary without any danger” that Bellarmino believed was undone by the catalog of defined opinions. Now both catalogs were removed. It might seem that with no catalog of “free opinions” there could be no real institutional protection for theses that challenged Aquinas. On closer examination of the Ratio of 1599, however, it becomes evident that the contents of the Delectu did not disappear but were dispersed and repositioned outside of the curriculum for scholastic theology where liberty of thought ostensibly reflected no theological disunity. The guidelines for professors of scholastic theology contain a selective outline of the Summa that is intended to serve as a

296 MPSI VII: 44: “[Q]uia ista definition tot propositionum, quarum contrariae sine ullo periculo defendi possunt, videtur fere seminarium multarum querimoniarum et discordiarum in Societate.”
pedagogical roadmap. In almost every case, the points from the *Summa* that correspond to propositions from the *Delectu Opinionum* are skipped. That does not mean necessarily that professors outside of scholastic theology were granted an implicit license to discuss these points freely. But in at least two instances, questions that were derived from the *Delectu Opinionum* are relegated explicitly to other disciplines. The *Ratio* of 1599 declared that the discussion of how infinity can be created and how reason governs the body are the prerogative of the philosopher and moral philosopher, respectively. These issues are related not at all to the immaculate conception and the solemnity of vows, which were the only two contra-Thomistic doctrines left in the final *Ratio*, and therefore represent the institution of a broader degree of freedom to dissent from Aquinas than is suggested by the aforementioned Rule 13. The revised scholastic curriculum contains a plethora of additional examples in which the professor is instructed to defer to the metaphysician, the logician, the natural philosopher, moral philosopher, scriptural exegete and commentator. While these points are not always plainly extracted from the *Delectu*, when taken together with ones that are, they convey a pattern of conserving and redistributing freedom rather than abolishing it outright.

As plausible as this interpretation of the text might be, it could become much more historically compelling if there were evidence that contemporaries read it the same way. General Aquaviva’s subsequent correspondence with Jesuit provincials supplies exactly that. Less than a year after approving the *Ratio*, Aquaviva responded to a
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297 See MPSI V: 387-394.
298 See MPSI V: 321, 389.
299 MPSI V: 389-394.
300 Reinforcing this assessment, Robert Maryks traces a similar evolution of the *Ratio Studiorum*, from 1586 to 1599, toward increasing latitude for diversity of opinions within the “Cases of Conscience” curriculum. See his *Saint Cicero*, 84-88.
concern expressed in the German province about having to follow Aquinas in the Cases of Conscience course. While stressing that Jesuit professors ought to strive for uniformity, he acknowledged that a universal rule could only be applied to all local circumstances with great difficulty and he conceded that professors might follow other probable opinions in that course as long as they were attributable to “grave and proven authors.” \(^{301}\) One clarification or exemption seemed to lead to another. Over the next decade, Aquaviva found himself addressing similar concerns from the regions of Milan, Andalusia (Baetica), Poland, Belgium (Gallo-Belgica), Aquitaine, Toulouse, Lyons several times, and Germany again. \(^{302}\) Finally, in a letter to all the Jesuit provinces in 1611, an exasperated Aquaviva implored his deputies for answers as to why diverse theological opinions in the colleges, a problem that he believed the Fifth General Congregation had resolved, continued to proliferate more than a decade after he ratified the final *Ratio*. \(^{303}\) Either Bellarmino and the other framers deliberately embedded certain concealed freedoms within the final version, as I have suggested, or various provinces, colleges, professors, and students continued to find ways to construct the text as they wished, all the while touting the authority of Aquinas. The book of former student Thomas Marwood may be an example of just that. His annotations almost superimpose the Summa upon the Vulgate. How he interpolated readings of other authorities and of his own within his forest of citations to Aquinas will be discussed in the final chapter, which considers how Marwood accommodated his Bible to the circumstances of his recusant household. What should be clear now, however, is that a Jesuit education would have provided him with more than one option. The Scriptures remained navigable and
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\(^{301}\) MPSI VII: 367. This letter was also appropriated in the interpretation of Maryks, *Saint Cicero*, 87.


\(^{303}\) MPVII: 657-659.
the Summa negotiable in the Society long after the *Constitutions*, the Fifth General Congregation, and the final *Ratio Studiorum* were supposed to have sealed the fate of each one.

******************************************************************************

**De Scripturis**

If Bellarmino turned out to be the very one who found ways to legitimate dissent from Aquinas in the general curriculum, what are we to make of the other claim attributed to him – that the Scriptures ought to be subordinated to the *Summa* in Jesuit schools? That hierarchy of theological disciplines was decisively rejected in the original Ratio of 1586. Its preface to the section *De Scripturis* lamented the hitherto unequal relationship between the study of Sacred Scripture and scholastic theology and pleaded for reform:

Truly it seems that we should strive by every effort for the study of the divine Scriptures, which among us flourish too little, to be awakened and blossom forth. To it indeed, we are exhorted by the examples of the fathers, who always thought more usefulness and more worthiness to be in the Scriptures than to press on into so many questions; and to hear God speaking through his prophets and apostles, than to waste away in our own cogitations and speculations.304

---
304 “De Scripturis” in *Ratio studiorum (1586)* MPSI V: 43. «Omni sane contentione conandum videtur, ut divinarum Scripturarum studium, quod apud nostros parum viget, excitetur atque efflorescat. Ad id enim nos hortantur exempla sanctorum patrum, qui semper utilius atque honestissimae esse putarunt in Scripturas, quam in tot quaecunque incumbere; et Deum audire loquentem per prophetas et apostolos suos, quam in nostris cogitationibus ac speculationibus consensescere. »
The pejorative references to *quaestiones*, *cogitationibus*, and *speculationibus* were unmistakable appropriations of conventional humanist jibes at university theology. The preface opened, therefore, not just as an apology for scripture study, but as a polemic against scholasticism. It continued:

Certainly it seems that a great fortress of the church has been erected in scholastic disputations, but there is a by far even greater one in the investigation of the true and genuine sense of the scriptures. Indeed … commentaries seem to follow which, having abandoned the text, compromise the solidity of the Scriptures and surrender completely to scholastic theology. This is as if to shape theologians who are maimed and crippled.\textsuperscript{305}

The *Ratio* assured its reviewers that no warrant could be found for the Society’s dearth of scriptural training in the *Constitutions*, which they asserted was at least as favorable to the Bible as it was to scholasticism.\textsuperscript{306} In rectifying the current imbalance and fulfilling the precepts of their charter, they could not afford to delay any longer, given the “necessity of the times.” That “heretics were surpassing Catholics” in scripture study was not just “exceedingly shameful”; it was quite dangerous, too:

Truly most loathsome is what happens to Catholics in the transalpine regions who delight in the study of the Scriptures; when they observe that part of theology discarded by Catholics and flourishing among heretics, they then flee to the commentaries of the heretics. These same ones, nevertheless, as long as they strive to collect gold from filth, as it is in the proverb, will carry back now and

\textsuperscript{305} MPSI V: 43. «Magnum sane praesidium Ecclesiae positum videtur in scholasticis disputationibus, sed longe maius in vero ac germano Scripturorum sensu pervestigando. Ex ipsis enim desumendae sunt veritates, in quibus explicandis scholastici versantur; ut commentarios sequi videantur, relictio textu, qui se totos scholasticae theologiae tradunt, posthabita soliditate Scripturorum. »

\textsuperscript{306} MPSI V: 43. «Constitutiones certe non scholasticae solum, sed Scripturae etiam, et quidem multo magis studium commendant. » The preface may have been coaxing the text that it cited beyond its plain meaning. See Const.P.IV.c.5.sec.1 and c.12. sec.1 (MPSI I: 217, 281). Bible study is endorsed, briefly, by the *Constitutions*, but not more so than scholastic theology or any other component of the theology curriculum.
then more filth than gold. Nothing is more intolerable, especially in the Society, when it is so eager to adjust its theology to the necessity of the times and to instruct its own to fight with heretics, that it meanwhile equips its own with no type of weapon less than that very one with which we ought to rely on most in waging the battles of the Lord.\textsuperscript{307}

The demands of the Counter-Reformation indeed are invoked in this section of the \textit{Ratio Studiorum}; they are invoked, however, not to restrict Scripture study, but rather to promote it. Specially identified here are particular inter-confessional zones – “the Transalpine regions” – to which we will return when evaluating whether provincial responses to \textit{De Scripturis} can be categorized by different confessional contexts. The drafters of this preface, however, did not intend any geographical differentiation in the study of the Sacred Scriptures, which they later suggested should have been privileged always and everywhere even if a Reformation had never happened. “Nothing is more venerable,’ they observed, ‘than reading the Scriptures even when peace thrives in the Church.”\textsuperscript{308} It cured spiritual dryness and nourished piety. Those who are not refreshed by the substance of scripture, they reasoned, are forced to consume something else. The \textit{exempla mala} here were not Protestants, but again certain scholastic theologians within their own order who “barely sipped the Scriptures with their outermost lips” before

\textsuperscript{307} MPSI V: 43. « Rape defecissem, quod in transalpinis accidit regionibus, catholicos, qui Scripturarum studio delectantur, cum eam theologiae partem iacere apud catholicos animadvertant, vigere autem apud haereticos, ad haereticorum commentaries confugere. Qui tamen, dum student aurum de stercore colligere, u test in proverbio, plus interdum sordium quam auri reportant. Ea vero re nihil indignius, in Societate praesertim, quae cum percupiat suam theologiam necessitati temporum accommodare, et suos instruere ad pugnandum cum haereticis.… . »

\textsuperscript{308} MPSI V: 43. «Quin etiam si Ecclesiae pax vigeret maxime, nihil tamen esse oporteret antiquius lectione Scripturarum. Haec enim magnopere, cum in caeteris arescentem spiritum experiamur, non parum alit animorum pietatem. »
putting them back down, “defiled with their alien glosses and painted flourishes.”

Declining the satisfaction of the Scriptures, they filled up instead on ephemeral things “with their knowledge puffed out”, they became as “horses having been fattened, disobedient and of no use to the Society.” On these two notes, the preface ended, having just likened scholastic theologians to lame beasts and fancy ladies. Which of these comparisons would have been more irksome to contemporaries is unclear. What is clear is that the Jesuit preface-writers deployed heavy rhetoric in their case for enhancing Scripturistudy -- and they targeted scholastics even more than heretics.

The writers must have believed, therefore, that the humanist case for promoting the Bible in the theology curriculum would be even more welcome to members of their own order than a Counter-Reformation case would be. They might have felt that way, in part, because they did not have to invent De Scripturis. Not all of it anyway. Benito Pereyra, a Valencian Jesuit who taught philosophy and theology at the Collegio Romano, had circulated a similar proposal for augmenting scripture study only four years earlier. He too sought to raise its status relative to scholastic theology, invoking the Council of Trent to justify himself. Pereyra’s plan had been adapted from a treatise written a decade before by Juan Maldonado, a professor at the University of Paris and one of the Jesuits’ most eminent scriptural exegetes and theologians of the sixteenth century, whom
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309 MPSI V: 44. “Concionatores etiam scholasticis tantum imbuti studiis, non raro in suis evanescent cogitationibus; de Scripturis vero, quas vix primoribus labris degustarunt, aut nihil afferent in medium, aut parum ad rem, alienis glossis et fucatis argutiis Scripturam adulterantes.”

310 MPSI V: 43-44. «Cuius nisi aliquo quasi pabulo recreentur, qui literis vacant, paulatim fervore pristino tepescente in externas diffluent consolationes, et , inflante scientia, tunc equus nimium saginatus recalcitribit, cum maxime eius opera Societas indigebit.»

311 Benedictus Pereira, S.I., «Annotata de Ratione Studiorum: De ratione interpretandi Sacram Scripturam in gymnasiis nostrae Societatis » in MPSI VII: 122-123.

312 MPSI VII: 126.
Bellarmino among others counted a significant theological influence. Five years prior to that one, another had been composed by Pedro Pablo Ferrer, another Valencian Jesuit who was professor of Sacred Scripture and chancellor of the college of Evora (Portugal). In short, apologia for a greater commitment to Scripture study had been percolating within the Society for a number of years. This one of 1586 was no fluke.

After establishing the problem, the original Ratio outlined a solution. Jesuit superiors must choose superior professors in order to “promote, cultivate, and invigorate the study of Scriptures among those who have been idle.” Professors had to be well-trained, not only in scholasticism, but also in languages and knowledge of antiquity so that they could elucidate “the literal sense, which demanded special consideration.”

Humanistically trained professors were also better able to identify the special figures of the Scriptures and “reconcile the Latin Vulgate edition with the Hebrew and the Greek.” Yet they were not to “tarry” over these matters: to capture the attention of formerly uninterested students, expositions had to be swift and progress rapid. The professor was to indulge neither his own opinions, nor rabbinical ones unless “they favored the Vulgate or the mysteries of faith”. Very notably, the professor was not to dwell upon points of controversy with heretics either. These places were to be treated

---

315 MPSI V: 44.
316 MPSI V: 44-45.
317 MPSI V: 44-45.
318 MPSI V: 44.
319 MPSI V: 45-46.
320 Here the Ratio follows Peyrera more closely than Maldonado or “Gulielmus Brochaeus, Limburgus”, a professor at the Jesuit College of Mainz who submitted his own proposal for teaching Scripture to the Superior General Everard Mercurian after being introduced in 1575 as “perhaps the most skilled and profitable interpreter of Sacred Letters in all our colleges in this province.” Cf. MPSI IV: 193-4 (Maldonado), 591-593 (Brochaeus); MPSI V: 46 (1586 Ratio); MPSI VII: 124-125 (Peyrera);
briefly and, emphatically, “not in the scholastic manner.”321 The professors should follow instead “in the footsteps of the fathers.”

Classical, expeditious, and systematic: those appeared to be the crucial elements of the approach articulated here.

That final element, however, did not get carried over into the next section, where the Ratio delineated the order of books by which professors were to lead students through the Bible. Reading the canon continuously, from Genesis through Apocalypse, was not a priority. What was prescribed was the continuous reading and thorough explication of certain “principal books”: “Job, the Psalms, the Prophets, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle [Song of Songs], Proverbs, the first chapter of Genesis, the Gospels, the Canonical Epistles and the Apocalypse.”323 The last book named here is indeed the last book of the canon; but the first book of the canon, or actually only the first chapter of it, is sandwiched in the middle of the Ratio’s order. An alternative system of organization is operating here, governed chiefly by allegory, tropology (morality), eschatology, and liturgy. That would explain why Job, the Psalms, the Prophets, Proverbs, and the Canticle are placed before the central historical narratives of Genesis and the Gospels. If the agenda is not set, therefore, by the historical narrative, the canon, or some other kind of linear comprehension of the Bible, then neither is it defined by scholasticism, as the earlier guidelines adamantly maintained. For one thing it included the Apocalypse, that mystical book that many ecclesiastical authorities and scholastic theologians considered too obscure to be taught safely, let alone made generally accessible. For another it excluded the entire Pauline corpus, which was ground zero for contemporary inter-confessional

321 MPSI V: 46.
322 MPSI V: 45.
323 MPSI V: 46. Note that “Canonical Epistles” refers to the Epistles of James, Jude, Peter, and John – in other words, not the Pauline Epistles.
apologetics. Paul’s letters were not the only exclusions, of course; what happened to the rest of the Bible not featured in the original Ratio’s list of principal books? These unnamed “other books”, the Ratio explained, “may be run through summarily, noting only the difficult places or chapters.”\footnote{MPSI V: 46.} This “summary reading” would not necessarily follow a linear path through the canon either. Rather, in order to “avoid repetition”, the professor would explicate “common matter” by combining certain books – like “Deuteronomy with the last three books of Moses, Paralipomenon [Chronicles] with the three books of Kings, and all four Gospels with each other, constructing out of them a Monotessaron.”\footnote{MPSI V: 46.} The goal of proceeding expeditiously overlapped with the goal of maintaining a coherent narrative thread to make the synthesis of historical books, or the Monotessaron, a compelling strategy here. The other “principal books”, however, were somehow individuated as keys to understanding the word in the moral, devotional, and liturgical life of the Christian community. They had long served as fountains of the three traditional “spiritual” senses of Scripture, making their selection quite apt if the intention was to “follow in the footsteps of the fathers” as the prior guideline had prescribed; less so if the new focus was supposed to be the literal sense, and the new end a linear, comprehensive knowledge of the entirety of the text. They evidently were not, or at least not in the way that the literal sense and scripture-comprehension were coming to be defined in a post-Reformation context. In the Jesuit model of education proposed here, more careful attention to the literal sense did not require supplanting the “spiritual” ordering of the books; and greater devotion to the study of scriptures did not entail
explicating each book of the canon, nor even each of the “principal books”, as will soon become clear.

For all the details that the original *Ratio* provided about the order and method of studying the Scriptures, it offered few about the course’s duration. It did stipulate that the New and Old Testament should be taught in alternate years. That did not mean, however, that all of the aforementioned books of the New Testament would be studied one year, and likewise those of the Old Testament the year after. This section’s first guideline conveys a rather different impression, recording that it “was considered praiseworthy when a professor expounded all of Isaiah in one year.”

This rate of studying *at most* one principal book per year is confirmed by extant curricula records of contemporary Jesuit colleges. In the College of Cologne, for instance, “Doctor Henricus Dionysius, S.J.”, was registered as delivering his lectures on the Gospel of Matthew in three consecutive *ordo lectionum* from All Saints Day (Nov 1) of 1560 until Easter 1562. That Dionysius’s *praelectiones* were restricted to Saturdays at 4 P.M. helps explain why progress was slow. Sacred Scripture was taught with greater frequency at the Iberian College of Evora, where it was one of the three theology courses; even there, however, the book of Isaiah held its place on the curriculum from May 1562 until January 1564. Plodding through one book in a year and a half, it should be noted, was still a relative achievement. Many Jesuit colleges at this time did not offer sacred scripture as a theology course. Sometimes, a Hebrew course was the only place where

326 MPSI V: 44.
327 MPSI III: 556-563: At the College of Dillingen, for instance, the professor moved on to the Gospel of Matthew in 1565 after completing the letters to Timothy in 1564.
328 MPSI III: 541-551.
329 MPSI III: 588-593.
theology students could undertake continuous, systematic reading of particular Bible books, usually the Psalms.\textsuperscript{330}

More clues about the new timeframe for scripture study that the 1586 \textit{Ratio} was attempting to institute can be derived from the other proposals on which it was based. Within a four-year theology curriculum, both Pereyra and Maldonado recommended a full four years of coursework in Sacred Scripture.\textsuperscript{331} Both also identified certain books that warranted special attention. Pereyra’s list proceeded as follows: Genesis, Isaiah, Job or Daniel, and Psalms; Matthew, John, Romans, Hebrews or Corinthians or Apocalypse – though he was nervous about the last one. For Maldonado, the books of the Old Testament that “ought to be narrated” included Genesis, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, and the Prophets. The table below shows significant overlap among the principal books of Pereyra, Maldonado and the 1586 \textit{Ratio}. The differences among them, however, extend beyond the appearance or absence of particular books to the ordering and coverage of the biblical canon as a whole (See Table 2.1 below).

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{330} See, for example, MPSI III: 537 (Rome, 1560); 569 (Dilingen, 1565); 580-81 (Coimbra, 1562-1565).  
\textsuperscript{331} Cf. MPSI IV: 193 and MPSI VII: 125. Pereyra was willing to settle for three if necessary.}
Table 2.1: Comparison of Different Orders of Scripture Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1586 Ratio (MPSI V: 46)</th>
<th>1582 Pereyra (MPSI VII: 123)</th>
<th>1573 Maldonado (MPSI IV: 192)</th>
<th>1605 Vulgate of T. Marwood**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Genesis (whole bk)</td>
<td>Genesis (whole bk)</td>
<td>Pentateuch (Gen, Ex, Lev, Num, Deut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophets</td>
<td>Job or Daniel</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Histories (Josh, Judges, Ruth, Regum I-IV, Esdrae I-II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Romans &amp; Galatians by compendium</td>
<td>Prophets (Major: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Esdrae I-II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(only Chapter 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John by Monotessaron)</td>
<td>Hebrews w/ Canon. Epistles OR Cor I-II OR Apocalypse</td>
<td>Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel</td>
<td>Tob, Jud, Est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonical Epistles</td>
<td>Rest by compend-</td>
<td>Other OT books read</td>
<td>Wis 1: Job, Psa, Prov, Eccl, Cant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wis 2: Sapient,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**T. Marwood** refers to the Vulgate of Thomas Marwood.
(Jam, Pet, Jn, Jude)ium, if time permits (esp. Josh, Ecl., 1 of the 12 Prophets; “aliaquæ” from other epistles of D. Paul or from the canonicals, or a chapter of Acts) in Hebrew course in All of the NT: Major Proph: Apocalypse

& the rest either by “difficult places” or by compendium, if time permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pentateuch</th>
<th>Histories</th>
<th>Wisdom Books</th>
<th>Major Prophets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Prophets</td>
<td>Deuterocanonical Books</td>
<td>Gospels</td>
<td>Acts, Pauline Epistles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Canonical” / “Catholic” Epistles</td>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Books from Marwood’s Vulgate that are not covered by Pereyra are in red; those that are not covered by Pereyra or by the 1586 Ratio are crossed out.

Maldonado’s order was most closely tied to the Vulgate’s Old Testament canon, which proceeded from Pentateuch to Histories to Wisdom Books to Prophets, though it
appeared at first that he would omit the Histories. Pereyra, on the other hand, inverted the Wisdom Books with the Prophets, imposing a supra-canonical order upon the study of Scripture, just as the original Ratio did. These last two plans formulated an approach to the Scriptures that was not bound to the book, but ordered instead to alternative hierarchies of interpretive significance and devotional practice. With respect to coverage of the text, the dissimilarities between the lists of Maldonado and Pereyra are even more marked. Like the 1586 Ratio, Pereyra advocated the systematic explication of a certain number of “principal books”, even though these books together would total much less than half the length of the biblical text. The other unexplicated books would be selectively skimmed or summarized if any time remained. Maldonado identified “principal books”, too; but he explained immediately thereafter that “the other books of the Old Testament w[ould] be taught through the Hebrew language [course] where indeed they also will be interpreted.”

Why none of the books of the New Testament were separately identified was because Maldonado believed the professor needed to lecture on “indeed all of it.” Maldonado’s proposal, therefore, called for a comprehensive study of the entire biblical text, mobilizing both the Scripture and the Hebrew courses to achieve that end. Studying Matthew or Isaiah for an hour every Saturday over the course of a year and a half would not suffice as it once had for the pupil of Dionysius in Cologne. For all four years of the theology curriculum, Maldonado’s professor of Scripture would lecture for one hour every day leaving another half hour for repetition, and neither of those activities included the time spent in Hebrew

---

332 MPSI IV: 192.
333 MPSI IV: 192.
class nor the extra-curricular practice of memorizing the Psalms and Proverbs.\textsuperscript{334} Maldonado maintained, nevertheless, that even that major time commitment remained insufficient, and that the student of Scripture should not stop learning from it until he died. What Maldonado’s program was supposed to do, therefore, was to \textit{introduce} students to the entirety of the text and to equip them with methods that would enable them to continue plumbing it for the rest of their lives.\textsuperscript{335}

The course of study that Pereyra was proposing looked to be of rather long duration as well, even if it would not last a lifetime. Labeled the “octennio”, his plan would distribute the study of the eight “principal books” into eight years, alternating each year between the Old and New Testament just as the 1586 \textit{Ratio} would prescribe.\textsuperscript{336} The entire theology curriculum, however, lasted only four years. Even if students were required to study Sacred Scripture for all four years, as Pereyra indeed desired, they would miss out on fully half of the eight-year cycle. That meant students arriving in cycle-year-one would be taught Genesis, the Gospel of Matthew, Isaiah, and Romans (along with Galatians, which was supposed to be interjected into the study of Romans “because of their very many similarities”), while students arriving in year five would be exposed to an entirely different corpus featuring Job or Daniel, the Gospel of John, the Psalms, and Hebrews or Corinthians or Apocalypse.\textsuperscript{337} The omission of key biblical genres, let alone particular books, is obvious for each course of study. No Wisdom books for the first Jesuit reader, no Pentateuch for the second. The implications of this proposal are significant for understanding the one reader who spent four years at the College of La

\begin{footnotes}
\item[334] MPSI IV: 193.
\item[335] MPSI IV: 193.
\item[336] MPSI VII: 123.
\item[337] MPSI VII: 123.
\end{footnotes}
Fleche. If Thomas Marwood had entered a college that adhered to this curriculum, he would not have been guided by his professor in annotating an entire Bible, which in fact he did. He instead would have heard four books explicated at length and others only summarily. The comprehensive markings extant in his Bible, therefore, would have to have another source than the dictation he may have received in class. Whether Pereyra’s program actually was instituted at La Fleche is a separate question. What can be concluded here is that the original *Ratio Studiorum*, after levying an anti-scholastic polemic in favor of augmenting scripture study and after demanding more expeditious progress through the Bible, appears to endorse a non-comprehensive scripture-cycle similar to that of Pereyra – at least that is what the different Jesuit provinces perceived when the *Ratio* was sent to them for comment.

I.C. The Provinces Respond

If indeed the Jesuits were the reliable agents of the Counter-Reformation, imposing *Summas* in those schools where the Scriptures once had been, then the provincial superiors should have scrapped the first draft of *De Scripturis* as soon as they received it. Reactions to almost every part of it, however, including the preface’s denigration of scholasticism, were mixed. Some bristled. “Beware that opening,” the Higher German Province warned, “its odious comparison between the Scriptures and scholastic theology is not advantageous.” The reviewers of the French Province

---

descended into particulars: “scholastic theology is not so many questions and cogitations and speculations of ours, as it has been said.”339 Phrases like these, they protested, “should be expunged … lest the position of scholasticism be reduced.”340 They directly rejected the claim, made by Pereyra and the drafters of the Ratio, that the superiority of Scripture study was enshrined by the Council and by Ignatius, believing it both false and dangerous:

All that should be omitted lest we seem to speak with the heretics bringing up another reason against scholastic theology; instead we should accommodate ourselves both to our Constitutions in this place cited, which makes mention of scholastic theology earlier than Scripture, and to the rules of F. Ignatius of blessed memory, so that we may conform to Church orthodoxy; where it reminds us to speak always with honor of scholastic theology and scholastic doctors.341

Those that opposed the polemical language of the preface tended to be situated within the “Transalpine regions”, where “heresies flourish.”342 Apologetics were especially crucial where Catholicism was not consistently imposed by church and state, and these provincials did not want to cede any rhetorical ground to their Protestant neighbors.

---

339 MPSI VI: 133.
340 “Iudicia Congregationum” in vol.6 of MPSI, 133. «In praefatione huius capitis cavendum occurrit, ne in tractatu seu regulis conficiendis, aliquid inseratur minus commode dictum; qualia sunt: odiosa illa nonnihil inter studium Scripturarum et scholasticae theologiae comparatio, in Societate nullum esse Scripturae honorem, nullam exercitationem…. Atque adeo maxime expediret, si R.P.N. Generalis mandaret alicui in transalpinis partibus, ut insignes haereticorum in vertendis Scripturis errors et notaret et evulgaret. »
341 “Iudicia Congregationum” in MPSI VI: 133. «Quae praetermittenda videntur, tum ne loqui videamur aliqua ratione cum haereticis scholasticam theologiam elevantibus; tum ut accommodemus nos et Constitutionibus nostris loco hic citato, quae prius mentionem faciunt scholasticae theologiae, quam Scripturae, et regulis beatae memoriae P.N. Ignatii, ut sentiamus cum orthodoxa Ecclesia; ubi monet, semper honorifice loquendum esse de scholastica theologia de doctoribus scholasticis. »
342 This was not uniformly the case, however; the Rhenish Province called the preface “laudable” because it would lead more students in the Society toward Sacred Scripture as opposed to other courses of theology. See MPSI VI: 132.
Reactions in the lands of the “Church Triumphant” were notably different. The preface “seemed worthy to everyone” in the province of Milan, where it was agreed that actions had to be undertaken “so that our students approve the study of Sacred Scripture and increase their affection for it.”\textsuperscript{343} The Province of Portugal likewise requested a further “command from Reverend Father General” for more institutions and personnel capable of training Jesuits so that “ours press forward with alacrity upon the divine letters.”\textsuperscript{344} The Spanish provinces were split. The response from Aragon paralleled the one from Superior Germany in its expression of anxiety. If the words of the preface had to be retained, the Aragonese conceded, then at least “such exaggeration concerning the insufficiently vigorous study of Scriptures among us should be softened.”\textsuperscript{345} The province of Castile on the other hand, oft-considered the military arm of the Counter-Reformation, embraced the preface with conviction:

What is written in this place on the dignity and utility of divine letters, and of the ignorance and foolishness by which our men labor, is very true. Indeed so much distorted tradition prevails such that the delightful knowledge of the divine Scriptures is of the utmost necessity for our lettered men…. They may strain all their nerves in acquiring scholastic theology … yet being deprived [of the Scriptures, they] miss the fruit of that study. … What can be done to rouse the spirits of our men and to advance those studies?\textsuperscript{346}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{343} MPSI VI: 128.
\item \textsuperscript{344} MPSI VI: 130.
\item \textsuperscript{345} Iudicia Congregationum” in MPSI VI: 130. Quote: «Si verba ipsa huius loci retinenda sunt, mollienda esset tanta exaggeration de studio Scripturarum apud nostros parum vigente, … . »
\item \textsuperscript{346} “Judicia Congregationum … De Scripturis” in MPSI VI: 131. «Ea, quae scribuntur in hoc loco de divinarum litterarum dignitate et utilitate, et earum ignoracione atque inscitia, qua nostri laborant, verissima sunt. Tantum enim valet depravata consuetudo, ut cum divinae Scripturae cognition iucundissima et summa necessaria sit nostris litteratis, sive secum agant, sive cum aliis, sive populum de superiori loco doceant, sive cum haereticis disputant, sive paganos instituant; tamen, illa neglecta, in una scholastica theologia discenda omnes nervos intentdant. Paulo autem post, cum disputandi ardor deferbuit, et hanc facile dediscunt, et illa, quam nunquam didicerunt, orbati, fructis carent studiorum suorum. … Quare aliquid statuendum est, quod nostrorum animos incendere et studia possit iuvarae.»
\end{itemize}
Most of the professors of the Roman College, excepting the very ones who drafted “De Scripturis”, believed that the preface “offer[ed] nothing to us.” That was not, however, because they were offended by its acerbic tone, but simply because “it d[id] not prescribe anything.” If the scripture course was supposed to be efficient, then so too should be the guidelines for it. This practical reasoning was echoed by the province of Naples, and revealed a way forward through what appeared to be an impasse. Before moving ahead along with it, what should be emphasized is the discrepancy among the comments. There was not one definitive response to the preface of “De Scripturis.” Whereas Aragon and Germany objected to its tone, the province of France rejected it entirely, recognizing it as a revolution against scholastic theology. The French provincials marshaled the same authorities as had the writers that they opposed. The reviewers from Castile and Rome, on the other hand, either felt unthreatened by the preface or wholeheartedly embraced it. These responses indicate that the conventional ideological geography of the Counter-Reformation and the ideological coherence of the early modern Jesuits may need to be reconsidered. Here within the lands of the “Church Triumphant”, there was more room for internal criticism. Dissent was more likely suppressed in the “Church Suffering”.

It is evident that the original Ratio, composed after Ignatius’s Constitutions and after the Council of Trent (and, by its own reckoning, with the support of both), did not intend to reinforce the unequal partnership between scholastic theology and sacred scripture. In fact, it intended the opposite. When the subsequent drafts of the Ratio

---

347 MPSI VI: 127.
348 MPSI VI: 129.
Studiorum were issued in 1591 and 1599, however, the polemical preface of De Scripturis did not emerge with them. Did that mean that the program for invigorating Scripture Study was left behind, too?

That is hardly what the opponents of the preface desired. They, too, sought a robust program of scripture study, but one better suited to the circumstances of their embattled regions. That meant that, even if they might have agreed with Milan, Portugal, and Castile about the scandalous lack of scriptural training in their colleges, they could not surrender a preface that would supply ammunition for their own undoing to the “heretics” that surrounded them. That also meant, according to the reviewers in France and Higher Germany, that their scriptural training should not avoid controversies as the 1586 Ratio prescribed, but rather seek them out.\textsuperscript{349} It was incumbent upon the professors “of the transalpine parts to identify and divulge the more notorious errors of the heretics in corrupting the Scriptures… [since] experience testifies that many are confounded by them.”\textsuperscript{350} A non-controversial approach to the Bible seemed to them a luxury that only the colleges in Italy and Iberia could afford. In addition to more controversies, Germany wanted more books of the Bible to be studied, including those Wisdom Books that most Protestants considered apocryphal, the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus.\textsuperscript{351} Adding books was a desideratum of the Roman College, too, or at least of Bellarmino. Certainly more than eight books, he believed, should be able to be covered in a cycle of eight years.\textsuperscript{352} Higher Germany was also far from alone in judging the Monotessaron method an unsatisfactory way to make genuine progress through the

\textsuperscript{349} MPSI VI: 132-135; Note that the Roman College approved the original Ratio’s decision to leave the controversies out of the Scripture curriculum (MPSI VI: 127).
\textsuperscript{350} MPSI VI: 132.
\textsuperscript{351} MPSI VI: 132.
\textsuperscript{352} MPSI VI: 128.
Bible – it only meant reading more Scripture less well.\textsuperscript{353} So, while there were differences among the provinces about tone and approach, there was near universal agreement that swift progress was the goal.

Unity in the final \textit{Ratio}, here as before, was secured by avoiding over-definition. That way forward was again set out by Bellarmino. When the second draft of 1591 was submitted to the Collegio Romano for comment, Bellarmino, who was then rector, advised against imposing a fifth year of theology upon all the Jesuit scholastics.\textsuperscript{354} If a fifth year was not required, objected his former colleague Francisco Suarez, the illustrious Jesuit theologian at the School of Salamanca, then many Jesuits would continue allocating the greater portion of their time to scholastic theology and not enough to Scripture. In his response to this challenge, Bellarmino did not defend his commitment to academic scripture study. On the contrary, he defended the liberty of the schools. It was not outrageous to him that in many colleges, including his own “academy of Rome”, only scholastic theology was taught while the scriptures were read only on feast days. Those who did not study enough Bible in their ordinary course of theology, he suggested, could return to it in the \textit{biennium}, which was a subsequent graduate-level two-year theology course.\textsuperscript{355} He knew, however, that not all scholastics were selected to pursue the graduate \textit{biennium}, as the final \textit{Ratio} would make clear.\textsuperscript{356} He therefore revealed his more fundamental position about why scripture study in the initial theology course might not always be necessary: “no one should be able to call himself a learned scholastic,” he

\textsuperscript{353} MPSI VI: 127, 129-130, 132.
\textsuperscript{354} Xavier-Marie Le Bachelet, \textit{Bellarmin Avant son Cardinalat}, 500-504.
\textsuperscript{355} Xavier-Marie Le Bachelet, \textit{Bellarmin Avant son Cardinalat}, 500-504.
\textsuperscript{356} For the \textit{biennium}, see the 10\textsuperscript{th} Rule in the 1599 Ratio’s “Rules for the Provincial”: Pavur, \textit{Ratio Studiorum}, 11 (Rule 1.10).
asserted, ‘who cannot work his own way through the Scriptures when accompanied by commentary.”\textsuperscript{357} As we know from Chapter 1, Bellarmino was not simply boasting. He was revealing his plan for the Bible. It was not supposed to be a text alone as Pope Sixtus V had demanded, but rather a book with commentaries. He ensured with his preface that the “authentic Latin vulgate” would become so. Having achieved that, he now was attempting to ensure that the \textit{Ratio Studiorum} would not impose more than was necessary.

Nor did Bellarmino wish to impose more than was possible. He and his colleagues acknowledged that they had to overcome a culture in which the prioritization of scholastic theology was deeply rooted. Changing institutional policy could only achieve so much if they could not sell these changes to their students. These ones would have to be convinced that a new commitment to the Scripture and Hebrew lessons would yield swift progress; and to hold their attention, future lessons would have to be “extremely brief.”\textsuperscript{358} Otherwise, these same lessons would be “fully deserted by students.”\textsuperscript{359} The drafters themselves acknowledged the “need for brevity” in the original \textit{Ratio} of 1586: “For if strange things are heaped up [in the teaching of Scripture], it will not be pleasing, except for a certain idle few. … Thereupon the school becomes worthless and is bereft of students.”\textsuperscript{360} These sentiments were captured in the final

\textsuperscript{357} Xavier-Marie Le Bachelet, \textit{Bellarmin Avant son Cardinalat}, 500-504
\textsuperscript{358} MPSI VII: 134.
\textsuperscript{359} MPSI VII: 134.
\textsuperscript{360} “De Scripturis” in MPSI V: 44. «Nam si aliena coacerventur, iis non delectabuntur, nisi pauci quidam otiose. … Inde schola vilescit et auditorium infrequens est. »
version, which demanded that the Professor of Scripture should “teach nothing other than Scripture.”

Bellarmino’s commission concluded in turn that there was indeed a best way to determine how to make theology students study Sacred Scripture, Hebrew, and cases of conscience as much as they hitherto had been studying scholastic theology. That was by relinquishing responsibility to the provinces, so that each one, in consultation with their own rectors and professors, would “establish that which might be useful in their own colleges.” Even though the Collegio Romano itself had decided now to conduct daily lessons in Sacred Scripture for the first three years of theology (and in Hebrew for the second year), Bellarmino and his colleagues were unwilling to establish a general rule in the Society that would require more than two years. They believed that progress in the Scriptures should be made, but could be made only if the goals were more modest and the means consonant with the principle of subsidiarity.

The final Ratio Studiorum of 1599 included guidelines for Scripture study that indeed were in some ways chastened. Stripped away were the injunctions for the Monotessaron method, the curriculum of particular biblical books, and the entire preface, or at least all the polemical content such that the preface seemed no longer to exist. All of these items, which had sparked conflicts among the provinces, were dropped. The suppression of polemic did not necessarily signal, however, a retreat from a program of scriptural renewal in the colleges. It was rather the compromise necessary to achieve unity toward that end. What it meant was: less talk, more action. What was defined,

361 Pavur, Ratio Studiorum, 59-60 (Rule 5.16).
362 MPSI VII: 133.
363 MPSI VII: 134.
furthermore, was just as significant as what was not. Despite the grievances of the French provincials, the Ratio of 1599 continued to treat Sacred Scripture first, prioritizing it above scholastic theology and all other disciplines. It established a two-year Scripture course, which was a minimum period that could be exceeded according to the particular judgments of each province, just as Bellarmino’s commission had advised; just as Ferrer, and Pereyra had warned, it also stipulated that these two years should not be put off to the very end of the four-year theology cycle when students either tire and lose interest or get summoned away from their studies.364 Students would have to complete their Scripture course, and complete it well.

The two-year Scripture course does not seem particularly impressive unless one recalls the dearth of scriptural training in the Jesuit theology programs prior to the Ratio Studiorum. In 1575, Superior General Everard Mercurian surveyed the colleges for information on how sacred scripture was being taught, so that the best approaches might be incorporated into the draft of the general curriculum.365 The reports were not encouraging. The provincial of Naples, Alfonso Salmeron, who also was one of the original companions of Ignatius of Loyola and arguably the greatest biblical commentator and preacher among the first Jesuits, admitted that his college rostered no scripture courses at all. Establishing even one year of scripture study, he professed, would be a major improvement. The problem, however, was personnel. He himself was tied up with administrative duties; and no other students and instructors in his college had taken the scripture course that would qualify them to teach it.366 The provincial of Toledo made a

364 Pavur, Ratio Studiorum (1599), 9 (Rules 1.11-12); MPSI III: 437-8, VII: 125.
365 MPSI IV: 587.
366 MPSI IV: 604.
similar confession: no scripture course was available at his college either. He claimed, however, that his theology students sometimes traveled to Alcala for systematic biblical instruction, and that the cross-regional communication that resulted was indeed “quite fruitful.”\(^{367}\) That story was not corroborated by the Valencian Jesuit, Fr. P.P. Ferrer, who was professor of Sacred Scripture and Chancellor of the College of Evora. Writing to the Superior General only a few years earlier, he did acknowledge the acclaimed program of Alcala, where “Fr. Cypriano teaches [scripture] with such celebrity, having at times as many as six hundred students.” Not among the masses, he regretted, were the Jesuits: “It is only our theology students who do not take the course, and they are known for this.”\(^{368}\) At his own College of Evora, where he ensured that Scripture was taught, a period of a year and half was often necessary to complete a single book.\(^{369}\) Ferrer blamed this sluggish and inconsistent progress upon his “brothers that study theology commonly showing little or no affection for the studies of Sacred Scripture.”\(^{370}\) This malaise, Ferrer lamented, would spread out of the Society to enervate the whole Church: “the study of the scriptures is notably discredited by our students; when others on the outside see that ours do not care for it, they learn; and, as a result, many would leave off learning if they could.”\(^{371}\) Similar testimonies emerged from Aragon and especially Andalusia, where the provincial demanded that the superior general no longer license Jesuit preachers “unless they have studied the scriptures for some time”, because “in Spain it is known that our preachers do not know the Scriptures.”\(^{372}\) Under these circumstances, the two-

\(^{367}\) MSP IV: 615.
\(^{368}\) MPSI III: 438.
\(^{369}\) MPSI III: 588-594.
\(^{370}\) MPSI III: 437.
\(^{371}\) MPSI III: 438.
\(^{372}\) MPSI IV: 229, 262.
year scripture-course that the *Ratio Studiorum* ultimately imposed upon the colleges seems not the least that could have been done, but rather, as Bellarmino anticipated, the most.

The problem was not limited to the lands of the Catholic Church Triumphant either. Transalpine Europe was familiar with it as well. The provincial of Austria informed General Mercurian that the College of Vienna had replaced its scripture course with more scholastic theology once the Professor of Scripture “disappeared.”

373 No one could be counted on to teach Scripture systematically in the several colleges of Poland, remarked the provincial, because everyone was busy doing something else. 374 Similar gaps in the north still needed plugging even long after the *Ratio Studiorum* was codified. In 1615 the provincial of Lyons berated his students for neglecting the Sacred Scriptures, and insisted that it was “of the greatest necessity to devote more time and effort to that study for the sake of opposing heretics.”

375 Compared to their counterparts in southern Europe, however, the Jesuit schools in these lands where “heresies flourished” -- the “Church Suffering” -- generally offered more scripture-courses to their theology students. Despite a smattering of disappointing reports, General Mercurian remained assured that scriptural instruction in the colleges of Germany, Belgium, France, and even Italy was much more stable and rigorous than it was in Spain. 376

It was this General and his successors, therefore, who sought to use a *Ratio Studiorum* in order to regularize the study of Sacred Scripture in the colleges of the north as much as to invigorate it in the colleges of the south. Many of the southern provinces

---

373 MPSI IV: 603.
374 MPSI IV: 616-7.
375 MPSI VII: 426.
376 MPSI IV: 231-2.
were receptive to this program of scriptural renovation, as we have seen, including Castile, which recognized it as consistent with both the Council of Trent and the Jesuit Constitutions. The Jesuit program of education that emerged from these two authoritative documents and putative statements of the Counter-Reformation, therefore, did not suppress the academic study of the Bible. The suggestion that it did, which opened this chapter, is exactly wrong. There was too little to suppress. There was indeed a Bible problem for Catholic universities in the sixteenth century, and the Jesuits were hardly exempted. Their effort to address scriptural education in the second half of the century is, as a result, not a minor historical point that ought to be overlooked because it did not target the laity. The final two-year settlement required a decisive, pan-European commitment to renew scripture education. It furthermore reflected the consensus at Trent about the ultimate cause of the Reformation and about its solution. The object of the Ratio Studiorum’s section on Sacred Scripture was not to withdraw the Bible from lay people held to be incapable of understanding it, but rather to redress the ignorance of the pastors held to be incapable of communicating it.

II. Lay students and the Scriptures

The Jesuit schools were thus supposed to have empowered priests to teach and preach the scriptures to the lay people outside them. What about the laymen within them? If scripture courses were generally restricted to theology students, how did the

---

schools make the scriptures available to their other pupils? Perhaps they did not. They offered lay students a classical education. The direct intrusion of religion into the classrooms of the lower faculties, according to the universal *Ratio* of 1599, was confined to a single hour of catechism at week’s end. That is usually less time than most “Sunday Schools” today commit to supplementing a constitutionally secular public education.

The historian John O’Malley, focusing on the overwhelming absence of Christian studies in the arts curriculum, explained that the schools were not meant to teach laymen *Christianitas* so much as *pietas*. By leading them to the wisdom and even grace nestled within non-Christian, classical texts, the instructors were to form their students in the dispositions to virtue and civic duty that, they believed, formed the foundation of the entire Christian social order. Within that order, these students were meant to become leading citizens, for the benefit of church and community alike. Though the schools for the most part reserved theology for professional students (the ordained), they were not supposed to be withholding the “Word of God” from those students who were meant to become professionals in the world outside. The early Jesuits habitually conceived the “Word of God”, according to O’Malley, in a much broader sense. It included not just the text of the scriptures, but the pastoral ministries described within that text. That is, God also spoke, they believed, through personal meditation, “devout conversation”, and spiritual direction. They aimed to share these means of divine communication with all their students as much as they practiced them themselves.

---

The theology students that emerged from these schools, however, were also supposed to be delivering the more obvious, textual “Word of God” to the people they encountered on the outside. In addition to preaching, which the Jesuits indeed prioritized like contemporary mendicant orders and protestant reformers, they regularly conducted what were known as “sacred lectures.” More instructional and systematic than sermons, these lectures would be organized in a series of twenty or more around a biblical book or devotional subject (e.g., Diego Lainez’s “De Oratione” or Alphonso Salmeron’s “De Lettioni”). Though they would feature the verse-by-verse exegesis common to theology classes, their target audience remained lay people. Coming to church to hear them on Sundays, Tuesdays, and Fridays, these new auditors experienced what John O’Malley called “the first attempts at adult education undertaken systematically and on a large scale.” The Society of Jesus could not hold pride of authorship for this sacred lecture concept. It was the Council of Trent itself, in its Fifth Session, that established parochial lectureships on Scripture. The Jesuits, in turn, promoted the lectures across Europe. Extant notes from these lectures sometimes indicate the speaker’s presumption that his listeners followed along with their own Bibles. The same is true for what was the signature ministry of the Jesuits, delivering the *Spiritual Exercises*, which recommended that retreatants meditate upon the Gospels and upon narratives of the Life of Christ. Taken altogether, does that suggest that opportunities for scriptural contact were actually more limited for laypeople within the schools than outside them?

---

There were other spaces for engaging with biblical texts in school besides the theology classroom. The *Ratio Studiorum* of 1599 (as well as 1591) stipulated that, occasionally, during lunch or dinner in the refectory, “someone from the student body should be assigned to explicate some rather well-known passage from Sacred Scripture in a polished and thorough manner. When he is finished, one or two of his fellow students should adduce proofs against him, but not on the basis of anything apart from the different passages of Sacred Scripture, or the idioms of the languages, or patristic interpretations.”

This rule was located, however, only under the guidelines for the Professor of Sacred Scripture. There is no evidence in the *Ratio Studiorum* to suggest that these extra-curricular scriptural opportunities were intended for students of the lower faculties. On the contrary, it was customary for Jesuits and other scholastics to dine apart from the externs.

For these lay students then, the refectory provided no more opportunities for bible-reading than the theology classroom did.

The formidable libraries of the Jesuit schools no doubt provided access to books that those outside the colleges ordinarily did not have. For the sake of the resident preachers and theology teachers, the library shelves would have been stocked with Bibles and Bible commentaries, as well as with titles that the Index had forbidden to all others. On 8 January 1575, Pope Gregory XIII had conceded to the Society the special faculty of using prohibited books “however expedient for the glory of God.”

---

385 MPSI V: 243, 385.
386 For this custom at the college to which Marwood brought his ward, see Camille de Rochemonteix, *Le Collège Henri IV de la Flèche* (Le Mans: Leguicheux, 1889), II: 41. Division at mealtimes between the *communia superior* and *communia inferiorea* also was standard at the English College Douay, the humanities program of which followed “the methods already established throughout Europe in Jesuit schools,” according to A.C.F. Beales, *Education Under Penalty: English Catholic Education From the Reformation to the Fall of James II, 1547-1689* (London, 1963), 118, 134.
387 MPSI IV: 576 n. 2.
the Jesuit’s Superior General, Everard Mercurian, reminded his provincials that whereas obscene literary works were to be excluded from the colleges unless they were expurgated, the school texts of Erasmus and Vives, for instance, might be permitted where the “greater glory of God seems to require it.”\textsuperscript{388} This exemption covered Erasmus’s biblical volumes, as the remains of some of these libraries appear to indicate. The Folger Library, for instance, preserves a copy of Erasmus’s \textit{Apophthegmatum} (Basil, 1535) as well as his \textit{Novi Testamenti} (Zurich, 1553), both of which were previously held by the Jesuit College of Trier.\textsuperscript{389} The latter was prefaced by Erasmus’s celebrated \textit{Paracletus} (1516), which derided the vanity of scholastic theologians and promoted Bible-reading for people of every rank, class, sex, and faith.\textsuperscript{390} This New Testament octavo was published in Heinrich Bullinger’s Zurich just six years before his \textit{opera omnia} (and that of Erasmus) was placed on the notorious Pauline Index of 1559. Both volumes were retained by the college of Trier, however, through the seventeenth century.

And they are not atypical holdings for early modern Jesuit libraries, as the Folger collection again demonstrates: Erasmus’s Bible commentaries and evangelical treatises were also owned by the Jesuit College of Freiburg im Breisgau and one of their mission libraries in Austria.\textsuperscript{391} Unforbidden Bibles and commentaries, of course, were also

\textsuperscript{388} MPSI IV: 576.
\textsuperscript{390} Just below the title-page provenance mark attributing the book to the College of Trier is the early modern inscription: “pr[a]efatio prodit ingenium auctoris” (or, \textit{the preface reveals the mind of the author}). The message certainly does not convey a positive endorsement of Erasmus’s \textit{philosophia Christi}, but it does suggest some reader engagement with this book in a Jesuit library.
stacked in the libraries. And the school libraries were not reserved for the scholastics alone as the theology classrooms generally were.

Bible books of all sorts then were present in the libraries. What has not been established, however, is for whom they were intended and for whom they were made available. The Ratio Studiorum addresses both questions. In the ratified version of 1599, the Prefect of Studies is assigned the responsibility for “keeping a good supply of the books that both Jesuits and non-Jesuits use every day” and, at the same time, for “not having too many superfluous ones.” The decrees of the Council of Trent and the Bible were explicitly named among the books assigned to all those in the theology program, so that “those students may consult them in their private study” and “become familiar with them.” The earlier drafts of the Ratio specify further that in the daily quarter of an hour allotted to students for learning something of piety and Christian doctrine on their own, those in theology “ought indeed to commit to memory the Psalter, the Proverbs of Solomon, and something from the New Testament.” Those in the lower disciplines of grammar, humanities, and rhetoric – i.e., all the college students – were “vehemently encouraged,” on the contrary, “to conduct their spiritual reading especially on the lives of the saints.” The Bible went unmentioned. What followed instead was an exhortation to the teachers of the lower faculties to do everything in their power to deter students from reading indecent writers, both in class and outside it. This concern about the private

---

392 The Folger Library also possesses, for instance, a copy of Augustine’s Enarrationes in Psalmodis [Paris: Girault, 1542] Folger: 178-384f], formerly owned by the Jesuit college of Genoa.
393 MPSI V: 377.
394 MPSI V: 377.
395 MPSI V: 165, 231.
396 MPSI V: 417.
reading of the college students was reiterated throughout the Ratio Studiorum. It also surfaced in General Mercurian’s aforementioned circular letter of 1575. Immediately after recalling that the Society was given permission to use prohibited books, he reemphasized the restrictive conditions for reading them. The rector was enjoined to monitor the books and their readers, who were forbidden to consult them in the school libraries, cubicles, or any public place where other students might encounter them. Selectivity and secrecy were both paramount. In sum, Bibles and commentaries (that is, the non-forbidden ones) indeed may have been accessible to the extern students in some libraries, but they were never intended for them. Their reading choices, both sacred and profane, were much more highly regulated.

The evidence thus suggests that lay Catholics did not find in the Jesuit schools a uniquely hospitable space for systematic biblical instruction nor for private bible-reading. Parents sent their children to the colleges for a classical education, not a theological one. Juan de Polanco, who was secretary to Ignatius of Loyola and his next two successors, marketed the colleges as “centers of letters, learning, and Christian life.” It was Christian life, notably, and not doctrine. Doctrine was not to be excluded, but it was not the purpose of the colleges. It would be taught there the way that the Jesuits taught it elsewhere – that is, through the catechism. That is not to say at all that the methods and instruments of catechesis were uniform across the Society. Whether the catechism of Canisius, Auger, Avila, Bellarmino, or another was to be used varied from province to province and even from college to college, as did the amount of time devoted to it. On

---

397 MPSI V: 364, 377, 447.
398 MPSI IV: 577.
399 O’Malley, First Jesuits, 200.
the other hand, the universal *Ratio Studiorum* of 1599 required all the colleges to hold catechism contests, in Latin excepting only the lowest grammar classes, and to award prizes to the “one or two students who have surpassed the rest in reciting Christian doctrine.”\(^{400}\) The language of catechesis shifted to the vernacular elsewhere in towns, where Jesuits set up “confraternities of Christian doctrine.” Emerging in Italy before the Council of Trent, these confraternities consisted of lay men and women, who had been instructed by Jesuits, who in turn took responsibility for the Christian education of children.\(^{401}\) One of the Jesuit supervisors reported to General Mercurian more than a decade after the Council on their continued flourishing: in Urbe there were 40 “spiritual men” teaching 400 boys and in Bologna there were at least 40 confraternities of both sexes.\(^{402}\) The Jesuits catechized, therefore, inside and outside the colleges. Despite the variance in means, agents, and objects of catechesis, there was a common understanding in the Society that catechisms, and not Bibles, were the books of Christian doctrine for lay people.

That conclusion resonates with the familiar “confessionalization” story of sixteenth century Europe in which civic and ecclesiastical authorities of all confessions agree that the catechism is a safer substitute for the Bible.\(^{403}\) The concept of substitution, however, may be inadequate for describing the reality of the Jesuit schools. Those that were more intense about teaching catechism tended to be the same ones more committed to having students encounter the scriptural text. Again, it was the transalpine colleges

---

\(^{400}\) MPSI V: 414. Henry Bedingfeld, the ward of Thomas Marwood, won the prize for best recitation of a chapter of Canisius’s catechism in 1702. See CRS VII: 133.


\(^{402}\) MPSI IV: 636-8.

that had established more regular Scripture courses in their theology curricula before the *Ratio Studiorum* inaugurated a two-year minimum requirement for all. It was these colleges, too, that sought to ensure that their lay students were catechized well enough to hold their ground against their Protestant neighbors. Immediately after the *Ratio Studiorum* was codified in 1599, the French Province of Jesuits requested that their colleges be allowed to continue the fourth, lowest level of grammar, so that their students could be formed in Christian doctrine from the earliest age. It was “Gallic custom”, they argued, and necessary “to satisfy parents who feared that anyone else would teach their children with a heretical catechism and imbue them with depraved morals.”

The Province of Austria explained at the same time that their colleges also would be teaching Christian doctrine through four levels of grammar, as well as through humanities, rhetoric, and philosophy, and that they would be supplementing the catechisms of Peter Canisius with “P. Coster’s *Handbook of the Controversies of our times.*” Steady, polemicized catechesis was old news in the Province of Germania. Since 1561, the curricula of the College of Cologne revealed that Coster himself taught catechism using Canisius’s books along with Johann Eck’s *Handbook of Common Places against the Lutherans.* It was in the same college of Cologne, as well as in Dilingen, Wurzburg, and elsewhere in Germania, where the catechisms of Canisius were recited with zeal, that intense scripture study was a regular part of the theology program.

---

404 MPSI VII: 370.
406 MPSI III: 541-551. Ioannes Eck (1486-1543), *Enchiridion locorum communium adversus Ludderanos* (Landshut, 1525).
In these same colleges, moreover, Bible-reading was not restricted to theology. The Wurzburg curriculum of 1567 explained how all the students of the college were taught the Sabbath Bible lections:

On Sundays and feast days in the morning at the 6th hour, all students hear (audient) the explication of the gospel. As the exact sense is handed down to the students of the superior classes, the explication is handed down to the simple students (rudiis) of the inferior classes in keeping with their capacities. When finished all convey themselves to the church, mindful of modesty, and participate devoutly in the sacrifice of the mass, hearing the homily, zealously drawing fruit from it.\(^{408}\)

While the gospel explication is modulated according to the different capacities of the higher and lower faculties, it is delivered to all students before they enter the church, where they hear the gospel solemnly read and preached. The explications are distinct from the homily, and most likely approximate the more systematic genre of the sacred lectures that were similarly available to lay auditors in the towns. How highly the students, faculty, and staff valued them was revealed when a central administrator, Rev. Visitor Baldwin, S.J., attempted to cancel them. He deemed them inconsistent with the practice of the Roman College. In a series of complaints directed to General Mercurian himself, the outraged faculty of the Wurzburg college decried the abrogation of the praelectiones as “the achievement of the devil.”\(^{409}\) It was both “publicly deplored by students” and ridiculed by “heretics who now accuse us of excluding the word of God

\(^{408}\) MPSI III: 567-8.
\(^{409}\) MPSI IV: 694.
from our schools.” The homily might suffice in the Roman College, they suggested, but “not among the German people who require the explication” and who thereby will be “eagerly summoned to communion, confession, and to the more worthy celebration of the feast that follows.” The other German colleges substantiate this contemporary linkage between the reception of the sacraments and biblical instruction for the laity. In Cologne, it was at first only the grammar students who were hearing the gospel and epistle read and explicated on Saturdays and holy days before Mass. That privilege then was extended to the students of dialectic. Students in the highest level of grammar (poetica) also read during class the Gospel lections in Greek (evangelia graeca dominicalia). The curricula of the College of Dillingen record the same practice of grammar students reading the Greek lections. And when Geronimo Nadal, S.J., was completing his visitation of Dillingen in 1566, he affirmed younger students (pueri) reading the liturgical Gospels and Epistles as long as it was the Vulgate version and not that of Erasmus.

Since the lections were extracted from the Vulgate, Nadal’s insistence further consolidated the bond between Bible-reading and the Mass for lay students. In the Province of Lithuania, however, where Jesuit superiors expressed particular concern about the liturgical formation of “the sons of heretics who frequently attend our schools,” the gospel explication was delivered to grammar students in the vernacular. This modification was not applied to the other students, who also received the gospel

410 MPSI IV: 694-5.
411 MPSI IV: 692-3; see also MPSI IV: 669-70.
413 MPSI III: 529-31.
414 MPSI III: 541-547.
415 MPSI III: 561.
416 MPSI III: 108.
explication, but in Latin. In any case, what remained constant in these transalpine Jesuit colleges was that lay students received the scriptures within a liturgical context. The curricula of the cisalpine colleges do not record similar scriptural opportunities for students of the lower faculties, but they rarely disclose any catechism sessions either. The evidence suggests that these college students read from the scriptures and the catechism, or that they read from neither. One was not a substitute for the other, because the two served different functions for the laity -- the catechism for Christian knowledge and the scriptures for Christian life.

It was Christian life, according to Juan de Polanco, that was a primary object of the Jesuit colleges, and the Ratio Studiorum entrenched his position. The catechism was given its own fixed hour on Saturdays; but prayer, liturgy, and sacraments permeated the schedule every day. Students were to go to Mass each morning, to sermons on feasts, and to confession every month – and the Ratio held their teachers responsible for ensuring that they did. The Ratio also enjoined the teachers of the lower faculties to begin each class with a prayer and to “urge his pupils to say their daily prayers, in particular the rosary or the little office of the Blessed Virgin, to examine their consciences every evening, frequently and devoutly to receive the sacraments of penance and the holy eucharist, to avoid bad habits, to hate vice, and to cultivate the virtues befitting a Christian.” Books were associated with these activities, too. The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary could be found in many printed compilations of liturgical prayers and scripture-passages, some of which included the gospels and epistles.

418 Of the collected curricula of sixteenth-century Messina, Rome, Naples, Milan, Braga, Coimbra, Evora, and Lisbon, only the first records a time slot for catechetical instruction. See MPSI III: 527-598.
419 Pavur, Ratio Studiorum, 137, 139.
420 Pavur, Ratio Studiorum, 138.
that were studied in the Jesuit colleges of Northern Europe. One compilation, Louis de Blois’s *Paradisus Animae Fidelis* (Antwerp, 1540), had been possessed by the early modern Jesuit college of Montpellier. It featured among various prayers and psalters, the Hours of Mary and of Jesus, as well as a *Vita Christi*. Blois’s *Life of Christ*, which he introduced as a “most sacred bundle” of the “most sweet and easy parts” of the gospels, was used in this case not as a substitute for the Bible but as a key to reading it: the readers of this Life marked its passages with the biblical chapters and verses to which they corresponded. 

Miscellany Books of Hours like these, which bound together liturgical prayer with the scriptures, could be found elsewhere in the Jesuit colleges of early modern France. A seventeenth-century *Ordre du Jour* for La Flèche, the very college attended by Thomas Marwood and his ward Henry Bedingfeld, instructed students to bring books with them to the chapel and to read the “Heures” during Mass. Since they were considered necessary for following the Mass, these Books of Hours likely would have included not just the Hours, but also the prayers and lections of the Mass. Where the schools provided Bible-reading opportunities for the laity, they grafted them into the liturgical experience.

Not during every part of the liturgy, however, were these Mass books to be read. Students were directed to “not have anything in hand during the holy Sacrifice except the books of prayers, and to not read it when the priest prays in a high voice, but rather to meditate on the liturgical words and to pray principally from the Consecration to the Our Father for the Church, for the Pope, for the bishops, for the most Christian king, for France, for the Company, for the college, for the conversion of heretics, and finally for

---

421 Folger Library Shelfmark: 175-883q.
the friends who suffer in purgatory.” In other words, students were not to read or follow the Canon of the Mass. That was normally held to be much more dangerous than reading the Gospels, as we learned in chapter one and will see again in chapter four. A layman who learned the Canon, which included the words of consecration, could usurp it for blasphemous purposes, whereas one who followed the Gospel could be more closely united to the mission of whatever church was homilizing on it. Jerome Gonnelieu, a faculty member of La Flèche in Marwood’s day, addressed this subject in his *Les exercices de la vie interieure* (Paris, 1689). His readers were encouraged to cultivate a fervent sense of commitment during the Gospel reading, personally affirming everything that the priest read and begging for the grace to live by his words, for the conversion of themselves and of all heretics. The approach to reading scripture in the church and with the church, which was promoted at La Flèche, indeed circulated throughout the network of Jesuit education. The aforementioned works of Gonnelieu and Blois, for instance, were frequently republished in Latin and French during the seventeenth century, and simultaneously were translated into English and published as many times. The approach that they disseminated to lay readers, however, was by no means revolutionary. On the contrary, the Jesuit schools were simply reinforcing traditional Catholic modes of appropriating the scriptures.

There may be yet one distinctive mode of scriptural appropriation that the Jesuit schools made available -- sacred theater. At least it would have been distinctive for those students coming from Reformed territory, where the cultural framework for the medieval mystery plays had been progressively dismantled over the course of the sixteenth

---

423 Rochemonteix, *Collège de la Flèche*, II: 114-5.
All the way until the suppression of the Society in 1773, the Jesuit colleges continued to offer students the opportunity, sometimes two or three times per year, to not just encounter the Bible, but insert themselves into it and inhabit its personalities. The College of La Flèche, for instance, performed *Daniel, Filius Prodigus*, and *Jonathas et David*, as well as classical pieces such as *Alexandre-le-Grand* and *Romulus et Remus* and works of ecclesiastical history like *Celsus, martyr*. One variable that united the great majority of these plays, significantly, was the language. The *Ratio Studiorum* seemed to permit only Latin productions except perhaps in very rare cases. When rectors wrote to General Aquaviva at the turn of the seventeenth century requesting exemptions, he was more amenable to granting boys the privilege of playing women than he was to permitting vernacular interludes of any but the briefest duration. The resolute Latinity of these productions for much of the early modern era does represent a rupture with the medieval mystery play tradition, which had presented the unlettered of town and guild with the opportunity to interpret central narratives of the Bible.

This general policy underscores the system-wide commitment of the colleges to Latin education. That policy would seem to restrict access to the Scriptures in the case of the theater: the language of learning would mystify many would-be attendees from outside the college. The case of the liturgy, however, was a different story. Since it
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428 MPSI V: 371. Another rule prohibited the college students from attending any other “spectacle” that was put on outside the school, “with the exception of the punishment of heretics”: MPSI V: 447.
429 MPSI V: 371: The same rule that established the principal language of the plays also forbid female characters. The rectors who petitioned Aquaviva explained that the rule would make it impossible for them “to exhibit many of the histories of Sacred Scripture including Judith, Esther, Magdalene, etc.” See MPSI VII: 368-70, 404, 421.
continued to be performed in Latin throughout the early modern Catholic world, the lay graduates of these classical Jesuit academies achieved access to the rites of worship and the communication of the scriptures therein that was unprecedented in scope. By the middle of the eighteenth century there were more than 800 Jesuit schools.⁴³⁰ The tens of thousands of students that emerged from them formed a new class of unordained, secular men fluent in the learned language of the church. Not only would their education grant them access to the liturgical presentation of the scriptures, which they had been trained and habituated to prefer, but it also granted them the capacity to read any Latin Bible that they had the means to purchase, as well as the scholarly apparatus surrounding it. If the Jesuit colleges never aimed to bring the Bible to the language of the people, they nevertheless succeed in bringing their students to the language of the Catholic Bible.

PART II:

READING ACROSS THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND
Nicholas Byfield, the Reformed “Preacher of God’s Word” in Middlesex, had been exhorting reluctant parishioners to follow his systematic program for reading the scriptures. In 1618, “having been urged by many friends in diverse places of late,’ he finally ‘suffered [his instructions] to come into public view.” His Directions for the Private Reading of Scripture constructed a daily schedule for reading the entire Bible, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, in one year. The thin octavo manual enjoyed a successful print run, appearing in a fourth edition in 1648. It was not the first Protestant text to set out a linear, consecutive mode of Bible-reading. So too did the Church of England’s official (and very much commercially successful) titles, the Book of Common Prayer (1st ed., 1549) and the Authorized Version of the Bible (1611), albeit with certain scheduled interruptions. What appears to emerge from this prescriptive evidence is a distinctively Protestant approach to reading the scriptures, especially when compared to the Jesuit curriculum of the previous chapter.

Continuous scrolling, however was only one among many reading practices that English Protestants actually employed. All the rest were discontinuous. Though the
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431 Directions for the private reading of the Scriptures wherein besides the number of chapters assigned to every day, the order and drift of the whole Scriptures is methodically set downe: and choice rules (that shew how to read with profit) are likewise given... By Nicolas Biefield preacher of Gods word at Isleworth in Middlesex. (London: N. Butter, 1618), 4 [STC (2nd ed.) 4214].

preface to the Book of Common Prayer scorned the Catholic mode of liturgical reading, which it claimed bounced around the Bible, missing important passages and obscuring the general narrative, the reading schedule it proposed still retained jarring liturgical exceptions. Following the order of the liturgy rather than that of the biblical books is one method of discontinuous reading. A second is to cross-check the passages indicated by marginal concordances, which were printed in nearly all English Bibles. Geneva Bibles facilitated a third: by initiating verse divisions in 1557 and introducing new alphabetical indices in 1580, it inclined its readers toward conceiving discrete portions of text as moral or doctrinal commonplaces which could be reorganized thematically. That at least was the accusation of John Locke, who a century and a half later charged the Geneva divisions with having “mine’d and chopp’d” the biblical narrative into “distinct Aphorisms”, thereby facilitating doctrinal wrangling in the church.\footnote{John Locke, An Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul’s Epistles. By Consulting St. Paul himself (1707), as discussed in D. F. McKenzie, Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts (Cambridge, 1999), 55-57.} Indeed, Byfield’s Directions explicitly encouraged the discontinuous reading practice of biblical commonplacing. The Middlesex preacher instructed the reader:

> Make a little paper book of a sheet or two of paper, as may be most portable: then write upon the top of every leafe, the title for that thou wouldest observe in reading. Chuse out only six or eight titles out of the whole number of such as for the present thou hast most need to observe … In reading observe onely such places as stare thee in the face, that are so evident, thy heart cannot looke of them. … In noting the places, set downe under each title only the Booke, Chapter, and Verse, and not the words.\footnote{Directions, Byfield, 13-14.}
After creating this personal index, Byfield’s reader could reenter the Bible at various points to review the places of ‘moral and spiritual profit’; the ‘hard partes’ that ought to be referred to the Preacher; and, very specifically, those places that vindicate the social separation of the godly. Byfield’s method did not demand the physical reconstruction of the Bible: it remained the continuous text of the Protestant canon in a single codex. Yet, with “the little paper book” that he suggested making, the Bible indeed was transformed into a miniature set of common places, extracted from anywhere in the canon and leaving out the rest of it.

To note these practices is not to lament another compromise of the ideal of continuous reading, but rather to suggest that the ideals and inclinations of early modern readers may not yet be fully understood. To analyze how, why, and when early modern Christians took advantage of the material technology of the biblical codex, perhaps it is better not to begin with a standard for reading that is historically bound to the eighteenth century novel. Now that a variety of discontinuous reading strategies have been revealed in English Protestant Bibles, it is necessary to trace the historical development of these strategies, so that we might determine what role if any the Reformation played in privileging some and stigmatizing others. Why does Byfield, on the one hand, admonish his readers to begin and end each reading session by flipping to his chapter summaries and, on the other, wholly avoid discussion of liturgical reading? To appreciate the broader significance of that particular omission, and by extension the biblical reading landscape in which Thomas Marwood was raised, is the project of this chapter.

435 For each point, see respectively Directions, Byfield, 8-9; 14; 12-13.
The Liturgy in Latin Manuscript Bibles

It is a contingent historical achievement for a book’s most important role to be a text. That ought to be recalled when we begin an investigation of bible reading strategies in the early middle ages, where many extant biblical manuscripts bear few traces of reading. These giant books could serve instead as commodities, symbols of authority, objects of devotion, and carriers of relationships. Those that were read were characteristically read discontinuously. One of the principal effects of the transition from scroll to codex over the first four centuries of the common era was to denaturalize strict linear progression through texts, particularly the sacred ones. The Benedictines certainly heard the scriptures read continuously in the refectory. But they did not always proceed through the books in the order of the canon. In addition, they regularly encountered the scriptures through alternative schemes of organization. The most common order was liturgical – the liturgy of the mass and, even more frequently, the liturgy of the hours. Performance of neither liturgy required all the scriptures to be bound together in a single codex. The Lectionary contained the epistles and gospels of the dominical masses throughout the year while the Psalter provided the texts of the eight or nine daily offices from vigil to compline. The Psalter was subdivided and rearranged so that certain Psalms would be repeated, others skipped and returned to, and others recited consecutively. The tortuous path around this biblical book would have been perplexing had the monks been habituated to linear reading. They were not. And their other biblical service-books, the missal and the breviary, further prioritized progress through the liturgy, rather than through the biblical canon.
Lectio divina, however, was a non-liturgical monastic enterprise. It was not, Beryl Smalley argued, “the pious exercise we now call ‘spiritual reading’.”

Encompassing biblical scholarship, according to the tradition of Jerome and Augustine, it was amenable to continuous reading. Hugh of St. Victor in his Didascalicon advised the student apprentice first to read the Bible three or four times the whole way through in order to master the historical narrative. But lectio divina was by no means limited to continuous reading. It involved the exposition of texts, the reconciliation of authorities on these texts, and the collation of their wisdom upon the sacred page itself. The way that the academic project transformed the indexical apparatus of the Bible is well-known. The second half of the twelfth century witnessed the proliferation of finding aids. Tables of contents, tables of concepts, concordances, summaries, abridgements, headings, chapters, and foliation all assisted the studious clerk to navigate the text and its scholarly paratext. Some scholars have suggested that these new books, and the corporate projects within which they were situated, institutionalized discontinuous reading -- and a quite pernicious form of it. Readers became inclined, therefore, to extract pre-determined sententia and discard the textual remains, such that the context surrounding any passage was removed from the ordinary process of interpretation. This “scholastic mode” of reading allegedly became the dominant form of lectio, displacing the continuous ruminatio of the monks until the latter was restored by renaissance

437 Smalley, Study of the Bible, 89. Smalley advances this argument about lectio divina on 26-36 and passim.
439 For this polemicization of Jacques LeClercq’s monastic / scholastic dichotomy, see Jacqueline Hamesse, “The Scholastic Mode of Reading,” in Chartier, R., & C. Guglielmo, eds., Reading in the West (Amherst, 1999), 103-121.
humanists and their Protestant descendants. Yet methods of commonplacing long outlived the scholastics, as we have seen even among those who were supposed to have replaced them.\textsuperscript{440} To cast humanists and reformers together as the \textit{deus ex machina} in a tragedy of continuous reading would be to assign them all a part that perhaps few would know how to play, and perhaps fewer would desire. The scholastic mode of reading was never so hegemonic in its own time, nor was it supposed to be. Masters encouraged their students to read the originals while also supplying them with strategies for coping with vast quantities of information.\textsuperscript{441} But the indexical form of discontinuous reading was as useful for medieval scholastics as it was for those humanists and reformers who employed it for the accumulation of knowledge, moral reflection, self-help, determination of political counsel, and evangelization. The most productive question, again, is not when was discontinuous reading abandoned, but how was it appropriated and transformed.

To investigate the perdurance of a liturgical form of discontinuous reading, it does not seem that the best place to search would be the workspace of the schoolmen – that is, the remnants of the university’s scriptural booklets (or \textit{pecia}) or the margins of glossed books. Yet Latin “pocket-bibles” of the thirteenth century bridged liturgical settings for reading inside the university and out of it. These new portable pandects, squeezing the scriptures out of multiple folios into a single volume, were conventionally labeled “Paris Bibles” because their canons followed the order established at the University of Paris. The indexical device for which they are most famous are the standardized chapter


numbers, which further linked together communities of scholars around an increasingly precise and shared system for referencing scriptural passages.\footnote{Laura Light, “The Thirteenth Century and the Paris Bible,” in Richard Marsden and Ann Matter, eds., \textit{New Cambridge History of the Bible, 600-1450} (Cambridge, 2012), 380-391. Light corrects the common misconception that pocket bibles were equivalent to Paris Bibles. In fact, the label “Paris Bible” concerns text, paratext, and textual order, rather than size; hundreds of “Paris Bibles” were small and portable, while others were more substantial and lavishly illuminated.} Yet these small books also facilitated liturgical reading, for there is another indexical device frequently found within them – the liturgical calendar of bible-readings for Sundays and special feasts. This calendar directed the homilist to the book, chapter number, and often incipit of the next gospel to prepare. The liturgical apparatus of these unprecedentedly small Bibles made them ideally suited for the itinerant friar, argued the bibliographer and historian Christopher De Hamel, since they could fit in the fold of his habit as he wandered from church to church across the continent preaching on the regular mass readings.\footnote{Christopher De Hamel, \textit{The Book: A History of the Bible} (London, New York: Phaidon Press, 1999) 114-138. This interpretation is supported in part by Light, “The Thirteenth Century,” 382-3.} The regular inclusion of these liturgical calendars is not in itself proof that they were used. That the Franciscan constitutions in 1338 required the book for every friar provides some circumstantial evidence. Clearer testimony can be gathered from the readers themselves.

Two small thirteenth-century pandects that can shed light on this subject are Penn MS Codex 236 and MS Codex 1065. MS 236 possesses a liturgical apparatus that even exceeds that of the Paris Bibles described by De Hamel. Its table of epistles and gospels includes the standard readings for Sundays and special feasts, but also those for innumerable ferial days and votive masses (460v-462v). Assigning readings for 315 occasions, this section offers almost a daily scheme for Bible-reading. The table was bound into the volume after its original production – an indication that its owner considered it worth an additional cost. And one early reader betrayed a particular
attachment to the liturgical reading order, inserting a manicule next to the reading references for a Mass of the Holy Trinity (Fig. 3.1). If this table was a subsequent addition to the volume, other liturgical pieces were part of the original. Leaves 400v to 458v feature a monthly calendar of the church year, the canon of the mass, a table of prefaces, graduals, and antiphonals. An early reader periodically marked these components, inscribing extra Latin directives where useful – an indication that the book was used for participation in the Liturgy of the Mass (Fig. 3.2).

A reader’s interactions, however, should not be judged by manuscript alone. The first chapters of Matthew’s gospel, where if there were any designations of liturgical readings one would expect them to begin with frequency, reveal no intelligible reader marks at all. There may be more than one reason for that. On other pages of the Bible, traces of Latin manuscript notes survive underneath concerted efforts to whitewash the margins. Reader marks designating the liturgical gospels may have been victims of the same process. But one can bracket that question and still conclude that MS 236 is the product of a joint effort to unite the Bible and the Liturgy of the Mass together in a single volume. The reader(s) left manuscript evidence of having used both sets of texts. While the liturgical sections must have influenced how the scriptures were read, they did not always determine the process of reading.

444 That is not to say that the book was used for publicly officiating the Mass. The size of the script, abbreviations, and customary church “lighting” would have made solemn, public reading exceedingly difficult. On this point, see Peter Stallybrass, “Epilogue” in Laura Light & Eyal Poleg, eds., Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible (Brill, 2013), 379-394.

445 On the custom of whitewashing manuscript annotation, see William Sherman, Used Books, 151-178.
Figure 3.1 UPenn Ms. Codex 236, Kislak Center for Special Collections and Manuscripts, University of Pennsylvania (Table of Gospels & Epistles with manicule on right)
Figure 3.2 UPenn Ms. Codex 236 (432v-433r Missal Section annotated by early reader)
UPenn Ms. Codex 1065 offers a second biblical venue to observe the interplay of liturgical cues and reader response. The book conformed to the Paris model in the order of biblical books, prologues, and chapters. Smaller, thinner, and less sumptuously illuminated than MS 236, this book could have been more suitable to take on the road. In at least one respect, it also was more suitable for liturgical performance. The Psalms of MS 236 are rubricated and numbered facilitating multiple discontinuous reading strategies. A reader enhanced his capacity for rapid visual indexing by inscribing Arabic numerals alongside the Roman originals at the beginning of each Psalm. The Psalms of MS 1065, on the other hand, is the only biblical book in the volume without numeric subdivision. What differentiates one psalm from another is the incipit, which always begins with a painted capital letter. This scheme might retard a silent reader, but it would assist a listener waiting for an oral cue to locate the next psalm to recite. Whereas MS 236 was rubricated by psalm, MS 1065 was rubricated within psalms. The latter’s more frequent transition from red to blue capital letters marked the antiphonal shift from one chanter to the next. In Ms. 1065, the Liturgy of the Hours shaped the structure of the Psalms.

What this pocket bible is missing, however, are the liturgical appendices available in MS Codex 236 and in so many of those surveyed by De Hamel. No table of gospels and epistles found its way into the back of this volume. If it is true that this book was produced in England as its cataloguers conjecture, what would that suggest for the

446 This book did not follow the “Paris Bible” order, however, in placing the Interpretationes Hebraicorum Nominum after the Book of Psalms.
The liturgical reading market in Marwood’s homeland? The rest of this chapter will resolve that question. The reader notes in Ms. 1065 will be enough in the interim. The Franklin Catalog entry identifies thirteenth- to fifteenth-century Dominicans as the book’s likely owners. It identifies the presence of Albertus Magnus, Peter Lombard, and the glossa ordinaria in their marginal annotations. What it neglects is the readers’ consistent designation of the texts for the liturgical year. In the first chapter of Matthew’s Gospel, the reader draws a double-loop symbol inside a red bracket that is affixed to the line beginning: “Cum e[ss]et despontata m[ate]r Iesu Maria Joseph…” (Figure 3.3). The next red bracket appears on the following page closing the line “Ip[s]e eni[m] salvum fact[um] populum suum a pecc[at]is eorum.” Inscribed within the second bracket are the letters “fi” for finis or ‘end’ (Fig. 3.4). The passage demarcated by the brackets exactly corresponds to the gospel appointed for Christmas Eve in Sarum use, which was the order for public worship first established at the cathedral of Salisbury in the eleventh century, but which in the following centuries had become prevalent throughout the British Isles and Ireland, too. Throughout the opening chapters of Matthew, these signed red brackets systematically expose the otherwise camouflaged liturgical gospels. Prominent script underlined or encased in red frequently identifies the holy days to which these readings belong. For instance, in Figure 3.4, note at the center of the left margin: “In epiph[an]ia die”; on the bottom left: “p[ro] sanctorum i[n]nocentu[m]”, “In vigilia epiph[a]ni[a]e”, and “d[o]mi[n]ca i[n] xL.” (Quadragesima Sunday, or the first Sunday in Lent); and on the top right: “In Festo S[an]ct[i] Andre[a]e.” It is difficult to determine whether the other reader marks (concordances, commentary references, glosses, scholia, manicules, and possibly preaching notes) on the page are all in the service of those gospel readings
so boldly distinguished from the rest. It is likely that they are not. Given their familiarity with the texts of the scholastic masters as well as with the *Glossa*, these Dominican readers likely have received some formation in academic methods of discontinuous reading. The friars then are employing a variety of reading strategies to read their pocket Bible, but even without the table of epistles and gospels bound into it, the liturgical order holds a central place.

**Fig. 3.3: UPenn Ms. Codex 1065, f.285r (Inset below)**
Inset: “fi[nis]”

Inset: “In ep[i]ph[an]ia die”

Inset: pro sancto in[nocentu]m, In vigilia ep[i]ph[anie], and d[o]mi[nica i]n xL

Inset: In Festo S[an]cti Andre[a]e
These two books could be positioned toward the deluxe end of the “pocket bible” spectrum. Their relative bulk, wide margins, and ornate decoration distinguish them to some extent from the pocket bibles on the other end of the spectrum, of which there were many. Possibly thousands still survive of these books that were produced in France, Italy and England in the thirteenth century. De Hamel argues that their dissemination among the itinerant friars brought them into contact with promising new markets – both inside and outside the hierarchy. Within the latter domain, the readers of these Latin books were likely to be found among the gentry, civil servants, professionals, estate managers, and others. For many of them, this Bible would have been their first introduction to the book. How they approached it would depend upon its material structure, indexical apparatus and paratextual supports – a set of factors that all encourage discontinuous reading. But discontinuous reading of what variety? Formal academic training, which with some caution we have attributed to the early users of MS 236 and MS 1065, would have predisposed a reader to engage the Bible frequently in a scholastic or dialectical manner. These new lay readers would lack the education and set of professional concerns inclining them to deal with the text on that level. But all the readers were formed by the liturgy – through its spaces, rites, time, prayers, seasons, celebrations, sensations, services, and occasional homilies. It should not be difficult to predict for those more spiritually intense laymen and women, who lacked a scholastic

background, inhabited a liturgical world, and acquired a Latin codex laden with considerable liturgical cues, which mode of reading would predominate.\footnote{It is telling that printed Latin Bibles did not feature tables of the liturgical gospels and epistles until their sizes contracted significantly. The magnificent folios were intended for wealthy patrons, magistrates, bishops, churches, and monastic and academic communities. Within the first three decades of print, many of these Bibles came equipped with glosses, concordances, hieronymine prologues, alphabetical tables and other tools for the scholarly reader. The first two Latin New Testaments in sextodecimo, both printed in 1525, were also the first two with the table of gospels and epistles. It seems that Latin Bible publishers did not tap into the market for liturgical reading cultivated by the Pocket Bibles until they could approximate the size of Pocket Bibles. The conventional heuristic that large lectern Bibles are for the liturgy while pocket Bibles are for linear, private reading should be inverted. For bibliographical data on printed Latin Bibles, I examined Darlow, T, & H. Moule, eds., \textit{Historical catalogue of the printed editions of Holy Scripture in the library of the British and foreign Bible society} (London, 1903), Vol. 2 (2), 903-990. For the two testaments referenced above see description no. 6104 (Paris: Simon de Colines, 1525) and no. 6105 (Antwerp: Jean Thibault, 1525).}

\textit{The Liturgy and the Lay Reader}

To assess how deeply the liturgy was embedded in lay reading habits, it is unnecessary to rely only on thick descriptions of medieval parish life or inferences from extant pocket Bibles. Especially not the latter, as the production of pocket Bibles declined steeply after the thirteenth century.\footnote{De Hamel, \textit{The Book}, 138. De Hamel suggests that this drop-off in production means not that pocket-bibles were no longer fashionable but only that the reading market had been saturated and could absorb no more. That, however, only begs the question of why no more were demanded. See Stallybrass, “Epilogue”, 390. It appears that other books like the \textit{Legenda Aurea} and \textit{Horae} became more hotly demanded, perhaps because they were configured more thoroughly for liturgical functionality.} From that point onward, what were producers making and consumers acquiring instead? The structure of these “bestsellers” offer even more satisfying testimony that the liturgy pervaded the late medieval book world. Though originally composed in Latin for Dominican preachers in the late 13\textsuperscript{th} century, the \textit{Legenda Aurea} quickly spread throughout Europe in the vernaculars as well. Over nine hundred manuscripts survive along with innumerable incunabula. One scholar
of the *Legenda* concluded that the laity’s widespread use of the book for “private reading and devotion seems indisputable.”⁴⁵⁰ “Private reading” in this context is not code for linear, non-liturgical reading. Jacopo de Voragine, OP, organized his compilation of saints’ lives and anecdotes according to the liturgical calendar. The page to which the table of contents directed one to turn depended upon which day in the church year one opened the book. If it was November 30th, one would turn to the life of Saint Andrew, the second chapter, which reconstructed the deeds and lessons of the apostle borrowing from the gospel that was appointed for mass the same day (that is, Matthew 4). The previous chapter was not about a saint at all; rather, it was a description of the liturgical rites and traditions for celebrating the season of Advent. In a collection of hagiography, this chapter would seem out of place. It was not. The liturgy rather than the saint determined the content and order of chapters. There was not one reading on St. John the Baptist; there were two: chapter 86 marked the feast of his birth and chapter 125 that of his beheading. There were ten interspersed chapters corresponding to liturgically canonized events in the life of Jesus and Mary; two more on the Cross (Chapter 68 for finding it, Chapter 137 for exalting it); one each for Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, Quadragesima, and the Ember Fast Days; and a final one for a votive mass to dedicate a church. The animating principle of the book is to supply reading material for every important day of the liturgical year. The *Legenda* thus integrates its user into the discipline and worship of the church and reinforces the liturgical mode of discontinuous reading.

A second popular devotional book, which soon after the invention of print could boast an even wider diffusion than any edition of the *Legenda Aurea*, was the Book of Hours (*Horae*). Although *The Golden Legend* (1483), an English translation of the *Legenda*, was among the earliest works printed by William Caxton, for instance, this first English printer already had run off several editions of *Horae* in the previous decade.\(^{451}\)

Books of Hours also were constructed liturgically, but not according to the Liturgy of the Mass as the *Legenda* had been. This scriptural prayerbook, composed of psalms and other set prayers, enabled its users to participate in the Liturgy of the Hours, the daily prayer cycle of the church. While most manuscript *Horae* share certain features (the Gradual and Penitential Psalms and the Litany of the Saints), they are all to some extent idiosyncratic in their textual content and ornamentation. This diversity held tremendous significance for Paul Saenger, who has argued that *Horae* incline their users to privatize liturgical experience and cultivate religious individualism (or in some cases, sneaky voyeurism).\(^{452}\) Eamon Duffy countered this provocative interpretation with his own: that the Books of Hours worked to de-personalize spirituality and to incorporate the laity into the official prayer of the clergy. Nothing else, he explains, can account for the “otherwise baffling fact” that the vast majority of these books remained in Latin despite their readers’ imperfect grasp of the language.\(^{453}\) Duffy’s response suggests that the relative function of liturgical reading, whether liberating or integrating, is dependent upon the language of its texts. The strength of this connection between vernacular texts

\(^{451}\) *Horae ad usum Sarum* (Westminster, 1476), STC 15867; *Horae ad usum Sarum* (Westminster, 1479), STC 15868; *Festum visitationis beatae Mariae virginis* (Westminster, 1480), STC 15848.


and reader independence will be assessed by exploring reader engagement with the earliest English Bible.

Labeling the Wycliffite Bible controversy as a “premature reformation” inclines one to imagine that the vernacular scriptures are inevitably revolutionary texts. But it is anachronistic to assume that lay readers would use these books, or any book, as a means to confront authority. Some scholars acknowledge that orthodox members of the laity and religious did own Wycliffite Bibles; but they determine that these books must have been the larger, expensive manuscripts befitting conservative social elites who left the content of the text “doubtless unused.” Conversely, the more humble versions had to be the textbooks of the lower and middling sorts who discussed them in lollard conventicles and ultimately proved themselves “fertile ground” for Puritanism in the following century. Such a reconstruction is based upon a number of suspicious premises, not the least of which is the automaticity of critical reading practices.

There is no doubt that some fifteenth-century “lollards” testified to poring over the Wycliffite texts in small, purposeful groups. Christopher De Hamel argues, however, that these readers are disproportionately represented in official records. They were martyrs convicted of public heresy. Orthodox readers of the book, on the other hand, must have been tolerated – and they must have been the majority of readers. The survival

---

of over 250 of these manuscript codices is otherwise difficult to explain if “they were at daily risk from the heresy police.”455 When used in a liturgical context, these “heretical” books became traditional devotional aids. Even Thomas More could not recognize the Wycliffite scriptures when he observed his friends with them. He imagined that the “good and catholyke folke” that he had witnessed reading the book were reading some other English translation of the scriptures. Most of the books do not contain the prologue critical of church practices, while many do contain a table of gospels and epistles to be read during the year. This paratextual support should have been of little use to those who condemned the liturgy of the mass. It is worth considering whether the table was included to disguise the heterodoxy of the reader. De Hamel examined reader annotations to distinguish between those who read the book to accompany what they heard in church and those who read it as a substitute for that church. He found that readers employed the table to designate the liturgical readings in the New Testament text itself. The table was not a disguise. Liturgical reading compromised radical impulses, even in vernacular texts.456

As a brief survey within a book on a more general subject, Christopher De Hamel’s provocative chapter has not yet been embraced by all scholars of Lollardy. 457 But the Wycliffite New Testament at the University of Pennsylvania (MS 201) can supply another datum of support. MS Codex 201 is a small, handy volume (20cm),

457 For growing confirmation, however, see Richard Rex, The Lollards (Palgrave, 2002), 74-76, Mary Dove, The First English Bible (Cambridge, 2007), 58-67; and Matti Peikola, “Table of Lections in Manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible” in Laura Light & Eyal Poleg, eds., Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible (Brill, 2013), 351-378.
approximating the size of a printed octavo. For her master’s thesis, Josephine Koster examined the manuscript, devoting most of her attention to the middle English moral poem in the prefatory leaves.\footnote{Josephine A. Koster, “An Edition of the Middle English Verses in University of Pennsylvania MS English 6 [now MS 201]”, Master’s Thesis, University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, n.d. A copy is on file with the manuscript.} Koster argues that the poem is utterly traditional in its summons to beware death, contemplate the crucifixion, reject vanity, and practice virtue. But preceding the poem there are five leaves of patristic extracts regarding “priestly duties and behavior” which, she briefly observes, are “distinctly Wycliffite.” This abbreviated Wycliffite Rosarium, along with the poem, and the New Testament text itself belong to an Anglicana hand dating between 1383 and 1396, the dates of the translations of Nicholas Hereford and John Purvey, respectively. Because of the book’s modest appearance and paratextual material, Koster believes that it was originally designed for a Lollard preacher. But there are other paratextual materials following the biblical text that would be of greater use to a Christian with more traditional aspirations. Koster acknowledges the presence in separate Anglicana hands (late 14th or early 15th century script) of several liturgical texts: a short Latin explanation of why the priest prays before distributing the body (\textit{corpus}, a strange word choice for a follower of one who rejected transubstantiation); a fragment of the Middle English Homiletic Treatise \textit{Memoriale Credencium} (f.226v); six verses from the first chapter of John’s Gospel (f.227v) – which is part of the gospel passage read out at the end of Mass; and, sure enough, the Calendar of Gospels and Epistles for the liturgical year according to the use of Salisbury (228r-236v). Several omissions in the calendar lead Koster to presume Wycliffite inspiration for it. If Koster is right, and if all this paratextual material in different Anglicana hands...
was part of the original volume, then the ‘Lollard’ owners of this book must have been much more traditional (and certainly more liturgical) than the anti-hierarchical, proto-Reformer Lollards who attract the attention of historians.

Whether or not the early readers of MS 201 were some conservative species of Lollard, we can be certain that they were committed to reading the scriptures liturgically. Koster identified two autographs in the text; both are Elizabethan, neither can be connected to a historical author with any surety. Koster does associate the second one, “John Mey”, with the curious Xs in the margins. She observed that they correspond to liturgical gospels and epistles only occasionally. What she did not observe are more regular liturgical designations in other early hands. Each chapter is only partially subdivided by letters. When the marginal letters (usually ‘a’ to ‘g’) of a chapter would correspond to the beginning of a liturgical gospel, they are given; those that do not are skipped. In Matthew 1, “a” is included because it signifies the start of the gospel for the Christmas Vigil [Fig 3.5]; the next letter, “d”, shows where the shorter gospel for the evening Mass begins. Underneath that “d”, a reader communicates awareness of the liturgical order: “vigilia natalis domini” [Fig 3.6]. The only letters in the second chapter of Matthew’s gospel - “a”, “c”, and “f” – are pegged to the beginning of liturgical readings as well. Though the pages have been cropped, a reader’s association of Matthew 2f with the vigilia epiphanie is still visible [Fig 3.7]. Those readers who had some degree of latin fluency were not the only ones to inscribe the liturgical order upon the text. In Matthew 5, adjacent to the lines beginning “ye be[e] the salt of the erthe” is the note “confessor & doctor” [Fig. 3.8]; the liturgical calendar in the same volume unites
that votive mass with precisely that gospel [Fig. 3.10]. On the following page, a reader indicates the start of the gospel for a particular ferial day, as well as its “ende” [Fig. 3.9]. Whatever its creator’s intention was, this New Testament yields scant evidence that it was being pored over in conventicles for neat indictments of the traditional church. Nor does it reveal an effort to read beyond those texts proclaimed during the Mass. Readers adapted this book to the order with which they were most familiar – the order of the liturgy.
Fig. 3.5 New Testament in the Translation of John Wycliffe [manuscript], UPenn Ms. Codex 201, Kislak Center for Special Collections and Manuscripts, University of Pennsylvania (page 1)[reproduced courtesy of SCETI]
Inset: *vigilia natalis d[omi]ni*
Inset: [vig]ilia epiphan[i]ae
Inset: “co[n]fessor & doctor”
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Fig. 3.9 Penn MS 201 (page 7)
The Bibles of English Protestants

Given the preeminence of the liturgical mode of reading the English Bible, it might be expected that those reformers who opposed this reading strategy faced an uphill battle. Not all of them did oppose it. It was perfectly compatible with the institutionally guided “Prayer Book Protestantism” so well described by Judith Maltby. Even many godly preachers learned to accept it -- at least as one reading strategy among others. But some pedagogues were more reluctant to compromise. Though all editions of his Directions studiously ignored the liturgical order of reading, Nicholas Byfield would not have been able to deny that it remained a vigorous habit within his own congregation well into the seventeenth century.

When converted to print, the English scriptures became more liturgical, not less. An examination of how the first printed English Bibles evolved in the 1520s and 1530s will reveal that. In 1531 from his refuge in Antwerp, William Tyndale, the translator of the first English New Testament in print, reportedly promised that he would “most humbly submit [himself] at the feet of his royal majesty” if King Henry VIII would “grant only a bare text of the scriptures to be put forth among his people”. It is true

460 Thomas Cranmer employs John Chrysostom to support his recommendation that the laity pre-read and then re-read those scriptural passages that are appointed to be proclaimed by the priest during a given liturgical service. See his prologue to the second edition of the Great Bible. William Whitaker repeats the injunction employing the same patristic authority. See William Whitaker’s *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura* (1610).
461 The source of this familiar quotation is supposed to be a letter that the king’s emissary Stephen Vaughan wrote to Thomas Cromwell about a conversation he had with Tyndale in Antwerp on April 18, 1531. The
that the pages of Tyndale’s first complete New Testament (Worms: Peter Schoeffer, 1526, octavo) were clean of almost all paratexts. There were no prologues, marginal notes, cross-references or chapter summaries -- only a brief epilogue and list of errata. It was a bare-bones edition, but it actually was not the form that Tyndale wanted. The epilogue To the Reder blames “necessitie and combraunce (God is record) above strength” for the “many things lacking which necessarily are required.”

We have a good indication of what exactly these “many things” were from the remains of his first abortive attempt to print the New Testament months earlier in Cologne. The twenty-two chapters of Matthew that he had pressed out before fleeing from imperial authorities were equipped with a general prologue and a collection of ninety marginal notes derived primarily from the glosses of Martin Luther. [Fig. 3.12] Like many reformers, Tyndale believed that these interpretive aids made the scriptures more digestible; so it must have been their absence that he was regretting when he pledged to make his next edition “more apte for weake stomackes.” Indeed, his revised New Testament of 1534

---


463 [Tyndale, New Testament (1526)], fo. Tt ii r-v. Daniell speculates that the notes and prologues were omitted in the 1526 edition for the following reasons: (1) Tyndale had just barely escaped capture in Cologne; perhaps he wanted to take further precautions in Worms by scraping out the Lutheran tinges to his book; (2) Peter Schoeffer tended to print octavos and folios -- not the quarto that Tyndale had been working on in Cologne; so perhaps he had to jettison his notes and prologues from a larger edition (quarto) in order to conform to the working habits of Schoeffer and produce some text of the New Testament in a timely manner. “And the important thing was to get the book out and across the sea and on sale in England.” See
(Antwerp, Martin de Keyser) returned these aids albeit in modified form. The marginal notes were trimmed while the prologues were expanded, including a new prologue to Romans that was longer than the epistle itself. The capacity of these paratexts to determine the meaning of the scriptures was denounced by contemporary magistrates and has since been debated by modern scholars. 466

What has been neglected is the other set of paratexts featured in Tyndale’s second edition; that is, the formidable liturgical apparatus that restructures the entire text. 467 Just as in the first edition, the New Testament books were divided into chapters and paragraphs; significantly, not into verses, which the Geneva edition of 1557 would introduce. Unlike the first edition, the chapters were subdivided further by marginal letters (A-G). In addition, curious crosses and half-crosses were situated within the text

---

Daniell, *William Tyndale*, 147. What is clear, however, is that Tyndale would have preferred his original glossed edition to the austere text that he actually released. In the meantime, while Tyndale labored to produce his more complete glossed revision, he did not encourage his readers to interpret the scriptures freely on their own. Rather in the epilogue to the 1526 edition, Tyndale instructs readers to “Marke the playne and manifest places of the scriptures and in doubtfull places see thou adde no interpretation[n] contrary to them” (fo. Tt i v). Ordinary Christians were urged not to engage in exegesis, but to seek out the aid of “them that are learned and able to remember there duetie to help there unto” (fo. Tt ii v). The point is not that Tyndale compromised the evangelical program of *sola scriptura* from the very beginning, but that evangelical programs modified communitarian modes of reading instead of rejecting them altogether. 466 Thomas More’s *Dialogue Concerning Heresies* (1529) condemned both the translation and notes of Tyndale as false and pernicious. These condemnations were repeated in successive statutes through the Act for the Advancement of Religion in 1543. Modern scholars debate whether these notes infringe upon the liberty of the reader. Daniell considers these notes nothing more than a restatement of the text (see note 8 above). William Slights disagrees. Slights skips over the notes of Tyndale’s 1525 edition, but then groups the marginal annotations of the 1534 revision within a tradition of “preemptive strikes in the white space intended to defend the perimeter of Scripture from the unholy attacks of contending sects.” For Slights, Tyndale is among the “rival gangs of Protestant commentators, who could match marginalia with the best of the papists. These men, especially the more “Puritan” among them, exuded confidence – sometimes quietly, sometimes fanatically – in their abilities to interpret the word of God to their readers.” See Slights, *Managing Readers*, 107-109.

467 In the hefty introduction to his critical edition of Tyndale’s 1534 New Testament, David Daniell devotes only a pair of lines to cataloguing these elements, apparently out of bibliographical duty. Why these parts might have been included and how they might alter the function of the book receives no comment. See Daniell, *Tyndale’s New Testament* (Yale, 1989), xiv, xviii.
itself [Fig. 3.13]. Their meaning becomes clear when one turns to a new appendix at the back of the volume.\textsuperscript{468} It begins:

This is the Table where / in you shall fynde the Epistles and / the Gospels after the use of / Salsbury:/ For to fynde them the so-/ner: so shall you seke after the-/se Capitall letters by name:/ A B C D which stande by / the side of this boke alwayes / on or under the letter ther shall / you fynde a crosse + where the Pystle or the Go/spell begynneth and where the end is there / shall you fynde an halff crosse I-

The next 18 pages delineate the readings for 187 Sundays, saints’ days, special feasts, solemn masses, votive masses, and certain ferial days over the course of the year. [Fig. 3.14] These liturgical paratexts impose an emphatically non-linear order upon the text, in which some parts of the canon are read, more are skipped, and many are repeated. Take the sequence of readings in Tyndale’s “Table” for the period of roughly a week and a half from Whitsunday (Pentecost) to Corpus Christi [Fig. 3.15]: the gospels move from John 14 back to John 3 ahead to John 10 back to John 6 back to Luke 9 back to Luke 5 back to Luke 4 again to John 3 and again to John 6.\textsuperscript{469} Following this order only makes sense if one is participating in the traditional rites of the church. If Tyndale’s glosses and prologues direct the reader to locate the meaning of the scriptures in the margins and in textual comparisons, these liturgical interventions redirect the reader toward a source of meaning outside the book – that is the setting of communal worship. These two sets of

\textsuperscript{468} The ne-/we Testament, dyly/gently corrected and / compared with the Greke by Willyam/ Tindale: and fynes-/shed in the yere of ou/re Lorde God. / A.M.D. & xxxiiij. / in the moneth of / Nouember. (Marten Emperowr: Antwerp), fo. 400v. Tyndale’s revised edition (STC 2826) is available on EEBO.
\textsuperscript{469} [Tyndale, New Testament (1534)], fo.405r.
paratexts mold the New Testament into something of a composite book – on the one hand a self-sufficient manual of Christian truth and on the other a supplement of the Mass.470

The glosses and prologues can be traced back to Tyndale’s original design, but the new liturgical form of the book still demands a source. While it does not seem to coincide with Tyndale’s intentions, it does mirror the form of the portable Latin Bibles and Wycliffite New Testament examined earlier. Unlike these earlier books, however, this edition does not abandon readers to make their own connection between the table of liturgical readings and the biblical text. It combines the two parts itself. The more proximate origin of this advanced liturgical form begins to emerge when we recognize that Tyndale’s 1534 edition (STC 2826) was not the first “Tyndale New Testament” to come equipped with liturgical supports. George Joye, the former Cambridge fellow turned evangelical fugitive, also had revised Tyndale’s text. Catherine Endhoven of Antwerp published Joye’s revision three months before Martin de Keyser published Tyndale’s own revision. Joye’s edition (STC 2825) omitted Tyndale’s notes, prologues and all other marginal paratext besides biblical cross-references. What it included was a twelve month liturgical calendar and the Table of Gospels and Epistles, along with its

470 None of the English evangelicals discussed in this paper would have approved of the term ‘Mass’ since they rejected the notion of liturgical sacrifice that the term represented. They would have subscribed instead to the “Lord’s Supper.” Nevertheless, I use the term ‘Mass’ here, despite the possibility for confusion, because that was the form of the liturgical service that readers of these New Testaments were engaged in (until the reign of Edward VI) and it was the form for which these liturgical supports for Sarum use had been constructed.
organizational scheme of crosses and half-crosses.⁴⁷¹ We might assume then that the origin of the liturgical frameworks in both revised editions was Joye.

But Joye himself denied it. When Tyndale publicly accused him of corrupting his translation (particularly for replacing the word ‘resurrection’ with ‘life after death’), Joye issued An Apology in which he briefly narrated the publishing history of Tyndale’s New Testament.⁴⁷² Here Joye professed a fondness for an open, unglossed text of scripture “so the reder might once swim without a corke”,⁴⁷³ but he claimed never to have had the opportunity to fashion the book according to his preference. Liturgical paratexts were already firmly in place before he agreed to a revision:

---

⁴⁷¹ While the Lection Tables of Joye and Tyndale “after the use of Salsbury” neatly coincide, their respective tables of “Pistles & Gospels of the Sayntes” are significantly different. Joye’s table features all the high celebrations of late medieval English Catholicism, including the feasts of the “Cathedra Petri” and the “Exaltation of Thomas Mart [Beckett]”. Tyndale’s table appears to be somewhat reformed featuring only the holy men and women of Christian antiquity (while maintaining numerous celebrations of “Our Lady” and, of course, “Corpus Christi” from the previous table). It should be noted here too that the editions with the more traditional calendars vastly outnumbered those with the purges of Tyndale in the 1520s and 1530s.

⁴⁷² Historians have been drawn in to the theological debate between Joye and Tyndale about whether “resurrection” should be translated as “life after life” - they often do not hesitate to take sides either. For a proponent of Tyndale, see Daniell, Bible in English, 167-8; Daniell, William Tyndale, 322; for an advocate of Joye, see Gergely Juhász, “Translating Resurrection: The Importance of the Sadducees’ Belief in the Tyndale-Joye Controversy”, in R. Bieringer, V. Koperski, & B. Lataire, eds., Resurrection in the New Testament: Festschrift J. Lambrecht (BETL: Leuven, 2002); see also Orlaith O’Sullivan, “The Bible Translations of George Joye,” in O’Sullivan, Bible as Book, 25-38. These historians have neglected to analyze other connections and misconnections between these editions, especially the one that I discuss here.

⁴⁷³ An apology made by George Joy, to satisfy, if it may be, W. Tindale.... Feb. 27, 1535, STC (2nd ed) 14820, image 23 (C6v-7r): “S. Jerome de optimo gen[er]e interp[re]ta[n]di / yet toke vpo[n] hi[m] to teche me how I shuld tra[n]slat the scriptur[es] / where I shuld geue worde for worde / & whe[re] I shulde make scholias / not[es] / & gloses i[n] the merg[e]nt as hi[m]self & his master doith. But in good faiithe as for me I had as lief put the trwth in the text as in the merg[e]nt a[n]d excepte the glose expowne the text (as many of theirs do not) or where the text is playnough: I had as lief leue siche fryuole gloses cle[n]e out. I wolde the scripture were so puerly & playnly tra[n]slated that it neded nether note / glose nor scholia / so that the reder might once swim without a corke But th[is] testame[n]t was printed or T[yndale] was begu[n] / & that not by my preue[n]cio[n] / but by the printers quicke expedicio[n] & T[yndale’s] own lo[n]ge sleaping / for as for me I had nothing to do with the pri[n]ting therof / but correcced their copie.” (my italics added)
First thou shalt knowe that Tindal aboute viij. or ix. yeres a goo translated and printed the new testament in a mean great volume, but yet wyth oute Kalender, concordances in the margent, & table in thende. And anon aftir[ward] the dwche men gote a copye & printed it agen in a small volume adding the kalendar in the beginning, concordances in the margent, & the table in thende.474

These ‘Dutchmen’ that Joye invoked are the Endhoven printers of Antwerp whose offer to correct Tyndale’s New Testament Joye accepted only after they already had pirated it three times and produced some seven thousand liturgized copies.

The author of these paratexts is now clear, but the motive is not. Why did the Endhovens’ liturgize the New Testament? Like Tyndale and Joye, they could exhibit solid evangelical credentials. Christoffel van Endhoven, the patriarch of the firm, was arrested in 1531 for his role in the printed Bible trade and ultimately died in Westminister prison. His widow Catherine carried on the business publishing polemics of the reformers Heinrich Bullinger, Philipp Melanchthon, John Bale, and Joye himself. The Endhovens’ participation in the forbidden and reformed book trade might render unintelligible their simultaneous efforts to transform the English Bible into a service book for the Mass.

Printers did have to be careful. The Dutch New Testament that Christoffel van Endhoven printed in 1525 was suppressed because of its Lutheran prologues and annotations. As a result, he left out these commentaries in his next edition and added

474 An apology made by George Joy, image 20 (C4r).
many of the liturgical supports described above. But if the vernacular scriptures were illegal in themselves, as they still were in England in the 1520s, then adding these paratexts would not make their enterprise any more licit. In short, legality does not suffice for an explanation of why liturgical frameworks in particular were included in publications of Tyndale’s New Testament.

Good business sense does. The Endhovens may have invested their lives in godliness, but that does not mean that they were opposed to profit. The best-selling books of the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, as we have seen, were devotional works organized by the liturgy. And by 1534, the Endhovens had acquired plenty of experience with the market for liturgical books: they had published *Horae* of the Virgin Mary, *Hymnorum*, Breviaries, Processionals, a Manual and a Latin Psalter all organized according to the predominant order of Salisbury (i.e., “Sarum use”). They knew what would sell and they fashioned their product accordingly. Liturgical paratexts in themselves do not constitute a subversion of the evangelical program unless we agree with previous scholars that the naked text is the program’s defining characteristic and critical reading its necessary consequence. The Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper was a central act of worship celebrated by Tyndale and Joye, and in both the Lutheran and

---


477 *Horae* of the Virgin Mary (1523, 1530, 1531); a *Hymnorum* (1524, 1525); a Latin Psalter (1530); and a Manual (1523), Breviary (1524, 1525), and Processional (1523, 1525, 1530, 1532).
Reformed traditions. Liturgical reading then might reinforce Protestant doctrine if conducted within a Protestant ecclesiastical context. But these books were shipped to the realm of Henry VIII. Their particular liturgical interventions, designating the lections for such feasts as Corpus Christi, suited them to the traditional liturgy of the Mass. Joye recalled that the ‘Dutchmen’ were confident that they would be able to sell all their cheap, liturgical books of scripture regardless of whether Tyndale ever reissued his bare text again.478

The rival printer Martin de Keyser took the hint. The revised New Testament [STC 2826] that he and Tyndale produced together three months later included Tyndale’s glosses, prologues, and two prefaces (one of which derided Joye’s translations), as well as the Endhoven’s package of liturgical paratext. They did subtract a few of the Endhoven’s saints’ days that even Henry himself would have found objectionable, such as the Feast of St. Thomas Beckett and the Chair of St. Peter. But then they did their competitors one better. They added the Epistles taken oute of the olde testament which are red in the church after the use of Salsburye ...(fo.385r – 400r). The 40 lections then were reproduced in full. Tyndale’s New Testament was no longer just the Christian half of the Bible – it now completed the function of a layperson’s lectionary.479

478 An apology made by George Joy, images 21-22: “Then the dewche bega[n] to printe the[m] the fourt yrme because thei sawe nom[a(n)] els goyng aboute them / & aftir thei had printed the first leif which copye another englissh ma[n] had correcket to them / thei came to me & desiered me to correcke the[m] their copie / who[m] I answered as before / that if T[yndale] ame[n]de it with so gret dilige[n]ce as he [pro]mysethe / yours wilbe neuer solde. Yesse quod thei / for if he prynte. ij. m. & we as many / what is so little a nou[m]ber for all englo[n]d? & we wil sel ours beter cheape / & therfore we doubt not of the sale.”

479 This adaptation may help explain why the New Testament was so much more of a popular commodity than the Bible for the next forty plus years. Ian Green demonstrates that New Testaments outsold Bibles from the 1520s to 1566 by a ratio of more than 2 to 1. Green argues that the relatively low cost and portability of New Testaments account for this imbalance, as does the reformers’ pronounced sense of
The market value of this adaptation was immediately apparent to the Endhovens. Two months later Catherine issued yet another edition of Joye’s New Testament [STC 2827] that poached the section and advertised it in its title: *The hole new Testame[n]t with the Pistles taken out of the olde Testament to be red in the chirche certayn dayes thorowt the year* (1535). Tyndale’s prologues and marginal notes, however, continued to be left out. The title of Tyndale’s New Testament in 1536 [STC 2831], the first ever to be published in England, followed suit. These Old Testament Epistles became a staple of the English New Testaments of Tyndale and Coverdale, as well as the Latin-English diglot of Erasmus. It is revealing that separate editions of the New Testament from the “Great” and “Bishops” Bibles did not contain them until sometime after 1572. Perhaps the proprietors were concerned that the market for their officially-sanctioned Bibles would suffer if they too converted their New Testaments into self-sufficient lectionaries. We at least know that uncompromising ideological opposition to liturgical reading cannot explain the few omissions of these Old Testament passages. Virtually every single edition of the English Scriptures published from 1534 until 1557 contained the Table of Epistles and Gospels and designated the liturgical...
readings in the text.\textsuperscript{481} These liturgical paratexts were included more consistently
than any particular set of glosses, alphabetical tables, chapter summaries, indices,
prologues, exhortations, or prefaces, or any genre of paratext at all.

\textbf{Fig. 3.11.} First Complete Tyndale New Testament (Worms: Peter Schoeffer, 1526), 8vo. Francis Fry, \textit{The First New Testament Printed in the English Language} (Bristol, 1862) [Facsimile of the 1526 N.T.]

\footnote{The only exception is the editio princeps of the Coverdale Bible. This omission was corrected just as quickly as the same omission in the editio princeps of the Tyndale New Testament had been – immediately. See A.S. Herbert, \textit{Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible, 1525-1961.} revised & expanded from the edition of T.H. Darlow & H.F. Moule, 1903 (London and New York, 1968), 1-171. There is no doubt that the number of readings in the Table was reduced drastically after the Book of Common Prayer recodified them in 1549. The Table shrank from 187 specially designated celebrations to 87. The continued popularity of these tables, nevertheless, shows how liturgical reading could be accommodated to reinforce institutionally guided change.}
Fig. 3.12

Fig. 3.13

STC 2823: Tyndale NT Fragment (Cologne: Fuchs, 1525), Mt 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This is the Table whe re in you shall finde the Epistles and the Gospels after the use of Saltisbury.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John bare witness of him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the iii. Sunday in the Advent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let men this wise frame vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I shon shen in percy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the weodnesday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle the ii. Chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And in the vi. moneth the.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the fryday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle the vi. Chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary arose in these wyse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the iii. Sunday in the Advent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejoyce in the Lord alway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And this is the record of John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the weodnesday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the ii. and iii. Chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And this rumor of him went.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the fryday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharias the ii. Chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take note breave of the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Christmas even.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul the servant of Jesus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When his mother marre was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Christmas mirth at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the grace of God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It followeth these dayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But after that the hynhnes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Shepherdes sowe one to, Luke.iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the iii. maesse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God in tyme pass diversely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the beginning was the.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On shon Shemera dayes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strewy full of sayth g power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wher-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 3.15. Table of Gospel and Epistles Enlarged
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Early English Bibles *in manuscript* already have told us a similar story. Of the over 250 surviving Wycliffite copies, the most frequent compilations are New Testaments and a great majority of these are fully equipped with liturgical frameworks.\(^{482}\) Furthermore recent research has uncovered very few Lollard owners of these books, but has on the contrary located a plethora of owners among the professed religious, secular priests and gentry families with impeccably orthodox profiles.\(^{483}\) The language of the scriptures then must not have been the most critical element in triggering reader dissent.\(^{484}\) Of course print enabled the Tyndale New Testaments to circulate more widely than the Wycliffite manuscripts, but it was the thoroughly liturgized *and* unglossed editions of the Endhovens that were both the most affordable and accessible. Before Martin de Keyser issued Tyndale’s revised octavo edition in 1534, the Endhoven’s had released four print runs in sextodecimo. So, if the Bible was being diffused more widely, so was the liturgical framework for appropriating it.

Does that mean that early evangelical Bibles became Catholic books? Not quite. We should not forget that the testaments of Tyndale and the Wycliffites were officially forbidden. Ecclesiastical court records (as well as Foxe’s Book of Martyrs) reveal some readers using these Bibles subversively, even sacrificing their lives for doctrines that the

\(^{482}\) See Christopher De Hamel, *The Book: A History of the Bible* (Phaidon, 2001), 180-189; Mary Dove, *The First English Bible: The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions* (Cambridge, 2007), 58-67. Only 20 Wycliffite Bibles survive even though the greater size, value (expense) and sturdiness of Bibles (relative to smaller compilations of biblical books) makes them more likely to have been preserved. Hence it is likely that many more New Testaments were made than Bibles. Mary Dove has discovered that ‘at least’ 89 of the 250 surviving Wycliffite MS have a lectionary and in 2/3 of the mss containing a lectionary, the lectionary comes first followed by the New Testament.


\(^{484}\) For a more extended discussion of how both Lollards and their orthodox neighbors employed the same vernacular religious texts, see Shannon McSheffery, “Heresy, Orthodoxy, and English Vernacular Religion, 1480-1525”, *Past & Present*, Vol. 186 (Feb 2005), 47-80.
Church condemned but that that they believed their books proclaimed. But it is also true that the structure of these books was most conducive for those who were coordinating their devotions with the liturgical seasons and ceremonies of the established church, who were following the readings of the Mass, and who were hearing them expounded in the common tongue by parochial ministers at least on Sundays. That does not mean readers imbibed everything they were told, but it does mean that they were materially disposed to listen. As the confessional commitments of ministers changed over the course of the sixteenth century so did the content (and frequency) of their oral exegesis. But the forms of books that readers were using remained remarkably constant. In the end, these material forms of continuity may have been the bridge to a more stable reformation and lasting change.

The year 1557 marks the arrival of the Geneva New Testament, the first printed edition in English with verse divisions. It hardly marks the departure of liturgical reading. The Geneva Bibles did not feature the Table of Gospels, nor did the Geneva New Testament feature the Old Testament Epistles. But neither one overwhelmed the books that did feature these supports, at least until several decades later. When the moment of victory came, the winner was the Geneva version itself, not necessarily an alternative mode of discontinuous or continuous reading. The Geneva Bible gained its competitive edge by becoming both more affordable and more liturgical. The historian

---

Ian Green outlined how, during the moment of transition in the late 1570s, publishers began to endow Geneva quarto Bibles in black letter with sources of appeal previously enjoyed only by the Bishops’ Bible. The Geneva Bible of 1579 included: (1) abridgements of the Book of Common Prayer, of which the Table of Epistles and Gospels remained a critical part; (2) the Great Bible’s Psalms, that is the version used for liturgical worship and song which the Bishops’ Bible often set alongside its Hebrew translation in parallel columns. While this experiment only lasted until 1585, it seemed to be long enough. The last quarto edition of the Bishops’ Bible was printed in 1584. Even though publishers stopped binding the Genevan quarto together with the abridged Prayer Book and liturgical psalter, they continued to print these sections separately in sizes that matched the Genevan quartos (as well as various sizes of the Authorized Version). Readers then could bind the materials together themselves and, according to Ian Green, many did.\(^{486}\) An affordable Geneva Bible that could be adapted to suit liturgical purposes did replace the Bishop’s Bible in quarto. But David Daniell’s grim judgment that the Bishops’ Bible “was, and is, not loved” is misleading.\(^{487}\) The most popular size of New Testaments during the reign of Elizabeth was octavo. In that form, the Bishop’s New Testament remained competitive until all other English editions were eclipsed by the Authorized version in the 1620s.\(^{488}\)


\(^{488}\) Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 64-5. Green assigns the continued success of the Bishops’ New Testament to its black letter typeface. He excludes the book’s liturgical superiority from his explanation without offering any reason. In general, in his otherwise excellent survey of how the Reformation was *read* in England, Ian Green explores a score of paratextual supports for reading the Bible in as many different
The last version of the Bishops’ New Testament, equipped with the Old Testament Epistles and the Table of Gospels and Epistles, was published in 1619, the year after Nicholas Byfield first issued his alternative set of instructions. Byfield may have observed that the liturgical mode of reading was effective at integrating readers into the devotional life of the institutional church and familiarizing them (at various levels of depth) with those pre-selected “central mysteries” of Christianity which were revealed in the life of Jesus and echoed by his saints. Yet it was not as effective as some combination of continuous and discontinuous reading strategies might be in ensuring comprehensive engagement with Christianity’s central text, internalization of a set of precisely defined doctrines, or identification with a godly core of the broader community. While there might be tension between these enterprises, they are not mutually exclusive. They did not require a firm either-or resolution. But the liturgical mode also carried baggage. As it was resonant of the traditional religion, even those newly authorized texts that used it as a more digestible carrier of reformed catechetics felt compelled to register a formal criticism of it, just as did the preface to the Book of Common Prayer. Byfield then must have believed at least that the liturgical mode was so deeply engrained as to not require any further encouragement. Godly puritans like him might ignore this mode of reading while official church publications indeed might denigrate it. It had been the characteristic approach to the scriptures of late medieval lay readers, and it remained a pervasive mode of English Protestant reading well into the seventeenth century.

sections. But the single most popular paratextual element, the Table of Gospels and Epistles, is missing from his account. The indisputable contemporary attachment to the liturgical mode of reading does not match the minimal degree of scholarly attention it has received.
CHAPTER 4

English Catholic Bibles (1582-1718) and their Readers

King James was a “nourishing father”, according to the preface of the Authorized Version (1611), because he allowed the “sincere milk of the word” to flow to his people. The preface then contrasted the bountiful lactation of James with the parsimony of that other parent:

“Now the Church of Rome would seeme at the length to beare a motherly affection towards her children, and to allow them the Scriptures in their mother tongue: but indeed it is a gift, not deserving to be called a gift, an unprofitable gift: they must first get a Licence in writing before they may use them, and to get that, they must approve themselves to their Confessor, that is, to be such as are, if not frozen in the dregs, yet sowred with the leaven of their superstition. Howbeit, it seemed too much to Clement the 8. that there should be any Licence granted to have them in the vulgar tongue, and therefore he overruleth and frustrateth the grant of Pius the fourth. So much are they afraid of the light of the Scripture (...) that they will not trust the people with it, not as it is set forth by their owne sworne men, no not with the License of their own Bishops and Inquisitors. Yea, so unwilling thay are to communicate the Scriptures to the peoples understanding in any sort, that they are not ashamed to confesse, that wee forced them to translate it into English against their wills.”

The charges levied here against “mother Rome” are to some extent true, verifiable by the decrees of the Index and Inquisition as well as by the preface to the Rheims New

---

489 *The Holy Bible, conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former translations diligently compared and revised, by his Maiesties special Commandement. Appointed to be read in Churches.* (London: Robert Barker, 1611), A5v-A6r.
Testament, which was the English Catholic edition first printed in 1582. Relying upon these same sources, modern scholars have determined first that Pope Clement VIII tried to child-proof the Tridentine reading license system by shutting it down; and second, that Cardinal William Allen and Gregory Martin built the Douai-Rheims Bible to be a weapon of the Counter-Reformation. It would either equip missionary controversialists to fire scriptural prooftexts back at Protestant interlocutors or publicly expose Protestant translations as corruptions of the word of God. What this prescriptive evidence cannot determine is what actually happened to these Bibles after they were printed – who possessed them and for what purposes did they use them? A survey of extant copies will help us to assess whether the function of this book coincided with its authors’ design.

While opening these bibles and examining what is inside them should seem like an obvious strategy for evaluating reader reception, there are legitimate objections to be raised. Large, sturdy and relatively immobile volumes are most likely to survive. Well-marked and highly traveled copies, on the other hand, are the most worn down. They are

least likely to be selected and preserved by nineteenth century collectors who sought
pages that were pristine or that could be made pristine by whitewashing and cropping.  

If then we might expect to find few copies with meaningful signs of use, we
should be doubly surprised to encounter signs of Catholic use. The Douai-Rheims Bible
was, effectively, a forbidden book. Elizabethan and early Stuart governments
conceived of it the same way that its authors did – as a threat to the Protestant
establishment. State officials successfully confiscated many copies and redistributed
them to ecclesiastical authorities so that they could prepare to respond. These confiscated
books have a disproportionately high rate of survival because of their security on the lofty
shelves of episcopal and academic libraries. The Douai Rheims Bibles at New College
Oxford, for instance, have been sitting there since 1618, when they were bequeathed by
Arthur Lake (d.1626), former warden of the college as well as Bishop of Bath & Wells.  
He likely gained possession of the Bibles in 1609 when a whole cache of Catholic books

491 William Sherman, Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England (Penn, 2007), 98-100. For an
eexample of an English Catholic Bible with bleached pages, see the 1609-10 Douai Old Testament at the
National Library of Scotland (Edinburgh): Shelfmark: Hax. 53, 54; Bible ID #468.
492 The Rheims New Testament (hereafter RNT) was first printed abroad in 1582 and could not be openly
printed in England until 1772. Interestingly, however, despite the many royal proclamations and acts of
Star Chamber against “popish” and “seditious” books “defacing true religion”, as well as accompanying
statute law (e.g., 23 Eliz I, Cap. 2, “against seditious words and rumours”), the Catholic Bible was never
explicitly named among the prohibited titles. See P.L. Hughes & J.F. Larkin, eds., Tudor Royal
Proclamations (Yale, 1964-9), II: 312-313, 341-343, 347-8, 376-9, 506-8; III: 13-18; and Stuart Royal
Proclamations (Oxford, 1973), 247, 256. Perhaps it was deliberate policy to shield the government from
the aspersions that its apologists cast upon the Roman Index for having formally banned Scripture, in
certain editions. Throughout the early modern era, in any case, the Douai-Rheims Version never obtained
the required license to be printed in England, and port authorities did not hesitate to read the generic
proscription of Catholic books as a warrant for confiscating these Bibles that many were attempting to
smuggle into the realm. It was not until the turn of the eighteenth century, during the campaign of the
British and Foreign Bible Society to have Catholics read Scripture through any possible medium, that
official policy toward the Douai-Rheims Version began to change.
493 1600 RNT and 1609-10 Douai Old Testament (hereafter DOT, and together with the RNT = DRB) of
New College, Oxford. Shelfmarks: New Restricted BT3.190.4, & BT3.190.16-17 (Bible ID #73-74).
was seized from a Dutch priest stationed in the residence of the Venetian ambassador.\textsuperscript{494} Like many Catholic bibles acquired in this way, its pages are unmolested. Aside from extravagant provenance marks and sometimes a quibble in Greek, these otherwise clean copies testify to a substantial patron community of Protestant divines who were required to know and refute the enemy, or at least to have the physical props to show that they could.

With a massive print run of up to five thousand copies for the first edition of the Rheims New Testament alone, however, state officials could not snag them all. The hundreds of extant copies, in fact, do possess rich evidence of user interaction.\textsuperscript{495} They reveal three other principal consumers: (1) missionary priests; (2) continental nuns; and (3) Catholic gentry. Each will be addressed in turn, though all three reading communities, as we shall see, were inter-connected.

\begin{center}
I. Missionary Priests
\end{center}

Jesuits and other English missionaries, historians have long believed, were the target clients of the Douai-Rheims Bibles.\textsuperscript{496} Their executive producer, Cardinal William

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{494} See British Library Lansdowne MS 153, ff.67r-69v. This manuscript records a list of the titles seized from the embassy, including four RNTs, as well as a list of the churchmen to whom they were redistributed, including “The L. Bishop of Bath & Wells.” It also is possible that Arthur Lake acquired his Douai-Rheims Bible from a different confiscation or a different method altogether.
\item\textsuperscript{495} I have located and logged 579 copies of Rheims New Testaments and Douai Old Testaments published between 1582 and 1635, and I have personally reviewed 348 of them. One hundred ninety-seven of those that I have reviewed still possess manuscript annotation.
\item\textsuperscript{496} See Daniell, The Bible in English, 358; Walsham, “‘Domme Preachers?’ Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print,” Past & Present, 168 (2000): 110; Walsham, “Unclasping the Book”, 152-5.
\end{itemize}
Allen, was an Oxford exile who would serve with Bellarmino on the commission to revise the Tridentine Index, including the system for licensing vernacular bible-reading prescribed therein. Allen also served as the chief architect of the University of Douai’s English College, which was the first of the Continental seminaries erected to train English Catholics to return home as missionary-priests. The success of the English Mission, therefore, was also somehow linked to bible-reading in Allen’s grand strategy. At the English College, he ensured that the scriptures were the regular meal of his students’ diet, quite literally: in 1578 Allen reported to his collaborator, Dr. Jean Vendeville, the Regius Professor of Canon Law at the University of Douai, that “every day at table after dinner and supper, before they leave their places, the students hear a running explication of one chapter of the old and another of the new Testament.”

This was not to be a passive or pro-forma listening routine either. According to Allen, each student “read over these chapters beforehand privately in his own room.” Through these exercises in the refectory and in their private quarters, as well as through their coursework, Allen’s missionaries were to read through the Old Testament twelve times and the New Testament sixteen while they were training at the College, which Allen estimated was a period of about three years on average. That was a far more comprehensive and systematic path through the Scriptures than was customary for all the many Jesuit colleges and universities that were not committed to the English mission, as we have seen in Chapter 2.

---


Also generally unlike contemporary Jesuit approaches was Allen’s design for his students to assimilate the Bible in a particular way. His final goal was for them to “have at their fingers’ ends all those passages which are correctly used by Catholics in support of our faith or impiously misused by heretics in opposition to the church’s faith.” When students were listening to the daily lectures and table expositions, therefore, they were not simply engaging in personal meditation or moral reflection; rather, they were instructed to “take down from dictation all those passages” that “relate to the controversies of the present day … together with short notes concerning the arguments to be drawn [for Catholics] and the answers to be made to the [heretics].” These notes would then be deployed by students in their weekly disputations, biweekly discourses, and sermons on every holy day of the year.

Allen’s subsequent discussion of these activities is especially significant for the historiography of the Douai-Rheims Bible. They were “calculated,’ according to Allen, “to inflame the hearts of all with piety” and with “zeal for the bringing back of England from schism.” The same could be said, however, of the whole project of the English College. What was different about the discourses and sermons was their language. It had to be English. “Power and grace in the use of the vulgar tongue, a thing on which the heretics plume themselves exceedingly,” was also something, Allen admitted, in which “heretics have the advantage over many of the more learned Catholics,” whose biblical

500 Knox, Letters and Memorials, 64; Knox, First and Second Douai Diaries, xl.
501 Knox, Letters and Memorials, 64; Knox, First and Second Douai Diaries, xl.
502 Knox, Letters and Memorials, 64; Knox, First and Second Douai Diaries, xl.
education remained in Latin.\textsuperscript{503} “Hence,’ he continued, ‘when they are preaching to
the unlearned and are obliged on the spur of the moment to translate some passage which
they have quoted into the vulgar tongue, they often do it inaccurately and with unpleasant
hesitation, because either there is no English version of the words or it does not then and
there occur to them.”\textsuperscript{504} To require that his students practice preaching in English was his
first solution then, but not his only one. It was here that Allen advocated the publication
of “some Catholic version of the Bible, for all the English versions are most corrupt.”\textsuperscript{505}
He acknowledged that it was not always “desirable” to have the Scriptures “translated
into barbarous tongues”, but he believed that the “dangers” that followed “from reading
more difficult passages [in the vernacular] could be obviated by suitable notes.”\textsuperscript{506}
Approving this request would not entail resetting the general policy of the Church, as
Allen later clarified to Cardinal Sirleto, his correspondent in the Roman Curia. The
English Bible was only a short-term strategy: it could be revoked once England returned
to the Catholic faith.\textsuperscript{507} Yet it was a necessary strategy: Allen already had gathered “men
most fitted for the work” who would be faithful to “the edition approved by the Church”
– i.e., “the Vulgate” (which had been declared authentic at Trent, even though it was
never identified there with a concrete “edition”).\textsuperscript{508} Allen’s “men” – fellow Oxford exiles
led by Dr. Gregory Martin – also would supply the “suitable notes” and other polemical
appendices that Allen believed were crucial to the success of the English mission. Chief
among these would be Martin’s \textit{Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy

\textsuperscript{503} Knox,\textit{ Letters and Memorials}, 64; Knox,\textit{ First and Second Douai Diaries}, xl.
\textsuperscript{504} Knox,\textit{ Letters and Memorials}, 64; Knox,\textit{ First and Second Douai Diaries}, xl-xl.
\textsuperscript{505} Knox,\textit{ Letters and Memorials}, 64; Knox,\textit{ First and Second Douai Diaries}, xli.
\textsuperscript{506} Knox,\textit{ Letters and Memorials}, 65; Knox,\textit{ First and Second Douai Diaries}, xli.
\textsuperscript{507} J.H. Pollen, “Translating the Bible into English at Rheims,” \textit{The Month} 140 (1922): 146-49.
\textsuperscript{508} Knox,\textit{ Letters and Memorials}, 65; Knox,\textit{ First and Second Douai Diaries}, xli.
Scriptures by the heretics of our days, which would be included within each Rheims New Testament, upon Allen’s insistence, when they were printed together in 1582. These letters of Allen are what historians cite to demonstrate an intrinsic connection between the patrons and function of the English Catholic Bible – it was always conceived to be the most powerful work of controversy that Allen’s missionary priests would take with them into England.

Within this community of English missionary priests, the Society of Jesus established itself as a distinctly influential minority. Jesuits ultimately comprised a quarter of the almost six thousand missionary priests toiling in England and Wales through the eighteenth century. Yet they were late to the game. When in 1580 the first two Jesuit priests, Robert Persons and Edmund Campion, disembarked in England, more than a hundred seculars already had been dispatched there from Allen’s College of Douai. Only two years after their arrival, however, the Rheims New Testament made its debut. The close timing of these two events was not merely coincidental, as some historians have emphasized. Indeed Allen’s correspondence in the interim year of 1581 indicates that “Father Robert [Persons] demanded from him three or four thousand English Testaments” shortly after landing in his mission field. Persons and the

---

511 D. Aidan Bellenger, O.S.B., English and Welsh Priests, 1558-1800: A Working List (Bath, 1984), 248. This is a conservative estimate of secular priests, who always constituted the majority of the missionaries. See Bellenger, English and Welsh Priests, 5-7, 246-8. See also Beales, Education under Penalty, 142.
513 Knox, Letters and Memorials, 96.
companions of his order, Allen relayed, “longed for them to the greatest degree possible.” The press of John Fogny in Rheims did not start churning out the first run, however, until Persons secured a capital investment of one thousand golden crowns “from certain English gentlemen.” It was this intercession of the superior of the English Jesuits, therefore, that put the New Testament into print.

The coincidence of these two “invasions” was not lost on the Elizabethan government either, nor on the Protestant Divines commissioned to refute the Rheims New Testament. The same year that it was first published, the Queen’s Privy Council offered Thomas Cartwright, the exiled presbyterian theologian, a chance to be restored to the regime’s good graces if he would “undertake an answer to the Papist’s Testament, and other books of the Jesuits.” Though it was not until 1618 that Cartwright’s *Confutation of the Rhemists Translation, Glosses, and Annotations* was finally published (posthumously), other churchmen in the meantime had entered the fray against this “Jesuit book.” In 1588 Edward Bulkley issued his *Answere to ten frivolous and foolish reasons set downe by the Rhemish Iesuits and papists in their preface before the New Testament*. William Fulke’s definitive refutation was first published the following year and then again multiple times upon the release of new editions of the Rheims New Testament. The fifth edition of Fulke’s book blasted the “invasion of a Troupe of Romish and Rhemish Iesuites, who endeavoured by this [book], as the most subtilly and

---

517 *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* 2: 62 (State Papers 12/154, f.87).
plausible way that ever yet they enterprised, to build up the walls of Rome in England.” It is certainly possible that these state-commissioned polemics linked the Rheims New Testament to the Society of Jesus for pragmatic purposes – that is, simply to discredit the book in the public eye. Even so, they have been joined together by modern scholars, too, strengthening the perception that, among the missionary priest community, the Jesuits were the principal patrons of the English Catholic Bible.

Provenance information supplies further evidence. Many extant copies of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Rheims New Testaments that still bear their contemporary binding display a distinctive ownership mark. The IHS symbol, a monogram composed of the first three Greek letters in the name of Jesus, dates back to the first centuries of Christianity. There are, however, various representations of it. Into the board covers of two Rheims New Testaments preserved at Ushaw College (Durham), the symbol is engraved together with a cross above the H and three nails below, surrounded by the rays of the sun (Fig. 4.1). That rendition of the IHS mirrors the seal of the Society of Jesus (Fig. 4.2).

---

The similarity is not a coincidence. Inscribed on the title page of that second Rheims New Testament from Ushaw College is the provenance mark, “Westby Mission” (Figure 4.3), which refers to the recusant household of Westby Hall in Mowbreck, Lancashire, which had become the center of a Jesuit mission by the end of the seventeenth century.519

In another variation of the I H S symbol that appears frequently upon contemporary Rheims New Testament bindings, the customary three lower nails are plunged into a heart. Sometimes this is done with the rest of the Jesuit seal intact, as it is upon the cover of a 1738 Rheims New Testament at the Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal (Fig. 4.4). In other renderings, the sun’s rays are replaced with rosary beads (Fig. 4.5). In either case, however, a pierced heart with the I H S symbol appears to be strongly associated with the Society of Jesus, especially in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when the Society was experimenting with this form. According to Guillaume Montbard’s sketch of 1689, it was engraved above the door of the College of St. Omer’s in Northern France, where English Catholic boys entered for a classical Jesuit education (Fig. 4.6). The heart had been appropriated earlier by the Jesuits in Naples (Fig. 4.7) and even by Ignatius of Loyola himself, where the emblem was recently uncovered upon a wall of his own private study (Fig. 4.8). Ignatius employed yet another variation of the IHS symbol for his personal seal – one without heart or nails (Fig. 4.9). Notable instead are its heavenly bodies – sun, moon, and stars – which appear to be collected and fused together with all of the prior Jesuit elements – cross, heart, nails, and rays – on the cover of a 1621 Rheims New Testament held at the American Bible Society (Fig. 4.10).

It may be true that English government officials were prepared to identify any English Catholic Bible as a “Jesuites testament”, as they did when seizing the books of the recusant gentleman Sir Thomas Tresham in 1584. Their Jesuit radar, however, was
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520 For directing my attention to Figures 4.7-4.9, I would like to thank Dr. Thomas Lucas, S.J.
acutely sensitive to I H S symbols. After the raiders of landowner George Brome’s personal library encountered one with the cross and nails printed on the title page of Edmund Campion’s notorious apologetical tract, *Rationes Decem* (Fig. 4.11), they composed a report highlighting the “superstitious figure” that to them had become a Jesuit trademark.\(^{522}\) It now should be evident that they were not mistaken.\(^{523}\) In the early modern period, therefore, it appears that all the forms of the I H S symbol so frequently engraved on the English Catholic Testaments were signatures of the Society.

---


\(^{523}\) On occasions when contemporaries *inaccurately* linked the I H S symbol to the Jesuits, it likely was not a mistake, but rather a deliberate attempt to defile a book or its owner. See Alexandra Walsham, *Domme Preachers*, 107, which recalls the Puritan William Prynne’s accusation in 1627 against another English Protestant, John Cosin, whose devotional collection Prynne feared was bound together with the rise of Arminianism. Prynne condemned the I H S symbol on the frontispiece as “an undoubted Badge, and Character of a Popish, and Jesuiticall Booke.”
Fig. 4.6: From 1689 Engraving of St. Omers
Original at Stonyhurst College

Fig. 4.7: Littera I H S 1604. Naples

Fig. 4.8: From Roman Office of Ignatius

Fig. 4.9: Personal Seal of Ignatius
Fig. 4.10: 1621 RNT [ID #346, IMG 4671], courtesy of American Bible Society

Fig. 4.11: Frontispiece of *Rationes Decem* (1581-1585?), STC 4536.5
Of the Douai-Rheims Bibles that are not clothed with the Jesuit seal, there are yet many more that reveal a Jesuit provenance by some other means. The Jesuits were doing more with these volumes, in any event, than simply binding them. Inscribed in the flyleaf of one of the I H S-bound volumes identified above, the 1633 New Testament attributed to the “Westby Mission”, is a Latin petition for the health (salvum) of Pope Innocent, King James II, Queen Maria Modena, Queen Catherine Braganza (widow of Charles II), and the whole royal family. This prayer is politically charged already on account of its language and order of precedence (pope before king). Yet the magnitude of the charge depends upon which “Pope Innocent” the reader intended. Innocent XI reigned simultaneously with James II, while Innocent XII assumed the papacy three years after James had been deposed and his court exiled to St. Germain. If the latter pope was intended, then this prayer seeks the salvation (salvum) or vindication of King James the Catholic over the reigning King William the Protestant. Placed atop the New Testament as an oath, it would mark the reader out as a sworn Jacobite and the book as the pledge of an alternative allegiance.

Not many of the Jesuit-linked New Testaments were appropriated so decisively as anti-state manifestos. More were marked out more narrowly to combat the state religion, as Gregory Martin had originally designed them. “Societatis Iesu Insulis”, or the Society of Jesus on the Island, is the early modern inscription that heads the title page of the
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524 1633 RNT of Ushaw College Library, Durham, Shelfmark W.C.2.24 (Bible ID #288).
Morgan Library’s Douai Old Testament published in 1609-10. The ink of these 17th century Jesuit readers then skips from the title to the Table of Controversies in the appendix of volume two, where it enumerates the 92 entries that must have been deemed most apt for confuting Protestants and confirming Catholics. Among these selections are “Faith alone doth not iustifie” (#28); “Ministers amongst heretics are contemptible” (#50); and “Worldlie men thinke the Church may be destroyed by persecution” (#90). The text of the New Testament went unmarked. Only the apologetical appendix attracted the attention of the reader’s quill.

A Rheims New Testament now held at Heythrop College once belonged to the “Residencia de Sancta Wenefred”, signifying the Jesuit missionary district of North Wales that was set up by 1666. These readers systematically mined the Table of Controversies, just as the previous ones did, even reinforcing them with extra scriptural citations. But they also demonstrated that the book had uses apart from interconfessional polemics. In the same hand as before, a reader identified a passage in the second chapter of Luke as “The Gospel on / Sunday within / the octave / of the Nativity” and then designated the end of the lection with a half-cross. Since Catholic liturgies would continue to be celebrated in Latin for the next three centuries, the missionary reader could not have been marking out the actual words of the lection he would proclaim in Mass; but, he could reflect upon that lection in his native tongue as he prepared to preach on it.

---

525 1609-10 Douai Old Testament of the Morgan Library, New York, Shelfmark E1 05 C 000930-1 (Bible ID #354).
And we know from the accounts of Edmund Campion, John Gerard, William Weston and other itinerant English Jesuits, that they would devote considerable time to homilies, since any one sermon might have to satisfy a gentry household community for sometimes months or years. This book’s liturgical annotation therefore reminds us that the missionary’s strategies were pastoral as well as confrontational, and that his English Bible assisted him in carrying out both missions.

The seculars, who always made up the majority of the missioners, as well as the Benedictines, Franciscans, and other regulars, appropriated their Testaments in a manner similar to the one just described. A 1582 Rheims New Testament now held at the National Library of Scotland was signed by a learned seventeenth-century reader named William Dawson, likely the secular priest ordained at the English College Seville in 1631. Dawson added his own substantive Latin commentary to the text’s English endnotes, reinforcing counter-reformation arguments about the necessity of tradition, the primacy of Peter, and the inerrancy of the visible Church – for the last of which he referenced the Controversies of “the most erudite, most eloquent, and most reverend Father Bellarminus.” Dawson again demonstrated, however, that his New Testament was useful for more than controversy. He not only augmented the Table of Gospels and Epistles, correcting the lection references for certain feast days and adding new ones; he


529 1582 RNT of NLS (ID #446), f. Ccccc1r.
also inserted the Latin acclamations that the people were to recite before and after the priest read the Gospel: “In principio evangeli, dit: Gloria tibi, Domine. In fine: laus tibi xpe [Christe].” In other words, this Bible was an instrument not only for the missionary to prepare the Mass, but also to help the laity to participate in it with him. The same reader also assimilated the Bible to a Life of Christ, calculating the age of the child Jesus in the margins next to landmark events, such as the baptism and the return of the holy family to Israel. After being constructed for three different purposes, the book eventually made its way from the hands of a secular priest to a Benedictine monk, Thomas Shuttleworth, who worked the northern district of England in the eighteenth century.

Other missionaries besides the Jesuits, therefore, were using the English Bible. Despite being a minority among them, however, the Jesuits left more traces of their provenance. And they were more likely to leave liturgical annotations than anything else. The Mass lections are the only passages bracketed, asterisked, and cross-marked in a 1582 Rheims New Testament, now held at the Catholic University of America. Next to a few of these lections, an early eighteenth century reader underscores his or her relationship with the Jesuits by identifying the festial readings of “St. Xaverius” and “St. Ignat.,” which were not recorded in the printed appendix. A 1609-10 Douai Old Testament, which was designated the common book of the Jesuit community in
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531 Bellenger, *English and Welsh Priests*, 107. For another English Catholic Bible used by the Benedictines, see the 1635 DOT held at Cambridge University Library (Shelfmark: BSS.201.C35.6, Bible ID #203). It was autographed by James Blair, O.S.B., in 1682.
532 1582 RNT of Catholic University of America Library, Washington, D.C., Shelfmark BS 2080 1582 STC Copy 1, Accession # 145.252 (Bible ID #645).
Cornwall, and was later autographed by “Joannes Gradell Societ. Iesu” in the middle of the eighteenth century, recorded just two reader interventions. The first, an “N.B.”, stressed the passage in Exodus 3 that enjoined the righteous to be willing to give up all temporal possessions. The missionary might have chosen the text either to affirm his own ascetical struggle or to exhort the households he was visiting. The second intervention was more systematic and devotional: the designation of the Seven Penitential Psalms. The 1621 Rheims New Testament of the American Bible Society, the one whose binding bears an amalgamation of Jesuit insignia into its I H S emblem (Figure 10 above), is still more decisively liturgized. In order to shrink this sextodecimo edition into a handy, pocket size, it was published without any of its ordinary appendices. The reader “fixed” it, however, by inserting twenty flyleaves, upon which he sketched, in a seventeenth century hand, only the Catholic liturgical calendar as it was particularized in England. This type of liturgical reconfiguration was not uncommon among other readers, as we shall see later. If, however, Jesuit readers approached their English Bibles as a corpus of controversies less frequently than the other missionaries, it may have been a result of their differential formation. The apologetical method invoked by Cardinal Allen at Douai (see above) became the model for the other English Colleges of Rome (founded 1579), Valladolid (1589), and Seville (1592). Even though these subsequent colleges originally and regularly maintained a Jesuit rector, they were designed for secular priests. Jesuit seminarians were trained instead in their own colleges and houses of study, from
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St. Omers to Louvain to Liège to Watten. And the Jesuit curriculum, which was codified at the end of the sixteenth century, established a plan for scripture study that generally avoided confessional controversy (as we have seen in chapter 2). What then happens to the perception, cultivated by the Elizabethan government and modern historians alike, that the Rheims New Testament was the Jesuit missionary’s apologetical toolkit? The extent to which Jesuits did use the English Bible with greater frequency than other priests, as the evidence appears to show, would indicate that the book’s missionary readers were more likely to dwell upon the mass lections. To them, the Table of Controversies was secondary at best.

II. Continental Nuns

Surviving Douai-Rheims Bibles reveal that they also had other users besides missionary priests and the government officers that apprehended them. Their most reliable method for avoiding confiscation, in fact, was never leaving the continent. The illicit books were published abroad in Rheims, Antwerp, Douai, and Rouen, if not also in Paris, Louvain, and Brussels. It was these Catholic realms of Northern France and the
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535 The New Testament editions published in Rheims (1582), Antwerp (1600, 1621, 1630) and Rouen (1633) as well as the Old Testament editions published in Douai (1609-10) and Rouen (1635) are all a matter of public record: extant copies survive, have been reviewed by the present author, and are recorded in STC, ESTC, and EEBO. There are no extant copies of additional editions in Paris, Louvain, Brussels, and London, which are attested by various sources: Gee, *Foot out of the Snare*, 97; J. Lewis, *A Complete History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible and New Testament into English* (London, 1738; rpt 1818), 295; Leona Rostenberg, *The Minority Press and the English Crown, 1558-1625* (Brill, 1971), 99; Beales, *Education under Penalty*, 55, which also records a Rouen edition of the Rheims New Testament in Welsh. If these editions, were indeed printed, it is likely that they failed to survive on account of their clandestine domestic printing, as in the case of the London editions, or on account of their smaller, fragile form, which also made them more portable and potentially more accessible to readers of modest means.
Spanish Netherlands that afforded hospitality to the “popish” books and peoples outlawed in England. Many newly printed Old and New Testaments effectively stayed put after print and remained comfortably in the houses of English exile communities all the way until the nineteenth century when they were collected by Napoleon. Preserved thereafter in the National Libraries of Paris and other centralized locations, these Bibles are autographed by the English Benedictines of St. Edmund in Paris, the English Jesuits in Liege, and even the Scottish Benedictines in Wurzburg. More voracious readers than all of these male religious communities combined, however, were the English nuns, as their provenance marks on the English Bibles testify. Copies in the Bibliothèque François Mitterand, Sainte-Geneviève, and Mazarine bear the recurring inscription: “This Booke Belonges to ye English Benedicten Nunneres of our Bles: Lady of good Hope in paris.” The formidable collection of eighteen English Catholic Bibles once possessed by the Poor Clares of Rouen contain lists of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century autographs, successively crossed out and replaced by the name below: e.g., “Sr. Elisabeth Joseph” (crossed), “Lent by holy obedience to Sr. Elisabeth Clare” (crossed), until finally, “Lent by holy obedience to Sr. Ann Raphael, 1749.” The ones ascribed to other convents of English exiles tell a similar story: with the Benedictines of Pontoise
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536 The Henrician dissolution of the monasteries, 1536-41, included convents, friaries, and priories and made institutionalized religious life impossible in England long before the Elizabethan recusancy laws began to target individuals who absented themselves from established worship. For a classic, if dated, survey of the exiled religious communities, see Peter Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795* (Longman, 1914). For a recent study that is more temporally and geographically limited, see Katy Gibbons, *English Catholic Exiles in Late Sixteenth-Century Paris* (Boydell, 2011).
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and of Brussels and of Cambrai, the Poor Clares of Aire-sur-la-Lys and of Dunkirk, the Augustinian canonesses of Louvain and of Paris, these Bibles were not simply library trophies to be displayed. They were communal books, checked-in and -out, passed from one sister to the next.  

The manuscript notes indicate not only who read these books, but also how they were read. Srs. Elisabeth Joseph Throckmorton (professed 1695) and Eugenia Clare Hales (professed 1696), of the Poor Clares in Rouen, both leave unblemished the front and back matter of their 1600 Rheims New Testament, using their quills instead to identify in the text 20-25 more liturgical lections than had been specified already by the printed marginal paratexts. They especially emphasized those lections corresponding to special feasts for their order: they write “for y[e] Stigmata/[f] of o[r] holy [f]ather / S[t] Francis” at Matthew 16, and “for o[ur] holy Mot[her]/” [meaning, St. Clare of Assisi] at Matthew 25. They composed for themselves, moreover, seven lections from the Old Testament in the back flyleaves. Sr. Mary Joseph Clavering (prof.1715) from the Benedictine convent of Pontoise was even more resolute in her liturgical focus. She tore out all the printed annotations and the preface from her 1621 New Testament, inserting in their place 50 blank flyleaves that she filled with a liturgical table in her own hand. She then coordinated this table with the text, penning crosses where the lections began and
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540 See, for example, Bible IDs# 7, 225, 265, 267, 303, 547, 573. For a list of the twenty-two enclosed English convents funded abroad in the seventeenth century (not counting Mary Ward’s congregations of English Ladies, nor the migrating Syon Abbey), see Caroline Bowden, “Community space and cultural transmission: formation and schooling in English enclosed convents in the seventeenth century,” History of Education (July 2005), 34 (4): 385-6. Within these convents there were more than 1950 professed women.

541 Bible ID #256; see also #259, 264, which were marked by the same readers.

542 Bible ID #7. Compare with Bible ID #347, where the Jesuit reader just added flyleaves for the liturgy without also subtracting the existing Table of Controversies.
half-crosses where they ended. Following suit were the English Benedictines of Notre Dame de Bonne Esperance in Paris, who added to the cross-and-half-cross system the liturgical dates corresponding to some forty lections – none of which had been designated in the printed appendix.\textsuperscript{543} If these nuns had received a book for winning debates, they reconfigured it to follow the Mass.

The missionary priests approached the English Bible as a liturgical book as well, but not as exclusively. The language of the Roman rite, in which the Mass lections were proclaimed, was legible to them. They were not so dependent upon accompanying English translations, because the English seminaries systematically trained them in Latin. The English convents, on the other hand, as the scholarship of Caroline Bowden has shown, generally trained their postulants (and lay students) in Latin only to the extent that would enable them to recite the Offices.\textsuperscript{544} Yet provision was made in Benedictine Convents for those that did not even acquire that modicum of Latin literacy: after the death of a sister, those that were unable to recite the Offices of the Dead were permitted to substitute beads.\textsuperscript{545} “Latinists” do appear sometimes in convent records precisely because their presence in the community was uncommon and, therefore, notable.\textsuperscript{546}

That distinction was not always considered praiseworthy either. Fr. Augustine Baker (1575-1641), confessor to the Benedictine convents of Cambrai and Paris, advised

\textsuperscript{543} Bible ID #23.
\textsuperscript{544} Caroline Bowden, “‘For the Glory of God’: A Study of the Education of English Catholic Women in Convents in Flanders and France in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century”, *Paedagogica Historica, Supplementary Series. V. Ghent C.S.H.P.* (1999), 77-95, esp. 82-4.
\textsuperscript{546} Bowden, “For the Glory of God”, 82-4.
the nuns in his care against overtaxing themselves in the reading of Latin. His warning was the result not only of his particular assessment of their “vnreadines and vnskillfullnes in the Latein tongue, which makes the saieng of the office much more greeuous”, but also of his general recognition of their womanhood: since they were “of a colder complexion” than men, they were consequently “weaker in the understanding.”

And it was not just the physical health of the nuns that concerned Baker:

If sometimes there be founde a woman more knoweing in matter of Learning then other women doe, commonlie she is founde to be the more uaine and phantasticall, and soe in a greater impediment of attaining to the Diuine Loue.

Baker’s admonitions were consonant with contemporary attitudes about female education, both inside and outside the cloister.

That does not mean, however, that the English convents and their adjoining schools promoted illiteracy. Of vernacular reading, there is abundant evidence. Almost all the books kept or composed by the English nuns were in English. The manuscript notes in their Bibles, too, are most often in English, even when recording prayers. Alternative reading languages were less likely to be Latin than another vernacular, typically that of the host kingdom. That is illustrated by programmatic educational
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547 Wolfe, “Reading Bells”, 141.
548 Wolfe, “Reading Bells”, 145.
550 Bowden, “For the Glory of God”, 82-3, 86-7.
551 See, for instance, the 1582 Rheims New Testament of the Mazarine Library in Paris that belonged to English Benedictine nuns (Bible ID #1). Their title page invocations do not reproduce traditional Latin formulas: “Grant to us your handmaids, what we / ask of you, that you will watch over us / according to your usuall ceremony.” “Glory be to the Father, who nourishes, / governs & cherishes those whom the Son / redeem’, and the H. Spirit has anointed.”
materials from three English Augustinian convents identified by Caroline Bowden.\textsuperscript{552}

A seventeenth century manuscript on the “Direction of … Yong Ladys and Gentlewomen Pensioners”, from the Augustinian house of Bruges, whose school opened in 1629, states that every morning “at eight of the clock the children are to learn to write and chiefly to spell well, ye contrary defect being very generall.” English is the language that they are taught to write and spell in, as is implied by what else the manuscript identifies as part of their education: needlework, devotional exercises, French, History, and Latin. That last subject then is something in addition to the main lessons on writing and spelling. It was altogether omitted from the daily plan of the English house of Augustinian Sepulchrines at Liege, where a former student recalled in 1652 that her education featured “all the qualities befitting their sex, as writing, reading, needle-work, French, musick.” Among the Augustinian canonnesses of Paris, Latin was further subordinated to French, which was the only language that students were allowed to speak. For these women who considered themselves English ladies, learning French was not just a function of lingering aristocratic tastes; at times it was a matter of life and death, as is illustrated by a page from an eighteenth century English-to-French medical phrase book, stuck between the pages of a Douai-Rheims Bible that belonged to the Poor Clares of Rouen:

\textit{Dialogue familiers}

\begin{quote}
N. Nurse, let somebody go for a surgeon. \textit{N. Garde, qu’on maille querir un Chirurgien.} \\
R. Whom will you have? \textit{R. ...} \\
N. The same who has let my blood already. \textit{N. ...}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{552} Bowden, “For the Glory of God”, 80-83.
R. What is his name? …
N. I don’t know. …
R. How do you find your self now?
N. I am very sick. Call some one. I am almost spent. I am dying.
…

The combination of this French dialogue within this English Bible demonstrates that these nuns had been inclined toward the vernacular, for scripture-reading as well as practical necessities.

As these medical scripts also suggest, contact with the outside world itself was supposed to be for emergency situations. The enclosure of women’s religious communities was made normative by the Council of Trent in 1563 and subsequently reaffirmed by Pius V in 1566 (Circa Pastoralis) and 1568 (Lubricum Vitae Genitus). If the law of enclosure confined nuns to their convents, its practice also entailed strict hierarchical divisions within the convents. At the top were the “choir nuns”, who brought with them hefty dowries and carried out the primary duties of the order, which included performing the divine office and voting in chapter elections; these were followed by the “lay sisters”, who were also professed and were responsible for the more menial tasks; last were the students, who ultimately might profess or might not, as well as sometimes gentlewomen pensioners. Traditional social distinctions followed women into the convent. The lay sisters generally originated from more modest backgrounds: no one who had the social capacity to profess as a choir nun became a “lay sister” unless she
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553 1609-10 DOT at the Library of the University of Durham (PG Special, PoorClares 0387-0388), Bible ID #260.
freely chose to do so “out of humility.” There is no evidence for mobility in the other direction. Educational expectations were similarly tied to social status. The Benedictine Constitutions, for instance, prohibited lay sisters from “learn[ing] to sing, read, or write.”

If social distinctions were to be observed amongst the nuns, so much more was to be the physical separation between the professed and unprofessed. This created problems for running a school, especially before the convents were able to muster the resources for a separate building located outside the enclosure, yet adjoining it. To preserve the inviolable space between choir nuns and lay students, for instance, the Franciscans in Brussels practiced “teaching through a grille”: it was a short-lived experiment, dismissed in 1637 as pedagogically unsound. Other orders navigated the issue by appointing lay women as teachers, so that the choir nuns could avoid contact with the schoolchildren altogether. In short, the women were to be segregated almost as much from each other as they were from the outside world. The relevant question here is whether the same is true for these women’s books. Was the dispersion of Douai-Rheims Bibles in these convents restricted by religious state and social status? Whenever they are autographed, the autograph is always linked to the identity of a choir nun.
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557 See Roberta Gilchrist, Gender and Material Culture: The Archaeology of Religious Women (Routledge, 1994).
559 Bowden, “Community space and cultural transmission”, 383.
560 The only exception is Catherine Throckmorton (1695-1792), who became a lay sister at the Benedictine convent of Cambrai in 1721; however, Throckmorton also had been a choir nun at the Augustinian convent of Paris since 1713, switching convent and status on account of “mental health.” It seems, moreover, that her 1621 Rheims New Testament (Bible ID #573) may not have accompanied her to Cambrai, but rather was transferred to her brother, Sir Robert Throckmorton, the 4th Baronet of Coughton Court in Warwickshire, about which there is more below.
It was the particular vocation of the choir nun that seemed almost to demand these Bibles. The rule of St. Benedict required a library from which sisters could borrow books for mealtime and bedtime; in fact, they were forbidden from not reading during these hours.\textsuperscript{561} “The reading Bell” alerted them to additional periods of required reading, as Heather Wolfe has illustrated for the English Benedictine convents of Cambrai and Paris: in common after midday recreation and privately in their cells upon completing their afternoon work. Scripture, hagiography, and martyrology featured prominently among their reading materials, but so did their own loose compilations of commonplaces and personal reflections upon these same works.\textsuperscript{562} As these products indicate, the choir nuns were to read not for information, but for assimilation.\textsuperscript{563} The goal was “mystic union” with God, and scripture-books were the means, especially those that could link liturgical lections with spiritual reflections, if the remnants of their libraries are any indication.\textsuperscript{564}

Nor were the Benedictines unique in this regard. A 1609-10 Douai Old Testament ascribed to the Poor Clares of Rouen contains a pair of printed inserts and loose notes in the hands of Sr. Elisabeth Joseph Throckmorton (d.1724) and Sr. Eugenia Clare Hales (d.1738), who autographed a number of Bibles in this collection.\textsuperscript{565} In her note, the reader exhorts herself while reading to keep “ye maxims of ye holy Gho[st]/ in your hart”; the printed insert is from a Latin-French Missal. The two pieces together mark the meditative and liturgical spaces in which this Bible was appropriated. The

\textsuperscript{561} Bowden, “For the Glory of God”, 85-7.
\textsuperscript{562} Wolfe, “Reading Bells,” 136, 139, 146.
\textsuperscript{563} Wolfe, “Reading Bells,” 138-140, 142.
\textsuperscript{564} Wolfe, “Reading Bells,” 142, 151; Bowden, “For the Glory of God,” 86-88.
\textsuperscript{565} Bible ID #259.
English Augustinians of Paris, as one sister recalled, were accustomed to read the gospel for fifteen minutes after Mass every morning.\textsuperscript{566} It apparently was not sufficient to hear the Gospel proclaimed in Latin during the liturgy fifteen minutes earlier. Prescribing a second focused reading session on the same scriptural passage in English translation was consonant with the skills and objectives of the canonesses as well. At the Augustinian house in Louvain, the nuns relied upon one of their sister’s to make English translations of the “Homilies, Sermons, and Expositions of Psalms out of the Holy Fathers, which we read in our Refectory.”\textsuperscript{567}

It is possible to find within the scripture-books of these choir nuns an enclosed mystical microcosm, sealed off from the dramas and developments of the temporal world outside. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the four-volume English Catholic Old Testament published in Edinburgh in 1796 and autographed by Sr. Francis Benedict Plunkett (d.1811) of the Poor Clares of Rouen.\textsuperscript{568} On the flyleaf of volume one, Sr. Francis recorded an episcopal reading license granted to their convent by the Bishop of St. Omer in 1771. The general permission was accompanied by certain prohibitions. The “English Religious Women” had been given “leave … to read the H. Scriptures Excepting: the undermentioned Chapters … Genesis Chapter 38, Leviticus Chap: 10 & 11, Judges Chap: 19, Ruth Chap: 3&4.” The reader notes on the flyleaf of the third volume (the second is missing) that “the entire book of Canticles [is] to be omitted” and on the fourth, “To be omitted: Ezechiel Chap 23. & 24, Daniel Chap 13, Osee Chap. 1 &

\textsuperscript{566} Bowden, “For the Glory of God,” 80-81.  
\textsuperscript{567} Bowden, “For the Glory of God,” 86-87.  
\textsuperscript{568} Holy Bible Translated from the Latin Vulgate (Edinburgh: John Moir, 1796), 4 vols, 12mo, at the Durham University Library (PG Special, Poor Clares 0153-0155), Bible ID #276 (D&M 1408). It is a new edition of Richard Challoner’s revision of the original Douai Old Testament (1609-10).
3.” That Sr. Francis was willing to identify parts of Scripture to be skipped in favor of a traditional, devotional inner canon does not distinguish her from other Catholic readers as we have seen in Chapter 2 and will see again in Chapter 5, even in the context of teaching scripture in the colleges and universities. What does distinguish her is that she was willing to identify the license. The Tridentine Index of 1564 had required vernacular scripture-readers to obtain such a license from their ordinary, but rarely if ever did they actually inscribe any record of one in their books, whether before or after the Roman Index officially banned vernacular Bibles in 1596. It is striking that Sr. Francis elected to record in her 1796 Old Testament a license that was at least twenty-five years old and that had been bequeathed by an episcopal see that no longer existed. Its final ordinary resigned in 1790 in the wake of the French Revolution. Another fourteen years before this episcopal license was issued, moreover, Pope Benedict XIV had relaxed the Inquisition’s ban on vernacular scripture-reading. In the middle of the eighteenth century, therefore, as English Catholic Bibles finally were printed openly in at least some parts of the British Isles, many other new Catholic editions were being published throughout Europe with the open approval of Rome. Indeed the very Challoner version of the Bible autographed by Sr. Francis already had been widely disseminated -- printed in at least eleven other Old and New Testament editions before she received it. That she nevertheless inscribed an outdated dated episcopal permission into her scripture-books might suggest that she was oblivious to everything outside her convent. It is not, in fact, what it seems: she could not have been oblivious, for the same revolutionary

570 See, for instance, Hugh Pope, English Versions of the Bible (Herder, 1952), 669-670.
forces that suppressed the See of St. Omer also expelled her community from Rouen. One year before her Bible was published, the Poor Clares returned to England. Before her death in 1811, they would relocate twice more, from London to Northumberland to Yorkshire. She did not reside in a conventual cocoon, therefore, nor could she have endured reading in blissful ignorance of what her late bishop no longer had the power to control. By inscribing her Bible with his special permissions and prohibitions, she was attempting more deliberately to reclaim a lost world, and to preserve from invaders that mystical reading space that she believed had been the lot of her sisters for centuries as members of an exiled women’s religious community. As vernacular Bible-reading was increasingly “vulgarized” around her, she strove to continue experiencing it as a sacred privilege.

If the enclosure may have had a decisive, if not always distinctive, impact upon the way that women religious read the Bible, what about religious women outside the enclosure? In the first three decades of the seventeenth century, the English Institutes of Mary Ward spread across continental Europe: St. Omers, Liege, Cologne, Trier, Rome, Naples, Perugia, Munich, Vienna, Pressburg and Prague. Like the Ursulines who swept across France in the century before, Ward summoned her “English Ladies” to undertake a more active apostolate, emphatically outside of the cloister. Together they developed a new vocation of “the teaching nun”, whose lessons would never be delivered through the grill. They also developed the institutional infrastructure around her, which was

571 For a systematic comparison of the Ursulines and English Ladies, see Lux-Sterritt, Redefining Female Religious Life.
572 Lux-Sterritt, Redefining Female Religious Life, 9.
intended to remedy the traditional imbalance of educational opportunities between
genders as well as across social strata – students of all financial means were to receive a
free education. For her schools to achieve this social breadth, Mary Ward imitated Jesuit
models, admitting boarders who carried a pension along with them as well as “externs” or
day-students. It was no accident that her first community and school was founded in
St. Omers, where the Jesuits’ singular college for English boys also had taken root. She
traced her own vocation to a vision, wherein she was instructed to “Take the Same of the
Society.”

Ward also followed the Jesuits in designing her schools to be something more
than a vocations factory. They certainly would help increase the ranks of the professed,
but their primary purpose was to form Catholic laypeople, “mothers” in her case, who
would then have the capacity to sustain and spread the faith in England. Their mission
reinforced a strong, ongoing relationship between recusant households and English
Ladies abroad. This was notably true of the Bedingfeld household of Oxburgh Hall,
which was the residence of this study’s principal subject, Thomas Marwood. Winifred
Bedingfeld (1610-1666) and Frances Bedingfeld (1616-1704), who were cousins of
Marwood’s ward, Henry Bedingfeld, did more to establish the Institute of the Blessed
Virgin Mary in England than anyone else besides Ward herself. Marwood’s
contemporary, Frances, was perhaps even more of a linguist than he, renowned for her

573 Lux-Sterritt, Redefining Female Religious Life, 3, 76-77.
to the Jesuits (Cambridge, 2008), 120-135; Lux-Sterritt, Redefining Female Religious Life, 12-17.
576 Lux-Sterritt, Redefining Female Religious Life, 5-6, 91-92; Henriette Peters, Mary Ward: A World in
learning in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. Latin education was also a priority at the school that she established for Catholic girls in York, during the reign of James II, but that was true of all the schools under Mary Ward’s Institute. It was not just the admissions structure of the Jesuit colleges that they adopted, but a good portion of the curriculum as well. That meant, in addition to a robust Latin education for the purposes of comprehending the scriptures and canonical devotional works and for free interchange among the institutes across the continent, the schools would be hosting plays, which were so characteristic of the Society, as well as disputations. Mary Ward promoted disputations as a method for sharpening wits. Her more precise purpose for them, however, mirrored the ultimate objective of her entire enterprise: not the refinement of young gentlewomen, but the formation of women missionaries to assist the reconversion of England. Her students had to be trained to resist the “scattered poison of heretical depravity which is daily spreading itself more widely,” as her Brevis Declaratio put it in the campaign to win papal approval for the Institute. Given the emphasis of Ward’s Institute on learning Latin to understand Scripture and on acquiring the skills of
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581 Bowden, “For the Glory of God,” 82.
582 This campaign did not achieve the desired result. Instead of winning approval, Mary Ward’s Institute was formally condemned as a religious congregation for refusing to accept the Tridentine law of enclosure. Ward and many of her religious sisters persisted in their work, however, as members of the lay faithful. Frances Bedingfeld’s community in Munich became the unofficial mother house and her school continued. Mary Ward returned to London in 1639 to form a recusant center and school, before the political turmoil of the 1640s compelled her to relocate to Yorkshire. Frances Bedingfeld followed the Stuarts back to England after the Restoration. In 1669 she formed a house, priest center, and elementary Catholic school in Hammersmith, and then in 1686 did it all over again in York. See Lux-Sterritt, *Redefining Female Religious Life*, 6, 15-16.
debate to counteract Protestantism, we might expect either that the English Ladies had no use for the English Bibles or that they read them in a fundamentally different way than the other women religious – that is, for their controversies.

In both cases, we would be mistaken. At the York Bar Convent, which was the site of the religious community, priest center and elementary school formed by Frances Bedingfeld, there are seven New Testaments and two complete Old Testaments of the Douai Rheims Version that were published by 1750. The earlier ones show scant evidence of anything besides liturgical reading. The 1582 Rheims New Testament was autographed by Sr. Mary Metcalfe (d.1747), who was a “nun” of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which was the unofficial descendant of Mary Ward’s Institute that finally gained papal approval in 1702. Metcalfe’s Testament exhibits the conventional manuscript cross and half-cross system for marking the gospel lection as well as manuscript dates next to the lections marked printed in the appendix “For Saints and Festival days peculiar and proper.” The only annotation of the polemical endnotes occurs on page 292, where the reader bracketed all the patristic support for Catholic Mariology, which communicates perhaps less of an attempt to harvest the Bible for controversy than a religious community’s expression of devotion, or hyperdulia, to the saint for whom it was named. The convent’s 1600 Rheims New Testament witnesses the close contact between the Jesuits and the English Ladies: on its original front cover, a cross ascends from an I H S monogram, and underneath is the heart pierced by three

583 Bible ID #369. Shelfmark: G.5.3.
The pages inside the book are spotless, with the important exception of corrections to the liturgical paratext and appendix. More liturgical annotations are inscribed in the Table of Epistles and Gospels of the 1633 Rheims New Testament, which similarly is annotated in no other way. Both the French Ursulines and Mary Ward Sisters prioritized personal assimilation of the liturgy over mere mechanical repetition of it. Reflecting on the lections in one’s native tongue is consonant with that mystical goal no matter how much Latin one acquired. It was not that the English Ladies did not read the Latin Bible: the Bar Convent also possesses a copy of the 1605 Clementine Vulgate -- the same edition so meticulously annotated by Thomas Marwood for the Bedingfeld household. It is just that there is no evidence that they read their English Bibles any differently than did religious women within the enclosure.

Reading the English Bible liturgically, furthermore, does not mean that sisters were disconnected from the temporal world outside the convent, whether or not it was formally enclosed, nor that they eschewed religious controversy in other books and other contexts. While the English Ladies were the only ones to choose the Jesuits as their

---

585 Bible ID #373. Shelfmark. F.8.5.
587 A similar observation about the relationship between sacred reading and religious controversy, this time with respect to English Catholic lay women, has been made by Alexandra Walsham and Earle Havens: though the vast majority of “popish” books confiscated from them were liturgical or devotional, we should not assume that they were wholly uninterested in polemics. See their “Catholic Libraries: An Introduction”, in Fehrenbach & Black, eds., Private Libraries in Renaissance England (ACMRS, 2014), VIII: 153. Not every one of the nuns’ English Bibles in the surveyed sample, furthermore, is marked by liturgical reading exclusively. The two salient exceptions are Bible ID #24 & 449. In the first case, a 1582 Rheims New Testament autographed by Mother Agnes Temple (d.1726) of the Benedictine convent in Paris, a reader enthusiastically annotated many controversial paratexts, especially those that criticize Protestant support for indiscriminate Bible-reading! In both cases, however, the evidence suggests that the nuns received these Bibles after they already had been annotated in this way by the other readers who left their autographs.
models, many of the other English religious communities chose them as their confessors.\textsuperscript{588} Other orders embraced the mission to form English Catholic mothers, as well, most notably the Augustinian Canonesses and Sepulchrines (who also followed the Augustinian Rule).\textsuperscript{589} And all the orders competed for new recruits from the prominent Catholic families, which ensured continual contact and collaboration between the religious exiles and the Catholics at home.\textsuperscript{590} These contacts facilitated certain covert operations and political negotiations: for instance, the English Bridgettine Convent in Lisbon, the former Syon Abbey, involved themselves in the Spanish Match, subtly petitioning the prospective bride of Charles I, the Infanta Doña María, for the toleration of English Catholics; during the Commonwealth period, the Benedictines of Ghent operated a secret news service on behalf of the exiled court of Charles II; and after the exile of James II, the Benedictines of Pontoise were only one of the convents to maintain contacts with the Jacobite Court, even winning vocations from within the royal family.\textsuperscript{591} The regular contact between cloister and household also facilitated the transmission of books. Elizabeth Teale, the wife of conformist Isaac Teale, apothecary-general to the

\textsuperscript{588} Heather Wolfe claimed that “most communities of English nuns on the Continent had Jesuit confessors”: see Wolfe, “Reading Bells,” 137. The lists of confessors produced by the “Who were the Nuns Project” at Queen Mary University, London, however, does not bear this out. See http://wwtn.history.qmul.ac.uk/publications/lists/index.html.

\textsuperscript{589} Bowden, “Community Space and Cultural Transmission,” 368-9, 381-383.


army of Marlborough, received her 1633 Rheims New Testament from Lady Abbess
Elizabeth Marina Plowyden in 1693 when visiting her Augustinian convent in Louvain. Sir Robert Throckmorton, 3rd Baronet of Coughton Court, autographed a Rheims New Testament in 1684, but his sister with the Poor Clares at Rouen autographed no less than four others, and promised to procure for him the biblical commentaries of a contemporary French Benedictine. The convent’s role as a center of the forbidden book trade, however, did not please everyone involved, as one choir nun’s inscription on her Douai Old Testament makes clear: “Dear Mother Abbis has given / me leve to have these booke[s] / for my use but they are not / to be given from ye house.” The mobility of these Bibles reveals once again that the enclosure was much more permeable than the rules might allow. It afforded a privileged space for the English Bible, but not one that was sealed off from the general culture of lay Catholic reading, which was nourished by it, and on which it was patterned.

***

III. Catholic Gentry Households

593 See Bible ID: 285, 256, 259, 266, 573. See Geoffrey Scott, “The Throckmortons at Home and Abroad, 1680-1800”, in Geoffrey Scott & Peter Marshall, eds., Catholic Gentry in English Society: the Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation (Ashgate, 2009), 191. Note also that even the most thoroughly liturgical English-Bible reader, Sr. Mary Joseph Clavering (see above), was proximate to Jacobite politics. Her maternal cousins, the Widdringtons, were living in French exile as well, educated by the Jesuits in Paris at the College Louis-Le-Grand, and regular guests of the Stuart Court in St. Germaine.
The English gentry constitute the third major set of Catholic readers of the Douai-Rheims Bibles. They often acquired these books by visiting their sisters in the convent, as we have seen, but there were other means for smuggling them through English ports, which became a lucrative enough trade to entice many dealers who had little sympathy with the texts that they were plying. Once the books were ensconced in the country, it seems that those gentry who were in contact with missionary priests regularly got hold of them. Though Pope Clement VIII had revoked the Tridentine license system for reading vernacular bibles, exactly as the preface to the AV had charged, he and his successors continued to grant English missionaries plenary power to read prohibited books and “to read and give licenses to the laity … for Sacred Scripture written in the English idiom.” Many scripture-books autographed by seventeenth-century lay Catholics indeed remain in their original custom binding with embossed Jesuit seal; that includes the aforementioned 1621 Rheims New Testament of Sir Robert Throckmorton (1662-1720), whose aforementioned sisters were also readers of the Douai-Rheims Bible, evincing the frequently triangular Bible distribution network between priests, nuns, and gentry.
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595 See Walsham, “Domme Preachers”, 82-88; John Gee, The Foot out of the Snare... Whereunto is Added... the Names of Such as Disperse, Bind or Sell Popish Bookes, 3rd edition (London, 1624), STC 11703; Beales, Education under Penalty, 206. For smuggling Catholic books into Wales, see Maurice Whitehead, “The Jesuit Collegium Sancti Francisci Xavierrez in South Wales and the South-West of England and Its Links with the Low Countries, ca. 1600-1679”, in Rob Faesen & Leo Kenis, eds., The Jesuits of the Low Countries: Identity and Impact (1540-1773) (Peeters, 2012), 197-212, esp. 200.
596 APF, SC Anglia I, 1627-1707, ff.54r, 391r-392r.
Exchanges among them, when they happened in England, might occur in several places. One notorious site of Catholic reading and book exchange was the prison. There “it was possible to do more good than outside”, as Henry Garnet (d.1606), the Superior of the English Jesuits, famously commented, because within them priests could minister more openly, and lay people would know where to find them. When detaining missionaries, the cell could become a quasi-public church with altar, pulpit, and confessional, or a retreat center, or even in some cases, a school. The lists of books confiscated within prison during the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods demonstrate that it was possible to accumulate libraries of “popish books” while warders temporarily looked the other way, knowingly or not. Notable by its absence from these lists, however, is the Douai-Rheims Bible. The only exception is the substantial collection of Stephen Vallenger (d.1591), the incarcerated Catholic printer, who was recorded as possessing the Rheims New Testament through the confutation of the Cambridge divine, William Fulke. Vallenger’s list is also exceptional, however, because it includes non-confiscated books, and perhaps illustrates the concessions formally offered in certain jails of the period for inmates to keep patristic and Protestant
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601 See the sample of 30 booklists (212-241) printed in Fehrenbach & Black, eds., *Private Libraries*, VIII: 159-219.
books, as well as English Bibles. For that reason, the other lists ought not to be interpreted as exhaustive accounts of any prisoner’s library. While it is possible then that Douai-Rheims Bibles were overlooked by confiscators, it is unlikely given the government’s special diligence in confiscating these particular Bibles when discovered elsewhere. If these prisoners were caught with many other controversialist books in both Latin and English, why never Gregory Martin’s notoriously polemicized Bible? The evidence does not present a clear solution. It does show, however, that the most frequently recorded book is the Roman Breviary. That one book contained the Psalter and all the scripture-readings necessary for the public offices of their religion. With this church-approved liturgical scripture-book in hand, and with state-approved English Bibles available upon request, perhaps the Douai-Rheims version was considered relatively superfluous.

A better place to find the English Catholic Bible circulating then, perhaps, might be those clandestine schools outside the prison. The most celebrated of them during this period were also outside England: the schools of the exiled convents were discussed above, and the Jesuit colleges on the continent were addressed in Chapter Two. Within

---

604 Note also that an English Catholic translation of the Psalter was seized in the Fleet Prison in 1582 -- The psalter of Sainct Hierome (Antwerp, 1575). See Fehrenbach & Black, *Private Libraries*, VIII: 185.
606 The booklists do record some of Gregory Martin’s other works of English controversial theology, including his *Treatise of Schism* (London, 1578) in a couple places as well as his *Discorverie of the manifold corruptions of the holy scriptures by the Heretikes* (Rheims, 1582). The latter is notable, because Martin had it printed alongside his English New Testament and meant for it to be issued and read alongside it, too. Instead, in this booklist attributed to Richard Warnford, a recusant landowner of Hampshire and inmate of Winchester prison in 1583, what is recorded immediately above Martin’s *Discorverie* is not the New Testament, but rather “A Masse Booke.” See Fehrenbach & Black, *Private Libraries*, VIII: 179-180, 192, 195, 197.
the kingdom, too, however, there were some opportunities for a formal Catholic
education, as it was then conceived. Despite the strictures of the penal code, 130 schools
and 170 schoolmasters have been documented in seventeenth-century England.\textsuperscript{607} A
half-dozen of these Catholic establishments have endured until the present day, though
most were fragile, short-lived, and available to only a few pupils at a time.\textsuperscript{608} Their
coverage was also spotty, with Yorkshire, Lancashire and London being the most reliable
and concentrated zones of opportunity.\textsuperscript{609} Since evidence for these schools normally
comes from the records of their suppression, however, it is likely that the documented
numbers undercount the total, with other schools managing for a while under the radar.
To avoid detection, some masters were willing to compromise: one might attend the
established church himself in exchange for the freedom to “not catechize his scholars as
by law established” – this was not a compromise, however, that the government always
was willing to accept.\textsuperscript{610} All of these educators required books for their trade, including
Swithin Wells, the tutor for the household of the earl of Southampton, who was arrested
in 1587 “for receiving Catholic books from abroad” and later executed.\textsuperscript{611}

Would it be typical for Douai-Rheims Bibles to be featured among these Catholic
school books? Not necessarily, and not even likely. Whatever curricular records survive

\textsuperscript{607} Beales, \textit{Education Under Penalty}, 264. Only four of the schools were for women. Over one hundred
schoolmasters were lay men and women. The penalties against non-conforming schoolmasters escalated
from a £10 fine in 1581 to life imprisonment in 1700. For a more comprehensive list of “The Penal Laws
affecting Educaiton”, see the appendix in Beales, \textit{Education Under Penalty}, 272-3.
\textsuperscript{608} Beales, \textit{Education Under Penalty}, 265-6.
\textsuperscript{610} Beales, \textit{Education Under Penalty}, 201.
\textsuperscript{611} Leys, \textit{A Social History}, 155. Swithin Wells was one of 21 Catholic schoolmasters executed during the
for these schools indicate a rudimentary education in Latin and Greek. That education might be sufficient for one’s social station or preparatory for the more advanced training in grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, and theology offered by the colleges and seminaries abroad.\textsuperscript{612} An English Bible was not ordinarily employed to teach these subjects. One textbook that remained in the library of Fernyhalgh, a Catholic school founded in Lancashire during the Commonwealth era, was Obadiah Walker’s treatise \textit{On Education} (1677).\textsuperscript{613} Compiled by one of the twelve Catholic schoolmasters who obtained a license to teach under James II, this popular treatise inculcated the habits of refinement befitting a gentleman, including twenty-two chapters on such subjects as “Elocution”, “Civility”, “Prudence in Conversation”, “Concerning Business”, “Of Servants”, and of “Travelling into foreign countries.”\textsuperscript{614} Not among the designated contents were the scriptures nor religious instruction at all. Doctrinal formation was more commonly supplied by the catechism. Even when domestic education reached into theology, as sometimes seems to have happened in Jesuit missionary centers, involving the Douai-Rheims Bible for this purpose was still unconventional.\textsuperscript{615} The only two Jesuit mission libraries that have survived were both uncovered and confiscated in 1679 during the crackdown on Jesuit domestic activity that had been precipitated by the “Popish Plot” revelations of Titus Oates.\textsuperscript{616} The first was at Holbeck in Nottinghamshire and the second at Cwm in the

\textsuperscript{612} Beales, \textit{Education Under Penalty}, 209-13, 218, 222, 250-1.
\textsuperscript{613} Beales, \textit{Education Under Penalty}, 223.
\textsuperscript{615} When describing the relatively well-developed network of Jesuit schools within England, Beales concludes that “the seventeenth century in English Catholic education is still supremely their century.” See \textit{Education Under Penalty}, 187.
\textsuperscript{616} See \textit{A short narrative of the Discovery of a College of Jesuits, at a place called the COME, in the County of HEREFORD … to which is added a true Relation of the Knavery of Father Lewis, the Pretended
Welsh Marches. Both of them contained multiple copies of the *Ratio Studiorum*, the Jesuit formula for education ratified in 1599. The possession of these books would not be surprising, if both libraries also served schools or schoolmasters. In addition, almost twenty-five percent of each collection can be classified as “controversial theology.” It is especially likely that the library at Cwm assisted not only the missionaries themselves, but also the educational efforts of those among them who were preparing students for the seminaries abroad, which depended upon at least prior competence in Latin if not also an introduction to theology. These studies apparently did not depend upon familiarity with the Douai-Rheims Bible, which is conspicuously

---

*Bishop of Landaffe: Now a Prisoner in Monmouth Gaol* [London, Printed by T.N. or Charles Harper at the Flower-de-luce against St. Dunstan’s Church in Fleetstreet. 1679.]


620 The Jesuits were known to be operating two schools in Wales during the seventeenth century, and the one in the south was associated with the Cwm library in Beales, *Education Under Penalty*, 229-230, and Thomas McCoog, SJ, “The Society of Jesus in England, 1623-1688: An Institutional Study,” (DPhil Thesis, Warwick, 1984), 281-286. Cwm was the seat of the College of St. Francis Xavier, an organizational subdivision of the Jesuit Mission covering the Welsh Marches. A “college” on the English Mission was not necessarily an academic institution in the ordinary sense. It was an organizational unit that was larger and more financially stable than a “residence”. The “College of St. Francis Xavier”, however, was actually the largest territorial subdivision of the whole “English Mission”; moreover, it was founded out of an expressed “desire to further the education of Catholic youth.” See Whitehead, “The Jesuit *Collegium Sancti Francisci Xaverii*”, 198. Robert Jones, SJ, a rector of this college, was sending students to the continental seminaries of Douai and Valladolid by 1604, which meant that his students must have been receiving some preparatory education from him and his associates on the mission beforehand. David Lewis, SJ, a leading member of the same College when Cwm was suppressed, was the son of a conforming Catholic schoolmaster in Abergavenny. See Thomas McCoog, SJ, “Jones, Robert (c.1564-1614)”, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn., May 2009 [DOI: 10.1093/ref:odnb/37615]. McCoog traces schoolmasters within the Cwm community until 1646.
absent from the robustly theological Cwm collection of approximately 350 volumes.621 Other biblical books indeed were present: A Clementine Vulgate (Antwerp, 1618, 4°), François Lucas’s Vulgate Concordance (Antwerp, 1617, 2°), and the two-volume Vulgate Commentarius of the Belgian Jesuit scholar, Jacobus Tirinius.622 The Latin Bible, with its accompanying scholarly apparatus, was a traditional schoolbook, even on the English Mission, and the English Catholic Bible was not.623

Independent schools, therefore, may not be the most promising places to find Douai-Rheims Bibles circulating in England. The first record of a Catholic school lending library, after all, only cropped up in York during the momentary season of indulgence ushered in by James II.624 The school libraries, on the contrary, were perhaps more likely to receive books than to yield them. The Cwm collection blossomed from the

621 The Hereford Cathedral Library does possess a 1635 Douai Old Testament (Bible ID #319), but it has no identifying marks characteristic of the other Cwm books, and therefore past and present catalogers have resisted the urge to identify it with that collection. It likely was confiscated and redistributed at another, perhaps earlier time, like many of the Douai-Rheims Bibles acquired by bishops in the Church of England. A subsequent English Catholic version of the Bible does have provenance marks that link it to this Jesuit community. The copy of Robert Witham’s Annotations on the New Testament (1730), now held at the library of Downside Abbey (Bible ID #245), contains the autograph "Coll: S: Xav: Soc: Jesu" and the bookplate "E Bib. S' F Xii/ HEREFORD:"; however, its publication date postdates the Cwm confiscation of 1679. It, therefore, was not present in this library or any associated school.


623 Interestingly, several non-Catholic vernacular scripture-books have been attributed to the Cwm collection, including a Welsh New Testament (1567), German Bible (1667), and King James Bible (1642) bound together with the Book of Common Prayer and Metrical Psalms. Hannah Thomas conjectures that these books, along with Edmund Bunny’s famously Protestantized version of the Jesuit Robert Parsons’s Christian Directory, whose spine only read “BUNNY”, would have been left out on the table of the Cwm house as decoys to trick potential informants. See Thomas, “Annotated Catalogue”, 6, 30-31. My own survey of this King James Bible revealed no manuscript reader notes whatsoever.

624 Beales, Education under Penalty, 249.
death bequests of local Catholic families. The 1582 Rheims New Testament now possessed by the library of Stonyhurst, which St. Omers College became after moving to Lancashire in 1793, was bequeathed by the staunchly recusant Shireburn family, who also bequeathed to this Jesuit school its very building and property. The Shireburns, in turn, had inherited the volume from the Arundell family, Catholic lords of Wardour in Wiltshire. It was through the households of the gentry and aristocracy, whether or not they sheltered formal schools, that the scripture-books of Douai-Rheims circulated in England. It was in these same households that authorities seized the Bibles, whereas the records of prison raids exposed none. The more links that families had to continental seminaries and convents, the more likely it appears that these Bibles would pass through their hands. One 1633 Rheims New Testament appears to have started its journey to England from one of the continent’s six English Colleges, according to its title page inscription of “Rec[tor]. Ang[liae].” There is another early modern inscription in the back of the volume; on the bottom of the Errata page is this message:

This Book being called for to send to y° I could not correct all y° faults here shewn to be corrected. Obtain the favour of M° Bixted who is now yr house Doctor.

The code betrays something of an organized distribution network, conducted from continental seminary to Catholic household by means of specially appointed and aliased

---

626 Stonyhurst College Shelfmark: Arundell I.A.10 [Bible ID #493].
628 BNF Mitterand (Shelfmark Z RENAN 1470; Bible ID #13. The six seminaries and foundation dates are Douai (1568), Rome (1579), Valladolid (1589), Seville (1592), Madrid (1612), and Lisbon (1628).
missionary priests, who were often referred to as “doctors” on the mission. This particular book was summoned, not as a generic gift but as a necessary instrument. To do the work requested of it, it had to be fixed. Notable therefore is that the corrector had completed and lined out only half the list of prescribed typographical corrections before he shipped it. He had intended to complete the rest, but he apparently considered that task of secondary importance because he had embarked upon it after already having completed all the liturgical corrections and additions that the printer had not prescribed. These corrections he must have deemed more vital to the book’s function in the community for which he destined it.

Another 1633 Rheims New Testament that appears to be similarly fixed for travel along a similar “route” is now held at the John Rylands Library of the University of Manchester. Its provenance is something of a palimpsest of the history of the English Bible, the Reformation, and Catholicism. The autograph of “Senior John Rooper” is most likely linked to the noted recusant, Sir John Roper/Rooper (d.1697), the sixth Lord Teynham of Kent. To his ancestors, William and Margaret Roper (née More), who were remnants of Henrician Christianity and progenitors of post-Reformation English Catholicism at the same time, is attributed a liturgized Wycliffite New Testament

---

629 The identity of “Mr. Bixted” remains a mystery as there is no entry for that name in the major indices of English missionary priests (Anstruther, Holt, McCoog).
630 The reader, conversely, did not mark the Table of Controversies nor the Table of Heretical Corruptions.
631 Another Bible that appears to have been transmitted in a similar way is the 1600 Rheims New Testament autographed by “Thomas Spencer, Anno D[omi]ni 1690”, which is at the British Archives of the Society of Jesus (ABSI Shelfmark AR, II, *174, copy 1; Bible ID #66). On the flyleaf, Spencer writes: “Thomas Spencer his / booke givn him by the / Reverend Father Mr. Turner / who departed this miserable / life, and I pray god almight have / mercy on his soule, Amen.”
632 John Rylands Library Shelfmark R14787 [Bible ID #328].
633 Another possibility, albeit a small one, is the landowner John Rooper (1677-1740), whose eldest daughter Elizabeth married Sir John Dryden, 7th Baronet.
preserved at the Morgan Library.\footnote{Morgan Library Ms M.400. This manuscript does not contain the anti-papal “general prologue” missing from most extant copies, but does contain the characteristic package of Lessons and Liturgical Gospels and Epistles, which are marked in the text by marginal letters in the same manner as Penn MS 203 (see Chapter 3). The book also contains a record of intra-family confessional disputes, with some marginal notes supporting Catholic arguments and others criticizing the same in a different hand. See f.68v, 83r, 124v, 139r, 144v, 153r, 155v.} It may have been this very book above all that Margaret’s father, Sir Thomas More (d.1535), was considering, when in his opposition to Tyndale’s New Testament, he famously defended himself and his friends from the charge that they were categorically opposed to all English translations of the Bible: he would never deprive the many “good and catholyke folke” of the existing vernacular Bibles that he knew were being read with due reverence, but would rather ensure that they be “left in l[a]y mennys handys & womens.”\footnote{Thomas More, \textit{Dialogue Concerning Heresies} (1529), cited in De Hamel, \textit{The Book}, 187.} While this notoriously forbidden Bible was being preserved by some members of the family, the Rheims New Testament was acquired from another source. Its original I H S custom-binding seals its Jesuit provenance, which is not surprising giving contemporary rumors about the Roper family’s role in the Jesuit book trade. The following testimony was surrendered against Thomas Roper (d.1597/8), the son of Margaret Roper and grandson of Thomas More, by a former steward-turned-informant:

The Priest Thompson whom I before named, brought two books set out by Campion and Parsons to his master, Mr. Thos. Rooper, his house at Orpington in Kent, and did leave both or one of them to one Mr. Tyles Virar of the said town.

There are two bookbinders in Powells Churchyard, called Cawood and Holder, whom I verily think were of the council for the printing and binding of the said
Jesuits books, for I am sure they sell Papisticall books forbidden to be sold. And this is all yet I can remember.636

“The Priest Thompson” was an alias for John Gerard, S.J., the fugitive missionary who was offering his services not only to Thomas Roper in Kent, but also to the household of Roper’s cousin, Lady Elizabeth Vaux of Harrowden Hall in Northamptonshire. In his sensational Vita, later translated as An Autobiography of a Hunted Priest, Gerard recounted that at Harrowden Hall, “We had a good store of books,” such that, with the support of several conforming tutors, they were able to manage “a Jesuit College in the heart of England.”637 This Rheims New Testament, however, was not linked to Harrowden, but to Lynsted Lodge in Kent, the seat of Elizabeth’s father, Sir John Roper/Rooper (d.1618), 1st Lord Teynham. Rewarded with the baronage in 1616 for his early profession of loyalty to James I, as well as for his gift to the crown of £10,000, John Roper was simultaneously a recusant, priest-harborer, and central agent in his family’s covert Catholic activity.638 He and the subsequent holders of his title all grappled with the tensions in their dual allegiance to Church and Crown, a quandary also negotiated in the pages of their New Testament. The 6th Lord Teynham, Sir John Rooper (d.1697), who appears to have autographed the book in several places, reminded himself (and perhaps others) in the backmatter to “Reade Chap: 13: In the Annotations of S’t Paul to ye Romanes” on “Obedience to our Lawfull Prince” as well as, on the contrary, “ye 2d Chap. to ye First Epis: of S’ Peter” on “the libertie of ye Heriticks in Doctrine & theire lives.”

That Catholic loyalty contrasted with Protestant rebelliousness was a common refrain of recusant landowners and of English Counter-Reformation polemic generally. For nonconformist Catholics to articulate their own loyalty required some subtlety: “the Annotation” that Rooper singled out here for continual review distinguished between spiritual and temporal authority, and then further distinguished a subject’s temporal obligation “to him whom God hath put in authoritie over him”, which was absolute, versus the subjection owed to anyone that happened to “be in Office or Superioritie”, which was not. It was upon this logic, here backed by a scriptural warrant, that the familiar rhetoric of disobeying the Prince’s “evil counselors” was justified. It was also enacted by the overwhelming proportion of Catholic gentry that became cavaliers during the Civil War, as well as by the fewer numbers who remained committed to the Stuarts after the Glorious Revolution in 1689, including a subsequent reader of this volume.

If this book’s annotations helped its readers to navigate (or at least rationalize) their complicated political commitments, what does that suggest about their approach to the Bible? Was the Rheims New Testament for them primarily a collection of Catholic arguments? That is the impression given from the recurring anecdotes of Thomas Manby, Thomas Poulton, and one James Roper, who claimed to have converted to


640 Baker, Reading and Politics, 7-8; Questier, Catholicism and Community, 499-507; Walker, “Prayer, Patronage and Political Conspiracy”, 1-23; Claire Hibbard, Charles I and the Popish Plot (Chapel Hill, NC, 1983); P.R. Newman, Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War, 1642-1646 (Manchester, 1993). The subsequent reader is Sir Thomas Haggerston, of whom more below. The first Lord Teynham to conform was the eighth, who swore the Oath of Allegiance and assumed a seat in the House of Lords on March 21, 1715/6, in the wake of the Jacobite rising of 1715.
Catholicism “chiefly by the assiduous reading of the Rhemish New Testament.” If readers were plundering this Rheims New Testament for its prooftexts, it would be expected that they left some palpable evidence of their presence in the Table of Controversies. They, however, left very little. If not guided by this Table, how then did Rooper maneuver himself to the political annotations on Romans 13? There are many possible avenues. One clue, however, remains on the same page with Romans 13. There, next to the printed annotation that corresponds with Rooper’s directive on the flyleaf, is a manuscript cross. Immediately above this endnote, in the text of the Epistle, are two other manuscript crosses, designating the lections for the first Sunday in Advent and the fourth Sunday after the Epiphany. Rooper thus might have encountered the annotation upon following the readings of the liturgical year, which manifestly commanded his attention throughout the volume. He consistently draws half-crosses at the end of lections when they are missing and inserts asterisks at the beginning of lections when the existing cross designation is ambiguous. He occasionally corrects the names of liturgical dates in the margins and thoroughly edits the Table of Gospels and Epistles. In the Table of Controversies, in fact, the only entries that he visited with his pen were those on “Praier” and “Ghospel”, which he simply retraced, and these interests also harmonize with his other flyleaf injunction on “as to ye great Devotion we are to haue in keeping Lent.” Rooper was both reading the scriptures liturgically and “fixing” the book for subsequent readers to be able to follow suit. In addition to the systematic liturgical

corrections, there is another note on the Errata page, similar to the one left in that Rheims New Testament commending the “house Doctor, Mr. Bixted”:

These Errata herein aboue razed out are with the Pen:

are Corrected in their proper Places of yᵉ Text it self.

Not all the “faults escaped” have been “razed”, however, suggesting again that making textual corrections was secondary in the process of transmitting a functional Bible to the next reader. The next one to autograph the volume was another Catholic gentleman, Sir Thomas Haggerston, who testified to acquiring it in 1771 from the Roper’s “Lodge” of Lynsted. Thomas’s brother Carnaby (1756-1831) was 5th Baronet Haggerston and prominent member of the Catholic Committee, and Thomas’s son and namesake (d.1842) succeeded to the baronetcy. Thomas’s ancestor and namesake was hauled off by dragoons after the Revolution of 1689: according to his captor, Colonel Rupert Billingsley, “Sir Thomas’ bigoted zeal to the catholic cause is so well known that I need give no character of him.”642 These gentle Catholic families might conduct dissident political activity or conform to the state, or do both simultaneously as scholars in the line of Alexandra Walsham, Michael Questier, and Peter Lake have shown clearly; but when reading their English Bibles they appear to be focused above all on the liturgical gospels and epistles. The book and its annotations were dumb preachers, as Luis de Granada had anticipated, to the extent that they first performed the role of surrogate sacrament.

The Douai-Rheims Bibles of the gentry exhibit, to be sure, a great variety of reading strategies. William Blundell (1620-1698) of Crosby Hall, Lancashire, possessed all the types of connections that generally coincided with the possession of these books: two of his sons were educated at St. Omer’s College before returning to England as Jesuit missionaries; five of his daughters populated the Poor Clares convent of Rouen, to whom he served as a financial agent; and his wife Ann was the daughter of the 1st Baronet, Sir Thomas Haggerston, another Catholic gentry family to whom the 1633 Rheims New Testament just described above ultimately arrived.\textsuperscript{643} As Geoff Baker has recently shown, Blundell commonplaced his Douai Old Testament, categorizing verses under two headings: (1) \textit{Historia} – for discrete bits of knowledge about the ancient world; and (2) \textit{Scriptura Difficilis} – for pairs of readings which, he confessed, he was unable to reconcile. Commonplacing was a standard technique for reading and writing taught to social elites throughout the early modern world, and it is likely that Blundell received some formal education at the clandestine Catholic school nearby at Scarisbrick Hall.\textsuperscript{644} But Blundell’s method of commonplacing, Baker argues, betrays a certain deviance from the model of unquestioning Catholic loyalism that he attempted to portray to the outside world. It is a deviance, Baker suggests, that may be just as representative of other Catholic readers as it is of the “revolutionary” Protestant readers that have attracted more scholarly attention.\textsuperscript{645} After depicting Blundell as a Catholic gentleman who could read the biblical text from a critical distance, Baker nevertheless situates Blundell’s

\textsuperscript{643} Leys, \textit{A Social History}, 216-217; Geoff Baker, \textit{Reading and Politics}, 10-11, 45, 47-49.
relationship with the book in a sacramental context: the commonplace book where he confided his personal doubts about the scriptures, he says, “functioned as a form of confessional.”

The annotations of one John Evington in a 1633 Rheims New Testament appear to be predicated upon a more systematic, even scholastic Catholic education than that acquired by Blundell. Besides citing Thomas Aquinas with regularity, Evington frequently supplemented the printed paratexts with references to extra-biblical works in Latin and Greek and etymologies in Hebrew. On a flyleaf he sketched a triangular diagram of Trinitarian theology, captioned with a highly technical Latin question and his own initials [Fig. 4.12]. Above the diagram is Evington’s dated autograph (1640) and the I H S symbol, alluding to the Jesuit connections that may have made possible the acquisition of the book and the formation of the reader. Both of these forbidden Catholic attainments, in turn, may have been enabled by Evington’s conformity. “John Evington, Gentleman of Lincolnshire” took the Oath of Allegiance and was granted a three-year travel license in the same year that “John Evington” first autographed the Rheims New Testament. If this oath was the price of a continental education and Catholic Bible, he would later wonder why it also could not afford him protection from persecution back home. Having underlined Ephesians 4:28 (“He that stole, let him now steal no more”), Evington pleaded in the margin below: “He that plundred me of my worldlie Goods, I desire him to take this one passage into his serious consideration. / An.ο Dom: [ini] /

647 1633 RNT from ABSI (Mount Street Jesuit Archives); Shelfmark: ARCR, II, *177 [Bible ID #67]
1645.” [Fig. 4.13] The destructive consequences of the English Civil War bleed onto this date and appear to color the reader’s personal reaction to a passage he likely encountered as “The Epistle for the 19th Sunday after Pentecost”, as it is so designated by the printed marginal note. To these printed liturgical marks, the reader continued to add his own, suggesting that the longer he was separated from his experience abroad and from his “worldie Goods” at home, the more liturgical his Bible became.649

---

649 Evington’s English annotations, which are deeply personal in themselves, express a preference for the traditional routines of Catholic prayer: “It is a peice of holy, and heavenly thrift, often to use the same prayer againe, for though often used, yet is it still fresh, and faire in the eares and eyes of Heaven” (p.70). They also dwell upon martyrdom, to the extent that through them he contrives to gain the martyr’s mantle for his heavenly namesake, John the Evangelist. Though he escaped a traditional martyr’s death, Evington acknowledges, he alone among the twelve remained with Jesus throughout the Passion, which agony must have “as sharply peirce[d] the martyr’d soule of John, as afterward did the nailes the crucified body of Peter” (p.193). In Evington’s reckoning, apparently, being a saint and evangelist did not have the same caché as did being a martyr; and the crown of holy suffering appears to be something that Evington sought to claim for his patron as much as he desired a similar consolation for himself. On how Reformation-era Catholics appropriated the medieval tradition of “white martyrdom”, see Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Harvard, 2001), esp. 30-73.
Figure 4.12: Flyleaf of 1633 RNT (Bible ID #67),
Courtesy of ABSI, Mount Street Jesuit Archives
Other Douai-Rheims Bibles exhibit the same kinds of marks commonly identified in contemporary English Protestant Bibles. These include family genealogies and the routine doodles, to-do lists, and letter drafts that reveal how often the sacred page could become a mundane element of the household economy, dutifully employed as a ready supply of scratch paper. To dismiss these marks too easily as specimens of

---


651 For examples of genealogies: Inscribed within a 1609-10 DOT held at the Harry Ransom Center of UT-Austin (Shelfmark: BS 880 1609 Copy 3; Bible ID #335) is a catalogue of the Ingleby family, prominent recusants of North Yorkshire in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the flyleaves of a 1633 RNT at Georgetown record the birthdates of 11 children in the mid-seventeenth century, and links them to the liturgical calendar: “Christopher: borne on St Dominiks day: being the 4 of august, betwixt 2 and 3 in the after noone. 1659” (LAU SPCOLL Shea BS 2080 1633; Bible ID #670). Early modern financial memos, letter drafts, and autograph practice are all on display within a 1609-10 DOT of the Providence College Bonniwell Collection (Bonniwell BS 880 1609; Bible ID #443). More playful annotation can be observed in a carnivalesque poem of a 1633 RNT at the British Library (465.c.19 Copy 3; Bible ID #28), but only if one squints through the subsequent efforts of a more fretful reader to line them out.
“avoidance” would be a mistake. They suggest less about the irrelevance of the scriptural text to domestic life than they do about the centrality of the scripture-book to the same.

Evidence for engagement with the controversial paratexts is by no means entirely absent, though it is visible most frequently either in the copies of later Protestant readers or in the Protestantized versions of William Fulke. An exceptional 1582 Rheims New Testament at the Huntington Library bears the marginal notes of at least four early modern readers, one of whom confronted another in doctrinal disputation. The book’s first reader, a sixteenth-century English Catholic, expressed support for the scriptural places and paratexts that “proved” his church’s positions on, among other things, the necessity of the sacraments, free will, petrine supremacy and papal infallibility, relics, and purgatory. On that last subject, a learned Protestant reader who acquired the volume in the following century was especially unsympathetic. Until then he had been trading arguments in Latin with the editors’ printed annotations. Upon encountering 1 Cor 3:15, where the first reader claimed that Augustine also had identified this Pauline verse (“saved as by fire”) as a scriptural warrant for purgatory, the subsequent reader retorted: “at alibi dubitat Aug./ Autoritas August-in no[n] est dogmatica contra scripturas: sic Aug. de scripto” (but Augustine doubts this elsewhere; and the authority of Augustine is not dogmatic if opposed to the scriptures, as Augustine himself says in his own writing).

653 For a similar argument, see Molekamp, Women and the Bible in Early Modern England: Religious Reading and Writing (Oxford, 2013).
654 The Huntington Library (San Marino, CA), shelfmark: RB 96512 [Bible ID #562].
Polemical exchanges happened much less frequently among readers, however, than between reader and editor, both in this volume and in the other extant Douai-Rheims Bibles. Representative in this respect, if not also in the acerbic tone of its notes, is a 1582 Rheims New Testament held at Exeter College, Oxford. Its early modern reader first clarified the title page’s ambiguous privilege ("CVM PRIVILEGIO"), adding to it the name “DIABOLI” (i.e., with the permission of the devil). On the same page and with the same spirit, this reader seized upon the opening quotation of Augustine, which the editors had intended as a guiding principle for Catholic readers of this Bible: “Al things that are readde in holy Scriptures, we must heare with great attention, to our instruction and salvation: but those things specially must be commended to memorie which make most against Heretikes….” Cutting in after the printed word “Heretikes”, the reader extended Augustine’s counsel: “And those w[e] make against the hereticall tenets of ye Papistes shoulld most be com[m]ended to memory.” He proceeded to follow his own advice, contradicting the printed annotations with Latin commentary and patristic citation. His interventions were regularly combative, if not always scholarly. At the endnote to Mt 24:30, which asserted that heretics cannot abide the Sign of the Cross, he could not resist inscribing a cross in thick, dark ink. In sum, the readers most likely to engage with the
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655 Exeter College Library Shelfmark: EXE Strong Rm 9M 2884 [Bible ID #77]. Chiseled into the brown cloth binding is the name, “IOHN DAVY”, which might refer to the 1st Baronet (1588-1654) or 2nd Baronet (1612-1674) of Creedy in Devon. Both were matriculants of Exeter College, sheriffs of Devon, and representatives from Tiverton to the House of Commons. Neither their biographies nor the annotations in their book suggest any attachment to Catholicism.
controversialist directives of the Rheims New Testament editors were like this reader, who had precisely inverted them.\textsuperscript{656}

Instead of responding to the paratexts systematically, sometimes hostile readers would dismiss the arguments of the Douai-Rheims Bible from the outset, noting in the opening flyleaf that the Cambridge Divine William Fulke (d.1589) already had done the work of refutation for them.\textsuperscript{657} With his \textit{Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scripture into the English Tongue} (1583), Fulke first targeted Gregory Martin’s purposely incendiary tract on the “Manifold Corruptions of Holy Scripture”, which Martin had designed as a companion text to his Rheims New Testament. In 1589, the year of his death, Fulke issued his magnum opus, a state-commissioned refutation of the Rheims New Testament itself.\textsuperscript{658} In parallel columns it displayed the Rheims text and annotations alongside the text of the Bishops’ Bible (1568) and Fulke’s marginal rejoinders. Three more editions of Fulke’s \textit{Text of the New Testament} were published

\textsuperscript{656}For examples of Douai Rheims Bibles that contain manuscript notes reinforcing the controversialist paratexts, see also the Huntington Library’s copies of the 1600 Rheims New Testament (Shelfmark: RB 55355; Bible ID #565) and of the 1609-10 Douai Old Testament (Shelfmark: RB96554; Bible ID #568). In the latter book (Volume II), a reader contrasts the printed “four marks of the Church” with his or her own “4 thinges to be noted in Heretikes”; in the former, the reader identifies the Antichrist with Martin Luther.\textsuperscript{657} See, for instance, the 1600 Rheims New Testament of St. John’s College, Cambridge (Shelfmark: T.12.15; Bible ID #218), the pages of which are almost entirely unmarked except for the opening flyleaf, wherein the reader is directed straightaway to “See a defence of the English Translations of the Bible, and a confutation of all such arguments, glosses and annotations as contain manifest impiety or heresy treason and slander against the Catholic Church of God and the true Teachers thereof, or the Translations used in the Church of England. London fo: A°. 1617. Wherein the Rhemes translation and the English are printed in Opposite Columns, with the arguments of books, chapters and annotations of the following work.”\textsuperscript{658} William Fulke, \textit{The text of the New Testament of Iesus Christ, translated out of the vulgar Latine by the papists of the traiterous seminarie at Rhemes, with arguments of bookes, chapters, and annotations, pretending to discover the corruptions of divers translations, and to cleare the controversies of these dayes. Whereunto is added the translation out of the original Greeke, commonly used in the Church of England, with a confutation of all such arguments, glosses, and annotations, as conteine manifest impietie, of heresie, treason and slander, against the Catholike Church of God, and the true teachers thereof, or the translations used in the Church of England: both by auctoritie of the Holy Scriptures, and by the testimonie of the ancient fathers. By William Fulke, Doctor in Divinitie. Imprinted at London by the Deputies of Christopher Barker, printer to the Queens most excellent Maiestie, anno 1589. (STC 2888)
posthumously, deliberately timed to coincide with subsequent editions of the Rheims New Testament in order to mitigate their anticipated effect.\textsuperscript{659} This policy, however, was a risky business: scholars regularly suggest that the English government itself extended the reach of the book that they continued to confiscate, by circulating it in a legalized form.\textsuperscript{660} The size and accompanying cost of the book, however, would have restricted it from penetrating any further down the social hierarchy than the Rheims New Testament itself did; until the eighteenth century, no Rheims New Testament was published in a format larger than quarto, whereas no Fulke New Testament was issued in any format smaller than folio. Provenance marks and manuscript annotation do reveal that Fulke’s book was used by both convinced Protestants and Catholics – and more often the former.\textsuperscript{661} When these readers occupy the margins, in fact, they are more likely to engage the polemical paratexts than anything else. They marked nineteen of the extant Fulke New Testaments surveyed: in at least fourteen of these volumes, the reader notes participate in religious controversy.\textsuperscript{662} In none do they participate in liturgy. Readers were plumbing the Fulke New Testament for its arguments. This scripture-book appears, therefore, to have been no substitute for the Rheims New Testament, at least not in the way that the Rheims New Testament was ordinarily used.

\textsuperscript{659} These later Fulke New Testaments were released in 1601, 1617, and 1633; the corresponding Rheims New Testaments were published (at least) in 1600, 1621, 1630, and 1633.
\textsuperscript{661} Copies of the original 1589 edition at the Cambridge University Library (Shelfmark: BSS.201.D89.4 (BFBS); Bible ID #185) and at Selwyn College, Cambridge (Shelfmark: A.2.1; Bible ID #234), for instance, contain evidence of Protestant readers affirming and supplementing the notes of Fulke; whereas the 1589 edition at the Harry Ransom Center (HRC BS 2080 1589; Bible ID #308) preserves the voices of opposing readers fulminating against papists and protestants, respectively.
\textsuperscript{662} The database records information on fifty-five copies of Fulke’s New Testaments, forty-one of which I have surveyed.
For the scripture-books of Douai-Rheims, the liturgical mode of appropriation remained dominant. Recalling that the production of liturgical books massively outnumbered any other genre of religious literature before the Reformation makes this post-Reformation pattern less surprising, especially for the levels of society that the Catholic Bible was reaching. Scholarly assessments of the Douai-Rheims Bible dwell upon its polemical structure and purpose, but the book also came equipped with an apparatus of liturgical paratexts and appendices that continually expanded across consecutive editions, from 206 lections marked in 1582 to 328 by 1633, when the Table of Gospels and Epistles were first marketed on the title page. It is likely that publishers were retailoring their product to meet consumer demand. Before the start of the English Catholic mission when the Roman Inquisition still was fielding requests from English Catholics for reading licenses, none of these requests was for an English Bible (at least none that have yet surfaced); what was requested was “the gospels and epistles for the entire year in the vernacular language,” as one petition put it in 1567. In that same year, the Cardinal-Protector of England, Giovanni Morone, received a similar request from Thomas Harding and Nicholas Sanders, two English Catholic polemicists of the College of Louvain. They claimed that their opponents’ most effective instrument for “leading astray the simple and unlearned” were “false translations of the Bible.” They believed, however, that “the people [would be] reluctant to abandon these very books”.


unless “at last the historical and moral books of the Old Testament and the Gospels and Epistles [were] published by Catholics in the vulgar tongue.” Cardinal Allen himself recognized that the liturgical books were the most desired, as we have seen, even though what he wanted to design and what he thought his curial patrons would be willing to support was a Bible surrounded by counter-reforming annotations. English readers, however, were able to adjust the Bible into the book that they wanted. In the only seventeenth-century editions of the Rheims New Testament that did not offer liturgical supports – the 1621 and 1630 pocket editions of Jacob Seldenslach, which on account of its vastly reduced size dropped all marginal paratext -- readers frequently marked the lections themselves, as we have observed. The most common form of reader annotation in extant Rheims New Testaments from this period is liturgical: of the 216 copies reviewed, almost 60% possess marginalia; and of these marked books, almost 60% are marked liturgically; in most of these copies, that is the only way that they were marked.

**************

IV. Surrogates

The annotations of these Bibles, therefore, have revealed much about the priorities of their readers. More is revealed about them when their Bibles cease to be

---

666 Of the five editions of the Rheims New Testament published during this period (1582, 1600, 1621, 1630, 1633), there are at least 352 copies known to be extant, all of which are logged in Appendix I.
published. A century intervenes between the fifth (1633) and sixth (1738) edition of the Rheims New Testament. Where prior scholars were content to understand this gap as overwhelming evidence that English Catholics had no use for the Bible at all, Ellie Gebarowski-Bagley attempted to identify other English Catholic books that substituted for the Douai-Rheims Bible by approximating its function. That function, she argued, was primarily controversial: to delegitimize the English Protestant versions of the Scriptures, as well as the Church and State that authorized them. The substitutes she then found were first, John Heigham’s *Gagge of the reformed gospell* (1623), and second, Thomas Ward’s *Errata of the Protestant Bible* (1688), which were issued in numerous editions throughout the intervening century. Each one featured a modified version of Gregory Martin’s argument without the bulk of his scriptural text. Their efficiency, she claimed, effectively rendered the Douai Rheims Bible obsolete.\(^{667}\)

The proposition has merit. If, however, that Bible had been used primarily as a liturgical instrument, then there ought to be alternative explanations for the long publishing hiatus. The first is material. During the upheavals of the Civil War and Thirty Years War, English Catholic publishing returned home: before 1640, approximately 80% of Catholic books in English were published on the continent; during the rest of the century, continental output dwindled below 20%.\(^{668}\) The secret presses in England enjoyed neither the capacity nor the security to fashion the hefty quarto volumes that clothed most editions of the Rheims New Testament (1582, 1600, 1633) and all of the Douai Bibles (1609-10, 1635). One black market veteran, Peter Smith, was arrested in

---


Bunhill in the early 1620s for attempting to publish a pocket version of the Rheims New Testament, akin to the foreign duodecimo editions of 1621 and 1630, but no copies of it survive.\textsuperscript{669} Given that our knowledge of the 1630 edition itself is due to the survival of a single copy now held at the National Library of Scotland, it is entirely possible that subsequent printings of it are among the many lost books of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{670}

The second explanation for the apparent suspension of the Douai-Rheims version is functional, like Bagley’s explanation, though it depends on a different assessment of the Bible’s function. Small liturgical or paraliturgical books swept through the country in the wake of the Douai-Rheims Bible: these include, above all, psalters, primers (Englished Books of Hours), and the \textit{Manual of Prayers}, many of which were even printed at first by the same people who published the Douai-Rheims Bibles. Five years before Laurence Kellam published the first edition of the Douai Old Testament (1609-10), he published an octavo \textit{Manual of Prayers}, which contained the seven penitential psalms together with a motley collection of other sacramental prayers and collective devotions ranging from \textit{The Gospel of John} recited at the end of each Mass to the \textit{Litany of Loretto}.\textsuperscript{671} Two other editions, in duodecimo, were printed secretly in England that same year.\textsuperscript{672} Jean Cousturier of Rouen, who published the final known Rheims New Testament of the seventeenth century in 1633, also published two editions of \textit{The Primer},

\textsuperscript{669} See Rostenberg, \textit{The Minority Press}, 99. John Gee, the covert Catholic-turned-government informant, also denounced several other domestic presses for churning out pocket editions of the Rheims New Testament in his attempts to hype both the popish menace in London and his own indispensable role in overcoming it. See his \textit{Foot out of the Snare} (1624), 97. Gebarowski-Bagley recognized both of these reports in her own account.

\textsuperscript{670} The \textit{New Testament of Iesvs Christ....Printed at Antwerp. By Iames Seldenslach, 1630}. STCS 2937.5. National Library of Scotland, Shelfmark Cassidy.724 (Bible ID #458)

\textsuperscript{671} \textit{A manual of prayers. Now newly corrected and also more augmented and enlarged. At Doway by Lau. Kellam. Anno 1604}. STC 17268.

\textsuperscript{672} STC 17267, 17269.
or the office of the blessed virgin Marie in that same year, as well as a Manual of godly prayers both before and afterward. Even John Heigham published only half as many editions of the Gagge, which he himself authored, as he did of the Manual and of the Primer, for which he diligently secured a privilege, even one that he was forced to share. The overall publishing numbers for the seventeenth century tell the same story: if the Gagge was reprinted thirteen times, under various titles including The Touchstone of the Reformed Gospell, then Primers were reprinted twice as much, and Manuals more than thrice as much – the latter was quite simply the most frequently printed English Catholic book of the century.

Catholic scriptural controversy was by no means ignored by English readers; it is just that liturgical books were a better substitute for the Douai Rheims Bible, given the general pattern of its appropriation. Other liturgical reprints reinforce this pattern of scripture-reading. Richard Lascelles addressed his Little way how to heare Mass with Profit and Devotion (Paris, 1644) to Lady Ann Brudenell and her servants, who were

---

673 The office of the blessed virgin Marie in Latin with the rubrikes in English for the commoditie of those that do not understand the Latin tongue. By Iohn le Cousturier, 1633. 24mo. STC 16101.6 & 16101.4 (12mo). For the manuals, STC 17277.3 & 17277.7. Note that the original producer of the Tridentine English Primer (1599) was Richard Verstegen, who is sometimes reputed to have printed another edition of the Rheims New Testament as well. See Beales, Education under Penalty, 55. See also J.M. Blom, The Post-Tridentine English Primer (CRS, 1982), 16-19; Paul Arblaster, Antwerp and the World: Richard Verstegan and the International Culture of Catholic Reformation (Leuven, 2004).


675 For the Manuals and Primers, see the handlist in Blom, English Primers, 168-188. For the Gagge, the STC Catalogue lists four editions until 1634. The Wing Catalogue, according to Gebarowski-Bagley (pp.148-9), records editions of the Touchstone in 1652, 1674, 1675, 1676, 1677, 1678, 1683, 1685 (2 eds?), 1687. Note that during the four decades between 1634 and 1674, there was only a single reprint of the Touchstone, whereas there were 6 of the Primer and 11 of the Manual. That has significant implications for whether that book can be conceived as a substitute for the Rheims New Testament, since that was the first 40 years in which publication had ceased for these English Catholic scripture-books.

living in Parisian exile during the Long Parliament. They were counseled to avoid
distraction and private devotions while attending mass, instead “let[ing] thine eyes be
modestly fixed upon the Ceremonies, or upon this little Book.” The book also counseled
and anticipated that, during proclamation of the Epistle and Gospel in Latin, they would
have access to another book: “Read the Epistle in English (with the leave of the Ghostly
Father) out of the Rhemish Testament; but read it with great Reverence, as a Letter
brought unto thee from St. Peter or St. Paul in Heaven, by the hands of some Angel.”
Reprinted in a fifth edition in 1686 in the same form in England, the book continued to
expect that its lay readers “of condition” would have some type of access both to “ghostly
father” confessors and to venerable copies of the Rheims New Testament.677 Both
consecrated items were integral to their experience of the Mass, and to their capacity to
“heare” it “with profit.” As their manuscript annotations have revealed, the scripture-
books of Douai-Rheims did continue to circulate through and across gentry homes,
convents, and missionary priests into the late seventeenth and eighteenth century.

Thomas Ward’s *Errata of the Protestant Bible* was not accepted as a suitable
replacement for the Douai-Rheims Bible either. It first emerged during the second half of
the hiatus period in 1688, but there is no record that it was printed again until 1737 – and
the long-awaited 6th edition of the Rheims New Testament arrived the following year.678

Not only were primers and manuals being steadily reproduced in the meantime, but new

677 For the fifth edition, see Lassels, *An excellent way of hearing mass with profit & devotion...Printed in the year, 1686* (Wing L462F), ff. A6v-A8r, pp.10-12.
678 Thomas Ward, *The errata to the Protestant Bible, or, The truth of their English translations examin’d* (London, 1688), Wing W833. Gebarowski-Bagley does show that Ward’s *Errata* argument also was communicated through his satirical poem, *England’s Reformation*, which was reprinted in 1710, 1715, 1716, 1719, 1731, 1747, 1815, and 1863 – - 8 new editions over the course of a century and a half. See Gebarowski-Bagley, *Heretical Corruptions*, 162-163.
English liturgical books with perhaps an even greater claim upon the priorities of Douai-Rheims readers emerged as well. First issued in 1676, James Dymock’s *The Holy Mass Englished* already reached its 8th edition by 1687, the year before Ward’s *Errata* was first printed. In his *Advertisement* to the 8th edition, Dymock acknowledged what he expected his readers to know – that “seven English translation of the Mass by Catholics” had already been circulating before his own. What Dymock did not acknowledge, but what likely made his book even more appealing than the rest, was that it included a translation of both the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass. The latter included the mystical prayers of consecration, which the earlier pioneers had deliberately omitted. John Heigham, who always seemed to have his finger on the pulse of his Catholic reading community, produced the very first English translation of the Mass, *Devout Exposition of the Holy Mass* (Douai, 1614), which enjoyed a successful print run of its own. He did not dare, however, to translate the consecration prayer, what he called the “prex periculosa”, out of regard for its “dreadful venerableness.” In 1661, in fact, Pope Alexander VII condemned the vernacular translation of the Missal (and the Canon especially), targeting French Jansenists who were fashioning similar books to render the liturgy textually accessible to unlearned readers. This prohibition was transgressed, silently, by Dymock and others who began producing the books that they believed their English readers might desire even more than vernacular bibles – a textual passport that offered
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679 See James Crichton, *Worship in a Hidden Church* (Dublin, 1988), 54-58. Note that previous editions of Dymock’s work were entitled, *The great sacrifice of the new law, expounded by the figures of the old.* See, for instance, Wing 1776:06.
680 STC 13032. Heigham’s *Devout Exposition* was printed in 1614, 1622, and 1624. See Crichton, *Worship in a Hidden Church*, 52.
them access to what Francis De Sales called, “the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, The Center of Christian Religion, the Heart of Devotion, and the Soul of Piety”, as Dymock put it in the opening line of his book. 682 A similar desire to incorporate readers more fully into the action of the Mass and to cultivate a “priesthood of the laity” was expressed by John Gother in his own Instructions and Devotions for Hearing Mass (1694). 683 To this end, he also translated into English the Gospels and Epistles of the Mass, which were published within his posthumous Holy Mass in Latin and English (1718). It constituted the first complete English version of the Missal, issued one year before the next English Catholic version of the New Testament, and reprinted throughout the century. 684 Neither expressly approved or proscribed, these liturgical scripture-books ignored broad ecclesiastical restrictions in order to promote greater cohesion among priests and people within the church. The explosive production of personal liturgical books from the medieval era through the early modern has been interpreted by scholars as both a reflection and cause of the growth of “religious individualism.” 685 The producers of these English liturgical books, however, deplored what they considered to be their church’s

682 Dymock, Great Sacrifice of the New Law (London, 1687), a2r (Wing D2975). Another “evidently popular” liturgical book, according to James Crichton, was The Office of Holy Week, which passed through fifteen editions from 1670 until the end of the eighteenth century. Translated by Sir George Blount and Sir Walkter Kirkham Blount, the Office included the liturgical texts for Holy Week, which differed from the ordinary formulas translated in Dymock’s collection. See Crichton, Worship in a Hidden Church, 84-5. See also Clancy, English Catholic Books, 19-20.

683 For seventeenth-century reprints of Gother’s Instructions and Devotions, see Clancy, English Catholic Books, 72-78. See also Crichton, Worship in a Hidden Church, 56.

684 Crichton, Worship in a Hidden Church, 68-69.

customarily permissive attitude toward the laity’s pluralistic participation in liturgical worship, which might consist of beading, loud prayers, or whispering conversation. They opposed what they considered to be the devolution of ritual union into a cacophony of private performances. Insofar as their books promoted instead the integration of the laity’s attention with the central actions of the priest in common worship, they did not so much facilitate religious individualism as counteract it. That they effectively functioned as complements and substitutes for the Douai-Rheims Bibles while they remained out of print for a century reinforces the liturgical patterns of reading observed in the Bibles themselves. It suggests, furthermore, that vernacular scripture-readers were not just habituated to the liturgy, but that they may have sought scripture-books in order to enter into the liturgy. The proliferation of other books that achieved the same purposes more efficiently made the reproduction of scripture-books less of an urgent priority for producers and consumers alike.

It is important to remember that liturgical reading is hardly a uniquely Catholic approach to the scriptures, as we learned in the previous chapter. English Protestant Bibles and New Testaments from Tyndale until Geneva consistently featured liturgical supports, indeed more consistently than any other paratextual type. The Authorized Version was shorn of ‘bitter notes’ and all other marginal paratexts aside from diverse readings, but the AV was bound together with the Book of Common Prayer and the Metrical Psalms of Sternhold and Hopkins almost as a rule. The cross-confessional popularity of liturgical books indeed led establishment divines and publishers to pirate Catholic bestsellers. Clement Knight provided the Church of England with its own
Manual (1620) and John Cosin’s Collection of Private Devotions (1627) with its own primer.686 The circulation of these liturgical books and liturgized bibles may be another reason why publishers stopped investing in Douai-Rheims Bibles for the rest of the seventeenth century. Their broad appeal also reinforces recent scholarship that rejects the notion of “recusant”, whether applied to history or literature, as a synonym for “Catholic.”687 English Catholicism was not an enclosed body of nonconformity in the seventeenth century, and the devotional world of post-Reformation English readers generally cannot be so easily parceled out into discrete categories of recusant, church-papist, or puritan, where one is opposed to and sealed off from the other.688 Perhaps then we overemphasize the radical or individualistic forms of reading engendered in the Reformation, when readers across confessions continued to encounter the Bible as lectionary and appropriate it in the exegetically deferential setting of common worship.689


689 See Judith Maltby, Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England (Cambridge, 2000).
Of course, not all church-goers are docile – especially not when attendance is compulsory. Catholics and Puritans could join common prayer in order to avoid recusancy fines, but then perform their objections through disorderly conduct, including vocal recitation of alternative texts. Some of the Douai-Rheims Bibles show readers marking differences between the translation of their Catholic text and that which they would hear proclaimed in the Church of England. While the Book of Common Prayer contracted the number of feasts in the Roman liturgical calendar, many of its lections still coincided with those of the English Catholic Bible. This counter-reformation book then may have facilitated occasional conformity or church papistry, though its original designers never would have conceived it that way.

---


691 For instance, a 1600 Rheims New Testament at the John Rylands Library (Shelfmark R10730; Bible ID #325) and a 1635 Douai Old Testament at Ushaw College (Shelfmark I.D.6.15-16; Bible ID #289) show an early modern reader inscribing in the margins short one-line verses from the Authorized Version (1611) next to the corresponding verses in the Douai-Rheims translation. Alternatively, a 1609 Clementine Vulgate at St. Mary’s College Oscott (Shelfmark 05003/R43; Bible ID #437) has been bound together with a Book of Common Prayer (1678) in front and the Metrical Psalms of Sternhold & Hopkins (1678) in the back. The French priest, Vincent Bernicot, who discovered the book while taking refuge in England during the French Revolution believed that those two Protestant liturgical staples were flanking the Vulgate to provide cover and to “sauver cette Bible”, for “sans cette sage précaution, elle aurait été détruite.” Given the number of overtly Catholic works linked to the Throckmorton and the library of Harvington Hall, where this book was linked in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, it is unlikely that this book would have been disguised simply for home use. It is possible this book it was employed during parish worship to cross-examine the lection translations or to perform Catholic identity while conforming to the established church. The 1633 Rheims New Testament of John Evington, who took the Oath of Allegiance in 1640 right before traveling to the continent and acquiring the book (see above), contains manuscript citations to the paratexts of English Protestant Bibles.

692 That authors of some Catholic liturgical books began to speak more favorably of Anglican worship suggests an expectation that their readers were attending their parish services at least periodically and would continue to do so. A Liturgical Discourse of the Sacrifice of the Mass (1669), for instance, composed by Richard Mason, who was Franciscan Provincial of England from 1659 to 1675, assured its readers that “the English Church cannot rationally be condemned for the Rites and Ceremonies it hath retained” for “it carries a more Majestical form of a Church and is to be preferred before all other Protestant Churches, having no small resemblance to the true Catholic Church...” See A liturgical discourse of the holy
As the Rheims New Testament editors Gregory Martin and Richard Bristow had warned, liturgical conformity made one obedient to the state religion and ultimately a convert to it. That judgment is consonant with the manuscript evidence left in Latin Books of Hours and other prayer books that straddled the English Reformation: readers systematically and voluntarily configured them to the Henrician Settlement preached in their parishes, especially crossing out all the texts for celebrating the feast of St. Thomas Beckett, the traditional champion of the church’s independence from the state. It would be a mistake, however, to equate liturgical conformity with quiescence, as the work of Michael Questier, Peter Lake, Alex Walsham, and Ethan Shagan has emphasized. The Jesuit missionary William Weston expressed alarm upon hearing of the belligerent confrontations that allegedly characterized Puritan services where preacher and people would be “arguing among themselves about the meaning of passages from the Scriptures – men, women, boys, girls, rustics, labourers and idiots – and more often than not, it was said, it ended in violence and fisticuffs.” Conformist Catholics may have been using their books to express defiance, too, in perhaps more subtle but
equally radical ways. They may have been engaging less frequently in open
discursive controversy with their preacher than in signaling their allegiance to an
alternative community, both to him and to themselves. The English Catholic Bible
functions here, again, not as a polemical text but as a physical bond, or as a rite for
making its readers present within the sacramental community otherwise forbidden to
them. In this sense then, the liturgical appropriation of the Douai-Rheims Bibles and
their correlates inverts the classic dictum of John Bossy that, as English Catholicism
“became more typographical, so it became less sacramental.” 697 On the contrary, it
appears that it was precisely through typography that readers sought to sustain their
sacramentality. 698

Since a Bible preface began this chapter, another one now will conclude it. In
1718 the Dublin priest Cornelius Nary tried to tap into the market for English Catholic
Bibles. He hoped to expand readership “to the Generality of People” – a tactical shift
that would be consonant with the supposed social transformation of eighteenth century
British Catholicism, in which the centers of pastoral direction shifted from the country
estate to the city street. 699 Before the century closed, there would be released a second
edition of Nary’s octavo New Testament, three editions of Robert Witham’s octavo

---

Preachers”, 81.

698 While Walsham’s “Domme Preachers” explicitly takes up Bossy’s line or argument, her “Beads, Books,
and Bare Ruined Choirs” develops the conceptual space for the inversion of the same argument, whereby
books facilitate the “transmutation of ritual life.” Compare Walsham, *Catholic Reformation*, 244, 314, with
373, 376, 379, 381-2.

699 Cornelius Nary, *The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus, Newly Translated out of the
Vulgate, and with the Original Greek, and divers Translations in vulgar Languages diligently compared
and revised. ... Printed in the Year 1719* (2nd edition), f.a2v. On eighteenth century English Catholicism,
see Gabriel Glickman, *English Catholic Community, 1668-1745* (Boydell, 2009), and Eamon Duffy, ed.,
*Challoner and his Church* (Dartman, Longman, and Todd, 1981).
version, and seven of Richard Challoner’s duodecimo version.⁷⁰⁰ The date of Nary’s first edition, 1718, is itself significant: it is the same year that the Catholic Bishop Bonaventure Giffard and William Crathorne published John Gother’s *Roman Missal*, which combined the full English translations of the liturgical Gospels and Epistles along with the Ordinary, Canon, and other scripts of the Mass.⁷⁰¹ Since the papal constitution *Unigenitus* (1713) had quashed the Jansenizing scriptural and liturgical movement in France, at least as contemporaries understood it, Nary might have suspected that the English *Missal*, too, would be a prime candidate for proscription.⁷⁰² That would leave his book as the sole competitor of the decrepit Rheims New Testaments, which continued lurking around gentry households since they were last published generations prior. The only competitor he explicitly named, therefore, was the “Rhemish Testament”, which had numerous “defects”:

> “[T]he Language whereof is so old, the Words in many Places so obsolete, the Orthography so bad, and the Translation so very literal, that in a number of Places it is unintelligible, and all over so grating to the Ears of such as are accustomed to speak, [it is] in a manner, another Language.”⁷⁰³

Nary denigrated the literalist, Latinate translation of the Rheims New Testament, and yet, in the very first paragraph of his Preface, he pledged his own commitment to the Vulgate. Of course he had to – that’s what Trent demanded. But he had other reasons, too.

> “[I]t is not to be expected I shou’d translate the New Testament, which is design’d for the Use of the people, from the Greek, or from any other Latin Copy than that

---

⁷⁰⁰ For a somewhat dated list, see Hugh Pope, *English Versions of the Bible*, 669-670.
⁷⁰¹ *Roman Missal for the use of the Laity* (London, 1718), 2 vols, 12mo.
⁷⁰² For more on *Unigenitus* and its impact on English Catholic Scripture compilations, see chapter 6.
of the said Vulgar; because, it is fit the people should understand the Scripture as it is read in the Catholick Church, and as they hear it in the public Service, and at their private Devotions.\textsuperscript{704}

Since Catholic services and devotions are Latin, then this Bible must be Englished from Latin, too; otherwise, he suggests, it will not function. Or at least not in a way for which his customers would be willing to pay. In attempting to win over the old readers and court new ones, Nary marketed his book not as a polemical tool, but as a liturgical one. He must have become aware that, throughout the seventeenth century, readers and publishers had been reconstructing the Douai-Rheims Bible the same way.

\textsuperscript{704} Nary, New Testament, a2v. In the same place, Nary announced that his New Testament would be published in a portable size so that it can be “conveniently carried about for publick Devotion.” His preface concludes: “And that it may be more useful to them [“my Country-men”], I have annexed a Table to the end of the Work, by looking into which, they shall find in what Chapter and Verse of the Scripture, the beginning and end of every Gospel and Epistle that is read in the Mass every Sunday and great Holy-day all the Year over are to be found, that they may read the same to themselves, while the Priest reads them at Mass.”
PART III:

THE PARATEXTS: DIRECTIONS IN EARLY MODERN BIBLES
CHAPTER 5

Digesting the Scriptures:
The Transformation of Alimentary Reading Codes in Early Modern Bibles*

The traditional, categorical division between Protestant reformers who loved the Bible and Catholic churchmen who feared it has been outdated for some time. Richard Gawthrop and Gerald Strauss in their provocative essay, “Protestantism and Literacy in Early Modern Germany” demonstrated how Martin Luther denounced indiscriminate access to Scripture beginning in the mid-1520s. Luther’s institutional successors enshrined his will in state statutes and school curricula, subordinating Holy Writ to the catechism as the principal teaching text for monolingual German speakers until the end of the seventeenth-century. Gawthrop and Strauss concluded that, with respect to attitudes toward popular Bible reading, the magisterial reformation was more akin to the Tridentine Catholic Church than to Anabaptists and other contemporary radical reformers.

The two scholars did not, however, conclude the debate about the place of the Bible in the magisterial Reformation. They allowed for the possibility that ecclesiastical authorities might have acted differently in Calvinist-controlled territories. Francis

* Please see Appendix III for a reference list of the scriptural passages that the theologians, glossators, and editors under review integrated into a common alimentary discourse.
Higman was one of the scholars who pried this crack open.\textsuperscript{706} He announced that the material form, preface, and paratextual supports of the 1559 Geneva Bible in French suggest that Calvinists indeed encouraged Bible reading, even if that reading was to be substantially guided. This Bible was printed in octavo, “pocket-sized” editions which were widely affordable. Higman estimated that a Genevan workman could have purchased a copy with two days’ wages. Within the book, the printer invites the reader to open the text with pleasure and, using the extensive marginal commentary and visual aids, to obtain its true sense “with relative ease.” By supplying these substantive annotations and appending the catechism, the church elders could “ensure conformity to the official doctrine on the part of the faithful.”\textsuperscript{707} The contrast that Gawthrop and Strauss painted between the magisterial and radical reformers, Higman contended, was too stark. Rather than being restricted to advocate either unlimited or highly selective access to the Scriptures, Reformed authorities could and did pursue the third way of providing general access with inscribed interpretive direction.

How distinctive was this Calvinist third way of guided reading? Even the contemporary Catholic Church, the undeveloped foil of Gawthrop and Strauss, promoted some form of it as we have seen. Official policies were chronologically uneven, internally contested, and regionally diverse. In the first two decades since the dawn of print, Latin Bibles and New Testaments were accompanied by numerous vernacular

\textsuperscript{707} Higman, \textit{Bible as Book}, 121.
editions in French, German, Italian, and Dutch, many of which were annotated.\textsuperscript{708} “Pocket-Bibles”, however, these were not. The “Piacenza” Vulgate of 1475 was the earliest edition of the Bible in quarto; sub-folio sizes for vernacular editions of the Bible or New Testament did not arrive until almost fifty years later, with the New Testament octavos of le Fèvre d’Étaples and Luther.\textsuperscript{709} Post-Tridentine Catholic Bibles and New Testaments, however, were printed in reduced sizes “in the areas where heresies flourish”, where they were bound together with Catholic annotations. “Submerging the pure text of Scripture under onerous commentary”, as the early reformers cried, was not just a mark of the corruption of the medieval church then, but a characteristic approach to making portable vernacular scripture-books available within the early modern worlds of both Catholicism and Calvinism, wherein glossing was conceived positively.\textsuperscript{710} The criteria of size and gloss, therefore, do not adequately illuminate the differences between Calvinists and Catholics, let alone differences within Protestant confessions. Numbers, however, are much more revealing. While some Catholic Bibles and New Testaments, particularly those in the French language, passed through a considerable number of print

\textsuperscript{708} For the earliest recorded edition in each language, see T.H. Darlow, M.A. & H.F. Moule, eds., \textit{Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of The British and Foreign Bible Society} (London, 1903), 2(1): 298-300 (Dutch), 376 (French), 481 (German); 2(2): 801 (Italian). With respect to subsequent pre-Reformation Bibles, Darlow & Moule cited Wilhelm Walther’s scholarship of the previous decade on German language editions: “In the fifty-six years between 1466 and 1522, Walther enumerates 18 editions of the Bible (14 in High German and 4 in Low German), 22 of the Psalter (including one Breviary), and two of other books of the Bible.”

\textsuperscript{709} Darlow & Moule, \textit{Historical Catalogue}, 2(1): 379 (le Fèvre d’Étaples), 487 (Luther); 2(2): 910 (Latin quarto). Notably manifold smaller editions of vernacular Psalters and Liturgical Gospels and Epistles appeared in the interim, the significance of which already has been established in Chapter 3. See, for instance, D&M 2(1): 298-9, 482-3, 485; 2(2): 802; 2(2): 1425-6.

\textsuperscript{710} For a critical evaluation of this claim by John Milbank, see David Steinmetz, “The re-evaluation of the patristic exegetical tradition in the sixteenth century”, in Paul Saenger and Kimberly Van Kampen, \textit{The Bible as Book: The First Printed Editions} (British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 1999), 135-143. See also William Slichts, \textit{Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books} (Michigan, 2001), 129.
runs in the early modern era, none ever eclipsed the Geneva editions, or even came
close until the middle of the seventeenth century (as we shall see in Chapter 6).\textsuperscript{711} To
evaluate how this discrepancy in the scale of production of a particular type of biblical
book (the entire New Testament or Bible in a single codex) was justified, we ought to
reconsider Higman’s third criterion – that is, attitudes toward scripture-reading expressed
in the books themselves, through their prefaces and paratexts. That is the subject that
will be explored here, especially as it relates to the biblical landscape tread by Thomas
Marwood. In order to rearticulate and expand the conceptual and geographic frameworks
of Higman, Gawthrop and Strauss, this chapter will focus on the dynamics of the
scripture-eating metaphors embedded within the printed biblical texts and commentaries
most relevant to English Catholics and Calvinists.\textsuperscript{712}

\textbf{***************}

The Bible tasted “sweete” for readers on both sides of the early modern
confessional divide. Protestant and Catholic commentators, whether humanists or
scholastics, whether reformed, traditional, or “Tridentine”, all acknowledged that
consuming this book was nourishing and pleasurable. This fact is immediately
significant for two reasons. First, it substantiates the flaws in the essentialist
characterization of magisterial Protestantism as a religion of the mind rather than of the

\textsuperscript{711} For a sample of post-Tridentine Catholic Bibles printed in smaller than folio sizes, see for example
\textsuperscript{712}In addition to English Bibles, this material includes Latin Bibles that were intended for Catholics
throughout Europe, including England.
flesh, of the dry text rather than the sensory sacrament, as stoically intellectual rather than affective, or as rigidly transcendental rather than incarnational and immanent in various expressions of theology and practice. Second, it weakens the notion that Catholic churchmen maintained an instinctively antipathetic relationship with the Bible. Most importantly for this essay, tracing the alimentary signs in printed Bibles will reveal the existence of a cross-confessional metaphoric dialogue about eating Sacred Scripture that will disclose the common and variant tactics which Catholics and Calvinists employed in proposing Bible-reading.

“Sweetness” as an affective response to religious devotion disappeared, according to Eamon Duffy, as the Reformation advanced in England. It was an intrinsically Catholic word. Peter Marshall argued, however, that this void was not the fault of early English evangelicals who transposed the alimentary imagery traditionally associated with the Eucharist to new Protestant contexts. He produced evidence that, during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, evangelical reformers and their adherents would remember their conversion experiences when they “first savoured the life and sweetness of God’s most holy word, meaning the Bible in English.” But Protestants’ expression of such metaphoric language was neither a peculiarly English phenomenon, nor one that was exhausted by the middle of the sixteenth century. A continuous alimentary discourse is contained within reformed publications of the Bible and biblical commentary. John Calvin, in his commentary on Jeremiah 15:16, claimed that the “metaphor of eating

Scripture” was “well-known and sufficiently common.” He cross-referenced that verse with Ezekiel 3 and Psalm 119 – biblical passages encoded with culinary symbolism - to prove that the Word of God was just as nutritious as the Lord’s Supper. The title page to the 1535 folio edition of the Coverdale Bible displayed the following injunction: “Josue.I. / Let not the Boke of this lawe departe / out of thy mouth, but exercise thy selfe/ therin daye and nyghte.” William Tyndale’s New Testament editions of 1535 and 1549 were introduced by Erasmus’s Paraclesis, which exhorted Christians to be nourished by the sustenance of Holy Writ. The Book of Homilies (1547) appointed that the following be proclaimed to English congregations: “As drinke is pleaasunt to them, that be drie, and meate to them that be hungrie, so is the readinge, hearing, searching, and studying of holy scripture.”

When the Reformed Geneva Bible, which was the subject of Higman’s analysis, was first published in English in 1560, it did not introduce a new discourse of Bible consumption into the language, but rather preserved what was present already. In this

---

715 See Ioannis Calvini Praelectiones in librum prophetiarum Jeremiae, et Lamentationes (Geneva,1563,1576, 1589, and 1599), made available in English through the wonderful web database of Calvin College, “Christian Classics Ethereal Library” (http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom18.html). Calvin’s commentary upon Jeremiah 15:16 supports my foregoing analysis: “So also we are said to eat the word of God …. Since then celestial truth is good to feed spiritually our souls, we are justly said to eat it when we do not reject it, but greedily receive it, and so really chew and digest it that it becomes our nourishment. This then is what is meant by the Prophet; …. He then says, that the word of God had been to him the joy and gladness of his heart; that is, that he delighted in that word, like David, who compares it to honey. (Psalm 19:11; Psalm 119:103) The same manner of speaking is used by Ezekiel, (Ezekiel 2:8; Ezekiel 3:1-3;) for the Prophet is there bidden to eat the volume presented to him; and then he says that it was to him like honey in sweetness, for he embraced the truth with ardent desire, and made privately such a proficiency in the school of God, that his labors became afterwards publicly useful.”


717 Darlow & Moule, eds., Historical Catalogue, 1: 41-2.

edition’s “Epistle to the Reader”, the “word of God” is identified as the “only food and nourishment of our souls.” The 1578 Geneva edition returned the alimentary message of Joshua 1:8 to the title page, as it was so featured on title page of the Coverdale Bible. On the verso of the title, it appended a new “prayer” on “the incomparable treasure of the holy Scriptures”, which identified the Bible with “the bread that feeds the life.” The margin’s explicit reference to John 6, which had traditionally been connected with the “incarnate word” and the sacramental flesh of Christ, was an effort to appropriate this passage for the alimentary discourse of the written word. The Geneva paratexts reinforced this effort. In editions throughout the sixteenth century, the marginal annotation upon Job 23:12 proclaims that the “word [of God] is more precious

---

719 The Bible and Holy Scriptures conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament... With moste profitable annotations upon all the hard places, and other things of great importance as may appeare in the epistle to the reader (Geneva, 1560), [STC 2093] f.***4r. Note that this epistle, however, dwelt more upon the “hardness” of the text and the need for the Genevan paratexts to understand it, than it did upon the scriptures’ sweete taste. See especially f.***4v: “And considering how hard a thing it is to understand the holy Scriptures, and what errors, sects and heresies grewe dailie for lacke of the true knollage thereof, and how many are discouraged (as thei pretend) because thei can not atteine to the true and simple meaning of the same, we have also indued bothe by the diligent reading of the best commentaries, and also by the conference with the godly and learned brethren, to gather brief annotations upon all the hard places, as well for the understanding of suche words as are obscure, and for the declaratio[n] of the text, as for the application of the same as most apperteine to Gods glorie and the edification of his Churche. Furthmore wheras certeyne places in the books of Moses, of the Kings and Ezekiel semed so darke that by no description thei colde be made easie to the simple reader, we have so set them for the with figures and notes for the ful declaration thereof, that thei which can not by judgement, being holpen by the annotations noted by the lettres abc. &c. atteyn thereunto, yet by the perspectiue, and as it were by the eye may sufficiently knowe the true meaning of all suche places.”

720 The Bible translated according to the Ebrew and Greeke... with most profitable annotation vpon all the hard places ... (London, 1578), [STC 2123].

721 According to EEBO, this “prayer” was appended to most Geneva Bible editions beginning in 1578. See Early English books tract supplement interim guide, Harl. 5936[43], and Tract Supplement E1.3[30b]. This prayer is not visible in the 1578 copy accessible on EEBO, but it is visible in the 1586 version here: Reel Position: STC / 1618:2a (image 6 of 653).

unto me, then the meate wherewith the body is sustained.”

Nor was this message interrupted by the ‘King James’s Bible’ (1611). Though it eradicated the interpretive supports from the margins and was issued, in the first instance, in a sumptuous, generally unaffordable folio edition, still the editio princeps appropriated the alimentary discourse:

“[Scripture] is not a pot of Manna, or a cruse of oyle, which were for memorie only, or for a meales meate or two, but as it were a shower of heavenly bread sufficient for a whole host, be it never so great …. In a word, [Scripture] is a Panary of holesome food….”

In place of the transubstantiated host, English Calvinists enjoyed a spiritual sustenance of text, which was as savory as it had been before the Reformation, but which now was constructed as “sufficient”, too.

As John Calvin had suggested, the metaphorical application of culinary symbolism to the Bible was “well-established” and “sufficiently common”, such that it had not been a peculiarly Protestant practice. The preface to the ‘King James Bible’ also betrayed some recognition of that fact. It confessed that the translators’ critics, both Catholics and Puritans, framed their opposition to a new “authorized version” within a shared language of scriptural consumption: “Hath the Church been deceived, say they, all this while? Hath her sweet bread been mingled with leaven, her silver with drosse, her wine with water, her milke with lime? (‘Lacte gypsum male miscetur,’ saith S. Ireney). … Hath the nurse holden out the breast, and nothing but winde in it?”

Acclaimed Catholic humanists from the two preceding centuries, like Lorenzo Valla and Desiderius

---

723 Brown, 1599 Geneva, 1: 185v.
Erasmus, had both annotated Scripture using the idiom of food. But the translators of the King James Bible were engaging post-Reformation Catholic controversialists who were very familiar with their alimentary mode of biblical discourse. These included Gregory Martin, Richard Bristow, Thomas Worthington and William Allen, the Catholic exiles from Oxford turned theologians of the new English College of Rheims, who adapted the discourse in a preface to their own English New Testament (1582). Post-Tridentine Latin Bibles participated in this dialogue of scriptural consumption as well. The title page of the Sisto-Clementine Vulgate (1605) graphically depicted Revelation 10:10 – one of the key texts supporting the metaphor of Bible-eating. That verse describes John’s consumption of the book that the angel brought from heaven. The caption below the title-page image exhorted the reader to follow the apostle’s example: accipe et devora ( “take and devour”). The vulgate’s index corroborated this injunction, directing the reader to concrete places for evidence that Verbum Dei est cibus animae ( “the Word of God is the food of the soul”). Neither of these post-conciliar instances in which Catholics employed the language and imagery of Bible-eating should be considered novel, experimental or merely tactical – appropriating the discourse of the Reformation in order to neutralize it. The discourse long predated the Reformation.

---


727 See for example, New Testament of Jesus Christ (Rheims, 1582), a4r-v. On the extent to which the translators of the King James Bible were engaging with the Rheims New Testament and its translators, see: David Norton, The King James Bible: A Short History from Tyndale to Today (Cambridge, 2011), 28-32; Ward Allen, Translating for King James (Vanderbilt, 1969); Charles C. Butterworth, The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340-1611 (University of Pennsylvania, 1941); James G. Carleton, The Part of Rheims in the Making of the English Bible (Oxford, 1902).
The aforementioned reference of the King James Bible translators to the alimentary metaphor of St. Irenaeus, the second century bishop of Lyons, hints at the long tradition of constructing the Bible as food. Language consonant with this tradition abounds in the *Glossa Ordinaria* and *Interlinearis*, a selective accumulation of patristic and scholastic biblical commentary first assembled in the twelfth century. The edition printed at Strassburg in 1480, several decades before the confrontation at Wittenburg, elicited instructions for fruitfully swallowing the Word from multiple passages (Ezekiel 3, Job 23, and Psalm 118).\(^{728}\) It was to be devoured with the passion of Samson – “as a comb of honey reaches the mouth of a lion.”\(^{729}\) The glossed Bible printed at Lyons in 1545, now more than two decades after ecclesiastical schism, reiterated that the nourishing function of the Bible in Ezekiel 3 is “well-established”. The mind “feeds on the Word of God just as the body on physical food: following that said in Deu.8.a. Not on bread alone does man live: but on every word that proceeds from the mouth of God.”\(^{730}\) The Venice *Glossa* of 1588, the first postconciliar edition, synthesized these passages among others under the indexical category: “Sacred Scripture is bread, it is an appetizer, it is the wine that gladdens the heart of man, it is oil, and it is the nutriment of milk.”\(^{731}\)


\(^{731}\) *Biblia Sacra Cum Glossis, Interlineari, et Ordinaria; Nicolai Lyrani Postilla, ac Moralitatibus, Burgensis Additionibus, & Thoringi Replicis* (Venice, 1588), Index in Glos. Ord & Postil., Nico. De Lyra (unmarked pages), » *Scriptura sacra est panis, est pulmentum, est vinum laetificanscor homnis, est etiam oleum, est etiam cibus lactis.parte4.folio404.B. »
Therefore, to declare that the image of Bible-eating was “central to the humanist understanding of Biblical translation”, as one scholar does, misses the pervasiveness of the alimentary discourse among all varieties of Catholics and Reformers.\footnote{Wall, Jr., “Introduction” in \textit{The First Tome}, 14.} The specific congruities and subtle deviations in the discursive syntaxes of each one, however, will reveal the critical distinctions in their respective attitudes toward how one ought to read the Bible.

That in all cases the taste of the Word was sweet and its substance nourishing already has been noted. Three other prescriptive components for eating the sacred text carried parallel instructions for Bible reading: 1) preparing for the meal; 2) consuming the most suitable part; 3) allowing digestion. The Latin Glossed Bibles construct the metaphor of eating God’s material Word most reliably in the relevant passages of the Old Testament (Deuteronomy 8:3, Job 23:12, Ezekiel 3:3, Jeremiah 15:16, Psalms 118:103-5). Whether due to considered restraint or sheer material inertia, all advice on consuming the holy book contained in the annotations of the Strassburg \textit{Glossa} of 1480 remained in subsequent glossed editions for at least the next three centuries. With regard to preparing the scriptural meal, the \textit{Glossas} issue several considerations. Ezekiel disposed himself to eat the book, according to the commentary attributed to Gregory the Great, by cultivating a “right intention, holy desire, humility to God, and, in the first place, piety of the will.”\footnote{\textit{Biblia Latina} (Strassburg, 1480), 3: 228-9 [\textit{Glossa Ordinaria} to Ezekiel 3:2]. Text: ‘\textit{VENTER TUUS.}’ Gloss: “intention recta: sanctum desiderium: humilitas ad deum: pia voluntatis ad primum.”} Pride, self-aggrandizement, or a stubborn commitment to impose one’s own will upon the received sense of the scriptures would subvert any good that could come from
ingestion. The annotations – or *postillae* – of the medieval theologian Nicholas of Lyra (c.1270-1340) were included in all editions after the Lyons *Glossa* of 1528. The *postilla* that expounded Jeremiah 15:16 in the Lyons edition of 1545 adds that prophets were particularly apt to profit from their biblical feast. Since they “drag themselves away from the vanity of the world, they are more suited for perceiving divine illuminations.”

Whether this *postilla* relegates fruitful Bible-eating to a certain religious caste or extends it to all practitioners of some ascetic discipline is ambiguous. It is clear, however, that cultivating personal humility and worldly detachment is at least an essential pre-requisite before any meal.

The Rheims New Testament (1582) less ambiguously defines its own conditions for eating/reading. The Catholic annotators seized upon Revelation 10. John “devoured” the book, they declared, through “earnest study and meditation” – the opposite of vain curiosity, which they railed against in their preface.

The editors developed these conditions for reading outside the alimentary discourse in the prefatory material and the indexical “Table of Controversies.” They quoted Augustine of Hippo on the dedicatory page: “We come to the understanding of Scriptures through povertie of Spirit: where a man must shew himself meeke-minded, lest by stubburne contentions, he become incapable and unapt to be taught.”

Being teachable or docile signifies the editors’ precise meaning of “earnest study” above. The Table of Controversies points toward further development aside 2 Peter 3:16, in which the annotator discusses how apostles, 

---

734 *Biblia Sacra* (Lyons, 1545), 3: 133v-134r. [*Postillae Lyrani* to Jeremiah 15:16]. Text: ‘QUONIAM INVOC.’ Gloss: “Et quia prophetae se abstrahebant a vanitatibus mundi, ut essent magis apti ad perciapiendum illuminationes divinas. »

735 *New Testament* (Rheims, 1582), 717; a2r-b1v.

736 *New Testament* (Rheims, 1582), a1v.
fathers, and all great doctors prepared themselves to understand the Scriptures through “studie, watching, fasting, and praying” and how they too sought out help from other learned, holy men. In other words, the best eating accompanies a stomach emptied of all personal ambition and an appetite for receiving the teaching of the Church.

Humble prayer was also a necessary first ingredient for the biblical feast of English Evangelicals. Erasmus, the Catholic humanist reclaimed by the Church of England, communicated this recipe in the forward to the third edition of his New Testament (1522). He advised anyone who took hold of the sacred book to “offer a little prayer to season his reading.” The producers of the Geneva Bibles agreed. The Prayer on “the Incomparable Treasure of the Scriptures”, first published with the Geneva edition of 1578, links the alimentary texts of Psalm 119 with the following instructions: 1) “Reade not, but first desire God’s grace to understand thereby” and 2) “Pray still in faith with this respect, to fructifie therein.” The annotations to this passage in the book of Psalms, within all Geneva editions of the sixteenth century, parallel the guidelines of self-abasement and intellectual docility prescribed for traditional Catholic reading/eating: “Instruct me in thy word, whereby my minde may be purged from vanity and taught to obey thy will.” Prayer and obedience – to God and to divinely ordained authority – were inseparable.

Like their Catholic counterparts at Rheims, English Protestant translators did not hesitate to develop this corresponding concept of obedience, although neither integrated it

737 New Testament (Rheims, 1582), 673.
740 See Brown, 1599 Geneva, 2: 23v-24r.
explicitly within the metaphor of eating. The Admonition of Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, which was appended to the first Great Bible (1539) and its subsequent reprints warns the reader to prepare himself with prayerful devotion, reverence, and a spirit of charity and to leave behind any vainglory or carnal and corrupt affections. The requisite quality he emphasizes most frequently is “quyetnes” and “quyet behaveour.” Even though he had installed six royal folios in St. Paul’s Church for public use, he would be “evermore forseynte, that no nombre of people be specyallye congregate therefore, to make a multitude.” Unauthorized and undirected multitudes might contrive strange ideas and succumb to “disputation, contention, or any other mysdemeanour.” Individuals or small groups of pious readers who were cognizant of their “most bounden duetye of obedience to the Kynges maiestye … [and especially to] hys graces most honorable injunctions and comauandemente geven and made in that behalfe” were more likely to achieve the primary object of reading: “to be edefyed and made the better therby.”

Edmund Bonner, whom Edward VI quickly deposed and whom Mary Tudor reappointed, represented the Church of England at its most conservative phase. No English Calvinists, especially those familiar with Foxe’s *Booke of Martyrs* in which Bonner is demonized, would have counted him among their representatives. It does not follow from that, however, that the self-consciously Reformed Edwardian Church abandoned the Bible to unguided interpretation. Chained next to the Great Bible in every church, Edward commanded, should be Erasmus’s *Paraphrases* (1517) – the humanist’s lavishly annotated New Testament in which the evangelical text itself, occupying approximately 1/8 of every page, was surrounded on all sides by commentary. The

---

Calvinist Geneva Bible of 1560 also promoted “guided reading”, as we have seen. While its preface never commanded orthodox reading as explicitly and precisely as had the Rheims New Testament, for example, its copious, didactic commentary implied the same. Mathew Parker, Queen Elizabeth’s first Archbishop of Canterbury, denounced that Bible’s “bitter notes” for prematurely and polemically defining theological controversies that still were being disputed within the Church of England.  

Beginning in 1579, English Geneva Bibles often featured an additional prefatory section “How to take Profit in Reading the Holy Scriptures”, by Oxford theologian “T. Grashop”. It enunciated the heretofore implicit requirement to read with docility: “Refuse all sense of Scripture contrary to the Article of Christian faith, conteined in the common Creed … [and] commandments.” Furthermore, the reader must “take opportunity to reade interpreters…, conferre with such as can open the Scriptures…, heare preaching and prove by the Scriptures that which is taught.” It has been suggested that the final injunction actually validates a critical posture toward authority. The laity listening to a sermon with Bibles open on their laps could evaluate whether the minister’s interpretations were consonant with their own sense of scripture. William Whitaker, the Reformed master of St. John’s College Cambridge and principal apologist for the Elizabethan Church, advocated an essential but seemingly more circumscribed role for scriptural cross-checking during homilies:

---

742 W.E. Slights, “‘Marginall Notes that Spoile the Text’: Scriptural Annotation in the English Renaissance”, *Huntington Library Quarterly* (Spring 1992), 55 (2) 255-278.  
I allow, indeed, that the word preached is much more easily understood than when it is merely read; because, when preached, each several point is explained, & variously accommodated & referred to the use of the people, which cannot be done when it is merely read. Nevertheless the same word should be set forth for the people in their mother tongue, in order that, when it is preached, they may have it in their hands, and so may see whether that which is propounded to them be indeed the word of God, as we read of the Beroeans, Acts xvii. Otherwise any one, at his pleasure, might deliver what he liked to the people, and enjoin it upon them as the word of God.  

Here the people are asked to confirm that the preacher is reading scripture; they are not encouraged to challenge his interpretation of it. Anything more confrontational would venture into the realm of ‘disputing’ which, as we have seen and will continue to see below, was categorically forbidden to “the simple” by all ecclesiastics under consideration.  

The same section, “How to take Profit in Reading”, in the 1599 Geneva edition conveys to its readers the Bible’s position on how individuals are supposed to conduct themselves toward authority. It proclaims that “Scripture contains matter concerning” a list of moral polarities in which the superior of the two is intended to be obvious. Listed above “Wisdom and Folie”, “Love and Hatred”, “Sobrietie and
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744 William Fitzgerald, trans. & ed., William Whitaker: A Disputation on Holy Scripture Against the Papists, Especially Bellarmine and Stapleton (1610) (Cambridge, 1849), 242-3. Whitaker’s original Latin treatise was published in 1588, and in these notes it will be referred to as Whitaker, Disputatio (1588). Fitzgerald translated Whitaker’s Latin text from the 1610 publication of Whitaker’s Opera Omnia, so Fitzgerald’s translation hereafter will be cited as: Fitzgerald, Whitaker’s Disputation (1849).

745 Certain humanists, Erasmus being one, may be excepted from this general observation. Erasmus recognized that Christ, the supreme pastor, entrusted Peter with “feeding his flock … the sound staple of Christian doctrine.” (Erasmus, ‘Paraclesis’, in Adams, Desiderius, 126) Nevertheless, Erasmus explicitly encouraged the laity to listen discriminately to their preachers (Erasmus, ‘Forward’, in Adams, Desiderius, 131). While this admonition may not legitimate open public disputation, to which he earlier professed disdain (Erasmus, ‘Paraclesis,’ in Adams, Desiderius, 124), it does empower parishioners to cross-check their pastor’s scriptural interpretations, rather than just the lector’s scriptural readings.
Incontinencie” is the couplet “Subjects: quiet or disordered.” Docility is the scripturally favored choice. It is also possible then that English Calvinists conceived reading along with the preacher to be a positive, stabilizing force. Visualizing the text that was being pronounced orally helped to maintain the focus of the congregation. “To prove by the Scriptures that which is taught” equally could mean that one locate and memorize proof-texts that justify that which is taught. Certainly, that is how the editors of the Rheims New Testament conceived it. Annotating the same text cited by Whitaker (Acts 17:11), they observed: “And it doth the Catholikes good and much confirmeth them, to vew diligently the places alleadged by the Catholike preachers. Yet they must not be iudges for al that, over their owne Pastors whom Christ commandeth them to heare and obey and by whom they hear the true sense of Scriptures.” Piously thinking with the Church was a common staple for magisterial confessions - Catholic or Protestant.

Preparing one’s appetite was another mutually accepted condition for eating. While both the Glossas and the Douai-Rheims Bible encouraged fasting and clearing space in one’s stomach before consuming the sacred book, the Geneva Bibles stressed voracious eating. In all sixteenth and early seventeenth century Geneva editions, the annotations of Ezekiel 3 and Jeremiah 15 (which are cross-referenced together along with Revelation 10) teach that God’s messengers must have “zeal” for receiving God’s Word and “delight therein.” Echoing Calvin’s own annotation of Jeremiah, the Genevan editors declare that the bibliovore must approach the book ravenously “as one that is
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747 New Testament (Rheims, 1582), 344.
748 See Brown, 1599 Geneva, 2: 85r.
affamished eateth meat.” Abstaining from the Bible would effect starvation. The annotations aside Psalm 119 imply as much: “My soul is almost brought to the grave and without thy word I cannot live; If God did not maintaine us by his word, our life would drop away like water.” Therefore, the minimum schedule for “reading the scriptures and prayer” that was allowed by T. Grashop in most late sixteenth Geneva Bibles coincided with a minimal course of eating to maintain a healthy diet: “at the least, twise every daye this exercise be kept.” A similarly rigorous reading schedule was nowhere evident in the contemporary Catholic regimen of preparation outlined above. Though Catholic Bibles made reading equivalent to eating, too, they never reduced one to the other: the gospel was an essential meal, but there were multiple ways to ingest it, as will soon become clear.

After fulfilling these preparatory routines, what exactly of the Bible were the people to consume? Swallowing down the entire book wholesale was never advised. The tougher, more difficult parts could cause one to choke. It was better to cut those off and leave them to the side of the plate. Upon the text of Ezekiel 3 in which the prophet is commanded to “eat what you find”, the Interlinear Commentary of the Strassburg Glossa of 1480 interjects: “He does not say drink that which is obscure and hard in what I say.”

---

749 See Brown, 1599 Geneva, 2: 67v.
750 See Brown, 1599 Geneva, 2: 23v-24r.
The Gloss extends this admonition one verse later: “you eat by reading the simple story.”

Virtually everyone agreed that this most comestible “simple story” was the life of Jesus contained in the gospels. In his *Paraclesis*, Erasmus anointed the evangelical books and letters of the Apostles as the most reliable source of moral development and true felicity for each individual, provided that one piously reflected on them, “praying rather than disputing, and seeking to be transformed within rather than armed for battle.” In his Preface to the Third Edition, Erasmus narrowed the “simple story” further to the “writings of the evangelists in particular.” Furthermore, he warned that the laity were to be “shielded”, even if not universally forbidden, from “quite a few” books of the Old Testament, including Ezekiel itself and the Song of Solomon. The editors of the Douai-Rheims Bible (1609) added to the approved menu the Psalms, “which one booke (as everie one shal be able to lerne it, more or lesse perfectly) openeth and sheweth the way, to understand al other Scripture.” They marketed in particular that most edible Psalm 118 in which are comprised “principal Articles of Christian Catholic Religion … but especially Moral doctrine.” Nevertheless, referencing the authority of Ambrose, the editors caution that even in the Psalms “will be some thinges mentioned … which God wil have hidden, and those are not to be curiously searched.”

---


756 *Holie Bible faithfully translated into English, out of the authentical Latin* (Douai, 1610), 2: 6-7.

757 *Holie Bible* (Douai, 1610), 2: 217.

758 *Holie Bible* (Douai, 1610), 2: 14.
While Erasmus had boldly declared that he believed every man could become a theologian, he still held in the same manifesto that the primary purpose of scriptural study should be the culmination of piety.\(^{759}\) It has been claimed that this principle of devotion, much more than theology, was central to the humanist enterprise of biblical translation.\(^{760}\) If so, Erasmus represented the dominant strands of not just pre-Tridentine humanism, but post-Tridentine English Protestantism and Catholicism to a great extent as well. He acknowledged that there were mysteries in the Bible beyond those parts salutary for Christian morals and devotion. Rather than attempt to solve these scriptural puzzles, he approached them with simple reverence, quoting Augustine: “what I cannot understand, I adore.”\(^{761}\) He advised other Bible-readers accordingly: “reject frivolous quibbles and impious curiosities should these by any chance obtrude on your mind.”\(^{762}\) As examples of the insoluble mysteries about which one should stop asking and just believe, Erasmus included the resurrection, the eucharist, and the trinity. If a reader inquired too stubbornly into these and other difficult theological matters adumbrated in the book, then the “sacred fount [would] prove the source of quarrels, contentions, conflicts, hatreds, and even heresies, the bane alike of the faith and of Christian concord.”\(^{763}\) With simple faith and a spirit docile to the magisterium, the reader/eater of Scripture could become a morally upright Christian. Perhaps, just as importantly, this reader/eater would not corrupt the text through vain curiosity and spread disease among the community.

The Preface to the Rheims New Testament (1582) provided a sustained reflection on the biblical diet of the ordinary Christian. Its writers concurred with Erasmus that the gospels provided the most suitable moral education for lay readers. The “hard and high mysteries” were not for “meddling [in], but in pulpit and school (and that moderately too).” Rather, readers should consume those parts “pertaining to good life and morals.” They continued:

Such holy persons of both sexes, to whom S. Hierom in diverse Epistles to them, commendeth the reading and meditation of holy Scriptures, were diligent to search all the godly histories and imitable examples of chastity, humility, obedience, clemencie, povertie, penance, renouncing the world: they noted specially the places that did breede the hatred of sinne, fear of Gods judgment, delight in spiritual cogitations: they referred themselves in all hard places, to the judgement of the auncient fathers and their masters in religion, never presuming to contend, controule, teach or talk of their own sense and phantasie, in deep questions of divinitie. Then the Virgins did meditate upon the places and examples of chastity, modestie and demurenesse: the married, on conjugal faith and continencie: the parents how to bring up their children in faith and feare of God: the Prince, how to rule, the Subiect, how to obey: the Priest, how to teach: the people, how to learn.  

For the editors of the Rheims New Testament, abstaining from the tough meat (the obscure testimonies and Protestant proof-texts) might have been more fundamental to spiritual health than feasting on the soft flesh -- that is, the moral exempla. In the preface they lamented the contemporary landscape that they attributed to the Reformation, in

---

which “every simple artificer among them readeth much more the deepest and hardest
questions of holy Scripture, then the moral partes.” On the perils of this disorder, they
continued:

When every man and woman contemne or easily passe over all the moral partes,
good examples, and precepts of life (by which as well the simple as learned might
be much edified) and only in a manner, occupie them selves in dogmatical,
ymystical, high, and hidden secretes of Gods counsels, as of Predestination,
reprobation, election, prescience, forsaking of the Jews, vocation of the gentiles,
and other incomprehensible mysteries… [then] as St. Peter foretold … the
unlearned and instable would deprave to their own damnation (2 Pet 3).”

Unless a reader was disciplined enough to eat only those portions most conducive to
sound ethics and proper devotion, he would be better off leaving his meal for the learned
theologian.

With this cold prescription, however, English Catholic Bible producers
encountered a serious metaphorical problem. What would the people eat if their spiritual
food were prohibited? Would they be abandoned to starve? Apparently conscious of
these potential implications, the theologians from Rheims addressed the metaphor in their
preface. If the meate of Scripture was too tough for common people to gnaw on, then let
them drink milk:

That in Scripture there is both milke for babes, and meat for men, to be dispensed,
not according to every ones greediness of appetite or wilfulenss, but as is most

meet for each one’s necessity and capacities that as it is a shame for a Bishop or Priest to be unlearned in God’s mysteries, so for the common people it is often times profitable to salvation, not to be curious, but to follow their Pastors in sinceritie and simplicitie: whereof excellently saith St. Augustine … ‘Being fed with simplicity and sincerity of faith, as it were with milk, so let us be nourished in Christ: and when we are little ones, let us not covet the meates of the elder sort.’ … as he proveth both by S. Paules example (1 Cor 3), who gave not to every sort strong meat, but milk to many, as being not spiritual, but carnal and not capable: and by our lorde also who spake to some plainly, and to others in parables and affirmed that he had many things to utter which the hearers were not able to bear.  

Milk, the meat-substitute for the simple Catholic, could be received by reading edifying passages from the Bible (especially from the Psalms and New Testament) or by hearing the text explained and personalized by local preachers. Eating the book or drinking the Word preached, the Bible dispensed in either form was consumable. Maneuvering within this metaphorical space afforded by the first letter to the Corinthians, these editors plausibly insulated their Church from charges of parental neglect and deprivation.

Cardinal Roberto Bellarmino, the preface writer of the Sisto-Clementine Vulgate and principal interlocutor of William Whitaker, similarly modified the scripture-eating metaphor though without importing dairy products. In Bellarmino’s model, pastor and parishioner ate the same physical substance – only at different stages of preparation: “Mothers give to their infants bread dissected in particulars, or indeed pre-chewed; therefore they actually are able to give something entire and whole, for it is the same

---

Whether distributed through preaching or independent reading, the scriptural meal retained its elementary form and basic nutritional content.

Both figurative modifications restrain the summons of the 1480 Gloss, “As it was said, ‘who has ears for hearing, let him hear.’ Just so: who holds an open mouth for eating, let him eat.”

By 1609, moreover, the editors of the Douai-Rheims Bible did not exhibit much confidence that the metaphor of the eaten book could be salvaged at all. They did not include any clear references to Scripture in the familiar alimentary passages of the Old Testament. For instance, at Deuteronomy 8:3 (“Man does not live on bread alone, but on every word that proceeds from the mouth of God”), the editors comment: “God is able to make food of what he pleases, or to sustain men without meate.” What had functioned as a key text for identifying Scripture as sustenance was here rendered ambiguous: if meat was unnecessary for survival, so too perhaps was the unmentioned sacred text, since “God is able to make food of what he pleases.”

The dietary priority of reading the scriptures was again demoted in the commentary on Psalm 118, which reinforced the reasoning of the Rheims Preface and of Bellarmino with the authority of Jerome: “The word or law of God declared by Prophets, Pastors, or other Preachers is the ordinary meanes for others to lerne how to direct their wayes, and actions.” Unlike Bellarmino’s commentary, however, this explanation neglects culinary symbolism altogether. While this discursive movement away from the alimentary discourse of
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767 Bellarmino, Controversiis, 155 (HathiT); SCS 163-4.
769 Holie Bible (Douai, 1609), 1: 416.
770 Holie Bible (Douai, 1610), 2: 227.
scripture-reading paradoxically appears within the first postconciliar English Catholic Bible, it is nevertheless consistent with the Tridentine position that “faith comes from hearing” (Rom 10:17) and that bread is broken for the little ones (Lam 4:4) by bishops and their delegated preachers.\textsuperscript{771}

The contrary position was submitted by the Calvinist apologist William Whitaker. He responded to Bellarmino’s metaphor directly: “The people should not be always like infants, so as always to require chewed meat; that is, when they hear the scripture in their native language, understand nothing of it unless it be explained by a minister.”\textsuperscript{772} No: at some point at least the people must be allowed access to the Bible, an argument that he expressed with syllogistic clarity. From the authoritative premise of John 20:31 (\textit{Haec scripta sunt, ut credatis Iesum esse Christum filium Dei, \& ut credentes vitam habeatis per nomen eius}), Whitaker concluded: “without faith there is no life: without the scriptures there is no faith: the scriptures therefore should be set forth before all people.”\textsuperscript{773} That defiant conclusion, however, did not end Whitaker’s treatise. While he persistently maintained that all doctrine necessary for salvation was plainly set forth in the Bible, he nevertheless “confess[ed] openly that there are many obscure and difficult passages of scripture.”\textsuperscript{774} He agreed with Bellarmino and eight ancient fathers, “Irenaeus, Origen, Ruffinus, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory”, that

\textsuperscript{772} Fitzgerald, \textit{Whitaker’s Disputation} (1849), 243-4.
\textsuperscript{773} Whitaker, \textit{Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura} (1588), 169-170: “Sic ergo ex isto loco ratiocinamus: Sine fide nulla vita: sine Scripturis nulla fides: Scripturae ergo sunt omnibus proponendae.” The English translation is my own, because the Fitzgerald translation could suggest that Whitaker intended only male Bible-readers, when his Latin does not denote any gender differentiations. For the Fitzgerald translation see \textit{Whitaker’s Disputation} (1849), 236.
\textsuperscript{774} Fitzgerald, \textit{Whitaker’s Disputation} (1849), 359.
“scriptures cannot be perfectly understood without a master; next, that there are some obscure and difficult places in scripture, and that teachers and masters should be consulted upon them; lastly, that the Epistle to the Romans is obscure, so that some books are more obscure than others.” So, access: yes; but yes to caution, too. “Masters” had to be incorporated into the biblical diet to avoid digestive problems.

Whether or not English Calvinists generally affirmed Whitaker’s syllogism, many did acknowledge along with him that the Bible contained enigmas. Protestant Bible producers were no exception and they, like the Catholic producers above, cautioned their unlearned readers not to select items from the adult menu. Thomas Cranmer’s preface to the Great Bible editions invoked the ancient witness of John Chrysostom that the godly ought to read scripture in between sermons; at the same time, it repeated the equally ancient admonition of Gregory Nazianzus that “not everyone should investigate high matters of divinity.” Theodore Beza, the successor of Calvin, set forth for the godly readers of his pocket Geneva Bible of 1603 his own example of approaching obscure passages with “fear and reverence…as mysteries of God…rather than, as many doe, either mocke at them, or defile them with their fantasticall commentaries.” The preface-writers to the King James Bible (1611) echoed Cranmer, Whitaker, and Beza that although all matters necessary for salvation are clearly revealed in the Bible, those

775 Fitzgerald, *Whitaker’s Disputation* (1849), 373.
obscure parts should be left in reverential mystery rather than curiously or vainly scrutinized.

But many English Protestants exhibited much more confidence than the Rheims translators in the ability of readers to choke down the Word, even when some “tough meate” happened to be present – that is, as long as the meat was sufficiently lubricated with orthodox commentary. Nicholas Udall, the English editor of Erasmus’s Paraphrases (1548), admitted that scripture, though “good and holesome food”, occasionally was “hard of digestion.” But when read with the explanations of Erasmus, the Bible became “everie English mans meate, though his stomake bee never so weake or tender … liquide to renne pleasautly in the mouth of any man whiche is not too muche infected with indurate blindness of hete, with malicious cancardeness, and with too muche perverse a judgement.”

Similarly, prefaces to the Geneva Bibles warn of “hard places” that make Scripture “so hard to understand”; but when reading the text in conjunction with the adjoining Calvinist notes, “the true and simple meaning” of scripture can be apprehended easily. This Bible’s commentary on Psalm 119:130 went much further: “The simple ideots that submit themselves to God, have their eyes opened and their minds illuminated, so soone as they begin to reade Gods word.”

The necessary role of the exegetical master is hereby elided. This note undermines the
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778 Holy Bible (London, 1611), B5r.
780 The Bible and Holy Scriptures conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament. ... with moste profitable annotations upon all the hard places. [1560], ff. ***4r-v; Brown, 1599 Geneva, “To the Christian Reader”, 1: 3.
781 Brown, 1599 Geneva, 2: 25r [Commentary to Psalm 119:130].
message of the preface – that the obscure scriptures become comprehensible with learned commentary - to the point of invalidating the notes’ reason for existence.

Catholic Bible producers, especially in the wake of the Reformation, did not proclaim this confidence in the clarity of Scripture. While they churned out annotated editions “in lands where heresies flourish”, they still expressed ambivalence over the ability of ordinary readers to grasp the contents therein. The editors of the Rheims New Testament showcased prooftexts for all challenged dogmas of the Roman Church.782 Nevertheless, they affirmed that “none can understand the meaning of God in the Scriptures except Christ open their sense.”783 The proper approach to the Bible, they advised, was that of Augustine who, recognizing the inability of the human intellect to grasp God’s Word, cried out “O Wonderful profoundness, O wonderful profundness….”784 The preface to the updated and polemicized Antwerp Gloss (1634), which would remain the standard Glossa for the next two centuries, warned the reader to accept the interpretations of learned teachers. Given the supine profundity of the text and the depths of human imbecility, the editors encouraged the readers to be guided by living authorities that could explain the text and the notes together.785 The same editors that

782 New Testament (Rheims, 1582), 230 [Annotation of John 5:39 (“Search the scriptures”]): “Catholikes searche the scriptures, and finde there, Peters & his successors Primacie, the real presence, the Priests power to forgive sinnes, justification by faith and good Workes, Virginities preferred before matrimonie, breach of the vow of continencie damnable, voluntarie poverty, Penance, almes, and good deedes meritorious, diverse rewardes in heaven according to divers merites, and such like.”

783 New Testament (Rheims, 1582), Preface, A4r. Calvinists did not disagree with this foundational hermeneutic, but they argued that Christ would not deny the basic sense of his Word to any reader who earnestly sought it.

784 New Testament (Rheims, 1582), Preface, B1r.

furnished the textual meat counseled readers not to bite into it without the accompaniment of liquid preaching.

Finally, Bible producers revealed their post-reading recommendations by describing how to digest the book. The Glossas counseled an extended period of digestion in which, after “swallowing” the text, the reader would “ruminate” upon it, drawing up in prolonged meditation.\(^786\) The Strassburg Gloss (1480) annotated the alimentary text of Job 23:12 with this instruction: “We conceal the words of his mouth in the sinews of our heart, since his command is not fleeting.” By allowing enough time for Christ’s lasting message to settle, the reader then possessed the understanding and strength to “harken to His works which fill us.” Doing good works after eating would not cause indigestion, the glossator anticipated. “And if his words proceed in our works, still they are stored in the heart as long as our spirit is not proud. But if extra praise is sought, then the word of God no longer is hidden in our sinews.”\(^787\) Quietly performing acts of charity rather than public discoursing on the text was the ordinary way to avoid scriptural dyspepsia. The Strassburg glossators set forth complementary directives alongside the relevant verses in Ezekiel and Psalm 118. Those readers who were “truly simple without the cunning of the serpent, who have simple faith, the innocence of doves” could truly

\(^786\) Biblia Latina (Strassburg, 1480), 2: 615-6 [Glossa Ordinaria to Psalm 118:103].

“enjoy his food as sweetness.”

If they rejected the desire for learned ostentation, the humble reader could receive the word of God as “honey drips to the lips of the harlot: permitting sweetness and planting fruitful seeds.” These seeds developed into “highest wisdom” if the reader “obeyed His commandments.” The postillae to these alimentary verses included in the Lyons Gloss (1545) echoed the message that reading the Bible was “for my progress in good works.” They added, however, that the experience of digestion could feel “bitter”, as a result of the “chastening…God decreed…for the salvation of the soul.” The annotators of the Rheims New Testament (1582) provided a slightly modified interpretation of this bitter digestion, perhaps adjusting it to the precarious circumstances of Elizabethan Catholics. They observed that the apostle John’s eating of the scroll in the Book of Revelation was “sweete in the reading, but in fulfilling, somewhat bitter, because it commandeth workes of penance and suffering of tribulations.” Whether or not the aftertaste was sweet or bitter, the complete model of scriptural consumption remained fundamentally the same: eating God’s Word, treasuring it, and then humbly allowing it to bear fruit in good works.

Despite warnings that indigestion was caused by pride and self-publicity, no Catholic annotator forbade readers to evangelize altogether. The Strassburg Glossa

---

788 Biblia Latina (Strassburg, 1480), 3: 228-9 [Glossa Ordinaria to Ezekiel 3:3].
790 Biblia Latina (Strassburg, 1480), 2: 615-6 [Glossa Ordinaria to Psalm 118:104]. Text: ‘A MANDATIS’. Gloss: “Non mandata ipsa dico me intellexisse sed a mandates quia faciendo venit ad altitudinem sapientiae quia nisi por obedientiam mandatorum non pervenit ad sapientiam occultorum.”
792 Biblia Sacra (Lyons, 1545), 3: 214r-v [Postilla to Ezekiel 3:3]. Text: ET FACTUM EST IN ORE MEO. Gloss: « Secundum illud psal.cxviii.n.Quam dulcia faucibus meis eloquia tua super mel ori meo. Et quam praedicator debet esse pervigil ad procurandum salutem animarii, sequitur. »
(1480), on the contrary, promoted it. It matched Pope Gregory IV’s commentary to
the Ezekiel text and enjoined the reader to “first eat; and after you will be able to digest
and teach others.”

From the springboard of Revelation 10, the glossator adds that the reader will please [God] by supporting the work of Christ, that is, by meditating and by
proclaiming.”

The key was that the reader not feign erudition in scripture, but preach the “simple story” – that portion of the Bible to which, we have seen, all readers were
directed. The Gloss’s note on Ezekiel confirmed that the reader’s “conscience achieves
more through preaching of sacred love than of skilled knowledge of the word.”

But the Strassburg edition was not the only gloss to connect eating scripture and preaching.
The notes to the Ezekiel text in the Lyons Gloss (1545) related, “Indeed before he hurries
to preach, he ought to be restored by the sustenance of sacred scripture through the
pursuit of reading and prayer.”

This postilla, however, is framed in reverse order: it directs preachers to read, not necessarily readers to preach. Preachers, by office, were
either biblical prophets or Christian clergy, not lay readers. It cannot be denied that the
Rheims New Testament was intended to serve as an accessible weapon for disputation:
the title-page commands the reader to “commend to memory…specially those
things…which make most againste Heretikes.”

The audience for this vernacular annotated Catholic Bible, of course, is a special case: the English laity lacked sufficient
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797 New Testament (Rheims, 1582), title page.
numbers of preachers of the Catholic type prescribed above, because those preachers were prohibited. The Rheims editors, therefore, allocated this glossed Bible as the substitute font of preaching even while they recognized that it was less than ideal for that purpose.\textsuperscript{798} Furthermore, the editors instructed the reader to preach from memorization of polemically annotated verses, rather than from speculation on the naked text.

Despite the heterogeneity of the examples above, there was a common staple within most glossed Catholic Bibles, which did convey a clear position on biblical preaching. Jerome’s ‘Letter to Paulinus’ served as a standard preface to Latin Bibles from the Strassburg Gloss (1480) to the Antwerp Gloss (1634), a period that encompasses pre-Reformation Christianity and post-Tridentine Catholicism.\textsuperscript{799} The last Antwerp Gloss presented an explanation for its frequent inclusion:

In almost every edition of sacred scripture this epistle of the holy Doctor is spoken; … it is an epistle of high notability, in which by not only invincible reasons, but indeed by incontrovertible evidence (as the Philosophers speak), and any other pious declaration or testament, the immeasurable profundity and supine inaccessibility of sacred scripture without a faithful teacher is proved clearly.\textsuperscript{800}

\textsuperscript{798} Alexandra Walsham, “‘Domme Preachers?’ Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print”, \textit{Past and Present} (2000), 168 (1): 72-123.
\textsuperscript{799} \textit{Historical Catalog}, 3: 911-967. Jerome’s ‘Letter to Paulinus’ was included in at least the following non-vernacular Catholic Bibles: Strassburg Vulgate (1480, folio), Paris Vulgate (1534, octavo), Paris Polyglot (1540, folio), Lyons Vulgate Pentateuch (1544), Louvain Vulgate (1547, folio), Paris Vulgate (1555, octavo), Lyon Vulgate (1555-67, sextodecimo), Paris Vulgate (1558, folio), Antwerp Vulgate (1561, folio), Antwerp Vulgate (1570, octavo), Venice Vulgate (1572, folio), Paris Vulgate (1573, folio), Antwerp Vulgate (1574, octavo), Venice Vulgate (1573, quarto), Rome Vulgate (1618, quarto), Antwerp Vulgate (1605, folio, epistle moved to back of the volume); Antwerp Vulgate (1634, folio).
\textsuperscript{800} See prefatory section “F. Leandri des Martino Benedictini Congregationis Angliae, Expositio in Prologos et Praefationes S. Hieronymi, quae libris Bibliics praefigi consueuerunt”, in \textit{Biblia Sacra cum Glossa Ordinaria} (Antwerp, 1634).
Jerome’s epistle discouraged Bible-reading dilettantes, even pious ones, from expounding on the text. That task was reserved for the official teachers of the Church. In the letter’s sixth chapter, Jerome explained how all the diverse fields of knowledge (from philosophy to masonry) were taught by specialists within each field. The only exception, he lamented, was scriptural exegesis:

But the only art that all people everywhere claim for themselves is of the scriptures. The learned and the unlearned everywhere write poems. This garrulous hag, this delirious old man, this verbose sophist, this whole universe presumes to mangle and teach sooner than they learn. And other lofty words of the sacred scriptures are being arrogantly drawn up, weighed, and philosophized among little hussies. … I speak with ill-temper, that these same may know that of which they are ignorant.  

If Jerome was not direct enough, the Antwerp glossators were even more forthright. They noted in the margins that Jerome’s diagnosis of his own time was “pregnant with comparisons” for their own:

For now men unacquainted with the human arts indignantly presume to penetrate for themselves the most profound mysteries of scripture without a teacher. … it is to be bewailed that the unworthy, unskilled, and stupid be guided as well by the unlearned whose lack of skill is here weighed by these words. … This very thing is reprehended with such ill-temper by the holy doctor, when simple idiots arrogate this for themselves with presumption: how much more should these be reprehended who teach and advise that presumption that such is necessary for the salvation of the faithful? … it is owed to us to reprehend that chaos indeed
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801 Biblia Sacra (Antwerp, 1634), 23-4.
reigning everywhere, by which not only learned priests but rather unskilled and plebeian men claim for themselves to be able to judge the senses of the scriptures.\textsuperscript{802}

This Antwerp glossator’s polemic had not adorned Jerome’s Letter until 1634. But even when only the epistle itself was appended to the Strassburg Gloss (1480), the message remained unambiguous. This standard preface, taken together with the previously surveyed metaphoric cues in Catholic Bibles, generally convey that the safest way to digest was to meditate and then perform good works. The unlearned Bible eater who preached God’s love was also commended, but the one who expounded the scriptures chapter and verse was reproached.

This prescription for digestion appears wholly antithetical to that endorsed by evangelical humanists, if Erasmus is counted among them. The parallels between his recommendations for digestion and those just sketched above allow for a fertile comparison. For the Antwerp Glossators noted that even Erasmus borrowed wisdom from Jerome’s Letter to Paulinus.\textsuperscript{803} In his Preface to the Third Edition of the New Testament (1522), he approvingly references Jerome’s suggestion that all pious individuals read scripture, but that only learned teachers profess it:

Saint Jerome encourages virgins, widows and wives to read the holy scriptures – yet he too would try to keep the unqualified from professing this sort of knowledge. In this matter, he says, the talky old woman, the maundering old

\textsuperscript{802} Biblia Sacra (Antwerp, 1634), 23-4.
\textsuperscript{803} Biblia Sacra (Antwerp, 1634), 21-2.
man, and the prating sophist all presume to an opinion; they butcher the subject, because each wants to teach before he has learned anything.  

Erasmus upholds for the reader the “right of pious and sober investigation, especially of those parts that might render his life better”, rather than the right of explication, pious or otherwise.  

Earlier in his Paraclesis (1516) Erasmus seemed to have encouraged lay Bible readers to be more vocal. After advocating for translation of the scriptures into every language so that they could be read “not just by the Irish and the Scots, but by the Turks as well, and the Saracens”, Erasmus catalogued advisable post-reading activity: “As a result, I would hope that the farmer might chant a holy text at his plow, the spinner sing it as she sits at her wheel, the traveler ease the tedium of his journey with tales from scripture.” Yet echoes of this seemingly provocative exhortation can be heard in the preface to the Rheims New Testament (1582): “The poore ploughman, could then in labouring the ground, sing the hymnes, and psalms either in knowen or unknown languages, as they heard them in the holy Church, though they could neither read nor know the sense, meaning, and mysteries of the same.” Clearly, Erasmus’s message was not swallowed whole. The editors of Rheims approved the way the ploughman absorbs the language of the scriptures by hearing the liturgy. They did not heed

805 Erasmus, “Preface to the Third Edition (1522)”, Adams, Desiderius, 129-30. Emphasis added to highlight the correspondence between this recommendation for digestion with the one for consumption (which part of the Bible to eat) noted above.
806 Erasmus, “Paraclesis (1516)”, Adams, Desiderius, 121.
807 New Testament (Rheims, 1582), a3r.
Erasmus’s emphasis on reading and understanding the scriptural text itself. But the two parties substantially agreed on the manner in which the unlearned should profess the Word: chant, sing, and tell tales – that is, the simple story. Despite these similarities, Erasmus at times departed more decisively from the digestive program espoused by many of his coreligionists. Though he conceded to the learned the first place in teaching, he joked that “there are plenty of girls whom I would rather hear speaking of Christ than various of these so-called supreme rabbis.”

With more sobriety later, he decided that by the authority of Paul none may be restrained from prophesying. Erasmus’s apparent conclusiveness here, however, should not lead one to ignore the reservations he expressed elsewhere. Even he absorbed many of the cultural and theological assumptions about preaching in which all Catholic Bible producers were formed.

One might expect from Calvinist Bible producers a starkly different prescription for scriptural digestion – one that articulates a broader role for exposition and evangelism. English Calvinists’s more voracious appetite for consuming the text has been acknowledged already. With regard to digestion, however, their pastors followed the example of the Catholics in counseling restraint. John Calvin declared that proper digestion must include meditation as well as personal reformation. In his commentary on the alimentary passages, Calvin explained that those who “truly consecrate themselves to God” would ruminate upon their scriptural meal, just “as food is eaten, so also they receive within them the word of God, and hide it in the inmost recesses of their heart, so that they may bring it forth from thence as food properly dressed.” The word must be

---

“really chewed and digested and become our nourishment” before it is expounded. Like Jerome, Calvin forbade readers to “prattle about heavenly mysteries, and have the words of God on their tongues.” Instead, readers “eat the word of God, not when we only taste and immediately spew it out again, as fastidious men do, but when we receive inwardly and digest what the Lord sets before us.” The scriptural bulimics that Calvin condemns are not “true servants of God”, but rather “talkative men, who are satisfied with their own powers of eloquence, or rather garrulity; for there are many ready speakers who utter what they have never digested, and thus their teaching is vapid.”

If Jerome’s letter to Paulinus was audible in Calvin’s commentary, it resounded in Whitaker’s treatise, too. In his Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura, Whitaker approved Jerome’s condemnation of scriptural exposition by the unlearned and “impudent.” Whitaker emphasized, however, that their fault is in their teaching, not their reading; he avers that Jerome “would have all to read the scriptures, provided they read with modesty and reverence.” Whitaker supported this crucial distinction that he discerns from Jerome’s Letter to Paulinus with the wisdom of Basil the Great, to whom along with Jerome, “we are bound to render the highest deference on account of their consummate and manifold erudition.” Whitaker recounted the story in which an imperial kitchen servant “was prating [to Basil] with intolerable impudence and ignorance concerning the

---

810 For Calvin’s lectures on Jeremiah 15:16, see fn 9. Calvin’s lectures on Ezekiel were published as Ioannis Calvini Praelectiones in Ezechielis prophetae viginti capita priora at Geneva in 1583, 1616, and 1617 and as Leçons ou Commentaires & expositions de m. Iean Calvi, sur les vingt premiers chapitres des revelations du prophete Ezechiel at Geneva in 1565. As before, the translation is from Calvin College’s web database of biblical commentary available at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom22.vi.viii.html.
811 On Whitaker’s systematic Calvinism, see Peter Lake, Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church (Cambridge, 1982), 6, 7, 57-73.
812 Fitzgerald, Whitaker’s Disputation (1849), 234.
dogmas of theology," to which the “illustrious father” responded: “It is your business to mind your sauces, not to cook the divine oracles.” Whitaker extended the analogy to present circumstances, declaring that if a person “wholly unlearned and very foolish” like that cook still “disput[ed] upon the scriptures with …[one] most expert in scriptures, and [a] bishop of the church” like Basil, then “this man ought to be treated in like manner, and rebuked with much severity.” But again Whitaker recognized the distinction between reading and preaching: “This arrogance of his (the servant) Basil wished to crush, and to shut his impudent mouth with that answer, not to prevent him from reading the scriptures.”

For the simple, rude and unlearned, Calvinist theologians were borrowing post-reading prescriptions from familiar Catholic traditions. Discouraging discoursing on the text was not among them.

The effort of these theologians to confine the preaching component of scriptural digestion to the official ministry is perceptible in Calvinist Bibles. Several of them continued to include Jerome’s aforementioned letter in their frontmatter. The preface “How to take Profit in Reading the Scriptures”, which regularly introduced Geneva editions after 1579, identified the Bible as be the source for “knowing and establishing true opinions and confuting false [ones].” But then the same preface designates the “pastour” to execute the public task of exegesis. This “pastour” is one set apart from ordinary readers: “The Prophets and expounders of Gods will, are properly and peculiarly

814 The Letter to Paulinus was printed in at least the following Reformed Latin Bibles: Geneva (1557, folio), Geneva (1574, octavo), Geneva (1583, octavo), Hanover (1605, quarto). See Historical Catalogue, 3: 941-961.
called, Men of God.” English Geneva Bibles throughout the sixteenth century display this suggestive gloss on the third chapter of Ezekiel: “Hee sheweth what is meant by the eating of the booke, which is that the ministers of God may speake nothing as of themselves, but that only, which they have received of the Lord.” While the simple believers are not formally excluded from preaching the word, only their trained ministers are explicitly entrusted with that faculty. Given the frequent references to simple readers otherwise throughout the preface, their omission here is meaningful. English Calvinist formulas for biblical digestion – prayerful reflection, personal reformation, and limited scriptural exposition – scarcely differ from contemporary Catholic instructions.

This chapter traced the alimentary discourse embedded in printed Bibles across the Reformation era in order to illuminate confessional differences in approaches to Bible-reading, in particular to the considerable discrepancy in volume of production. Bible producers and commentators in both Calvinist and Post-Reformation Catholic camps extracted their substantially uniform instructions for popular scripture reading from an earlier cross-confessionally shared discourse on scripture-eating. Every glossator, commentator, editor, publisher, and theologian under review instructed the reader to a) read with humility and obedience to orthodox interpretations, b) focus on the

815 Brown, 1599 Geneva, “How to take Profit in Reading the Scripture”, commentary cross-referenced with 2 Timothy 3:15-16 (Vol. 3: 95v) and then with 2 Peter 1:20 (Vol. 3: 106v), emphasis added in quote.
816 Brown, 1599 Geneva, 2: 85r, emphasis added.
simple moral and devotional parts of the text, and c) reflect after reading, seek
conversion of self, and serve others. To the last component, both Calvinist and post-
Tridentine Catholic Bibles added the recitation of doctrinal proof-texts, but neither
encouraged popular preaching. The subtle but meaningful distinctions that did emerge
between confessions, especially in England, stemmed from the efforts of polemicists on
either side to wrest the discourse from the other. The most significant divergence in the
respective alimentary metaphors of later sixteenth century Calvinist and Catholic Bible
producers, that of allowing general or limited access to the tough scriptural meat,
manifests itself in a further alimentary metaphor with which this chapter will conclude.

Some scholars have held, as we have noted, that the printed Bible replaced the
Eucharist in the affective devotion of Protestants. Acknowledging that the tradition of
constructing the scriptures as food antedated the reformation by centuries may reduce our
appreciation for the novelty of this Protestant achievement just as it may enhance our
understanding of how the adaptation could work so well. English Calvinists harvested
this tradition to emphasize that reading the written word was the necessary sustenance of
every Christian. Hence, even as they feared that readers would abuse the text by not
following their reading prescriptions, they still considered it imperative that everyone had
access to the text in order to prevent starvation. On the other hand, English Catholic
Bible editors, rather than dismiss the alimentary tradition of the scriptures, reappropriated
it perhaps in even greater consonance with Eucharistic theology and devotion. The
editors of the Rheims New Testament labeled the Bible the “Book of Priests”, whose
prerogative it became not only to transubstantiate the bread into the body but now also
the word into the bread.\textsuperscript{817} Just as the reception of the Eucharist by the priest was considered spiritually efficacious for all who attended Mass, so Christians could receive the nourishment of the Word by hearing the words of the priest even if they did not read the word on their own.\textsuperscript{818} As Communion could be offered in two kinds, so scripture could be dispensed in whatever form, whether meat uncarved or pre-chewed or even milk, was deemed most suitable for the individual layperson. The same conditions for receiving Christ’s body were applied for receiving his word. Without having fasted, having cultivated a right intention and spiritual docility, and having separated oneself from paralyzing vice, one was permitted neither to eat nor read; because, unlike in the Calvinist alimentary discourse, eating or reading unworthily would induce depravity and damnation.\textsuperscript{819} In that sense, even when it came to the scriptural meal, Catholics held fast to transubstantiation, as well all the practices and disciplines that accompanied it.

\textsuperscript{817} New Testament (Rheims, 1582), “Preface”, a4r. “Holy Scripture is called the Book of Priests … at whose hand and disposition we must take and use it.”
\textsuperscript{818} New Testament (Rheims, 1582), “Preface”, a4r.
\textsuperscript{819} New Testament (Rheims, 1582), 673.
CHAPTER 6

Rendering Other People’s Scriptures:

Bible Boundary-Crossing From France to England in the Marwood Era

The Jesuits promoted the vernacular scriptures in their schools as much as they promoted the vernacularization of anything inside them – that is, hardly at all. The question now is whether the elite educational force of the early modern Catholic world assumed a different approach outside the schools. The series of “sacred lectures” and accounts of the *Spiritual Exercises* discussed in the second chapter suggest that in certain contexts some Jesuits encouraged scriptural meditation and provided quasi-systematic biblical instruction to ordinary lay people. Another matter, however, is how they appreciated the phenomenon of ordinary lay people being able to carry the scriptures around with them in books. Apparently not very well, if we begin with the judgments expressed by one of the Society’s foremost experts of pedagogy, Diego Ledesma, whose influential tract against vernacular scripture-reading decisively shaped the apologetics of another Jesuit professor, Roberto Bellarmino, as we learned in Chapter 1. That, however, was the late sixteenth century, oft-considered the height of European confessionalization. By Marwood’s day a century later, one might think that the presuppositions and expectations of this leading order of intellectuals had changed. Not so, according to a different movement of leading Catholic intellectuals, known by their opponents as the Jansenists. Attributed to them, for instance, is a miscellaneous collection of polemics
printed while Marwood and Bedingfeld were attending the Jesuits’ College of La Flèche.\textsuperscript{820} Within it is a petition to the Bishop of Arras “demanding justice against the enemies of reading Holy Scripture in the vernacular tongue.”\textsuperscript{821} The injustice that these “enemies” were accused of was the composition and circulation of a “diabolical poem”, which averred that Bible-reading was the “sure route to perdition” and “one hundred times worse than reading a novel.”\textsuperscript{822} The petitioners sought restitution from the Jesuits, who were “not without reason” held to be the ones responsible for the poem.\textsuperscript{823}

Historians must render their own verdict: should this request be admitted as another piece of evidence supporting a general Jesuit policy against vernacular scripture reading that spans the early modern era? Or is it simply a loose vestige of the cut-throat intra-confessional controversies of “Golden Age France”? In Tudor-Stuart England, where inter-confessional controversies followed an alternative logic, the Jesuits were on the contrary firmly associated with the English Catholic Bible by both friends and enemies, as we observed in Chapter 4 and will continue to see later. The data appear to be mixed outside Europe as well. Despite opposition to translating the Bible into the indigenous languages of Africa, India, and Malaysia, some Jesuits lobbied for early vernacular translations into Quechua and Mandarin.\textsuperscript{824} Conflicting evidence is, therefore,

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{820} Folger Library Miscellany, Shelfmark: Bd.w. BX3705 A2 C8 Cage.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{821} Requête présentée par les devotees de la Paroisse de S. Jacques de Douai a Monseigneur L'Eveque d'Arras pour lui demander justice contre les ennemis de la lecture de l'Ecriture-Sainte en langue vulgaire… (n.p., c.1700).}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{822} Requête présentée, x-xii.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{823} Requête présenté, x.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{824} It is likely that the Jesuits’ differential approaches to vernacular Bible translation in their mission territories coincided with how they appraised the socio-cultural development of the non-European peoples that they were attempting to evangelize. See Andrew C. Ross, “Alessandro Valignano: The Jesuits and Culture in the East”, in John W. O’Malley et al., eds., \textit{The Jesuits II: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540-1773} (Toronto, 2006), 342-43, 46-49.}
\end{footnotesize}
one obstacle to determining a global Jesuit posture. The picture is likely to become no more clear, however, while our focus is an unstable subject – the vernacular Bible. As we have learned throughout this project, no such abstract entity exists. The question, therefore, again must be posed differently: it is not so much whether the Jesuits promoted access to vernacular scripture, but what kind of vernacular scripture books and what mode of engagement did they favor under what circumstances. How were the particular scripture-books that they promoted similar or different to those promoted by the French Jansenists, who are supposed to be the most radical supporters of vernacular bible-reading among all early modern Catholics? How did they compare, for that matter, to those of English Protestants, many of whom had been advocating universal Bible-reading a century earlier? Did the Jesuits adjust their books and positions on account of the different ecclesiastical contexts in France and England? And how did the central administration of the Roman Church factor into these decisions if at all? None of these questions can be answered with the precision required if our only sources are discrete treatises and lofty legal codes – that is, not if what we ultimately are after is how all these positions translated into which scriptures the readers of Marwood’s day actually encountered. All of the questions, however, are connected through the study of a single book. What was a single book, rather, was then reforged anew in all the intersecting reading communities that Thomas Marwood inhabited – Jansenist, French, Jesuit, English, Protestant, Roman. The story it communicates about the possibilities available to Marwood and his contemporaries will be relayed in this chapter.

*************************
I. Quesnel’s Scripture-Books: Two Authorized Versions and the Space Between

In 1719 the Anglican divine Richard Russel published the first two volumes of his ultimately four-volume edited compendium, *The New Testament with Moral Reflections upon every verse*. Despite the surplus of Bibles already in circulation, he contended that this new edition was necessary for “the generality of persons [who] receive so little advantage from the free use of Scriptures.” These poorly equipped readers now could rely on his paratextual tools for extracting practical resolutions from the sacred text. Russel did not claim to invent the handy book. That had been done three decades earlier—by a French Catholic priest. The Oratorian Pasquier Quesnel’s *Nouveau Testament en François avec des Réflexions Morales* (1692) was the best, Russel avowed, “among all the books written upon the New Testament which I have seen” (A2r). But some other devout entrepreneurs had seen this book too. Russel had to admit that it was translated into English a few years before. His preface dismissed this other edition, which retained “all the errors of the Church of Rome” and was distributed only “among those of the Romish Persuasion” (A3r). It was hardly even worth discussing since, as he was informed, it had been “quickly suppressed . . . by the influence of the Jesuits” (A3r). The previous translators should never have believed that they could make Quesnel’s book a Catholic New Testament, he argued, because the Pope had anathematized it. Russel’s narration of how Catholic efforts to frame the book had failed were part of his own effort

---

to convince his Protestant subscribers that the book belonged to them. Examining the contests of the Protestant Russel, of the English Catholics, and of Quesnel himself to package and sell this New Testament will illuminate (1) the conditions for legitimating Bibles within two alternatively confessionalized kingdoms and (2) the possibilities for borrowing across them at the close of the second Reformation century.

By the time Richard Russel issued his New Testament, Anglophone Protestants for more than a century had been reading what we now call the King James Bible or, more emphatically, the Authorized Version (AV). First published in 1611, the AV recently celebrated its quatercentenary. The occasion was commemorated by an explosion of conferences, exhibitions, and monographs on both sides of the Atlantic, expanding an already sprawling body of literature on this one title.\textsuperscript{826} Whereas scholarship surrounding the tercentenary could claim that the book triumphed from “sheer merit,” recent accounts emphasize the coordinated effort of king’s printers and archbishops to drive the popular Geneva Bibles out of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{827} Post-Genevan competitors have received much less attention.\textsuperscript{828} Catholic editions barely have been recognized as competitors, except by the contemporary Protestant governments that

\textsuperscript{826} For a sample listing of hundreds of AV quatercentenary events in 2011, see King James Bible Trust, “Past Events,” http://www.kingjamesbibletrust.org/events/past.


\textsuperscript{828} Of the six new English Testaments published in the first-third of the eighteenth century, only one received even a cursory notice in the Oxford and Cambridge monographs that marked the quatercentenary of the AV. That one, Daniel Mace’s diglot New Testament (1729), was none of the four derived from Catholic versions. For the classic account of the Geneva Bible’s place in England, see Christopher Hill, \textit{The English Bible and the Seventeenth Century Revolution} (London: Allen Lane, 1993).
prohibited them. An exploration of these other Bibles would reveal contests for legitimacy continuing long after the last Geneva Bible was printed in England. After that year, 1644, the “Authorization” of the AV had not become a solid barrier to biblical diversity, but rather a set of symbols that publishers had to represent in order to enter the market. These symbols were not wholly abstract. Royal monopolies endowed them with concrete legal value. Yet clever competitors, including the one who refurbished a Bible from the Catholic world, still figured out how to manipulate them.

Within early modern Catholicism, there was only one unequivocally authorized version: the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate (1592). This one “vulgar” Bible of the Latin Church just eclipsed its 420th anniversary, experiencing as much fanfare as it received for previous milestones—little. Scholars have labored over its putative offspring, however, scrutinizing in particular the textual DNA of French Catholic Bibles in order to resolve their paternity. Their examinations frequently yield a diversity of parents, even though canonical injunctions seemed to make these multiple lines of descent impossible. The Council of Trent in 1546 recognized only the Latin Vulgate as

---

829 The Rheims New Testament (1582) is the only English Catholic version regularly featured in historical surveys of the AV or of the English Bible generally. Even this version, however, is analyzed less as a competitor to the AV than as a hidden source in its translation. See, for example, David Daniell, *The Bible in English* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003), whose assessment dryly concludes: “Mercifully, the Rheims New Testament had little effect” (368).

830 When the Council of Trent declared the “old Latin Vulgate edition” authentic in 1546, the Latin “Louvain Bible” emerged as the de facto “vulgate” until the Clementine (1590) and then the Sixto-Clementine versions (1592) were formally proclaimed the Vulgate almost half a century later.

831 On this Bible’s quatercentenary, only one relevant study was published in English, and that was to illuminate the unraveling of the vulgate’s authority. See Robert Coogan, *Erasmus, Lee and the Correction of the Vulgate: Shaking the Foundations* (Geneva: Droz, 1992).

“authentic”, even though there were multiple Vulgate texts that remained permissible and emendable throughout the next century, as we have seen. It did not prohibit vernacular translations from other received versions, unless one counts (as some later theologians did) the Tridentine command that immediately followed the declaration of the Vulgate’s authenticity: “no one may dare to presume under any pretext whatsoever to reject it.” The Roman Index of 1564, however, clarified the matter. It declared “Old Testament” translations legitimate “only as elucidations of the Vulgate edition” and “New Testament” translations irredeemably illegitimate when “made by authors of the first class,” that is “heresiarchs.” Now that it has been shown that some Catholic New Testaments borrowed text from Protestant versions anyway, what ought to be investigated is how that borrowing was done, and under what circumstances it could avoid censure. This study of Quesnel’s Bibles will explore the mechanics by which authors and publishers could perform fidelity to the text of the Vulgate and the traditions of Trent while circulating books that were less faithful, establishing new precedents for the form of Catholic scripture-books in so doing. By following the transmission of Quesnel’s book from France to England we will be able to detect relationships among

833 H. J. Shroeder, ed. and trans., Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (Rockford, Ill.: Tan, 1978), 18. Whether or not the Council of Trent actually required all vernacular translations to be made from the Vulgate turns upon this one debatable phrase. Whereas the language of the decree itself might accommodate the use of Hebrew and Greek texts in translation, contemporary Catholic translators and publishers realized that it was safer to market a Bible that was faithful to the vulgate in an era where many of their ecclesiastical authorities considered all vernacular translations suspect. During the next century in France, however, it became possible to print New Testaments “translated according to the Vulgate, with the differences in Greek” (cf. the Nouveau Testament “de Mons”). The legitimacy of these translations was contested by the Sorbonne and the Roman Index. By the end of the seventeenth century, however, it was those ecclesiastics committed to the exclusive authority of the Vulgate, like Michel Le Tellier, who felt that the burden had been shifted back on them to prove that vernacular translations which deviated from the one “authentic” text violated the Tridentine decree, as will be discussed below.

834 Schroeder, Canons and Decrees, 273-4.
various traditions of authenticating Bibles that have been obscured by a division of historiographical labor along national and confessional boundaries.

This chapter proceeds in four stages. First, it examines how Quesnel secured a place for his New Testament in France. Building upon scholarship on French Bibles accumulated over the last twenty-five years, this case study aims to refine judgments about how French editions of the Vulgate were legitimated, weighing the relative force of texts and paratexts, of conciliar decrees and regional expectations, of institutional validation and popular acclaim.835

835 Scholarship on the Bibles of early modern France erupted between 1989-1991: La Bible de Tous les Temps, eds. Guy Bedouelle and Bernard Roussel, vol. 5, Le Temps des Reformes et la Bible (Paris: Beuchesne, 1989); Bernard Chêdozeau, La Bible et la Liturgie en Français: L’église tridentine et les traductions bibliques et liturgiques (1600-1789) (Paris: Cerf, 1990); Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, ed., Les Bibles en Français: Histoire Illustrée du Moyen Age à nos Jours (Turnhout: Brepols, 1991). It was Chêdozeau who placed the post-Tridentine Catholic Bible back on the map of French historians and in the foreword to his subsequent magisterial work, Port-Royal et la Bible: Un siècle d’or de la Bible en France (Paris: Nolin, 2007), he was proclaimed “le Christophe Colomb” of the rediscovery. Anglophone scholarship has yet to advance upon his research. For example, in M. Lamberigts and A. A. Den Hollander, eds. Lay Bibles in Europe, 1450-1800 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), only the post-Tridentine readers of the Dutch Republic and the Netherlands are studied. The essay of Bettye Chambers in Wim François and A. A. Den Hollander, eds., Infant Milk or Hardy Nourishment? The Bible for Lay People and Theologians in the Early Modern Period (Leuven: Peeters, 2009) does analyze some French Catholic Bibles of the sixteenth century, but focuses on the material distance of Protestant Bible layouts from the principle of sola scriptura. There are two relevant exceptions. The most recent is Elizabeth Morley Ingram’s “Dressed in Borrowed Robes: The Making and Marketing of the Louvain Bible (1578)” in The Church and the Book, ed. R. N. Swanson (Suffolk, U.K.: Boydell & Brewer, 2004). The present study seeks to build upon its findings while adopting an alternative conceptual framework. The second exception is Dominique Julia’s essay “Reading and the Counter-Reformation,” in A History of Reading in the West, eds. Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), which briefly synthesizes Chêdozeau’s description of the French hierarchy’s attitudes toward lay Bible-reading. Between the Jansenists of Port-Royal who promoted independent Bible-reading as a universal obligation and the faculty of the Sorbonne who increasingly sought restrictions on access to vernacular scripture, there was the “position catholique-romaine française.” Those within this mainstream “école” favored regulated access to scripture based upon the capacity of the lay reader and the permission of ecclesiastical supervisors (249). Chêdozeau suggested that paratextual explications had “seemed to be required, according to the criteria of the period, by the Council of Trent” (“La Bible française chez les catholiques” in Les Bibles en Français, ed. Bogaert, 147). He later showed how Port-Royalists tried to use Trent-inflected paratextual layouts to protect their more ambitious project of Bible-distribution (Chêdozeau, Port-Royal, 60-63, 425). These suggestions will be developed and modified in the present study, which examines how paratexts could both compromise and legitimate vernacular Bibles between the last year of Trent (1563) and the first Port-Royalist biblical commentary (1672).
Second, it traces the relentless campaign of one French Jesuit, Michel Le Tellier, to de-legitimize Quesnel’s scriptural texts. Only when Le Tellier becomes royal confessor to the Sun King, Louis XIV, do historians begin earnestly tracking his career and charting his tactics for achieving *Unigenitus* (1713), that comprehensive papal indictment of Quesnel’s New Testament. Yet Le Tellier did not emerge from nowhere. For almost three decades he served as Rector and Professor of Arts and of Holy Scripture at the Jesuit College Louis-le-Grand in Paris as well as at the College of Le Flèche in the same era that Thomas Marwood and Henry Bedingfeld were formed there. His program for Holy Scripture extended well beyond these students and the school they inhabited. What historians have passed over are Le Tellier’s efforts, both before and after he became Royal Confessor, to undermine Quesnel’s Bibles by producing his own.836 By focusing instead on Quesnel’s competition from within his own Oratorian community, historians fold Le Tellier’s later political maneuvers into a more tidy narrative of the French Catholic Bible, whereby a semi-Jansenist cohort of Oratorians and Port-Royalists promote access to the scriptures while the Jesuits and other ultramontane traditionalists

---

836 This historiographical tradition was cultivated first in the *Memoires* of the Duc de Saint-Simon, Le Tellier’s contemporary political adversary. The Jesuit scholars that have attempted to rehabilitate Le Tellier against the accusations of Saint-Simon have focused narrowly on Le Tellier’s activities as royal confessor. See Pierre Bliard, S.J., *Les Mémoires de Saint-Simon et le père Le Tellier, Confesseur de Louis XIV* (Paris: Libraire Plon, 1891) and more recently, Joaquín Domínguez and Charles O’Neill, eds., *Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús* (Rome: IHSI, 2001), 4:2309-2310. The substantial chapter on Le Tellier in Lucien Ceyssens and J. A. G. Tans, *L’Autour de L’Unigenitus* (Leuven: Peeters, 1987), 333-400, lists Le Tellier’s publications as a biographical prelude. They suggest to Ceyssens only that Le Tellier’s record as a Jesuit apologist and anti-Jansenist mudslinger should suffice to explain his quest to suppress Quesnel as soon as he gained power over the king’s conscience. Because Le Tellier’s biographers have failed to sift his earlier writings on vernacular scripture, scholars of the French Bible have expressed surprise upon encountering copies of the *Nouveau Testament* (1697/1703) of Le Tellier and his Jesuit confreres, Dominique Bouhours and Pierre Besnier (Chédozeau, “La Bible française,” 151).
favor restrictions. Returning Le Tellier to an earlier part of the story will enhance our understanding of Quesnel’s success: his book altered the conditions for circulating the scriptures in large part because it induced hostile players to enter the field. Though Le Tellier and other opponents sought to stem the demand for Quesnel’s books through competition, they eventually imitated the innovative style that they believed consumers desired, solidifying the changes that Quesnel introduced.

Third, it evaluates how another set of Catholic publishers, this time in England, sought to re-package Quesnel’s Gospels for their own community, navigating between the suspicion of the Roman Index and Jesuit missionaries on the one hand, and on the other the authority of an alternative vernacular Bible, the Rheims New Testament. This English scene of the drama of Quesnel’s book has been reviewed before only briefly as evidence that the larger Jesuit-Jansenist conflict had crossed the Channel. Revisiting it will allow us to compare the contexts that structured how Catholics read scripture in lands where their institutional hierarchy still possessed coercive power and in lands where that hierarchy had long been deprived.

Fourth and finally, it shows how the evicted minister Richard Russel traded on the papal condemnation and paratext of Quesnel’s New Testament to render it saleable in an

---


English Protestant kingdom where a different Bible and biblical layout had been authorized and a new dynasty, which Russel deemed illegitimate, still demanded authorization. Tracing the genealogy of Russel’s hitherto unstudied book back to Quesnel will allow us to consider some fundamental questions: what counted as sacred scripture for various communities of early modern Christians? How were its physical components determined, exhibited, policed, and subverted? What is the role of confessional difference in fixing opportunities for scriptural appropriation, and how is that variable affected by different political and ecclesiastical contexts? Overall, this study should illuminate the historically contingent shape of the scriptures as material and symbolic objects whose meaning could be formed and reformed by the disparate communities that depended on them as a single, stable, and authoritative sacred text.

II. Making Quesnel’s Scripture-Books French and Catholic

In 1713, the papal bull *Unigenitus* passed judgment on Quesnel's “Reflexions Morales.” One hundred and one propositions discovered within it were declared:

false, captious, shocking, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and her practice, . . . likewise against the secular powers, seditious, impious, blasphemous, . . . and likewise favouring Heretics, heresies, and schism, erroneous . . . and in fine even heretical, and manifestly reviving several heresies, and chiefly those which are contained in the infamous Propositions of Jansenius.839

---

839 Clement XI, *Unigenitus dei filius*, September 18, 1713, § 3(2).
Before trying to parse this exhaustive condemnation, we first ought to investigate how
for several decades Quesnel’s book had succeeded. Given its starting point as an attempt
to salvage another condemned New Testament, it is surprising that the book ever had a
chance. Quesnel had attached his *reflexions morales* to the text of the *Nouveau Testament
“de Mons,”* a wildly popular version translated by the embattled community of Port-
Royal.840 It already surpassed twenty print runs between its debut in 1667 and its
prohibition the following year.841

On this disciplinary action, the ecclesiastical powers of Rome and Paris united—a
notable achievement. Agreement on the permissibility of particular French translations of
the Vulgate was hardly automatic after the Council of Trent (1545-1563). The Council, in
fact, enabled these divergences. It had ratified a policy of *local* ecclesiastical oversight:
the “ordinary” would examine and approve Bibles before they were issued in his diocese,
ensuring that the text of “the Holy Scriptures, especially of the old Vulgate Edition,
would be printed in the most correct manner possible” and that the title identified the
author and press, so that all responsible parties could be held accountable.842 This
conciliar principle of subsidiarity enabled the publication of *La Sainte Bible* in Paris,

840 Despite their “de Mons” imprints, the New Testaments of Port-Royal actually were printed from
Amsterdam, Brussels, Lyon, and Leiden: see Chambers, *Bibliography*, 2:i-x. On why Mons may have
been chosen for the false imprint, see Léopold de Sailly, *Étude Bibliographique du Nouveau Testament de
Port-Royal* (Mons, Belg.: L. Dequesne, 1926), 26-27. On Quesnel’s decision to use the Port-Royalists’
translation, see Chédozeau, *Port-Royal*, 437n39. Chédozeau suggests that Quesnel’s relationship with this
community began in late 1666 when he received a new superior, Colin du Juanet, who was a close
associate of the Port-Royalists’ principal spokesperson, Antoine Arnauld.
841 See Chambers, *Bibliography*, 2:409-452, 455-7, 464-73. There were eighteen separate printings in 1667,
plus four to ten more in 1668. Clement IX’s condemnation of this book is reprinted in L. de Sailly, *Étude
Bibliographique*, 15-16.
Lyon, and Rouen, where the bishops of those dioceses permitted it; the production of
the Catholic Bibbia Vulgare, on the other hand, ceased in Italy.\footnote{357}

The opposition of Haroüin de Péréfixe, the archbishop of Paris, to the New
Testament adopted by Quesnel demands an explanation then, even if the antipathy of the
Roman Inquisition might not. Péréfixe issued two ordinances in quick succession against
the “Nouveau Testament imprimeé a Mons.”\footnote{844} Each one submits a different complaint,
both of which reflect the expectations set up by the Council. Péréfixe first proscribed the
book on 18 November 1667 for the simple fact that he, as the ordinary of the diocese,
ever approved it before its publishers dared to print it.\footnote{845} Five months later he explained
\textit{why} he would continue to refuse his approval: according to the faculty of the Sorbonne,
the translation was not faithful to the Vulgate, nor even to the Greek, “in an infinity of
places.”\footnote{846} Péréfixe admitted that he was disposed to reject the Mons New Testament
even before encountering these two acts of non-compliance with Trent. He was aware
that “this Translation was put into light by suspect persons,” the primary translator, Louis
Isaac Le Maistre de Saci, having been imprisoned in the Bastille for his alleged
Jansenism.\footnote{847} He reported that the Sorbonne’s exacting review vindicated his suspicion.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[843] “\textit{La Sainte Bible}” is the opening title of the version known as the “Bible of the Theologians of
Louvain,” which Christophe Plantin first published in Antwerp in 1578. It was revised and reprinted in
dozens of editions without any significant competition from other Catholic versions until the Amelote and
“de Mons” New Testaments emerged in the 1660s. \textit{La Bibbia Vulgare}, the short title of Nicolò Malerbi’s
standard Catholic translation, was reprinted approximately seventy times in either full or partial form
between 1471 and 1567. See Edoardo Barbieri, “Tradition and Change in the Spiritual Literature of the
Cinquecento,” in \textit{Church, Censorship, and Culture in Early Modern Italy}, ed. Gigliola Fragnito
\item[844] Both are reproduced in \textit{Recueil de diverses pièces publiées pour soutenir la traduction du Nouveau
Testament imprime à Mons, contre ceux qui en ont voulu interdire la lecture} (Cologne: Nicolas Schoute,
1669), 3-17.
\item[845] \textit{Recueil} (1669), 4-5.
\item[846] Ibid., 13.
\item[847] Ibid., 10.
\end{footnotes}
Not only did the translators “alter the text according to their own fantasy,” but in many important places they “followed the ministers of Geneva” and “favored the errors of Jansenism.” Borrowing Calvinist Bible translations damned the supposedly Catholic version of René Benoist one century earlier, he affirmed, and the same offense would damn this one, too. What Péréfixe failed to acknowledge was the resurrection of the Benoist text in a modified form, and its ascension as the quasi-official French Catholic Bible by the end of the sixteenth century.

The damnation of the Mons New Testament, similarly, did not last forever. It barely lasted a year. Bibliographers have recycled the claim that “after the Paix de l’Eglise (1669),” in which Pope Clement IX, King Louis XIV, and four French prelates brokered a temporary resolution of the Jansenist conflict in order to avoid a national schism, “this version was permitted in France on the condition that the text would be accompanied with explicative notes for the understanding of obscure and difficult passages.” No official authorization is cited to support this claim. It is sensible that the “Paix” would have outmoded accusations of Jansenism. That does not explain, however, why exegetical paratext alone should cure both a book that defied the canons of Trent and a text decreed heretically corrupt. Pasquier Quesnel knew that it would, though; the publication of the Mons New Testament that he modified depended on it.

The legitimating force of paratext emanated from the same session of the Council of Trent discussed above, even though the decrees seemed to offer only criticism of
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848 Ibid., 14-15.
849 Ed Finot, Port-Royal et Magny (Paris: G. Chamerot, 1888), 57; L. de Sailly, Étude Bibliographique, 68; Chambers, Bibliography, 2: 414.
contemporary biblical annotation. The seed from which the new tradition of
glossing later sprouted was planted in the statement against private interpretation: “No
one . . . shall presume to interpret sacred scripture contrary to the sense held by holy
mother church or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.” This decree
introduced no further restrictions upon the circulation of approved Bibles: anyone with
sufficient means could buy one; vocal heretics would be punished. It was only when a
papal delegation altered these conditions the year after the council ended that Bible
producers employed this decree as an agent in their negotiations for ecclesiastical
approval.

This first post-conciliar index, promulgated in 1564, erected an intermediate layer
of requirements that made the reception of even properly vetted Catholic editions
dependent upon the possession of a special reading license. Bishops or inquisitors would
dispense these licenses to individuals who, according to the judgment of their local pastor
or confessor, would derive from such reading “no harm but rather an increase of faith and
piety.” Had this licensing system been implemented throughout the early modern
Catholic world it would have constrained access to the Bible well beyond the terms
sketched out by the council. Leading French churchmen generally embraced the object of
reader restraint, that lay readers should engage the scriptures only in proportion to their

850 Although both Catharini and Madruzzo promoted explicative notes for vernacular Bibles in the debates
leading up to the 4th Session, as we learned in Chapter 1, the decrees that actually emerged from the session
conveyed only the frustration expressed by some of the delegates: “And wishing, as is just, to impose a
restraint, in this matter, also on printers, who now without restraint [ . . . ] print, without the license of
ecclesiastical superiors, the said books of sacred Scripture, and the notes and comments upon them of all
851 Chédozeau flagged this decree as the origin of paratextual expectations in France (“La Bible Français,”
174). The process by which post-Tridentine Bibles cemented these expectations must be traced now.
852 Schroeder, Canons, 275.
intellectual capacity and orthodox formation;\textsuperscript{853} but they, along with many other bishops outside the Italian and Iberian peninsula whose dioceses were populated by substantial Protestant communities, experimented with access as a means of restraint.\textsuperscript{854} They recognized that Catholic readers in their care might be exposed only to heretical texts and interpretations if they did not permit the broad circulation of orthodox ones. The Roman Congregation of the Index itself was sympathetic to this dilemma, as we learned in chapter one: the eminent consultores William Allen and Roberto Bellarmino deliberated about the manner in which Catholic Bibles could be circulated safely in “areas where heresies flourish” so that vulgar readers were not left to “suck venom.”\textsuperscript{855} It was under these circumstances that the apologist René Benoist found the conciliar decree against private interpretation useful, because he sought approval for a new Bible accompanied with annotations that would bind the text to the sense pronounced by the Catholic Church.

Benoist’s marketing strategy was successful: in 1566 his Bible was granted a royal privilege. In 1567, however, the Sorbonne condemned it. The faculty objected, not surprisingly, to Benoist’s dependence upon the text and paratext of the Geneva (Calvinist) Bible.\textsuperscript{856} As a result, the whole paratextual layout became tainted by association with Geneva for the next two decades. When in 1573 Christophe Plantin risked re-publishing in Antwerp the Benoist text, now partially revised by the Dominican

\begin{footnotes}
\item[853] Chédızu, \textit{La Bible et la Liturgie}, 186-189; Julia, “Reading,” 249.
\item[854] Ronnie Hsia in his magisterial survey, \textit{The World of Catholic Renewal, 1540-1770}, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 178, recognized that Catholics in Germany, Poland, Switzerland, Bohemia, and Dalmatia gained access to vernacular Bibles after Trent, but he neglected to mention Catholic France.
\item[855] Archivio Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei (ACDF), Indice, Protocolli B, 324r-v, 331v, 543r-v.
\item[856] When pressed, Benoist justified his borrowing strategy by likening it to the Israelites’ despoliation of the riches of Egypt. See Chédızu, “Les Bibles Français,” 91-93.
\end{footnotes}
Jean Henten and approved by three of his colleagues from the theology faculty of Louvain, he first made sure to (1) delete the name of Benoist from the title of his New Testament “translated from latin” and (2) erase all marginal annotation. Five years later in Lyon, Barthelemy Honorat republished the whole “Louvain” Bible, again without Benoist’s name and, as he promised anxious readers and censors, “sans gloses, additions ny distractions qui la puissant render suspecte.” The legitimating force of marginal notes, therefore, did not flow directly from Trent nor continually from the medieval tradition of scholastic glossators, whose methods Catholic humanists and Protestant reformers ridiculed together. In fact, to the extent that they mirrored the form and content of the notes in the Calvinist Geneva Bibles, glosses initially compromised post-Tridentine Bibles.

Glosses finally returned in 1586, as four Parisian booksellers attempted to circumvent a competitor’s royal privilege for this denuded version of the Bible. But they also needed to circumvent the incriminating perception of notes, so they introduced their innovation through the language of that decree against private interpretation. Their title marketed a Louvain edition augmented “avec les annotations des anciens Peres et Docteurs de l’Eglise, aux marges, pour l’intelligence asseurée de plusieurs passages et lieux de l’Ecriture sainte.” While most French Catholic Bibles continued to circulate without marginal paratext, this edition established a discursive precedent for the legitimate inclusion of annotations.

858 Chambers, Bibliography, 1:424.
Annotations shifted from legitimate to legitimating by the middle of the seventeenth century as ecclesiastical authorities discerned a blurring distinction between Catholic and Protestant Bibles in French. Since the Louvain version borrowed the Geneva text, which Benoist and Henten had used the Vulgate to “correct” rather than to translate anew, identifying textual differences always required careful scrutiny. For the less fastidious reader, the task of discrimination became even more perplexing when an increasing number of Geneva editions appeared bare, shorn of their distinctive marginal paratexts. Intervening in 1621, the Parisian publishers Jean Richer and Pierre Chevalier printed a “Louvain Bible” with an appendix entitled “Moyens pour discerner les BiblesFrançaises Catholiques d’avec les Huguenotes.” It designated the textual places “corrupted” in the Geneva version, but newly emended in this book by a doctor of the Sorbonne according to the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, which in 1592 had been declared the “authentic” text recognized by the Council of Trent. To remove further ambiguity, the title also marketed a new paratextual apparatus, featuring chapter summaries extracted from the apologetical church history of Cardinal Baronius as well as “L’Explication des passages de L’Escriture selon le sens des Peres quoi ont vesu avant & durant les quatre premiers Conciles Oecumeniques.” Nevertheless, François Veron, the king’s “reader of controversies,” chastised this translation for not doing enough to rectify the “falsifications of the Bibles of Geneva.” But after sprinkling the revised text of his New Testaments, published in 1646 and 1647, with more patently Catholic terms, especially “la messe”

860 For some early sixteenth-century Protestant New Testaments that exemplify the pattern of paratextual down-sizing (Bibles showed no such pattern), see Chambers, Bibliography, 2:3, 9, 15, 16, 33, 59; see also pp. 2, 4, 18, 39, 50 for early sixteenth-century editions that were shorn of paratext entirely. 861 Chambers, Bibliography, 2:124-130. 862 Ibid., 264.
(Acts 13:2), he followed the example of the Louvain edition he otherwise opposed in advertising exegetical commentary “a la marge de chaque Livre & chapitre.” The royal privilege conferred for his “N. Testament avec ses Notes” affirmed that paratext had become an essential component of this Bible’s authorization.

Even as the demand for a polemical translation began to wane, the necessity of annotation endured. In 1666, less than a year before the Nouveau Testament “de Mons” first appeared, the Oratorian Denis Amelote published his first New Testament volume with the copious footnotes, marginal glosses, and chapter summaries that progressively enveloped and overwhelmed the pages of his second and third volumes. His text, however, differed little from the Port-Royalists’ “Mons” translation, which the archbishop of Paris and the faculty of the Sorbonne uniformly condemned for perpetuating the errors of Geneva and Jansenius. In fact, the Port-Royalists accused Amelote of plagiarizing their translation! The General Assembly of the Clergy of France, however, commissioned Amelote’s version. All of its royal privileges, theological approbations, and episcopal permissions (including that of Archbishop Péréfixe) together authorized not a scriptural text, but an annotated book: “Le Nouveau

863 Ibid., 281.
864 Ibid., 264.
866 The Port-Royalists’ accusation has been substantiated by later bibliographies and reproduced by modern scholars. See Darlow & Moule, Historical Catalogue, 2.1:405: “According to the Port-Royalists, confirmed by Sainte-Beuve, Amelote’s production is merely the Port Royal version, disguised by certain changes”; and Chambers, Bibliography, 2:390: “But according to Petavel, citing Sainte-Beuve, Amelote’s translation is in large part plagiarized from the Port-Royal version.” The charge was again repeated in Chédozeau, Port-Royal, 27.
on the other hand, appeared as an unglossed text proliferating through a defiant printing campaign that targeted all social levels of the French reading public. Péréfixe feared that these “badly explicated” scriptures “were falling into the hands of all sorts of persons indifferently” causing them “to die by the letter that kills when they should have been given life by the spirit of the [letter’s] true sense.” It hardly mattered that other Mons New Testaments were printed with paratext and that some Amelote editions were printed without it. The entire political, ecclesiastical, and theological hierarchy of France had already committed itself to a title that marketed notes. If a competitor sought toleration, especially one that had to overcome suspicious origins, a more vocal and unwavering allegiance to the now authoritative tradition of printing explications was required.

Both Pasquier Quesnel and Saci himself soon perceived that the Mons New Testament had been proscribed as much for what it did not print as for what it did. In the year, Quesnel re-issued the Mons Gospels similarly shielded by a new paratextual layout.
and episcopal approbation. Reuniting the vernacular scriptures with interpretive notes, Quesnel made the Port-Royal edition conform to precedent—but only formally. For his glosses emptied the post-Tridentine tradition of its Counter-Reformation substance. Instead of framing his commentaries as bulwarks against solipsistic, heretical interpretation, as both François Véron and Denis Amelote had done, he pitched them as more benign “Christian thoughts.” Quesnel’s preface then sharpened the evangelical rhetoric of the Mons New Testament, proclaiming not just a “right” of all men and women to read the Bible, but now an “obligation.” Both textual innovations provoked conflict (and competition) later, but their peculiarities were masked for the time being by their format, as well as by the mandate Quesnel secured from Felix Vialart, the bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne. Addressing his letter to pastors, Vialart reclaimed the New Testament as “the book of priests.” His prominently displayed approbation dimmed the book’s appeal to the general populace, projecting instead a primarily clerical

870 P. Quesnel, L’ABRÉGÉ / DE / LA MORALE / DE L’EVANGILE, / OU / PENSEES CHRÉTIENNES / SUR LE TEXTE DES QUATRE EVANGELISTES/: Pour en rendre la Lecture & la Meditation plus facile / à ceux qui commencent à s’y appliquer... (Andre Pralard: Paris, 1672).
871 Chédozeau remarked that Quesnel’s “new moral way of reading the sacred texts” (“Les Bibles Français,” 147) was “less strictly faithful perhaps to the Council of Trent” (Port-Royal, 426; also 446-447).
872 This preface was revised in all subsequent editions until it returned in a 1736 edition published in Amsterdam. On the difference between “necessity” and “obligation” in the respective preface of the New Testament “de Mons” and the Abrégé, see Chédozeau, Port-Royal, 368-371, 449-450.
873 Vialart was one of the three delegates appointed by Pope Clement IX to mediate the Jansenist controversy in 1667, which led eventually to the “Paix de l’Eglise” (concordat on January 19, 1669). Vialart issued his approval of the Abrégé after Quesnel achieved an “agreement” with Archbishop Péréfixe, the ordinary of Paris where the volume was printed. On Vialart and the publishing families of Chalons-sur-Marne, see Jane McLeod, Licensing Loyalty: Printers, Patrons and the State in Early Modern France (University Park: Pennsylvania State Press, 2011), 51-54, 241n40.
874 Quesnel, L’Abrégé, a2v. At the end of his approval, Bishop Vialart concedes that priests might grant those under their care permission to read this book, but only “as it is useful according to their capacity” (f.3v), invoking a safe interpretation of Trent—that is, Chédozeau’s “position catholique romaine-français.”
readership.\footnote{Chédozeau suggests that Vialart’s imagined audience is not just a rhetorical artifice for sneaking by the censors, but the original expectation of both Quesnel and Vialart, see Port-Royal, 447.} Despite or, more likely, because of this projection, the book was able to be distributed among a much broader audience in a portable duodecimo volume.\footnote{Before Andre Pralard published Quesnel’s entire Nouveau Testament (1692) two decades later, he had issued five editions of Quesnel’s annotated gospels, while pirates were responsible for an additional six.}

For Quesnel then, as much as for Saci, Amelote, and the “Louvain” Bible publishers before him, performing the rejection of private interpretation according to the paratextual scripts developed since Trent provided enough cover to get away with stealing lines from the illicit translation of another. These producers all auditioned their books before a review committee, which historians tend to analyze through the intensely focused conceptual lens of censorship. Indeed, the board did repress deviant texts here; but, it also conferred authority on them when they assumed the characters of books that gestured toward some of the community theater’s norms of propriety—which in turn were modified by the style of these approved Bibles.\footnote{For a revisionist approach to the study of licensing and censorship in France along these lines, see McLeod, Licensing Loyalty (2011). Debora Shuger argued that in seventeenth century England, book producers often did not object “to pre-publication censorship because they desired the legitimacy—the authority—it bestowed by peer review.” See her Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 258.}

II. De-Catholicizing Quesnel: The Opposition and Competition of Michel Le Tellier, S.J.

The Jesuit Michel Le Tellier, the last confessor of Louis XIV, would become known by his detractors as the architect of Port-Royal’s demolition; some even claimed that Unigenitus, the papal bull that condemned Quesnel’s Nouveau Testament in 1713,
“was written in the shadows by the servants of Le Tellier.”

While it is undeniable that Le Tellier participated in the construction of the bull, it is not enough to understand his opposition to Quesnel as a visceral reaction against all things Jansenistic. Thirty-four years before he was appointed royal confessor, before he composed any other polemic, he had expressed concern about the resurgence of the Mons New Testaments. In 1675, while Professor of Holy Scripture at the Jesuit college of Louis-le-Grand in Paris, he published a tract euphemistically entitled *Avis Importans et nécessaires aux personnes qui lisent les traductions françaises des Saints Ecritures, et particulièrement celle du Nouveau Testament imprimé a Mons*. Le Tellier’s advice for reading the Mons New Testament proved remarkably simple: Don’t. His reasoning hewed to the two salient arguments that Archbishop Péréfixe had levied against this version in 1667/8: (1) the text deviated from the Vulgate; and (2) the publishers flouted the authority of the episcopal ordinary to license Bible editions or, in this case, to proscribe them. Péréfixe’s second ordinance also alluded to the Sorbonne’s “discovery” of numerous textual corruptions, and Le Tellier proceeded to enumerate a few dozen significant ones.

Unlike Péréfixe, however, Le Tellier had to mollify his language. The archbishop had died and the new one, François Harlay, though no friend of Jansenists, was responsible for maintaining the tenuous “Paix de l’Église” negotiated in 1669. Palpably aware of the delicate circumstances, Le Tellier advanced his searing criticism of the Mons text while struggling to preserve a polite, collegial tone towards its translators. He
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878 P. Duclos, “Le Tellier, Michel” in *Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús*, 4:2309-2310. Not only does Ceyssens’s study of Le Tellier designate him one of the “pincipaux promoteurs” of Unigenitus, it also re-opens the question of whether he played a significant role in the destruction of the monastery of Port-Royal, a charge that prior accounts had dismissed. See Ceyssens and Tans, *L’Autour*, 350, 363-365. 879 Ceyssens and Tans, *L’Autour*, 337-338, 346, 357, and again esp. 350: “Si l’on range la grace efficace et la predestination gratuite parmi les opinions erronees, il est facile de multiplier les heresies a combater.”
warned Catholic readers how this scriptural translation would lead them to “very pernicious errors,” but he hesitated to categorize these errors in loaded terms. He made not one single accusation of “Jansenism.” When he pointed out doctrinally meaningful places where the Mons and Geneva texts coincided, he suggested that the translators “without trying to insult them” committed the mistake unwittingly, “perhaps without having thought about it.” After all these courtesies, however, he still felt compelled (1) to conclude by defending himself preemptively from the charge of disturbing the peace and (2) to remove his name from the book entirely.

Just as notable as the manner and content of Le Tellier’s first assault on the new Mons versions is what Le Tellier left unopposed. He did not contest the social trajectory of the Port-Royalists’ printing campaign. The sacred text, he explained, originally was composed in a style “that appears sometimes very simple, that it might accommodate the feeble minds of the most middling sort.” He affirmed “the great number of Christians of either sex who have no knowledge of the Latin language, but who nevertheless desire the consolation of reading the scriptures and of nourishing their souls on the word of God, which is their most salutary food, as our Lord has declared”—provided that they “have the assurance that what they read is truly the word of God.” His stipulation then was intended to rule out the text Quesnel employed, but not the approach to reading that Quesnel designed. Like Quesnel, Le Tellier here did not advocate reading for apologetical training or for consolidating Catholic identity. He disparaged curiosity, but

880 Le Tellier, Avis Importans (Lyons: P[ierre]. Guillimin, 1675), 78.
881 Ibid., 40-42, 45-6, 62-3, 70-71.
882 Ibid., 77-80.
883 Ibid., 4.
884 Ibid., 18. On “inviting all the faithful” to read, see also p. 7.
so did the prefaces of both the Port Royalists’ New Testament and Quesnel’s *Abrégé*. While he invoked the Tridentine decree against private interpretation, he did not mention any paratextual conditions that corresponded to it. As long as readers cultivated a “humble and docile spirit” and “a disposition to listen to the Church,” they could “draw forth some instruction and light for making themselves capable of serving and glorifying God.” Le Tellier’s standards of exegetical submission were so nebulous that the self-described “Doyen” of the Faculty of Paris approved his book only on the condition that he add some remarks about how readers of vernacular scripture should repair to their confessors “for explication of the difficult parts.” Le Tellier’s *Avis*, therefore, counters the judgment that French Jesuits did not follow the Oratorians and Port-Royalists in recommending the reading of vernacular New Testaments until the very end of the century. Competition between the Mons and Amelote versions had generated ecclesiastical conflict and a flurry of censures in the late 1660s, but the ensuing “Paix” enabled familiar biblical formats to shelter radical proposals for lay Bible-reading. This Jesuit’s own daring proposal was a response to them, rather than to the conventional watershed moment, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), which would not happen for another decade.

The question remains whether Le Tellier’s *Avis* achieved its end of re-suppressing the Mons New Testament. The answer: certainly not Quesnel’s version of it. Pierre
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885 Le Tellier, *Avis*, 5, 13 (vs. “a roaming curiosity”); The Mons Preface of Sacy and Arnauld advises the reader to adore some of the scriptures’ depths “without trying to understand them”: *Nouveau Testament* (Mons: Gaspard Migeot, 1667, 2nd ed.), *3v*; Quesnel chastised those “qui abandonment leur esprit a une infinité de recherché purement curieuses et inutiles” in *L’Abrégé* (Paris: Pralard, 1674, 2nd ed.), *2r*.
888 Chédozeau, *La Bible at la Liturgie*, 192; Chédozeau, *Port-Royal*, 438n46.
889 Julia, “Reading,” 249.
Nicole, one of the original contributors to the Mons New Testament, wrote Quesnel in 1681 still urging him to read Le Tellier’s tract so that he somehow might “profit from its nonsense.” Instead of bothering with it over the last six years, Quesnel simply continued issuing his annotated gospels while his publisher in Paris, Andre Pralard, renewed his royal privilege to print them in 1677—for the next thirty years! Quesnel, however, was not yet the target of Le Tellier. Two new editions of Quesnel’s vernacular scripture-books immediately preceded the publication of Le Tellier’s *Avis* and openly circulated in the city where Le Tellier taught. Yet neither one was a New Testament, nor even an obvious reproduction of the Gospel text. Both were *L’Abrégé de la morale de l’Évangile*. These were titles that might lead would-be censors to mistake the scripture-books they headlined for another genre entirely—a devotional genre, not subject to the Tridentine review developed in France. Perhaps Le Tellier’s anti-Mons polemic never named Quesnel’s book because he believed that its paratextual apparatus fortified it against direct assault. What cannot be denied is that Le Tellier elected to have his *Avis* published in Lyon—the only city in France for which there is unequivocal evidence that the Port-Royalists’ New Testament was reprinted, without Quesnel’s annotations, between the Paix de l’Eglise (1669) and the end of the seventeenth century.

---

892 The *Abrégé* printed in 1674 was Pralard’s second edition. The 1675 pirated edition was issued with the false imprint of “Mons: Gaspard Migeot.”
893 For the New Testaments “de Mons” published in Lyons in 1674-1675, see Chambers, *Bibliography*, 2:526-7, 536-538, 543. Le Tellier was a professor in Paris then, publishing his two works that chronologically flanked the *Avis* in Paris.
even secured the same permissions of the Royal Procurators “Vaginay” and “De Seve” to publish his opposition to the New Testaments that the Lyonnais printers had just received the previous year to issue them. When these printers attempted to republish their New Testament during the following decade, with the support of Antoine Arnauld’s *Nouvelle Défense de la Traduction du Nouveau Testament imprimée a Mons* (1680), Le Tellier resolved that his next polemic would not be as deferential as his first.

In his *Observations sur la Nouvelle Défense* (1684), Le Tellier signaled his new strategy by opening with a dictum of Tertullian: “wherever the adulteration both of the scriptures and of their exposition has been recognized, that is where diversity of doctrine may be found.” As Le Tellier continued to unveil textual “falsifications,” which spread from a few dozen places across the New Testament to 240 in the Epistles alone, he now began to dissect the paratext as well: headings, summaries, and even a few annotations. He was no longer coy about equating “alterations” with precise heresies. In various places the Port-Royalists “borrowed maxims from the school of the Semi-Pelagians,” “insinuated the condemned dogmas of Jansenius,” and imitated “the principle of Calvin which destroys the foundation of religion.” The “Paix” was clearly over for Le Tellier.

Sensing danger again, Pierre Nicole advised Quesnel to remove from his *Abrégé* the Mons passages criticized by Le Tellier and to replace them with the approved texts of Amelote. Quesnel already had determined, however, that Le Tellier’s *Observations*

---

895 For the Lyon editions published between 1680-1681, see Chambers, *Bibliography*, 2:583-584, 590-593.
“was not even worth losing his time to address.” Manifestly confident in his existing defenses of genre, paratext, approbation, permission, privilege, and consumer demand, Quesnel had his annotated gospels published in Paris in 1685 as well, followed two years later by an edition of his commentaries on the rest of the Nouveau Testament.

Quesnel demonstrated the stability of his Mons scripture-books at the same time as Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes and commissioned 150,000 copies of Amelote’s New Testament to be distributed among those Huguenots who chose to become Catholics rather than exiles. If Le Tellier despised the translation of the Port-Royalists, he was never satisfied with the one revised by Amelote either. With the wide circulation of both now assured, Le Tellier decided to retreat, or at least shifted to defense. In 1687 he published the Défense des nouveaux Chrestiens et des missionnaires de la Chine, du Japon, et des Indes, a rejoinder to the Port-Royalist Antoine Arnauld’s scathing parody of the culturally accommodationist policies of Jesuit missionaries. If

899 Quesnel to Cl. Nicaise, dated June 23, 1684, excerpted in Quesnel inventaire, 2:2:618-9. Quesnel claimed that the Archbishop of Paris originally approved the Abregé alongside Archbishop Vialart of Chalons. “All of Paris would witness,” he insisted, that he had worked “under the eyes and with the consent of M. Archbishop François de Harlay” (see Chédozeau, Port-Royal, 439). Vialart, according to Quesnel, would have refused his approbation had he not secured this unwritten “agreement” from Harlay (Quesnel, Explication Apologetique des sentiments du P. Quesnel dans ses Reflexions sur le Nouveau Testament . . . 15 juillet 1710, 22-23). It is notable that Harlay continued to allow Quesnel’s book to be circulated in Paris even after he pushed Quesnel himself first out of the city and then out of the realm.

900 In 1685 Pralard published the 4th edition of Quesnel’s of L’Abrégé de la morale de l’Evangile; in 1687 he published his first edition of Quesnel’s L’Abrégé de la morale des Actes des apostres, des epistres de S. Paul, des epistres canoniques, et de l’apocalypse; ou, Pensees chretiennes sur le texte de ces livres sacres.

901 In his Avis (1675), Le Tellier compared several dozen “mistranslations” of the Mons text with (a) the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate and (b) “the faithful translation” of the Vulgate. This “faithful translation” does not match Amelote’s translation, which had been approved by the entire ecclesio-political establishment of France. That bibliographers and the Port-Royalists themselves accused Amelote of poaching from the Mons text itself has been noted above.

902 Arnauld’s most celebrated anti-Jesuit polemic was entitled La Morale pratique des jesuites (Paris : Estienne Michallet, [1687]). Ceyssens, in L’Autour (340), catalogued this hiatus between Le Tellier’s anti-Mons polemics and the Defense, but he does not offer any explanation for it.
Le Tellier was abandoning his campaign against the Mons texts, Quesnel did not hesitate to press his advantage, launching a counter-offensive so that his opponent might never be able to mobilize again. In 1688 he published a pseudonymous denunciation of Le Tellier’s *Défense*, accusing it of reintroducing a theology of grace that the faculties of Douai and Louvain had censured one hundred years earlier.\(^\text{903}\) If Quesnel could incite them to censure Le Tellier now, then perhaps Rome and Paris might find him guilty, too. He was right; and he rejoiced in 1690 that Douai was readying its indictment.\(^\text{904}\) In 1692, the first year that his entire *Nouveau Testament en François avec des Reflexions Morales* was published, Quesnel announced to Pierre Nicole that the Roman Index had conceded Le Tellier only five months to correct his *Défense* before it would become a forbidden book.\(^\text{905}\) Facing censorship himself, Le Tellier realized that his decades-long case for re-censoring the Mons New Testaments or any other Jansenizing work would be compromised in the court of ecclesiastical opinion. He thus turned to a different judge, the market, and decided to compete.

Quesnel discovered within a year that Le Tellier had begun collaborating with two other Jesuit priests to produce their own *Nouveau Testament*.\(^\text{906}\) In 1697 Louis Josse, the archiepiscopal printer of Paris, pressed out the first edition of their Gospels reinforced by the approbation of the Sorbonne, the permission of their ordinary, and the privilege of

\(^{903}\) *Apologie historique de deux censures de Louvain et de Douay sur la matière de la Grace, a l’occasion du livre intitule: Défense des nouveaux chretiens, Par M. Gery.* (Cologne: Nicolas Schouten, 1688).


\(^{905}\) Quesnel to Nicole, letter dated July 10, 1692, reprinted in *Le Roy, Janséniste en exil*, 1:215-6. Le Tellier’s *Defense* was placed on the Index three times: March 23, 1694; July 7, 1694; December 22, 1700.

\(^{906}\) Quesnel to Du Vaucel (June 18, 1693), reprinted in *Le Roy, Janséniste en exil*, 1:269-271.
their king. The “Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus” (the approvals only identified them corporately) let their preface explain why yet another version of the vernacular scriptures was necessary: “among all those that have appeared until now, and that Catholics have in their hands, there is none that has followed exactly the latin version commonly called the Vulgate” (A4r). They present this alleged lacuna as more of an opportunity than a problem at first (A4v). They conclude, however, by appealing to Trent, “which has declared authentic, not the Greek text of which it said nothing, but the Vulgate only. … and the same Council expressly prohibits that [the Vulgate] should be rejected under any pretext, which no doubt pertains to translators as much as or even more so than to anyone else” (A4v-5r). To demonstrate that their reading of Trent was the authoritative one, they recalled the Sorbonne’s condemnation of Benoist’s text, which they agreed was not faithful to the Vulgate (A5r). Like Archbishop Péréfixe, they neglected to observe that Benoist’s translation had become the foundation of the “Louvain” versions that French bishops did approve. As a result, the preface’s implied argument that no French translation yet met the minimal standards of Trent only underscored the opposing practices of the bishops, confirming that textual fidelity was negotiable and that legitimacy could be achieved by other means.

The Jesuits proved the legitimacy of their own version by modeling its fidelity to the original Sixto-Clementine Vulgate (1592) in text and paratext. They lifted their chapter summaries directly from this Roman Catholic authorized version, and reproduced

907 Pierre Besnier, Dominique Bouhours, and Michel Le Tellier, ed. and trans., LE NOUVEAU TESTAMENT/ De NOSTRE SEIGNEUR/ JESUS-CHRIST, TRADUIT EN FRANÇOIS/ Selon la Vulgate./ . . . / A PARIS, Chez LOUIS JOSSE Imprimeur de Mon-/seigneur l’Archevesque, . . . / M.DC.XCVII / Avec Approbation, & Privilege de Roy.
its empty, unannotated margins. The first preface to this vulgate, however, explicitly permitted the addition of printed commentary, especially from patristic sources.\footnote{See the last paragraph of the preface, reproduced in Xavier-Marie Le Bachelet, \textit{Bellarmin et la Bible Sixto-Clémentine: Étude et Documents Inédits} (Paris: Beauchesne, 1911), 148-149.} The legitimation of French Catholic Bibles had come to depend upon the representation of this type of glossing, even more than upon the reality of faithfulness to the vulgate. That is exactly why Le Tellier had tired of notes. Not only had their appearance distracted censors from spying and arresting inaccurate or even condemned translations, but they increasingly served as convoys for smuggling in heretical doctrine, as he had protested in his \textit{Observations}. By stripping away the printed explications though, the Jesuit editors did not intend to abandon readers to a naked text and to their own interpretations. They did allow one appendix to remain—and its presence was significant. The \textit{Table of Gospels and Epistles that are read in Church during Mass for the whole year} re-conceives the New Testament as a liturgical instrument.\footnote{This appendix was a staple of Catholic Bibles since the advent of print. Including it here, however, without the apparatus of printed explications that structured the French New Testaments since the mid-seventeenth century versions of Amelote, Port-Royal, and Quesnel, represented an alternative approach.} Its passages became synched with those read and expounded by the ordained pastor during the sacred rituals of common worship. Oral instruction had long been the preferred mode of catechesis in the church, and Le Tellier sought to re-integrate it with the rapid development of lay scripture-reading in Catholic France, especially after recognizing how rival factions could impose contentious theologies of sin, grace, and salvation upon the reading community by controlling the margins of Bibles.\footnote{On Quesnel’s explications being “pregnant with Augustinianism,” see Chédozeau, \textit{Port-Royal}, 478. On their theological anthropology and “moral rigorism,” see Brian Strayer, \textit{Suffering Saints: Jansenists and Convulsionnaires in France, 1640-1799} (Brighton, U.K.: Sussex, 2008), 39-42, 60.} The first edition of the Jesuits’ New Testament then prescribed the
re-oralization and liturgization of scriptural experience, even as it diffused the printed text in almost pocket-form to the reading public.

Despite its most self-conscious imitation of the Council of Trent’s official Vulgate, Le Tellier’s New Testament encountered resistance from the ordinary, whose permission the same council required. Cardinal Louis-Antoine de Noailles, the current Archbishop of Paris, mandated the correction of over one hundred sheets before he would allow the first tome to be published in his diocese, according to Quesnel, whose correspondence monitored the affair.911 Quesnel reported that Noailles refused to permit the second tome in 1699, already disgusted with himself for having permitted the first one.912 Why Noailles opposed the book is not entirely clear.913 Quesnel flatly stated that it was “badly translated,” but conformity to the vulgate could not have been Noailles’s principal grievance.914 A more likely irritant was the book’s rejection of the paratextual tradition, or rather its object of displacing the new Mons scripture-books protected by that tradition, especially the editions of Quesnel that Noailles had just re-approved.

It was, paradoxically, Noailles’s approval of Quesnel’s Nouveau Testament that ultimately proved its undoing. The content of the “moral reflections” that Quesnel attached to the Mons scriptures only attracted critical attention after Noailles certified that the augmented work had changed genre, from an “abridgment of scripture’s moral teaching” to a proper “New Testament,” the explications of which were deemed a crucial

911 Quesnel to Du Vaucel (October 26, 1696), reprinted in Le Roy, Janséniste en exil, 1:419-20.
912 Quesnel to Du Vaucel (September 12, 1699), reprinted in Le Roy, Janséniste en exil, 2:65.
913 Ceyssens claimed that Noailles refused to let the translators print their names on the New Testament on account of rumors that P. Bouhours had been unfaithful, not to the vulgate, but to his vow of celibacy. Fear of scandal can explain only part of Noailles’s resistance, however, because he registered further complaints after all names were removed. See his L’Autour, 350.
914 Quesnel to Du Vaucel (September 12, 1699), in Le Roy Janséniste en exil, 2:65.
part of the legitimation process. In 1698, an anonymous pamphlet accused Noailles of inconsistency: the “Moral Reflections” that he approved in 1695 allegedly harbored the same errors of Jansenius that he had detected and condemned in a theological treatise of 1696. With pressure mounting on Noailles to rescind his permission from Quesnel’s book, the Archbishop of Malines arrested Quesnel in 1703 and commenced a thorough review of his publications. Though Quesnel escaped to Amsterdam shortly thereafter, Le Tellier seized the opportunity to renew his campaign against the Mons New Testaments, this time by a frontal assault on Quesnel. He collaborated with Jacques-Philippe Lallemand, his colleague at the Jesuit College Louis-le-Grand, to circulate two consecutive polemics: Quesnel Seditieux in 1704 and Quesnel Heretique 1705. Just before each one appeared, the bishops of Apt and Gap posted ordinances against Quesnel’s book. Quesnel immediately pleaded with Cardinal Noailles to censure the libels of Lallemand and Le Tellier in order to undermine the censures against him. Noailles did continue to resist Le Tellier, but ultimately even the cardinal’s power was not enough. Le Tellier’s efforts to subvert Quesnel by polemic and counter-Bible were

915 The anonymous tract was entitled Problème ecclesiastique propose a M. Boileau de l’Archeveche: A qui l’on doit croire de Msr. Louis-Antoine de Noailles, evesque de Chalons, en 1695, ou de Msr. Louis-Antoine de Noailles, archeveque de Paris, en 1696. Some historians claim that it was written by the pro-Jansenist Benedictine Thierry de Viaixnes, who was hoping to shame Noailles into approving both titles. J. A. G. Tans and L. Ceyssens, however, contend that these historians are “from the Molinist camp”; instead they assign authorship, tentatively, to a cabal of Jesuits. See Tans, Les troubles causés par la Constitution Unigenitus. Correspondance entre P. Quesnel et les principaux évêques apppellants, in Lias I (1974), 186n2; Ceyssens and Tans, L’Autour, 346.

916 According to Le Roy, Lallemand was a member of Le Tellier’s “Norman cabal”; according to Ceyssens, he was Le Tellier’s “right hand.” In 1701 the two Jesuits co-founded the Mémoires de Trévoux through which, from the putative location of Trévoux, they were able to circulate more anti-Jansenist literature without the approval of their ordinary in Paris: Ceyssens and Tans, L’Autour, 334n5, 348-349, 359, 408.

917 Le Tellier and Lallemand’s polemics were republished together in 1705 and 1707 with an explicit titular link to the ordinance of the bishop of Apt: Le P. Quesnel seditieux et heretique dans ses Reflexions sur le Nouveau Testament . . . dont la lecture pernicieuse a ete interdite par des eveques d’un grand merite, & particulièrement par l’ordonnance de monseigneur l’éveque d’Apt.

918 Quesnel to [Fr. M. de Joncoux] (April 1,1704), extract printed in Le Roy, Janséniste en exil, 2:218.
reinforced decisively by his own spectacular ascent through the ecclesiastical ranks beginning the following year. In rapid succession he was made the rector of Louis-le-Grand, secretary of his company’s general assembly in Rome, provincial of the Society of Jesus in France, and finally, in 1709, royal confessor to Louis XIV. Condemnations of Quesnel’s *Nouveau Testament* seemed to follow in lockstep.

But when Le Tellier did direct his new powers of influence against Quesnel’s book, it was neither because he was flailing wildly against all the Jansenist threats that his Company imagined, nor because he rejected the vulgarization of scripture. He had decided to promote Bible-reading for all the faithful over thirty years beforehand. But since that same time he had resolved to eradicate “false translations,” especially those that deviated from the Vulgate toward the Geneva text of the French Protestants. He continued to believe that the Mons text was infected with “damnable errors,” following the solemn diagnoses of the archbishop of Paris and the pope himself in 1667/8. He could convince his church and state to condemn it again only when he maligned its legitimating paratexts. He finally defeated Quesnel’s version not by stripping away the paratexts that hid a corrupt text, but by laying bare the paratexts themselves as a “Manual of the Jansenists.”

The incriminating identity of the Mons text was detected at last too, but only as a minor accomplice, overshadowed in the line-up by the nefarious “Reflections.” In fact, the scriptural text remained almost as concealed as it had been

---

919 [Le Tellier], *Le P. Quesnel Heretique dans ses Reflexions sur le Nouveau Testament* (Brussels: M. Michiels, 1705), a3v (Avertissement). Note that Le Tellier’s title inverts the title of Quesnel’s New Testament, foregrounding the paratexts ahead of the scriptural text.

920 In *Le P. Quesnel Heretique* (139), Le Tellier identifies the Mons text as only the twentieth reason (out of twenty) to condemn Quesnel’s book. Lallemant’s *Le P. Quesnel Seditieux* (1704) ignores the Mons text completely.
when Quesnel first covered it more than three decades earlier. The Council of Trent had declared a text authentic, but in France authenticity came to depend on paratext.

IV. Making Quesnel’s *Nouveau Testament* Catholic Again, and English

Proponents of Quesnel in England followed Le Tellier’s progress carefully. Since the sixteenth century, when the Elizabethan government legally re-established the Reformation and banned “popish books,” English Catholics had been imbibing religious literature flowing through underground continental pipelines, especially those rigged into France and the Low Countries. Richard Short, a London medic also trained in philosophy at Douai, believed that Quesnel’s writings would be salutary for the urban Catholic mission that he was aiding covertly with his physical and spiritual therapy. Since 1706 he had been corresponding with Quesnel in Holland and importing his works,

---

921 All 101 propositions that *Unigenitus* (1713) condemned are drawn from Quesnel’s “Reflexions,” not his biblical translation. It is not until the penultimate page of the bull that the scriptural text is assimilated with “another French translation done at Mons long since condemned, and disagreeing very much with and differing from the vulgar edition.” The preface even depicts Quesnel’s explications as the “false prophet” who is covering himself “with sentences of the divine law as with a kind of sheeps clothing”—that is, that the heresy of Quesnel’s paratexts were hiding behind the authority of the scriptures, when all along it had been Quesnel’s paratextual form that hid the Mons text.


including “the Reflections.”

Quesnel warned Short, however, not to “draw to himself the eyes of the world if he wanted to defend the truth.” Short understood: in order to have the scripture-books of this French priest translated and published through the Catholic secret press, he had to avoid triggering not only the sedition laws of the English Protestant state, but also the sensors of the Jesuit missionaries whose confreres, he believed, were pushing the condemnation of Quesnel’s Reflections in Rome. In 1706 Richard Short published Moral Reflections upon the Gospel of St. Matthew without any attribution except “T. W.,” the initials of the elderly country squire Thomas Whitenhall who had completed the translation. All references to the authorship of Quesnel were expunged. Publishing Catholic scriptures anonymously was still a direct violation of Tridentine protocol, but had long been accepted as a practical necessity for the presses hidden in this non-Catholic kingdom.

Catholic censures could be averted by other means. Short reversed the order of the title, foregrounding the “reflections” ahead of the “gospels,” just as Quesnel had done for the two decades that his Abrégé flew under inquisitorial radar. But the need to forestall an authoritative Catholic review of the text qua scripture was not as urgent for him as it was

924 See Quesnel inventaire, 1:235, 239, 241; 2:2:1081; the third extant letter (November 6, 1706), where Quesnel inquires about Short’s translation of his “Reflexions,” is extracted in Le Roy, Janséniste en exil, 2:272-4, see also 281-282.

925 See Quesnel inventaire, 1:242; 2:2:1082.

926 MORAL / REFLECTIONS / UPON THE / GOSPEL / OF / St. Matthew. / To make the Reading of it more/ Profitable, and the Meditating / on it more Easie. / Translated from the FRENCH. / By T. W. / Printed in the Year 1706. [London], 12mo. For Thomas Whittenhall, see Gillow, Bibliographical Dictionary, 3:621; Clark, Strangers, 167; Jos Blom, Frans Blom, Frans Korsten, and Geoffrey Scott, eds., English Catholic Books, 1701-1800 (Brookfield, Vt.: Scolar, 1996), 259; Duffy, “Rubb-up,” 304n4, which refers to him as “Henry Whetenhall” in contrast to Clark (285, 360), and Gillow (5:503, 543) and the implication of the initials “T. W.” from the title of his translation.

for Quesnel, because Short jettisoned the Mons New Testament. His opening Advertisement promised that “the Text was translated from the Vulgat[e] according to the version of Rhemes 1633.” Using this pre-approved translation to meet the demands of Trent was a tactic calculated to reassure English Catholic readers as well as their Jesuit supervisors.

Not a single Jesuit, however, had been involved in the production of the Rheims New Testament. The project was commissioned by Cardinal William Allen—the same cardinal who (1) founded the English College of Douai, which was the first of the Continental seminaries that trained English Catholics to return home as missionary-priests; and who (2) had lobbied the Roman Congregation of the Index, along with Cardinal Bellarmino, to encourage the publication of paratextually barbed vernacular Bibles for those Catholics who were hemmed in by Protestant neighbors. Under Allen’s direction, the Oxford exiles Gregory Martin, Thomas Worthington, and Richard Bristow furnished a scrupulously Latinate translation with aggressively contra-Protestant notes in 1582. Their book was duly approved by the archiepiscopal vicar and theologians of Rheims, where the College of Douai had temporarily relocated. Two years before it began pouring forth from the city’s presses, the Society of Jesus initiated its own mission to England. Historians have not interpreted the close timing of these two seminal events, the advent of the English Jesuit Mission and the Rheims New Testament, as coincidental; and indeed, as we have seen, there is evidence that the Jesuits appropriated the book in

---

928 Moral Reflections (1706), a1r.
929 The first edition was entitled THE / NEW TESTAMENT / OF IESVS CHRIST, TRANSLATED FAITHFULLY INTO ENGLISH, / out of the authenticall Latin ... (Rheims, 1582).
their missionary effort. But this Counter-Reformation Bible became even more firmly identified with the Jesuit Mission by the English governments that forbade it. “The version of Rhemes 1633,” which Short employed, was the 5th edition of this English Catholic New Testament; it was opposed the same year by the 4th edition of a Cambridge divine’s state-commissioned refutation, which blasted the “invasion of a Troupe of Romish and Rhemish Iesuites, who endeavoured by this [book], as the most subtil and plausible way that ever yet they enterprised, to build up the walls of Rome in England.” Production of full-scale Rheims New Testaments and Douai-Rheims Bibles ceased during the English Civil War and did not resume for an entire century. Before Short printed his Moral Reflections on the Gospel of St. Matthew, none of his co-religionists had hazarded to publish a new translation. By recovering the “Jesuits’” Rheims text, then, he actually was reinforcing its position as the sole authoritative translation of the Vulgate for the English Catholic community.

If Short’s scriptural text would not compromise his Moral Reflections, his paratext might. The Advertisement was followed by the Author’s Preface, in which an astute reader would detect both the dates that signaled Quesnel’s authorship and the expressions that betrayed his non-conformity. This preface was the less radical one from

930 Walsham, “Unclasping the Book?,” 152-55; See also Walsham, “‘Domme Preachers’? Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print,” Past & Present, 168 (2000): 110; Daniell, Bible in English, 358.

Quesnel’s *Nouveau Testament* (1692): where the *Abrégé* (1672) had proclaimed a universal “obligation” to read scripture, this one only pronounced a “right.” Even a “right,” however, was more than the Rheims New Testament’s preface had allowed. Hearing the gospel preached was the necessity there, but private scripture-reading was a privilege dependent upon the ordinary’s assessment of regional circumstances and personal capacities—just as so many French bishops had interpreted the prescriptions of Trent.⁹³³

Sylvester Jenks, a secular priest in London whom Short had coaxed into proofreading his first manuscript, opposed the inclusion of Quesnel’s preface. In fact, he claimed that he had burned it. A self-consciously “quiet” missionary who later would be elevated as the vicar-apostolic of England’s northern district, Jenks was anxious to keep his record clean of Jansenism. He published a disclaimer in 1710, confessing that he agreed to review Short’s first volume only reluctantly, as a personal favor to the physician who had saved his life. He alleged that he had warned Short that there was still enough left in the annotations to merit the pope’s censure. Realizing that his doctor’s devotion to Quesnel was incurable, Jenks quit the project. Short salvaged the preface somehow, because it appears in extant copies of his first Quesnel gospel.⁹³⁶

---

⁹³² *Moral Reflections* (1706), a3v.
⁹³³ [Martin], *New Testament* (1582), a2r, a3r, a4r.
⁹³⁴ The quotations and details of Jenks’s life that are used in this paragraph are dependent on Gillow, *Bibliographical Dictionary*, 3:616-621.
⁹³⁵ [Jenks], *A Short Review of the Book of Jansenius . . . MDCCX. Permissu Superiorum*.
⁹³⁶ Of the six extant copies, I reviewed four at the following locations: Ampleforth Abbey, Downside Abbey, Heythrop College, and Ushaw College. The preface is present in each one.
Promptly regretting his decision, he fulfilled the penance that his priest had
prescribed. In both volumes published the next year, Short abandoned the preface. He
tore all the front matter out of the *Moral Reflections on the Gospel of St. Mark* (1707).
With Luke (1707), however, he sought not just to avoid the appearance of a forbidden
book, but to embrace the likeness of an authorized one. After the title page, he inserted
the two episcopal permissions that Vialart and Noailles had granted to Quesnel’s
scripture-books, of course without attaching Quesnel’s name to them. He informed
readers that these “orders” show how his *Moral Reflections* were published “not only by
the Permission and Approbation but even by the Command of the Church.” Then he
replaced the Author’s Preface with an entirely new one entitled, “Useful Reflections of
the R.R.F.F. of the Society [of Jesus].” Here, astonishingly, Short reproduced the
exposition of Le Tellier, Bouhours, and Besnier on literal translations of the Vulgate,
acknowledging its origin in the preface to the Jesuits’ *Nouveau Testament* (1698, 2nd
dition). In sum, Short intuited that his English Catholic readers and their supervisors
might be satisfied if he remodeled his Quesnel Bible on the very Jesuit Bible that had
been designed to sabotage it.

Not even these daft redactions, however, could preserve Quesnel’s *Reflections* for
Catholics. When Pope Clement XI issued his first general condemnation of Quesnel’s

937 *Moral Reflections upon the Gospel of St. Mark* (1707), a1r, in copies at Dr. Williams’s Library and
Oscott College Library. The other copies at Oscott, the Bodley, and the British Library were bound together
with other Quesnel volumes and did not possess any frontmatter.
938 Of seven extant copies, all three that I reviewed (at Ampleforth, Bodley, & NYPL) wanted frontmatter.
939 “F. T.” is Francis Thwaites, a secular priest educated at Douai and the nephew of Whittenhall.
940 *Moral Reflections upon the Gospel of St. Luke* (1707), a6r, borrowed from [Le Tellier et al.], *Nouveau Testament* (1697),
ã12r–e3r.
Reflexions Morales in 1708, Short’s press stopped.\textsuperscript{942} The following year Short began to reconsider. Why should a Latin edict from Rome about a French book concern English Catholic prelates who were struggling to maintain a hidden church on a Protestant island? Perhaps these worlds were so disconnected that London’s vicar apostolic, Bonaventure Giffard, was not yet even aware of the papal brief. Quesnel reasoned that his French adversaries would have to make their own effort to get the brief publicized in England; and Quesnel confided to Short in March 1709 that he did not think Le Tellier had enough credit to do that.\textsuperscript{943} Short’s press was in motion again when, three weeks later, Quesnel expressed shock and utter bewilderment upon learning that Le Tellier had just been named royal confessor while, simultaneously, the Roman Index issued its official condemnation of Le Tellier’s Defense of the Chinese Rites.\textsuperscript{944} One month later Giffard assured his Jesuit interlocutors that he suppressed Short’s publication of the Moral Reflections upon the Gospel of St. John (1709) as soon as the year-old bull was made known to him.\textsuperscript{945} Short ultimately failed in England because Le Tellier won in France—even though he lost in Rome.

Short had tried to legitimize Quesnel’s Gospels by performing adherence to Tridentine regulations, just as they had been developed among English Catholics. He

\textsuperscript{942} The hiatus between the publication of the Moral Reflections on Luke (1707) and John (1709) led one historian to conclude that Short died in 1708. See Gillow, Bibliographical Dictionary, 5:503. Duffy, however, pushed Short’s death back to December 1709 (“Rubb-up,” 309), which is more harmonious with the chronology of the Quesnel-Short correspondence. Quesnel continued to write him until 1712. See Quesnel Inventaire, 1:252, 256-257, 263.

\textsuperscript{943} Quesnel Inventaire 1:246; 2.2:1082; letter (March 12) extracted in Le Roy, Janséniste en exil, 2:301-302.

\textsuperscript{944} Du Vaucel to Quesnel, April 4, 1709, recorded in Quesnel Inventaire, 2.2:1086.

\textsuperscript{945} Duffy, “Rubb-up,” 307. Vicar-Apostolic Giffard could impose discipline on Short effectively because he used to be Short’s confessor. Catholic pastors were unable to censor English Catholic books generally and, moreover, were unwilling to alert their Protestant hosts to potential sources of dissidence.
substituted the approved, English translation of the Vulgate for the version of Mons; he showcased the requisite approbations; his copious “Reflections” appeared to mirror the dense annotations of the authorized Douai-Rheims Bible. Short’s scripture-books may have appealed to an English Catholic readership, but they could not persuade English Jesuits that they were safe for them too, even with their jesuitizing accommodations. So, in his final Quesnel volume, Short renounced all of them. Published the same year that Giffard foreclosed his English Catholic market, Short’s second edition of the *Moral Reflections upon the Gospel of St. Matthew* (1709) beckoned for an alternative consumer base. Short reinstated Quesnel’s “Author’s Preface” that he cautiously omitted three years earlier. That it could incite his ecclesiastical superiors to accuse him of heterodoxy no longer worried him, because he no longer was engaging with them. His new “Advertisement” confirmed his new audience: “as care is taken to make the English answer faithfully the French Original, so no Alterations are made in any of the Expressions which do not suit with the Opinions commonly receiv’d in England.”

“The Opinions commonly receiv’d in England” were certainly not the same as those defended by Pope Clement XI against the alleged assault of Quesnel. This “Advertisement,” therefore, asked English *Protestant* readers not to be scandalized by any Catholic-tinged expressions in an otherwise good book, and not to hold the anonymous English producers responsible for them. The translator, it suggested, merely followed sound philological principle in faithfully rendering the original rather than expurgating it

---

946 MORM / REFLECTIONS / UPON THE / GOSPEL / OF / St. Matthew. . . Printed in the Year 1709. [London.] a1r. Clark mistakenly believed this “Advertisement” was present in the first edition of Short’s *Moral Reflections* (1706), and so interpreted it not as an advertisement but rather a prophylactic, protecting a Catholic book from English government censors. See her *Strangers & Sojourners*, 167.
for sensitive eyes. The publisher withdrew his previous “advertisement” of the Rheims text, of course, because his current patron community did not consider that version legitimate. For that community, there was only one Authorized Version, and Richard Russel, as we shall see, knew to market that version explicitly when he first attempted to sell Quesnel’s Reflections in 1719. By that time, however, it had been a decade since the English editions of Quesnel’s scripture-books had been converted from Catholicism.

V. Making Quesnel’s New Testament Protestant

The papal bull Unigenitus did as much to keep Quesnel’s Bible open in England as it did to close it in France. That Catholic books circulated across Europe to an extent formerly ascribed to the Calvinist international publishing network has been recognized already.947 Recent scholarship, moreover, has multiplied examples of Protestants appropriating Catholic devotional literature, sometimes expurgated and licensed and sometimes not, especially in England.948 The Bible, however, was supposed to be different. Historians have highlighted the transformation of Luther’s German New Testament and French Geneva Bibles into licit Catholic editions, but not migration in the

---

other direction. But Protestant Tudor and Stuart regimes had forbidden English Catholic Bibles since they were first published in 1582. But Richard Russel believed that he could use *Unigenitus* to persuade his English audience that this Catholic Bible was Protestant. He explained in his preface that he attached “the act whereby the Pope condemns the Book, [that] it may serve as a recommendation of it to us” (xiii). Still, Russel realized that this exotic “recommendation” might not be enough to assure his pious patrons that the whole work was doctrinally safe and sound. Unlike Quesnel, Le Tellier, and Short, Russel lacked the assistance of an institutionalized system for validating the orthodoxy of religious publications within his own confessional tradition. The responsibility of the Stationers’ Company to police the content of registered books had dissolved when the Licensing Act lapsed in 1695. In the absence of another analog to the Sorbonne and Roman Congregation of the Index, Russel promised his readers that he had performed the role of the censor himself. He dutifully expurgated Quesnel’s commentaries, showcasing his corrections in “crotchets” and then shaming the “popish errors” by parading them back out in a final appendix (x).

Making the book anti-Roman was only the first step to making it properly English. Unlike Le Tellier, Russel did not question whether Quesnel’s New Testament was rendered from “the vulgar Latin” (ix). Russel assumed it was, and consequently refused to translate it. He pledged instead that he “printed the Text according to our own english translation” (ix). The reign of this translation, which we now know as the AV,

---

had become entrenched in England with the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660—
that is, just a few years before Quesnel began to show how porous the Vulgate's
dominion was over the Catholic world. Though Russel was under no legal obligation to
use the AV text, he considered it necessary for procuring the economic allegiance of
English Protestant readers.

Russel did not translate Quesnel’s commentary afresh either. He confessed to
borrowing the English Catholics’ translation, but only after purifying that too, sweeping
out the “Gallicisms and other odd words” that “daily corrupt our language” (xi-xii).
Russel insinuated that Catholics were to blame for sullying the national idiom, but he
could not have been unaware that they were no longer the ones primarily responsible for
the invasion of French books. Bibliographers have designated the end of the seventeenth-
century as the origin of “Anglomania” in France, where French readers began devouring
English-language books of political philosophy, experimental science, and enlightenment
literature. Yet, in the same period, French books were pouring into England at an
unprecedented rate. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 swept into London a
substantial refugee community of French Huguenots, many of whom were intent to vend
religious texts in their native tongue. Furthermore, the Copyright Act of 1710 removed

---

951 How the AV became sacrosanct, almost invested with that aura of divine inspiration attributed to the
original texts, is traced in Jonathan Sheehan, The Enlightenment Bible (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton
University Press, 2005). Sheehan links the stagnation of English translation efforts until the late eighteenth
century with contemporary anxieties that historical-philological scholarship would undermine the
theological authority of the Bible. Emphasis on the specter of skepticism and the rigidification of the text,
however, can obscure the possibilities for experimenting with scriptural formats that Russel exposes and
that had profound political, social, and confessional resonances beyond that of the Deist controversy.
952 In Scotland and Ireland, however, use of the AV had been made compulsory. See Mandelbrote, “The
English Bible and its Readers in the Eighteenth Century,” in Books and Their Readers in Eighteenth-
953 Georges Ascoli, La Grande-Bretagne devant l’opinion francaise au XVIIe siecle (1930; Geneva:
Slatkine, 1971), 2:172, 175-344; Donald Bond, “Introduction” in C. A. E. Rochedieu, Bibliography of
traditional restrictions on the importation of non-English books, and the close of the War of Spanish Succession in 1713 marked the end of Anglo-French conflict and the trade embargo that had accompanied it. It was not much of a coincidence then that the year that Russel published the first volume of Quesnel’s *New Testament* was the same one that the influx of French books to England was reaching its zenith. This proliferation must have acquainted Russel with new opportunities for translation as well as with the need to distinguish his own text by its distance from inferior transliterations, which in this case he did not hesitate to label Catholic.

By demonstrating that his authorized text was bound to orthodox annotation, Russel would seem to have satisfied the same conditions for validating a Bible that Quesnel did in France. That was precisely Russel’s problem. If exegetical paratexts validated a Bible in France, they could brand it as foreign in England. For when Le Tellier decoupled text and commentary from an approved New Testament, he was striving to re-establish a precedent in his Catholic realm that had been settled in Protestant Britain almost a century earlier—and for similar reasons. Ever since James VI/I reacted to the “bitter notes” of the Geneva Bibles and the Rheims New Testament by vacuuming out the margins of the AV in 1611, glossing had been reconstructed as a sectarian act, if not a seditious one. Protestant non-conformists reinforced these

---


suspicions when they strapped the Geneva notes back onto the pages of AVs, and then printed them from their refuge in Amsterdam both during and after the English Revolution. Reversing this troubling legacy of annotation would be especially challenging for Russel, given his own borderline political identity. He was a non-juror: a minister deprived of office for refusing to abjure the Stuart court (sheltered in France) and to swear allegiance to the Hanoverian King George I. Though Russel’s theology and politics were inextricably intertwined, the latter was more potentially compromising—without the licensing act, only the laws against sedition remained to discipline the press.

If returning glosses to the scriptural text was a subversive enterprise for Russel, it was at the same time his only hope for publishing a legitimate Bible in England. Seeking a royal privilege, as Quesnel and Le Tellier had done in France, would have been a vain pursuit. The King’s Printer and the two universities already held an exclusive privilege to produce Bibles, which they guarded jealously and litigiously. A few crafty entrepreneurs, however, had exploited a loophole: publish “paraphrases” or “expositions” instead of “Bibles,” and then package the complete text of the AV neatly within them. A similar genre game, indeed, had provided cover to Quesnel’s Abrégé. The difference

was that Quesnel’s *Reflexions* concealed a condemned text, whereas Russel’s *Reflections* had to shroud the authorized one.

Since Russel’s dissent had cost him his parish in Sussex, he needed his new book to be not just acceptable, but lucrative.\(^{960}\) To solicit a wider clientele than the Jacobite hard-core, he tried to suggest that his glossed New Testament ought to be welcomed by all socially and theologically respectable readers. Unlike the English Catholic version, which was printed “with a small and indifferent character, and on very ordinary paper” (Russel, ix), his edition conformed to national standards of excellence in both religion and workmanship. On the other hand, his *Reflections* would help correct less worthy domestic traditions of Bible-usage. The preface of Quesnel that Russel reproduced berated those who “take upon themselves to interpret the holy scriptures of their own heads.” Quesnel’s *Reflexions* would help readers cultivate “respect, docility, caution, humility, submission, and simplicity of faith, far from bringing along the presumption, pride, boldness, and that spirit of self-sufficiency and independency, which heresy insensibly conveys into all those whom she has seduced” (xxxviii). Russel promoted his adaptation similarly as a remedy for the undisciplined scripture-reading of “the generality of persons who receive so little advantage from the free use of scriptures” (vii), appropriating an establishment critique of vulgar reading practices that was calculated to make his transgressive reintroduction of scriptural annotation appear, by contrast, more conservative.\(^{961}\)

---

\(^{960}\) Russel first tried farming to make ends meet, but he quickly determined that it was “a business for which, both by genius and education, he was very unfit.” Russel, *New Testament*, 1:xviii.

\(^{961}\) Russel makes another pejorative reference to the “generality of persons” in his farewell sermon, *The Obligation of Acting According to Conscience, especially as to Oaths* (London, 1716), 21. For conservative
Russel’s purposes were not simply commercial. They were devotional, but they were more than that, too. What should not be overlooked is Russel’s urge to disseminate these “Reflections” on account of the marginalized political and ecclesiastical principles embedded within them, however much his marketing strategy suggested the contrary. Quesnel’s Reflexions were flavored with the Gallican and acutely Augustinian sensibilities of a Jansenizing Catholic priest, most of which the non-jurors wanted the English public to taste. The divine right of bishops and kings, the abuse of oaths, and the illegitimacy of secular control of ecclesiastical office—all generously mixed into Quesnel’s scriptural exegesis—were the necessary ingredients of Russel’s refusal to swear allegiance to George I.

Since Russel attached his name to the publication, he did not openly avow sentiments liable to be held seditious. On the other hand, he did not want his points buried completely, so he supplied readers a map for unearthing some. Immediately after assuring them in his preface that he had purged the text of “erroneous tenets,” he admitted rather curiously that he did not expurgate everything. He requested forbearance in these places, singling out two “which, tho’ designed by the Author in a popish [sense],

\[\text{discourses against undisciplined Bible-reading in the post-Reformation era, see David Katz, } \text{God’s Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2004), 40; Sherman, } \text{Used Books, 115-118; Green, Print and Protestantism, 43-44; Mandelbrote, “English Bible,” 40. The rector William Lowth’s } \text{Directions for the Profitable Reading of Scripture (1708), republished in 1712, 1726, 1735, and 1769, reveals their currency through Russel’s generation. Lowth (1769 ed., 28-33, 38-39) scolds those of “meaner capacities” whose reading practices strengthen the “papists’ objections”: they must heed the minister’s interpretation and not perplex themselves with abstruse passages, which has lead them to confuse doctrine and disturb the kingdom.}\]

\[\text{Russel reported that he was able to enlist subscribers even among “persons whose political principles are directly counter to mine.” New Testament (1719), 1:x.}\]

\[\text{See Paul Kleber Monod, } \text{Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 17-19.}\]

\[\text{On oaths, see Russel, New Testament, 1:49, 185, 492; on the divine right of kings and bishops and on whether the state ought to control ministers, see volume 4:15-17, 67, 85-6, 91, 191, 431, 547, 558.}\]
are notwithstanding true in an orthodox sense” (x). Upon flipping to the second place (John 20:2-8), the reader finds an affirmation of pastoral authority to interpret scripture for the faithful and, by extension, a vindication of the structure of Russel’s glossed New Testament. Russel had voiced his hermeneutical agenda more clearly (and stridently) in the farewell sermon that he had published anonymously three years earlier. There he vilified “Dissenters” for de-contextualized reading practices which caused them “to pervert and abuse scripture,” the effect of which is “that unreasonable schism, which has so long infested this Nation, and involved us in so much Blood and Confusion.”\(^{965}\) He, of course, had made sure to distance himself from an alleged Judeo-Catholic tradition of commentary that privileged paratext over the text itself.\(^{966}\) Concluding that sermon with a plea for a middle way between “Papists on one Hand, and Fanatics on the other,” Russel took it upon himself to assemble a composite scriptural book that both suggested and would be itself the solution.\(^{967}\)

The first unexpurgated passage that Russel identified for his readers was more overtly political. The scriptural citation (John 13:24-25) led to a critical analysis of the subject’s relationship to the sovereign. The Reflections conceded that “Piety must with simplicity obey power,” yet it maintains that “we must be curious to know who are bad, upon no Account but to the Advantage of the Church, and to secure ourselves against them.” The application of Quesnel’s counsel to the present state of England certainly would not have felt conservative to the incumbent Hanoverian regime. But Russel’s meticulous efforts to package his whole edition as such enabled him to enlist subscribers

\(^{965}\) Russel, The Obligation of Acting According to Conscience, especially to Oaths (1716), 10-11.
\(^{966}\) Ibid., 16-17.
\(^{967}\) Ibid., 23.
quite successfully, not only in the relief of his financial straits, but in his subtle rebuke of the government that caused them.

VI. Conclusions

Although Russel’s edition of Quesnel’s book may not have been the only one motivated at least in part by subversive political and theological commitments, as indeed Le Tellier insisted, the stated objectives of all the versions appear uniformly innocuous: to help scripture-readers grow in personal piety. No one in any of the confessionalized communities surveyed here quarreled with that objective. Yet neither authorities nor consumers considered that objective sufficient for a vernacular Bible edition to be approved. Authors, translators, and publishers carefully adjusted their editions of the *Nouveau Testament* to existing paratextual traditions and reader expectations, altering both in the process. Stretching to meet some measures of legitimacy could allow wiggle room in others. By securing the permission of the ordinary, feigning a clerical audience, assuming a devotional genre, claiming fidelity to the vulgate, and performing hostility to private interpretation, Quesnel’s books at least for a time lulled official reviewers into looking past the identity of their scriptural texts and the substance of their explicative notes. Bible-producers in England, however, considered translation a non-negotiable issue. Richard Russel and Richard Short quite simply reproduced the “authorized versions” that they believed their respective Protestant and Catholic readerships demanded. But after Russel met that requirement and exhibited his anti-papal credentials,
he was able to smuggle even dissident commentary past his own community’s boundaries and back into the margins of Bibles.

The Tridentine decree on the Vulgate still mattered for Catholics and the principle of *sola scriptura* still mattered for Protestants. But for constructing vernacular Bibles, regional developments and alterations mattered more, neither of which were reducible to confessional allegiances. The opposite was true. Paratext could trump the official text in Catholic France, whereas in Protestant England the official text could trump paratext—or the duty to be liberated from it. For the English Catholic community, where the institutional Catholic Church was unable to impose regular discipline and the discipline of the Church of England was rejected (if only in principle), the textual and paratextual requirements for legitimating Bibles proved to be, paradoxically, the least flexible. The struggle between Quesnel’s proponents and competitors ultimately diversified the modes of packaging and appropriating scripture-books in both French and English. By the end of the second Reformation century, then, the conditions for legitimating other peoples’ scriptures had become malleable enough to be reshaped by the diverse forms in which Quesnel’s New Testament squeezed through them.

“Trans-confessional texts,” as some have labeled them, did inhabit this turn-of-the-century publishing world, which was as dominated by religious printed matter as it had been since the invention of print.968 But a road map for charting their course across reformation barriers, which highlights the movement of biblical texts from Protestant to Catholic editions and of Catholic devotional material the other way around as if both

---

were distinct genres passing through opposite one-way streets, is misleading. The avenues of exchange were, instead, multi-directional as well as intersecting. The transformations of books studied here, furthermore, suggest flaws in a conceptual framework that considers form and layout extrinsic to an essential text, the bodily content of which is what all readers genuinely sought no matter the “robes” that it might have to cast on or off to gain entrance into a specific community. In each case, it was not just the scriptures in themselves that were desired, but particular ways of expressing and encountering them. All readers—editors, licensors, and customers—participated in determining these ways, sometimes in concert and sometimes in contest. Neither way should be presumed before exploring, in the creative adaptations of books as much as in the purgings of text, the guidelines they crafted for structuring the local contours of their scriptural communities.

VII. Scripture-Books after Quesnel

The history of Quesnel’s book does not just reflect, in a passive sense, the types of vernacular scripture-books that could be legitimated in multiple kingdoms and confessional communities; the reconstructions themselves helped reconstitute the boundaries of legitimacy. Richard Russel showed it was possible to privilege text over

---

970 For the concept of the “textual community,” or groups of readers who respond to similar texts in similar ways, see Brian Stock, The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983). The concept is useful here as long as we recognize how decisively the material organization of scriptural texts affected possibilities for appropriation.
paratext in the title of a New Testament commentary and yet still avoid a conflict with
the existing Bible monopolies. Three years after Russel’s first volume appeared, another
set of London printers re-tested the experiment publishing *The New Testament, with . . .
notes chiefly on the difficult and mistaken texts of scripture*, by the vicar Francis Fox.971
By 1726, the year after Russel’s last volume appeared (safely, once again), a pattern had
been established: London printers adopted the same nomenclature for their Bible
commentaries every year for the rest of the decade. At the same time, these printers were
emboldened to change the independent variable of English Bibles, namely the authorized
text. The first attempt at a new English translation was derived from a French text
composed by the Protestant chaplains of the king of Prussia; the second was from the
“Original [Greek] Text”; and the third, in 1730, “according to the Ancient Latin
Edition.”972 Yet two levels of legitimacy ought to be distinguished here: what was
possible to print is not identical to what was welcome. None of these new translations
was reprinted anytime soon.973 Popular attachment to the AV, however, was attested most
eloquently by competitors, one of whom in 1768 lamented “that the bald and barbarous
language of the old vulgar version hath acquired a venerable sacredness from length of

---
971 *The New Testament, with references set under the words at length so that the parallel texts may be seen
at one view: to which are added the chronology, marginal readings, and notes chiefly on the difficult and
973 Only one of these English versions appears to have been issued again that century, and then only in part:
*A/ NEW VERSION / OF THE / GOSPEL / ACCORDING TO / SAINT MATTHEW:/ WITH A / LITERAL
COMMENTARY / ON ALL THE DIFFICULT PASSAGES/ . . . WRITTEN ORIGINALLY IN FRENCH / by
Messieurs DE BEAUSOBR and LENFANT* (Cambridge, 1779). The other two versions are Daniel Mace,
*THE / NEW TESTAMENT / IN GREEK and ENGLISH* (London, 1729); and Richard Simon, *The New
Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: according to the antient Latin edition. With critical
remarks upon the literal meaning in difficult places* (London, 1730).
time and custom. As Richard Russel perceived in 1719, this “vulgar version” was still England’s Vulgate.

National commitments to a naked scriptural text were, on the other hand, more negotiable. Russel recognized this opportunity just as clearly as he had discerned the value of presenting a stable, venerable text. Buttressing the AV with Quesnel’s reflections, Russel fashioned an annotated scripture book that enhanced a quickly developing genre of “Family Bibles.” These heavy, deluxe Bibles, laden with devotional commentary, and marketed as “very useful for families,” were printed often by subscription just as Russel’s New Testament was. But the domestication of biblical reading experience and interpretation was not necessarily as conservative or quiescent as it was meant to appear. Most frequently issued by evicted ministers, these glossed books relocated the primary place of exegesis from the established church and its pulpits to the privacy of the household. Russel had not only seethed against the “fanatical” impulse to extricate scripture from the senses communicated by authority and tradition, but he designed his whole project of biblical annotation in opposition to it. Despite Russel’s inclinations, what his project made possible was an expansion of nonconformist reading opportunities for those on the high-church end of the political and ecclesiastical spectrum. These readers could use Quesnel’s commentary to appropriate the scriptural text separately, without the direction of the new establishment that had disenfranchised

---

them, according to the pattern set out by contemporary low-church dissenters as well as by English Catholics long before them.\footnote{In \textit{Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript, and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), Andrew Cambers illuminates the communitarian settings in which puritans and dissenters read the Bible, challenging the dominant motif of the solitary godly reader and suggesting that the reading practices of English Catholic non-conformists might be studied the same way.}

Since 1582 these English Catholics had possessed their own New Testament replete with the apologetical and liturgical paratexts that could support a dissenting community of belief and worship. Even though the book had not been republished since 1633, it retained in both form and substance a quasi-canonical status. Richard Short’s \textit{Moral Reflections} on the four gospels were not the only unsuccessful attempts to replace it. Both Cornelius Nary and Robert Witham understood that annotations were necessary, marketing the same on their title-pages.\footnote{[Cornelius Nary], \textit{THE / NEW TESTAMENT / OF OUR/ Lord and Saviour / Jesus Christ, / Newly Translated out of the Latin Vulgat. / AND / with the Original Greek, and divers tran-scriptions in vulgar languages diligently / compared and revised. / TOGETHER / With Annotations . . . .} (n.p., 1718); [Robert Witham], \textit{ANNOTATIONS / ON THE / NEW TESTAMENT} (n.p., 1730). But with new translations accompanying their new glosses, these versions were less similar to the original template than Short’s. Nary’s New Testament was placed on the Roman Index in 1722, but Witham’s did not require a condemnation to fail. Neither one survived beyond a second printing. Only Richard Challoner’s New Testament was able to secure a stable place in the market, progressing through nine editions from 1738 until the end of the century; but Challoner, who would later become the vicar apostolic of London, explicitly co-opted and revised the Rheims text, debuting his book as \textit{The Rheims New Testament, 5th edition}. The Rheims version, though never solemnly decreed the “only authentic” one, continued to demand a more exclusive allegiance from English Catholics than the Vulgate ever did for the French.
Though Quesnel’s scripture books had been banished from the English Catholic community, a comparable style of devotional commentary found a way to return. It is difficult to determine how widely read Short’s Quesnel-adaptations were before they were suppressed. But when Thomas Meighan succeeded Thomas Metcalfe as the principal Catholic publisher of London in 1715, he began to publish works that approximated their function. John Gother, the missionary who received Richard Challoner into the Catholic Church, had been issuing “practical thoughts” and “moral reflections” on the gospels and epistles that were read during the liturgy of the mass until his death in 1704. Meighan revived these in 1717, frequently republishing them through mid-century. At that point Richard Challoner, the architect of the reconstructed Rheims New Testament, capitalized on the genre by publishing and then republishing his own Morality of the Bible. Ultimately then, the biblical entrees of “Christian thoughts” and “moral reflections” that Quesnel had prepared were consumed by English Catholics on a different plate, but in a familiar setting—that is, a liturgical one. While their Rheims New Testament remained fundamentally intact, complementary books were produced alongside it to facilitate the evolution of their sacred reading habits,

---

978 Duffy claimed that Quesnel was “popular among English Catholics,” but did not try to justify the claim (“Rubb-up,” 311). Fewer than ten copies of each of Short’s volumes are known to be extant.
979 For Gother’s liturgical works, see James Crichton, Worship in a Hidden Church (Dublin: Columba, 1988), 68-80.
980 Meighan republished the volumes of Gother’s Instructions / FOR THE/ whole year... Being / Practical Thoughts on the / EPISTLES, GOSPELS, and LESSONS ... in 1717, 1718, 1723, 1726, 1730, 1736, 1744, and 1752, as well as THE / Instructive PART / OF THE / MASS; / VIZ. / MORAL REFLECTIONS/ ON THE / INTROIT, PRAYER, EPISTLE and/ GOSPEL of all the Sundays / in the year in 1729.
981 [Richard Challoner], The Morality of the / BIBLE:/ Extracted from all the canonical / books ... for the use of such pious Christians as/ desire to nourish their souls to eternal / life (London, 1762), republished in 1765.
with the scripts for common worship and interior development now meeting and interacting within one scriptural volume.\textsuperscript{982}

In like manner, \textit{Unigenitus} signaled the victory of Le Tellier over Quesnel’s \textit{Nouveau Testament}, but not the defeat of the genre it developed. The church hierarchy was not alone in deciding the legitimacy of Catholic New Testaments. The reading public judged, too. Le Tellier must have determined that he could not satisfy the persistent demands of the latter court with only his denuded liturgical New Testament, though it did proceed through several editions.\textsuperscript{983} In 1713, the same year that Pope Clement XI promulgated his bull, Jacques-Philippe Lallemant re-released the gospels of Le Tellier and his Jesuit companions, this time with their own \textit{Réflexions Morales}, adopting the same title and paratextual style that Quesnel had concocted to legitimize his New Testament for both judges decades earlier.\textsuperscript{984} The initial public response must have gratified Lallemant’s Parisian publisher, who issued a second edition of these Quesnelized Jesuit gospels the next year, followed by another eight more volumes to complete the New Testament over the course of the decade. A third edition was published in 1757, the watershed year in which Pope Benedict XIV waived the general ban on vernacular scripture-reading that the Roman Index had imposed in 1596. While finally pulling canonical legislation into line with broader Catholic practice, the papal brief still left a few constraints in place. Prominent among these were (1) the requirement for

\textsuperscript{983} The first edition of the gospels only was published in 1697 and republished in 1698. The entire New Testament was published in a variety of forms and layouts in 1703, 1704, 1709 (twice), 1711, and 1734.  
\textsuperscript{984} [Lallemant], \textit{REFLEXIONS / MORALES:/ AVEC / DES NOTES / SUR / LE NOUVEAU TESTAMENT, / Traduit en Francais}, 2nd ed. (Paris: Montalant, 1714-25), 12 mo., 12 vols. The first edition (1713) contained only the four gospels.
explicative notes and (2) the re-prohibition of works defending Quesnel’s *Nouveau Testament.* Both, paradoxically, represented victories for Quesnel: the first, that the court of ecclesiastical opinion had decided against the bare, unannotated scriptural layout of his nemesis Le Tellier; the second, that efforts to promote and appropriate Quesnel’s books had continued despite the previous decisions of that same court. Quesnel’s New Testament had become French, Catholic, English, and Protestant, and Le Tellier’s protégé showed how it might become both Jesuit and Roman, too.

---

985 Decr. S. Congregationis Ind. 13 junii 1757, reprinted in Chédozeau, *La Bible et la Liturgie,* 44-46. Note also that the brief confirmed an absolute prohibition on certain works of heretics, including “the holy Bible printed by their care, or augmented by their notes, arguments, summaries, scolia, and indices.”
PART IV:

CONCLUSION: THE READER
Reglossing the Vulgate after the Reformation:

Thomas Marwood (d. 1718), Convert Tutor & Revolutionary Reader?

*Sola Scriptura* was invoked not only as the epistemological foundation of a new Reformed Church, but also as the ideal structure of a new Reformed Bible. Liberating the sacred text from the scholastic commentary that engulfed it was a rhetorical priority among early Protestant Reformers, including William Tyndale, the translator of the first edition of the English New Testament. In 1531, from his refuge in Antwerp, he reportedly promised King Henry VIII that he would “most humbly submit himself at the feet of his royal Majesty if he would grant only a bare text of the scriptures to be put forth among his people.”\(^{986}\) Tyndale, however, issued no such thing. In order to make his New Testament text more digestible, or as he put it, “more apte for weake stomachs”, he printed alongside it much of Luther’s marginal commentary; seven decades later, a successor of King Henry was still unwilling to forgive him for that. To James I, Tyndale’s “pestilent glosses”, as he called them, inaugurated an appalling new tradition that was perpetuated and exacerbated by the ubiquitous Geneva Bibles, whose notes he labeled “very partiall, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceites.”\(^{987}\) The campaign of King James to sweep commentary out of the Authorised Version, excepting only concordances and variant readings, is well known.

\(^{986}\) See Chapter 2.
What is not is the parallel but prior campaign to purge the margins of the Vulgate, which was the Authorized Version of the King’s Catholic subjects according to the Council of Trent. There in 1546, the Vulgate was recognized as “authentic” even though it was simultaneously recognized that the Vulgate needed to be emended and “printed in the most correct manner possible.”

Despite the urgency of the decree, a half century passed before anyone of competent authority assumed responsibility for implementing it. When Pope Sixtus V finally took the project upon himself, he determined to make the authentic text “pure and pristine.” His bull Aeternus Ille, which accompanied the first printing of the Sixtine Vulgate in 1590, explained his decision to print the text and only the text in language pregnant with the subsequent grievances of King James. By forbidding glosses, he would ensure that “the false and captious scholia of the heretics would not creep back into the margin.”

Even variant readings he refused. It was not because these undermined any particular church teaching, he asserted, but because they at best distracted the reader and at worst engendered a kind of bold, argumentative spirit toward this “most proven edition of the scriptures itself, which should be the bond of peace, the unity of faith, the nexus of charity, the consensus of dissent, and the most certain norm in matters of doubt.”

Sixtus’s decision was to be final. Anyone who infringed the bull by daring to print a Latin Bible from a different exemplar than this one, with all its blank margins, would suffer excommunication. The question now is whether Sixtus indeed had his hand on the pulse of the reading public.

---

888 For more, see Chapter 1 & 6.
889 Franz Kaulen, Geschicte Der Vulgata (Franz Kirchheim: Mainz, 1868), 452.
890 Kaulen, Geschicte, 450.
891 Kaulen, Geschicte, 450.
What were readers and printers doing when they occupied the margins that he deliberately left empty? Did annotation constitute a radical act of defiance as Sixtus appeared to anticipate? Or was it simply a function of the more mundane need for note-paper, as William Sherman, Peter Stallybrass, and others have made plain.992 The latter is undeniable. Yet when reader marks actually engaged the text, it seems that the scholars who study them are inclined to follow at least something of Sixtus’s line of thought – that manuscript annotation is our source matter for unsanctioned readings of authorized texts; that we should track Michel De Certeau’s “poachers” in order to uncover the intellectual liberty and eccentricity hidden in an era that increasingly demanded conformity; and that Bible margins in particular are where we might come closest to observing how individuals were interpreting those scripture books that they could now hold themselves, privately rejecting the party line delivered them either in print or from the pulpit.993

This final chapter explores one Tridentine Vulgate and its accompanying manuscript notes, which were composed by Thomas Marwood, a late seventeenth century


tutor in an English Catholic household (Fig. 7.1). This layman’s systematic
annotation of this Vulgate should appear impressive given Sixtus’s pronounced
opposition to marginalia; but also because English Catholics, unlike their coreligionists in
Italy and Spain, were supposed to have had their own vernacular scriptures—the Douai-
Rheims Bible. Furthermore, Marwood should have been even more familiar with the
Authorized Version of King James, since he had been raised in the Church of England.
Marwood’s book then may provide an opportunity to reflect not only on the questions
already posed above but also upon the conventional polarities in the history of Bible-
reading that have surfaced in the six chapters below: Catholic vs. Reformed, Clerical vs.
Lay, Learned vs. Vulgar, Center vs. Periphery, and Marginal Notes vs. Authorized
Readings.
Before rushing to the notes, however, we should recall the preface. Recounted there is a litany of paratexts that do not appear in this Bible, including marginal concordances, notes, diverse readings, book prefaces, and chapter arguments. Inserted within this list, however, is a parenthetical clause stipulating that these paratexts “are not forbidden to be added later.” What happened to the flat prohibition? This is not *Aeternus Ille*. It is, in fact, a new preface of Roberto Bellarmino, SJ, the papal theologian and veteran *consultore* of the Roman Inquisition and Roman Index. He had withdrawn from circulation both the bull and Bible of Sixtus V when that pontiff died shortly after issuing those two texts together. In his autobiography, Bellarmino explained that he elected to
recall and correct the faulty text “in order to save the honor of Pope Sixtus.” In his letters to Pope Sixtus’s successors during the revision process, however, he also forcefully stated his opinion that a bare text made for a worthless book. Literally, he believed no one would buy it – if it lacked the paratextual apparatus or “little libraries” in the margins that made the Louvain Vulgates published by Christophe Plantin so appealing to scholars. He also dismissed Sixtus’ concern about the destabilizing effects of marginalia. Bellarmino won his case. When Marwood’s Bible was published in Antwerp in 1605, its title insisted that it was the “Sixtine Vulgate”, and yet its frontmatter permitted printers and readers to do exactly what Sixtus had forbidden – add notes. They obliged. Printers steadily returned the old Louvain paratexts to the Tridentine Vulgate throughout the seventeenth century. Marwood accepted the invitation as well. Too well? The preface simply conceded that adding paratexts “would not be forbidden.” What about flooding the margins with manuscript? Was this an act of defiance against the Pope for whom the book was named? Perhaps the better question is not whether he was defiant but to which authorities and to what extent he aimed to be compliant.

Marwood was, after all, not a just a solitary reader of a Bible. He was a Reader for a prominent recusant family in Norfolk – the Bedingfelds of Oxburgh, who were awarded a baronetcy after the Restoration (Figure 7.2). He had taken up his professional residency “in the year 1679, that I came to Oxburgh Hall,” as he indicated on the first page of the Bedingfeld family’s Rentall Book of 1688-1696. His record-keeping in that

994 See Chapter 1.
book as well as his collection of Oxburgh farm receipts dating back to 1681 suggests that from the very beginning of his tenure there he was asked to fulfill numerous roles. This is not surprising, since the “reader”, or tutor, was hardly an exalted social position in the gentry household, and its holder was regularly summoned to contribute more than education to the domestic economy.  

According to the account book of Henry Bedingfeld, 2nd Baronet, which he assembled in the year 1698, Marwood is owed 160 pounds for undifferentiated service. For the next five years he was recognized as governor to 2nd Baronet’s only son, Henry Arundel Bedingfeld; three years earlier Marwood was identified more capacious as the baronet’s “steward”, when he was ordered to be arrested along with him and his coterie during the Jacobite Assassination Plot scare of 1695/6. Marwood’s decision to join the Bedingfeld household proved all-encompassing: indeed he would be buried there forty years later.

---

996 Leys, Catholics in England, 83: “In 1670, when a tutor was being sought his recompense was to be £5 a year; he was to eat with the servants and supervise the children’s toilet.” Not much had changed since the previous century when Roger Ascham, the tutor of Queen Elizabeth, consigned the following lament to his tract, The Scholemaster (John Daye: London, 1570), ff.6v-7r: It is a pitie, that commonlie, more care is had, yea and that amonges verie wise men, to finde out rather a cunnynge man for their horse, than a cunnynge man for their children. To the one they will gladlie giue a stipend of 200 crounes by yeare, and loth to offer to the other 200 shillinges. God suffereth them, to haue, tame, and well ordered horse, but wilde and vnfortunate children.”

997 BP 35, 38.

Like earlier Renaissance readers described by Anthony Grafton, William Sherman, Deborah Harkness, and others, Marwood was charged with a variety of academic tasks.\textsuperscript{999} Tutoring the young heir and future 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baronet, Henry Arundel Bedingfeld, was one of them; another was plumbing literature to draw timely lessons for the present. Besides his Vulgate, there are six other extant volumes autographed and marked by him that span a range of genres and languages: Greek scriptures, Latin systematic theology, medieval church history in French, religious controversy and

modern history in English, and a Latin-French diglot of Cicero.\footnote{The first five books remain in the library of Oxburgh Hall (shelfmarks are included after their title): Louis Abelly, \textit{Medulla Theologica ex sacris scripturis} (Paris, 1684, 13\textsuperscript{th} edition): F3.1.8; Greek Bible Compilation: Apocrypha & New Testament (Cambridge, n.d., no t.p., 12mo): A2.1.12; Philippe Goibaut Du Bois, \textit{Les Offices de Cicerón} (Paris, 1698, 3\textsuperscript{rd} edition): E3.2.11; Louis Maimbourg, SJ, \textit{Histoire du Grand Schisme D'Occident} (Paris, 1679): A2.1.21; R.H. [Abraham Woodhead], \textit{Rational Account of the Doctrine of Roman Catholicks} ([London], 1673): B2.7.9. At least three other books left Oxburgh Hall in 1951 during the dispersal sale. One is now held in the library of Ham House in Surrey: Aaron Hill, \textit{A Full and Just Account of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire} (London, 1710): A.3.11. The Harry Ransom Center of the University of Texas at Austin acquired two books from Oxburgh Hall, only the first of which is autographed and marked by Thomas Marwood: Henry Holden, \textit{Analysis of Divine Faith ... With an Appendix of Schism} (Paris, 1658): BX 1780 H64 1658; and the Douai Old Testament (Rouen, 1635, 2 vols).} Marwood’s annotations in these works are more symbolic than verbal – he underlines, cross-references, and inserts manicules [Figure 7.3]. He seems not to supply manuscript commentary, as he did in his Vulgate, because printed commentary is already supplied. All that he needed to do was make selections and extractions, as a draft list of commonplaces on one of the flyleaves suggests he was preparing to do. [Figure 7.4]
CHAPITRE XXVIII.

C'EST renverser les fondemens de la nature, que de distinguer l'honnêteté de l'utilité. Car qui
doute que nous ne défirison
tous ce qui nous est utile ?

Une pente naturelle nous
y porte, et nous ne seguons
nos empêcher de la
suite : Il n'y a donc per-
sonne qui rejette ce qui est
utile, et qui même ne le
recherche avec beaucoup
d'ardeur. Mais comme
Marwood’s annotation of the Vulgate, however, was much more comprehensive. His *modus operandi* is on display immediately in the first chapter of Genesis. [Figure 7.5] He underlines discrete passages, affixes a symbol to them, reproduces the symbol in a margin with adequate space, and then inserts theological commentary. The commentary here is not his own invention – it is typically patristic (*Latin* fathers, not Greek) and scholastic: Augustine, Gregory, Leo, and especially Thomas Aquinas. On the very first page, five out of five glosses are credited to “St. Thom[as]”, all of which can be traced back to the *Summa Theologiae*. For example:

Gen 1:26: *et ait faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram:* “*Man is the image of God, but not a perfect one. ... Man is able to imitate God to the greatest extent by nature of the intellect. How much so can be considered by the triple image of God. 1...2... 3... St. Thom.*” [Summa, I, Q.93. Art. 4]

Gen 1: 28: *Deus et ait crescite et multiplicamini:* “*There is reason this precept ought to be followed, but the obligation binds in two different ways. 1. It is to be fulfilled by each one, such that it cannot be omitted without sin, since each one is to be sustained*
only according to the law of nature given to men about eating. v.29. 2. The work of carnal generation may be fulfilled by the multitude who sufficiently provide for humanity so that others indeed abstaining may be free for the contemplation of Divine things, for the beauty and salvation of the whole human race. St. Thom.”
[Summa, II.b., Q.152. Art. 2.][1001]

Figure 7.5: Genesis 1 in MB

[1001] Biblia Sacra (Antwerp, 1605) [Penn RBC BS 75 1605]. Hereafter referred to as Marwood’s Bible = MB. N.B. Marwood’s Vulgate annotations are composed in Latin. Italicized translations are my own.
These notes, laden with complex distinctions, appear at least impersonal, if not wholly irrelevant to the circumstances of Marwood and his household. He appears to have reconfigured the Bible into a schoolbook of technical theology. Why?

Here is one obvious causal explanation: the Jesuits made him do it. Not only were Jesuit priests in almost continuous residence at Oxburgh Hall throughout the eighteenth century (even while the Society was formally suppressed), Marwood himself spent a term of residence in a European Jesuit college. He even resided for a number of years in the house of the college president. Marwood was acting as governor to Henry Arundel Bedingfeld while the latter acquired his formal education abroad. In December 1699 their academic tour began in Brussels, where Henry took up study at the Jesuit college while his three sisters simultaneously entered the school of the Augustinian convent. Not two months later, in the wake of a smallpox outbreak, the Bedingfeld company evacuated the city, though tragically leaving one member behind: Elizabeth, the oldest daughter, succumbed to the disease on their Christmas eve, and was quietly entombed among the English exile community. Regrouping, the two younger daughters enrolled at the Benedictine convent of Dunkirk, which was bound within the Bedingfeld kin network, as the only son entered the fledgling Dominican school at Bornem in Flanders, where his cousin was subprior. Not even the plague and family bonds,

1002 A working list of eighteenth century Jesuit chaplains at Oxburgh Hall includes William Pordage (1699-1736), Philip Carteret (1742-7), Nicholas Porter (1750-54), Thomas Stanley-Massey (1755-8), Bernard Stafford (1758-60), Richard Clough (1762-6), Thomas Hawkins (1768-85), Thomas Angier (1790-95). See Geoffrey Holt, SJ, *The English Jesuits 1650-1829* (CRS, 1984), 20, 53, 62, 115, 157, 201, 234, 236. It is clear from J.H. Pollen’s casual acknowledgment in the *Bedingfeld Papers* (p.220) that in 1909, the year that the volume was published, there was still a Jesuit chaplain at Oxburgh Hall: Francis Goldie, SJ.

1003 BP 102, 107, 113, 148.

1004 BP 44-75.
however, could keep the boy and his governor from a Jesuit education. In January of 1701 they reached the ultimate destination of their half-decade academic journey: the Collège Royal de La Flèche.

**Figure 7.6: Collège Royal de La Flèche, 18th century engraving**

(Wikimedia commons)

N.B. Jesuit I H S monogram top right includes heart & three nails

La Flèche was the elite Jesuit school southwest of Paris that counted among its distinguished alumni René Descartes and would soon count among its distinguished faculty Michel Le Tellier, the former provincial superior of the Society of Jesus in France.
and last royal confessor of Louis XIV. Long before Le Tellier assumed his post as Professor of Holy Scripture at La Flèche, he had spearheaded the Society’s campaign for vernacular scripture-reading in France, publicly promoting the New Testament for “the great number of Christians of either sex who have no knowledge of the Latin language, but who nevertheless desire the consolation of reading the scriptures and of nourishing their souls on the word of God” as early as 1675. First published in 1697, Le Tellier’s Nouveau Testament had proceeded through at least 7 editions by the time of his death in 1718, the same year that Marwood himself died.

Whether Marwood obtained his own Bible in this context, annotating it at the French college during courses of philosophy and theology while the Bedingfeld boy completed the conventional five-year arts curriculum, now must be considered. These higher faculties were supposed to be restricted to Jesuit scholastics and other students pursuing ordination, according to the Ratio Studiorum, which was the Society’s universal plan of studies ratified in 1599. Latin academic theology was still officially the privilege of theologians, even if the preeminent one on the faculty, Le Tellier, was more than willing to concede vernacular scripture-reading to the laity. And even Le Tellier wanted clean Bible margins, just as James I and Sixtus V had before him. All three believed the Church should control scriptural interpretation for the laity not by printed paratext but by the word spoken from the pulpit. That is why they fashioned unglossed Bibles, including

1005 Le Tellier, Avis Importans et necessaires aux personnes qui lisent les traductions francaises des Saints Ecritures, et particulierement celle du Nouveau Testament imprime a Mons (Lyons: Pierre Guillimin, 1675), 18, also 7.
the one that Marwood received. Marwood’s other extant books, nevertheless, do suggest that La Flèche is the key for interpreting them all. His *Histoire du Grand Schisme D’Occident*, authored by a French Jesuit and published nearby in Paris, may have been obtained by Marwood for Bedingfeld to use in the college humanities class. In the same class and in grammar and rhetoric as well, the boy certainly would require Cicero’s *De Officiis*, a Latin-French diglot version of which Marwood did obtain, sign, and date on 17 November 1701, while the two of them were together in the college (Figure 7.6). It may be that at the same time he acquired the *Medulla Theologica* and the Greek Bible compilation for his *own* coursework in theology, especially since his travel journal suggests that his pupil never learned Greek.\footnote{BP 155, 160.}
Fig 7.7. *Les Offices de Ciceron*: Marwood autograph on TP and date on adjacent flyleaf
The *Ratio Studiorum*’s guidelines for scholastic theology, furthermore, manifest the same unflinching commitment to Thomas Aquinas that was visible in Marwood’s Vulgate: “Either defend Thomas or omit the question” (Rule 13). It would seem that Marwood may have brought the Vulgate with him to class and copied into it the dictation of the lecturer. That kind of direct reader reception of scriptural interpretation from the mouth of a vetted and authorized theologian also would harmonize with the printing program of Le Tellier, as well as James II and Sixtus V. Marwood’s biblical marginalia, therefore, would have required no selectivity at all, let alone creativity—they were the result, it seems, of a simple, mechanical process of transcription.

That explanation, however, does not fit the rest of the evidence so neatly. If Thomas Marwood was attending class, he left scant record of it in his *diarium*, which otherwise freely chronicles what he considered the most noteworthy activities of his day. Regularly recorded instead are his excursions to historic and sacred sites, his entertainment at the homes of local lords and ladies (both French and English), his letter-exchanging and accounting, wine-tasting, and especially shooting, in which another near catastrophe suggests that Marwood did not possess the customary familiarity with the rifle that his erstwhile partners did. His journal suggests, in other words, that he was entirely content to live the life of the professional gentleman foreclosed to him in England, at least in his own right. And when he was not conducting notable activities of the sort listed above, he writes simply that he was “at home all day” or “I was onely at

---

1008 BP 44-158 *passim*, but for shooting see for example, 100, 108, 109, 111, 113, 114, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 128, 132, 137, etc., with the gun accident recorded on 122. Other pastimes include billiards (111, 145, 157), Tric Trac (129), peruke-testing (96-7, 113, 120), horse-watching (105), and boar-hunting (111).
my Lord Widdrington’s place.” Whatever he was doing in these locations is not specified, but it is clear at a minimum that he was not then at the college attending class.

The argument from silence does not render it impossible that Marwood ever participated in coursework, and over a few years there are a few references to him at least poking around the college during instructional time; but other evidence makes it increasingly unlikely that the college’s theology and philosophy professors directly indoctrinated Marwood’s Bible. The first problem is the Bible’s form: the neat script and meticulous spacing of Marwood’s notes suggest fair copy, not the frenetic scribbling that characterizes lecture notation. Whatever this student might have collected from a professor’s oral remarks would have to be sifted, recategorized, and assimilated later into his Bible, the quarto size of which would have been inordinately cumbersome for classroom transport and use, especially relative to his other aforementioned books, which were duodecimo editions. Second, and more importantly, the Jesuit curriculum did not provide for comprehensive coverage of the biblical canon. Only two years of Scripture were prescribed for theology students, and in each year only one principal book like Job was exegized systematically, with others feathered in as time permitted (see chapter 2).

Even if Marwood crashed the scripture course for four full years, his direct instruction still could not keep up with the progress of his annotations -- not even close. To flood the margins from Genesis to the Apocalypse as he did, much of his work had to be done in private. Marwood’s experience at La Flèche, therefore, may have disposed him to approach the Vulgate in a certain way, but it could not have determined his annotations.

1010 BP 126, 143, 152, and esp. 136.
The same could be said for the many thousands of mostly-middle-to-upper-class lay students who were Marwood’s contemporaries, attending Jesuit colleges throughout the early modern Catholic world. By the time of the Suppression in 1773 there were more than 800 schools.\textsuperscript{1011} The rigorous instruction in Latin grammar that these students received, free of charge, equipped them with the linguistic tools for accessing the Vulgate, but it did not provide them an encounter with the book itself. That was up to the reader who bought it, or whose patrons did.

If the faculty of La Flèche are not responsible for Marwood’s scholastic annotations, then perhaps their source is another kind of teacher – a “dumb preacher”, or printed book. That would be a much simpler solution. The careful script and spacing does suggest transcription. That activity certainly would have kept Marwood occupied on those occasions that he was “at home all day”, as he reported in his travel journal. He did return certain unnamed books to the “Capuchin P. Clement” on April 29, 1701; yet he had only arrived to La Flèche three months earlier, which would hardly be enough time to extrapolate from these books a comprehensively annotated Vulgate, especially given his other domestic duties and lively social calendar.\textsuperscript{1012} Longer access to a printed template would have been required. Indeed he had that with another work, according to an early editorial pencil note on the second flyleaf (verso) of the Vulgate itself: “The Commentaries of Sanctius on which the notes of Mr. Marwood are chiefly based are in the Library of Oxburgh Hall.” That conclusive statement appears to crack the case of Marwood’s Bible. It certainly is plausible given what we know of Marwood’s affinity

\textsuperscript{1011} O’Malley, \textit{First Jesuits}, 239.  
\textsuperscript{1012} BP 101.
with the Jesuits: Gaspar Sanchez, S.J. (d.1628), or “Sanctius”, was a Jesuit professor of Holy Scripture at the College of Alcalá and a leading representative of what has been labeled, the “Golden Age of Catholic Exegesis, 1546-1660.” The flyleaf statement, however, is misleading in a number of ways. First, these “Commentaries of Sanctius” are, unfortunately, no longer in the library of Oxburgh Hall; it is likely that they were among the books dispersed in 1951 when the library and estate were sold to the National Trust. Second, and more importantly, the absence of these commentaries does not so much matter, because it is impossible for Marwood’s notes to have been “chiefly based” on them anyway. The corpus of Sanctius’s published commentaries spans most of the Prophetic Books (Nevi’im), some of the Wisdom Books (Ketuvim), and the Acts of the Apostles. It excludes, on the other hand, all the Torah plus Joshua and Judges, the Psalms, and Proverbs, and almost the entirety of the New Testament – that is, the lion’s share of the Bible (including the traditional inner canon discussed in Chapter 2, excluding Isaiah) – that Marwood annotated just as diligently as the rest. Finally, Marwood is not wholly dependent upon the Commentaries of Sanctius even in the books that are included in that corpus. While it is evident that he imports heavily from the Sanctius commentary on Jeremiah, he cites other patristic, medieval, and contemporary theologians much more


1014 The biblical commentaries of Gaspar Sanchez known to be published are the following: Isaiah (Lyons, 1615; Mainz, 1616; Antwerp, 1616); Zechariah (Lyons, 1616); Canticle of Canticles and Psalm 68 (Lyons, 1616); Acts (Lyons, 1616; Cologne, 1617); Jeremiah (Lyons, 1618); Ezechiel & Daniel (Lyons, 1619); Baruch & Twelve Minor Prophets (Lyons, 1621); Job (Lyons, 1621; Antwerp, 1712); 4 Kings and 2 Paralipomenon/Chronicles (Lyons, 1623; Antwerp, 1624); Ruth, Ezra/Esdras Nehemiah, Tobias, Judith, Esther, and Maccabees (Lyons, 1627; Lyons, 1628). Note that in his brief biography of Sanctius, Carta... sobre la muerte y virtudes del Padre Gaspar Sanchez (Madrid, 1628), Gerónimo de Florencia indicated that his subject had prepared commentaries on Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, but he did not believe that they had been printed. While there is no record of extant copies of these commentaries in any digital catalog that I have yet encountered, Marwood’s citations demonstrate that he himself had access to them.
frequently while annotating other books covered by Sanctius, including, for example, the deuterocanonical books Tobias and Ecclesiasticus (Sirach). The Commentaries of Sanctius, in sum, were only one well among others from which Marwood drew to irrigate the barren margins of his Bible.

It is undeniable then that Marwood constructed his commentary from other printed commentaries. The next questions to be answered are, what were these other commentaries, and how did the process of transcription work? His references are wide-ranging, but the authorities he cites most frequently are Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, and especially Thomas Aquinas, as we already have seen. Reading “extensively”, a supposedly eighteenth century reading revolution, would not have been necessary for Marwood to cut and paste relevant quotations of these and other classic theologians into his Bible. Composite templates were available. The “Glossa Ordinaria and Interlinearis”, that set of biblical commentaries commonly used in monasteries and universities from the ninth through the sixteenth centuries, was updated and reprinted in Douai in 1617 and Antwerp in 1634. The Catena Aurea, Thomas Aquinas’s collection of patristic glosses on the four gospels, was printed forty times after 1550. In his annotation of Matthew 1:19, Marwood quotes Jerome on the righteousness of Joseph, Mary’s husband – a quote that can be located verbatim in the matching section of

1015 On the contestability of this eighteenth century “revolution” from intensive reading, in which individuals read few books repeatedly, to extensive reading, in which they read many books once, see Sherman, Used Books, 27-28.
the *Catena*. That this may be an instance of direct copying is worth noting; what is more illuminating, however, is that on this one verse Marwood elected not to transcribe nineteen other possible glosses from the *Catena*. If Marwood was using either of the above templates, he would have been confronted with this selection process for every verse he did or did not annotate. There is little doubt that Marwood’s *Medulla Theologica* (Paris, 1684), which he marked with the same Greek lettering system as he did his other books, did supply him abundant theological authorities to quote; yet he still had to determine their placement from the *Summa* to the *Scriptures*, which are based on fundamentally different organizational schemes. His mode of transcription, therefore, demanded his own design. Based on the particular content, tone, or origin of each option, Marwood consciously decided which commentary would direct his reading.

There are additional indicators of the breadth of Marwood’s repertoire. A further comparison of his glosses on the Gospel of Matthew with the aforementioned printed compilations reveals little coordination between them. Marwood’s margins surely are filled with “St. Thomas”, but they are by no means confined to him, nor even to other patristics and proven scholastics. Late sixteenth and seventeenth century vernacular sources find their way into his commentary, too. Marwood appropriates Peter Heylin’s *Cosmographie*, Henri de Sponde’s chronologies, Antoine Godeau’s homilies, and Luis de

---

1018 Kenneth Gouwens, “Perceiving the Past: Renaissance Humanism after the ‘Cognitive Turn’”, *American Historical Review* (February, 1998), Vol.103, No.1, pp. 55-82, esp. pp. 59-63. Gouwens appropriates the work of the cognitive psychologist Jerome Bruner in criticizing historians who assume that the humanist pedagogical program of rote memorization and Ciceronian imitation “stifled creativity and promoted docility”. Gouwens argues that reproducing the masters often induced intense emotional or affective responses with important intellectual and cultural consequences – it especially could reconstruct the past as a critique of present circumstances. This analysis could be applied to or even magnified in Marwood, since before copying he had to select – an additional rational step.
Granada’s devotional treatises, among other works. Postdate even the most updated “Glossa” of 1634, which therefore could not have been their conduit to Marwood’s Bible. Marwood may or may not have anticipated the “extensive reading” revolution in his disparate biblical references, yet he certainly demonstrated a variety of resources and interpretive possibilities available to English Catholics. It would be simplistic, and indeed wrong, to conclude that through free-wheeling reading practices Marwood bucked Christian tradition and completely reinvented the Bible. Marwood showed instead his own capacity to fashion an “orthodox” and “traditional” scripture-book.

Given Marwood’s sensitivity to his own “convers[ion]” and to the faith of the household adopting him, one would not expect to find his Bible annotations parading Reformed doctrine. Should one expect to find in this layman’s very activity of annotating the Bible, however, a reflection of conventional Protestant habits and practices internalized before he committed to recusant Catholicism? If Marwood had attended grammar school in England, he would have been taught how to annotate books both to enhance memorization and to apply textual lessons to life. During the middle of the

---

1019 MB, e.g., 442, 457, 544, 673, 778, 895, 976-7, 981, 995.
1020 Upon the epistles of Peter and John, Marwood cites the French Jesuit Antoine Godeau, whose commentaries on the Catholic Epistles were not published until 1640. Heylin’s Cosmographie was not published until 1652 — also too late. The biblical commentary of the French theologian Henry Spondamus were not promoted in the standard glosses either. In his preface to Biblia Latina (1992), Froehlich explicitly names Jean Gallemart, Nicholas of Lyra, Paul of Burgos, and Matthiae Thorigi as those theologians inserted in the updated Glossas, though he mentions that “many others” were included as well (see xxiii-xxvi). Marwood does not cite Gallemart and Thorigi. References to Lyra and Burgos are questionable.
1021 Margo Todd, Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order (Cambridge, 1987), esp. 61-95; Sherman, Marking Readers, 2-5, 9-11. For a general survey of relevant educational developments, see Helen M. Jewell, Education in Early Modern England (Macmillan, 1998), 17-18, 21, 26-28, 34-42, 52-84. See also Ian Green, Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education (Ashgate, 2009); and
seventeenth century, academic annotation gradually shifted from book margins to loose-leaf and notebooks. Marginal notation in Bibles, however, tended to persist. As William Sherman has shown, early modern biblical annotation, on account of its colorful variety, has summoned numerous scholarly attempts at categorization; within English Bibles overall, ongoing theological commentary in the scholastic tradition occupied a limited portion of marginal space. The rest was inhabited more regularly by sporadic manuscript marks, the association of which to adjacent printed texts is often oblique. Extant English Bibles frequently contain penmanship exercises, family trees, and other domestic mementos upon their pages. Marwood’s annotations, by comparison, are notable for systematically theologizing the entire text. That, as we have seen, distinguishes Marwood’s book from English Bibles, both Protestant and Catholic. The Latin language of the Bible, therefore, may be a more important determinant for the style and purpose of its annotations than the confession of its reader.

The circumstances of the reader’s formation and training are also important to reconsider. That is, it is not at all clear that he actually was educated as a Protestant. There is no record of his matriculation in English universities, though that certainly leaves open the possibility of grammar school education. What he reports in his spiritual memoranda is that his “Convers[ion]” happened on “Jan. 11. [16]7½” – within three months of his departure from the “aedibus D’ Lett.”, where he had spent the last three

years, according to the lines above. The proximity of these two journal entries suggests something of a causal connection in Marwood’s own perception of his autobiography. “Dr. Lett.” has avoided detection in the current dictionaries of English missionary priests, but that may be not only because his surname is abbreviated, but also because these priests typically were assigned aliases. And they frequently traded the title of “Fr.” for “Dr.” while working underground. Whether “Lett” was a cleric or layman, the result was that Marwood emerged a convinced Catholic shortly after living in his company for three years. It certainly is possible that Marwood’s parents, who according to the same journal entries were both still living at the time, purposely sent him to an unlicensed Catholic schoolmaster. Evidence for the Marwood family’s Catholicism runs deep into the reign of King James I: the tombstone of an earlier “Thomas Marwood, Gent., who practiced Physick and Chirurgery” testifies that he “departed in the Catholick Faith, Septiember ye 18th, Anno Domini, 1617.” Marwood’s parents may have been “church papists”, or conformists, who sought to transmit their forbidden faith to their children through education; this same education ultimately seems to have led their child to reject religious accommodation as schism, both for them and for himself. Whatever theological training he may have received either from “Dr. Lett” or others

---

1024 BP 41.
1025 Bernard Kelly, *Historical Notes on English Catholic Missions* (London, 1907), 217; George Oliver, *Ecclesiastical Antiquities in Devon* (London, 1840), 75. I am grateful to Dr. Mitch Fraas for these references.
1026 Generations of the Marwood family here manifest the interdependence of church papists and recusants, that has been well-articulated by Alexandra Walsham in *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Boydell & Brewer, 1999). They also suggest that the intra-familial relationships among occasional conformists and steady recusants might also sometimes resemble co-dependencies, as well as the bitter rejections that often follow in their wake.
along the way, his annotations communicate his own subjective awareness that he at least learned how to read the Bible not like a Protestant.

Reading the scriptures through dense theological commentary was not only the customary practice of scholastics, it became conceived in the sixteenth century as a polemical stance against Protestantism. In his preface to a revised Glossa Ordinaria (Paris, 1590), the Franciscan theologian Francois Feuardent condemned what he considered to be the reductionist principle of sola scriptura, which dismissed the interpretive tradition of the church fathers. The polemics of Feuardent and others were little affected by the fact that at the same time Reformed theologians at Cambridge and Oxford continued to rely upon and edit patristic commentaries and that the well-glossed Geneva Bible remained the most popular edition of the English Bible until it was displaced by the well-purged Authorized Version during the following century. It was in the latter half of that following century, however, that Marwood assumed the role of annotator. Marwood marked his Vulgate differently from his other books, as we already have seen: while his cross-referencing system of manicules, Greek letters, and lining is consistent across all the books, only his Bible is packed with substantive verbal commentary. A note in one of these other books, however, does illuminate his approach to the scriptures. Henry Holden’s Analysis of Divine Faith (Paris, 1658), is a treatise of Catholic apologetics that differentiates between authentic and erroneous Christian belief. Marwood’s manuscript trail suggests that he did not comb through every part

1027 Froehlich, “Printed Gloss”, xxiii.
1028 Marwood’s copy of the Analysis is held at the Harry Ransom Center of the University of Texas at Austin (BX 1780 H64 1658). The full title is: THE / ANALYSIS / OF / DIVINE FAITH: / OR / TWO
of the book with the same diligence, but a printed marginal note on page 83 did catch his pen: “One may believe all the articles of our faith, and yet not be truly a Catholick in his faith.” For someone who had begun to define himself as a Catholic only as an adult, this section seemed worth reading:

Hence it follows (which is to be specially noted) that if any man should believe all the articles of our Catholick faith, nor more nor lesse, but should assent unto them by the force of his own private and particular ratiocination, because forsooth, he thinks, that all these tents are either expressly set down in the Scripture, or at least, that they are so implicitly contained in it, as that he conceives, he can manifestly deduce them all from thence. So that his assent and adhesion to these articles is such, as that he would not believe them, unless he thought he could evince them out of the Scripture; This man, I say, were no Catholick, nor could be rightly esteemed a member of the Catholick Church. For since the means whereby this believer doth apply unto himself all these revealed truths, is no other then his own private ratiocination, he could not be said to have a certain and infallible faith, but onely an opinion of the truth of these tenets, being it is manifest that no particular and private mans ratiocination and discourse can be a means convenient and able of itself to ground an assent of Divine, infallible, and Catholick faith; but only will beget an opinative judgement, or at most a theological faith.

It was not enough, in other words, to assess that Catholic doctrine was proven by the scriptures themselves. Scriptural prooftexts had to be grounded in the authoritative
ecclesial tradition of interpretation, and had to be held as “prooftexts” on that account.

Otherwise one made oneself, “by his own private ratiocination”, the arbiter of the relationship between text and church. That sardonic phrase was repeated three times in the paragraph and singularly underlined by Marwood (see above). Immediately adjacent to it, Marwood blurted out a rare remark in English: “Observe this!” He did indeed observe it, as his annotations throughout the Vulgate demonstrate, especially at several classic prooftexts. Marwood underlined 2 Peter 1:20 (omnis prophetia Scripturae propria interpretatione non sit), and composed next to it the following commentary:

Vs. 20 & 21: The Heretics of our time should not consider which scriptures might be interpreted on their own, but rather they should have recourse to the Church, which the Holy Spirit promised to lead. It is, on the contrary, brazen impiety to draw out the hidden Mysteries by human reason and by virtue of our own Light. Godeau.\(^{1029}\)

Two chapters later, Marwood underlined an even more notorious place against “private interpretation” (2 Pet 3: 16: ...in quibus sunt quaedam difficilia intellectu quae indocti et instabiles depravant.), and returned again to the commentary of “Godeau”:

The occasion of this Epistle being written (just as that of Sts. James & John) is the error and Heresy of Simon Magis, who badly understanding and rashly interpreting certain places of the Apostle Paul, about not seeking justification by the works of the law, were teaching that good works matter nothing for justification. Whereby the Apostle warns us that there are certain places very difficult to understand, and that the ignorant and inconstant pervert them to their

\(^{1029}\) N.B. Marwood composed his Vulgate annotations in Latin unless otherwise noted. English translations are my own.
ruin. For that reason, the Roman Church prohibits the promiscuous reading of the Scriptures; but it is the calumny of the Heretics that [the Roman Church] forbids [reading] absolutely. Since it is free to the pastors to permit the competent ones to read the Scriptures, since it is the book of life and the Testament of God and of our Savior. Godeau.

Both of Marwood’s annotations are paraphrases of Antoine Godeau’s Paraphrase sur les epistres canoniques (Paris, 1640). The choice of Godeau (d.1672) is notable here, because this contemporary bishop of Vence and Grace lacked the time-worn seniority and authority of a Thomas Aquinas or Latin Father. It may be that Marwood was seeking a commentator who had the experience of wielding this scriptural passage against Protestants, which all medieval and ancient theologians did not. That Marwood cancels Godeau’s name at the end, however, may be an indication that he later had second thoughts. Godeau had successfully marked himself out as Christian poet, for which he was lampooned by French Jesuits, whose parodies Marwood may have become acquainted with over the course of his years at La Fleche. But Godeau also assembled a paraphrase of the entire New Testament (1668, 1672), by which he would convey the

---

1030 See Paraphrase sur les epistres canoniques par A. Godeau eveque de Grasse. A Paris: Chez la veuve J. Camusat, 1640, 109 (2 Peter 1) & 111 (2 Pet 3).
1031 Godeau was one of the original members of the Académie Française. Among his literary works were Discours sur les oeuvres de Malherbe (1629), Discours de la poésie chrétienne (1633), a metrical Psalm text, a panegyric on the life St. Augustine and an elogy on the life of St. Francis de Sales. A satire on Godeau, Antonius Godellus Episcopis Grassensis (1647) was published by the Jesuit poet François Vavasseur, and was circulated in manuscript forms as well. See BNF-Richelieu, Fonds Latin 911708, ff. 313-319. For a brief biography, see F. M. Rudge, “Antoine Godeau”, Catholic Encyclopedia (1913), Volume 6.
Latin scriptures into a more simple French idiom. The vulgarization of the Bible was not an enterprise that Marwood exhibited a keenness to promote, as is illustrated on the other hand by his assiduous reworking of Godeau’s French commentary into Latin. He further indicated a sensitivity to this subject in his comment on Acts 25:19 (Quaestiones vero quasdam de sua superstitionem habebant adversus eum), in which he channeled the Tridentine prohibitions against defiling Holy Scripture with “jokes, exhibitions, rude treatment, superstition, and impiety.”

Marwood’s distaste for the “rude treatment” of the Bible resonates with the contemporary lament about “the book thus put in every vulgar hand”—a lament voiced by another English Catholic, John Dryden, the poet laureate who was part of the Bedingfeld kin network and whose son reconnected with his cousin Henry Arundel Bedingfeld and Thomas Marwood in 1700 at the Dominican School of Bornhem. Given the emphasis that scholars have placed upon Dryden’s reaction to what he believed was the over-common use of the English Bible, it is worth noting here that the other book from Oxburgh Hall that accompanied Marwood’s Analysis of Faith to the UT-Austin Library was a Douai Bible (Rouen, 1635)—that is, the two volumes of the English Catholic Old Testament. Both volumes are distinct from the other Marwood books, however, in that they bear no physical record of Marwood’s presence: no symbolic-marking system,

1033 MB 902.
1034 BP 58, 63.
no characteristic autograph, and certainly no verbal commentary. The manner in which Marwood did employ the Douai-Rheims Bible will be discussed in due course, but if these were the very volumes he used, then he effaced his ownership of them in a manner unlike any of his other books. Though Catholic prelates had long been conceding vernacular Bibles to lay readers in Marwood’s surroundings of England and France, Marwood himself evinces a commitment to the Latin Bible with something like the zeal of a convert. His appropriation of authoritative glosses within a handsomely packaged and maintained quarto Vulgate likely reinforced his self-definition against the religious community from which he departed. His copious annotation, on the other hand, seemed to flout the hesitant permissions granted by the Vulgate’s preface, whose author Cardinal Bellarmino was a formidable gatekeeper to the community that he was planning to enter. A way to overcome this perception of license would be to exceed all expectations for orthodoxy, as we shall see next. Having neither strictly obeyed the Cardinal’s directive nor embraced what he conceived to be the reading practices of his former coreligionists, Marwood demonstrated his capacity to shape his own Bible and to imagine the religious community that would accept it as their own.

***************

1036 The only autograph is “Henricus Bedingfeld” and there is an armorial bookplate for “Sir Henry Bedingfeld of Oxburgh Hall.”

1037 Marwood’s resistance to vulgarization here recalls from Chapter 3 the Rouen community of Poor Clares led by Sr. Francis Plunkett (d.1811), who continued touting their own outdated Bible-reading privileges and corresponding reading-restrictions to distinguish themselves from the commonality of Catholics who by then needed no such permissions to read.
Post-Reformation English Catholicism was torn by conflict. That has been a principal historiographical lesson of the present generation. If the pioneering scholars of “recusant history” had approached their subject as an isolated whole, dedicated to cataloging the heroic pastoral care of missionary priests and the patient suffering of the faithful squires that supported them, the more recent work of Peter Lake, Michael Questier, Ethan Shagan, and Alexandra Walsham has illuminated the internal fissures of English Catholicism as well as its amorphous boundaries. It was in fact these boundaries – these questions of whether occasional conformity and accommodation with the state constituted authentic Catholicism – that triggered the explosive conflicts within and made study of English Catholics (and not just anti-Catholicism) relevant to the history of the English nation as a whole. This lesson, however, has been confined generally to the pre-Civil War or Reformation era. Historians have continued to observe in their later Catholic subjects a different lesson at work, one beaten into them by the Civil War and Glorious Revolution and ever threatened by the penal code, that they were to accept society as it was and settle into a stable, social network of quiet nonconformity.

Michael Mullett presents the conventional wisdom that late seventeenth-century English Catholics generally assumed a defeatist posture toward the state and, withdrawing from political activism, cultivated a quiescent spirituality. Their “long-term shift in priorities…away from controversy, confrontation and political involvement” is reflected in the “nondenominational Christian themes” which emerge in their devotional writings.  

John Bossy, the historian upon whose seminal study these conclusions primarily are based, asserts that “conflict was certainly on the way out” for Catholics after the Civil War. And especially after the flight of James II in 1688, the leaders of the “English Catholic Community” – the gentry - would not have welcomed another restoration of the Catholic establishment, or a religious revolution that reintroduced the traditional institutions of ecclesiastical hierarchy, undermining the dominance that the landowning class was able to exert over the clergy in patronage, control, and devotional style. Jacobitism, the movement to restore the Stuarts to the throne, was largely absent from Bossy’s account. English Catholics at the close of the seventeenth century instead followed their countrymen around the “modernist” turn, and “shared the essential secular values of the society [they] lived in.” Quietistic devotion, syncretistic ecumenism, political detachment and loyalty supposedly form the ethos of a chastened English Catholicism.

---

1039 Michael Mullett, The Catholic Reformation (Routledge, 1999), 175-177.
1042 Bossy, English Catholic Community, 283-4.
These conclusions based upon perceived tendencies in Catholic printed literature, anecdotes about the politically enervated Catholic gentry, and impressive statistical analysis of church registers, did not tell the whole story. Recent scholarship on this later period of English Catholicism has aimed to put the politics back into it. Gabriel Glickman’s important work, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745*, is a patent revision of Bossy’s own *Community*, and it explores the wider Catholic culture of Jacobitism, both in England and on the Continent, that the limited state records of criminal rebellion failed to reveal. To challenge the “Whiggish and confessional narratives of Catholic cultural degeneration”, Glickman sheds light on “the mental framework to recusant gentry life” and its burgeoning “political imagination beyond the Revolution of 1688.”¹⁰⁴³ As the English Catholic “squirearchy” made common cause with Anglican Jacobites, at least discursively, “an idea of irenic patriotism became the dominant position within English Catholic thought over the course of the century.”¹⁰⁴⁴ Geoff Baker, who returned to the earlier, Restoration period, formulates a complementary conception of Catholic political negotiation that encompasses conflict without the all-or-nothing approach of outright rebellion or passive loyalty to the state.¹⁰⁴⁵ Both narratives, however, shift much of the locus of contemporary English Catholic antagonism from London to Rome. Baker’s subject, William Blundell, is assimilated to the historiographical model of “radical readers” sketched by Kevin Sharpe and others, in part because he read the Bible critically, in the novel naturalistic mode of Francis Bacon, and

especially against the official dogmatism of the Catholic magisterium. Glickman’s Catholic Community embraced the Gallican model of an independent national church in order to distance themselves from papal hegemony and to establish a rapprochement with the English state. They turned against controversial theology and casuistry and toward contemplative spirituality that fostered an active spirit of fraternal charity toward their Protestant neighbors. Both studies seek to unearth the progressive roots of the vibrant, critically-minded English Catholic Enlightenment of the later eighteenth-century, Glickman very explicitly so, and both unwittingly back into a quasi-whiggish trajectory of English Catholic intellectual history. In short, intellectual creativity and political engagement come back into the picture to the extent that religious dogmatism comes out.

---

1046 Baker, Reading and Politics, 2, 12-13, 19-22, 136-207, 211, esp. 12.
1047 Glickman epitomizes these new “Erasmian sensibilities” in “Recusant religion” through the devotional books of François de Sales and the pastoral counsels of the Benedictine priest Alban Dawnay (Glickman, English Catholic Community, 64-7). Neither example quite substantiates the thesis, if one takes into account that (1) De Sales was not just the author of An Introduction to the Devout Life, but also one of the more prolific Catholic polemicists of the early modern era; (2) The same manuscript that records Dawnay’s opposition to any “zeal for the faith” that “destroys charity” also records Dawnay’s regular debates with English ministers, “Protestant Ladies” and various “Lutherans” on indiscriminate Bible-reading and the “Rule of Faith”, a preeminent subject of inter-confessional controversy in the earlier “Reformation era”, which preoccupied Bellarmino and De Sales as well. Despite the pastoral counsel that Glickman emphasizes as representative of a new irenicist strain in Catholic spirituality, Dawnay shows no compunction here about “shew[ing] the wickedness of the first pretended Reformers, and the absurdity of the pretended Reformation, in reality horribly blasphemous deformation and perversion of the one only true Faith of Christ.” Dawnay, incidentally but not insignificantly, was ensconced in the support network of the Bedingfeld family of Oxburgh Hall. For Dawnay, see BL Additional Mss 28254, ff. 1r-2r, 3v-5v, 6r-v, 28r-31r, 46r-51r, 69r-71, 89r-98v, 99ff, 171ff, 209r-214v, 225r-228v, etc. For this forgotten aspect of De Sales’s career, see Richard Popkin, The History of Scepticism from Savonarola to Bayle (Oxford, 2003), 7-9, 16, 65.

1048 For another important recent study that returns to the earlier model of post-Civil War “English Catholicism [which] found itself retreating into the private domestic sphere, becoming increasingly quietist and separatist,” see Peter Marshall & Geoffrey Scott, eds., Catholic Gentry in English Society: The Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation (Ashgate, 2008), 16.
Investigating the particular content and tone of Marwood’s annotations, therefore, enlarges our conception of what was possible within the “mental world” and “political imagination” of an English Catholic layman at the turn of the eighteenth century. If the printed Bible was indeed the primary source for criticizing authority in the two centuries of English Reformation and Revolution, it will be important to evaluate how it was harnessed or subdued in the hands of an aspiring establishment professional turned Catholic recusant. Marwood’s Bible, together with the rest of his textual remains, reveals that the existing historiographical categories are inadequate to characterize this moment of English Catholicism, as well as the relationship between religion and politics in this era as a whole.

Marwood extracted orthodox Tridentine doctrine from the scriptures. He acknowledged that these positions had divided formerly unified Christians. Rather than appeal to an ecumenical Christian consensus, Marwood denounced the heretics. His discussion of sacramental theology is illustrative. Marwood underlined Mark 6:13: “So they went out and proclaimed that all should do penance (ut poenitentiam agerent). They cast out many demons and anointed with oil many who were sick and cured them.” From this passage Marwood adduced the sacraments of penance and extreme unction and waded into a Reformation controversy dating back to Martin Luther. Luther claimed that the Vulgate’s Latin rendition of the concept “poenitentiam agere” was a

---


mistranslation of the original Greek word “metanoia”. The former terms implied that repentance was a human action – something that one did. The latter term “metanoia” was amenable to Luther’s doctrine of justification by faith alone. Marwood confronted the issue unabashedly:

To do penance in the sense of Scripture, according to the doctors of the Church, does not mean only the bare confession of sins and emendation of life (as the Heretics with Beza pretend is the meaning of ‘metanoia’), but also contrition and painful satisfaction. As in Matthew 11:21 they once urged penance with ashes in Cilicia….and the ancient Greeks named “metanoia” the doing of public penance, see Socrat[es] Bk.5 Ch.19, Cyprian Lt.52, August[ine] Bk.13. Confess[ions].

Even though Marwood does not show direct quotation of an authority, it is doubtful that he himself gathered and sifted all the ancient texts cited here for evidence. His “extensive reading” of myriad printed commentaries available is itself surprising. Whether through invention or selection, Marwood submitted commentary that confidently defended the Catholic understanding of penance and ridiculed the Lutheran position here attributed to Theodore Beza, the most eminent Calvinist theologian of the later sixteenth-century.

Marwood then noted that the second underlined sentence in the verse cited above proved definitively that baptism, penance, and the eucharist - those sacraments usually confirmed across confessions and denominations - were not the only ones instituted by Christ. He quoted Thomas Aquinas that the Apostles certainly promulgated “the
Sacrament of Extreme Unction”. Marwood stated, furthermore, that belief in those sacraments as divinely instituted “pertains to the necessity of everyone’s salvation.” Indisputably aware that Protestants universally rejected anointing as a sacrament, Marwood was closing the gates of heaven to his former coreligionists, decisively and unabashedly. This commonplace belief, on its own, will support no generalized abstraction about the steady polarization of early modern English communities. More significant than the content of the belief is the place of its expression. Marwood has converted the margins of his Bible into a platform for apologetics – a surprising technique for one whose spirituality was supposed to have become quietly devotional.

Marwood’s eagerness to confute the heretics of the Reformation continues to surface in his commentary. Catholic and Protestant apologists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries waged sustained polemical warfare over the foundation of true doctrine. Both agreed that this “rule of faith” was the Bible. But leading Catholic controversialists, including Bellarmino, challenged that human reason on its own would generate multiple, conflicting doctrines from the verses of Scripture. The Catholic Church, they argued, was the only certain exponent of the Bible. They also held that the Bible could not contain all that Christ taught his disciples. This unwritten revelation, or “tradition”, had been faithfully preserved in apostolic practice and continued to be transmitted by the Church. To advance this argument, Marwood underlined Mark 7:3:

1053 Daniel Cheely, “‘Can it be that a Sole Authority Remains?’ Epistemological Conundrums in Post-Reformation Polemic”, *The European Legacy* (2014), 19.7: 819-832. Note that Alban Darnay, O.S.B., the English missionary priests supported by Marwood’s Bedingfeld household, was continuing to wage this same form of epistemological apologetics in the early eighteenth century. See BL Add Mss 28254, ff.1r-2r, 89r-98v, 171r.
“For the Pharisees and all the Jews do not eat unless they thoroughly wash their hands, thus observing the tradition of the elders.” He reasons:

The Tradition of Christ’s Church is not a purely human tradition (as is the tradition of the elders), but rather the Church is the infallible rule of doctrine, which proceeds out of the principal truth manifested in the Scriptures. St. Augustine says that it is sufficient to believe the Church against anyone….

Whoever fears to be deceived should consult the Church. The truth of the Scriptures is held by us when we do that which the universal Church appoints, just as the authority of these Scriptures commends. Thus, Jeremiah the Patriarch of Constantinople responds to select Lutherans of Tubingen: We, brethren, stand firm upon the rock of the faith and the tradition of the Church, not transgressing the boundaries set forth by the Holy Fathers, nor giving space to those who, desirous for new things, attempt to overthrow the structure of the holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of God. If indeed any license is conceded to these, gradually the whole body of the Church will be destroyed.  

The concept of “tradition” is the only link between the gospel verse and Marwood’s commentary. Since Marwood contrasts the “tradition of the elders” with the “infallible tradition of the church”, he could not have intended that the passage would serve as a prooftext for his epistemological position. By his use of a merely associative passage as a springboard for expounding Protestant errors, Marwood demonstrated his eagerness to engage in confessional controversy even beyond the traditional method of finding scriptural evidence for particular beliefs.

1054 MB 820.
If touting the infallibility of the Roman Church was not sufficiently contrary to the priorities of the subsequent English Catholic Enlightenment, Marwood also confronted the original challenge of the Henrician Reformation by affirming the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. Having underlined the gospel verse, “Responding Peter said to him, you are the Christ”, Marwood wrote:

The ancient Fathers teach that the Roman Pontiff is the Successor of Peter. One may select St Augustine who said to Philippus the Presbyter in the Council of Ephesus: No one doubts, indeed, throughout all known ages, that St. Peter is the First and Head of the Apostles and the Catholic Church continues through his successors who will always survive, and will resolve controversies and will always conquer….

Marwood cross-referenced this triumphalist commentary with Daniel 10:13: “But the prince of the kingdom of the Persians resisted me for twenty-one days: and behold Michael, one of the chief princes, came to my assistance.” It would seem that connecting this Hebrew Bible text to the doctrine of papal primacy would require considerable artifice. Marwood was ready and willing:

Michael, thus it is said, is one of the chief Princes, and he is commonly known to be appointed below from among the Angels: and prudence was divine, to give also to the Church Militant a leader upon earth so that the ship may not be left abandoned, devoid of a helmsman to assume responsibility. He corrected this with Peter, therefore, and through Peter’s successors, the Roman Church has Bishops, according to Matthew 10, ver. 2. In the company of the Apostles, it is certainly said that Peter is First, in rank and power, by the order constituted by

---

1055 MB 821 (Mk 8:29).
Christ, according to Jerome…On account of this among the twelve one was chosen to be constituted the head so that the pretext for schism would be destroyed.\textsuperscript{1056}

Marwood again is deploying the fathers not to elicit their customary allegorical interpretation, but to fix a pontifical one. Similar examples of Marwood’s taste for confessional polemic are innumerable. Marwood identified Luther and Calvin as the “false prophets” about whom Christ warned his disciples.\textsuperscript{1057} On the very last page of the canonical Christian Bible, Marwood denounced Protestant millenarians.\textsuperscript{1058} He was establishing his religious identity against the beliefs of his Protestant neighbors at least as much as from his quiet, pious, devotional practices.\textsuperscript{1059}

His notes that bear the most palpable Counter-Reformation residue are often linked to the curious designation “Test. Duac.” For instance, at Genesis 21:9 (\textit{cumque vidisset Sarra filium Agar Aegyptiae ludentem dixit ad Abraham}), Marwood writes:

St. Aug. says, Behold the freewoman afflicted the handmaid, and the Apostle does not call it persecution; the servant plays with the master, and he \textit{does} call it persecution. ... Ismail’s playing with Isaac was persecution because it tended to pervert him, showing it to be a greater injury to delude and deceive anyone in drawing them to new and particular companies, than to persecute them corporally.

\textsuperscript{1056} MB 705 (Dn 10:13).
\textsuperscript{1057} MB 808 (Mt 24: 5-6).
\textsuperscript{1058} MB 996 (Apoc 22:21).
\textsuperscript{1059} I have emphasized Marwood’s polemical expressions in order to correct the historiographical emphasis on the English Catholic community’s “devotional turn” away from controversy. I do not intend to imply, however, that Marwood’s Catholic devotions were unimportant to him. On the contrary, he cultivated a serious program of piety including daily meditation on the Hours of the Blessed Virgin and Penitential Psalms, weekly recitation of the rosary, thrice-weekly fasts, annual retreats, periodic abstention from wine, and, of course, spiritual reading. See BP 41-46.
The Church and Catholic Princes punish heretics for their own good, to make them return to the truth, or to cease from seducing others. Test. Duac.

Marwood here inscribes his Church’s justification for persecuting heretics while inhabiting a kingdom in which he and his household are the national heretics, or at least idolaters and perverters of true religion. To a state that officially resisted punishing Catholics as heretics, Marwood’s scripture-baiting would have been neither conciliatory nor practical. “Test. Duac.”, Marwood’s source for this inflammatory annotation, turns out to be his Latin abbreviation for Douai Testament -- that is, the English Catholic version of the Scriptures better known as the Douai-Rheims Bible. The book was notorious in the Church of England for its vitriolic annotations, which are on display here. Marwood, however, even outdid the “Test. Duac.” -- he omitted a final line of the original Douai-Rheims annotation on this passage, which actually would have moderated its violence:

“St. Hierom also teacheth that the spiritual never persecuteth the carnal: but spareth him as his rustical brother, knowing that he may in time be profitable.”

This is not an isolated instance of reverse-engineering commentary from English to Latin, as already has been shown with Marwood’s use of Godeau and Heylin. In these cases, and in others with “Test. Duac”, Marwood paraphrases as well as translates.

---

1060 MB 673, 895.
1061 For another example, compare Marwood’s commentary on Gen 6:15 with the corresponding Douai-Rheims annotation. While the meaning remains fundamentally the same, in this case, Marwood’s evident paraphrase demonstrates that he is mastering, recapitulating, and translating theological content before he begins the process of transcribing.
This is the first time, however, that his efforts to manipulate the meaning of the commentary in the process of reverse-engineering has been exposed. For illustration, one more example will suffice. Next to Matthew 24:5 (et respondens Iesus dixit eis videte ne quis vos seducat), Marwood again cites “Test. Duac”:

They should be avoided who dare to invent themselves as Christ, like Simon Magus and Menander; but also all arch-heretics and those first manufacturers of the new doctrines. These indeed are deified by their own followers, such that Luther has his Lutherans and Calvin his Calvinists, so that they would rather have faith in these little men (homunculis) than in Christ speaking through his Church. Test. Duac.”

The concealed difference between the annotation of Douai and Marwood this time is even more subtle, but no less revealing. Where Douai printed “men”, Marwood inserted “homunculis”, gratuitously adding the diminutive form to the referent for Luther and Calvin in order to add another layer of insult upon them. Marwood, evidently, is an aggressive editor. He finesses ancient Latin glosses and Latinizes amped up English glosses so that he could bind his scriptures and himself more firmly to the Roman Church.

**********

If then one would expect to find evidence of smoldering Catholic dissidence in Marwood’s Bible, his annotations on political authority would be disappointing. In some of the most likely places, he has neglected comment entirely. The margins adjacent to the dictum of Jesus, “Give to Caesar what is Caesar’s and to God what is God’s”, are left
blank in all three instances (Mt 22:15-22, Mk 12:13-17, Lk 20:20-26). While he did not hesitate to insert a critique of Protestant solafidian theology in the book of Daniel, he offered no pertinent remarks on the prophet’s discussion of earthly kingdoms (chapters two through four). \(^{1062}\) These omissions should not be taken to mean that he lacked all interest in the biblically prescribed relations of Christians to the state. When he does comment, he unequivocally affirmed allegiance to legitimate authority. He matched 1 Peter 3:13-17 with Thomas Aquinas’s declaration that inferiors should be subordinated to superiors on behalf of both natural and divine law. \(^{1063}\) He underlined Romans 13:2, that “those who resist [temporal power] acquire for themselves damnation.” Here without any citation he equated such resistance with “rebellion against God and the order of His Providence.” Those who commit this treachery “would be repaid most justly with capital punishment.” \(^{1064}\) Marwood even opposed a counterprecedent to Christian submission. To Jesus’ inquiry about the temple tax, Simon answers that the kings of the earth collect duties and taxes from others, rather than from their sons. Marwood underlined Jesus’s response (Mt 17:25-6): “Then the sons are exempt.” Marwood commented:

> Although through faith in Christ we are made Sons of God and spiritually free from the servitude of sin, we nevertheless are not freed from the servitude of the body, by which we are held strictly by our lords in the temporal world. For faith

\(^{1062}\) MB 697: Marwood cross-referenced Daniel 3:91 with James 2:17 (“Faith without works is dead”).

\(^{1063}\) MB 974.

\(^{1064}\) MB 914.
in Christ is the origin and cause of justice, and therefore through this faith, the order of justice is not lifted but confirmed.\textsuperscript{1065}

Marwood combined a statement of loyalty with a rejection of antinomianism, which was the doctrine associated with radical Protestantism that Christ abrogated natural and positive law for the elect. This mixture of confessional polemic with doctrinal exposition was a recurring theme of Marwood’s notes. Even when the opportunity to assail Protestant beliefs was not present, however, Marwood continually expressed his duty to the civil ruler.

His political commitments were less straightforward outside the text. While his family background remains murky, the best indication is that Marwood inherited a prestigious legacy in the medical profession. Thomas Marwood I (d.1617), the partriarch and namesake most likely to be the great-great grandfather of the subject of this chapter, was the “Gentleman” and “Physick” of Honiton, Devonshire. Known in the family as the “old Doctor” (having died at 105!), having been trained at the great medical faculty of Padua, he became the personal physician of Queen Elizabeth, then acquiring even more fame after allegedly curing her volatile court favorite, Robert Devereaux, the Earl of Essex.\textsuperscript{1066} John Marwood (d.1626), the second son, succeeded to his father’s estate at Honiton, and had Marwood House built upon it. He also took up his father’s trade,

\textsuperscript{1065} MB 803.
\textsuperscript{1066} John’s older brother, Thomas Marwood II (d.1619) settled in Northleigh. His son Thomas Marwood III settled at Bucknoll and died in 1661. There is no record of another Thomas coming directly through the line of Thomas Marwood II-III. See W.H. Hamilton Rogers, \textit{Memorials of the West, Historical and Descriptive, Collected on the Borderland of Somerset, Dorset, and Devon} (Exeter, 1888) 234-5.
becoming known as the “Gentleman Physician.” John was followed by eight children, the second of which, Thomas Marwood (d.1667), the “Loyal Physician”, assumed his estate and carried on his ancestors’ medical fame. He graduated from Exeter College Cambridge in 1609 and may have received medical training thereafter in Padua, just as his grandfather did. He practiced in London, possibly monitored King James I at his deathbed, certainly received a beleaguered King Charles I at Marwood House in 1644, and was in fact a member of the Royal College of Physicians. His position in the established church is verified in 1663, when he is listed as churchwarden of Honiton. The nephew of the “Loyal Physician” (by one of his eight siblings) is likely our own subject’s father, whose death was recorded in 1676. While the first of the line, the “old doctor”, believed he could reconcile his public service and profession with his “Catholick Faith”, Thomas Marwood “the Annotator” appears to have believed that his recommitment to the Catholic faith demanded another profession entirely.

Thomas Marwood, the subject of this chapter, also may have been preparing for the vocation of a physician. Though the alumni registers of England’s universities do not record his presence, and though in later life he regularly summoned external physicians to treat the individuals under his care, he nevertheless continually manifested an at least amateur familiarity with medicine. Whatever his original plans were, he ultimately

---

1067 See Rogers, Memorials, 235-6.
1068 See William Munk, “Marvodia,” The Genealogist (Exeter, 1895), 3-20; Rogers, Memorials, 236.
1069 Munk, “Marvodia”, 22.
1070 There was not another “Thomas Marwood” in the direct line of the Loyal Physician (d.1667) until “Thomas Marwood of Sutton, Esqr, Dyd March 21, 1748.” Rogers, Memorials, 238. For the death record our Thomas Marwood’s father, see BP 41.
1071 The only Marwood in “the annotator’s” line who is listed in the university registers is the “Loyal Physician” (d.1667): see Joseph Foster, ed., Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford,
forsook any professional post that might have been accessible to him as a legacy.

Some physicians in late Tudor and Stuart England privately identified themselves as Catholics, but anyone seeking an official medical license was required to take the oath of allegiance. Marwood, instead, “conver[ted]” in 1671 after an ambiguous, three year period of formation in the “House of Dr. Lett”, and after another ambiguous eight years was confirmed in Flanders at Our Lady of Sichem. That he met a member or representative of the Bedingfeld family there is likely, both because it had become a popular pilgrimage site for English Catholics and because he began his life-long position in Oxburgh Hall the same year. The political significance of Marwood’s rejection of a medical career in favor of his domestic service in a recusant household should be recognizable. In his reaction against the study of sixteenth century English Catholicism as “a purely private exercise in conscientious devotion”, Ethan Shagan argued that “any Catholic who withdrew from public life and elected not to engage in these processes [of collaborating with the Reformation] was necessarily making as bold a public statement of his or her religio-political views as the most ardent revolutionary.” This statement, though patently hyperbolic, underscores the significant political implications of Marwood’s confessional and professional decisions. Marwood did not believe that his religion, even if practiced covertly, could be reconciled with the public service of his

---

1072 Williams, Catholic Recusancy, 12-14.
1073 BP 41.
1074 BP 43.
ancestors. The private service he offered to a recusant family that shared his religion, on the contrary, led in 1695 to an order for his arrest.

Marwood did affirm his sacred duty to obey authority in his biblical annotations, which he must have composed after his religious conversion and abandonment of professional aspirations. But the object of his asserted loyalty became ambiguous after 1688. Who exactly was the legitimate monarch to whom Marwood owed and pledged allegiance? No simple answer existed for either question. William III of Orange was occupying the English throne. But had he unjustly usurped it from James Stuart II, the deposed Catholic king, who from his French exile of St. Germain continued to claim the English crown? Thomas Aquinas, with whose work Marwood displayed considerable fluency and affection, theorized that the commonwealth, under certain circumstances, could resist and overthrow a usurper. Marwood then could have understood his steadfastness to King James as following the dictates of his commentary, even though William III would have interpreted his stance as treason. Marwood’s biblical notes did not indicate which royal claimant he was supposed to obey.

Under these circumstances, his absence from public life becomes more revealing. Marwood migrated east to Norfolk during the reign of Charles II, James II’s non-Catholic predecessor whose legitimate reign he did not question; but he exited England itself in 1699 during the rule of William, whose legitimate reign he left questionable. Marwood escorted Henry Arundel Bedingfeld around the English exile communities of the Spanish

---

1076 Thomas Aquinas, Commentaria in Libros Sententiarum, Bk II., d.XLIV, Q. ii, a.2; Aquinas, Summa Theologica, II-II, Q. XLIII, a.2.
Netherlands and Northern France, to the religious vitality of which the Bedingfeld family had long been contributing. Among their first stops was the Carmelite convent of Lierre to visit the baronet’s sisters, Sr. Ann Bedingfeld, who died shortly after they arrived, and Sr. Margaret Bedingfeld, who would soon be elected prioress and would remain crucial to Marwood over the course of the entire period abroad. Their ultimate destination was the Jesuit academy of La Flèche, just west of Paris. Over the course of Henry Bedingfeld’s cinquième, or liberal arts education normally spread over five years, the young heir achieved the rank of “first imperator” for his mastery of French and Latin composition, rhetoric, and recitation of the Canisian catechism. While this half-decade study abroad program may seem benignly eccentric, Marwood knew it to be highly illegal. Only a few months after his party reached the Continent, Parliament affirmed the century-old penalty of £100 for sending a child abroad for a “Romish education”; moreover, it escalated the punishment for unlicensed recusant schoolmasters to imprisonment for life (11 & 12 Gul. III Cap. 4). The first prong implicated his patrons and dependent, while the second was a direct threat to himself. Was Marwood’s conscious defiance of Parliament a private act of conscientious devotion? Within the exile community, the question of rightful authority was even more fraught than Marwood’s original dilemma: now added to the competition between James II and William III were two other Catholic monarchs, Carlos II and Louis XIV, upon whose benevolence or calculated interest (or both) the resources of the community depended. The tension only increased when, within the next three years, the first three monarchs

1077 BP 93, 150, 153, 155.  
1078 BP 59, 157; Beales, Education under Penalty, 273; Williams, Catholic Recusancy, 8.
died and the last prompted war with England. Far from being politically inert, Marwood’s public “withdrawal” and entry into a recusant family and exile network abroad inserted him into multiple overlapping and competing spheres of jurisdiction.

Figure 7.8: Votive Picture of the Bedingfeld Family featuring the household and friends of 1st Baronet Henry Bedingfeld “The Cavalier” (d.1656), sheltered underneath the royal gown of the coronated Virgin Queen Mary (BP Inset)
J.H. Pollen, who edited the diary Marwood kept during his five-year custodianship, minimizes the political import of this venture abroad. Dismissing the anticipated objection that Marwood involved himself in international intrigue, Pollen remarks, “Foreign politics do not seem to have excited much enthusiasm in Marwood; they do not often do so in Englishmen.”\(^{1079}\) While it is true that Marwood may never have professed himself an intransigent Jacobite, it would be simplistic to conclude that Marwood was just as loyal as any other subject. The problem is not necessarily that he was less loyal, but that the concept itself did not possess a consensual object or stable set of criteria during the period. Hinging the entire discussion on the rigidly dichotomous question of “dis/loyalty” stifles potentially fruitful inquiries into Marwood’s continental interactions and engagements, which may have been politically meaningful whether or not he intended them to be.\(^{1080}\) Since Marwood would have been liable to punishment should his diary have been confiscated when returning through English ports, he limited his daily entries to terse, sometimes cryptic, statements and often abbreviated or transformed surnames.\(^{1081}\) His diary, nevertheless, provides us with an opportunity to explore the confluence and cooperation of English exiles and foreign powers and the political possibilities therein created.

\(^{1079}\) BP 51.

\(^{1080}\) See Michael Questier, “Elizabeth and the Catholics” in Shagan, Catholics and the ‘Protestant Nation’, 69-90. See also Questier, Catholicism and Community, 15-29. Both Ethan Shagan and Michael Questier outlined a more sophisticated approach to understanding English Catholic politics in the late Tudor & Early Stuart period than the conventional binary model relied upon here by Pollen and more or less accepted by Bossy, which had counterposed the quiescence of the Catholic majority with the fitful conspiracy of a few expatriates. Glickman fruitfully extended the approach outlined by Questier & Shagan to the post-Revolutionary period. See Glickman, English Catholic Community, 11-12.

\(^{1081}\) BP 57. For instance, midway through his diary, Marwood begins to refer to his ward Henry Bedingfeld as “Ld. Nelson”, rather than “the esquire.”
Tracking the company through which Marwood passes is illuminating. On his way to La Flèche, he and his ward are welcomed by various regular communities – Jesuits, Benedictines, Dominicans, Carmelites, Capuchins – as well as Beguines and seculars; and he frequently dined in mixed religious company. These English priests, monks, and nuns manifested a spirit of fraternity and conviviality that contrasted with the competitiveness and mutual animosity for which they were notorious back in England. At one such “splendid” dinner party of “about 22 persons” in Brussels, Marwood “saw the Elector (being King Charles’ birthday, after he heard Mass at St. Gudule’s). And that night were Illuminations & 3 pieces of several sorts of Wine ran out of a Conduit in the Court.” After having indulged these festivities for the King of Spain’s birthday with a foreign potentate, later that same winter of 1699/1700, Marwood enjoyed encounters, usually accompanied by refreshments, with the Count de Bersails, the Prince-Bishop of Liege, and Arabella Waldegrave, the granddaughter of King James II. If these personages were not eminent enough, he later held an audience with Charles Theodore, who was the Governor of Lierre, the Baron of Winterfeld, and not least importantly, the lieutenant general of King Philip V’s armies in the Netherlands - in the near future these armies would engage the English military in battle. Less than a year later, he supped with “the King of France, the Dauphin, Mons. the Duke of Chartres & Duchesse de

---

1082 BP 46-51, 55.
1083 See Questier, Catholicism and Community, 290-301, which surveys the loci classicci of English Catholic infighting from the late sixteenth century “Wisbech Stirs” and “Apellant Controversy” through the middle of the seventeenth century.
1084 BP 53-4 (November 6, 1699).
1085 BP 54, 57 (November 15 & 17, 1699 & January 17, 1700)
1086 BP 86 (January, 26, 1700).
Burgogne” and then followed them to Mass the next morning. That Louis XIV by this time had violated his Partition Treaty with William III, an infringement that ultimately would draw their nations into war, did not seem to unsettle Marwood’s journal account. Marwood also greeted prominent English lords – prominent at least until 1688, though Marwood continued to record titles conferred upon them by the Stuart Court after 1688. At the Scots College in Paris, Marwood visited John Caryll, James II’s former Secretary of State and a loyal Jacobite. He shared a table with Charles Widdrington whom the English government would arrest in 1715 for his role in the rebellion. The company Marwood kept should be no surprise since the College of La Flèche was one of the two academic destinations most frequented by Catholic Jacobite sons, many of whom had family in residence at the nearby Stuart Court of St. Germain. Pollen denies that Marwood ever attended the court in an editorial comment next to one close shave recorded in his journal, yet elsewhere his journal inscribes two visits to St. Germain. During his recreational jaunts through Angers in May 1701 and October 1702, Marwood resided with Lord Melford and his friends, Sir Adam Blair and Sir Charles Lyttleton, all noted advocates of Stuart restoration. And when Marwood stayed put at the College, his most frequent if not weekly social destination was the house “of my Lord Waldegrave”, the cousin and classmate of Marwood’s ward and grandson of James II,

1087 BP 90 (January 13, 1701).
1088 BP 54, 62.
1089 BP 86.
1089a BP 94 (Jan. 27, 1701). Note that Widdrington was the cousin of Sr. Mary Clavering, OSB of Pontoise, whose Bible-reading practices were witnessed in Chapter 3, and whose book of religious controversy remains at the library of Oxburgh Hall on account of a subsequent Clavering-Bedingfeld marriage.
1091 BP 86, 109, 151.
1092 BP 118.
whose father indeed died at St. Germain.\footnote{BP 93, 94, 95, 97, 102, 106, 107, 113, 115, 116, 119-20, 122, 125, etc.} When Marwood was not transmitting correspondence and finances to Oxburgh Hall through the covert intermediary, \textquotedblleft Mrs. Southwell\textquotedblright{} (who, in fact, was Sr. Margaret Bedingfeld, prioress of the \textit{enclosed} Carmelite convent of Lierre), he relied upon the Stuart banker in Paris, Sir Daniel Arthur.\footnote{BP 59, 62, 63, 66-75, 78, 79, 80, 89, 94, 95, 96, 99, 102, 104, 108, 111, 113, 121, 125, 130-1, etc. Together they exchanged letters and requests not just with Henry Bedingfeld, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baronet, but also with Edward Bedingfeld, their legal contact, who had been admitted to Gray\textquotesingle s Inn in 1667 and called to the Bar during the reign of James II (BP 234). For Arthur see BP 97 and Glickman, \textit{English Catholic Community}, 84.} Marwood continued to intermingle with representatives of foreign nations that held strained relations with England as well as with exiled countrymen who maintained pronounced Jacobite allegiances for the duration of his continental stay.

Marwood\textquotesingle s diary also shows him alert to international events that could affect religio-political alignments. He would hear about the religious conversion of influential English lords or about the deaths of continental Catholic nobility \textquotedblleft instant[ly].\textquotedblright{}\footnote{BP 67, 105, 132, 139 (June 24, 1700; July 13, 1701; Aug. 27, 1702, Dec. 22, 1702).} News relating to the royal succession in England especially captured his attention. On August 19, 1700, Marwood recorded the death of William, duke of Gloucester, the last Protestant grandchild of James II.\footnote{BP 70.} Marwood\textquotesingle s notation betrays his keen awareness that William\textquotesingle s demise was quite significant - it paved the way for the future accession of James\textquotesingle s oldest Catholic son. Marwood leaves unrecorded the less auspicious development of the Act of Settlement (1701), which legally blocked the succession of Prince James. Marwood did deem noteworthy, however, the rumors that William III, the
deposer of James II, had become “desperately sick.” William appears in Marwood’s diary variously as “K.W.”, King William, or “P.O.”, the Prince of Orange. Given that Marwood only referred to James with his supreme title - “K.J.”, his inconsistent nomenclature for William suggests that his conviction in the legitimacy of William’s rule was variable.

But Marwood’s personal sympathies or ambitions alone cannot account for the selectivity and partiality he exhibits in his news coverage. Rather, the underlying structures that supported the exile community molded its specific political orientation. When Carlos II grew morbidly ill, “orders came abroad to pray for the King of Spaine.” Beseeching God on behalf of this foreign king was a command, not just a suggestion. The news of his death was transmitted to Marwood “by a French officer.” It should not be inferred that such prayers or pro-Spanish sentiments were imposed upon the exiles against their will. But it should be recognized that, removed from England, neither Marwood nor his colleagues were operating within a political vacuum. The strategic interests, confessional allegiances, religious convictions, and institutional frameworks of the regions that these exiles inhabited shaped the public expression of their private sympathies.

1098 BP 102 (May 23, 1701).
1099 BP 86, 102, 122 (May 23, 1701; March 31, 1702).
1100 BP 86, 105, 110 (June 21, 1701; Sept. 19, 1701). Marwood’s reference to the birthday of the “Prince of Wales” rather than to the “Pretender”, the derogatory epithet for Prince James made commonplace by whig propagandists, also is indicative of his political considerations.
1101 BP 74 (Oct. 23, 1700).
1102 BP 77 (Nov. 14, 1700).
External pressures became more pronounced when the exiles’ host and home countries became adversaries in a broad continental conflict – the “War of Spanish Succession.” Marwood’s diary documented the French military’s increasing presence within the daily activity and imagination of the English Catholic community. Soldiers quarreled within their local quarters leading on several occasions to manslaughter; a “handsome regiment” of dragoons paraded through the town and showcased their siege weapon “cald Le Turc”; the embargo against English commerce was proclaimed publicly; a sergeant exposed a woman suited in “man’s armour”; and Henry Bedingfeld’s new sword broke in another simulated struggle.\(^{1103}\) As the mobilization effort swept through the community, it determined to leave no useful agent behind. On March 7, 1702, Marwood writes, “Yesterday was Published by Sound of Trumpet an Ordonnance du Roy for all English, Scotch, and Irish, from 18 to 50 that were in France & not in Employ to take Service in the Army on peine of being treated as Deserters.”\(^{1104}\) Either the ages or academic “employ” of Marwood and his ward must have excused them from military service, because the diary shows no pause in the student’s education. Nevertheless, the French army still managed to elicit the moral allegiance of the exile community. On April 8, 1703, Marwood reports, “Today the Te Deum was sung at the Church & College for the taking [of] Kelle.”\(^{1105}\) Whose victory was celebrated here? The French General Villars had conquered Kehl from the Holy Roman Emperor, the ally of England. Marwood and his community rejoiced at the success of their host, England’s

\(^{1103}\) BP 144-5, 148-50, 152 (Mar. 6, 8, 23, 1703; May 2-3, June 1 & 17, July 18, 1703).
\(^{1104}\) BP 121 (Mar. 7, 1702).
\(^{1105}\) BP 140, 146 (April 8, 1703).
current adversary, knowing that Louis XIV had proclaimed Prince James Stuart the legitimate Catholic king of England.

One might argue that room exists in the Bossy thesis to accommodate these erstwhile Catholic Jacobites. We could designate Marwood and his fellow exiles as those few radicals who removed themselves from the English body politic precisely because they rejected the syncretism and quiescence characteristic of the majority of their co-religionists. Yet we should resist this designation; it rests upon a dubiously rigid distinction between English Catholicism in the county and on the continent, exposed by Caroline Hibbard, Ethan Shagan, Geoff Baker, and Gabriel Glickman. The two regions certainly provided distinct opportunities to express religio-political inclinations. Each region had the propensity to shape the expression of these inclinations as well. But the variance in ideological commitment between individuals in one community or the other can be exaggerated. Very often there was no variance in the individuals either.

Thomas Marwood and his student, Henry Bedingfeld, were politically engaged in both communities. How their personal associations, social engagements, and liturgical celebrations became integrated with the public expression of Jacobitism in the Low Countries has been noted. After returning across the English Channel, their political activity transformed. Upon the death of his father in 1704, Henry inherited the title of the Bedingfeld estate. The manifest commitment (intentional or not) of Marwood and his former ward to the restoration of Stuart Catholicism, thereafter was supplanted by their

---

effort to protect *and expand* the resources and personnel of the domestic Catholic community. This revision of objectives did not necessitate a fundamental compromise of confessional principle. English Protestantism still had to be resisted. If it could not be conquered altogether at once, then it still could be reduced incrementally. Marwood’s favorite theological authority had argued that it would be wrong to resist an illegitimate monarch, even a tyrant by usurpation, if such resistance lacked a reasonable hope of success or would cause more injustice and suffering than it could correct.\textsuperscript{1107} After the successive accessions of Queen Anne and King George, the head of the Bedingfeld household could have calculated that the stability of the Hanoverian regime made rebellion morally impermissible.\textsuperscript{1108} A minority of his co-religionists decided differently in 1715 and 1745. Yet neither decision confirmed a new Catholic program of apolitical devotionalism.

The Bedingfeld agenda included negotiation with the state, rather than passive submission to it. Thomas Marwood testified in 1713 to the acclaimed lawyer Philip Yorke, Lord Hardwicke, on behalf of a suit filed by his former ward.\textsuperscript{1109} The two former exiles sought the complete return of the Oxburgh Hall property, some of which, they contended, had been unjustly alienated from Sir Henry Bedingfeld (d.1656) while he was imprisoned during the Civil War. Even more favorable to the recusant community than


\textsuperscript{1108} The economic disadvantages of failed rebellion would also have factored into Bedingfeld’s calculus, but not necessarily just for the sake of his own interests. The vitality of English Catholicism in part depended upon the financial, social, and political support of the gentry. Should his property be forfeited, the recusant network he supported would collapse along with it.

\textsuperscript{1109} BP 15.
the material outcome of this several-years-long trial was the political contact that was established with Hardwicke.\textsuperscript{1110} Local government agents began rigorously enforcing the recusancy laws against Bedingfeld after Prince Charles Stuart, the youngest son of James II, successfully invaded Scotland in 1745. Bedingfeld petitioned Hardwicke, now lord chancellor of the region and a member of the Council of Regency, to intercede on his behalf. Following the model of his old tutor, Bedingfeld did not disclaim his confessional commitments in order to feign a shared ecumenical program with the Protestant state. He explained to Hardwicke that the prosecutors had pledged not to relax the penalties against him “until his Conversion.” To prevent Hardwicke from having to puzzle over the potential meanings of this phrase, Bedingfeld clarified: “You know that conversion for a papist is fatal.”\textsuperscript{1111} Under these desperate circumstances his willingness to profess to his principal political intermediary, a Protestant, that he would seal his own damnation if he abjured Catholicism indicates that Bedingfeld had not toned down his confessional stance in the four decades since his education abroad. Even with this bold pronouncement in some sense renewing the credential of his long expired and always illicit Jesuit education abroad, Bedingfeld’s loyalty was affirmed by his powerful correspondent. Four days after Bedingfeld submitted his letter, Hardwicke responded with a pledge to support that one whose dutiful conduct had been reported by “all the Lords and Gentlemen of the County of Norfolk.”\textsuperscript{1112} Hardwicke apparently considered the difference between treason and fidelity more complex than whether or not one had

\textsuperscript{1110} On the English Catholic gentry working to secure establishment patronage in ways very similar to English Protestants, see Marshall & Scott, \textit{Catholic Gentry in English Society}, 13. For examples of Marwood and the Catholic Bedingfelds of Oxburgh relying upon their connection to Edward Bedingfeld at the Bar, see BP 54, 63, 95, 99, 101, 253.

\textsuperscript{1111} BP 163-4.

\textsuperscript{1112} BP 164.
been affiliated with the English Catholic exiles. The local prosecutors of Norfolk, however, believed that Hardwicke was wrong. Their collective dispute indicates that the distinct political meanings we have affixed to county or continental English Catholic affiliation were highly contestable in the middle of the eighteenth century.

Bedingfeld’s political engagement was not limited to a defense of his own assets, even if his first two suits could be reduced to that. A decade later Bedingfeld orchestrated the support of an Anglican bishop and a well-connected scholar in order to advance his libel against the “renegade Jesuit” Archibald Bower.\(^\text{1113}\) Bower, who was a former Jesuit turned Protestant tutor and public intellectual, was in the midst of producing a scathingly critical *History of the Popes* (1748-66). On account of Bower’s relatively high profile conversion story, his seven-volume instrument for deflating Catholic belief was a work widely anticipated – and the former pupil of Marwood meanwhile was preparing his challenge. Bower’s former superiors at the Jesuit College of Rome thought that they had the evidence to confound his scholarship. They had retained the letters that Bower had written them, in which he threatened to “apostasize” and compose the polemic if they would not remunerate him. Bedingfeld’s county estate hardly isolated him from the continental Jesuit network; in fact, Bower had first been reconciled to Catholicism by the Jesuit Philip Carteret in 1744 when Carteret was the chaplain of Oxburgh. After procuring the materials that he believed would expose Bower as a fraud, Bedingfeld convinced John Douglas, the Bishop of Salisbury, and Dr. Thomas Birch, the Secretary of the Royal Society, to lobby the court on his behalf. How did Bedingfeld successfully

\(^{1113}\) BP 165-197.
recruit these powerful members of the religious and academic establishment to support the Catholic interest, especially given his practice of expressing his confessional allegiance in a polemical manner? Bedingfeld decided to present his cause with the same confessional resolution, but this time without rhetorical hostility. Even Marwood’s Bible, which passed into Bedingfeld’s studious care, justified this moderated approach:

> Behold, the prophetic sign for the heretics of our time; [the angels] do not stop their sacred ministry or civility even though all heretics, through their lust, blaspheme and slander and curse. But in spite of the indignity, the apostle shows the example of angels who do not curse the demons, out of reverence for the common Creator and nature of society, however much their grace has been despoiled. Godeau

This commentary’s stark Manichean designation of Catholics as angels and Protestants as demons is consonant with the principles that Marwood and Bedingfeld had maintained all along. It suggested the possibility, nevertheless, that the angels might conduct “their sacred ministry” amongst the demons with civility so that society might be sustained. While it is doubtful that Bedingfeld meditated on this passage before composing his petitions, it is clear that his negotiation embodies its message. He could not conceal his intention to frustrate Protestant polemic. Yet he was able to persuade his intercessors that banning the book would serve their own confessional interests, too. Birch wrote that he was:

\[1114 \text{MB 977 (2 Pt 2:11).}\]
incapable of … intending any Service to the Church of Rome. Her Cause will indeed receive much more Advantage from the Character of such an Antagonist as Mr. Bower, than that of the Protestants will from his Work, which I know, upon Examination, to be the Product of Plagiarism rather than of real Knowledge of the Subject and proper Industry and Judgement in the Management of it.1115

Both Birch and Douglas believed the cause of Protestantism unable to benefit from the assistance of one “who in his heart, at the time of writing, was of no religion at all.”1116 For the success of Bedingfeld’s libel, their political leverage proved sufficient. The Bishop Douglas proceeded to engage Bower in a pamphlet war impugning both the integrity of his conversion and the authenticity of his scholarship.1117 Bedingfeld negotiated victory for the Catholic interest by actively engaging the political process. He won not because he had followed the “Modernist” turn and appealed to shared secular values, but because he was able to convince powerful Protestant patrons that his confessional interests coincided with their own.

The connections between the political activities of the tutor and his ward suggest that the boundaries between loyalty and disloyalty or between county and continental English Catholicism were rather fluid. The soft Jacobitism of Marwood and the confessionalized negotiation of Bedingfeld occupy two points on a continuum of Catholic engagement with the state. Communities of English Catholics could and did continue to

1115 BP 175.
1116 BP 175.
1117 John Douglas, Six Letters from A——d B——r to Father Sheldon, provincial of the Jesuits in England; illustrated with several remarkable facts, tending to ascertain the authenticity of the said letters, and the true character of the writer (1756) and Bower and Tillemont compared (1757).
operate through the first half of the eighteenth century as if “conflict was in.”

Marwood’s Bible implies that nondenominational spirituality and quiet devotion was not.

**************************************

Conclusion

To what extent then was Thomas Marwood a “revolutionary reader”? The Revolution of 1688 certainly impacted his position as Reader, officially defining his professional duties as criminal activities and requiring most of his personal relationships to be covert. Long before the Revolution, however, he had determined to reject the religion of his home and the church of his state. He communicated both rejections by glossing the Vulgate: no vernacular language, no vulgar or handy size, no blank space for family record-keeping and mundane note-taking, and no Reformed doctrine.

As much as that constituted a revolution against the Protestantism of his past, it appeared to be an embrace of traditional Catholicism. Yet even with respect to Catholicism, Marwood was resisting the developing traditions of the early modern era. The flow of lay Catholic scripture-reading in both England and France seemed to be moving over and beyond him as soon as he waded into these overlapping communities. He made his Bible an anchor against the rising tide of vernacular

---

1119 See Chapter 6.
scripture-books and moral commentary in these worlds as much as he did against the
content and form of biblical marginalia in the world that he tried to leave behind. If he
managed to avoid the Quesnel controversy when he was near the center of it at the Jesuit
College of La Flèche, the controversy managed to accompany him back to England. Not
only were the Moral Reflections being published in English a year after his return, but the
Bedingfeld kin network was involved in the production. The translation of the first
volume on the Gospel of Matthew was completed in 1706 by the elderly squire of Kent,
Thomas Whetenhall, whose second wife Elizabeth Bedingfeld was the aunt of
Marwood’s ward, and whose daughter was called upon by Marwood and company at the
Hôtel d’Estrade while they were touring Paris.\textsuperscript{1120} The final volume on the Gospel of
John was translated in 1709 by the Jacobite monk Thomas Southcot\textsuperscript{e}, OSB, whose family
members on the Continent were also visited by the Marwood party a few years earlier
and whose family in England one year later tagged with the Bedingfelds to support
one of his brothers in religion, Alban Dawnay, OSB, and his “riding mission” to the East
Anglian poor.\textsuperscript{1121} Despite his inescapable familiarity with the Quesnel campaign to
Jansenize and massively disseminate scripture books at home and abroad, Marwood
never addressed this pan-European Catholic Bible controversy, save for one Word: his
bulky, confessionally-glossed, Latin Bible. If its copious annotations expressed anything,
it was that it would leave no space for any accommodation with doctrines and reading
practices perceived to be Protestant.

\textsuperscript{1120} BP 86, 90-2; John Kirk, \textit{Biographies of English Catholics in the eighteenth Century} (London, 1909),
249; Gillow, \textit{Bibliographical Dictionary}, 3:621; Clark, \textit{Strangers & Sojourners}, 167; Jos Blom, Frans
Blom, Frans Korsten, and Geoffrey Scott, eds., \textit{English Catholic Books, 1701-1800} (Brookfield, Vt.:
\textsuperscript{1121} BP 45, 48, 64, 77, 79, 193, 208; Glickman, \textit{English Catholic Community}, 55, 178-9; Kirk, \textit{Biographies},
215; BL Add Mss 28254 f.47.
In this statement, though not in its language, Marwood made his book akin to the original Douai-Rheims Bibles, from which he heavily borrowed. But among Catholic annotators of those books, he situates himself distinctly in the minority. He actually was plundering the polemical printed notes, that notorious layer of the Bible that scholars have too frequently assumed was the readers’ center of gravity. Most marking readers sought this Bible’s liturgy, or demanded new editions with more of it, or contrived to impose it upon their books themselves.¹¹²² Early modern Christians, Catholic and Protestant, were habituated to the liturgical rite of worship before becoming accustomed to handheld scripture-books.¹¹²³ That they would be inclined to situate the latter within their experience of the former is not only attested by the evidence surveyed but it coincides with the religious priorities that had been consistently communicated to them by the bells ordering their days and times, by the physical plan of their towns and villages, by the solemn activities of priests more than by their words, by sacramental financial requests and will bequest formulas, by the built environment within churches that funneled awe and mystery toward “the holy of holies”, by the disciplines imposed upon them for infrequent reception of that which was restricted and elevated in that same space, and by their prior contact with sacred books – Hours, Primers, Legends -- that served as instruments for communing with the transcendent in manners and forms formerly reserved to the ordained. It was for these reasons that the new vernacular scripture books could be received as new physical instruments, as books first and texts second. That they might serve as more perfect passports to the established nodes of

¹¹²² See Chapter 4.
¹¹²³ See Chapter 3.
power, mystery, and communion, such that they might also, ultimately, amplify, substitute for, alter, or supplant them, was the trajectory of possibilities played out through the English Reformation and Counter-Reformation. That Marwood sought to extricate the Bible from these historical processes is equally clear. He uncharacteristically concealed his mark on the English Catholic Bible, and he appropriated instead an explicitly liturgically ordered book, *Meditations pour l’Avent*, to inscribe *himself* -- that is, both those foundational records of his chronology and lineage and the intimate spiritual resolutions and personal mementos that his former coreligionists had long been inscribing in the flyleaves of their Bibles.\textsuperscript{1124} Marwood’s Vulgate was for no such things. It bore the scriptures theologized. It is true that he labeled the Penitential Psalms, but he also surrounded them with the usual scholastic commentary, transmitting the Psalms and their labels as knowledge rather than rubrics for recitation. Marwood was transplanting the Bible, it seemed, from the setting of lay liturgical participation back to the clerical context of the university.

Even Marwood’s theological commentary, however, was not quite flowing with the current of contemporary *academic* study of Sacred Scripture. When the Jesuits’ *Ratio Studiorum* finally prescribed the teaching of Thomas Aquinas in 1599, it nevertheless bequeathed to different provinces and colleges, tacitly but deliberately, considerable latitude not to follow the *Summa Theologica* on all questions, and especially so outside the strict discipline of scholastic theology; moreover, the *Ratio* expressly prohibited the

\textsuperscript{1124} BP 41. This liturgical book, *Méditations pour l’Avent, & c., composées en Latin par le R.P. Busée: Nouvelle Traduction* (Paris, 1684), is lost from Oxburgh Hall. See also Chapters 3 & 4.
scholastic manner of teaching the Bible. Marwood’s resistance to novel curricular and pedagogical developments in the Catholic academy may perhaps then be better understood here as a conservative opposition. What may make it more revolutionary is that he was formulating this opposition as a non-cleric, as one normally excluded from the station of biblical theology in the first place. He was a proponent and scribe of established theological authorities, certainly, but he was more than that. He made theological authority new: mixing patristic, scholastic, and counter-reformation commentaries from a variety of linguistic traditions, sifting, paraphrasing, adjusting, augmenting (never diluting) and Latinizing in order to bring forth a fresh Glossa. If he was wary of vulgarizing the scriptures, he was daring in his assertion, implicit but unmistakable, that a layman could really do Catholic theology, and could construct a comprehensive Vulgate theology text.

Might we say then that Marwood expressed his creativity through Catholic forms, hiding his individuality under authoritative Latin citations? Indeed we might, without any inaccuracy. But if we are content to leave it at that, to isolate once again a reader’s dissent from the norm and identify that activity as critical or even revolutionary, we may miss more than we grasp. Marwood was not trying to protect notes that he was jotting to himself. Recall the well-laid structure and fine script. He very deliberately prepared this Vulgate. He was the Reader of Oxburgh Hall, and this book ultimately was a goodwill

1125 See Chapter 2.
1126 Besides the complete absence of any positive evidence for Marwood being a priest, there is a preponderance of negative evidence, the most convincing item of which is Marwood’s desperate summons of a priest to administer final absolution to Elizabeth Bedingfeld, dying of smallpox in Brussels, while he himself remained at her bedside. See BP 55.
offering of his to the Bedingfeld household.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1127}} Ahead of the dense theological commentary upon the text, Marwood inscribed on the title page a traditional Latin blessing to greet those whom he intended to open the book:

\begin{quote}
The Blessing that Moses gave to the people of Israel proclaims the Mystery of the Trinity. Numbers / Chap. 6.V.24.25.26

1. May the Lord Bless you and keep you.

2. May the Lord Show his Face to you and take pity on you

3. May the Lord Turn his Gaze to you and grant you Peace!\footnote{\textsuperscript{1128}}
\end{quote}

Marwood’s blessing also immediately signaled his capacity to draw orthodox Catholic dogma about the Trinity even from the Torah.

For his host family, Marwood composed this book as a teaching instrument in two different ways. First, it was to teach the Bedingfelds Catholicism. The Bedingfelds were among the privileged and non-risk-averse gentry families who periodically maintained a chaplain; yet they knew they could not count on holding down a priest forever, and a priest was not necessary for all the religious functions that this recusant household

\footnote{\textsuperscript{1127} Another presentation volume of Marwood may be his manuscript transcription of An abridgement of the life of St. Anne of Jesus, schooler and companion of St. Teresa of Jesus, of the holy order of our Lady of mount Carmel [1693], now held at the Yale Beinecke Library (Osborn b400). This book also contains the characteristic “é libris Thomae Marwood” autograph on the first page. One of the first destinations on the continental venture of Marwood and his Bedingfeld entourage was the Carmelite convent of Lierre. With the Carmelite nuns, which included “Mrs. Southwell” and Henry Arundel Bedingfeld’s other aunt, Sister Anne Bedingfeld, Marwood celebrated their grand jubilee on the feast of St. Theresa on Oct 15, 1699. This would have been a fine occasion to demonstrate to Sr. Anne his devotion to her Carmelite namesake, St. Anne of Jesus, by showing her his transcription of her \textit{vita}, which could be preserved for her family at the Oxburgh Hall Library. See BP 44-5, 48.}

required someone to perform. One of these functions was to offer a Catholic education, starting from the ground up. Priests often chafed at these extra obligations that their patrons demanded, which restricted their capacity to perform sacramental functions outside the domain of the household. Such was the lament of Alban Dawnay, OSB:

I know not whether I should have been employ’d more like a Missioner, if I had been in England tied to a particular family, especially with the drudgery of teaching ABC or Hic, Haec, Hoc; which I think a great impediment that a missioner cannot do that good to the souls, particularly in conversions, as otherwise he might.1129

Lay tutors could relieve the pedagogical burden. It was in this same letter of 1709 that Dawnay revealed that his “riding mission” to the East Anglian poor was dependent upon the sponsorship of Henry Arundel Bedingfeld. He could gain Bedingfeld’s support without having to become his “house priest”, because Thomas Marwood and Fr. Pordage, SJ, already had the religious functions covered. The “seigneurial Catholicism” of the post-Reformation was not eclipsed here in the “transition” to the eighteenth-century urban missions – the two missions remained interdependent.1130 But a reader could not remain in the household forever either. His books, however, could be less mortal. He had to be sure that the ones he left behind were useful. It was Dawnay again who explained what would not be useful – the plain scriptures, for “it is evidently proved that

1129 BL Add Mss 28254, f.47r.
many by reading the Scriptures fall into damnable errours”.

They had to come “explicated” in order for anyone “to be duly qualified for reading the Scriptures without danger of interpreting them wrong to their own destruction.” In Marwood’s absence then, his Vulgate would be protected from false interpretation. It would, moreover, become his surrogate teacher, or a “domme preacher” as Alexandra Walsham has argued, taking the phrase from the sixteenth century Catholic devotional writer Luis De Granada, whom Marwood indeed appropriated and Latinized for his marginalia. Subsequent autographs suggest that the male heirs returned to this teaching Bible and claimed it as their own – a family chaplain, was only allowed to borrow it for his own study in 1819 after signing it out. The tutor had fixed the Vulgate, such that it no longer belonged to the clergy anymore.

Second, the Vulgate was to teach the Bedingfelds that Marwood himself was Catholic. Whatever formation Marwood received in the house of Dr. Lett, he “converted” to Catholicism shortly thereafter. Whether or not that got him disowned, he ultimately cast his life and death with the Bedingfeld family, serving them in residence for almost four decades and, at the end of his term, accepting burial in their church. It took eight years after his conversion, however, before he was first welcomed to Oxburgh Hall. He already had acquired the education necessary to exercise his position, it seems; he just lacked bona fides. Renaissance patrons typically viewed their readers and scribes

1131 BL Add Mss 28254, f.1r.
1132 BL Add Mss 28254, f.1v-2r.
1133 MB Flyleaves include, in addition to “è libris Thomae Marwood”, the inscriptions of “Sir Henry Paston Bedingfeld _Bart_” and “Lent to Chaplain / April 1819 / MB.”
with some suspicion, as Ann Blair and others have sketched.\footnote{Ann Blair, \textit{Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age} (Yale, 2010); and Blair, Hidden Hands: Amanuenses and Authorship in Early Modern Europe (forthcoming, based on Rosenbach Lectures, March 2014); see also Gadi Algazi, "Scholars in Household: refiguring the learned habitus, 1480-1550," \textit{Science in Context} 16 (2003), 9-42; Deborah Harkness, "Managing an Experimental Household: the Dees of Mortlake and the Practice of Natural Philosophy," \textit{Isis} 88:2 (1997), 247-62; Alix Cooper, “Homes & Households,” in Katherine Park and Lorraine Daston, \textit{The Cambridge History of Science, Vol. 3: Early Modern Science} (Cambridge, 2006), 224-237. Leys, \textit{Catholics in England}, 83.} English Protestant schoolmasters faced the same scrutiny: to obtain a license to teach, orthodoxy was the most important credential.\footnote{Jewell, \textit{Education in Early Modern England}, 81-84.} That condition was even more crucial in an English recusant household where an untrustworthy servant could cost a family crippling fines, imprisonment, or, in rare cases, even death. Marwood’s background did nothing much to recommend him. He was not born into the family, nor was he raised a recusant. His notes in the family bible, however, could do some convincing. That kind of performance would help explain his heavy dose of Thomism and his extra-polemization of the Douai annotations, which already were more polemicized than any other printed annotations on the market. What Marwood was doing then was not primarily employing convention in order to shroud his creativity; his objective was precisely the opposite – he had to be creative in order to demonstrate his conformity. By emphasizing his rejection of his Protestant allegiance, he sought to be trusted with a Catholic one. If his Bible gained him entry, Marwood did not cease proving himself thereafter. When Henry Arundel Bedingfeld’s father died in 1704, the household intellectual was summoned by the brother of the deceased, Edward Bedingfeld, to compose the 2nd Baronet’s epitaph. Though the family’s recent tombstones passed over their illegal faith commitments in silence, Marwood did not hesitate to defy convention. After sending his draft to Edward,
Marwood record that “it was not, it seems, liked by him.” The line that had to be omitted in the end was this one:

His Religion & Loyalty he receiv’d, from a long & uninterrupted Line of Ancestors, as a sacred Depôt, which he left untainted to his young children.  

Despite his confessionalized exuberance, or more likely on account of it in the end, Marwood did win the confidence of his recusant patrons. On his own epitaph in Oxburgh, he was memorialized as “a true friend and singular benefactor to the Bedingfeld household.” Marwood is peculiar, no doubt, like every individual case; but perhaps we might understand each individual reader better if we are as attentive to their unprecedented needs to reconstruct community in a fractured early modern world as we customarily have been to their inclination to dissent.

1136 BP 241.
1138 BP 229.
### APPENDIX I

**Rheims New Testaments (RNTs), 1582-1738**

*L = Liturgical Notes

Total RNTs: 362  
Total Reviewed: 216  
Total with Notes: 138  
Total with Liturgical Notes: 78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Y/N notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Mazarine (Paris)</td>
<td>A 12941</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Keble, Oxford</td>
<td>KEB STC 2898 SPEC COL</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Keble, Oxford</td>
<td>KEB STC 2884 SPEC COL</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Mitterand (Paris)</td>
<td>A-10402</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Mitterand</td>
<td>Resac. A-4200</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Mitterand</td>
<td>Z RENAN - 1470</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1738 RNT</td>
<td>Arsenal (Paris)</td>
<td>FOL -T-227</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Arsenal</td>
<td>4-T-147</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Arsenal</td>
<td>4-T-78 (3)</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Arsenal (Paris)</td>
<td>4-T-146</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Bibliotheque Sainte-Genevieve, Paris</td>
<td>BSG Delta 65084 FA</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>British Library (BL)</td>
<td>1008.d.8 (Copy 1)</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>465.c.19 (Copy 3)</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>219.k.5 (Copy 2)</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>1006.a.17</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>C.69.bb.24</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>1109.f.22</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>12197</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>218.e13. or 2a2 (?)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>C110d2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1738 RNT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>L15g2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop College (London)</td>
<td>BS 2080 1633. Copy 1</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>BS 2080 1633 Copy 2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>BS 2080 1633 Copy 3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>BS 2080 1621 Res.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>BS 2080 1600 Copy 1</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>BS 2080 1600 Res Copy 2</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>BS 2080 1600 Res Copy 3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Accession No. Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>BS 2080 1582 Res. Copy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>BS 2080 1582 Res. Copy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Archivum Brittanicum Societatis Iesu (ABSI), London</td>
<td>AR, II, *173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>ABSI (London)</td>
<td>AR, II, *174, copy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>ABSI (London)</td>
<td>AR, II, *174, copy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>ARCR, II, *177</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St Johns, Oxford</td>
<td>STJ Main Libr C.4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Queens, Oxford</td>
<td>QUE Select Sel.d.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>New College, OX</td>
<td>New Restrictd BT3.190.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Exeter College, OX</td>
<td>EXE Strong Rm 9M 2884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>(Cudington) OX</td>
<td>ASC Gallery q.12.1 Deck B STC Vault STC 2884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Folger (DC)</td>
<td>Copy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Folger</td>
<td>Deck B STC Vault STC 2898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Folger</td>
<td>Copy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Folger</td>
<td>Deck B STC Vault STC 2946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Corpus Christi, OX</td>
<td>CCC Rare bks Z.58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Christ Church, OX</td>
<td>CHC Spec Coll. WA.5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth (York)</td>
<td>C.V.94 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>8E73 / R4004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>8E73 / R4003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>8E73 / R4005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>R4009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>R0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>8D37 / R0328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>8C42 / AA074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>AA075 / 8C42 [U225.52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>CV 94 DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>952 6x24 (or U 225.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td>C224 / 8B52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Arundel Castle</td>
<td>Arundel 42e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Arundel Castle</td>
<td>Arundel 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>CUL (Cambridge)</td>
<td>BSS.201.B82.8 (Anderson Room = BFBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>BSS.201.B82.9 (Anderson Room) = BFBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Catalogue</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>BSS.201.B82.10 (Anderson Room = BFBS)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>Syn.6.58.1 (RBR)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>Young.92 (RBR)</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>Ely c.258</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>Syn.6.60.8</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>BSS.201.C00.5 (Anderson Room = BFBS)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>Rel.c.60.2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>BSS.201.C21.3 (Anderson - BFBS)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>BSS.201.C21.4 (Anderson = BFBS)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>Syn.8.62.85</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>1.18.1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>Rel.c.63.1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT CUL</td>
<td>SSS.59.4</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT St. Johns, CAM</td>
<td>T.8.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT St. Johns, CAM</td>
<td>T.12.15</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT College, CAM</td>
<td>C.12.74</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT Selwyn, CAM</td>
<td>A.2.11</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT Parker Library</td>
<td>EP.V.13</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT Penn: Kislak RBC</td>
<td>BS 2080 1582</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT Downside Abbey</td>
<td>F 61 D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT Downside Abbey</td>
<td>F 62 F</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT Downside Abbey</td>
<td>F 63 E?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT Library (London)</td>
<td>1101.I.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT Dr. Williams</td>
<td>3050.c.28</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT Dr. Williams</td>
<td>3050.e.9</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT Durham University</td>
<td>Poor Clares 0389</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT Durham University (Cathedral)</td>
<td>ChapterLib Q.IV.8</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT Durham University</td>
<td>Cosin.B.4.3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>RNT Durham University</td>
<td>Routh 1.E.11</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT Durham University</td>
<td>Poor Clares 0331</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT Durham University</td>
<td>Poor Clares 0335</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT (Durham)</td>
<td>Lisbon BIB / CE≤</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>I.D.6.11</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>I.D.6.17</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>I.F.9.7</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>VIII.A.10.8</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>XVIII.D.2.3</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>I.D.6.14</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>W.C.2.24.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>1738 RNT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>I.E.5.3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harry Ransom Center (HRC), UT-

| 299 | 1582 RNT | Austin | BS 2080 6A3 | Y |
| 300 | 1582 RNT | HRC    | HRC BS 2080 Copy 2 | N |
| 301 | 1582 RNT | HRC    | HRC BS 2080 Copy 3 | N |
| 302 | 1582 RNT | HRC    | HRC BS 2080 Copy 4 | Y, L |
| 303 | 1600 RNT | HRC    | HRC BS 2080 1600 | Y, L |
| 304 | 1621 RNT | HRC    | HRC BS 2080 1621 | Y |
| 305 | 1633 RNT | HRC    | HRC BS 2080 1633 | N |
| 310 | 1738 RNT | HRC    | HRC BS 2080 1738 | N |

Houghton

| 312 | 1582 RNT | (Harvard) | Houghton STC 2884 | Y |
| 313 | 1600 RNT | Houghton | Houghton STC 2898 | Y |
| 315 | 1633 RNT | Houghton | Houghton STC 2946 / Bi 64. 633.5* | Y, L |

Chetham Library (Manchester)

| 322 | 1633 RNT | Chetham Library | B3.29.566 | N |

John Rylands (Manchester)

| 324 | 1582 RNT | John Rylands | R4438 | Y |
| 325 | 1600 RNT | John Rylands | R10730 | Y, L |
| 327 | 1621 RNT | John Rylands | R14140 | N |
| 328 | 1633 RNT | John Rylands | R14787 | Y, L |

American Bible Society (ABS), NYC ev.E.4.266A [1582 RNT Copy 1; Accn # 17761]

| 341 | 1582 RNT | Society (ABS), NYC | 17762 | N |

Ev. 1293 2.H.2. (Accn #19068)

| 342 | 1582 RNT | ABS | 17762 | N |

1582 RNT Copy 2; Accn #

<p>| 343 | 1600 RNT | ABS | #19068 | Y, L |
| 347 | 1633 RNT | ABS | 2.I.2. e 818 [Accn # 19981] | N |
| 351 | 1633 RNT | Fordham, NYC | 224.47 / Rhem. | Y, L |
| 353 | 1600 RNT | Morgan, NYC | E1 07 A | N |
| 356 | 1633 RNT | Morgan | E1 07 A [Accn #] | Y, L |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>RNT</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>NYPL</td>
<td>STC 2898; *KC 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>NYPL</td>
<td>STC 2898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>NYPL</td>
<td>*KC 1621 [STC 2923]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NYPL</td>
<td>STC 2946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td>Union Theological Seminary (NYC)</td>
<td>Tower BS2080 1582g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Union Rare: CB97 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Bar Convent (York)</td>
<td>G5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Bar Convent</td>
<td>F.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Bar Convent</td>
<td>F.8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Bar Convent</td>
<td>F.8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Bar Convent</td>
<td>E.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Newberry (Chicago)</td>
<td>Sp Coll Case 4A 1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>NLS BCL.A724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohlhausen Collection, St. Mary's</td>
<td>R01528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>1582 RNT Ohlhausen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Ohlhausen</td>
<td>1600 RNT Ohlhausen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Ohlhausen</td>
<td>1633 RNT Ohlhausen Copy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott</td>
<td>R05101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Seminary, Oscott</td>
<td>R05083: 1621 RNT Copy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott</td>
<td>R05082: 1621 RNT Copy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott</td>
<td>R05102: 1633 RNT Copy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott</td>
<td>R05098: 1633 RNT Copy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott</td>
<td>R05099: 1633 RNT Copy 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott</td>
<td>English College, Nat'l Library, BCL.S12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott</td>
<td>R05099: 1633 RNT Copy 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td>English College, Rome</td>
<td>202.4 1582 RNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Scotland (NLS)</td>
<td>BCL.A335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.AA522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Dry.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Hax.92 Unverified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>RB.m.601 [formerly L.2.E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>RB.s.2584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Accession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Hax.8 Unverified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Cassidy.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.E300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.C1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.AA379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Hax.88 Unverified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>RB.s.2590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Andrews,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Scheide, Firestone (Princeton, NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Scheide, Firestone St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>College, Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[D.228]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-Cabinet, Top Shelf, 2nd Row, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Beinecke</td>
<td>BEIN MLm639 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Beinecke</td>
<td>BEIN MLm639 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Huntington, CA</td>
<td>RB 96512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>RB 55355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>RB 30104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>RB 438000:498 / JRP 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>RB 47560 [C 2946]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>BS 2080 1582 (Bancroft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Bancroft</td>
<td>BS 2080 1600 (Bancroft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>KB1633.B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>Newberry 1633 RNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Oratory</td>
<td>Not Rev'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Abbey (UK)</td>
<td>Not Rev'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Archive</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Dublin (TCD)</td>
<td>24.k.65 (Santry Stacks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>TCD</td>
<td>Press A.6.12 (Early Printed Books)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>TCD</td>
<td>FF.hh.3 (Early Printed Bks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Marsh's Library</td>
<td>Dublin Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>UC-Davis</td>
<td>Shields Sp Coll BS 2080 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>UC-Davis</td>
<td>Shields Sp Coll BS 2080 1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>CUA (Wash, DC)</td>
<td>BS 2080 1600 STC (CUA), Copy 1, Accn # 145.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>CUA</td>
<td>Accn # 149100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>CUA</td>
<td>BS 2080 1600a STC (CUA); Accn # 148177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Congress (DC)</td>
<td>BS2080 1582 (LC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>86A567 Copy 1 (LAU SPCOLL General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>94A327 (LAU SPCOLL General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>94A424 (LAU SPCOLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>89B6 (LAU SPCOLL General) 86A567 Copy 2 (LAU SPCOLL General) [&quot;STC 2884 Copy 6 on flyleaf]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>BS 2080 1582 (LAU SPCOLL Shea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>220.4191 D743 (LAU Woodstock SPCOLL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>(Shea) Georgetown</td>
<td>E220.4191 D743 (ID 26-4180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>(Woodstock) Georgetown</td>
<td>Copy 7 Georgetown Sp Coll Shea Copy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>(Woodstock) Georgetown</td>
<td>L274 (LAU SPCOLL GTC) BS 2080 1633 (LAU SPCOLL Shea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>(Shea) Georgetown</td>
<td>225.52B582 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Smathers Spec Coll</td>
<td>225.52 .Am (Spec Coll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>UIUC (Illinois)</td>
<td>X 220.5 D741633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>UIUC (Illinois)</td>
<td>Baldwin 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>UIUC (Illinois)</td>
<td>IUA01454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>UIUC (Illinois)</td>
<td>IUA01456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>UIUC (Illinois)</td>
<td>Baldwin 4890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Benedictine College, KS</td>
<td>BS180 1633 (Benedictine RBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>St. John's Seminary (MA)</td>
<td>Unlisted [no online catalogue for library]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Garrett Library</td>
<td>225.52 Ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>(Johns Hopkins) Peabody Library</td>
<td>BS2080 1582 c. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>(Johns Hopkins) Chapin Library</td>
<td>225.52 B582 1582 c. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>(Williams College) Detroit Public Library: Burton Historical</td>
<td>Bible 2: 1582 (unavailable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Collection Univ. of Detroit, Mercy</td>
<td>225.52 Ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Univ. of Iowa</td>
<td>Not listed in online catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Michigan</td>
<td>BS 180 v.3 (Michigan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>(Univ. of Minn)</td>
<td>225.52 B47r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Duke Univ.</td>
<td>A-7 B582IOA c.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Duke Univ.</td>
<td>Herbert 177 c.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Cincinnati Public Library</td>
<td>225.5202 A 1582 (3rd floor, main library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Cincinnati Public Library</td>
<td>225.5202 A 1600 (3rd floor, main library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Malby Library, Mt. St. Mary's Seminary (Athenaeum of Ohio)</td>
<td>24008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Temple Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Library Company of PHL</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>1738 RNT</td>
<td>Library Co. of PHL</td>
<td>*A Bibl NT Eng 973.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Free Library of Philadelphia (FLOP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Dickinson College (PA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>La Salle University (PA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Villanova Univer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>(Philadelphia)</td>
<td>BS 2080 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>(Philadelphia)</td>
<td>BS 2080 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Fuller Theological Seminary (CA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>St. Mary's College (CA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>San Francisco State Univ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>USD J.S. Copley Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>USF - Gleeson Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Delaware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Emory Univ. Marbl. Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Emory Univ., Pitts Theology Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Loras College (IA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Loyola Univ. (Chicago)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Wheaton College (IL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>St. Meinrad Archabbey &amp; School of Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Southern Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>LSU (Louisiana State)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Gordon Conwell</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>St. John's Univ. (MN)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Wake Forest (NC)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Seton Hall (NJ)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Buffalo &amp; Erie County Pub Lib, Rare Books</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Canisius College (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>St. John's Univ. (MN)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>St. Joseph's Seminary (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Union College (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Cedarville Univ. (OH)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Ohio State (OSU)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Xavier Univ. (OH)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Mount Angel Abbey Library (OR)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Tennessee</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Houston</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>John Leland Center for Theological Studies (VA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Virginia Theological Seminary</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Gonzaga Univ. (WA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Nat'l Lib of Australia</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>State Lib of New S. Wales</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>State Lib of Victoria</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Western Australia</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>McMaster Univ (CA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>State Lib of New S. Wales</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>UT - Thomas Fisher Rare Book Lib (Toronto)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>UT - Trinity College Library (Toronto)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Donisha Women's College, Liberal Arts Lib (Japan)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve (OH)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>BYU (Utah)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Middlebury College (VT)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Dalton Mccaughey (Aus)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Dunedin Pub Library (NZ)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Tulane Univ. (LA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Our Lady of Guadalupe Seminary (Neb)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Dayton</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Leicester</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Boston Athenaeum</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Univ. of Tasmania</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>Christendom College (VA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>St Charles</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RNT = Rare Book Trade Network
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Library Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>USD - J.S. Copley Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>USF - Gleeson Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>FSU</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Emory Univ.</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Emory, Pitts Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Gordon Conwell (MA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>(HDS) DIV SCR 506.10 Bible</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>St. Louis Priory</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Buffalo &amp; Erie County Pub Library (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>College of Mt. St. Vincent (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>St. John's Univ. Library (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Univ. of South Carolina</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Ambassador College Library (TX)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>SMU-Bridwell Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Gonzaga Univ (WA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>St. Mary's College Library (CA, USA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Depaul Univ. (Chicago)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>St. Mark's General Theological Seminary (NYC)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Trinity Episcopal (PA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Univ. of Leicester</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Loyola Marymount Univ.</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Lutheran Theol. Sem. At Gettysburg</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Univ. of Leicester</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Allegheny College (PA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>USF-Gleeson Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Emory, Pitts Theol. Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>BC Theol. &amp; Ministry Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Gordon Conwell (MA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Andrews Univ. (Michigan)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Syracuse Univ.</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>SMU-Bridwell Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Catholic Theological College Mannix Library (Aus)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Nat'l Library of Australia</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Queen's College Library (Aus)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>Atlantic School of Theology Library (Nova Scotia)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>UCSB (CA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>1633 RNT</td>
<td>BC (Chesnut Hill, MA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>E220.4191 D743 Copy 2 (ID 52-508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>1582 RNT</td>
<td>(Woodstock)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>E220.4191 D743 (ID 28-7182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>1635 RNT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>1600 RNT</td>
<td>CUA (Catholic Univ of America)</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>1621 RNT</td>
<td>Auctioneers Philadelphia in Apr 2013</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX II

**Douai Old Testaments (DOTs), 1609-1635**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Y/N Notes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Mitterand (Paris)</td>
<td>A-23221</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Mitterand</td>
<td>A-4044</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Mazarine (Paris)</td>
<td>A 12954 (1-2)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Arsenal (Paris)</td>
<td>4-T-78 (1-2)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-A-367 inv. 406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>BSG (Paris)</td>
<td>FA.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BSG Delta 16610 (1-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>BSG</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>465 A 6</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>C.110.d.3. 1008.c.10. &amp;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>1008.c.11.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Heythrop (London)</td>
<td>BS 180 1635</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS 180 1610 Copy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>3. (Tome 2 only)</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS 180 1609_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>Res. Copy 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS 180 1609_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Heythrop</td>
<td>Res. Copy 1.</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>ABSI (London)</td>
<td>AR, II, 171 (vol.2)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR, II, 171 (Vol.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>ABSI</td>
<td>Copy 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR, II, 171 (vol.1, copy 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>ABSI</td>
<td>ARCR, II, num.172</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>ABSI</td>
<td>STJ Main Libr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>St. Johns, OX</td>
<td>C.4.32.v.2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QUE Select</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Queens, OX</td>
<td>Sel.d.2-3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Restrictd BT3.190.16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>New College, OX</td>
<td>EXE Strong Rm</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Exeter College, OX</td>
<td>BT3.190.16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>All Souls College, OX (Codrington)</td>
<td>9M 2207</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASC Gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>q.10.9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Bodley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bib.Eng.1635.d1-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Bodley</td>
<td>Bodley (Radcliffe Science Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Bodley</td>
<td>Bodley (Radcliffe Science Library)</td>
<td>AA.3.4.Th.Seld. Deck B STC</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Folger (DC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>VAULT STC 2207</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1609-10</td>
<td>Christ Church, OX</td>
<td></td>
<td>WA.5.13-14 8E77 R4013 &amp; R4014</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td></td>
<td>8E77 R4011 &amp; R4012</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td></td>
<td>8E77 R0323 &amp; R4010</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td></td>
<td>C.V. 94 B &amp; C.V. 94 C</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td></td>
<td>C223 8B52 8E67 R0325 &amp; R4025</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Ampleforth</td>
<td></td>
<td>R4025</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Arundel Castle</td>
<td>Arundel 42C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Arundel Castle</td>
<td>Arundel 42</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSS.201.C09.3-4 (Anderson = BFBS)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSS.201.C09.5-6 (Anderson = BFBS)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>*BSS.201.C09.7-8 (Anderson = BFBS)</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Syn.6.60.10</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Young.147 BSS.201.C35.6 (Anderson = BFBS)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSS.201.C35.6 (Anderson = BFBS)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Syn.5.63.7</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>College, CAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>T.5.27-28</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>St. Johns, CAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>T.5.27-28</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>St. John, CAM</td>
<td>T.12.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>College, CAM</td>
<td>C.12.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>H.6.16-17</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Penn: Kislak RBC</td>
<td>BS 180 1609</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Downside Abbey</td>
<td>F 62 C</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Downside Abbey</td>
<td>F 64 F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Poor Clares 0332-0333</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Poor Clares 0387-0388</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Poor Clares 0327-0328</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Poor Clares 0329-0330</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Ushaw College (Durham)</td>
<td>I.D.6.12-13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>Lisbon Bib / β</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Ushaw College</td>
<td>I.D.6.15-16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Houghton STC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Houghton STC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Andover HTS</td>
<td>Safe 306.10 Bible</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>A.6.10</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>John Rylands</td>
<td>R1806</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>John Rylands</td>
<td>13212</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>1609-10</td>
<td>Blondel house: Crosby Hall, Lancashire</td>
<td>Private: Crosby Hall, Lancashire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>HRC: UT-Austin</td>
<td>Copy 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>HRC: UT-Austin</td>
<td>Copy 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>HRC: UT-Austin</td>
<td>Copy 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>HRC: UT-Austin</td>
<td>Copy 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>EDOT</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Copy</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>HRC: UT-Austin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>HRC: UT-Austin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>HRC: UT-Austin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>HRC: UT-Austin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>American Bible Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>American Bible Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Columbia Butler (NYC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Morgan Union Theological Seminary (NYC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Bar Convent (New York City)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Bar Convent (York)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Bar Convent Ohlhausen Collection (Houston)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>1609-10 DOT Ohlhausen Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Ohlhausen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Ohlhausen St. Mary's, Oscott St. Mary's, Providence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott St. Mary's, Providence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Oscott Providence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>St. Mary's, Osco Providence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>English Language College, Rome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Shelf</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>RB.s.2588</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>RB.s.2589</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.C1417-18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A550-51</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.AA473</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.AA383</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.AA378</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.AA380</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.A552</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.C1120</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Unverified</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB.m.603</td>
<td>[formerly shelved at L.2.e]</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Univ. of</td>
<td>A.7.39</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Univ. of</td>
<td>JA 1053</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bib BS180.C09</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bib BS180.C09</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
<td>Arundell VE 23-34</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
<td>Arundell I.A.17</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
<td>Arundell I.A.15</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
<td>Arundell I.A.16</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arundell XV.E.14-15</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Stonyhurst</td>
<td>Scheide</td>
<td>Scheide</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>(Princeton, NJ)</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
<td>6.1.11_12</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>College (Ware)</td>
<td>S.6.18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
<td>S.6.14</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
<td>S.6.13, S.6.16</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
<td>S.6.17</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[D.241] S-</td>
<td>Cabinet, Top Shelf, 2nd Shelf, 2nd Row,</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-Cabinet, Top Shelf, 2nd Row, 5?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>1609_10</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Library Location</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
<td>Shelf Number</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542 1635 DOT</td>
<td>St. Edmund's</td>
<td>MLm239 609</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Beinecke (Yale)</td>
<td>MLm239 635</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 1635 DOT</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>RB96554</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Bancroft (UC-Berkeley)</td>
<td>BS 180 1609</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Beinecke (Yale)</td>
<td>BS 880 1635</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604 1635 DOT</td>
<td>York Minster</td>
<td>XI.N.5.6</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>BB.V.27.stc</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Dublin (TCD)</td>
<td>24.k.93,94</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Dublin (TCD)</td>
<td>Sp Coll STC 2207 copy 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>BS 180 1609 (LAU Woodstock Shrub Oak) ID 52-509, 513</td>
<td>Y, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>BS 180 1609 (LAU Woodstock Shrub Oak) ID 52-509, 513</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>Q147 (LAU SPCOLL GTC)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>BS 180 1609 (LAU SPCOLL Shea) 220.4191.D743</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>SpColl) (LAU Woodstock SpColl)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681 1635 DOT</td>
<td>UIUC (Illinois)</td>
<td>IUA01239</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>UIUC (Illinois)</td>
<td>Baldwin 4700</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>UIUC (Illinois)</td>
<td>IUA01224</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695 1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>BS180 1609 c.1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Library Name</td>
<td>Catalog ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>Chapin Library, Williams College</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>Detroit Public Library: Burton Historical Collection</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Collection Univ. of Michigan</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Duke Univ. Cincinnati Public Library</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Library Maly Library, Mt. St. Mary's Seminary (Athenaeum of Ohio)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Ohio Maly, Athenaeum of Ohio</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Temple Library (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Library Company of PHL Parrish</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>SCS (Phila)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Villanova</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>Claremont School of Theology (CA)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>San Francisco State Univ</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Emory Univ.</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>Emory, Pitts Theol. Library</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Loras College (IA)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>Indiana Univ.</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>Tulane (LA)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>St. John's Univ. (MN)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>St. Mary's Univ. of MN-Winona</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818</td>
<td>St. Catherine Univ. (MN)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819</td>
<td>Univ. of St. Thomas (MN)</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Kenrick-Glenn Seminary (MO)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>St. Louis Priory</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Seton Hall (NJ)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>St. Joseph's Seminary (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Xavier Univ. (OH)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Univ. of Portland</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Ambassador Univ. Library (TX)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Rice Univ. Fondren Library (TX)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Gonzaga Univ (WA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>McGill Univ. (CA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Nat'l Library of Ireland</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Nat'l Library of Israel</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Donisha Women's College, Liberal Arts Library (Japan)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Tokai Univ Library (Japan)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Lasalle Univ (PA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>USD-J.S. Copley Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>FSU</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Univ. of Florida</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Univ. of Chicago</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>BC Theology &amp; Ministry Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Buffalo &amp; Erie County Pub Library</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>NYPL</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Niagara Univ. (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>843</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>St. Joseph's Seminary (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Syracuse Univ. (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>OSU (OH)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Univ. of Dayton (OH)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>UT Thomas Fisher RBC (Toronto)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Nat'l Library of Ireland</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>University College Dublin</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Depaul Univ (Chicago)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Dunedin Pub Library (NZ)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Univ. of Houston</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>BYU (Utah)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Univ. of Leicester</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Angers-Uco-Bu-Lettres</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve (OH)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>St. Marks General Theological Seminary (NYC)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Univ. of Aberdeen</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southern Baptist Theological

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>St Meinrad Archabbey &amp; School of Theology (IN)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Nat'l Library of Australia</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>State Libr of New S Wales</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Cornell Univ. (NY)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Trinity Episcopal (PA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Our Lady of Guadalupe Seminary (NE)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Mount Angel Abbey (OR)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>St. Marks Seminary (NYC)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Alexander Turnbull Library (NZ)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Knox College (NZ)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>1635 DOT</td>
<td>Christendom College (VA)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Georgetown E220.4191 D743 (1609-10 DOT)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Mount St Alphonsus Seminary, NY (sold by Freeman's Auctioneers Philadelphia in)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>1609_10 DOT</td>
<td>Apr 2013)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

Alimentary Biblical Passages from Reformed English Bibles

• Apocalypse 10:8-11 (Geneva, 1599)

  o “And the voice which I heard from heaven, spake unto mee againe, and said, Goe, and take the little booke which is open in the hand of the Angel, which standeth upon the sea, and upon the earth. So I went unto the Angel, and sayd to him, Give mee the little booke, and He said unto mee, Take it, and eat it up, and it shall make thy belly bitter, but it shall be in they mouth as sweet at hony. Then I tooke the little booke out of the Angels hand, and ate it up, and it was in my mouth as sweet as honey: but when I had eaten it, my belly was bitter. And he said unto mee, Thou must prophesie againe among the people and nations, and tongues and to many Kings.”

• Ezekiel 2:8-10, 3:3 (KJV, 1611)

  o 2:8-10: “But thou, son of man, hear what I say unto thee: Be not thou rebellious like that rebellious house; open thy mouth and eat that I give thee. And when I looked, behold, a hand was sent unto me, and loe, a roule of a book was therein. And he spread it before me, and it was written within and without, and there was written therein lamentations, and mourning, and woe.”

  o 3:3: “And he said unto me, sonne of man, cause thy belly to eate, and fill thy bowels with this roule that I give thee. Then did I eate it, and it was in my mouth as honie for sweetnesse.”

• Jeremiah 15:16 (Geneva, 1599)
• Psalm 118:102-3 (KJV, 1611)
  o “Thy words were found by me, and I did eate them, and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart.”

• Job 23:13 (Geneva, 1599)
  o “I have not departed from thy Judgements: for thou hast taught me. How sweet are thy words unto my taste! Yea, sweeter than hony to my mouth.”

• Joshua 1:8 (KJV, 1611)
  o “This book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to doe according to all that is written therein.”

• Deuteronomy 8:3 (KJV, 1611)
  o “…that man doth not live by bread onely, but by every word that procedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live.”

• 1 Corinthians 3:1-3 (KJV 1611)
“And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. / I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able. / For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men?”

Hebrews 5:12-14 (KJV 1611)

“For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. / For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. / But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who be reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.”

1 Peter 2:2 (KJV 1611)

“As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: / if so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious.”
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