

The Guardian of the Text: Humanistic Philology and Authority in Bellarmino

Oswaldo Cavallar

For Roberto Bellarmino (1542-1621), the years between 1923 and 1931 brought more radical changes in his position in the extraterrestrial hierarchy than all the three hundred years that had elapsed since his death in 1621: beatification was followed by canonization, and the whole process was concluded by honoring him as a Doctor of the Church. According to the microhistorian Pietro Redondi, one of the consequences of this post-mortem promotion was a radical change in his iconographical representation as well. Bellarmino was the official theologian of the Roman church during the pontificate of Clement VIII and Paul V, a “protagonist of the principal political and religious cases of his time,” and twice a candidate for the papal tiara. That was the role, states Redondi, in which he appeared in his pre-canonization portrait. His *sguardo*, the expression on his face, was worthy of a great cardinal, one who “had sailed through all the Roman Congregations”, and of a “great politician of European stature”. But after the canonization, this *sguardo* disappeared; its place was taken by an “expression of meek spirituality and absentminded ecstasy”. His eyes lost their former impressive character, the power to pierce the heart of the spectator, and they now seem “to wander along the walls of the rooms of the Holy Office”.¹⁾

Yet the history of the written portraits does not follow the pattern

described by Redondi. Here the different *sguardi* appear to be the result of the peculiar interests of the biographers, and their basic alteration well preceded his beatification and canonization. The Roman *Avviso* (obituary announcement) of Bellarmino's death describes him as "a brilliant man, an outstanding theologian, a passionate defender of the Catholic faith, a hammer of heretics". Then, in accordance with the usual criteria of humanist biography, it adds a list of laudatory adjectives: "equally pious, prudent, humble, and generous to the poor in the highest degree".²⁾ Bellarmino's first Jesuit biographer, Giacomo Fulgiatti, also in deference to Renaissance literary standards, opened with a typically humanistic commonplace about the honor of his hero's family name; he carefully supported his theses by references to the considerable body of material gathered on the occasion of the preliminary inquiry for an eventual process of beatification, including Bellarmino's own last will.³⁾ The eighteenth-century biographer, Arcangelo Arcangeli, approached him solely from the point of view of "what can be useful to the soul of the reader". He thus put aside most of the historical research done by his predecessors and changed the humanistic virtues into "spiritual gifts". The "worth" of this biography was noted by the first of the two ecclesiastical censors appointed to review it. "This work," the censor wrote, "is a field, a garden full of flowers and fruits, where every person, ecclesiastics in particular, . . . can learn maxims of piety and doctrine to enrich his own soul and that of his neighbor."⁴⁾ Bellarmino's twentieth-century biographer, James Brodrick, who also wrote biographies of other prominent Jesuits, sought to strike a balance between his hero's scholarship and his sanctity. Yet, as Brodrick himself put it, he "flaunted his love for his hero" in a way that Bellarmino himself "would have found distress-

ing”. He “hardly admitted to a single spot in his sun,” and, as style was concerned, “he seemed to be addicted . . . to putting adjectives in front of almost every noun.” Even in 1961, when he published an abridged and revised version of his biography, upgrading the title of “blessed” to “saint”, he left the image he had created in the first edition basically unaltered.⁵⁾

Meanwhile, in the atemporal field of post-Tridentine theology, Bellarmino’s position remained immovable and unchallenged. According to the seventeenth-century scholar Jacques Bossuet, it was identical with the unchanging tradition of the Roman Church itself. This identification was still accepted in the late nineteenth-century, when Ignaz von Döllinger recognized in the definition of the First Vatican Council (1869–1870) of papal infallibility little more than a restatement of Bellarmino’s views.⁶⁾ At the beginning of the twentieth century, however, Bellarmino, the theologian at last, became the object of historical research. The historian of dogmas Joseph Turmel inquired into his elaboration of a positive theology, albeit mostly to demonstrate its longevity.⁷⁾ Then two others, Pontien Polman and E. A. Ryan, examined his historical scholarship; the former considered it within the context of the sixteenth-century theological controversies, the latter in the context of his other writings.⁸⁾

Bellarmino’s involvement in Galileo’s affair, on the other hand, has long elicited the interest of historians of science. Pierre Duhem, at the beginning of this century, elevated Bellarmino to the rank of forerunner of the epistemology of modern science—an epistemology, he stated, that was well expressed in his injunction to Galileo to treat the Copernican system as a scientific hypothesis, not as a description of the real world.⁹⁾ Out of deference for Duhem’s view, Brodrick, too, presented

him as a scientist with a defensible cosmological theory,¹⁰⁾ and Guido Morpurgo Tagliabue has also reasserted the soundness of his epistemological position.¹¹⁾ On the other hand, those who disagree with Duhem's views have presented an image of Bellarmino expressing "meek spirituality and absentminded ecstasy". Such, for instance, was the way Giorgio de Santillana described him in his book on Galileo: "an old man, plagued with ill-health, harassed with work, who found escape from it only in prayer and in sighing for the consolation of the other world." And in support of this image, he cited Bellarmino's spiritual writings, particularly his *De ascensione mentis in Deum* and *De gemitu columbae, sive de bono lacrimarum*, stating that this was indeed what he was interested in.¹²⁾

The major effect of beatification and canonization on Jesuit scholars was not to force them to change Bellarmino's image, but to send them to their own archives. Their labor had the merit of uncovering a considerable body of hitherto untapped sources. Xavier Marie Le Bachelet published a substantial collection of documents related to Bellarmino's curial activity. Sebastian Tromp edited his sermons and other theological writings as well.¹³⁾ This documentation has revealed several aspects of Bellarmino's activity that neither iconographers nor biographers, neither historians of science nor theologians, had ever noticed or taken into due consideration: his work as a biblical philologist.

The first of these documents is the so-called Bellarmino *Autobiography*. In 1613, at the request of Mutio Vitelleschi, an assistant to the general superior of the Society of Jesus, Claudio Aquaviva, Bellarmino sketched an outline of his life.¹⁴⁾ In form, this piece appears to be more a biography than an autobiography. It was written at the bequest of

Francesco Sacchini (d. 1626), who was the semiofficial biographer of the Society. Indeed, in the order of its presentation it follows the questionnaire provided by Sacchini himself. It conforms to a humanistic biographical pattern long before worked out and tested in the biographies Sacchini had inserted in his history of the Society.¹⁵⁾ It is written in the third person and, to disguise the referent, the author refers to himself as “N.”: “N. was born in the year. . .” It is replete with anecdotes, such as the Florentine episode of the old lady who, worried about Bellarmino’s weak physical constitution, prayed throughout one of his sermons that he would get to the end of it safely.¹⁶⁾ It puts also considerable emphasis on the author’s versatile mind: “His talents were neither subtle nor elevated, but suitable to any task so much that he could take up any field indifferently.” Similarly, the *Additiones* to the autobiography emphasize once again this versatility; but they identify it as a gift for comprehending and explaining every sort of subject matter: “*donum et facilitas ad omnia capienda et explicanda*”.¹⁷⁾

The autobiography also presents other aspects of the author’s commitments. It begins with a description of the elements Bellarmino thought important for understanding his life: his family, the Society of Jesus, and the papacy. It stresses the piety of his parents, particularly of his mother, who was “devoted to almsgiving, prayers, contemplation, fasting, and self-denial”. It introduces the Society of Jesus in the person of Paschal Broet, one of the first nine companions of Ignace of Loyola, who gave the Spiritual Exercises to Bellarmino’s mother. Finally, it presents the author’s particular relation with the papacy. The pope it describes is one whose intellectual accomplishments as a humanist also reflected Bellarmino’s lifelong ideals: Marcello Cervini (d. 1555), who was indeed his compatriot and his uncle.¹⁸⁾

The second thesis the biography advances derives directly from Bellarmino's own versatility. The chief manifestation of this adaptability was his capacity for mediating. Indeed, much of his efforts in the realm of theology were directed toward the task of reconciling two apparently contradictory roles he had chosen for himself: that of the theologian and that of the pastor. Of these two he preferred the latter. The model on which he patterned his sermons, at least until he created his own style (or thought he had), was that of Cornelio Musso (1511-1574), the renowned preacher who gave the opening sermon at the Council of Trent and whose preaching style was "based on ideas, not images" and was "clear and certain, not dubious".¹⁹⁾ And it is as a preacher that he often portrays himself. However, he was always careful to stress that he preached only in obedience to a command of his superiors or with their permission. During a brief visit to the monastery of Camaldoli, it was the local abbot who "*ex improvviso iussit, ut haberet N. exhortationem ad patres loci illius*"; and while he was in Mondovì he also preached "*pene coactus a superioribus*".²⁰⁾ The image Bellarmino wished to convey is that of a religious who followed and implemented the Tridentine norms on preaching. Yet, thanks to the demands of his superiors, he had the opportunity to exert himself in the field of theology.

More important still, the autobiography puts considerable emphasis upon Bellarmino's humanistic formation. In his youth, he learned to love poetry, and, after spending more than one night reading Virgil, he learned to versify in such a fashion that nothing could be found in his poems but one "*verbum virgilianum*" after the other.²¹⁾ He mastered Greek by himself, when he was assigned to teach Demosthenes at the college of Mondovì. He barely knew the alphabet, when he began the

course. He therefore told the students that he wanted to start with the basic rules of grammar and work up to the text. In this way he “mastered day by day that which he was going to teach next to his pupils”; and he ended the course reading Isocrates as well.²²⁾ Similarly, years later in Louvain, when he was ordered to teach Hebrew, he resorted to the same device. But, with increased confidence in his own didactic capabilities, he assured the students willing to follow him that in eight days they would be able to read and understand Hebrew with the sole help of a dictionary. Indeed, he learned the language by himself, for he discovered that the traditional organization of the material usually adopted by Jewish teachers and other compilers of Hebrew manuals did not meet the pedagogical standards of Jesuit colleges.²³⁾

Equally consonant with the humanistic training is Bellarmino’s expression of dissatisfaction with the various brands of scholastic philosophy, in which his early philosophical and theological formation had still been bound. He deemphasized his studies of philosophy and logic at the Collegio Romano, observing that he was sick for most of that time.²⁴⁾ He pointed out that professors at the University of Padua did little but read printed manuals, and they did not even deign to answer the questions posed by the students.²⁵⁾ According to the autobiography, he was thus, or wished to appear as, a self-taught humanist and theologian, but one who applied his humanistic training and learning specifically to the realm of theology.

The autobiography furthermore points out that Bellarmino’s sojourn in Louvain marked a turning point in his career. It was there that he was ordained priest and that he took the fourth solemn vow of obedience to the pope, thus becoming a full member of the Society of

Jesus. It was there that he changed definitively the subject of his teaching from the rhetorical arts to theology.²⁶⁾ It was there that he faced his first challenge as a theologian, and responding to it was by no means easy. Shortly before his arrival, the challenge of one of the leading members of that faculty, Michael Baius (Michel de Bay, d. 1589), had been so strong that it had been condemned by Rome. But Baius paid no attention to the injunction of silence imposed upon him. He started once again to discuss his theses openly and to publish a defense of them. Upon his arrival, Bellarmino found the university students in tumult and the professors sharply divided among themselves.²⁷⁾

Bellarmino was not immediately involved in the dispute, for he was assigned to teach at the local Jesuit college. But he could not avoid it; and indeed he soon became Baius's chief adversary. He disagreed with Baius on questions of grace, i. e., how to conceive the relationship between natural and supernatural or, in the terminology of that period, on whether the concept of *homo in puris naturalibus* should be admitted. Baius considered the status of *rectitudo* and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit necessary for the completeness of human nature. Bellarmino maintained the theoretical possibility of distinguishing between human nature in itself, on one side, and the *rectitudo* and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, on the other. In short, while Baius stressed a teleological conception of human being and consequently rejected the concept of "pure natural", Bellarmino stressed an ontological understanding of human being—one that required the distinction between natural and supernatural.²⁸⁾ Stripped of its theological cloak, this dispute foreshadows the recent debate on "nurture" vs. "nature"—or, if the theological stomach is squeamish, at least this recent debate may

furnish a way to approach that controversy.

It might, therefore, appear as if the role of grace was once again the primary subject of a theological controversy. Yet a diverse understanding of the proper method of theological inquiry was what also divided Bellarmino and Baius. Bellarmino agreed with Baius upon one element of methodology: the importance of patristic argument. He also accepted Baius's appreciation of positive theology in contrast to scholastic, for that was the counsel Ignace gave in his *Exercitia* and codified in the *Constitutiones*.²⁹ He disagreed with Baius's almost exclusive reliance on Augustine and on his manner of interpreting him. Baius thought that Augustine could provide a support for his theology of grace and the best weapon against the "heretics" of his time. He was also confident that Augustine represented the position of the whole Church, and he expressed this confidence in the motto: "*Ubi Augustinus ibi ecclesia. Malo cum Augustino errare quam cum pontifice recte vivere.*" Bellarmino, on the other hand, insisted upon including all the Church Fathers, Greek as well as Latin. He also stood for the inclusion of the decrees of the councils. Indeed the councils, in his mind, took precedence over the Fathers themselves, including Augustine. If a definition of a council seemed not to be in agreement with Augustine, worse for him, because the Holy Spirit was surely on the side of the councils. The decrees of the councils, moreover, had the function of furnishing the theological language to be employed in that particular historical situation—a language that could be non-Augustinian, because the heresies of that time were just the opposite of those Augustine had to fight against (*in altero extremo et contrarie illis contra quas beatus Augustinus agebat*).³⁰ In interpreting Augustine he paid attention to the historical context of his writings. And with the support of the "consen-

patrum”, he became convinced that his anti-Pelagian writings did not reflect his long-term theological views nor those of the rest of the equally authoritative Church Fathers.

Although the modern editor of Bellarmino’s refutation of Baius stresses that this debate helps to understand the relationship between natural and supernatural—a relationship, he asserts, that since the time of Baius’s condemnation (1567) has not found a definitive systematization—in reality, its importance lies more in Bellarmino’s first adoption of the criteria established by the Council of Trent concerning the proper method of theological inquiry.³¹⁾

An even more important consequence of the dispute with Baius was that it brought Bellarmino into contact with the post-Erasman theological world of the University of Louvain.³²⁾ And those contacts, for the first time, made him fully aware of the importance of the knowledge of Hebrew. In fact, no sooner had he completed his refutation of Baius as a part of a wider commentary on Aquinas’s *Summa* than he began to assemble the material for one of his hardly noticed works: a Hebrew grammar. So involved, indeed, did he become in this project that he put aside the compilation of a systematic treatise against Baius until his opinion was formally requested by the Roman authorities.³³⁾

The main purpose of this grammar, Bellarmino states in his autobiography, stemmed from his conviction that “Hebrew is extremely useful for understanding Scripture.”³⁴⁾ He meant it primarily for the self-taught student who desired to master the elementary structure of that language in a satisfactory manner—“*si non perfectam cognitionem, certe initio, et rudimenta percipere posset.*”³⁵⁾ With this didactical purpose in mind, he divided its content in two parts: a framework of general rules and an exercise in grammatical analysis on the thirty-

third psalm. He organized the content of the first section following the structure he was most familiar with—namely, that of Latin grammar.³⁶⁾ Similarly, he patterned the second section on what students were already used doing under the guide of any teacher of grammar: an analysis of the text word by word. Moreover, to render the exercise more useful, he filled it with references to the grammatical section, indicating not only the page but even the exact location (top, middle, or bottom) on each page where he had explained the pertinent grammatical rule.³⁷⁾ Notwithstanding his emphasis on clarity and simplicity, he did not neglect to observe the humanistic standard of accuracy, and the text of the psalm he presented matches that of a modern edition. The few mistakes that crept in seem due more to the printing process than to Bellarmino himself.³⁸⁾ This work, first printed in 1578, was considerably successful: it ran through several editions, revisions, and enlargements, and it was used through the middle of the seventeenth century.³⁹⁾

To this period of studying and lecturing at Louvain belongs still another work, described by Brodrick as “partly a kind of Hebrew exercise-book, and partly a commentary on Genesis,” which he probably wrote for the sake of some pupils eager to do further exercises in Hebrew. Although, according to Brodrick, this work presents a good example of Bellarmino’s independence of judgment as well as of his fondness for harmonizing conflicting interpretations, it was never published. Moreover, in the same period, he seems to have conspicuously annotated, partly in Hebrew, a Latin Bible, but unfortunately this text has perished.⁴⁰⁾

Bellarmino’s progressive acquaintance with the contemporary theological literature challenged his commitment to biblical philology, engendered a conflict with the interpretation of the biblical decrees of

the Council of Trent, and compelled him to advance a new interpretation of those decrees. In short, he had to find an answer to the question of whether or not his humanistic training was compatible with the theological statements of the Tridentine Council.⁴¹⁾ In his quest for compatibility he focused his attention on three topics: the position and the reliability of the Hebrew text; the alleged unity of authorship of the Septuagint; and, finally, the meaning of the definition of the authenticity of the Latin Vulgate. Beyond these issues and the contingent variety of the languages, there is a single and unifying question: how can one be sure of the authority of a text when its materiality⁴²⁾ is indisputably liable to errors? Then, in the case of a translation, what assures the reader: the ability of the translator, an extratextual authority, or the judgement of the reader? In contrast to the preceding generations of theologians, Bellarmino's philological activity constitutes an engaging case study, for he had the intellectual tools to understand the achievements of, and assess the charges pressed by, the humanists' application of philology to Scripture.⁴³⁾ Yet, philology was not alone in its quest to redefine and challenge authority, even if it was only that of a text. Approximately since the popes returned to Rome from Avignon, the loose configuration of the Lands of St. Peter became a highly visible body politic, indeed a principate, and the role of its regent also required redefinition not only in relation to the Papal State but also in relation to the modern States progressively asserting their own absolute autonomy.⁴⁴⁾ And, tellingly, Bellarmino is present in this field, too, with his theory of the *potestas indirecta* of the Pope—a balance between universal monarchy and the denial of any temporal power.⁴⁵⁾

In focusing his attention on the Hebrew text, one of the preliminary questions Bellarmino had to face was that of the philological reliability

of the transmitted text. He readily admitted that the manuscripts contained the usual kind of errors due to the negligence of the copyists. He was more embarrassed, however, by the thesis, recently rediscovered and reappropriated by several theologians, that the Hebrew text of the Old Testament was doctored by Jewish scholars and thus made unreliable.⁴⁶⁾ In the highest theological pronouncements of his age, the decrees of the Council of Trent, he found nothing that could be helpful to counter that argument. For the Council in considering the recent developments in the field of biblical studies paid attention only to their pastoral or canonical dimension, not to their philological implications. The only positive indication he could derive from that debate was that some of the fathers at the Council had indeed manifested the desire to have an edition of the Bible that was free of errors.⁴⁷⁾ In the contemporary theological debate, on the other hand, he found that the declaration of the authenticity of the “*vetus et vulgata*” was one of the strongest arguments against the need of learning and going back to the Hebrew — an argument that took the form of an objection based on convenience. Why take the trouble of mastering that language when the Latin text was so opportunely declared to be exempt from errors? This was precisely the fear of Gerolamo Seripando (d. 1563), the erudite superior of the Eremitans and papal legate during the last phase of the Council, when he opposed the plan for a too hasty edition of the *vulgata*.⁴⁸⁾ Yet, what for Seripando was still only a fear, for Bellarmino became a reality. In fact, no less prestigious a theologian than the Spanish Dominican Melchior Cano thought he had so well demonstrated the reliability of the *vulgata* that, at least temporarily, there was no need to check it against the Hebrew. In addition, Cano asserted that the Jewish scholars had tampered with the Hebrew text, and, in accor-

dance with the Tridentine criteria for theological inquiry, he buttressed his thesis with a full array of patristic quotations, as well as philological arguments.⁴⁹⁾ When the first prefect of the Congregation for the Council, cardinal Gianpietro Carafa, then Paul IV, stated that the best way to safeguard the position of the *vulgata* lay in a sweeping extension of its authority, not in a philological comparison with the originals, the position of the Hebrew text and Hebrew studies became even more precarious.⁵⁰⁾

In focusing his attention on the Septuagint, Bellarmino had to confront a text generally surrounded by neglect. Renaissance biblical philologists considered it of secondary importance, for it was a mere translation and thus one step below the original Hebrew, and its text was thought to have been corrupted by the Jews, who also did not score well as translators.⁵¹⁾ The Tridentine Fathers, at least initially, further weakened its position by adding their own parochial concerns: it lacked important passages used in establishing Trinitarian and Christological dogmas; and, since it was also the official text of the Orthodox Church, its use would be too big of a concession to a church regarded as schismatic.⁵²⁾ However, especially after the erudite scholar of patristic studies, Guglielmo Sirleto (d. 1585), pointed out to Cervini the connection between the Apostolic Church and the Septuagint and suggested taking it as the model for a unique and normative edition of the *vulgata*, the general attitude of the Fathers changed.⁵³⁾ In the final formulation of the decree on Scripture, the bishops removed any reference to it and limited their concerns to the Latin translation alone.⁵⁴⁾ Thus, even in this case, Bellarmino found no help for solving his problems connected with its alleged unity of authorship.

To a scholar familiar with both Greek and Hebrew and endowed

with a keen perception for subtle stylistic variations, the text of the Septuagint had something unconvincing: the style and the phraseology vary too widely from one book to the other to substantiate the traditional assumption regarding the unity achieved among those seventy translators. For instance, the translator of the book of Job had a remarkable command of Greek, but not of Hebrew—a view also endorsed by modern scholarship⁵⁵⁾—, while the translator of the book of Solomon excelled in Hebrew but not in Greek. The conclusion derived from philological analysis was cogent: the unity allegedly achieved by the translators crumbled, the authority of the text was endangered, and Epiphanius’s description of his visit to the cells where the translation had been made was also bereft of credibility—in other words, the authority of the authorities who supported the text was also slowly being undermined.

On the third topic he was interested in (the meaning of the definition of the authenticity of the Vulgate) Bellarmino found a precise definition of an elusive text:⁵⁶⁾ the “*vetus et vulgata editio*” should be regarded as the authentic version for the Roman Church.⁵⁷⁾ Yet soon after the Council its interpreters divided into two groups of sharply contrasting views: on one side, those who interpreted it in a dogmatic sense and claimed that authenticity meant verbal accuracy; on the other side, those who construed it as a disciplinary measure and maintained that authenticity meant absence of errors in matters of faith and morals.⁵⁸⁾ For the former group, the authenticity guarantees to the user in respect of the quality of the text; for the latter, it guarantees to the user in respect of the usage or the way the text has been used. When, for instance, the Franciscan theologian Andreas de Vega (d. 1556) made one of the first attempts to interpret that definition by pointing out the

presence of errors in the Vulgate and the need to resort to the originals, by viewing the authenticity as a sign or expression of deference, and by considering the occasional character of that decision, the Portuguese theologian Diego de Paya de Andreada agreed, although with the caveat of Roman approbation. Still, it was Carafa (d. 1559) who dismissed that whole interpretation as a very bold position.⁵⁹⁾ In addition, Philip Melanchthon, John Calvin, and Martin Chemnitz attacked the definition for what they thought was its myopic narrowness.⁶⁰⁾ Hence, the whole debate received an additional apologetic coloration.

More important, however, was that the Tridentine decrees also implied a positive step: the production of a text (the Vulgate) “with the fewest possible errors”—(*quam emendatissime*).⁶¹⁾ Although the editorial work began during the first phase of the Council, it was not completed until the last decade of the century.⁶²⁾ In the beginning, Cervini’s enthusiasm guided these efforts. In 1569, when Pius V formally installed the editorial commission for the Vulgate, a new phase began. Subordinating philology to the extratextual criterion of authority, Pius divided the labor of the commission among two groups, one composed of cardinals and the other of scholars. The task of the latter group was strictly philological: to point out incorrect readings and suggest the proper modifications. These findings were then examined by the cardinals, who had to decide which reading should enter into the new text. This procedure, first for contrasting opinions on what should be changed and then for the decision to edit the text of the Septuagint, turned out to be slow and irksome.

Since Sirleto, with whom Bellarmino was acquainted from the time of his studies at the Collegio Romano, was one of the members of the

editorial commission for the Vulgate, Bellarmino resolved that he was the expert to be profitably consulted.⁶³⁾ He wavered, however, but since some of his confreres also wanted him to submit a request on their behalf—no less than a confutation of the writings of the biblical scholars who dared to disparage the Vulgate—he overcame his initial reserve. His first question was on the meaning of authenticity. It could not be a definition of philological nature, he thought, for he had plenty of evidence that the translators of the Vulgate sometimes nodded and departed from the meaning of the originals. His second one centered on the reliability of the Hebrew text of the Bible: was it truly so doctored that no authority at all could be granted except in case of a complete agreement between all the codices? His final question was on the unity of the Septuagint. The only solution he could think of was to consider its original text lost or extremely corrupted, so corrupted, in fact, that he ascribed to it a classical quotation on original sin: “*nemo mundus a sorde, nec infans cuius est unius diei vitae super terram.*”⁶⁴⁾ For a staunch defender of the Septuagint like Sirleto this was probably too much; in any case he did not answer Bellarmino’s questions.⁶⁵⁾

Bellarmino presented his own solution in the first volume of the *Controversiae*, in a section opportunely titled *De verbo Dei*. First of all, he declared that the Hebrew text had survived in an unadulterated form.⁶⁶⁾ In compliance with the Tridentine criteria of theological argumentation, he supported his claim by referring to a patristic thesis, in this case, the argument “*a providentia*”, which was already elaborated by Justine and Augustine. Granted the importance of the Scripture, God’s providence has surely preserved it from any substantial falsification.⁶⁷⁾ Divine providence, however, requires human cooperation, for Scripture was entrusted to the Church as its foremost treasure

— *praecipuum thesaurum*. This was precisely the point where he thought some of his contemporary fellow theologians were uncooperative, lacked due care, and mishandled a precious treasure. In fact, he did not understand how they could state that the sources did not deserve any trust; how they could argue that it was possible to disregard the originals; and, moreover, how they could maintain that only one version survived uncorrupted when there were not even two Latin codices in total agreement.⁶⁸⁾ If the thesis that the text survived unadulterated is accepted, argued Bellarmino, the only point requiring explanation is the role of Esdras in the post-exilic restoration of the Law.⁶⁹⁾ First, he considered the theory that held that the Scripture perished at the time of the Babylonian captivity, but then Esdras restored it upon dictation of the Holy Spirit; for, in antiquity, no less authoritative scholar than Basil had proposed and supported it with data drawn from the fourth book of Esdras. He then dismissed this theory as an “unlikely theory” (*opinio improbabilis*) because, if Esdras wrote under inspiration, he should have rewritten the whole Old Testament in Aramaic, for that was his mother tongue and, indeed, the language in which he wrote the book that bears his name. Bellarmino also regarded as highly improbable the opinion that during the exile all the copies of the Scripture perished, even those in the hands of private citizens. But to dismiss the opinion of a Church Father, he needed a far more powerful argument. And he found it in the decrees of the Council of Trent: Esdras’s fourth book was not among those declared to be canonical and so it was not the best kind of source to reconstruct biblical history.⁷⁰⁾ Consequently, he regarded it more realistic to hold that Esdras acted as an editor, the same as any of the sixteenth-century editors.

In his insistence upon adherence to the Hebrew text, Bellarmino was willing to make exceptions. Taking a cautious attitude toward those scholars (for example, the Dominican translator and editor Sante Pagnini)⁷¹ who overestimated the purity of the Hebrew text, he admitted the presence of errors “that crept in partly because of the negligence or ignorance of the librarians . . . and partly because of the ignorance of the rabbis who added the Massoretic system of punctuation.” Yet he limited the spectrum of errors imputable to the copyists to the confusion between letters of similar shape, and those imputable to the ignorance of Jewish scholars to the moment in which the Massoretic system of punctuation was added to the text. On that occasion, he granted, it was not unlikely that a reading less favorable to Christians could have been introduced. On grounds that these circumstances belonged more to the history of the Jewish people, he suggested ignoring altogether the Massoretic system of punctuation, if this was what was bothering scholars.⁷²

The other exception Bellarmino was willing to make was to admit those passages that appeared to him to have the support of a liturgical tradition or whose deletion was inadvisable for pastoral reasons. This was, for instance, the case of the thirteenth psalm, which in the Hebrew has eight verses less than in the Septuagint and in the majority of Latin codices. In antiquity, Origen and Jerome on a strictly philological ground had already solved this difficulty. According to them, these verses were a collection from different psalms and on Paul’s authority they crept first into the Septuagint and subsequently back into the Vulgate. He accepted this explanation, but he feared that their removal might disturb and scandalize the common believer, who would not be persuaded by and easily agree with the arguments of philology. In

addition, these verses had been there for a long period of time, and thus they fell under the Tridentine criterion for authenticity: the long use by the Church.⁷³⁾ Indeed, Bellarmino's expression "since they had been there for a long time" (*cum longo jam tempore ibi fuerint*) echoes the Tridentine definition "*longo tot seculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia*". In this way, these verses could remain in their traditional place, even for the reason that they were, after all, part of the Scripture. The pastoral reasons he was to expand on later in his *De editione Latina vulgata*. Here he referred to the Church's practice both of correcting some of the errors that crept into the text and of tolerating others. He then reinforced this thesis, quoting Jerome, who expressed concern about not hurting people's feelings with his textual revision, and also reporting the case of the ancient Roman Church, which persisted in using the translation of the psalms based on the Septuagint even after Jerome had made available his new one, more faithful to the original and more elegant.⁷⁴⁾ And this was done, he argued, not out of disregard for Jerome's abilities as a translator, but for the purpose of avoiding a popular upheaval.⁷⁵⁾

The declaration of reliability also ruled out the objection of those who regarded the text as adulterated or falsified by the malice of the Jews. The position of these scholars, he granted, might be dictated by praiseworthy intentions—"zelum quidem bonum" in his own words—but he was not equally sure whether they were arguing with full knowledge of the matter—"nescio an secundum scientiam . . . contendunt." Worst still was that these scholars seemed to ignore totally the weighty arguments produced by Origen, Jerome, and Augustine to demonstrate that the text could not have been falsified either before or after Christ. They also lacked some knowledge of the respect, to the

point of verging on superstition, the Jews had for Scripture. Tampering with the text would hardly be the action of the same people who called for a few days of fasting if, even by accident, they dropped their scrolls on the floor.⁷⁶⁾ But in this case, Bellarmino thought, philology could be a better weapon. If the Jewish scribes had tried to falsify Scripture, they had done a rather poor job. As a matter of fact, they did not tamper with any specific messianic prophecy; and, Hebrew text at hand, he pointed out that in Ps 2 and in Is 53 the messianic prophecies were much more explicit in the original than in the Latin translation.⁷⁷⁾ To the argument that there is a contradiction between the Hebrew and the Latin text in Gn 8:7-8, he pointed out that some codices and printed editions supported the Latin reading. But he also attempted to accommodate the Hebrew reading to that of the Vulgate by simply changing the place where the raven returned, which was, after all, not specified by the text.⁷⁸⁾

Similarly, he ruled out the objections of those who referred to the Church Fathers as witnesses of the textual alterations. In this case he went back to their originals, examined the context of their quotations, and, lo, that position turned out to be based not upon the Hebrew but the Greek text of the Septuagint.⁷⁹⁾ To the authority of writings of the Fathers he also appealed when he had to answer an objection drawn from the Targum. This was the case of the so-called “*tikum sophrim*”, whose textual interventions were sometimes considered as a patent proof, and one given by the Jews themselves, of the alterations performed by their doctors. Yet he considered these interventions as a part of the editorial activity of Esdras and other “prophets” after the exile, not as an instance of corruption of the text.

Even when he was entrusted with the task of checking the writings

of the Jews,⁸⁰⁾ Bellarmino acted as a “censor” guided by a humanistic understanding of history and philology, defending the historicity of the Old Testament against what he thought to be an explanation overloaded with *fabulae*.⁸¹⁾ In particular he chastised those references that were in flagrant contradiction with the “factual” meaning of biblical narrative: the story that the patriarch Jacob was still alive, the story that king David did not sin in committing adultery, and the belief that the creation of the Law took place thousands of years before the beginning of the world. Similarly, the *fabula* connected with the Septuagint itself, that from the moment of its completion darkness covered the earth for three days as divine punishment, had to go because neither Philo nor Flavius Josephus mentioned it.⁸²⁾ For him history was a source of moral teaching par excellence. Thus unedifying episodes, such as that of the women brought to Samson to be inseminated, had to be ruled out, because they polluted the sanctity of Scripture and did not inspire youth with highly moral ideals.⁸³⁾ For the very same reason, the satirist Martial was expurgated before being used to teach pupils Latin in the Jesuit colleges.

Bellarmino’s position regarding those parts of the Old Testament that survived only in Aramaic was exactly the same as that regarding the Hebrew: they had the same unquestioned authority. This led him to consider the position of the Aramaic Targum. Since it was highly esteemed by the Jews, he regarded it as useful even for Christians. Although he contested its interpretation of the messianic prophecies in a collective sense and its presentation of unreliable details—such as the tables of the decalogue made of sapphire—following the editors of the Complutensian Polyglot, he valued it as an appropriate instrument, particularly for an understanding of the Pentateuch.⁸⁴⁾

Even when he was entrusted with the task of censuring the Aramaic translation of the Psalms, Bellarmino based his judgment on philological considerations. True, he did not accept the idea of an independent existence and validity of that text, but he criticized it mostly from the point of view of its internal coherence and fidelity to the Hebrew. In the case of Ps 54:10 and Ps 87:4-5, he pointed out their departure from all the other texts. In Ps 50:13 he noted the presence of an obvious post-exilic insertion, and in Ps 110:1 he remarked that the text, besides departing from the Hebrew, also presented a reading not reconcilable with the following verse.⁸⁵⁾

Concerning the Syriac text of the Old Testament, Bellarmino stated that it did not have the same authority as the Hebrew, since none of its books was originally written in that language.⁸⁶⁾ Nevertheless, he valued it for its antiquity and the support it lent to no less controversial a topic than the soundness of certain Catholic practices. In its titles and chapter headings he found valuable references to support the practice of fasting, the veneration of the cross, prayers for the dead, and other similar devotions that came under fire by humanists and Reformers.⁸⁷⁾

Still in the first section of the *Controversiae*, Bellarmino presented his position on the Septuagint. He apparently put aside what his earlier perceptive philological considerations had thought him on the composite nature of this translation and reconsidered it according to the opinions of the Church Fathers. He thus began to gather texts with a view to number rather than to value. Following Epiphanius's authority, he accepted as the best date of its translation the seventeenth year of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Against Flavius, Philo, and Jerome, but quoting Justine, Clemens of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Epiphanius, and Eusebius, he maintained that the original translation contained the whole Old

Testament. In spite of the authoritative opinion of Jerome, he had no doubts as to its miraculous origin. He asserted:

Vere miraculum fuit quod tot homines simul conferendo, tam brevi tempore potuerint convenire in singulis sententiis transferendis. Ubi enim est multitudo, diversitas iudiciorum evitari non potest, vel numquam conveniunt, vel non nisi post longas disceptationes.

But most probably in this he was also motivated by his negative experience with teamwork, such as that of the editing of the Latin Vulgate. With Augustine and against Jerome he considered it an inspired text and kept calling those seventy bilingual Jews prophets (*prophetæ*), not translators (*interpreters*). However, Jerome's authority was not always against him. For his attitude, Bellarmino noted, was more complex and subtle than the one commonly inferred from his motto: "back to the *haebraica veritas*". He did, after all, emend its Latin translation, and he also did not blame the translation itself, only the errors that crept in.⁸⁸⁾

In assessing its textual reliability, Bellarmino recognized that corruption, to which even an inspired text is subjected, is a byproduct of time. With Philo and Jerome he held that the original translation was a very faithful one; for the learned librarians of Alexandria would not have accepted a text that was less than a very good rendering.⁸⁹⁾ But if, in its first three hundred years of existence, it assembled such a large number of errors that a revision became indispensable, it was hard to believe that more than a thousand years could have elapsed without new errors having crept in.

Still in the same section of the *Controversiae*, Bellarmino presented

his partial answer to the third question. Although the nature of the work led him to consider the objections raised by the Protestants, he cast his whole confutation into the frame of a historical argument. He presented first a detailed description of the history of the Vulgate, with identification of the contribution of its diverse translators.⁹⁰⁾ He then examined its position from the time of Jerome and Augustine to the council of Trent, and illustrated the reasons why it became so authoritative. In accordance with a commonplace of humanistic historiography, he pointed out that the Middle Ages witnessed a general decline of learning, with a concomitant shortage of Hebrew and Greek scholars; under such circumstances it would be unrealistic to pretend that a council, for example, would invite some Jewish doctors to give the right interpretation of Scripture. Hence the use of a Latin text was the only viable alternative. In this way, he concluded, what the council of Trent had sanctioned was a century-long practice, but a practice that entailed a theological presumption: the Church's use of the Scripture could not be wrong.⁹¹⁾

For Bellarmino the Tridentine definition aimed also at reassuring believers that in matters of faith and morals the Vulgate contained no errors. Against Chemnitz and Calvin, he refuted their allegations that the Council had absolutized one version to the disadvantage of the originals, and that it did attribute the errors of the copyist to the Holy Spirit.⁹²⁾ To the translator of the Vulgate, although with hesitation, he denied the gift of inspiration, not in the least because Jerome had openly disclaimed it even for himself. Yet, while he subjected the translators to errors, he thought it correct to assert that, as a matter of fact, they did not err in the translation accepted by the Church—“*tamen dicimus non errare in illa versione, quam ecclesia approbavit.*”⁹³⁾

Cognizant of the presence of errors, Bellarmino listed and exemplified the cases in which he thought it was correct to resort to the originals. An evident error of the copyist required such a step. This was the case of Ps 41:3, where the old text had “*ad Deum fontem vivum*,” instead of “*ad Deum fortem vivum*.” The error took place, he observed, because of the similarity between “*fortem*” and “*fontem*.” Moreover, since the verse began with the expression “*sitivit anima mea*” the reading “*fontem*” was naturally invited.⁹⁴⁾ A variety of readings and the presence of ambiguities also required consultation of the originals. Thus the ambiguity of “*pax hominibus bonae voluntatis*” (Lk 2:14) could be solved by consulting the Greek, where “*bonae voluntatis*” modifies *pax*, not *hominibus*. Care for property of expression and elegant translation, too, sent him back to the original.⁹⁵⁾

It was, however, in his *De editione Latina Vulgata* that Bellarmino presented systematically the gist and the implications of the decree on the Vulgate. The main thesis he supported here was that authenticity is a theological concept, not a philological one. He structured his proof in three stages: a presentation of the common position of the theologians who interpreted the decree, the conclusion he thought could legitimately be drawn, and a list of errors contained in the Latin translation.⁹⁶⁾

The authenticity of the Vulgate, he emphasized, is theological and derives only from the long use of that text by the Church. No philological conclusion on the superiority of the Latin to the Greek and Hebrew can therefore be inferred from that definition. At the same time, the presence of errors can be inferred from its long use, and this point was evident from the writings of the Church Fathers, who attested to the practice of consulting the originals.⁹⁷⁾ Similarly, his views on the nature

of the object of a conciliar definition led him to the same conclusion. Since its object is disciplinary or theological, the sufficient condition for its soundness is the absence of errors in matters of faith and morals, not a perfect correspondence or a word-by-word fidelity of the translation to the originals. He supported this position, adducing what he thought to be the intrinsic limitations of philology. The too numerous and disparate variant readings of the manuscripts made it extremely awkward, if not impossible, to reconstruct a unique and definitive text. The text itself, in its continuous perfectibility, could not be the absolute warranty of the truth of a statement, hence he thought it was the role of the Church to supply the certainty the text did not possess.⁹⁹⁾ An additional dimension of this position is the theory, not peculiar to Bellarmino alone but also held by other sixteenth-century theologians, of the “obscurity” of the text: the text is a game that requires interpretation.

In the same treatise Bellarmino defined the authenticity as the “*signum discretivum*” of one text among many. The Vulgate required such a definition because it was a translation, whereas the Hebrew and Greek text were already authentic in themselves and prior to any conciliar definition. Consequently, the Vulgate stood out among the translations, not the originals. He supported this interpretation by pointing out the absence in the Council’s decision of any reference to the positions of the originals—a position, he said, that had already been stressed and formulated in canon law.⁹⁹⁾ Then, to forestall further objections, he quoted no less a reliable interpretation than that of an insider—Cervini, who in a note to Vega, had partly anticipated his own thesis.¹⁰⁰⁾

At the time of his letter to Sirleto, Bellarmino did not seem to have

been concerned with the critico-textual problems of the New Testament. As developed by the humanists, these problems centered around authorship and canonicity. In no time they become so controversial that they were among the first topics discussed at the Council.¹⁰¹⁾ To eradicate all doubts, the bishops listed all the books that the Roman Church regarded as canonical and restated their traditional attribution.¹⁰²⁾ It was perhaps this unambiguous listing of the canonical books and the unenlightened decision in matter of authorship that led Bellarmino to treat these critico-textual problems for the first time in his *Controversiae*.

To limit the treatment here to the Epistle to the Hebrew, for it is sufficiently representative, Bellarmino knew that Erasmus doubted its authorship and, more importantly, he was aware of the development of these doubts into a rejection of its traditional authorship by the general of the Dominicans, Cardinal Tommaso de Vio (d. 1534), called Cajetan.¹⁰³⁾ He also knew of the argument advanced by the Centurians of Magdeburg: a flagrant contradiction between the description of Paul's conversion in Heb 2:3-4 (taught by the apostles) and that in Gal 1:11-19 (revelation by God). To be sure, he was convinced that truth preceded error, orthodoxy heresy, and good evil; for this was the pattern established from the creation of the world and described in the early chapters of Genesis.¹⁰⁴⁾ Thus, he could not understand why there could still be room for doubts when such early witnesses as Clement of Alexandria and Dionysius, allegedly a disciple of Paul himself, had recognized the epistle as Pauline. He also could not understand why some scholars still insisted on sowing doubts when the Church had accepted the epistle as genuine, even having it read during the solemn mass of Christmas. For him these scholars displayed bad taste for

bringing up “a question already settled” (*quaestio olim sopita*).¹⁰⁵⁾

It was a sense of duty that led Bellarmino to consider these arguments. To solve the stylistic objections of Erasmus and Cajetan he supposed that the epistle could have been written with the help of a secretary or that it was first written in Hebrew and then translated into Greek. And of these two equally probable solutions he chose the first, for it was simpler and quicker. For solving the philological discrepancies this was the greatest concession that a post-Tridentine biblical scholar could make without ignoring the decree on the canonical books. In advancing such a solution, Bellarmino was not alone, for Seripando had already preceded him.¹⁰⁶⁾ To rebut the argument advanced by the Centuriators of Magdeburg, he resorted to a harmonistic interpretation of the two accounts of Paul’s conversion. Paul in Heb 2:3-4, he observed, was talking of “*confirmazione per miracula*”, not of “*confirmazione per doctrinam*”, as was the case in Gal 1:11-19, and therefore he could reckon himself among those who received the faith from the Apostles.¹⁰⁷⁾

In obedience to the letter of the decree on Scripture, Bellarmino denied one of the achievements of the humanistic biblical philology in matter of authorship. Although he wanted to preserve the canonicity of the epistle, he readily granted that the traditional attribution was not established beyond doubt. Whoever its author may be, he argued, the only important point is that it should not be stripped of its apostolic authority. He singled out Barnabas and Clement, two of the most probable candidates for the authorship of the epistle, as “*virī apostolici*” — the nearest position to that of a neo-testamentarian writer he could find.

Still applying a patristic criterion, Bellarmino passed over such

debated topics as that of the original language of some parts of the New Testament (Matthew, Mark, and the Letter to the Hebrews). By some humanist scholars Syrian was supposed to be that language, and its status was further enhanced by the belief that it was the language spoken by Jesus himself.¹⁰⁸⁾ Bellarmino, instead of entering into that debate, simply pointed out that the problem had already been solved when the Fathers accepted Greek as the language of the New Testament. Thus even an eventual discovery of the original Syrian text would not alter that decision. Similarly, he confined to the realm of “so they believe” the claim of the Syrian church that its translation of the New Testament was the work of the evangelist Mark himself, for he could find no patristic evidence to support such a claim.¹⁰⁹⁾

On the value of the Greek New Testament he was certain: the “*editio apostolica*” had the highest authority. He recognized the integrity of the codices, but warned that they were not “*fontes purissimas*”. He illustrated his thesis by giving a few examples of the better readings of the Latin codices: the short ending of the Lord’s prayer; Romans 12: 11 where the Latin had “*Domino servientes*” instead of the Greek *καίρῳ δουλεύοντες*, and 1 Cor 15:47. In this last case he ventured even to quote the opinion of his archrival, Calvin, as an example of a scholar who supported the reading of the Latin codices.¹¹⁰⁾

Bellarmino’s theological and philological knowledge qualified him for a more personal form of involvement in the program of actualizing the Tridentine biblical decrees by participating in the labors of the commission for the edition of the Vulgate. At the beginning of the pontificate of Gregory XIV (1590-1591), he was appointed to that commission. His task was to clear up the mess left behind by Sixtus V (1585-1590). Sixtus’s editorial activity, to borrow Bellarmino’s term-

nology, revealed more “*zelum*” than “*scientia*”, ruthlessness than patient philological acumen. His edition of Ambrose, a kind of rehearsal for the upcoming edition of the Vulgate, is generally regarded as one of the worst ever made. Bellarmino himself criticized it for its insertion of spurious works. A historian of the popes, Ludwig Pastor, regarded it as “disastrous.” The modern editor of Ambrose, Karl Schekel, also chastised it, for its editor worked mostly “*ad arbitrium suum*”.¹¹¹⁾ Yet Sixtus wanted it to be the normative edition for the whole Church.

Sixtus, frustrated by the slowness¹¹²⁾ of the work on the Vulgata but flattered by the success and speedy edition of the Septuagint (published in 1587), and confident of the divine assistance on which he believed he could rely even in matters of textual criticism, took the editorial work of the Vulgate in his own hands, dedicating to it the last two years of his pontificate. Yet, as soon as the first copies were distributed, he began to patch up the text by sending out corrections. After his death, the reaction to his editorial labors was as violent as his intervention in the field of textual criticism was authoritarian. It was the task of Gregory XIV to clear up that mess by appointing a new commission.¹¹³⁾

It was for this newly appointed commission that Bellarmino wrote his short treatise *De ratione servanda in Bibliis corrigendis*.¹¹⁴⁾ This treatise reveals that he regarded methodology as a matter of extreme importance; for a general agreement on methodology would solve most of the previous editorial difficulties and also would have forestalled future objections. To that end it sought the broadest consensus on the methodological rules and procedures to be employed in the edition. It was not intended to focus on the approbation of the text. Since time was running short, this consensus could be sought right there in the

cosmopolitan world of Rome. The syndic of the theological faculty of Paris, who was then sojourning in Rome, could be profitably consulted, and the same could be done with other scholars who also were residing in Rome. Then, to shield their labors from obnoxious criticism, a criticism that could endanger the authority of the papacy, the set of rules should be submitted to the pope for his approbation. Finally, the printed text with the rules could be forwarded to the theologians at the universities so that they might form their own judgment regarding both of them.¹¹⁵⁾

The treatise goes on presenting the advantages of this plan. It points out that the commission would be able to show the rationale for editing the text in a particular manner, rather than relying on an unaccountable subjectivity. It stresses that a truly coherent and uniform emendation could be produced. It indicates, moreover, that the adoption of a clear methodology could expedite their labors by avoiding a futile dragging out caused by the diversity of opinions among those who wanted to keep the text unaltered, those who wanted to change all, and those who chose a middle position.¹¹⁶⁾

Bellarmino based his methodology on the agreement between the four main texts of Scripture, i. e., Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin. Already from the beginning he ruled out some of the combinations; for example, there was no question about changing the Latin if it agreed with the Hebrew against Greek and Aramaic, because the Vulgate was based on a translation from Hebrew. He further narrowed these combinations by considering two main instances: when the Latin presents a univocal reading, and when it presents variant readings. His first question was, therefore, what should be done when the Vulgate, without variants, departed from the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. His

second one was what should be done when the Vulgate had the support of the Greek but was opposed to the Hebrew and Aramaic. He then repeated the same two questions but considering now the presence of variants. To further simplify the work, he suggested disregarding minor variants that would have neither altered the meaning of the text nor made it more obscure.¹¹⁷⁾

The nature of Bellarmino's edition of the Vulgate depends on the answer to his methodological questions. Ryan speculated that Bellarmino would have answered negatively to the first two questions and affirmatively to the rest. He recognized, however, that what Bellarmino was aiming at was "more than a critical edition of the Vulgate".¹¹⁸⁾ Yet Bellarmino's object was clear: a revision of the text based upon the sources that could be counterchecked by any philologist. Although Bellarmino's *De ratione servanda* presents no examples of textual emendations, his *De editione Latina Vulgata* has indications that permit us to reconstruct in a plausible manner a specimen of his textual criticism. In his observations on Gn 8:21, he exemplified the case in which the Vulgate, with no variants, is opposed to the Hebrew and Greek. Here the Latin has "*et ait ad eum,*" whereas the Hebrew and the Greek have "*et ait in corde suo.*" Since there were no reasons to suppose any kind of alteration in the sources, it is the reading of the Vulgate, he concluded, that is corrupted. In his remarks on Gn 38:12, he exemplified an instance in which the Latin is opposed to the Hebrew, but after a long search some old manuscripts supporting the Hebrew were found, and the erroneous reading became even more manifest. In yet another annotation he remarked that, although the Vulgate presents no variant readings, "*omnes codices consentiunt in errore.*" In his respect for the Hebrew, he did not stop even when faced with Jerome's

rendition. In Gn 24:32, Jerome translated: “*dedit aquam ad lavandos pedes camelorum et virorum, qui venerant cum eo*” —a translation suggesting speculations on the puzzling custom of giving water to wash the feet of the camels. Yet Bellarmino looked up the Hebrew, and clearly the water was for the cameleer’s feet, not for the camels.¹¹⁹⁾ Still because of his esteem for the Hebrew text, from 1 Chr 4:22 he deleted, without losing any of his admiration for the miracle, a potential anti-Copernican passage—“*et qui stare fecit solem*”—certainly unaware that it could be very convenient, say, in the case of a stubborn Galileo.¹²⁰⁾

The members of the commission ignored Bellarmino’s memo. They decided instead to redo what Sixtus had undone, restore what he had suppressed, suppress what he had added, reconsider what he had changed, and revise the punctuation. They also established that nothing should be altered without real necessity: variations of small importance could be neglected; variations of importance, however, should be settled by recourse to ancient manuscripts in accordance with the rules laid down by Augustine and other Church Fathers.¹²¹⁾ The only suggestion they accepted was that of not proscribing the Sixtine edition, but as quickly as possible to revise and reedit it, still under the name of Sixtus.

At the moment of printing the text, in compliance with Renaissance standards of text editing, Bellarmino insisted on the insertion of what one could call a sort of “critical apparatus”.¹²²⁾ A selection of variants taken from ancient manuscripts, he observed, would be like having a handy library in one single volume, and readers would be more prone to buy such an edition. He reported the authoritative opinion of Jerome, who advised to note on the margins the cases in which the Latin

departed from the Hebrew, and that of Augustine, who esteemed the variants for the understanding they provided of the diverse meanings of the text. Finally, he noted that the apparatus was convenient even for an apologetic reason: it would furnish a second line of defense if “heretics” attacked the text of the Vulgate. His argumentation was of no avail: the directive encoded in the “*Prefatio ad lectorem*”—namely, “*ut lectiones variae ad marginem ipsius textus minime adnotentur*”—retained its full force.¹²³⁾ After this futile appeal, the only thing he had to do for this edition was to draft the preface, where he kept the name of Sixtus as he maintained it in the dedication of his text of the *Controversiae*, despite their being shelved temporarily by the Congregation of the Index.¹²⁴⁾

It has not been hitherto noted, but the Sixtine “*ne adnotentur*” has an illustrious precedent: Justinian, the promulgator of the *Corpus iuris civilis*, who, in the opening constitution of the *Digest* (const. *Omnem*), ordered “that no one, of those who are skilled in the law . . . may dare to append any commentary to these laws”, save for literal translation into Greek and the composition of explanatory notes on difficult passages (*paratitla*).¹²⁵⁾ That stern Sixtine “dictate” not only brushed aside a patristic counsel but also disregarded the creative practice of the Middle Ages by which countless scholars with their interlinear and marginal glosses created that remarkable system known under the name of “*ius commune*”.¹²⁶⁾

In his late years Bellarmino was well known for his spiritual writings, for his daily involvement in the affairs of the Roman Curia, and for his role in Galileo Galilei’s troubles with the Roman tribunal of the Inquisition. He is not equally known for his attempt to edit the Greek New Testament. True, Copernicus’s *De revolutionibus*, Galileo’s

celestial discoveries, and Antonio Foscarini's attempt to show that the Bible was not the best manual for astronomy were none of his main concerns. Yet he was equally removed from a "*distratta estasi*." For he was working to realize one of the still unfulfilled desiderata of the Council of Trent: the edition of the Greek New Testament.

Quite probably Bellarmino began to think about editing the Greek New Testament during his Capuan exile (1603), when he had the leisure to run through the critico-textual annotations on the Vulgate that one of his old acquaintances from Louvain, Francis Lukas of Bourges, had just sent him. If that reading strengthened Bellarmino's awareness of the insufficiencies of the Vulgate, it also got Lukas to pursue with more determination his task as a philologist. Then in 1606, when Lukas sent another proof of his philological abilities, a set of annotations on the variant readings of the four Gospels, Bellarmino reconsidered the idea of a new edition and remarked that it was perhaps time to get the pope involved: "*si videro textuum ipsum certo in melio alicubi posse mutari, id significabo summo pontifici*." But he had to set aside that idea temporarily, for the pope had a more pressing and urgent problem, namely Venice and its interdict, which required all the abilities of such a consummate controversialist.¹²⁷⁾ It was in 1615, a year apparently free from care, when the self-styled "white and black dog of St. Dominic," Niccolo Lorini, denounced Galileo to the Roman inquisition and his confrere Domenico Caccini went to Rome to testify on the same matter "*pro exoneratione suae conscientiae*," that Paul V put Bellarmino at the head of the commission entrusted with the task of editing the Greek New Testament.¹²⁸⁾ To choose a text upon which to collate the variant readings was Bellarmino's first step. He selected the *Biblia Regia* (the polyglot of Antwerp). Then, during the early summer of the

same year, for the collational work he requested papal permission to bring out of the Vatican library six very ancient codices and borrowed four others from the Valicelliana Library.¹²⁹⁾ On July 25, “*nonostante qualsiasi proibizione o censura*” the permission was granted. In early 1617, knowing that in one library of Augsburg there was a codex of the Gospels “*in perantiqua pergamena descripta,*” he asked one of his local confreres to collate it with the text of the Biblia Regia and to send him the “*varias lectiones.*” By that time, however, he had almost completed the collational work, for to the same confrere he notified “*nos jam progressos esse non parum in accomodanda editione Novi testamenti Graeci.*”¹³⁰⁾

Although completed, Bellarmino’s edition was never published, for it did not receive the final approbation of Paul V. “*Et andando da sua Santità per havere il placet di darlo alla stampa,*” reported Andreas Eudaemon, a member of Bellarmino’s household, at the preliminary inquiry for the beatification’s process, “*per non so che difficoltà. . . non volse si dasse alla stampa.*”¹³¹⁾ The Jesuit historian Tromp accepted that account, and on the reason for the sudden suspension of this project he remarked laconically, “*ignoramus et ignorabimus.*” The biblical scholar Jean M. Vostè argued plausibly that the reason for not publishing it was the fear of repeating the bitter experience of the Sixtine Vulgate. The popularity and the immediate pastoral utility of the Vulgate were perhaps complementary reasons for the pope’s diminished interest in the Greek New Testament and its ultimate suspension.

Vostè also questioned the critical quality of Bellarmino’s edition. An edition of the New Testament, he remarked, was not something that could be done in such a short period of time, and therefore Paul V prudently refrained from giving his approbation to a critically impaired

text that could have dishonored the papacy. Yet his views reflect more the knowledge of a modern biblical scholar than Renaissance philological standards. The amount of time Bellarmino spent on the text was no shorter than that of any other Renaissance editor. The Complutensian team prepared it in a period of two years, and Erasmus in just less than two.¹³²⁾ Robert Estienne published three editions in four years (1546, 1549, and 1550); in his first two he used the Complutensian and Erasmian texts, in his third he added only a well-developed critical apparatus. Moreover, Bellarmino's choice of codices, though not broad, was secure and informed by the humanistic refrain "according to ancient manuscripts." He selected, in fact, the famous Codex vaticanus B (Cod. vat. gr. 1209), which was used to edit the text of the Septuagint; a codex of the Gospels (Cod. vat. gr. 354), written in the year 949; and another codex of the Gospels with a commentary that belonged to Nicolaus of Cusa.¹³³⁾ Unfortunately, the codices he borrowed from the Vallicelliana Library cannot be so precisely identified.

The elaboration of a set of rules was a characteristic of Bellarmino's policy for text editing. He did it for the edition of the Vulgate and also for that of the Greek New Testament. He was unsuccessful in the former case, but he hoped he would be able to implement them in the latter instance.¹³⁴⁾ According to Ryan, these rules reveal a grave limitation of his methodology, for "the text . . ., had it appeared, would have been injured by a criterion entirely extrinsic to the edition of a Greek text": the authority of the Vulgate. Indeed, these rules point out that one of his constant points of reference was the Vulgate, and one of his objects was to give the broadest philological support to the readings of the Vulgate. His fourth rule, for instance, states that an agreement of a Greek manuscript with the readings of the

Vulgate should be pointed out in the critical apparatus. Moreover, some kind of reference to the Vulgate appears in four of the six rules. To be sure, Bellarmino never concealed his satisfaction when the Greek text supported the Vulgate. In writing to one of his confreres in Augsburg, he reported the discovery of an agreement and commented “*quod nobis valde placuit.*”¹³⁵⁾ Yet for any textual change he required that a full explanation should be given in the apparatus. Moreover, it is only in the third rule that he introduces a noticeable limitation in his editorial criteria. It permits a change to be introduced in the Greek text with little and mostly negative evidence in the codices: “*quando Vulgata non refragatur,*” it states, “*et major pars manusciporum contraria est Regie: mutetur Regia.*” For the rest, the Latin is used to shift the balance of weight in favor of certain readings.

A few examples of corrections of the Regia permit a better understanding of Bellarmino’s methodology. Most of these examples refer to his sixth rule, which considers the case “When words have crept into the text from another sacred author no attention should be paid to them.” In Mt 4:10, he observed, the expression “*ὀπίσω μου*” had been introduced because of the similarity with Mt 16:23. He then noted its lack of manuscript support, its omission by the Church Fathers and some contemporary editors, and also its absence in the Vulgate. In the case of Mt 6:18 he argued in a similar manner. He styled the expression “*εν τῷ φανερωῷ*” an unwarranted explanatory clause and concluded “*tollatur.*” In Mt 10:12 he refused the reading “*λέγουντες*” of the Regia, which also had the support of the Vulgate. He then referred to the critical mark of Louvain’s Bible, which indicated a borrowing from the parallel pericope of Luke, and ruled out the verbal form.¹³⁶⁾ These few examples serve to reveal his respect for the manuscript tradition—a

respect more evident in the practice of text editing than in the theoretical formulation of editorial principles.

More importantly, these rules manifest Bellarmino's emphasis on the need for an accompanying critical apparatus: "*annotationes fiant*," commands the fifth rule, "*ad finem uniuscuiusque capituli*." In his mind they served to give the rationale beyond the text as well as to illustrate the soundness of the Vulgate. They also mark a remarkable departure from the negative attitude toward critical apparatus that emerged during the preparatory work for the Vulgate edition and was emphasized in the plain edition of the Vulgate itself. When Niccolo Majorano — the classical scholar, bishop, and victim of Carafa's zeal in implementing the Tridentine decree on bishops' residence—was working on the variants of the Codex Vaticanus B, a discussion arose on the usefulness of publishing such a work. On that occasion, the opinion of Francesco Torres, one of the collaborators of Sirleto, prevailed.¹³⁷⁾ He thought such divulgation perilous, for he feared that these notes could be used by "heretics" to persevere in their own errors or to attack the Church. On the other hand, Sirleto distinguished between the sole variants and their elaboration. Accordingly, he placed Majorano's work under an official ban but let the classical scholar Andrea Masio have a collation of the sole variants of the Codex.¹³⁸⁾ He was, however, consistent in his position, and indeed so consistent that he avoided publishing his own critical annotations on the New Testament.¹³⁹⁾ It is likely, therefore, that when Bellarmino insisted on the necessity of the critical apparatus, he had in mind this negative attitude that he wanted to overcome. In this regard, his critical apparatus, despite its limitations and its apologetic nature, would have brought the whole work up to Renaissance standards.

In spite of the theological principle “*ecclesia semper reformanda*,” those ecclesiastical personalities whose primary task is to check that the principle operates in reality easily grow tired of reform. Contrary to what happened in the field of the humanities, where the ideals of classical antiquity could be imitated or even surpassed, in the theological realm the high ideal set by the Council of Trent—the Age of the Fathers—could be imitated, never surpassed. Humanist biblical scholars, in their efforts to restore the text of the Scripture to its pristine integrity, endeavored to bridge the gap between themselves and the Apostolic Church. At the beginning of the seventeenth century their philological efforts seemed to have achieved that particular end. Thus biblical scholarship came to a standstill, not only when Paul V withheld his approbation of Bellarmino’s Greek New Testament or when Marcantonio Colonna’s attempt to edit the Hebrew Old Testament ended with his request to borrow the codices of the Patavine monastery of St. Giovanni in Verdara¹⁴⁰⁾ (if not with his death), but also when the Elzevir Press of Leyden in the preface of its edition of the New Testament claimed “*textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus.*” When, in 1609, the canonist Francisco Pena, recommended to Paul V nobody else but himself to be the censor of the perfectly Tridentine work of “questo cristianello” (Bellarmino’s *Controversiae*), the age of the Tridentine reform was certainly over.”⁴⁴¹⁾

All these instances may well exemplify the progressive withdrawal of the post-Tridentine Church from the field of active cultural production—here the emblematic case of Galileo should be mentioned again as one of the best known instances of this disengagement.¹⁴²⁾ For the field of biblical philology the long-term consequences of this withdrawal

were not totally negative. The task of text editing, after a parenthetical interlude such as was seen in the authoritarian edition of the Vulgate by Sixtus, was then returned to the hands of specialized philologists, where it had started almost a century earlier with Valla and Erasmus.

The “*malitia temporum*” and a papacy that was growing more and more into a visible body politic placed Bellarmino in the position of being regarded as the chief ideologist of the Tridentine Reform. Considering the challenges he had to face, from Baius to Protestant theologians, from the controversy on grace between Jesuits and Dominicans to the Venetian interdict, from Galileo’s affair to the controversy on the “*potestas*” of the pope, just to mention a few of the major controversies in which he was engaged, his acceptance of most of the achievements of Renaissance philology seems backward looking. In this juncture, where philology shattered a long cherished view of authoritative texts, such as Scripture and the *Corpus iuris canonici*, his versatile mind attempted to reconcile the conflicting demands of authority and philology. By advancing the theory of the “obscurity of the text” he thought to settle the upheaval philology had started and ended up placing a “guardian” (which hardly allowed emancipation) beside an “underage” text. Yet, even under the unpredictable mantle of “*obscuritas*” there seems to be one possibility: let scholars live with the contingent, yet perfectible, results of philological research. Naive medieval scholars thought and taught that “*textus*” came from “*texere*” (to weave) and “*auctor*”, and its cognate “*auctoritas*”, from “*augere*” (to increase).¹⁴³ It is not to be doubted that the invention and diffusion of printing has altered our perception of the text, fixing it to benefit diffusion and forestall manipulation. Bereft of its “*augere*,” the concep-

tion of the author also has changed: authors became the fathers of the text. The locus of authority, too, changed: from the multijurisdictional world of the Middle Ages to the unijurisdictional world of the “absolute state”. With this specter looming large on the horizon, it comes as no surprise that Bellarmino put a “guardian” beside the text.

Notes

- 1) P. Redondi, *Galileo eretico* (Torino, 1983), pp. 5-7; also see a review of this work by V. Ferrone and M. Firpo, “From Inquisitors to Microhistorians,” *Journal of Modern History* 58 (1986): 485-524.
- 2) Quoted from G. Fulgiatti, *Vita Roberti Bellarmini . . . Italice primum scripta. Latine reddita et aucta a Silvestro Petra Sancta* (Leodii, 1626), lib. VII, cap. III: “vir clarissimus, theologus eminentissimus ac fidei Catholicae propugnator acerrimus, haereticorum malleus,” and “aeque pius, prudens, humilis, ac summe elemosinarius.”
- 3) Ibid., *Preface*; lib. I, cap. I; lib. II, cap. IV; and D. Bartoli, *Della vita di Roberto Bellarmino* (Rome, 1687); P. Tacchi-Venturi, *Il beato Roberto Bellarmino* (Rome, 1923).
- 4) A. Arcangeli, *Vita del venerabile cardinale Roberto Bellarmino . . . descritta da un divoto del medesimo* (Rome, 1743), pp. 216-331, and the preface.
- 5) J. Brodrick, *The Life and the Work of Blessed Robert Francis Cardinal Bellarmine* (London, 1928); for the self-criticism, see his *Robert Bellarmine, Saint and Scholar* (Westminster, 1961), pp. ix-x.
- 6) On Döllinger, see Walter Brandmüller, *Ignaz von Döllinger am Vorabend des I. Vatikanums. Herausforderung und Antwort* (St. Ottilien, 1977).
- 7) J. Turmel, *Historie de la théologie positive depuis l'origine jusqu'au Concilie de Trente* (Paris, 1904).
- 8) P. Polman, *L'element historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVIe siecle* (Gembloux, 1932); E. A. Ryan, *The Historical Scholarship of Bellarmine* (Louvain, 1936), pp. 133-147, gives an evaluation of Turmel's and Polman's position.
- 9) P. Duhem, *The Theory of Physical Reality* (1st ed. Paris, 1909; New York,

- 1952).
- 10) Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine*, pp. 332-378, particularly pp. 365-366, note 3. U. Baldini, "L'astronomia del cardinale Bellarmino," in *Novità celesti e crisi del sapere* (Florence, 1984), pp. 293-305.
 - 11) G. Morpurgo Tagliabue, *I processi di Galileo e l'epistemologia* (Rome, 1981), pp. 13-71.
 - 12) G. De Santillana, *The Crime of Galileo* (Chicago, 1955), pp. 101-102. For the proper cultural context in which these manuals of piety proliferated, see E. Cochrane, *Italy: 1530-1630*, ed. by J. Kirshner (London and New York, 1988), pp. 192-193.
 - 13) Bellarmino, *Opera oratoria postuma*, ed. S. Tromp (Rome, 1942-1945); X. M. Le Bachelet, *Auctarium Bellarminianum. Supplément aux Oeuvres du Cardinal Bellarmin* (Paris, 1913); id., *Bellarmin avant son cardinalat, 1542-1598. Correspondance et documents* (Paris, 1911); id., *Bellarmin et la Bible sixto-clémentine: étude et documents inédits* (Paris, 1911).
 - 14) Döllinger-Reusch, *Die Selbstbiographie des Kardinal Bellarmin, lateinisch und deutsch mit geschichtlichen Erläuterungen* (Bonn, 1887); S. Merkle, "Grundsätzliche und methodologische Erörterungen zur Bellarminforschung," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 8 (1926); Ryan, *The Historical Scholarship*, pp. 194-198. The text of this autobiography was also published by Brodrick, in *The Life and the Work*, 1: 460-481 (hereafter abbreviated as *Autobiography*).
 - 15) For Sacchini as an historian, see E. Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago and London, 1981), pp. 449-457, 463-471.
 - 16) *Autobiography*, pp. 463-464. The use of the siglum "N." can be interpreted as a "sign" of humility, but it must be pointed out that on two other occasions Bellarmino resorted to a similar device: a pseudonym. First, under the pseudonym of "Franciscus Romulus" he published, in 1587, his *Responsio ad precipua capita Apologiae quae falso catholica inscribitur*—against Belloy's *Apologie*; the second time, under the pseudonym "Matthaeus Tortus" he published, in 1608, his *De potestate summi pontificis in rebus temporalibus*—against Barclay's *De potestate papae*.
 - 17) *Autobiography*, p. 461: "Ingenium habuit non subtile et elevatum, sed acomodatum ad omnia, ut equaliter se haberet ad omnes disciplinis capiendis." Also see p. 478.
 - 18) *Ibid.*, p. 460: "addicta erat elemosinis, orationi et contemplationi, jejuniis et corporis castigationis." See also Brodrick, *The Life and the Work*, pp. 1-11. For Cervini's humanistic background, W. V. Hudon, *Marcello Cervini, Curial and*

- Episcopal Administrator* (DeKalb, 1992).
- 19) *Autobiography*, p. 465: “Accidit autem illi, ut forte legeret conciones Cornelii Bituntini Episcopi, et ad ejus imitationem inciperet conciones scribere ad verbum, et recitare non sine magno labore.” For Bellarmino’s own views on preaching, see his *De ratione formandae concionis*, in *Auctarium*, pp. 655-657. For preaching in the context of the Tridentine Reform, see Cochrane, *Italy*, pp. 119-120, 197. On Mussos’s efforts to bring humanist style and rhetoric to bear on preaching while preserving the Franciscan tradition, see Corrie E. Norman, *Humanist Taste and Franciscan Values: Cornelio Musso and Catholic Preaching in Sixteenth-Century Italy* (Bern, 1998).
- 20) *Autobiography*, pp. 464-466. In preaching, besides biblical foundation and patristic inspiration, the consent of a superior authority should also be stressed, as Bellarmino himself duly noted.
- 21) *Ibid.*, p. 461; for the closely related topic of music, see A. Bernier, *Un cardinal humaniste, saint Robert Bellarmin, de la Compagnie de Jésus, et la musique liturgique* (Montreal, 1939). For Bellarmino’s early training up to his entrance into the novitiate and, thereafter, in the Collegio Romano, see M. Scaduto, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia, III. L’epoca di Giacomo Lainez. Il governo (1556-1565)* (Rome, 1964), pp. 272-282.
- 22) *Autobiography*, p. 464: “quotidie discebat quod alios doceret.”
- 23) *Ibid.*, pp. 468-469: “applicavit animum ad eam linguam discendam, et cum didicisset alphabetum ab aliquo perito illius linguae, et aliqua rudimenta grammaticae, confecit ipse sibi grammaticam hebraicam, faciliiori methodo, quam Rabbini soleant, et brevi tempore linguam hebraicam quantum theologum satis esse videtur; et instituit Accademiam.” For the grammars of this period, see W. Bacher, *Die Hebräischen Sprachwissenschaft vom 10. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert* (1st ed. 1892), now reprinted in *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistics* IV (1974), pp. 133-235; H. Hirschfeld, *Literary History of Hebrew Grammarians and Lexicographers* (London, 1926), pp. 99-102; and L. Kukenheim, *Contributions à l’histoire de la grammaire grecque, latine et hébraïque à l’époque de la Renaissance* (Leiden, 1951).
- 24) *Autobiography*, p. 463; for a concise presentation of Bellarmino’s theological method in the context of the Tridentine Reform, see Cochrane, *Italy*, pp. 191-193.
- 25) *Autobiography*, p. 466. Incidentally, it must be pointed out that this scholastic philosophy, particularly logic, unpalatable to humanists, came to play an important role in the intellectual formation of Galileo; on this, see M. A.

- Finocchiaro, *Galileo and the Art of Reasoning: Rhetorical Foundations of Logic and Scientific Method* (Dordrecht, 1980); W. A. Wallace, *Galileo and His Sources: The Heritage of the Collegio Romano in Galileo's Science* (Princeton, 1984).
- 26) *Autobiography*, pp. 467-469; Ryan, *The Historical Scholarship*, pp. 37-72.
- 27) *Autobiography*, p. 468. For an overall view of Baius in the age of confessional dogmatics, J. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)* (Chicago and London, 1984), 4: 374-385.
- 28) For an evaluation of this debate in a theological and anthropological perspective, see G. Galeota, *Bellarmino contro Baio a Lovanio. Studio e testo di un inedito bellarminiano* (Rome, 1966), pp. 100-164. For Baius in general, see J. B. Duchesne, *Historie du Baianisme or de l'heresie de Michel Baius* (Douay, 1731); F. X. Jansen, *Baius et le Baianisme* (Louvain, 1927); and J. Alfaro, "Sobrenatural y pecado original en Baio," *Revista española de teología* 12 (1952): 1-75.
- 29) For Ignatius's own brand of positive theology, see *Monumenta historica Societatis Iesu. Monumenta Ignatiana*, II/1, pp. 554; and *Monumenta historica Societatis Iesu. Monumenta Ignatiana*, III. *Constitutiones*, III, pp. 117-119, c. 5: *De doctrina, cui scholastici societatis studere debent*; and pp. 119-128, c. 6: *Quo modo iuветur scholastici ad has facultates bene addiscendas*.
- 30) Galeota, *Bellarmino contro Baio*, p. 363, discusses the contrast between councils and Augustine. For patristic scholarship during the Tridentine Reform, see Cochrane, *Italy*, pp. 132, 136-137; for the Augustinianism in this period, see A. D. Wright, *The Counter-Reformation* (New York, 1982), pp. 1-83.
- 31) Galeota, *Bellarmino contro Baio*, p. 5.
- 32) For the institution, after considerable opposition, of the "*collegium trilinguae*", see H. De Vocht, *History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilinguae Lovaniense (1517-1550)*, *Humanistica lovaniensia* 10-13 (Louvain, 1951-1955).
- 33) Galeota, *Bellarmino contro Baio*, pp. 41-54; Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine*, pp. 25-50.
- 34) *Autobiography*, p. 468.
- 35) *Institutiones linguae Hebraicae ex optimo quoque auctore collectae . . . una cum exercitatione in Psalmum XXXIII* (Lugdunii, 1596); the quotation is from Bellarmino's "*Admonitio ad lectorem*". Earlier in the century, around 1503-1504, Conrad Pellikan, a Minorite from Alsace, had published a rudimentary Hebrew grammar (*De modo legendi et intelligendi Hebraeum*), asserting that he

- had mastered that language alone.
- 36) In contrast to the sophisticated cultural operations performed by the Humanists, such as Valla's *Elegantiae*, rudimentary teaching has not attracted much scholarly attention; among the exceptions is P. F. Gehl, *A Moral Art: Grammar, Society, and Culture in Trecento Florence* (Ithaca and London, 1993), pp. 82-106, where the author describes the kind of exercises to which pupils were subject by teachers of grammar.
- 37) For Latin grammar as a model for any other grammars, see G. A. Padley, *Grammatical Theories in Western Europe, 1500-1700* (Cambridge, 1985). This model was then accepted and followed by Jewish scholars: Hirschfield, *Literary History*, pp. 99-102.
- 38) For the Hebrew text of the psalm, see *Institutiones linguae Hebraicae*, pp. 179-180.
- 39) C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Bruxelles, 1890), vol. 1, coll. 1115-1153.
- 40) Brodrick, *The Life and the Work*, pp. 45-46.
- 41) For the impact of humanism on biblical studies, see G. Bedouelle, "L'accès à la Bible du milieu du XVe siècle aux environs de 1530," in *Bible de tous les temps*, Vol. 5. *Le temps des Réformes et la Bible*, ed. by G. Bedouelle and B. Roussel (Paris, 1989), pp. 18-121; L. B. Pascoe, "The Council of Trent and Bible Studies: Humanism and Scripture," *The Catholic Historical Review* 52 (1966): 18-38; and A. Vaccari, "Esegesi ed esegeti al Concilio di Trento," *Biblica* 27 (1946): 320-337.
- 42) Needless to say, the invention of printing, the mechanical reproduction of a text, and the possibility of diffusing it beyond the circle of those who could afford manuscripts, made the problem of a normative and uniform text more acute than before.
- 43) Incidentally, humanistic philology also threatened canon law. With less éclat than burning the *Corpus iuris cononici*, Valla showed that the Donation of Constantine was a forgery and Antoine Augustin laid down the groundwork for a more reliable edition of that *Corpus* in 1580. Yet, in keeping with his humanistic training, Bellarmino was not involved in the preparation of this product of the Tridentine reform.
- 44) For this transformation, P. Prodi, *Il sovrano pontefice. Un corpo e due anime: la monarchia papale nella prima età moderna* (Bologna, 1982), pp. 15-40.
- 45) On the concept of "*potestas indirecta*," see J. C. Murray, "St. Robert Bellarmine and the Indirect Power," *Theological Studies* 9 (1948): 491-535; and, for the

- historical context in which Bellarmino elaborated this doctrine, F. Oakley, "Complexities of Context: Gerson, Bellarmine, Sarpi, Richer, and the Venetian Interdict of 1606-1607," *Catholic Historical Review* 82 (1996): 369-396. It is misleading to look at Bellarmino as if he was merely engaged in a debate with the "absolute" dimension of the modern State; he also engaged political thinkers who upheld conciliarism. On this controversy, see F. Oakley, "Bronze-Age Conciliarism: Edmund Richer's Encounters with Cajetan and Bellarmine," *History of Political Thought* 20 (1999): 65-86.
- 46) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin e la Bible*, pp. 4-7, 104-105.
- 47) See *Concilii Tridentini, Actorum* (Freiburg, 1911), V/2: 58-57, for the debate; and pp. 91-92, for the text of the two decrees on Scripture. The desire that the new text, of the Bible in this case, should be "free of errors" (*quam emendatissime*), is not an entirely new claim. Particularly with regard to law and medicine, medieval jurisprudence and university authorities paid much attention to the production of reliable texts; see F. P. W. Soetermeer, "La carcerazione del copista," *Rivista internazionale di diritto comune* 6 (1995): 153-189; id., *Utrumque ius in peccis. Aspetti della produzione libraria a Bologna fra Due e Trecento* (Milan, 1997), pp. 133-158.
- 48) H. Jedin, *Papal Legate at the Council of Trent, Cardinal Gerolamo Seripando* (St. Louis, 1947), pp. 95-98, 295-296. See also Seripando's letter to the eventual printer of the Vulgate, Paolo Manuzio, in A. Ceruti, *Lettere inedite di dotti italiani del secolo sedicesimo* (Milan, 1876), p. 75.
- 49) M. Cano, *De locis theologicis*, II, XIII.
- 50) For Carafa's and Cano's position, see G. Buonaccorsi, *Questioni bibliche* (Bologna, 1904), pp. 12-13; E. Emmi, "Il decreto tridentino sulla Volgata nei commenti della prima/seconda polemica protestantico-cattolica," *Angelicum* 30 (1953): 107-130, 228-272; and P. Batifol, *Le Vatican de Paul III a Paul V* (Paris, 1889), p. 73.
- 51) B. Hall, "Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 3. *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 38-93. Blaming sixteenth-century biblical scholars for not appreciating the Septuagint as a tool to go beyond the Massoretic text would be anachronistic.
- 52) For the position of the participants to the Council, see *Concilii Tridentini, Tractatum* (Freiburg, 1930), XII/1, pp. 509-511.
- 53) For Cervini's position, see *Concilii Tridentini, Actorum* V/2, p. 27; for Sirleto's letters to Cervini on the Septuagint, see *Concilii Tridentini, Epistolar-*

- um* (Freiburg, 1916), X/1, pp. 934-939.
- 54) For the final decision, see *Concilii Tridentini, Actorum* V/2, pp. 65-66.
- 55) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, p. 105. Also G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint I: The Book of Job* (Lund, 1946), pp. 31, 75 where the author states that "the Greek Book of Job is a genuine Hellenistic work, created by and familiar to circles comparatively foreign to all exclusively Jewish lines of thought."
- 56) For the fluctuating meaning of the term "*vulgata*" even in Jerome, see F. Stutcliffe, "The Name 'Vulgate'," *Biblica* 29 (1948): 345-352; and A. Allgeier, "Haec vetus et vulgata editio. Neue wort- und begrieffgeschichtliche Beiträge zur Bibel auf dem Tridentinum," *ibid.*, pp. 353-390.
- 57) For the text of the decree, see *Concilii Tridentini, Actorum*, pp. 91-92. The conundrum stemming from the identification of the *vulgata* with a precise text is well described by Seripando in a letter to Amulio. According to Seripando, the Council had decided that for preaching, lecturing, and engaging theological controversies a common text, the *vulgata*, should be used. Yet uncertainty existed on "qual fosse questa vulgata, perché qualunca si pigliasse, si troverebbe non star così hora, come era citato da alcuni padri sotto il titolo della vulgata." Furthermore, establishing a normative text would violate the principle of "freedom" attested by the Greek and Latin church: "si torrebbe ancora quella libertà, quale è sempre stata lodata nella chiesa tanto greca quanto latina di poter leggersi et servirsi a buoni propositi di tutte le interpretationi della sacra Scrittura, ancor che fossero Giudei et heretici . . ." Finally, the adoption of a restrictive policy would be counterproductive, for "quanto più vogliamo ligare et restringer l'ingegni, tanto più si sciogliono et allargano."
- 58) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, p. 104; Buonaccorsi, *Questioni*, pp. 7-74; and G. Vostè, "La Volgata al Concilio di Trento," *Biblica* 27 (1946): 301-319.
- 59) B. Ermmi, "Il decreto tridentino," pp. 107-130, 228-272; *id.*, "Senso e portata del decreto sulla Volgata," *Angelicum* 30 (1953): 347-374.
- 60) P. Melancthon, *Acta Concilii Tridentini anno MDXLVI celebrati: una cum annotationibus* (s. l., 1546); J. Calvin, *Acta Concilii Tridentini una cum antidoto*, in *Corpus reformationum* XXXV, coll. 371-506; M. Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (Frankfurt, 1556-1573).
- 61) For the decree, see A. Maichle, *Das Dekret 'De editione et usu sacrorum librorum,' seine Entstehung und Erklärung* (Freiburg, 1914); R. Draguet, "Le maître louvaniste Dreido, inspirateur du décret de Trent sur la Vulgate," in *Miscellanea historica in honorem Alberti De Meyer* (Louvain and Bruxelles,

- 1946), pp. 836-854.
- 62) For Bellarmino's role in the edition of the Vulgate, see Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, pp. 13-73; Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine*, pp. 112-120; id., *The Life and the Work*, 1, pp. 269-309; and F. Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata* (Mainz, 1868), pp. 379-496.
- 63) On Sirleto, see G. Denzel, *Kardinal Guglielmo Sirleto: 1514-1585* (Munich, 1966); Cochrane, *Italy*, p. 189. Bellarmino and his cousin, Ricciardo Cervini, met Sirleto for the first time four days after their arrival in Rome: Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Lainez*, p. 281.
- 64) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, pp. 103-106.
- 65) Brodrick maintains that Sirleto answered indirectly by sending some material to Peter Canisius. But see his *Saint Peter Canisius* (New York, 1936), pp. 727, 789, where that material is described; and p. 718, where Brodrick states that Canisius wrote that what he had received were "ancient texts that may serve to defend the Mother of God against the heretics."
- 66) *Disputationum de controversiis christiane fidei adversus hujus temporis hereticos* (hereafter abbreviated as *Controversiae*) in Bellarmino, *Opera omnia* (Venice, 1721), 1: 34-35, lib. II, c. 1: *Ostenditur editionem Hebraicam Mosis et Prophetarum numquam periisse.*
- 67) *Controversiae*, p. 36, lib. II, c. 2: *Utrum Hebraica editio sit corrupta.*
- 68) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, p. 116.
- 69) *Controversiae*, p. 34; for Bellarmino's position on the canon of the Old Testament, see *Controversiae*, pp. 6-8, 10-23.
- 70) For the definition of the canonical books of the Old Testament, see P. G. Dunker, "The Canon of the Old Testament at the Council of Trent," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 15 (1953): 277-299; and G. Bedouelle, "Le canon de l'Ancien Testament dans la perspective du concile du Trent," in *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament. Sa formation et son histoire*, ed. by J. -D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger (Geneve, 1984), pp. 253-282;
- 71) T. M. Centi, "L'attività letteraria di Santi Pagnini (1470-1536) nel campo delle scienze bibliche," *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 15 (1945): 6-51. His translation from the originals, *Veteris et novi testamenti nova translatio per Sanctum Pagninum nunquam edita, approbata a Clemente VII*, was published at Lyon in 1527 (Florentine style). Antonio Brucioli used this text for his vernacular translation (Venice, 1532) and claimed that his rendering was based on the originals.
- 72) *Controversiae*, p. 37: "qui partim irrepserunt negligentia, vel ignorantia

- librarium. . . partim ignorantia rabbinorum qui addiderunt puncta.”
- 73) *Controversiae*, p. 37.
- 74) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, p. 113.
- 75) For a classical description of such a popular upheaval, see Augustine, *Epistulae*, Ep. LXXI; for Jerome's fears at the moment of presenting his revised text, see his preface to the text of the Gospels in *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, ed. R. Weber (Stuttgart, 1983), 2: 1515-1516.
- 76) *Controversiae*, p. 35-36.
- 77) *Controversiae*, pp. 36-37. For the interpretations of the passage, in particular of Saadia Gaon, Salmon ben Yeruham, and Yefet ben Eli, see *The Messiah in Isaiah 53*, ed. by Joseph Alobiadi (Bern, 1998).
- 78) *Controversiae*, p. 36; Cano, *De locis*, I/II, c. 13.
- 79) *Controversiae*, pp. 36-37.
- 80) K. R. Stowe, “The Burning of the Talmud in 1553, in the Light of Sixteenth Century Catholic Attitudes toward the Talmud,” *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 34 (1972): 435-59.
- 81) For the position of the Jewish Roman community, see K. R. Stowe, *The Jews in Rome* (Leiden, 1995-97), vol. 1, pp. xxx-lvii.
- 82) For Flavius Josephus's historiographical, political, religious, and cultural concerns, see L. H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Leiden, 1998), pp. 539-70.
- 83) Le Bachelet, *Auctarium*, pp. 658-660, n. 101: “Impudicae narrationes passim insertae explicationi sacrarum literarum, quae et sanctitatem Scripturarum, et institutioni juventutis non parum efficiunt.”
- 84) *Controversiae*, p. 38, lib. II, c. 3: *De editione Chaldaica*.
- 85) Le Bachelet, *Auctarium*, pp. 660-661, n. 103: *Censura in versionem Chaldaica Psalmorum*.
- 86) *Controversiae*, pp. 38-39, lib. II, c. 4: *De editione Syriaca*.
- 87) Around the middle of the century, the Syriac text of the New Testament caused a stir and nurtured hopes that the originals of Matthew and Hebrew could be found. Its status was also enhanced by the belief that it was the language Jesus spoke. While Reformers used it to dethrone the Vulgate, their opponents undermined its credibility by showing that it was not as “old” as claimed and that the language was not understood. On the history of this version, see B. M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 48-63.
- 88) *Controversiae*, pp. 40-42, lib. II, c. 5: *De variis Graecis editionibus*; c. 6: *De*

interpretatione LXX Seniorum.

- 89) *Controversiae*, p. 42.
- 90) *Controversiae*, pp. 43-44, lib. II, c. 8: *De editionibus Latinis*; 44-46, lib. II, c. 9: *De auctore vulgatae editionis*.
- 91) *Controversiae*, pp. 46-48, lib. II, c. 10: *De auctoritate Latinae editionis vulgatae*.
- 92) For the debate with Chemnitz on the canonical books of Scripture, see P. Fraenkel, "Le débat entre Martin Chemnitz et Robert Bellarmine sur les livres deutérocanoniques et la place du Siracide," in *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 283-312.
- 93) *Controversiae*, pp. 48-49, lib. II, c. 11: *Solvuntur obiectiones hereticorum contra vulgatam Latinam editionem*; see also pp. 47-48 for Bellarmine's list of errors that Calvin and Chemnitz made in interpreting the Tridentine decree on the Vulgate. For the alleged inspiration of Jerome as a translator, see E. Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore, 1985), pp. 173-199. The change in viewing Jerome's role is made evident by paintings: in contrast to Renaissance iconographical standards, the dove, symbol of the Holy Spirit, is depicted beside Jerome.
- 94) The text "*iuxta vulgatam versionem*" reads "sitivit anima mea Deum fortem viventem," but see also the critical apparatus for the variants.
- 95) *Controversiae*, pp. 48-49; Cano, *De locis*, II, c. 14.
- 96) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, pp. 107-112.
- 97) *Ibid.*, pp. 112-113.
- 98) *Ibid.*, p. 114.
- 99) In contrast, Seripando lamented the absence of any reference to the position of the originals; see his letter to Amulio, cited above, note n. 56.
- 100) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, p. 115.
- 101) In relation to the canon of the Old Testament, a summary and an analysis of this debate is provided by P. G. Duncker, "The Canon of the Old Testament," pp. 282-292. The various proposals to consider, inside or outside the conciliar forum, the objections to books whose paternity was questioned, came to nothing.
- 102) *Controversiae*, pp. 1-6, 8-10. For humanistic biblical scholarship in general, see J. H. Bentley, *Humanists and the Holy Writ* (Princeton, 1983).
- 103) On his brand of biblical scholarship, see U. Horst, "Der Streit um die hl. Schrift zwischen Kardinal Cajetan und Ambrosius Catharinus," in *Wahrheit und Verkündigung. Festschrift Michael Schmaus* (Paderborn, 1967), pp. 551-577; A. F. von Gunten, "La contribution des l'Hébreux à l'œuvre exégétique de

- Cajetan," in *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Geneve, 1978), pp. 46-83; and T. A. Collins, "Cardinal Cajetan's Fundamental Biblical Principles," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1955): 363-378.
- 104) Ryan, *The Historical Scholarship*, pp. 63-80, 103-126.
- 105) *Controversiae*, pp. 24-27, lib. I, c. 17: *De epistola ad Hebreos*. For the Tridentine debate on the canon, see A. Maichle, *Der Kanon der biblischen Bücher und das Konzil von Trient* (Freiburg, 1929).
- 106) See *Concilii Tridentini, Tractatum*, pp. 483-496, 473-508, for the position of other theologians on the same topic.
- 107) *Controversiae*, p. 25.
- 108) Hall, "Biblical Scholarship," pp. 73-76.
- 109) *Controversiae*, pp. 38-39, lib. II, c. 4: *De editione Syriaca*. The first printed edition of the Syriac New Testament was prepared by the humanist Johann Albrecht Widmanstadt (1508-1559) and printed in Venice by Michael Cybermann in 1555. Instead of this text or the edition prepared by Immanuel Tremellinus, professor of Hebrew at Heidelberg, and printed at Geneve in 1569, Bellarmino might have consulted a later edition of Widmanstadt's text (1556?) that contains an appendix of Syriac texts comprising the Sanctus, the Lord's prayer, the Athanasian creed, the Magnificat, and a prayer for the dead. For a description of this edition, see F. C. Burkitt, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* XI (1906), pp. 265-268.
- 110) *Controversiae*, pp. 42-43, lib. II, c. 7: *De editione Graeca Testamenti Novi*.
- 111) Bellarmino, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, in *Opera* VII 93-95; with regard to Ambrose's work Bellarmino seems to prefer the Parisian edition of 1549. See also L. Pastor, *The History of the Popes*, XXI, 210; *Ambrosii opera*, ed. by K. Schenkel, in CSEL XXXII (Vien, 1897), pp. lxxvii-lxxix, in particular p. lxxviii, where the editor states: "maximum damnum Ambrosii libri illatum est editione illa a Felice cardinali de Monte Alto."
- 112) The slow progress was noted by Carafa in a letter to Salmeron (17 giugno 1569): "quanto a i progressi nostri nella correttione della Bibbia pochissimi sono perche in tutto un mese non habbiamo fatto una congregazione. . .", H. Höpfl, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgate," *Biblische Studien* 18/1 (1913): 1-339, citation at pp. 308-309. Two years later Amulio, in a letter to Seripando (10 settembre 1561), aired a similar complaint: "la correctione va molto lunga et uno o due huomini possono fare poca cosa a si grand'opera, bisognando vedere molti testi. . .", *ibid.*, p. 305.
- 113) Brodrick, *The Life and the Work*, pp. 269-309; Pastor, *The History of the*

- Popes*, 24: 222-226. For archival documents on the publication of the Sistine Bible (1590), see P. M. Baumgartner, *Die Vulgata Sixtina von 1590 un ihre Einführungsbulle* (Munster, 1911).
- 114) For comparison, see the note submitted in 1576 by Giovanni Cagra on the “modo facile, et sicuro, di essequire in Roma, senza gravar la Camera, il Decreto della Quarta Sessione del Concilio di Trento, che ordina, *ut Sacra Scriptura quam emendatissime imprimatur*” (edited by Baumgarten, *Die Vulgata Sixtina von 1590*, pp. 141-150). Faulting more the printers than the scribes for the errors that crept into the text of the Bible (and also illustrating his point with the claim that this new “*arte*” had introduced more than six thousand errors in the editions of the conciliar documents) and fearing that the same could happen to the editon of the breviary, the missal, and Scripture, he focused on how to “*ridurre i Stampatori a debita obedientia*.” The philological work of editing the text does not go beyond the construction of a structure comprising “*Classi*”, “*Collegi*”, and “*Uffitii*” on the model of the state apparatus.
- 115) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, pp. 128-129.
- 116) *Ibid.*, pp. 127-128.
- 117) *Ibid.*, pp. 127-127.
- 118) Ryan, *The Historical Scholarship*, pp. 163-169.
- 119) On this verse, see A. Vaccari, “Ad lavandos pedes camelorum (Gen. 24, 32),” *Biblica* 7 (1926): 439-443. Unable to understand Jerome’s peculiar construction of this sentence, the editors of the Sixtine and Clementine Vulgate, against the unanimous reading of the codices, emended “*pedes camelorum*” to “*pedes eius*”. For other scholars puzzled by this reading, see E. K. Rand, “Dom Quentin’s Memoir on the Text of the Vulgate,” *Harvard Theological Review* 17 (1924): 197-264, especially pp. 260-261.
- 120) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, pp. 119-125.
- 121) C. Vercellone, *Variae lectiones Vulgate Latinae* (Rome 1860), lix-lxxvi.
- 122) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, pp. 137-141, 142-145, for Bellarmino’s insistence on a variety of Latin translations of Scripture.
- 123) This prohibition engendered a caviling debate on whether “*adnotationes*” ought to be permitted at the bottom of the page. The matter was settled by the Biblical Pontifical Commission on November 1921, see *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 19 (1922): 27.
- 124) Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine*, pp. 105-111; H. Reusch, *Der Index der Verbotenen Bücher. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen-und Literaturgeschichte* (Bonn, 1883-85), 1: 503.

- 125) Dig. prooem. const. *Omnem* § 21.
- 126) On how medieval jurists skirted the Justinianic prohibition to gloss the text, see R. Orestano, *Introduzione allo studio del diritto romano* (Bologna, 1987), pp. 51-173.
- 127) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, 168-175. Francisco Luca Burgensi, *Romanae correctionis in Latinis Bibliis editionis vulgatae jussu Sixti V Pont. Max. recognitis, loca insigniora* (Antwerp, 1603); id., *Notarum ad varias lectiones in quatuor evangeliorum* (Antwerp, 1605); id., *Libellus alter continens alias lectionum varietas* (Antwerp, 1618).
- 128) S. Tromp, "De revisione textus Graeci Novi Testamenti facta Romae a commissione pontificia circa 1617 praeside S. R. Bellarmino," *Biblica* 22 (1941): 303-306.
- 129) L. M. Vostè, "De revisione textus Graeci Novi testamenti ad votum Concilii Tridentini facta," *Biblica* 24 (1943): 304-307. The Cod. Vat. Gr. 1150 is a collection of canonical texts. Vostè's indication should be read, perhaps, Cod. Vat. Gr. 1159, which corresponds to a text of the Gospels.
- 130) Tromp, "De revisione textus Graeci," p. 303.
- 131) *Ibid.*, p. 303.
- 132) For a brief account of Erasmus's scholarship and his editions of the Greek New Testament, see L. Bouyer, "Erasmus in Relation to the Medieval Biblical Tradition," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 2. *The West from the Early Fathers to the Reformation* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 492-505; Hall, "Biblical Scholarship," pp. 59-61; and E. Rummel, *Erasmus as a Translator of the Classics* (Toronto, 1985), pp. 85-102. The first hastened ("precipitatum verius quam editus") edition, published by Froben, appeared in 1516; the fifth, in 1535.
- 133) For the description of the codices, see H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testament* (Berlin, 1902) I/1 59; K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin, 1963); P. Canart and V. Peri, *Sussidi bibliografici per i manoscritti greci della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Vatican City, 1970); and R. Devreesse, *Le fonds grec de la Bibliothèque Vatican, des origines a Paul V* (Vatican City, 1965).
- 134) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, p. 177; Ryan, *The Historical Scholarship*, p. 170.
- 135) Tromp, "De revisione textus Graeci," p. 305.
- 136) Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible*, pp. 169-170.
- 137) P. Paschini, "Guglielmo Sirleto prima del cardinalato," in *Tre ricerche sulla storia della chiesa nel cinquecento* (Rome, 1945), pp. 198, 210-212.

- 138) P. Paschini, "Un ellenista del cinquecento: Niccolo Majorano," in *Cinquecento romano e riforma cattolica* (Rome, 1958), pp. 221-236.
- 139) These adnotations have been studied and published by H. Höpfl, "Kardinal Wilhelm Sirlets Annotationen zum Neuen Testament. Eine Verteidigung der Vulgata gegen Valla und Erasmus," in *Biblische Studien* 13, 2 Heft (1908): 1-126.
- 140) L. M. Vostè, "De revisione Bibliae Hebraicae iuxta votum Concilii Tridentini," *Angelicum* 18 (1941): 387-394.
- 141) Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine*, p. 110, where Peña's letter to Sixtus V is reported.
- 142) For an evaluation of the impact of Galileo's case, see Cochrane, *Italy*, pp. 282-283; and also R. J. Blackwell, *Galileo, Bellarmine and the Bible* (Notre Dame, 1991).
- 143) A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), pp. 9-72.